

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1902.

Number 229.

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.

Fitzsimmons, the prize fighter, has been made somewhat of a butt for ridicule because in referring to his recent defeat in the prize ring he said:

I prayed to win this fight. It was the first time I ever prayed to win. I lay in that room and prayed: 'God give me strength to win this battle, and I will be thankful. Amen.'

There does seem to be a false ring about that. But why should it be any more incongruous for a prize fighter to pray with sporting zeal for divine strength to "slug" his adversary, than for a clergyman to pray with patriotic fervor for military victories? Is it so much more religious to kill than to "slug."

If a report of the 19th from London is true, a use has been found for idle "nobles," Lady Raglan having agreed to place her coronation robes and coronet on exhibition for the benefit of a charity, wearing them herself just as in real royal life. She thus becomes as educational as a wax figure, while the exhibition is more lifelike. Admission fee six cents.

Anglo-Saxons, proud of their lineage and contemptuous of the dark-hued Ethiopian, might profitably pause to consider the simple plea for fair play which the Negro congress recently held at Atlanta has put forth. "In spite of theorists and their theories," they say, "we have shown ourselves able to live and thrive. A generation ago we came out of bondage without a foot of land, without a home, without a name. Even the clothes which covered our poorly clad

bodies were not ours. To-day we have some land, some homes, some money. Yesterday we had nothing; to-day we own millions of acres of land, pay taxes on property worth millions of dollars, and raise more cotton under freedom than under slavery." With all his boasted superiority, the Anglo-Saxon will find it hard to match that record of triumph, achieved, be it noted, in his own peculiar and chosen field—acquisition.

John W. Gates is one of the most "successful" men of the time. He is, therefore, worth listening to when he talks about success, as he did one day last week in a special newspaper interview given out at Saratoga. The airy way in which he scouts the growing idea that there is less chance for a boy now than formerly, rises almost to the plane of certain kinds of high art. It is delicious. Greater successes than were ever dreamed of are yet to be made, he says, but there will not be "so great a chance for success per man!" What can young men ask better than that? If the successes of the successful are sufficiently spectacular, who cares if the chance per man is worse? Yet Mr. Gates is making dangerous concessions when he thus confirms the idea that however roomy the top may be in business life, things are getting more and more crowded at the bottom. It is the chance per man that counts with all but gamblers.

Early next week the legislature of Ohio is to meet in special session to consider the enactment of a municipal code applicable to all the cities and villages of the state, this having been made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court of the state (p. 249) holding that the municipal charters of the state are special

legislation. Among the proposed codes to be submitted is one prepared for and approved by the State Board of Commerce. This is not complete, its authors having announced their intention of adding clauses with reference to taxation, borrowing, etc. But as far as it goes it is as nearly an ideal code as the constitution permits.

Under the Ohio constitution the legislature is required to provide for the organization of cities and villages. The authors of the code in question therefore assume that it need only provide a method of organization, leaving the details to each municipality upon home rule principles. Also that the method must be uniform as to all cities and uniform as to all villages, the distinction between cities and villages being the only distinction which the state constitution recognizes. Upon this hypothesis, which appears to be valid, the proposed code rests. It provides for municipal constitutions to be adopted by the villages and cities respectively at local constitutional conventions, the candidates for which are to be nominated only by petition and voted for upon ballots which shall not distinguish them by party names or symbols. These constitutions are to be easily amendable, and except in certain particulars, not many, are unrestricted. There must be a mayor elected by popular vote, who shall have the veto power; also a council, vested with legislative authority. And certain ordinances—notably those granting franchises or levying taxes—can be adopted only in compliance with specified formalities intended for public protection. But in the main, this code would leave the responsibility for good city and village government altogether with the inhabitants of each muni-

cipality. It is emphatically a home rule measure.

The officers of the American Anti-Trust League deserve a reputation for patience and perseverance. In their efforts to dig out the trusts through the attorney general's office and the White House, they resemble nothing so much as a persevering dog industriously making the dirt fly at one end of a ground hog hole, while the ground hog suns himself at the other end and looks on. If the league hasn't already reached the conclusion, it must reach it soon, that the administration has no more intention of enforcing the anti-trust law than it has of living up to civil service principles. The attitude of this administration toward trusts was determined once for all when Mr. Roosevelt went to Pittsburg to make a Fourth of July speech under the chaperonage of his pro-trust attorney general, and warned his auditors that the trusts must be handled very tenderly lest they collapse and do untold damage to Republican prosperity.

Mr. Roosevelt now has before him a letter from a joint committee of the Anti-Trust League and an assembly of the Knights of Labor. It was written last July, but remains unacknowledged as it probably always will. This letter recites the experience of the committee for a year past in their work of trying to get the administration to move against the trusts. They wrote to the attorney general August 19, 1901, receiving in reply an admission that he had formerly been the legal adviser for the Carnegie steel trust, but accompanied with an assurance that his department was ready to enforce the Federal laws "wherever there is probable cause for believing that they have been violated." Acting upon that assurance the committee submitted a sworn brief of evidence of violation of the anti-trust law by the Carnegie steel trust, the great steel trust, the armor plate trust, several railroad combinations, the Standard Oil trust and the anthracite coal trust. The attorney

general replied on the 11th of September, 1901, with a promise to "examine these papers with care at as early a date as is possible" and advise the committee of his conclusions. That is now nearly a year ago; but the attorney general has neither notified the committee of his conclusions nor proceeded against the corporations accused.

After waiting in vain more than three months for the attorney general to act upon their charges against the trusts named above, the joint committee already mentioned prepared the documentary evidence, absolutely conclusive as to the facts, against what is known as "The Eastern Railroad Association," and submitted it in person to President Roosevelt himself. This was on the 21st of December, 1901. The President utterly ignored the subject for three months, but in response to a reminder sent him on the 3d of April, 1902, he caused his secretary to reply that the papers had been "by the President's direction brought to the attention of the attorney general on March 27." The secretary suggested in his letter that the committee "communicate with Mr. Knox on the subject." They attempted to do so, but from that day to this have been able to get no further response about the case submitted than the assurance of a clerk in the attorney general's department that Mr. Knox "says he will not be able to take it up at all." Having waited three months longer, until the 9th of July, the committee laid all the facts before President Roosevelt, and as yet they have heard nothing from him. While they are digging away in this fashion for the trust ground hog, can't they see him cozily perched upon Mr. Roosevelt's shoulders and from that safe vantage ground watching their performances with amused curiosity?

The particulars of the case against "The Eastern Railroad Association," about which the administration manifests so much and such suspicious reserve, were given in full to

Congress on the 21st of June last, in a series of documents which Representative Dudley G. Wooten embodied in a speech from the floor. From these documents it appears that "The Eastern Railroad Association" is a secret combination of nearly all the railroads of the Atlantic coast. By the terms of the combination agreement each railroad is prohibited from making terms for the use of any patented invention, without the consent of a committee of the "combine," thus subjecting inventors of railway improvements to the dictation of the combined railroad interests. The attorney general's office during Cleveland's administration, and again under McKinley's, gave opinions to the effect that this combination is not prohibited by the anti-trust law. But neither opinion referred to judicial precedent, nor was either based upon any definite and controlling legal principle. Both were personal rather than professional opinions. Against these adverse opinions the joint committee of the Anti-Trust league and Knights of Labor have submitted the opinion of William E. Chandler, together with a carefully prepared professional opinion by Senator Turner, both of whom advise that the case comes clearly within the anti-trust law. In the absence of direct judicial precedent their views are apparently borne out by the text of the law, while those of Attorney General Olney and Attorney General Griggs are apparently not. For that law forbids "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce, among the several states," etc., and also combinations "to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several states," etc. If the railroad "combine" above described is not such a combination it is hard to understand what would be. Clearly the combination is organized to nullify trade rights in patented inventions. While the owners of patents are not entitled as a rule to much sympathy, since they also are monopolists, there is abundant

truth in Mr. Chandler's remark, that if patents are objectionable it is for Congress, not for railroad "combinations," to abolish them. However all this may be, the charge against the administration is that it refuses to prosecute a trust against which at least probable cause is shown, and that it haughtily and contemptuously ignores citizens who furnish it with evidence sufficient to convict should the courts hold the law applicable. This is only one case, and no more proves a pro-trust animus on the part of the administration than one swallow makes a summer; but when considered in connection with the manner in which other complaints against trusts have been treated by the administration, it goes far to confirm the growing and just belief that from top to bottom the administration is dominated by trust interests and sympathies.

After a three months' investigation Mr. Frank B. Thurber reported to the Trans-Mississippi Congress at St. Paul on the 19th that he had been unable to substantiate the charge that there is a beef trust. There probably is none, then, for Mr. Thurber has a well-trained eye for trusts.

To thousands all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf far up into the primeval forests of Canada, this description by John Stone Pardee's Red Wing Argus, of Frank D. Larrabee, the Democratic candidate for attorney general of Minnesota, will be intensely interesting:

His father was a Republican of the Lincoln following, an abolitionist when abolition was a title to persecution, which is in itself sufficient reason for his son's being a Democrat. Larrabee himself took it for granted he was a Republican, and cast his first vote for a Republican President. But when he moved to Minnesota in 1882 he put in his kit a copy of "Progress and Poverty." He read it three times that winter. He saw the injustice of letting speculators hold land out of use while workers pay the taxes on their useful belongings for the speculator's enrichment. He saw that equality of rights was not accomplished by abolition of chattel slavery and that

inequalities were perpetuated by Republican policies of tariffs and bounties. He became a Democrat down to the roots, and anyone who has traced the influence of Henry George knows that type of democrat. He never held office but that once in Clay county, never asked for it, took an honor that was thrust on him then as he accepts the nomination for attorney general now. He has never been looking for office, but he has never ceased to labor for the cause of Democracy, a cause to him for such earnestness and zeal as the ardor of abolition was to his father.

