

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1902.

Number 196.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

The post office department has been startled by a published construction of one of its recent rulings into proclaiming that the construction is unauthorized. The construction was made by a Publishers' Association with headquarters at Chicago. It announced last week that "the post office officials at Washington, D. C., have just ruled that a subscription to any publication entered as second-class matter must be discontinued when the time for which it is paid in advance has expired," and that this ruling is "directly opposed to all law and previous rulings" and "means a complete change and revolution in the publishing business." In consequence of that announcement, the third assistant postmaster general instructs postmasters to notify all publishers in their respective cities that there has been "no such change in the rules or practice with regard to subscriptions to legitimate second-class publications as is represented."

In making this proclamation, the third assistant postmaster general explains:

The report grows out of a ruling in an individual case of a New York publication which was carrying an enormous list of expired subscriptions which were largely first induced by premiums and where due notice had been given to the subscriber, who had failed to renew or to order continuance with a promise to pay, expressed or implied. When general rulings are made they are published in this Bulletin for the information of the public and all postmasters.

Upon the face of it, that seems to be a rational explanation. But after a little reflection we may see that so far from being reassuring to all publishers the explanation only exposes

the fact that any individual publisher is at the absolute mercy of the postmaster general.

The repudiated construction, says the third assistant postmaster general, grows out of "a ruling in an individual case." When "general rulings" are made they are officially published for general information. In other words, no general principle of action is to be inferred from decisions in individual cases. Each decision is to stand upon its own bottom. Only general rulings, promulgated as such, are to apply generally. That being so, a third assistant postmaster general may make any decision in an individual case which the whim, the prejudice or the corruption of the moment may inspire. No one is to regard the decision as a precedent involving principles of general application. It applies to that particular case and to no other. What possible rule of conduct could be better adapted to the establishment of a postal censorship? So long as severity is not of general application, strong papers care nothing about it. Confident in their strength that they are to be free from discriminations which are possible in "individual cases," and indifferent to the fate of weaker papers which are likely to be such as they themselves would gladly see suppressed, they are for giving the third assistant postmaster general a free hand. All they ask is that no drastic "general ruling" be promulgated, and that general principles be not inferred from particular decisions in "individual cases." And this modest request is granted.

It is this irresponsibility of the postmaster general over second-class matter that constitutes the real objection to that department of the postal service as now administered. He is given

judicial power; he uses the power unjudicially. It is left to him to decide, for instance, what constitutes a legitimate list of subscribers. He does decide, but arbitrarily in each "individual case." And in virtue of his decision, without the aid of a jury, without public examination of witnesses, without any inquiry that can truly be called a hearing, but simply through *ex parte* investigations by bureau subordinates, valuable property rights are ruthlessly destroyed. For the good will of a periodical is a property right; and it depends upon second-class mail privileges for existence. Yet the postmaster general cuts it off from these privileges by his mere dictum. He even cuts it off, when he sees fit so to do, in advance of his decision and while he makes his investigation.

One instance of this dangerous exercise of bureaucratic power we commented upon last week at page 596. Another was reported only a few days ago—the case of the Ladies' Home Journal, of Philadelphia. In a recent issue, that paper began "a new department—puzzle pictures," reads the report, in connection with which "prizes were offered to those who should correctly guess what woman's name was signified by each of the pictures given." The postal department did not in this case stop the publication, which has a large circulation and reaches a very influential clientele; but it did require the scheme to be abandoned on the ground that it was in the nature of a lottery. Now the Ladies' Home Journal is not a periodical calculated to win the admiration of a reading public much above the average of intelligence, nor was its guessing scheme of a very high order of intellectual entertainment. Indeed this scheme may have been a lottery, as the postal

department ruled that it was. But that is not the vital point. The point is that a postal bureau is able to command the editor of a periodical to omit a feature, on pain of having his publication ruined by being cut off from second-class facilities; and this without judge or jury, without any regular opportunity to defend his rights on the facts and the law before the courts of his country, without any alternative whatever, but to yield submissively to the arbitrary dictation of a bureau in the postal department.

A still more exasperating instance is the case of *The Penny Magazine*, now known as *The Unique Monthly*, published at New York. We take the facts from the pages of the latter publication for January, a year ago. This case is comparatively an old one, but it sheds light upon the administrative methods of the second-class matter bureau. Upon delivering the August (1900) number of *The Penny Magazine* to the New York post office, its publisher was there officially informed that the department at Washington had decided to exclude it from second-class privileges. No reason was given, and the New York postal authorities knew of none. To the publisher, who had been regularly mailing the magazine every month, for five years, the order came as unexpectedly as a bolt of lightning from a clear sky. He went to Washington, but information as to the accusation against his paper was refused him by the postal authorities there. They advised him to make application at New York for reinstatement, promising that then the accusation would be disclosed and an investigation made. The publisher assented, but asked that pending the examination the August number of his magazine be accepted as second-class matter because he could not raise the necessary amount to deposit for third-class rates—eight times the second-class rate,—Senator Depew, “the best friend and chief creditor of the magazine” being out of the country. The postmaster general granted this request, although his subordinate had previously positive-

ly denied it. No decision had been made by the department when the September number was ready for mailing; but at Senator Depew’s personal solicitation, he having meanwhile returned, second-class privileges were accorded for that number also. But no definite charge of violating postal laws was yet made, although the publisher had been given informally to understand that the legitimacy of his subscription list was doubted. Meanwhile the cost of production had so increased that the publisher decided he could no longer publish the magazine at 25 cents a year, and that upon increasing the price to 50 cents he could not continue to call it *The Penny Magazine*. So he changed the name to *The Unique Monthly*, announcing his intention in the October number and applying the new name to the November number. But his application for second-class privileges under the new name was rejected. The grounds stated for this were, (1) that *The Unique Monthly* was not a continuation of *The Penny Magazine*, but was “a new and different publication;” (2) that the postal department could “not give assistance to arbitrarily substituting to subscribers for an unexpired term of their subscriptions another publication than that subscribed for by them;” (3) that the subscription list of *The Penny Magazine* itself was in question. Accordingly, the application was denied “because of the lack of a legitimate list of subscribers.” A more remarkable specimen of “bureau law” was probably never penned. This, however, was only the ruling of the bureau; and the publisher, who, besides having the backing of Senator Depew, was a pushing man, got a rehearing before the postmaster general, who reversed the bureau decision and admitted the new magazine to second-class privileges. The mere statement of that case is a severe commentary on the administration of the second-class bureau of the postal department. It is in itself evidence of the dangerous power which congress allows the postmaster general and his subordinates to exercise. If further

condemnation were needed, it is supplied by the publisher, so nearly victimized, who, while asserting that Senator Depew took no personal part in the controversy, explains that “without his generous support”—an allusion, doubtless, to financial assistance—the magazine could not have survived. Nothing but the accident of having a rich and not uninfluential friend saved the publisher in this case from the ruin which a less fortunate publisher would certainly have suffered, and which other publishers less fortunate actually have suffered.

In the group of periodicals that have been made to feel the power of the third assistant postmaster general’s bureau, is a little paper of the far northwest. Its name is “*Discontent*,” and it is published at Home, Washington, as the organ of a colony of extreme individualists, who have drawn opprobrium upon themselves by repudiating the institution of marriage. They are reputed to be a mild-mannered band of people, who attend to their own business and leave other people alone. Though they have been settled in their Home colony for years, no one tried to molest them until the assassination of President McKinley. Then a cry of “anarchist” was raised against them, and some of their leaders were arrested upon charges of sending obscene matter through the mails in the columns of “*Discontent*.” The federal grand jury has indicted them, and they are to be tried in Tacoma in February. Of their guilt upon this charge we are not sufficiently informed to have an opinion; and if we had one we should not discuss it pending the trial. We may add that with their views regarding marriage we are not in sympathy. But we consider just property as sacred in the possession of its owners, be they rich or poor, high or low, popular or unpopular. And their paper is their just property, until by due process of law it shall have been found to be otherwise, and that has not been done. Not only have no legal proceedings found it otherwise, but none for that purpose

have been instituted. Yet the postal department has stopped several issues of the paper in bulk at the Tacoma post office. The postage was paid and the publishers supposed the papers had gone to their destinations. They were put upon inquiry only by complaints of subscribers, who asserted that no copies had been received by them for weeks. Investigation then revealed the fact that orders had been received by the Tacoma post office to hold the paper there, pending an investigation; though upon what charges the postmaster professes not to know, and the publishers are uninformed. After detaining some four or five consecutive issues the Tacoma postmaster forwarded to the respective subscribers the whole accumulation, his orders having apparently been revoked. How much worse than this is the Russian censorship in Finland?