One of the gratifying features about the coming election in Illinois is the disposition of independent voters to break up the combination rings of Democratic and Republican politicians in legislative districts, by taking advantage of the law providing for minority representation in the lower house of the legislature. Under this law members of the lower house are elected at large in senatorial districts, three from each. Every vote counts three if cast for one candidate, one and a half if cast for two candidates, and one if cast for three candidates. It is possible, therefore, to elect a minority party candidate in almost any district by throwing the full party vote for one man, which multiplies it by three. Consequently, Republicans are accustomed to nominate only two candidates in Republican districts, while Democrats nominate only two in Democratic districts, each thereby leaving the way open for one minority candidate to be returned. A nomination is usually, therefore, equivalent to election. So, instead of promoting good government this system has made it easier than ever for monopoly corporations to control Illinois legislatures. They have had only to control the nominating conventions. But this year the independent vote of both parties is revolting against these corporate "combinations" in politics.

One district in which a vigorous revolt is being made is the seventh senatorial, where Western Starr is the Democratic candidate for senator (p. 276) against the notorious John

Humphrey. The corporations felt so certain of Humphrey's election in a district which is overwhelmingly Republican, believing that Republicans would vote for a yellow dog if he bore the regular party label, that they neglected the Democratic nomination for senator and Starr got it. He is indorsed by the Voters' League, and unless the Republican voters of the district have been correctly sized up by the corporations, he will defeat Humphrey. But the corporations were not so careless with reference to the Democratic nomination for the lower house. Under the minority system his election was assured. They accordingly looked to it, and secured their own kind of candidate, a member of the local Democratic-Republican ring. Now, however, a Republican candidate has been put forward. Like Mr. Starr for the senate, he is indorsed by the Voters' League. This is Frank E. Herdman, who has been for three years president of that remarkable exemplar of home rule and direct legislation, the village of Winnetka. If the democratic-Democrats of his district vote for him alone, each of their votes will count three and probably result in the defeat of one of the corporation candidates. If, on top of that, they and the democratic-Republicans of the district unite and elect Starr as senator, one of the worst nests of political and corporate corruption in the state will have been broken up.

Another district in which the Democratic-Republican combination is to be assailed by a representative minority candidate is that in which Alderman John Powers holds sway. Only one Democrat has been nominated there for the lower house, and his brand is no riddle. Nominations having always been equivalent to election, the corporations have seen to it that the nominee should not be too democratic but just Democratic enough. But this cozy arrangement is to be rudely broken into by Clarence S. Darrow, partner of the late Gov. Altgeld, who has been nominated by petition and will make a

fight to win. Mr. Darrow is too well known all over Chicago, to say nothing of the rest of the state, as a democratic-Democrat, to need any further mention of his candidacy. He, like Mr. Herdman, of Humphrey's district, is making the very use of the minority representation law that it was intended for: he is giving the independent minority of both parties in his district a chance to vote with political effect against the political corruption about which they say so much and feel so deeply between elections. Every vote for him, and for no other candidate for the lower house of the legislature, will count three. His election thereby would make an instance of genuine minority representation, and put into the legislature an independent statesman instead of a corporation puppet.

So indifferent to the law and so reckless of the rights of possibly innocent persons accused of crime have the Chicago police become, they have at last aroused public sentiment against their "sweatbox" methods. The case in which they have done this is a murder mystery. With an impudent and criminal disregard of the safeguards with which the law designs to prevent arbitrary arrest, they arrested a man upon suspicion and held him in close custody at a police station six days, without a warrant, without bringing him before a magistrate, without even "booking" him as a prisoner; and while they thus held him a prisoner in defiance of the law, they subjected him to the "sweatbox" process to force a confession from him, or failing in that to entangle him in statements that might serve to weave a network of inculpatory evidence about him.

These police inquisitors became so bold that they allowed their "sweating" questions and the friendless and helpless and nervous prisoner's answers to get into the newspapers. It was in consequence of that that the prisoner was taken from their custody. Two well-known lawyers, Mr. Meagher and Mr. Darrow, prompted

thereby to bring the lawless proceeding to an end, sued out a writ of habeas corpus, and as soon as the prisoner came into court he was transferred from the "sweatbox" to the county jail, where he should have been taken immediately upon his arrest.

A remarkable thing about these lawless inquisitorial methods, is the notion that seems to prevail, even among lawyers, that when not cruel they are proper. They are not proper under any circumstances—cruel or kind. The first right of a prisoner is to be advised of the accusation against him and warned that he need not incriminate himself. If, after that, he makes a confession, it is his own affair. But until he has been so warned and has expressed a willingness to answer questions, his custodian has no more legal right to cross-examine him than he has to shoot him. Experience has proved that only by giving this immunity to all prisoners, guilty and innocent alike, can the innocent be protected from injury. Even in open court, no judge would dare question a prisoner without the prisoner's full consent, given after he had been advised of his rights. Every lawyer knows this. Then how can any intelligent lawyer defend the police practice of cross-examining prisoners in secret in a police station, provided physical cruelty be not introduced?

If a prisoner must not be questioned in open court, by a responsible judge with lawyers present to guard his rights and the whole community looking on and listening, then by what labyrinthine reasoning is it concluded that irresponsible police detectives may question him in the seclusion of a cell, where the prisoner has no lawyer and the public can neither see nor hear? If it is true, as some insist, that prisoners ought to be subjected to inquisition in order that the mysteries of crime may be disclosed, if our lawmakers and judges have been mistaken in their

tenderness for the rights of prisoners and the law in that respect ought to be changed, then let it be changed in the regular way—by the people and not by police detectives. If the continental practice of bringing prisoners before a court of first instance and probing them with questions is indeed better than the English and American doctrine that no one shall be compelled to give evidence against himself, then let us surround the inquisition at least with continental safeguards. Secret though they are, the proceedings of the continental courts of first instance are conducted by a responsible public prosecutor, before a responsible judge, and under legal rules and limitations. They are not conducted, as is the "sweatbox" inquisition, in defiance of rules, beyond the reach of judges, and by irresponsible detectives bent on making a case. It is to be hoped that the indignation at the police "sweatbox" now aroused in Chicago will not subside until it is voluntarily abandoned or some of the police who practice this species of crime are indicted and punished.

For some curious reason or other the recent international convention of the Typographical union, at Cincinnati, followed the example of last year's convention at Birmingham, in refusing to inquire into the relation of wages to taxation. The fact that the proposition came from members who advocate the single tax could hardly account for it, upon the reasonable assumption that the delegates were clothed in their right mind, for the resolutions proposed did not declare for the single tax. Resolutions advocating the single tax, or socialism, or any other reform about which the trade is not agreed, might be properly voted down. But the resolutions in question were simply these:

Whereas, labor organizations in New York, Colorado and other states are agitating for changes in the present system of taxation; and whereas, taxation has a vital effect upon the demand for labor and the rate of wages,

Resolved, that a committee of nine be appointed to investigate the relation of wages to taxation and report to the next convention of the International Typographical Union.

It is difficult to account for the refusal to make so sensible an inquiry. Of course, the socialists voted against it, as they did last year. Being committed to the narrow policy of drawing class lines, as the primary social reform, they would naturally oppose such an inquiry. To them it has a middle class flavor. But their vote was too small to account for the defeat of the resolutions. Other influences must have been at work. The professed objection was that the resolutions were political. Yet these very objectors voted to condemn "government by injunction," which is more distinctly political. However, there was a gratifying increase in the affirmative vote, over that of last year; and the Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' union, which met in international convention in the same city and at the same time, adopted the resolutions and appointed a committee to make the inquiry and report next year.

How much more alert than the Typographical union are the labor organizations of the mining regions near Johannesburg in the Transvaal. They have adopted a declaration of principles in which an emphatic demand is for "the taxation of land values, irrespective of improvements."

Mr. Bryan has set the "reorganizers" guessing again. In answer to an inquiry from the Times-Democrat of New Orleans, he writes:

I shall not be a candidate for the Presidency in the next campaign and, I may add, I have no choice beyond the desire to see some one nominated who was loyal, not only to the ticket, but to the platform in 1896 and 1900, and who, if elected, could be trusted to stand by the people in their struggle against organized wealth.

The latest astute explanation of Mr. Bryan's attitude is that he expects the party to be defeated in 1904 and is in training for 1908! Such guesses are vastly easier to people with ma-

ture and lusty prejudices than the simple and obvious explanation that Mr. Bryan's chief anxiety is that when the Democratic party does win at the election it shall not lose after the inauguration. Indeed, one experience of that kind ought to be enough for all Democrats who are not assistant Republicans.

#### THE FOUNDATION PRINCIPLE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.\*

There are only two general classes of government, whether for nation, state or municipality. One is autocratic, or government by superior power and without responsibility to the people governed. The other is democratic, or government by the people themselves through their own responsible agents. In greater or less degree every government on the face of the earth, large or small, national or local, has one or the other or both of these characteristics. And in establishing new governments, including new charters for cities, it is impossible to avoid adopting one or the other, or in a weak spirit of compromise confusing the two.

The question at such a time is which of these great opposing principles to prefer. Thomas Jefferson very distinctly preferred the democratic. He taught that government derives its just powers solely from the consent of the people governed. So did Abraham Lincoln, for his ideal was government of the people for the people and by the people. It may seem academic to quote these men and appeal to these principles. But have we not reached a point in the problem of municipal government where consideration of first principles, even at the risk of being thought academic, is imperatively demanded?

Experimentation in municipal government without regard to elementary principles, which has been the rule in this country since the question of municipal government became a problem, is a proved fail-

\* Written by Louis F. Post. Reprinted from the Columbus (O.) Daily Press of August 11, 1902, for which it was expressly prepared. The Press is edited by Ellis O. Jones, is the official organ of the city of Columbus, and is one of the most aggressive Democratic papers of Ohio. Its Democracy is democratic.

ure. Then why grope any longer? Why not make our further experiments in the light of the principle that Jefferson taught and Lincoln proclaimed, and that most men of all parties accept as true?

One of the most notorious failures in municipal administration is administration by state boards, having no responsibility to the people whose municipal affairs they administer. It is a system that finds favor only with politicians, especially with those whose party is in the minority in the home city, but in power in the state. Over and over again it has been demonstrated that the board-governed city is a boss-ridden city.

But a boss-ridden city is something to be avoided. Are we not repeatedly reminded that the municipal boss is the head-devil of municipal mischief? Then the cause of this mischief, or at least one great cause, must be the board system from which the boss so easily springs. If bossism is to be prevented, then, board government must be avoided. Instead of board rule we must have home rule.

Home rule is the ideal for city government. Let there be a municipal constitution, brief and general, applicable to all the cities of a state, which leaves the people of each as free to manage their own municipal affairs in their own way as the state constitution permits, and the problem of municipal government will soon solve itself. This does not require every municipal office to be elective. A system in which there are too many elective offices destroys responsibility by dividing it. Efficiency is thereby diminished, the popular judgment is confused, and many of the objectionable peculiarities of board rule are developed.

Responsibility to the people of a municipality is best secured not by electing every official, but by electing a council and a mayor, and making subordinate officers appointive. If they are appointed by an elective officer he is responsible to the people for them as well as for himself. This is the essence of popular government. While parliamentary power is best for legislation, one-man power is

best for administration, provided the one man is fully responsible directly to the people of the municipality whose affairs he administers.

With a constitution drawn upon the lines indicated above, including authority, of course, to establish the initiative and referendum as a check upon corruption in the councils, the cities of the state adopting it would soon become mædels for municipal government everywhere. And why shouldn't the state of Ohio make this experiment—this experiment in harmony with sound political principles, and the only one that has not yet failed? Now that the way is clear for almost ideal municipal legislation in Ohio, why cling to the systemless experimentation which has everywhere and in all its variations only made the baffling problem of municipal government still more baffling? Why not turn to first principles and give the rest of the country an example of an elastic municipal system, of a true home rule system, of a system of municipal government by the people governed?

Under such a system every Ohio city would be free to express the degree of civilization to which its inhabitants aspire, and through it the spirit of emulation and local pride would tend to lift them all to a realization of better and better things in municipal affairs.

### THE DEPENDENT MASSES.

Man thinks by necessity.

The coal strike and the beef trust, to their credit be it said, are making people think who were till then, to all appearance, incapable of that operation.

Every kick makes the donkey travel. And even a donkey can see that a cordon of monopoly is being drawn tightly around the American people as elaborately and effectively as those which Lord Kitchener's forces used in entrapping the Boers—a cordon which surely and inevitably reduces them to the condition of a garrison on the point of capitulation.

The people are beginning to open their eyes at last.

They are usually asleep at election times. Their periodical visits to the

polling booth resemble a somnambulist procession.

Now they have a bone to pick with the capitalist monopolists and "we shall see what we shall see."

"Well, but surely people can do what they like with their own," your smooth-tongued, full-bellied, empty-headed, trust-bamboozled simpleton will say.

Of course they can.

Where is the security for property if a man can't "wallop his own nigger?" or lock up at his own sweet will the mine that God specially created for the exclusive benefit of himself and his heirs in perpetuity? There is none.

If the public are in any way inconvenienced by the prospect of anthracite coal reaching the respectable figure of \$14 a ton, the public will please remember that their welfare formed no part of the intention embodied in the special creation above referred to; and that it is thankful they ought to be that these coal barons, out of the goodness of their hearts and not as a matter of legal compulsion, do sometimes keep their mines open, and allow the people to purchase these "black diamonds" if they have the money.

Really, democracy, thy name is ingratitude!

For think for a moment of the obligations you are under to these owners of the earth. Instead of keeping to themselves every square inch of the country, as they might have done, they actually allow you, the public—yes, you, the common scum of humanity; the accident of accidents whom a breath might make as a breath has made—to use the city streets and the country roads, aye and the railroads, too, for a consideration, as though your names were written in the original charter conferred upon these superior beings.

Is there need of more evidence?

Well, then, let us take the tariff wall. These same classes said to you: "Let us build this wall to keep the foreigner out; for if the blamed foreigner gets a chance he will fling coal, beef and other deadly missiles not provided for in the Geneva convention, at your unprotected heads, until the necessaries of life become so

dirt cheap that you can't afford to buy them because you will have no work to do."

This was quite right. Men from whom, as above shown, you derive your permission to live, deserve all the help that little microbes like you can give them.

But now here comes the rub.

A few degenerate parasites, grossly unworthy of the patronage and protection thus extended to them, are not ashamed to assert now, that the tariff wall was built, not to keep the foreigner out, but to shut the American citizen in! Can ingratitude and audacity go further than that?

Is there any sufficient reason why these worse-than-anarchists should not be hanged? None at all—unless it be that ropes are too expensive owing to the trust having, in obedience to fashion, sent up their price.

They are always crying out for justice, these agitators.

But they have had more than justice, they have had mercy!

And for that they must thank the trusts.

T. SCANLON.

## NEWS

The civil war in Hayti (p. 296) appears now to have extended all over the republic, and conditions are reported as growing worse daily. Government troops under Gen. Nord Alexis were defeated again on the 14th in a battle at San Miguel, which they burned upon retreating. But notwithstanding the military situation, the new chamber of deputies was organized at Port au Prince on the 19th, with Deetjen Senequist as president of the chamber; and proceedings for the election by the chamber of one-third of the senators, pursuant to the constitution of 1889, were begun.

The attack upon Cumana, on the north coast of Venezuela, in the State of Cumana, and not of "Bermudez," as accidentally misstated last week (p. 296), culminated on the 19th in the defeat of the government forces and the occupation of the city by the revolutionists, who now hold several customs ports, including Cumana, La Guairas, Angustora, Vela, and Barcelona. At Angustora three



steamers of the Orinoco Co., belonging to Americans but which fly the Venezuelan flag and had been forcibly taken by the Venezuelan authorities for government uses, were captured on the 14th by the revolutionists. The rebel general, Matos, is reported as menacing Caraccas, the capital of Venezuela, from Uritucu, to the southeast; and the strategic coast point of Porto Cabello, to the west, is threatened and its capture has been reported and denied. Should this point be captured by the rebels, the possession of the coast city of Barcelona would enable them to hem in President Castro. His position is regarded as serious.

Attention is once more directed to the revolution in the neighboring republic of Colombia (vol. iv., p. 760), by a possible clash between that country and Great Britain over a question of transporting government troops in British merchant vessels. The Colombian authorities at Buenaventura, on the southern coast of the state of Antioquia, have been endeavoring to compel the "Ecuador," of the Pacific Steam Navigation Co. of Liverpool, to carry government troops to Panama, where the war is raging. They claim the right to enforce their demands under a contract made by the steamship company in consideration of tax exemptions, subsidies and other privileges. Unwilling to comply, and fearing forcible measures, the agents of the company have asked protection through the British consul; and the British cruiser Phaeton has in consequence been ordered to Buenaventura.

When this revolution was last referred to in these columns (vol. iv., p. 760) a rebel defeat had just been reported as having occurred at Rio Frio, in the state of Magdalena, on the 21st of February. Further defeats of the rebels were reported early in April, which were so overwhelming as to encourage the belief in Washington that they had ended the war. But on the 16th of the same month the rebels captured a coast town, Bacos del Toro, west of Colon, after an all-night battle so severe that 150 men on both sides were killed; and on the 30th news of their capture of Rio Hacha was confirmed. A month later, June 1, it was reported by way of Kingston, Jamaica, that the revolution had then made such advances as to have taken from the control of the government all the

towns on the Isthmus except Colon and Panama, and to have compelled a complete reorganization of the government forces. Since then one of the severest battles of the war has been fought. It began at Agua Dulce, about 75 miles from Panama, on the 29th of July. The battle still raged on the 3d of August, with over 10,000 men engaged on both sides, but on the 4th there were indefinite rumors of its having ended. Several days later the rebels claimed a victory; but the government had previously claimed it, and definite news is still wanting.

Cuban disturbances are political, and grow out of the ordinary embarrassments due to the establishment of a new nation (pp. 121, 140, 153, 172) which has struggled through long years of rebellion against an alien power. The most notable event complete in itself, is the resignation of Emilio Terry as secretary of agriculture in President Palma's cabinet, which occurred on the 18th. Senor Terry's announced reason is his desire to visit Paris; but it is inferred that he found himself in total disagreement with the rest of the cabinet and the president regarding aids to agriculture. Another important event is the discovery that the tariff schedule adopted by the Cuban senate is designed to affect prejudicially about \$35,000,000 of imports from the United States, mostly such as are produced in the states that opposed Cuban reciprocity in the United States Congress at its recent session. It is hinted from Washington that the object of this measure is to assist President Roosevelt in securing tariff concessions by Congress to Cuban producers.

Over in the Philippine possessions of the United States disturbing news comes from Mindanao, whence indications of unrest (p. 265) were reported late last month. This unrest was more recently supposed to have been allayed by the surrender on the 5th of August of a Mohammedan priest who had been the leading opponent of American occupation of the island of Mindanao. He promised when surrendering, to influence the rest of the defiant Moros to follow his example. But this confidence in pacification appears to have been misplaced. On the 12th a party of Moros, armed with swords and spears, surprised an outpost of the 27th U. S. infantry, killing a sergeant and

one private and severely wounding another private. As the attacking party was from the strongly fortified Moros town of Bacolod it was expected that a retaliatory attack would be made upon that town by the Americans, especially as the reduction of its forts had been recommended by the American officer in command in the Lake Lanao region. But no decisive action is yet reported. The dispatches only say that the situation in Mindanao is again critical. Gen. Chaffee arrived in the island on the 15th on a tour of inspection.

Conflicts in the immediate neighborhood of Manila with what are called gangs of "ladrones," or highwaymen, are reported in somewhat astonishing number. In a Manila report of the 18th, which describes these rather significant conflicts, it is said that—

thirty members of the constabulary in charge of an American inspector encountered a strong force of ladrones near Manila yesterday. The inspector was wounded and four men killed. Reinforcements arrived and the constabulary killed six and captured five ladrones. Reports from Cavite report several skirmishes between the constabulary and ladrones in which the latter had eleven killed and nine captured. These were members of Felizardo's gang. The constabulary suffered no casualties.

In view of the fact that the Manila dispatches used to designate as "ladrones" bodies of men now admitted to have been "insurgents," these later reports not unnaturally suggest a query.