Nothing could be more prejudicial than conduct such as we have here traced to the second-class bureau of the postal department. The value of periodicals is as brittle as glass. It depends so much upon their regular delivery to subscribers that a voluntary suspension means abandonment. Enforced suspension therefore means suppression; and denial of mailing rights, though only temporary, is equivalent to enforced suspension. No bureau of the government should have that power. No bureau of the government should be allowed thus to trifle with the property rights of even the humblest publisher. No periodical, however poor in purse or unpopular for the cause it advocates, should be deprived of the prime necessity of a periodical's existence—untrammelled use of the mails upon equal terms with the richest and strongest and most popular—without that due process of law, which is one of the traditional bulwarks of our liberties. And in the interest of free discussion, not only should no established periodical be summarily or unjudicially deprived of customary mailing rights, but every new periodical seeking those rights

should have ready access to the courts to secure the benefit of the law as it is, instead of being forced to abide by the law as an irresponsible bureau officer wants it to be in this "individual case" or in that.

But the remedy for this bureaucratic evil of the post office is not what is proposed in some quarters. The Trades assembly of Springfield, O., for instance, urges that Mr. Madden, the third assistant postmaster general, be removed from office. It charges him with assuming legislative functions, with interfering with publications and thereby lessening the volume of employment in the printing trades, with having made himself especially obnoxious to labor organizations by forcing the discontinuance of trades union and social reform papers, and with diverting the postal service from its purpose of a disseminator of intelligence by setting up a press censorship. But Mr. Madden's removal is not the remedy for this condition. That would simply furnish another exemplification of the adage—"the king is dead, long live the king." Mr. Madden's successor would do what he is doing now. For it is the railroad interests, not their temporary representatives in a postal bureau, that cause these censorizing actions. The true remedy is to call upon congress to define second-class matter so exactly as to make bureaucratic interpretation fairly unnecessary; and to provide for speedy legal proceedings in local courts against local postmasters in the district of publication, whenever second-class rights are in question. So much, at least, ought to be done. In addition, it would be well to ascertain the average cost of postal service for second-class matter, and fix the postage at that amount. If this were done, it would not be oppressive to any paper, for all would be treated alike. It would be just, for each would pay for what he got. It would remove all pretense of necessity for reducing the volume of second-class matter, for no one could say that this causes a postal deficit. And it would force the big periodicals into the fight

against the railroad ring, which enormously overcharges for postal service and then disingenuously lays the blame of deficits at the door of a few more or less defenseless periodicals. Don't ask for Madden's discharge. Ask for a just reform of the law.

Although bureaucratic abuses in the postal department are most noticeable just now in connection with second-class matter, it must not be forgotten that in other respects also the post office department has become an irresponsible censor of the mails. Step by step, over a period of 30 years, post office administration has gained arbitrary control over mailing rights until now it not uncommonly cuts individuals off from getting even private letters and destroys business interests of magnitude by its own ipse dixit. There are said to be a considerable number of persons in the country who can get no mail in their own names. If you write to them, your letter comes back unopened, stamped "fraudulent" by some postmaster. They have been summarily convicted of fraud. Without any proceedings that can even by the widest stretch of terms be called "due process of law," the postal department has declared them engaged in fraudulent occupations and hassen-tenced them accordingly to deprivation of mailing rights. Mrs. Wilmans, of Florida, for instance, has been denied the use of the mails under that name, her own, without other trial, hearing or investigation than something equivalent to a star chamber proceeding at the post office department in which she was adjudged guilty of fraud because she held herself out as practicing "mental healing" and didn't practice it according to the honesty standards of the department. And only a week or so ago the news dispatches told of orders issued by the post office authorities at Washington to stop the mail of 13 investment companies doing business at Louisville, Ky., upon charges of carrying on business under false pretenses. Now it may be that all these people

are swindlers and ought to be denied the use of the mails. But that is not the question. The question is whether the prerogative of deciding that they are swindlers, and of denying them the use of a public service which has come to be a necessity of social and industrial life, shall be summarily and irresponsibly exercised by an administrative officer at Washington. Is "due process of law" obsolete?

Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has entered fully into plans to redeem his promise to do all in his power to give Cleveland a three-cent rate of street car fare. But obstacles are being thrown in his way by advocates of a per capita tax on street car passengers, through the indirect method of taxing gross receipts; and to the arguments for this highly objectionable plan Mayor Johnson replies:

It is best to invite proposals in such a way as to insure three-cent fare, and the provision for municipal ownership when the people are ready for it, rather than attempt to incumber the proposition with a plan of producing revenue for the city treasury; for there is no revenue from taxation on gross receipts possible without increasing fares. Increasing fare for the purpose of revenue is bound to cost the patrons two dollars for every one dollar that goes into the treasury, and in the final analysis it is a plan for raising revenue for the support of the city government by levying a tax upon street car riders, confessedly that part of the community that is today bearing the heaviest weight of taxation in proportion to its ability. This is a poll tax, the most unfair of all plans of taxation.

In a more detailed discussion of the subject Mr. Johnson explains:

A five-cent fare with 40 per cent., or two cents of each five cents, paid into the city treasury, seems to be equivalent to a three-cent fare and nothing paid to the city. But it is not. No company could afford to accept a five-cent fare ordinance on such conditions, while a three-cent fare grant would be very profitable, as the low fare would encourage short rides and largely increase the volume of business. A five-cent cash fare, with 20 per cent., or one cent of each five cents, paid into the city treasury in the same way, appears to equal a four-cent fare. The fact, however, is that no percentage of

gross receipts can yield to the public treasury an amount equal to the advantage of low fares to the public. In my judgment a four-cent fare with five per cent. tax on the gross receipts would not be so good for the investor as the straight three-cent fare with no tax, and I doubt whether there would be as many bidders. Even if the proposition were equal for the investors, it would be a hardship on the street car riders to pay one cent additional on each ride in order that one-fifth of a cent might be paid into the city treasury. The people would be taxing themselves five dollars in car fares to relieve themselves of one dollar in tax burdens. Knowing this, it seems wise to concentrate our entire effort upon securing a low rate of fare; rather than any percentage of gross receipts, or to attempt partly one and partly the other.

This succinct explanation of the low-fare idea, by a man who not only opposes the revenue diversion on civic principle, but also understands the financial advantage to street car investors of low fares without taxation over high fares with taxation, is worthy of serious thought wherever the street car problem is under consideration.

Mr. Roosevelt's recent cabinet appointments are curious if not significant. For postmaster general, he names Mr. Payne, of Wisconsin, a notorious representative in politics of railroad and other monopoly interests. Gov. Shaw, of Iowa, appointed to succeed Mr. Gage in the treasury, is also a railroad politician. Both he and Payne were "turned down" in their respective states by their own party because they are too representative of railroad interests. But it is not to this characteristic of the two men that we particularly refer. There is no novelty about that in Republican politics. What is especially noticeable is the fact that both men belong to the minority faction of their party in their respective states. Payne is held in check by the La Follette faction in Wisconsin, and Shaw by the Cummins faction in Iowa. Is it possible that Mr. Roosevelt is building up a machine out of minority factions, with the idea that they can be turned into majority factions by judicious uses of federal pat-

ronage? Additional color is given to that plausible suspicion by the situation of the Republican party in Ohio. Mr. Hanna has heretofore been the Republican boss in that state. But the indications now are strong that the federal patronage, whereby he maintained that position, has been placed at the disposal of Mr. Foraker, of the minority faction.

President Roosevelt's summary dismissal of Maclay, the historian who so viciously assailed Schley's courage, raises a question of civil service reform. As Maclay was in the classified service, he supposed and the public generally supposed, that he could not be discharged without cause—that is, without cause affecting him as a classified servant—and then only upon notice and after a hearing. But the president has discharged him without such cause, without even assigning a cause, and without a hearing. And this action by the president is approved by the head of the civil service commission, whose idea appears to be that any classified employe may be so discharged provided there are notorious reasons which do not appear to be those of partisan politics, even though the reasons are unrelated to efficiency. If this be true, classified servants are not, after all, so secure against pernicious politics as the public has been assured. He would be a poor politician who could not find "notorious" reasons not political for discharging clerks that happen to be objectionable politically, if not required to name any cause at all.

The Italian minister of foreign affairs is reported to have caused a sensation on the 20th in the Italian senate. No wonder. The question of the lynching of Italians in Mississippi was before the senate, and the minister explained that neither the Italian government nor Italian diplomats were guilty of any negligence in their efforts to secure the triumph of justice, but owing to the reticence of witnesses it had been impossible to identify the culprits. He then

added, and it was this that caused the sensation, that in consequence the grand jury had declared that the lynching in question had occurred by "the will of God." How like an anarchistic American grand jury, when its members approve the crime under consideration, to piously indict God! How like an Italian statesman to experience a sensation over so reverent a proceeding!