In furtherance of the establishment of civil government in the Philippines under the recent act of Congress (p. 199), Gen. Chaffee has issued an order to the army in the archipelago, a copy of which reached the war department by mail on the 19th, in which he gives strict orders to the troops not to interfere with the conduct of the civil government and to refrain from even making suggestions to civil officials. Only in case of a written demand are the troops to respond to any call for help, and no less authority than the governor of a province will be recognized by the military as competent to make such a call; nor will any less authority than a brigade commander respond. Soldiers are forbidden to use their weapons against a civil prisoner, and it is declared that "an at-

tempt to assault by bolts will not justify an attack of firearms."

In the United States a specific instance of what is known to the police as "sweating" a prisoner has come to public attention. It is a Chicago case. The prisoner, whose name is Oscar Thompson, was arrested on the 10th of August upon suspicion of being concerned in a mysterious double murder known as "the Bartholin case." Instead of taking him before a magistrate, the police confined Thompson in a police station, and held him there without warrant or commitment until August 16, when two well-known lawyers of Chicago secured his regular commitment to the county jail. During this man's six days' incarceration at the police station he was subjected to continual persecution by the police who were trying to extort a confession, and who were thereby, according to the press reports, gradually driving him to madness. The following instances of the brow-beating to which the prisoner was subjected were culled on the 16th by the Chicago Tribune from the various reports for a week:

Thompson didn't sleep last night. In his cell at the Hyde Park police station was a man who, Thompson thought, was a drunken tramp, but who in reality was a detective. This detective kept Thompson awake all night.

Thompson was haggard, unshaven and unmistakably nervous when led before the inspector.

Thompson was a pitiful sight when he shambled into the inspector's office and was pushed into a chair. His eyes were watery and sore looking. His hair was matted and unkempt.

"You've been lying to me for a week now, Thompson," shouted Inspector Hunt. "This is your last chance. I quit fooling with you right here."

"That's it, you coward," roared the inspector. "You try to shun that awful Wednesday night."

"Open your lying mouth, now, and tell the truth with it for once," said Hunt.

Inspector Hunt pursued the inquiry along merciless lines for more than an hour. Then he tried another tack.

"Come, now, Thompson," he coaxed. "Come here and tell me about this thing. I am your friend and I'll take care of you."

"Inspector," said Thompson, "if you were to kill me I couldn't tell you more about this thing than I have."

"Do you remember August Becker?" asked the inspector. "Becker who chopped up his wife and cooked and burned her? You are sitting in his place. You look and act like he did.

He lied for weeks, but at last he told the truth."

Thompson appeared on the verge of nervous prostration. His face was drawn, his form shook, and his answers came in a subdued whisper.

"Now you are shifting again, and resorting to lies and subterfuge," shouted Inspector Hunt. "You don't tell because you are a coward, and your silence is putting you in a terrible fix. You will tell me all about it before you leave here."

Thompson was led tottering away to his cell.

Thompson's commitment to the county jail removed him from the police inquisition.

The injunction against the Cleveland city council restraining it from granting Mayor Johnson's 3-cent fare street car ordinance, which was granted by a judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio and was to be passed upon by that court on the 15th, as reported last week (p. 291), was heard on that day by only two judges of the court—Shauck and Burkett. They refused to allow argument on the merits of the case, but decided to continue the injunction in force until the full hearing, which would not be, in regular course, for two years to come. When questioned about this latest obstruction to securing 3-cent fares in Cleveland Mayor Johnson said:

Since the 3-cent fare railroad has been defeated by the action of the Supreme Court, we shall now appeal to the people with every confidence that their decision will be in favor of 3-cent fare.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The Shah of Persia arrived in England on the 17th.

—The city of Tientsin, China, captured by the foreign allies two years ago (vol. iii., p. 232), was evacuated on the 15th.

—The revolt in Siam (p. 296) was reported on the 15th by the American minister to Siam as being practically at an end.

—An annual reunion of the National Society of the Army of the Philippines was held at Council Bluffs on the 15th.

—The North Atlantic squadron, U. S. N., began the so-called "naval kriegspiel," or war play, off the coast of Massachusetts on the 19th.

—The "regular" Republican convention of Delaware met at Dover on the 19th and nominated a ticket. The Addicks faction is to meet on the 2d.

—The parliament of Cape Colony assembled on the 20th at Cape Town. This is its first meeting since it was suspended as a military measure during the Boer war.

—Frank C. Andrews, the Detroit bank wrecker who became conspicuous nearly a year ago as an "anarchist" hunter, was convicted on the 16th of robbing the City Savings Bank.

—Both houses of the parliament of New South Wales have agreed upon a woman suffrage bill, and women now have the right to vote in that state of the Commonwealth of Australia.

—The rectification of the India-Thibet frontier has been completed. It has added 350 square miles to the British frontier. Numbers of Thibetan shepherds who had settled inside the line have been turned out.

—The emperor of Germany has changed his headquarters for the Fall army maneuvers (p. 263) from Posen, in Prussian Poland, to Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, in Brandenburg, to avoid the unfriendly atmosphere of the Polish city.

—Luther R. Marsh, once partner of Daniel Webster and later a leader of the New York bar, but better known later still as the impoverished dupe of the notorious Ann Odelia Diss De Bar, died at Middletown, N. Y., on the 15th.

—King Edward VII. granted on the 20th a royal charter for a British Academy for the promotion of historical, philosophic and philological studies, in which 49 fellows are named, including the earl of Rosebery, Arthur Balfour, William Leche and John Morley.

—Under the name of the Middle States and Mississippi Valley Exposition, the first general exhibit of the industrial progress of the American Negro was opened in the First Regiment armory in Chicago on the 13th. Twenty-two states are represented with industrial exhibits.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the month ending July 31, 1902, as given by the June treasury sheet, are as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	\$ 88,807,960	\$ 79,206,220	\$ 9,601,740 exp.
G	7,670,808	1,594,421	6,076,387 exp.
S	3,671,914	2,456,547	1,215,367 exp.
	\$100,150,682	\$83,257,188	\$16,893,494 exp.

—Botha, DeLarey and DeWet, the Boer generals, arrived from Madeira (p. 296) in London on the 16th, where they received a great popular welcome. On the 17th they were received on board the royal yacht at Southampton by the king, and departing for Holland on the 18th, they



arrived at The Hague on the 19th, whence they went to Utrecht on the 20th and called on Mr. Kruger.

—Another bye-election in a Conservative constituency (p. 267) has gone against the British ministry. It was for the south division of Belfast, to fill the vacancy in the House of Commons caused by the death of the Conservative member, William Johnston, who had twice received pluralities exceeding 2,600 and been three times returned without opposition. The contestants were Mr. Buller, the official Unionist candidate, who represented the landlord interests, and Mr. Sloan, the independent Unionist, who made his appeal to the tenants. Mr. Sloan was elected by 826 majority.

PRESS OPINIONS.

POLICE "SWEAT BOX."

Chicago Daily News (neut.), Aug. 16.—It is time for Police Superintendent O'Neill to give his subordinates plain warning that these methods of inquisition must be dropped. The "sweatbox" has no proper place in the legal machinery of civilized nations.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Aug. 20.—Every legitimate and lawful effort of the police to ferret out and punish crime is to be commended and encouraged. But when their misguided zeal, whetted to a kind of desperate frenzy by the mystery of a murder, oversteps the bounds of the constitution by depriving a man of his liberty and subjecting him to a "sweatbox" ordeal in order to extort a confession from him, it is time to call a halt.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Aug. 18.—If a prisoner wishes to make a voluntary confession, well and good, and an officer may without impropriety suggest to a prisoner the advantage of a free and honest confession. Hectoring, bullying, threats and abuse are a totally different matter—a matter distinctly forbidden by the law, and it is surely not unreasonable to ask that the police set an example of obedience to law. . . . Will not the Bar association, the judges and the grand jury pay some attention to the sweatbox evil, denounced by every intelligent adherent of justice, law and order?

IMPERIALISM.

Red Wing Argus (Dem.), Aug. 16.—We must not talk about it, they told us while the soldiers were fighting. Wait until the trouble was over and the country could discuss at leisure the disposition of the Philippines. We needn't talk about it now, they tell us. It is all settled and there is nothing to say. It is not settled. The Republicans either have no policy or it is a colonial policy. The Democrats propose a definite policy that recognizes human rights and detests the programme of benevolent despotism.

GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), Aug. 13.—If an injunction granted out of court by a country lawyer, who happens to sit on the Supreme bench when there is a long vacation on, can stop legislation by a city council properly elected by a city of five hundred thousand people, it would seem that we have really arrived at the point where the courts, guided by a few smart lawyers, are ruling us. It would appear that any one ought to understand that this is really "government by injunction."

TRUSTS.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Aug. 15.—The trusts must rely on one or the other of the

great political parties to sustain them in their policy of greed and grasp. Is their reliance on the Democratic or the Republican party? No one not a blooming idiot can doubt about their answer to the question. It is written in the legislation of the country, in the action or non-action of Congress, in the neglect of remedial measures by the executive departments, in the favor of the trusts by the judiciary.

TAXATION.

Boston Herald (Ind.), Aug. 12.—One of the strong arguments in favor of the single tax, the tax on land alone, is that it would bring back to the city many of those who inconveniently live in the country to save on taxes.

MISCELLANY

WORK.

Let me but do my work from day to day,  
In field or forest, at the desk or loom.  
In roaring market-place, or tranquil room:  
Let me but find it in my heart to say,  
When vagrant wishes beckon me astray—  
"This is my work; my blessing, not my doom;  
Of all who live, I am the one by whom  
This work can best be done in the right way."

Then shall I see it not too great, nor small.  
To suit my spirit and to prove my powers;  
Then shall I cheerful greet the laboring hours,  
And cheerful turn, when the long shadows fall  
At eventide, to play and love and rest.  
Because I know for me my work is best.

—Henry Van Dyke in THE OUTLOOK.

But the prevention of discontent will be the prior study, to which the intellect and the energies of the nobles and their legates will be ever bent. To that end the teachings of the schools and colleges, the sermons, etc., will be skillfully and persuasively molded.

—W. J. Ghent: "The Next Step: A Benevolent Feudalism." (THE INDEPENDENT, April 8, 1902.)

THE MINER SPEAKS.

Let me but do my work from day to day,  
A thousand feet from daylight in the mine,  
Bent double in a narrow vein of coal;  
While at his desk some lady-handed shirk  
Writes poems of the sunshine of the soul,  
A-preaching what my tired heart should say.