A PERSONAL STUDY IN CIVIC ETHICS.*

A group of enthusiasts met in New York 15 years ago to consult about bringing into practical politics what is now known as Henry George's single tax reform. One was the late Father McGlynn, the "soggarth aroon," or beloved priest, of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic parish, a notable man in New York even then. The most notable person present, however, was Henry George. He not only represented especially the cause which had brought about the meeting, but he had already achieved an international reputation. Three months later, as candidate for mayor upon a platform indorsing his cause, and after a campaign in which this cause was the sole issue, he polled 68,000 votes, being second in a triangular contest between himself, Abram S. Hewitt, who was elected, and Theodore Roosevelt, now president. Whether or not this campaign was in any wise due to the meeting mentioned above, that meeting served, at all events, to introduce to the single tax movement, and thereby to the political world, an obscure western millionaire, who, no longer obscure, but known throughout the country as Tom L. Johnson, has ever since been an unwavering supporter, as he is now the most conspicuous promoter, of the cause he then first publicly espoused.

Brought actively into politics by fidelity to this cause, Johnson has developed into a political leader of originality, skill, popularity and expanding influence, who interests himself in broad political principles instead

of wire pulling, and supports or opposes men with reference only to their attitude toward public measures. Yet, until 1886, he had acquired no experience in general politics, nor taken more than a bare business interest in political affairs.

His abilities had been devoted, from his youth up, to making a fortune. In this he had so far succeeded as to have advanced from a penniless boy, son of an impoverished Confederate officer, at the close of the civil war, to the financial grade of a millionaire while still under 35 years of age. His business success had not been achieved by laboriously and penuriously piling dollar upon dollar. The palaver about the magic of industry and thrift, so much in vogue in his boyhood, had never deceived him. He did, indeed, work hard; but not at what he could hire cheaper men to do as well. He did cultivate habits of thrift; but not of the penurious kind. He did use judgment, foresight, skill, and all the other industrial virtues; but these were not the foundation of his fortune. His fortune, like all other stable fortunes, rests upon monopoly. From the hour when as a newsboy he worked a railway paper route for which he had shrewdly secured the exclusive privilege, until a generation later, when he withdrew from business to devote himself to the cause Henry George bequeathed him, every business enterprise into which he embarked was bottomed upon and buttressed by legal privilege.

Johnson had early realized that this is imperative. He knew that the three requisites of business success are, first, monopoly, second, monopoly, and third, monopoly. He saw that in so far as the industrial virtues play a part in fortune-making at all, it is much more in monopolizing what people need than in producing what they want. These intimate relations of monopoly to business success were with him as with all successful business men, mere commonplaces of business theory and practice. He had given no consideration, however, to the subject in its ethical and broadly political aspects. Getting a fortune without getting into jail had seemed to him, as it seems to most en-

ergetic men of this commercial era, the one great object of life.

But Johnson's better mind awakened. His nightmare visions of piled-up dollars, pyramid after pyramid in vanishing perspective, were dispelled, and great realities burst upon his moral consciousness. The circumstances of his awakening, how in a railroad car he was misled by the title of Henry George's "Social Problems" into supposing it a trashy essay on marriage and divorce, and refused therefore to look into it; how the train conductor enlightened him on that point and advised his reading the book; how he did read it, and how his interest grew; how upon finding in this book a reference to "Progress and Poverty," he bought and read that; how completely he fell under the sway of this greatest of George's books, yet, fearing that his mind, then untrained in abstract reasoning, might have been tricked by fallacies, how he solicited the opinion of his lawyer and his lawyer pronounced the reasoning flawless but the premises false; how this clinched his conversion, because, though from lack of academic culture he was timid as to the logic of the book, he had, as an experienced business man, already acknowledged the truth of its premises; and how at the end he converted his lawyer, when the latter undertook to argue him out of his waywardness—this has all been told before in interesting detail. What concerns the present subject is the fact that Johnson was startled by seeing in George's book the commonplace principles of business translated into terms of political economy and civic morality. He now realized that whatever of wealth any man wins as a monopolist, other men must lose as productive workers.

The great economic truth that had been disclosed was the elemental economic power of the monopoly of land. Other monopolies there are, but without this the others could not flourish, and if they were abolished it would absorb their strength. Railroad monopoly, for instance, Johnson now recognized as land monopoly, its power consisting in exclusive rights of way and in terminal points. Street car monopoly, city service monopolies of

*By Louis F. Post, in *The Mirror*, of St. Louis, Christmas number. Reprinted by permission of William Marion Reedy, editor and proprietor of *The Mirror*.

all kinds, are also at bottom land monopolies, for it is by their exclusive rights of way over land that they control conditions of traffic. And in ordinary so-called competitive industry, whatever monopoly exists, the monopoly of patents alone excepted, has its roots in land monopoly. Moreover, if every monopoly except that of land were abolished, the financial benefits would go ultimately to monopolists of land. So, as Johnson saw the matter after his conversion from money-getting ambitions to humanitarian ideals, the monopoly of monopolies is the monopoly of land.

He saw also the great moral truth that land monopoly is robbery. To see this truth he did not need to have been a college fledgling. All he needed was common sense. Granted that God is no respecter of persons, and it follows that all men are intended by Him to enjoy equal rights of usufruct in the earth. This enjoyment the monopoly of land prohibits. Or, if the idea of a bountiful Creator be considered "unscientific," then, granted that Nature yields her stores only to productive labor (an hypothesis which defies dispute), and it follows, unless righteous principles be rejected altogether and moral adjustments are to be referred to the pirates' code of simple might, that there can be no moral title to products from the earth—which include every consumable thing—except it be derived from productive laborers with their free consent. Inasmuch, then, as monopoly of the earth enables monopolists to extort from productive laborers part of their earnings, it stands morally condemned.

Keenly alive to this manifest iniquity of land monopoly, a man of Johnson's moral energy could not say to himself: "Let be! Let be!" and go on complacently in his old life. He could not consent even by silence to the social maladjustments whereby he and his class prosper at terrible cost to their disinherited brethren. But, a rich land monopolist himself, one of the beneficiaries of this wrong, what ought he to do to right it? That was the problem uppermost in his mind, and it was no easy problem.

His first thoughts ran naturally to personal considerations. He might

wash his hands of the evil by giving away his fortune and ceasing to be a monopolist. That would have been a beautiful act of martyrdom for the delectation of sentimentalists of a future age. But martyrdom is oftener sublimated selfishness than disinterested altruism; and, despite the saw about the seed of the church, is generally easier of adoption than beneficent in results. In this case it certainly could have accomplished nothing. The monopolies Johnson might have abandoned would have fallen into other hands unshorn of power and been as extortionate as ever, while he, as a fighter of monopoly, would have been to that extent disarmed.

Even if he had been sufficiently self-centered to make the question of how he should use his own fortune the primary consideration, the thing would have been quite impracticable. Monopoly, which blights, and business, which serves, are so intimately though unnaturally blended by existing law and custom, that individuals cannot separate them. No opportunities for profitable business are free from legalized monopoly. To live at all, therefore, one must either exploit or be exploited. Even the hermit cannot elude the vigilant eye of land monopoly.

Opportunities for philanthropy might have been considered, though in Johnson's case this is not likely. He was too honest with himself to concede for one moment that fortunes extorted from the poor through predatory laws are given in trust by God for distribution to some of the poor under the stewardship of their owners. His problem was not a question of spending; it was the question of getting. And his mind could not be fogged with the notion that giving away such fortunes in charity is morally better than keeping them. He knew that what we have no moral right to keep, we have no better moral right to give. Ownership must precede generosity.

The moral impulse Johnson had received from George's writings, as well as the advice of George himself, had other than selfish bearings, even the sublime selfishness of spectacular philanthropy or martyrdom. Self had been thrust absolutely aside. It was completely out of the problem.

The question with Johnson was not whether he himself should remain rich or become poor. It was not whether his personal fortune should be tainted with monopoly or no. It was in no sort a question of whether he should or should not save or purify his own fortune, his own life, or his own soul, for his own sake. It was not whether he should seem to be consistent. The question was infinitely broader and deeper. It was a question of what he ought to do, regardless of the effect either way upon his private interests, to induce his fellow citizens to put away the terribly withering social sin which, under George's guidance, he had discovered to be land monopoly.

The truth is that Johnson's awakened conscience looked out upon an iniquitous social institution. It was not from the machinations of bad men, but from the development of a bad institution, that industry was plundered and that society suffered. The immorality to which he awoke, and out of which he had secured a fortune partly unearned but in which millions had found only poverty and distress wholly undeserved—this immorality was not individual and capable of correction by individual reform. It was an institutional immorality, which could be corrected only by institutional reform.

The notion that institutional evils can be put away, like personal evils, by individual abstention, is an eccentricity of narrow minds. Though every individual but one were to abstain from monopolizing land, land monopoly would not die out if the institution were still acknowledged, but would be worse. For the one unregenerate individual would then monopolize the whole earth, and all the regenerate would become his submissive serfs. Individuals can no more alter unjust institutions by declining to profit by them than they could alter the direction of a stream by not swimming in it.

Institutional wrongs can be remedied only by institutional reforms. Individual action there must be, of course, for society is composed of individuals. But it must be cooperative and not segregated individual action;

not the action of the recluse, but that of the citizen.

So Johnson solved his problem in the only way in which it could be morally and sensibly solved. He decided to devote himself to the destruction of the institution of land monopoly, by the method advocated by Henry George and now known as the single tax; and to do this without regard to its ultimate effect upon his personal fortune, and without any affectations meanwhile of an impossible consistency between his private business, in which monopoly was a factor, and his public work of abolishing monopoly.

He raised his lance not against millionaires nor monopolists, not against the rich because they are rich nor for the poor because they are poor; but against the institution of monopoly and for institutions of justice. The distinction he drew between utilizing monopolies in business and maintaining the monopoly institution, was sharply illustrated by him upon the floor of congress while he was a member. Congressmen representing the steel trust were struggling for the protective tariff on steel. Johnson himself was then in the steel business and his company was a member of the steel trust. He, therefore, like the others, was getting a tariff "rake-off." Yet he vigorously opposed the tariff measure. One of the steel trust congressmen, twitting him in the debate with his connection with the steel trust, implied that as he was getting part of the plunder he ought to support the law that secured it. "Gentlemen," retorted Johnson, "as a monopolist in the steel business I will take advantage of the bad laws you pass; but as a member of this house, I will not help you pass them, and I will try to get them repealed."

More in detail, and as a private citizen instead of a congressman, he made the same distinction at a public meeting in New York in 1891. A questioner in the audience asked him:

You have just advocated the abolition of land monopoly, of the tariff monopolies, of the patent monopolies, and of the street railroad monopolies. Is it not a fact that you have been, and are now, a shining beneficiary of

all these iniquities? And if you are, how do you reconcile your actions with your professions?

To that searching question Johnson replied:

I advocate now and have advocated the abolition of all these forms of monopoly, and yet I am and have been a beneficiary of them all. If there is any inconsistency in that it is not my fault. I preach what I sincerely believe to be the true and just social condition—the condition of equal rights, of real freedom. Yet I must live under such laws and usages as the majority of the people decree. They say that these monopolies shall exist; that bread-winning shall be a scramble; that there shall be many poor among us and comparatively few rich. I do not believe that this is right, and I am raising my voice wherever possible against it. But the people will not yet listen. They have different views from mine, and they hold to them. Now being compelled to live in this state of things where life is a scramble which the people will not stop, I am bound to do the best I can for myself. And so I rush in and grab all the monopolies I can get my hands on, firm in the purpose, however, to use the wealth so obtained to teach the people how misguided they are to permit themselves to be robbed in this way.

That purpose of using his fortune acquired by monopoly to break up monopoly has been faithfully adhered to. Not as an atonement, not as a means of satisfying his conscience for having got the fortune through monopoly. In no sense for personal reasons, but with the same motive that he gives to this work of his life what is incontestably all his own.

There is, indeed, a profound difference between getting rich through legalized monopoly, and supporting, either as private citizen or public legislator, the laws that legalize it. In the one case, we but adapt ourselves to an evil social environment which is forced upon us; in the other, we make ourselves personally responsible for the evils of that environment.

The men who were responsible for the perpetuation of slavery in the United States, and therefore the real sinners in that respect, were not the slaveholders as such. Slavery was perpetuated by men as citizens, by non-slave owners as well as slave owners, who used influence and vote to maintain the institution. Similarly the men who now perpetuate

monopoly are not the monopolists as such, but citizens who, whether themselves monopolists or not, contribute voice, pen, vote, even cowardly silence, to the maintenance of civic institutions that make for monopoly.

One such man as Tom L. Johnson, who profits by monopoly and excuses monopolists, yet denounces the institution of monopoly and makes relentless war upon it, is worth more to the cause of civic justice than a host of men who rail at monopolists as wrong doers merely because they are monopolists, yet allow the institution of monopoly to go unchallenged, or challenge it without intelligence. The true principle of civic ethics is that which Johnson exemplifies. It does not consist in rejecting profits which unjust institutions yield to the favored or fortunate. So long as social adjustments are such that those profits cannot be relinquished to the persons who earn them, justice is served neither by giving them to others nor by rejecting them altogether. It is not affirmatively ethical to get rid of them; consequently it is not unethical to keep them. What ethics does demand is that the beneficiary of such profits shall awaken to the enormity of the social institution that diverts them from their unidentified producers, and in his capacity of citizen aid his fellow citizens of like enlightenment and moral impulse to bring that vicious institution to an end.

NEWS

Once more the war in South Africa becomes the chief subject of general interest, in consequence of a notable Boer victory. Such revivals at the holiday season seem to characterize this most remarkable war. In 1899 the British commander had announced his intention of eating his Christmas dinner in the Boer capital; but instead, the British were badly repulsed at the holiday season in the battle of Tugela river (vol. ii., No. 90, p. 8), and all their advancing columns were held in check. A year later, 1900, after what was supposed to be the final victory over the Boers had been celebrated throughout England, and public interest in the war had subsided, the holiday season brought news

of a brilliant Boer victory (vol. iii., p. 583), which suddenly revived general interest in the subject. And now, another year having elapsed, during which the South African war news had again dropped to a minor place, the holiday season has again restored it and made the South African war the news topic of principal interest.

Though some indications of revived energy among the Boers was given last week, in that report the British appeared to have offset their losses somewhat by an important capture on the 24th. But later advices show that on the same day on which this capture was made in the Pietersburg district, the Boers were making a capture of much greater importance and winning one of the most encouraging successes of the year. This was at Zeefontein, in the Orange Free State, northwest of Bloemfontein and between Bethlehem and Lindley. Under DeWet they attacked four companies of British yeomanry, commanded by Col. Firman. Firman was absent at the time, and during the battle Maj. Williams was in command. The British lost 56 in killed, including Maj. Williams, and 250 in wounded and prisoners. The two guns in possession of the British at this point were captured by the Boers. After the battle the Boers were pursued by reinforcements of British horse, but unsuccessfully. Subsequently they released their prisoners.

The British casualties at Begin-deryn, reported last week (p. 602) prove to have been 10 killed and 15 wounded.

Boer leaders at Amsterdam are said to have decided to send C. M. Wessels to the United States, accredited by President Kruger to President Roosevelt, with a view to making peace overtures. American sentiment being regarded as friendly. This impression derives further support from the fact that pro-Boer meetings are becoming markedly successful. A large one was held in Topeka, Kan., on the 29th, and was addressed by prominent leaders of both political parties. The resolutions urged an offer by President Roosevelt of his friendly offices as an arbitrator. Other meetings of similar character are being arranged for, following the example (p. 568) of the great meeting last month at the Auditorium, in Chicago, which was pre-

sided over by Judge Tuley and addressed by Burke Cockran.

Curiously enough there comes a holiday message from the Philippines (the last previous reports from which were summarized at page 568), which resembles that from South Africa, though in minor degree. On the very day of the British disaster in the Boer war, Christmas eve, the Americans in the Philippines suffered seriously in an engagement in the island of Samar. An American detachment of 18 men, while scouting near Dapado, was attacked by Filipinos, and a hand-to-hand fight resulted. The American loss was seven killed and six wounded.

Other Philippine news is not so disheartening to the Americans. In an engagement in Batangas province, Luzon, only one American was badly wounded, while several Filipinos were killed. In Laguna province, Luzon, the Americans have made what the dispatches describe as a "clean sweep." They have burned not only all the Filipino barracks they could find, but also several little villages or hamlets. Still another item of Philippine news is the sentence to hanging of several Filipinos, by American courts-martial, upon allegations of murder, one of the accused being a commander of Filipino forces charged with aiding the assassination of prisoners.

The birthday of Jose Rizal, Filipino poet and patriot, who was executed by the Spanish before the occupation of the Philippines by the Americans, was celebrated at Manila on the 30th, by his countrymen. They decorated the spot upon which he died, and held a mass meeting on the site where a monument to his memory is to be erected.

The American civil governor, Taft, sailed from Manila for home on the 24th, on the United States army transport Grant, leaving Vice Gov. Wright at the head of the American civil government in the archipelago.