What boots it if swift death lurks close beside  
To snuff my life out at a candle's flame,  
The low walls reek with seeping wet,  
The fire-dew creeps my shortened breath to claim,

While far above me, curst by naked need,  
Wife suckles babe, and hearts of daughters  
beat

At giving all they have to shameless greed?  
What matters it! When the long shadows fall

At eventide I'll play and love and rest!  
A Van Dyke tells me that my work is best.

THE SWEATER SPEAKS.

Let me but do my work from day to day,  
In sun-baked attic room or reeking shack,  
My needle clicking to consumptive hack.  
My throbbing head, my stiff and aching back  
Are fitted best for this, the poets say.

Let me but find it in my heart to pray—  
When vagrant wishes beckon me astray  
(Wishes for food, or hope of rest, a day)—  
"Ah let this be my blessing, not my doom!"  
Of all who live, I am the one by whom  
This work can best be done, in the right way.  
Oh, let me sit and stitch and stitch away!"

THE WEAVER SPEAKS.

Oh, let me cheerful greet the laboring hours,  
From reddening dawn to silent gathering dark,

Stalking with empty mind and nerves in shreds,  
The endless travel of the running threads.  
What care I for the woods and blooming flowers?

This suits my spirit and this proves my powers!

What matter song of lark and radiant sky?  
Another reason for my spirits high:  
No one can tramp this floor so well as I,  
Oh, let me watch the looms until I die!

L'ENVOI.

Oh, Monuments of Greed, who take from toll

The Joy and hope that should in toll abide,  
How fortunate art thou, that at thy side  
A singer sweet, with specious song is set  
To counsel patience in the face of wrong,  
While Justice sleeps, and Tyranny is strong

To keep her throne on Labor's back, so long!

—Franklin H. Wentworth.

THE INCREMENT IN LAND.

For The Public.

George Emerson was guilty. He had taken the money from his employer's store. His rent had been raised three times while his earnings remained the same. Little Emily's sickness had been a heavy expense. Every one knew George to be guilty. Every one but his baby girl. She visited him in prison, putting her arms about him saying: "I know you are innocent, dear papa; will mamma pay rent for you here?"

R. W. M.

THE PEDAGOGIC SUBJECT.

For The Public.

In the summer season, when educators meet, loaded with eloquence and fads, many strange theories are broached for the development and delectation of unsuspecting little heads. Eloquent principals, presidents, professors and superintendents vie with one another in heated debate. Punch, London, had some verses in a recent issue which might be taken to express the pathos of the situation:

Dear human child, whose woolly head  
Closely recalls the unweaned lamb;  
You with the lips whose native red  
Is stained with inexpensive jam;

O virgin soll, O plastic clay  
Within the primary potter's grip,  
To whom, for moulding, day by day  
So unsuspectingly you trip;

I fondly hope you never dream  
That your prospective moral state  
Still constitutes the steady theme  
Of loud and bellicose debate.

Yes, when on Heaven's name they call  
And knock each other's doctrines flat,  
You are their object; it is all  
On your account, unconscious brat!

I wonder, should you come to know  
The facts about this deadly feud,  
Whether your little heart would go  
And burst with speechless gratitude.

J. H. D.

### THE RIGHTS OF THE MAN-STANDING-WHERE-HE-DOES-HIS-WORK.

So far as there is a right in any war, it is always on the side of the man that shoots from his own dooryard. . . .

Let us set it down here in despite of the doctors, that a man is a proprietor, in virtue of his existence. The only way to defeat his title is to kill him. So long as he is on his feet he is a landholder and his title rests somehow in the particular land that he walks and works on. Just how the title is to be defined is a question between himself and his neighbors to be adjusted on the spot by the balance of personal forces. It never can be settled for South Africa by a colonial secretary in London. No, nor for the Philippine islands by a lot of diplomats sitting around a green table in Paris. And for ages to come, if occasion shall require, the Man-Standing-Where-he-Does-his-Work will shoot at the invader until his ammunition gives out. So, if wars are ever to cease, it is the other party—the Man-Shooting-Where-He-Doesn't-Work—that must quit first.—The University, of Tucson, Ariz., for July.

### MR. DOOLEY ON THE REFORMER.

"Fornchitely, Hinmissy, a rayform-er is seldom a business man. He thinks he is, but business men know different. They know what he is. He thinks business an' honesty is th' same thing. He does, indeed. He's got thim mixed because they dhrass alike. His idee is that all he has to do to make a business adminis-tration is to have honest men ar-round him. Wrong. I'm not say-in', mind ye, that a man can't do good work an' be honest at th' same time. But whin I'm hirin' a la-ad I find out first whether he is onto his job, an' afther a few years I begin to suspect that he is honest, too. Manny a dishonest man can lay brick straight, an' manny a man that wud-ent steal ye'er spoons will break ye'er furniture.

"I don't want Father Kelly to hear me, but I'd rather have a competent man who wud steal if I give him a chanst, but I won't, do me plumbin', thin a person that wud scorn to help himsilf, but didn't know how to wipe a joint. Ivry man ought to be honest to start with, but to give a man an office jus' because he's honest is like ill-tin' him to congress because he's a pathrite, because he don't bate his wife or because he always wears

a right boot on th' right foot. A man ought to be honest to start with, an' afther that he ought to be crafty. A pollytician who's on'y honest is jus' th' same as bein' out in a winther storm without anny clothes on.—F. P. Dunne, in Chicago American.

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND.

For The Public.

A writer in the London Daily News calls attention to a part of a speech of Mr. Seddon, premier of New Zealand, which all the newspapers omitted in their reports. The speech was delivered at a dinner in London, at which Conan Doyle presided. The part of the speech omitted in the reports was that in which Mr. Seddon spoke of the great success of woman's equal suffrage in New Zealand. He said that under joint suffrage the colony had advanced with rapid strides, that important problems had been settled, and that legislation had been carried out which was being imitated in Europe and America. "Nevertheless, all domestic relationships were still the same as before; sons respected their mothers, husbands and wives loved one another, and the young men told him that sweethearts were quite as nice as in pre-equality days. One distinct change had been wrought—a man whose private and domestic life and business honor would not bear inspection would not now obtain high public position."

J. H. D.

### A WOMAN AS A "RECEIVER."

About a year ago the partners in the business firm of Hanley & Co., 96 Fifth avenue, New York, got into a snarl, and one of them, James H. Tucker, determined to withdraw his capital. Mrs. Jennie M. Packer was at that time accountant for the firm, a gentle little woman, with large blue eyes and prematurely gray hair. She knew every detail of the business, and when Justice O'Gorman was asked to appoint a receiver for the firm his choice fell to the quiet little accountant. Instead of closing up the business, Mrs. Packer continued it, paid all bills and put it in such a prosperous condition that the partners have become reconciled and she has been discharged with the gratitude of all concerned. One of her first acts after being made a receiver was to see every creditor of the firm. Then she began to straighten out the tangle. The partners brought

suit against her, but she calmly met each issue and the business went on with a smoothness that amazed the warring business men. One of the apartments in the company's offices was fitted up as a reception-room. There Mrs. Packer sat each morning, surrounded by plants and flowers, opened the mail and received business callers, while she directed every move of the business. Her work completed, she handed over greatly enriched cofers to the astonished partners, who are now on amiable terms. Mrs. Packer was a miss Jennie M. Moar, of New Hampshire. The death of her husband three years ago left her dependent on her own talents.—Chicago Chronicle of July 17.

### MAYOR JOHNSON ON SENATOR HANNA'S STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO MONOPOLY.

"I was very much interested to see what Senator Hanna had to say about monopolies at Chautauqua," remarked Mayor Johnson yesterday, when asked for his opinion on the senator's address of Saturday.

What the mayor alluded to was Senator Hanna's remark during his speech to the effect that: "When you talk about organized capital in this country forming monopolies, you talk nonsense. There is no monopoly in this country, except such as are protected by patents."

"Now what Senator Hanna had to say about labor and capital and the golden rule was good," continued Mayor Johnson. "I am willing to concede sincerity to the senator in these things and I say if he can solve the labor problem, why here's good luck to his elbow.

"But it seemed to me that the really important thing in his speech was that remark about monopolies. Senator Hanna says the only monopoly is the patent monopoly. Now I am willing to concede the patent monopoly, but when he says it is the only one existing, I take exceptions.

"For instance, if the patent monopoly is the only monopoly, what name does Senator Hanna give to the control of all the railways that enter the anthracite coal regions? This control is not acquired by the ownership of locomotives and cars, but by ownership of practically all the rights of way into those fields. It is almost impossible for a new railroad to get into the fields and if one does, it is soon absorbed. Isn't this something like the patent monopoly?

"Until the expiration of the present

franchises in this city the five-cent street railways control this kind of transportation in Cleveland. This is not because they own cars and rails, but because they have no competition. They are protected by grants and statutes preventing competition and by republican officials, who save them from the necessity of paying their just proportion of taxes. What is that but monopoly and privilege?

"The wages paid to their laborers constitute all the return that labor gets from these companies. All that capital should get is a fair return on the actual investment or cost of reproduction of the system. What they do get in excess of that is derived from monopoly and privilege, which these companies enjoy at the expense of the public and of the laborer. Anything paid to them in excess of a fair return on their actual investment is the price of privilege. If this is defensible Senator Hanna should bring forward his defense of it, instead of devoting himself to the spreading of the impression that a war, a contest exists between capital and labor. The real contest is between labor and monopoly, and capital and privilege.

"To illustrate: When President Schwab made his statement before the industrial commission and assigned nearly \$1,000,000,000 as a fair value for the ownership of the United States Steel corporation, of 80 per cent. of all the iron mines in the lake region and the ownership of all the Connellsville coke land, he not only specified his monopoly, but he put his price on it.

"Measured by the ability of this corporation to make people pay exorbitant prices for its products, I don't think he put the price too high.

"Now, principal among the privileges the United States Steel corporation enjoys, is that of making some one else pay taxes which should properly be paid by the owners of this \$1,000,000,000 worth of property. While farmers and home owners are paying on an average of \$20 in taxes on every \$1,000 worth of property, on this particular \$1,000,000,000 the United States Steel corporation is paying less than \$1 on \$1,000 in taxes.

"A billion dollars' worth of farm and home property is required to pay an average of two per cent., or \$20,000,000 a year in taxes. This coal and iron property pays less than \$1,000,000. In other words, the value of the privilege of making other people pay its taxes amounts to \$19,000,000 a year to the United States Steel corporation.

"And still Senator Hanna says that no monopolies, except the patent monopoly, exist in this country. After being for so many years closely identified with railroads and street railways and the coal and iron business, whose privileges I have just illustrated, it seems strange that these things should have slipped Senator Hanna's mind when he made his Chautauqua speech and said that no monopolies existed in this country except the patent monopolies."—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of August 11.

#### THE DESPOTISM OF THE DOLLAR.

From an address delivered February 22, 1902, before the Connecticut Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, by Walter S. Logan, of the New York bar, and former president of the Bar Association of the State of New York.

The Latin's battle cry of freedom has always been personal liberty. He considers himself free if he can keep out of jail. The Saxon's fight for freedom, on the other hand, has ever been lined up behind the dollar. The right to hold property has been the Saxon's battle cry. Property represents individual independence. The possession of property is what differentiates the citizen from the mob. The sacredness of property means the encouragement of individual initiative and individual independence. Self-reliance, the right of every man to be the architect and the artisan of his own fortune and to make the bed he is to lie in, is the cornerstone of Saxon freedom. From the Latin you might take away everything and he would consider himself free as long as his limbs were unhampered. The Saxon claims as his birthright to be assured that he may reap what he has sown and keep what is his own. . . .

We fought our fight against the despotism of kings to secure the right to have and retain all that the dollar stands for.

The despotism of the king is a thing of the past. We have won our fight against it and won it well. . . . But a new despotism has arisen. Our struggle for the dignity of the dollar seems to have culminated in the abuse of the dollar. The Dollar has come to be Deified. The despotism of the day is the despotism of the dollar. . . .

The old struggle was by men who demanded the right to retain what was their own and to enjoy the fruits of their own frugality. The new struggle is by men or corporations who by some special extraordinary privilege, license, immunity or advantage have accumulated their boundless millions and are using these accumulations to maintain the monopolies that

oppress and outrage the people. The throne of our modern George III. is no longer at Westminster but in Wall street. The Lord Norths of our day form steel trusts and sugar trusts and all other kinds of trusts, and then claim—not the divine right of kingship, but—the divine right of dollarship to rule the earth. If the interests of the people demand an Isthmian canal, that work is delayed year after year and Congress after Congress because it will interfere with the monopoly of a great railroad company. If the interests of the people demand and the conscience of the people insists upon a fair treatment of an adjacent island which we claim the right to take under our protection and whose product we use to sweeten our morning coffee, that must not be, because great trusts think they will have to lessen their dividends if the people of Connecticut do not pay full duty on Cuban sugar to the impoverishment of Connecticut and Cuba alike. If the interests of the people demand that the iron and steel that is needed in every industry in the land, in the construction of every home in the land, in the making of every tool or implement of trade in the land, in the transportation of passengers and freight throughout the land, shall enter our harbors free and unhampered, that must not be if it will in any wise interfere with the ten per cent. dividends of a billion-dollar corporation. If public improvements are planned in the interest of the people, if better roads or a better utilization of the highways of the people are in contemplation, if trolleys to bring neighborhoods together are asked for, all this must not be unless the consent can be obtained of hundred-million dollar railroad corporations that pay more in dividends every year than was the total cost of running the United States government a hundred years ago. If anything is to be done that the people demand, if any want is to be supplied that the people need, it must not be unless the great monopolies of the nation will graciously give their permission.

The modern dollar has become despotic. The dollars have left the masses and found their way into the pockets of the classes. . . .

The mighty men of earth to-day are not its princes or its potentates, its legislators or its ministers of state, its preachers or its orators, the men of the pen or the men of the sword. The men who wield the world's destinies are its moneyed men. By putting their money into the channels of trade they produce prosperity. By with-

drawing it they cause disaster, panic and ruin. If they wish to sell they loosen their hold upon the money market and the price of securities soars towards the sky. If they would buy, they tighten their grip, withdraw the money from circulation and panic prices prevail and misery runs riot in the community. Their will is potent in the councils of state and they decide the policies of cabinets. Nations go to peace or to war at their command and the welfare of continents depends on their will. They reign as supreme in the drawing-room as in the marts of trade and they control society with relentless hand. The church molds its creed to their belief and men's souls as well as their bodies are the slaves of the money power. Colleges receive their endowments from them, and the youth of the present generation, the fathers of the next, are trained in the social and political and economic ideas which the contributors to the college endowment approve, and have their ideas formed after the rich man's model.

No place seems free from their interference, no power sufficient to withstand their will.

Half a dozen men within easy telephone call of each other can meet on Wall street any afternoon and the American nation will sit still and wait till they adjourn.

Our fathers rose in their majesty and their might and fought a successful fight against the despotism of the king. The sons are made of no meaner clay than the fathers. Courage is not a thing of the past. The valiant man is not out of date and the people are really as powerful as ever—when they come to know it.

The struggle of our age and generation is not against the despotism of the king, but against the despotism of the dollar, and in any struggle for the amelioration of present conditions and the betterment of the lives and fortunes of the people, the sons of the men who stood behind the trenches at Bunker Hill, who went down to defeat and disaster but not disgrace at Long Island and Fort Washington, who followed the great commander in his campaign through the Jerseys and spent that long and weary and waiting, but all-important winter at Valley Forge, who stormed Bemis Heights and rode with Washington at Monmouth, who were with Greene and Morgan at Cowpens and King's Mountain and Eutaw Springs, and who witnessed the splendid triumph of our cause on the plains of Yorktown, will ever be ready, when the time comes, to

fight for financial and social freedom as they fought for political freedom a hundred and twenty-five years ago.

Do not misunderstand me. I am the surgeon diagnosing the wounds, not the mangled victim hovering between life and death. It is the general conditions, not the personal effect upon myself of which I complain. I have continued to steer my little boat with more or less success among the rocks that line the channel. I have even succeeded, they tell me, in harnessing my hundred-millionaire, crowned though he be, and making him pull as a tow-horse. Neither am I a prophet of evil. I do not believe that there is to be or that there is any need that there should be a military uprising among us. I do not think that the evils of which I have complained are evils that require blood-letting. They can be settled by men of peace and by peaceful methods. We have only to meet the enemy resolutely and they are ours. But just the same it requires a courage of no mean order to attack existing conditions. It requires leadership no less commanding than that of Washington, and followers no less devoted than those who followed him, to work out the salvation of the nation from the evils that now confront it.

#### PROPERTY AND MORALITY.

From an article on "Some Ethical Aspects of Ownership," by Prof. Richard T. Ely, in the *Cosmopolitan* for February, 1892.

Along with an alarming callousness about the rights of others, especially when those others are comparatively weak and defenseless, we have a growing body of men who desire to probe deeply their own consciences and to make their conduct square with the utterances of the "man within the breast." . . .

If it could be known how many people are, at the present time, more or less puzzled concerning ownership, and feel uneasy about their own position, all those who have not given thought to the matter would be astounded. It is rarely that one goes so far as to renounce one's private property, although such instances do occur; but doubt and uncertainty perplex many. Nearly all persons admit that private property has its legitimate place in the social order; but it is equally true that all who can be called normal in their moral nature recognize that private property has its limitations. What may I own? What may I not own? These are the puzzling ques-

tions. Every person with an ethical nature draws the line somewhere. May I own human beings? To this question diverse answers have been given, and the diversity of answers has led to much bloodshed in many lands and many ages. However, civilized men have at last, as an outcome of spiritual and physical conflict, reached a negative answer. It is felt that one man must not exist merely as a tool of another, without a definite end of his own, and that such existence is what slavery carries with it.

But may I own intoxicating beverages, and those forms of property which are connected with the traffic in intoxicating beverages? This question brings us into one of the great social conflicts of our day. Hundreds of thousands answer emphatically "No," and there are, too, hundreds of thousands who would shut out those who participate in such ownership from the sacraments of the Christian church, denying them the hope of heaven hereafter. On the other hand, there are hundreds of thousands who answer the question with an equally emphatic "Yes;" while between these two extremes we discover millions to whom the question is a troublesome one, suggesting no clear ethical answer.

But leaving this question, let us take up one which, to most people, demands a clear, unhesitating "Yes." May I own land? Yet we find thousands in recent years who say "No," and still a larger number of thousands who are more or less troubled by the question, having doubts in their mind. The writer recalls a case of a clergyman, to whom he was showing some suburban landed property and the beautiful views it afforded. This clergyman said: "I could not own this land." Subsequent conversation developed the fact that he had gone out of his way to avoid land-ownership in the neighborhood of a city, although it came naturally to him, and would have brought him large wealth. He had become imbued with the ideas of Henry George, and thought the private ownership of land not ethically allowable. . . .

Man's progress in material wealth, and all that goes with it, implies control and regulation of the requisites of production. Organized society establishes this control through the institution of property; and when, as in the case of land, the decision is in favor of private prop-

erty and not public property, the land is handed over to individuals as a social trust. It is to be well utilized, to furnish food and clothing to man, and sites for his dwellings. If we reflect on what this implies, do we not readily perceive that it throws a flood of light on the question: What may I own?

If private property is a trust from society, a social institution, an individual as an individual cannot change it. We must make use of external valuable things, and we are responsible as members of society, and not as individuals, for the institution of private property in its present form. It is not for the individual to change the institution of private property in land. If the individual thinks that some other form of landed property is better than the present, he may advocate a change, but then he must leave it to society to make this change or not.

But there is something more to be said than that. If private property is a social trust, has the individual a right to refuse that trust? Is it not incumbent upon the individual to show good grounds for such a refusal? Let us take for illustration our clergyman who was convinced that the private ownership of land was not consistent with justice. Might not society address him in this wise? "Private property in land is a social institution and is a social trust. Accept this trust and use it for the interests of society. You say that you think the public ownership of land in some form or another would be a good thing, but that is not something of which society has as yet become convinced. The social mind is not yet persuaded. Private property in land exists as a matter of fact, and it involves a trust—that is to say, not only a privilege but an obligation."