Warfare is not altogether the order of our time, but wars and rumors of war are the prominent facts which meet the eye in whatever direction it turns. South America, already furnishing news from two wars, is looked to now for news of a third. Chili and Argentina are the countries involved. We have already noted the possibility of this war (pp. 584, 602); supposing,

however, that it had been averted by the signing, reported last week, of a protocol between the quarreling countries. But news of the current week is to the effect that the government of Argentina has rejected this settlement.

The dispute between Chili and Argentina is over a boundary line. By treaty in 1881, the boundary line between the two countries southward to the fifty-second parallel of south latitude, was laid along the highest summits of the Andes mountains, between the watersheds on each side; and it was agreed that disputes as to its course should be decided amicably by experts chosen by the two governments. Disputes did arise, and in 1892 an attempt was made to fix the line in accordance with the treaty; but the experts could not agree, the Argentine government declaring that the line proposed by Chili fell far within Argentine territory. Disputes continuing, a new treaty on the subject was entered into in 1898, under which the definition of that portion of the boundary which is south of latitude 26 degrees, 52 minutes and 45 seconds, was left to the decision of the British government. In 1899 the British government accordingly appointed as arbitrators Baron Edward McNaghten, Gen. Sir Charles Ordagh and Col. Sir Thomas H. Holdich. Although the arbitration proceedings are still pending, Chili has opened roads in the disputed territory. She is also—and this is the immediate cause of the present friction—fortifying disputed territory in the region of the Straits of Magellan, south of the fifty-second parallel, territory which she claims to be outside the territory involved in the pending arbitration proceedings; and as a countermove Argentina has sent troops into the same territory, and is making active preparations for war.

The good offices of the United States were offered to Chili and Argentina early in December of this year, but they have not been accepted. Great Britain and Brazil made a like offer at about the same time, which as yet is also unaccepted. On the 13th Chili forwarded diplomatic proposals to Argentina, to which the latter replied on the 16th. On the 21st Argentina ordered her minister to Chili to withdraw if the terms of her reply were not complied with. An arrangement was made, however, on the 25th, whereby both governments agreed to

include the present dispute in the arbitration treaty of 1898, and to refrain from acts of dominion in the debatable territory pending the award of the British arbitrators. This arrangement was the protocol we mentioned last week. Accordingly, the Argentine minister to Great Britain was notified by his government on the 26th, so said the London dispatches, that—

the pending incidents have been settled direct with Chili in satisfactory form. Chili has given explanations concerning the roads. The police of both countries have been withdrawn from the disputed territory.

But since that notification Argentina is reported to have overruled her diplomatic representatives who assented to the protocol of the 25th, dispatches of the 28th from Washington being to the effect that the Argentina government has rejected so much of the protocol as requires her to withdraw her police from the territory of Ultima Esperanza, the territory in immediate dispute, and to include the present difficulty in the arbitration by Great Britain.

From Colombia, one of the two South American countries referred to above as being involved in war, there is news of an important battle. Our last previous reference to this war was at page 554, when Colon was re-surrendered to the government troops. News of the battle now referred to was not received until the 28th, though it was fought on the 9th. The insurgents, 1,200 strong, attacked a garrison of 430 men, beginning the fight at Honda, on the Magdalena river about 60 miles northwest of Bogota, the capital of Colombia. It lasted from six in the morning until 11:30 at night, ending at Caracol, nine miles away. The loss of life is reported as 400.

From Venezuela no important news has transpired since our report of last week (p. 601), except that Germany has postponed her contemplated naval demonstration for the collection of debts due German subjects. In this connection it is reported from Washington that the German ambassador to the United States has assured President Roosevelt that in the proposed German movement in Venezuelan waters there will be no violation of the Monroe doctrine; but that nothing more will be done than to hold and administer Venezuelan custom

houses until the amount of the indebtedness shall have been collected.

The first of the Cuban elections arranged by the permanent Cuban committee in cooperation with Gov. Gen. Wood, (p. 411) came off on the 31st. T. Estrada Palma was elected president of the Republic and Louis Estevez vice president. The president-elect lives in exile at Central Valley, a village near Goshen, N. Y. He intends to return to Cuba in the spring.

Practical steps to head off the railroad trust, known as the Northern Securities company of New Jersey (pp. 505, 534), have been taken by the states affected. Gov. Van Sant, of Minnesota, proposed a conference of these states on the subject as soon as the trust was formed (p. 534), but it was not until late in December that the conference got together. It met at Helena, Mont., on the 30th. The attendants were Gov. Van Sant and Attorney General Douglas, of Minnesota; Gov. Toole and Attorney General Donovan, of Montana; Gov. Herroid and Attorney General Pyle, of South Dakota; Gov. Hunt and Attorney General Martin, of Idaho; and Attorney General Stratton, of Washington. The recent death of Gov. Rogers, of Washington, prevented a gubernatorial representation from that state. Gov. Van Sant was elected chairman of the conference, and Attorney General Martin secretary. No definite business was transacted on the 30th; but on the 31st the conference laid out a plan of campaign. The whole plan has not been divulged; but it is understood that the first step is to be a law suit against the trust brought by the state of Minnesota, and morally supported by the other states. Congress was petitioned, also, in the matter.

Another check upon the Northern Securities company scheme for railroad consolidation came in the form of an injunction, probably instigated by some of the parties to the deal, for purposes of their own. One Peter Power, a stockholder of the Northern Pacific railway, owning 100 shares, obtained this injunction from the federal district judge at Minneapolis. It restrained the officers of the Northern Pacific from retiring preferred stock or doing any other act tending to transfer the management of the road to the Northern Securities company. The reasons for the injunction were that the officers of the Northern Pa-

cific the Great Northern, and the Burlington roads had made an agreement to stifle competition by consolidating them; and inasmuch as direct consolidation is unlawful under the statutes of several states through which the roads pass, they had organized the Northern Securities company for the purpose of acquiring ownership of the competing roads and thereby evading these statutes. But the injunction was quickly dissolved. The federal circuit judge dissolved it on the 31st, holding that there was nothing in the case to show an intention to consolidate either directly or indirectly. In consequence of this favorable decision the Northern Pacific retired all its preferred stock at midnight on the 1st.

NEWS NOTES.

—United States Senator William J. Sewell, of New Jersey, died at Camden on the 27th, after a prolonged illness.

—The American Historical society and the American Economic society met in joint session at Washington on the 27th.

—Three Finland newspapers have been suppressed and seven suspended by the Russian government for criticisms of Russian subjugation of Finland.

—At the New Year reception at the White House, from 11:05 a. m. to 2:35 p. m., President Roosevelt received 8,351 callers—3,000 more than were received last year.

—John R. Rogers, governor of Washington, died on the 26th, aged 63 years. He was a Populist. The lieutenant governor, who succeeds him, is a Republican.

—The American navy department is reported to have abandoned the use of carrier pigeons, intending to develop instead for naval purposes the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy.

—The Zionist congress met at Basle on the 26th, with 1,000 delegates in attendance. It has resolved to establish a fund of \$1,000,000, to be made up of collections from all quarters of the world for the purchase of land in Palestine for Jewish occupation.

—According to mail advices from Japan a German named Theyerson has attempted to kill the emperor of Japan. The Japanese government had seized a copper mine in which the German was interested, a fact which is reported as the motive for the crime.

—An agreement for a prize fight between James J. Jeffries and Thomas Sharkey was made on the 30th, the fight to take place between March

17th and April 30, before the club offering the best purse. The Yosemite Athletic club, of San Francisco having offered 62½ per cent. of the gate receipts, it is expected that the fight will take place there.

—The American Physiological society held its fourteenth annual session at Chicago during the current week. A sensational incident was the presentation of a paper by Prof. Loeb, on the possibilities of destroying the death tendency of life. Prof. Loeb announced the further theory that heart action is due not to heat energy but to electricity.

—Quo warranto suits were brought in Ohio on the 28th by ex-Attorney General Frank Monnett, representing the Anti-Trust League, for the revocation of the charters of the Hocking Valley & Toledo Railway company, the Kanawha & Michigan Railway company, the Buckeye Coal & Railway company, and the Sunday Creek Coal company. The companies are charged with violation of the state laws against combinations in restraint of trade.

—Advices from New Zealand, through the San Francisco Star, are to the effect that since our last report (pp. 324-27), two municipalities have adopted and one has defeated the single tax for local purposes. The borough of Petone, near Wellington, has rejected it for the second time. But on the 29th of August a flourishing farming center, the borough of Masterton, adopted it by a vote of 221 to 139, and on November 14, Wellington, the legislative capital and the third city of New Zealand, also adopted it, the vote being 1,261 for the reform and only 591 against it. This makes a total of 63 municipalities in New Zealand that have availed themselves of the right to adopt the single tax for local purposes.