Is not this position sound? If our clergyman believes that nationalization, so called, of the land is in the interests of society, he may attempt to persuade others that such is the case, while at the same time he accepts the trust of private property in land. Is it not evident that if he refuses the trust, it may fall into the hands of less conscientious persons, who will not make so good a use of it as he can? If, indeed, he conscientiously believes that the great thing needed, the thing above all others, is the nationalization of land, let him use the income of his private landed property to advance his view. It is not our purpose to argue concerning the correctness of

his view; we simply take the case as an illustration.

The argument which has just been advanced applies manifestly to the ownership of gas stock, railway stock, telephone and telegraph lines, etc. Of course, it is an entirely different thing, and one which needs no consideration at present, when a man on account of his private interests refrains from an expression of his own opinion, or attempts to suppress the expression of opinion by others. . . . We must have the regulation afforded either by public property or by private property in the case of land, of gas supply, of railway services, etc. But it may be asked: Does the social theory of property carry, then, no limitations upon the rights of ownership? Take the case of gambling halls and resorts of vice in cities. Can a person who tries to regulate his conduct by ethical consideration own property which is used to promote gambling or other vices? Certainly not. Here we have not to do with simply a question of expediency. The question is not: Shall we have public or private ownership? It is not admitted that the pursuits just mentioned are desirable. What the ethically sound person wants in these cases is entire suppression, or the nearest possible approach thereto. Consequently, no one who attempts to govern his conduct by ethical considerations will participate in evil pursuits and occupations through ownership of property.

But to return to our question of the traffic in intoxicating beverages. May a person own property connected in any way with such traffic? The answer depends precisely upon the view which one takes of the liquor traffic. If we think it a necessary and desirable thing, and all that is wanted is moderation in the use of intoxicating beverages, then we cannot condemn the persons who own the property in which the traffic is carried on with an honest effort to avoid anything which promotes excessive indulgence. But if we say that this traffic in intoxicating beverages works evil and only evil, then we must condemn those who own property used for saloons, or otherwise consciously and purposely connected with the traffic in intoxicating beverages. . . .

It is hoped that what has been said will be helpful theoretically and practically in working out ethical aspects of ownership; and in conclusion, the following is offered in a tentative way as what may be called the ethical law of ownership: When the service or commodity furnished is socially desir-

able, private property in the goods connected with the traffic or business is ethically permissible, if legally allowed. When the service or commodity furnished is socially injurious, private property in the good connected with the traffic or business is reprehensible, whether legally allowed or not.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### NO POLITICAL ASSESSMENTS.

Superintendent of Streets John Wilhelm was discharged by Director Salen at the instigation of Mayor Johnson, yesterday afternoon. Mr. Johnson stated that there were a number of reasons for Wilhelm's removal, but that the primary cause was that he had attempted to levy a political assessment in his department.

A few days ago Superintendent Wilhelm caused his secretary to make out notes to be sent to each employe of his department requesting an assessment of one per cent. of their salaries for campaign purposes, this fall. These notes were not taken in a kindly spirit by some of the jobholders, and a copy was presented to Mayor Johnson. The mayor at once sent for Director Salen and declared that Wilhelm must be decapitated.

As the mayor and Salen were leaving the city hall together they encountered Wilhelm on the sidewalk.

"You have been making trouble," said the mayor to Wilhelm.

"What do you mean?" asked Wilhelm.

"You tell him," said the mayor to Salen, as he stepped into his carriage.

Salen and Wilhelm went to the office of the director of public works, and Salen accused the superintendent of having attempted to levy a political assessment in spite of direct orders from the mayor that no assessments were to be raised. Wilhelm admitted the charge, and Salen announced that the mayor wished Wilhelm to hand in his resignation. Wilhelm flatly refused to comply with this request. He told Salen he had no reason for resigning, and said that if he wanted to get rid of him he would have to discharge him.

Salen attempted to reason with him, but without avail. He then told Wilhelm that he had better think the matter over. Wilhelm left Salen's office, and a short time later his discharge was upon his desk.

Mr. Johnson is very strongly opposed to political assessments of all kinds and had supposed that none were being levied under his administration. The mayor said that he had

not decided upon Wilhelm's successor.  
—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of August 9.

#### THE STREET RAILWAY COMPANIES MUST OBEY THE ORDINANCES.

Mayor Johnson combated with Director of Public Works Salen and with the Little Consolidated upon the same issue, yesterday, and came out victorious in each instance. The contest with the director occurred at the board of control meeting yesterday morning, and the subject of contention was the laying of new rails by the Little Consolidated in Superior street between the Square and Erie street. Mayor Johnson had learned that the rails which are being put down are not groove rails, as was required in an ordinance recently passed by the council. He requested Director Salen to stop the work at once and to force the Little Consolidated to live up to the requirements of the ordinance.

"I am informed," replied Director Salen, "that the company is unable to obtain groove rails."

"Then you are misinformed," said the mayor. "I could get those rails within ten days."

"The company says they cannot be obtained."

"Well, that is not so. An ordinance was passed for the express purpose of obtaining groove rails on the downtown thoroughfares. I think the work should be stopped at once."

"I do not think the street ought to be left open," persisted Salen.

"There is no reason why the street should be left open. Stop their laying the flat rails and they will get other rails which will answer the requirements of the ordinance."

"I will think it over," said Salen.

"No, that will not do," said the mayor, evidently becoming aroused at Salen's attitude of obstinacy. "I want your decision right now. Will you stop that work at once, or won't you?"

"I don't think the street ought to be left open," doggedly replied Salen.

"Will you stop that work or not, yes or no?" exclaimed the mayor.

Salen hesitated in replying.

"Because," continued the mayor, "if you don't have that work stopped immediately I will have it stopped by the director of police without consulting you."

"Well, I'll stop it," said Salen, but—

"All right," said the mayor, "and if the company says it can't get groove rails come to me and I will get them myself. We will have that work done as it ought to be if we have to do it ourselves. The Little Consolidated can get these rails if they wish to.

The Big Consolidated had no trouble in securing them."

The laying of rails was progressing in front of the city hall, and the loud crash as they were being riveted down was audible in the board room. City Engineer Carter at once left the room to order the work stopped. He found Superintendent George Mulhern, of the Little Consolidated, personally supervising the work. In three minutes Mr. Mulhern was in the mayor's office in a very excited frame of mind.

Mr. Mulhern explained to Mr. Johnson that it would be impossible for the company to obtain groove rails. Mayor Johnson doubted the accuracy of this statement. Mulhern then asked to be allowed to connect up the rails already laid, so that traffic could be resumed on both tracks. The mayor would not allow this, declaring that not another rail should be laid until the groove rails were obtained in accordance with the ordinance. Mulhern then left, and succumbing to the inevitable ordered the laborers to quit work. At the same time the mayor requested Police Director Dunn to place a policeman on guard to see that no work be done. He also directed that two officers be placed on duty all night to see that the order was not violated.

Two hours later Superintendent Mulhern again called at the mayor's office. When he emerged this time it was with a smiling countenance.

"We will resume work in the morning," he said.

"With flat rails?" was asked.

"No, sir, with groove rails, the same as required in the ordinance."

"You find, then, that you will be able to get the rails?"

"Yes, they will be on hand in the morning."

"Why didn't you lay groove rails in the first place instead of the flat ones?"

"Oh, didn't know anything about that ordinance. Never heard of it until to-day," and Mr. Mulhern smiled benignantly and retired.

The ordinance passed recently by the council provides that whenever new rails are laid by either of the street railroad companies they shall be of the groove pattern. This rail makes scarcely any depression in the streets, and is better for all kinds of vehicles. Both companies accepted the provisions of the ordinance as reasonable, and it has been lived up to by the Big Consolidated. The work at present being done by the Little Consolidated consists in taking up the old cable conduits and laying new rails.

The taking up of the conduits was

ordered by the board of control, as it was feared that the accumulation of filth through the open slots would be a menace to public health.—Plain Dealer, of August 9.

#### THE MAYOR'S TAX BULLETINS PRODUCE RESULTS.

Mayor Johnson's tax bulletins are having the desired effect. Discontent with the returns is being stirred up all over the city and the board of review is receiving letters from numerous taxpayers asking for remittances.

Yesterday morning an irate woman from Oregon street stepped into the board of review room.

"Is this the tax office?" she asked.

Upon being told that it was, she said: "Where's my \$1.10?"

"Your \$1.10!" exclaimed Sarstead, one of the members of the board, in surprise. "I don't know what you are talking about."

"Why, that is the money I paid on my taxes that I should not have paid. You assessed me too high, and I want you to take it off."

"How do you know we assessed you too high?" asked Sarstead.

"Because it says so right here and I want that money back." With a triumphant smile the woman produced one of Mayor Johnson's tax bulletins.

"Oh," laughed the board, "that has nothing to do with us."

"I'd like to know why it hasn't," exclaimed the woman, angrily. "You've got to pay that money back. I have paid \$15.30 taxes, when I should have paid only \$14.20, according to this book."

The members of the board explained that the statement was not official.

"Why," exclaimed the woman, "it is from the mayor himself."

It was then explained that the mayor was not on the tax board and that if there was anything wrong with the appraisement a petition should be filed and the board would look it up. The woman could not be convinced that she was not being swindled directly in some way or other, however, and left the office with vengeance in her eye and the vow that she would see the mayor.—Plain Dealer of August 15.

There is an old Shakespearean joke that is worth the retelling at this time. A wag, after having witnessed an unusually villainous performance of "Hamlet," remarked: "Now is the time to settle the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy. Let the graves of both be dug up and see which of the two turned over."—The Woman's Journal.



PAUL KRUGER.

For The Public.

Like a brave oak cleft, to its ruin left  
 Waiting in grandeur the final fall,  
 In the heavy gloom of his home-land's  
 doom  
 Waiteth in exile the grand Oom Paul.  
 He had wrought his best ere a troublous  
 rest  
 Beckoned and lured from kinship afar;  
 And his heart remained where was freely  
 drained  
 Blood of his own in the stress of war.

With his weight of years came no coward  
 fears  
 For life he counted of little worth,  
 When sadly he fled the land of his dead,  
 And all his stern soul held dear on earth.  
 Though England has won—all her foul  
 work done,  
 Paid and honored in hovel and hall,  
 Not a grant to stand at her king's right  
 hand  
 Could win the homage of stanch Oom  
 Paul.

D. H. INGHAM.

Josh—Mean ter say Solon was one  
 of the wisest men in Greece? I  
 thought he was some durned fool.

Hiram—What made you think so?

Josh—Well, I've noticed that they  
 speak of the members of the legis-  
 latur' as Albany Solons.—Puck.

"Every Napoleon has had his  
 Waterloo."

"Yes. And every republic its Ma-  
 nila."—Life.

BOOK NOTICES.

HIGHER LIFE FOR WORKING PEOPLE.

Under the above title, Mr. Walker Stephens discusses in a practical and prudent fashion certain social problems, making a little book of 130 pages (Longmans), which may do good service in awakening the conservative reader who has imagined that there is no social problem in the world except that of being content "in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me."

The keynote of the book is found in the quotation from the great Turgot, with which it closes—"Well-timed reform to avert revolution."

In the introduction Mr. Stephens says that the "greatest problem of all is work for the mass of unemployed," and asserts that "a solution of this greatest problem must be attempted sooner or later." The first chapter deals with the "Submerged Tenth," and shows by figures—for England—that it is a "submerged fifth or sixth," rather than a "submerged tenth," to which the great problem applies.

The author seems to see the necessity of getting more people back to the land, and takes pains to show that there is a abundance of land right in England. "Few people," he says, "realize to themselves the vast area of land in our own country still available for culture;" and, again, after speaking of the Scotch Deer Forest Commission, he reiterates, "that throughout England there is area ample enough to employ the labor of many hundreds of thousands of new hands for generations to come." His remedy is, in brief, the purchase of land by the state and the founding of home colonies.

It is surprising, in view of other statements of the writer in later chapters, that he has failed to see how much more effective, not to speak of the great principle of justice, would be the natural "colonizing" that would be done, if England's "available" lands were freed from uselessness by a righteous system of taxation.

Here are some quotations from his chapter on the "Distribution of Wealth." He says: "It has been a constant lament that our legislators some centuries ago lacked the wisdom and foresight to claim for the nation the property in minerals—the wealth beneath the soil. . . . During the last 35 years the landlords have drawn from this source over £220,000,000, which would otherwise have gone to increase the general wealth." And in the same chapter he lays down certain propositions in regard to the wealth not beneath the soil, which he might have seen would save, if carried out, the trouble of government purchase and all the great colonizing organization which he proposes: "Landlords should be called upon to contribute to the national revenue as far as their circumstances permit, while leaving them still an effective inducement to remain landlords." Again: "Some means must be taken to intercept, for the public good, at least a portion of the unearned increment of the value of land." Then he quotes with approval Mr. Fletcher Moulton, Q. C., as follows: "The present system of levying rates is both absurd and unjust. . . . The value of ground upon which buildings stand is wholly different in its origin. It is not due to expenditure on the part of the owner or his predecessors. . . . The whole benefit of any outlay in public improvements inevitably passes ultimately to the owners of the land." These quotations and other passages, coupled with the scheme of purchase and colonizing, show how it is possible to write around, and dally with, a great truth without accepting it, and its consequences, simply and boldly.

This failure vitiates some portions of the book; but several chapters are exceedingly interesting and suggestive, notably those on "The Eight-Hour Day," and "Self-Help." The author asserts that "the working classes are as fully alive to the importance of right living as are the middle and upper classes. . . . It may well be doubted whether, as a class, they do not exhibit a firmer moral character than belongs to their social superiors." He then proceeds to show how, under present conditions, most workmen have almost no time for any of the social amenities and rational pleasures of life. The fact is that there is every temptation, in the very nature of the human heart, to yield to a reaction of excesses in the brief moments of leisure that most workmen rarely have.

People who, so far as they think at all, have an idea that the great mass of our fellowmen are indifferent to the esthetic side of life, or would be if they had a chance, see only the surface. There is no essential difference in men by classes. The ratio of those who would appreciate the beautiful side of life—which may be called art for short—is just as great, granted a chance of development, in tenements as in mansions.

Sidney Lanier was thinking of the narrow limitations of the lives of the many—the poor—who toll, year in and year out, for bare necessities, when he sang these words in his splendid "Symphony":

"Look up the land, look down the land,  
 The poor, the poor, the poor, they stand  
 Wedged by the pressing of Trade's hand  
 Against an inward opening door  
 Which pressure tightens evermore;  
 They sigh a monstrous foul-air sigh  
 For the outside leagues of liberty,  
 Where Art, sweet lark, translates the sky  
 Into a heavenly melody."

If this little book of Mr. Stephens can arouse in its readers some sense of the in-

justice in present social conditions, which shuts out ninety-nine out of a hundred working men, as he claims, from rational participation in, or an opportunity of cultivating, the four sides of life, it has not been written in vain.

J. H. DILLARD.

Edward Osgood Brown's paper on "The Shore of Lake Michigan," read before the Law Club of the city of Chicago, on the 25th of April, 1902, has been printed by order of the club. Two interesting matters are considered, one of which is of great public importance. The latter relates to property rights in accretions along the lake shore induced by artificial means, which the courts have frowned upon; and considers the desirability of legislative action for securing to the public the benefit of the state ownership, which the courts sustain, of the submerged shallows along the lake front. The other point has to do with Capt. Streeter's and other irregular claims to natural accretions. In this connection Mr. Brown gives the legal history of the so-called "District of Lake Michigan," an extension into the lake by accretion to Chicago territory, over which Capt. Streeter asserts title and sovereignty as the original discoverer.

PERIODICALS.

—The summer number of the Single Tax Review (62 Trinity Place, New York) opens

The Public Leaflets.

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

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

The following pamphlets have been issued:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898.)—Out of print.
3. **Nero-Then**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. **The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust**, by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. **Monopoly and Competition** (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. **Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case** (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900). Out of print.
8. **Assassination and Anarchism** (from THE PUBLIC of September 14, 1901).
- 9.—**Australasian Taxation in Colorado** (from THE PUBLIC of August 31, 1901).
- 10.—**Landmarks of Liberty** (from THE PUBLIC of September 28, 1901).
- 11.—**The Chinese Exclusion Act** (from THE PUBLIC of December 14, 1901).
- 12.—**Brutal Degeneracy Disgracefully Defended**. By A. B. Choate. (From THE PUBLIC of July 26, 1902).



“EXPANSION.”

The water-cure method of extorting from Uncle Sam the confession that an Empire is better than a Republic.

with an historical sketch by Dr. E. M. Flagg, in which he describes the story of a land speculation in South America. Dr. Lewis H. Berens continues his account of Gerrard Winstanley, “the Henry George of the Commonwealth period.” A report of the Women’s National Single Tax Conference by Bessie Agnes Dwyer and a racy account by J. B. Vining of Mayor Johnson’s administration in Cleveland, are the other principal articles. The biography is of Warren Worth Baily, editor of the Johnstown Democrat.

—The New York Evening Post discusses “Direct Nominations” in a recent editorial (July 24). The movement is, as the editor says, “an evidence that the people everywhere are demanding with increased force to be permitted to conduct their government without the intervention of political bosses.” The trouble is that it will be difficult to devise any system which the bosses will not find a method to ride. Whatever the system of nomination may be, when the people are sufficiently determined and sufficiently independent, they will get capable and honest officials, and not till then. However, any reform that promises to do for the freedom of nominations what the Australian ballot has done for the freedom of voting, ought to be welcomed. How many who read this have ever had the slightest voice in selecting the candidates for whom, in their own party, they should vote? J. H. D.

—It is a long time since Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams and those benighted Americans of Revolutionary days said unpleasant things about a king, and even about kings in general. “Nous avons change tout cela.” What must the shades think of us! If ever there was occasion for the proverbial turning over in graves on the part of offended saints, surely there must have been a deal of subterranean disturbance in ancient cemeteries during the past few weeks over the words of king-worshipping descendants. Some of our leading articles would lead one to think that their writers were among Edward’s own “my people.” The Churchman, New York, for example, closes a most fervid editorial with the words: “Surely everything in these last days has combined to lend fervor

and depth and heartiness to the wish of every Anglo-Saxon, ‘Long live King Edward VII.’” Mark the fervor and the unanimity. But, after all, we must remember that there were tories in Revolutionary times.—J. H. D.

—In the “Editor’s Study,” of the August Harper, the editor gives some interesting experience with contributors. “The ablest writers,” he says, “are always, as a rule, most amenable to the natural demands of editorial management, and the most ready to admit reasonableness. . . . If the editor sees that a story is over long, and suggests stricter economy, the author must, of course, be the judge as to the demands of his art, but we have always found the lesser writers the most unwilling to see the possibility of and abbreviation.” It must be consoling to those who are acquainted with the pathetic words: “Returned with thanks,” to learn that sometimes contributions are declined from the best of writers. On the whole, the heart-to-heart talk of the editor deepens the impression of kindness and impartiality for which he has been known and admired these many years. And yet the most patient subscriber must sometimes wonder why he prints some of the stories. J. H. D.

**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.

## The Public

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

#### TERMS.

Annual Subscription . . . . .	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription . . . . .	1.00
Quarterly Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.10
Single Copies . . . . .	.05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

POSTED WEEKLY BY

### THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

1641 UNITY BUILDING

CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

#### ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,

613 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,

HOUSTON, TEXAS.

Presley K. Ewing.

Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,

COUNSELLOR AT LAW,

BENNETT BLDG.

99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.

Tel. Call, 1853 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.

NEW YORK.

### “Success in Life”

By LOUIS F. POST, Editor of The Public.

Per Copy, 5 Cents.

Per 1,000, \$6.00.

Address, THE CIVIC PUBLISHING CO.

43 Cedar Street, NEW YORK.

**ECONOMIC TANGLES**, by Judson Grenell; deals in popular yet practical way with industrial problems. Cloth, postpaid, \$1. PURDY PUB. CO., Room 81, McVickers Bldg.