PRESS OPINIONS.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Los Angeles Weekly Herald, Dec. 26.—The objection to the Chinese on the part of the people who are familiar with Chinese character is broad and fundamental. It may be summed up by saying that the Chinese are morally, socially, religiously and politically unfit to live in the United States.

RAILROAD CONSOLIDATION IN THE NORTHWEST.

Red Wing Argus, Dec. 29.—Between Hill and Harriman, we much prefer Hill. He is always willing to leave enough for seed. Southern Pacific, whose policy Union Pacific has inherited, wants all there is in it and a mortgage on next year's crop. But to continue—to protect their control of N. P. this group of capitalists had to retire N. P. preferred. To do that without risk of disintegration, they decided to put their holdings in a pool. Northern Securities is that pool. According to Mr. Hill, it does not change in the least degree the ownership of the

securities. Either there is no consolidation or it was accomplished some time ago.

THE PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Chicago Chronicle, Jan. 1.—The "temporary" tariff for the Philippines was rushed through the house with scant debate, and it was freely predicted that it would be railroaded through the senate after the holiday recess with almost the same expedition. This prediction was based on the assumption that there was really no serious Democratic opposition to any policy the Republicans might choose to pursue toward the Philippines, no matter how arbitrary or unjust. The assumption proves to have been unfounded. Those who entertained it now discover indications that "the free trade element" in the senate will improve the opportunity to offer amendments to the bill reducing the duties on certain articles.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL.

Chicago Record-Herald, Jan. 2.—It was inevitable that the official who undertook the active work of correcting the abuses of second-class mail privileges would incur the enmity of the powerful interests that have profited from these abuses. Failing to receive any aid in this direction from congress, the postmaster general, through his third assistant, availed himself of the large discretionary powers that were wisely vested in his office and exercised his undoubted right to throw out the publications not entitled under a fair construction of the law to second-class rates. These publications were serial novels, and advertising circulars which were masqueraded under the name of "journals." This is only a beginning, but it is a good one, and one of the most creditable achievements of Mr. Smith's administration.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Nashville Daily News, Dec. 28.—Kitchener's suggestion to his government to prepare an army of 60,000 to hold South Africa "after peace has been made" is in unnecessary haste. There will be plenty of time to make a draft before a desert is made and called peace.

Pittsburgh Post, Dec. 30.—Six British officers and 50 men were killed. This, with the list of wounded and missing, makes the battle of Zeefontein a memorable disaster for the British forces. As usual, it was a surprise by the Boers. They scaled mountains and attacked the British on the summit, shooting the soldiers down as they came out of their tents. The Boers numbered 1,500 men, which shows that their leaders are able to gather strong forces in an emergency, and to accomplish important results. History affords few parallels to the gallantry, skill and persistence with which the Boers are conducting a war against such great odds.

SCHLEY CASE.

Johnstown Democrat, Dec. 28.—Mr. Roosevelt is fully warranted in desiring to close the discussion. He is no stranger to the views of Don Quixote, and has learned that evil results flow from careless stirring of old scandals. But it is more than possible that Mr. Roosevelt may injure his cause by meddling with the ugly case. On his side the controversy no one has yet come out with clean hands. Mr. Roosevelt has formed no exception. He had better maintain a discreet silence.

San Francisco Star, Dec. 28.—Gen. Miles may have been indiscreet, and technically guilty of a violation of some weather-worn rule; but if so, he might have been chided gently, if at all, and in secret. But Roosevelt's "strenuous life" would not admit of such a course. He wanted

it known of men, and to go down in history, that he, Theodore Roosevelt, president of the United States, dared to flagellate Gen. Miles, and that he did so in a public anteroom.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

Pittsburgh Dispatch, Dec. 28.—The announcement of H. C. Payne, the new postmaster general, that he is in favor of government ownership of the telegraphs, was taken as an evidence of advanced views on the part of one who has been generally regarded as a corporation man. A certain jolt is administered to that opinion by some rumors in Wall street which present government purchase in the light of a very nice deal for the corporate interest. . . . Some state socialists are wont to characterize the combination policy as paving the way to their goal. Perhaps it is; but did it never occur to them that their industrious propaganda might be paving the way to the greatest financial coup of all? What more striking termination to the era of promotion could there be, when the ballooning and booming could be pushed no longer, than for the financial crowd to turn in with the government ownership party and unload the entire corporate outfit on the government at top prices, for, say, about \$25,000,000,000 of government two per cents?

TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS.

Buffalo Courier, Dec. 26.—Upon what theory of justice or expediency should the most valuable part of the assets of public service corporations escape taxation? The cars, power houses, rails, wires and other physical belongings constitute only a small part of the property of a street car company. The really valuable thing—and it is the essence of the monopoly—is the franchise or right of way on the public streets.

Columbus Evening Press, Dec. 28.—The new tax bill outlined by S. M. Bennett, as the policy of the Republican legislature, may please the dominant party, but it is too evident a makeshift to suit the plain business men or farmers of Ohio. . . . Where this bill is so palpably weak is in trying to make the people of Ohio believe that anything and everything bearing the name of "corporation" is a menacing ogre which ought to be hit by the tax power—a very ridiculous and suicidal idea, and no bill framed on any such principle will meet the exacting demands of the public for justice. It can never quiet the anti-corporation storm now gathering force each day. Why? Because the people demand, and demand rightfully, that a sharp distinction be made by the taxing power between private corporations and corporations that perform a public service. . . . The property of the people is deeded away, in greater or less degree, to every public service corporation, and these are the corporations which have for years been allowed to dodge an equitable share of the tax burdens; these are the corporations which have been fattened at the expense of the small fry and the farmer; these are the corporations which the people are after now, and which ought to put the general tax levy on the retired list if they were rounded up by an honest scale. It is these corporations—not the private enterprises which get nothing of value from the state—which the people are determined to reach.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. For references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, Dec. 20, 1901, to Jan. 5, 1902
No session of either house, both having adjourned over the holidays.

MISCELLANY

THE BURGHER'S WIFE.

(In the British Detention Camp.)

Outside, the guard goes heavily, the sun
beats on the roof,
He hears the sick ones moaning, but he
hold his eyes aloof;
In heaven is only sun-glare, dust-devils on
the veldt,
We could not pray the clouds up, however
long we knelt.
There are women who are sullen, there are
women who are wild,
And one perhaps is hopeful, but that one
has no child;
Katrina raved when yesternoon they took
her last away,
Annetje's went at candle light, and mine
will go to-day.

And is it you, brave England, that holds
us in the pen—
Making war on wives and children, since
you cannot match our men?
Will you swallow up our nation, make our
name as naught, you think?
By the living God of Dutchmen, you shall
spew the broth you drink!

I had seven sons, how long ago! Seven and
my good man,
And Greta—only woman-child that came to
me and Jan—
Six strong sons of my body, and one that
still was small;
They were stout for war or praying, and
their country took them all—
The wolf, the kite, the river trench, by
kopje and by veldt.
I did not weep, though all their wounds I
in my body felt;
It was I that scoured their rifles—one had
hardly done with play—
I did not weep to see them go, but I shall
weep to-day.

And is it wise, Great England, to build
your greatness so?
You that fatten on small peoples—though,
God's faith, the meal is slow!—
Growing wider by the holdings of a sim-
pler, feeblar folk,
It is fatness where no strength is, and
you too shall feel the yoke.

But once I wept for Wilhelm—he had his
father's looks—
The day that he was turned sixteen he
put away his books,
"Now, kiss me mother, let me go, for I am
grown a man"—
And so I wept for Wilhelm, though I did
not weep for Jan.
And for myself no whimper. I am past my
bearing time,
But I weep to know my woman-child must
die before her prime.
Is no coolness on the pillow for the tender,
fevered head?
Is no comfort in the sickness but my tear,
and captive's bread?

It is not for you, O England, to give me
back my sons,
We have paid the tale twice over by the
coughing, spitting guns;
But the small graves of the children, they
are yawning in the sod—
Deep enough to gulf your glory—high to
witness unto God.
—Mary Austin, in Land of Sunshine for De-
cember.

WORKING AT THE WAGE MARGIN.

Associated Press dispatch from Scranton, Pa., published in the New York Open Letter for December.

"Men, you all know me around here. You know the truth of what I say. I repeat it to you to remind you of the common lot of our misery and suffering which has made us combine to cry out for a better order of things.

"When I was six years and four months old I went to work in the breakers of the Pancoast Coal company. I have worked 19 years, every day that I could get. I have never been on an excursion in my life. I have never been to a theater but twice in my life. I have not drank a drop of beer or liquor for five years, and for two years I have not smoked. I have practiced the closest economy in food. But I have never been able to accumulate \$100 in my life.

"Men, I have lived in the hamlet of Throop all my life. You and I know this has always been a company store town. We know in our hearts what that means, whatever the operators may say.

"Eleven years I worked for the Pancoast Coal company, and during those 11 years I swear here before the Omnipotent I never handled one cent of earnings in money.

"I also have due bills of other members of the family to show they handled no money in all that period."

This is the astounding story told today before a vast audience by Stephen McDonald, a Throop miner, but it was declared to be one of almost ordinary occurrence. The voice of the young man rang with earnestness, his eye was fearless and flashed as he told it.

AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR HANNA.

Chicago, Ill., Dec. 30, 1901.

Hon. Marcus A. Hanna, Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.—Honored Sir: Your election as presiding officer over the newly organized arbitration board must give as much satisfaction to your other friends as it does to the undersigned. Your unswerving interest in the welfare of the workmen of our country has long been recognized. Your present attitude towards organized labor is entirely consistent with the well-established maxim that the highest prosperity is consonant with the most secure power to compel the consumer to pay as much "as the traffic will bear." While it may appear that our position is akin to that of socialism in our firm conviction that corruption must be stifled, it will not hurt our interests that its verisimili-

tude may be mistaken for identity.

Nevertheless, illustrious sir, should we not be exceeding cautious how, even for spectacular purposes, we seem to lean toward libertarianism? Here is a board composed of some of our very best people, who invite differences between capital and labor to be brought before themselves for arbitration. May not this be construed as a reflection upon the authoritarian principle for which our party stands? The project of compulsory arbitration will now be shelved, at least for some time; and instead of depending upon the paternalistic and sheltering care of a beneficent government, administered by a party embracing the intelligence and refinement of the country, we shall, I fear, be encouraging the lower classes to seek salvation in voluntarism.

However, you may be trusted to deal with our workpeople in a way best suited to the interests of our class, as you so signally demonstrated in your full-dinner pail campaign. I admit now that I was fearful the workfolk might resent our imputations of that period, but since then the veil has fallen from my vision and I realize that your estimate of the American workman was nearer correct than my own; and so I assume that your cooperation with a voluntarist board does not really mean a diminution of your reverence for the strong hand of government.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN KUEHN.

70 Dearborn Street.

A CONTRAST—ROSE AND JOHNSON.

Tom Johnson, of Cleveland, and Dave Rose, of Milwaukee, both Democratic mayors of cities of the same class, inevitably are suggestive of contrast.

Johnson was elected in a Republican city on a platform quite similar to the platform upon which Rose was elected four years ago. Johnson, in standing by the interests of the people, has made Cleveland a Democratic city and is more popular to-day than when elected. He has won the approval of the masses and the bitter antagonism of the public-utility corporations and the Ohio Republican machine. He is in a fair way to be elected governor of his state and is seriously considered as a Democratic presidential possibility.

Rose, who went into office with the confidence of a large majority of the people, was no sooner in office than he turned about and began to dicker for the political support of the street railway monopoly and the Republican machine, though elected in a campaign by 8,000 majority in which from the

stump he vigorously criticised the methods of the street railway monopoly and the Republican machine—whose political influence after election he straightway courted.

He was reelected by a combination between the Republican machine and corporation influences, but by a narrow margin, having lost near 6,000 of his former majority with many of the rank and file of Democrats voting against him. He has forfeited the confidence and respect of his party. His future is bound up in petty political dickers with Republican bosses, whose principal object in politics is to further the interests of semi-public corporations. His impending defeat in the approaching municipal election will eliminate him as a political factor.

And yet four years ago there was no Democrat in Wisconsin that had as bright a future before him as this same David S. Rose. Democracy everywhere in the state was looking for a capable, sincere leader. With a leader who would be sincere with the party and the people, the future of Democracy was on a rapidly rising wave. But Rose has been weighed in the balance of public approval and found wanting. The explanation of his utter inability to grasp the opportunities that have been thrust upon him may be found in his characteristic declaration at Kansas City: "This standing up and dying for principle is all d—n rot."—Editorial in Milwaukee Daily News.

FIRE AND SWORD IN THE PHILIPPINES.

A private letter from a soldier in the Philippines, whose name is for obvious reasons withheld from publication. The original letter has been copied in the office of The Public.

Balayan, P. I., October, 1901.

Your most welcome letter arrived and was delivered just as we were starting out on a war party. We were out ten days, and ravaged the country with fire and sword.

You see, this country is pacified. The civil commission says: "Lo, there is peace within the land." And though of late we can get a scrap every time out, of course what the commission says, goes. A few dead soldiers more or less don't matter; and the chorus of republican editors, led by Timothy Guy Daniells, sings: "Behold, what wondrous doings have we done." No one will tell the truth about this desolate land. The truth is so directly contradictory to administration reports that a teller of a truthful tale runs danger of prosecution for treason.

The civil commission goes around in a transport and stops at all the towns on the coast. Out comes the presidente of the town, and meets the commission with a native band, and American flags, and high-flown protestations of loyalty. The political tell the presidente he's a good American, and then depart, praising peace and native civil government. Next day a few soldiers are found with their throats cut, and the troops can't burn the place because there is peace and civil government in the land.

And so it goes on. You don't know of these things, but we do.

But enough of this growling. We've had a glorious time lately. The other side having been active of late, we got orders to start out and raise h—. We did. Our progress could be traced by burning shacks. And if a bird wants to follow our trail he will have to have a commissariat. Every shack in the mountains we came to we burned. Averaged one skirmish a day. Mud, rain, slop, short grub, and general discomfort.

Will write more at length later when rested up. Think we will be sent to Samar to help there. Pardon this rather incoherent letter, but everyone has the blues from the weather and official foolishness.

MILD AMAZEMENT.

Innocent Jim,
which is James J. Hill,
says it ain't him you should shame,
and there hasn't been any merger
because it was done long ago,
and he wants to know
why they are kicking on him
when he did so much
and gave so much
and lost so much
for the people he fosters so.
Poor little Innocent Jim,
why do the people blame him?

He says, says Innocent Jim,
there never was any merger,
he didn't do any such thing,
and the only reason he did it
was because the other fellow
would have gobbled up Northern
Pacific
if he hadn't swallowed it first.
And where would we have been then,
says Innocent Jim,
if he hadn't bravely stepped in
and headed off Harriman's crowd
with their blighting and baleful
control?

Hey?

It cost me millions to do it,
but I'll never, no never, go back
on the great northwest that I love,
especially Northern Pacific,
says trustful Innocent Jim.

It's been a lot of trouble,
says Innocent Jim,
to make this northwest
and bring it up by hand,
so to speak,

to feed it and clothe it,
as I have done all these years,
and share my earnings with it
—for I could have taken it all—
and then to be met by this,
this rank ingratitude,
and worst of all,
to have them set the dog on me.
I've half a mind,
says Innocent Jim,
never to build another northwest
again.

I was going, he says,
says Innocent Jim,
To go out and annex China
all for your benefit,
you pay me the freight
and so much a bushel besides
and I'll carry over your wheat
to sell, and if there's any left,
I'll give you the core, says he.
I was going, he says,
but I don't know now as I will.
For you don't seem to realize
how much I have done for you
and I don't care to stay
where I'm not appreciated.

It's a sin
the way we have treated him,
when he did so much
and gave so much
and lost so much
all for the great northwest
which he made himself by hand,
and to be treated so—
it's a blow
like the one that most killed father.

But what he can't understand
is why they should pick on him,
who never did a thing
but just be innocent—
poor little Innocent Jim.
—John Stone Pardee, in Goodhue Co.
(Minn.) News of December 26.

WEYLERISM IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Special telegram to Chicago Chronicle from Atlanta, Ga., under date of December 26.

Reconcentration, Weyler's methods in their extremity and desolation spread by American officers and soldiers acting under specific orders are some of the charges made by Josiah Obl, the Constitution's special correspondent in the Philippine islands. In an article written from Cebu and just received he says in part:

"The highly civilized and altogether humane methods that characterized the rule of the gentle Weyler in Cuba are being resorted to by the American army in its efforts to subject the Visayans of this island of Cebu, of Borol, and would be put into effect in Samar if the conditions were favorable. Whole villages have been burned by the orders of the general commanding this district and the reconcentration policy of which we heard so much in Cuba is about to be put into operation here—if, indeed, it cannot be said to have already been instituted.

"Gen. Hughes believes that war is

hell,' as Sherman said, and he is giving the people of Cebu a taste of the brimstone. Only a few nights ago an American officer boasted that he is known as the Weyer of the district where he is in command. He also said—though it may seem incredible—that he was proud of being so called.

"The people of the United States have no conception of the conditions prevailing down here. If they had a howl would go up from one end of the country to the other. Army officers tell of these things in confidence, but nothing is said with the idea that it shall get to the outside world. I have no doubt that when this appears in the Constitution there will be a chorus of denials, and yet I am writing only that which I get from the very best authority.

"General orders have been issued that whosoever shall in any way give aid and comfort to the enemy shall be visited with dire punishment; that his house shall be burned over his head and that he himself shall be dealt with as severely as is possible.

"The officer commanding the battalion over on Bohol has been given instructions to kill off everybody suspected of connection with the insurgents. He has been told that these orders give him the widest latitude; that he is not to be very particular whether the suspect is bearing arms or has been; if he is a suspect he is to be treated as an outlaw and shot down. The people are to be brought in from the country and cooped up in the towns. Those who refuse to come are to be hunted down."

Mr. Obl proceeds to give accounts of many villages burned and innocent lives taken and refers in scathing language to wholesale attacks upon native women by American soldiers. He then quotes Col. Crane, adjutant general to Gen. Hughes, as saying:

"The best thing to do with them (the Philippine islands) would be to kill off the people and then put a bomb under each island and blow it from the face of the earth. I would never leave here, however, so long as there was one of these fellows left to stick his fingers to his nose at us when we were passing."

Mr. Obl declares that many other officers feel similarly, although those well informed recognize in the Filipinos a race of promising ability and prospects.

A paternal government never becomes so thoroughly fatherly that its children don't have to pay all its bills. —Puck.

FOOLING LABOR SOME MORE.

The conference in New York under the benign influence of the Civic federation between the warring elements of "capital" and labor eventuated in a beautiful love feast that has set all the society saviors and other fools into a state of ecstatic confidence in the future. The spectacle was presented by Senator Mark Hanna and President Samuel Gompers meeting on a common platform in the support of trusts. Archbishop Ireland and Bishop Potter spread unction over the lovely platitudes and fond deceits which characterized the occasion. It was a splendid illustration of the spider and the fly.

The assumption of these people that there is or ever has been or ever could be a war between capital and labor—between the plow and the man who holds it; between the locomotive and the man at the throttle; between the wheelbarrow and the man who pushes it; between the sewing machine and the woman who runs it—is its own commentary on the honesty and intelligence behind it. No such war exists or could exist. The notion that a man can be at war with the things he uses in producing wealth might be worthy of savages or Standard Oil professors of "economics," but certainly it is out of place in the minds of men who have escaped the breech-clout stage without falling under the blight of Standard Oil "education."

The New York conference was a farce. Its result is the best possible proof of the utter incompetency of the so-called labor leadership. There was not a single man in the conference who posed as a labor leader possessing economic sense enough to lead a flock of geese. The geese themselves would have sense enough to seek water, but no labor leader would ever think of leading his flock to its native element. There was no sign of any comprehension of the real problem involved on the part of Gompers or Shaffer or any of the rest. They were absolutely unconscious of the grotesquery of their assumption of a war with capital. The suggestion of this idea came from the smooth and oily and self-satisfied gentlemen on the other side. The latter carefully concealed the real enemy and they made a charming pretense of fraternity, moving Gompers and his fellow dupes to tears by their eloquent pleadings for brotherhood.

One of these days perhaps the futility of such conferences as the one just held will be realized. Mark Hanna

and Mr. Schwab and their fellow monopolists know perfectly well what is going on. They know that there is no war between the tools of labor and the labor which uses the tools. But they know also that there is a bitter and relentless war—an irrepressible conflict—between privilege and its victims, between the monopolist and those who yield him tribute, between the forestaller and those who must pay him a price for opportunity. One right word fitly spoken thrown into that conference would have caused greater consternation than an anarchist bomb. But there was no man there to speak it. The Civic federation had taken excellent care on that point. It was really a conference between socialists who want to establish a universal militarism in production and those who are enjoying the benefits of a jug-handled paternalism. Mr. Gompers made it very plain that he was a socialist and that he welcomed the trusts as a stepping-stone toward his ideal. And Bishop Potter and Archbishop Ireland helped on the play. They want "capital" to do everything for labor except to get off its back.

Had some one been in that conference to point out the real conflict and to say how it could be resolved, felicitations among the organs of monopoly would not have been so vociferous as they are. We are now told that the problem is in the way of solution; that the lion and the lamb are going to lie down together; that the big fish are going to be good and cease to swallow the little ones. Mr. Gompers and Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Shaffer and Mr. Schwab, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Morgan are going to get together and work in beautiful harmony for the uplifting of labor. Labor is going to quit being naughty and boisterous and "capital" is going to exercise pink tea morality in dealing with the toilers. But meanwhile nothing is to be said about the legislative advantages enjoyed by Mr. Morgan and Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Schwab and Mr. Carnegie. These advantages are mere instruments in their hands for the uplifting of the horny-handed masses. Out of the millions which come to them as tribute they are to build great universities and endow libraries and cultivate the fine arts, allowing labor to luxuriate in their manifestations of munificence. Labor on its side is to dream dreams of the time when the trusts will metamorphose the country into a military industrial camp. And possibly labor fancies that a Gompers or a Shaffer or a Mitchell will then

be the great captain in command.—
Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat of Decem-
ber 18.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

WALKS MUST BE KEPT CLEAN.

A new ordinance relating to clean sidewalks was approved by the board of control Monday. It provides that the walks before all property, vacant or otherwise, must be cleaned of snow and ice by nine o'clock each morning. If the walk is of flag stone it must be cleaned from property line to curb, and if of brick or other material, other than flag or cement, a path five feet in width must be cleaned. Where it is impossible to scrape off all the ice the owners, occupants or agents of the property must cover it with ashes, sand or other substance so that people will not slip. If any person fails to obey this ordinance the director of public works has power to send out men to do the work and the cost will be charged to the person owning or occupying the property. If they don't pay the amount will be certified by the city auditor to the county auditor, who will place it against the property as a lien, the same as taxes.

While the board was considering the measure Attorney General Foster entered the room and asked that it be amended to provide that dead trees and dead limbs be removed by the owners, or by the city at the owner's expense. The amendment was made. It was further provided that no grass or weeds should be allowed to grow between the curb and walk, more than six inches in height. If the owner or occupant of the premises, the agent, if the lot should be vacant, and the owner out of town, fails to keep the grass or weeds trimmed the city will do the work and charge the cost against the premises.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of December 17.

NO UNREA-ONABLE PRICES.

The Gamewell Fire Alarm company may not be among the bidders when the sixth set of proposals for a fire alarm signal service are opened by the board of control. The agent of the company, who, by reason of storms, failed to reach this city in time to submit a proposal, Monday, called on Mayor Johnson yesterday with another agent who was here in time, but did not have the company's bid in his possession.

"We want to know, Mr. Johnson,"

began one of the agents, "whether it is worth while for us to come back here again and bid?"

"Not unless you follow the pace set by other companies and cut your price down from what it has been in the past," was the reply. "Let me see, if you come in on the next set of bids that will be six times, won't it?"

"That's what it will, Mr. Johnson, and we have spent a great deal of money running back and forth and paying hotel bills."

"Knowing considerable about machinery, as I do," said the mayor, "I am perfectly willing to admit that I think you have the best fire alarm system in the country, but it is because I do know something about machinery that I tell you that you are asking too much money for what you have. You have a good thing, but you are playing the hog on price."

"As we have the best system, it ought to be worth more money than any other."

"Exactly, but not as much as you ask. We'll keep on rejecting bids until we get the right thing at the right price; in fact, we may never buy a system. I tell you frankly, gentlemen, that before I would consent to the city paying you the price you ask for your system I would invent one myself."

"That's what we are trying to get at. We—"

"You want to know if we will give you the contract if you bid about the same price you did last time—is that what you want to know?"

"Yes."

"Well, we won't give you the contract. Unless you are prepared to come in with a bid that is reasonable you may as well stay at home and save your postage stamps. Does that answer your question?"

"Not the way we wanted it answered, but you are certainly frank enough to suit us," laughed the agents as they bowed themselves out.—Plain Dealer of December 18.

MORE ABOUT THE THREE-CENT FARE ORDINANCE.

Councilman Howe proposed an amendment to the three-cent fare ordinance yesterday, and insisted on it against the strong opposition of Mayor Johnson. The amendment was not inserted in the ordinance, but it may be yet, as Howe will have another chance at four p. m. Monday to urge it, and again after the measure gets back to the council.

The important amendment proposed at the meeting, which came from Howe, was that there should be a clause in the ordinance giving the city the right, after five or ten years, to rearrange the schedule of fares charged by the new company.

"If a three-cent fare road is an attractive proposition at this time," he said, "it will be twice as attractive ten years from now. If there is money in it now, what will there be then? Unless the city has the right to reduce fares still further, if, on examination, it is shown that the company can well afford to do it, we will then be in the same position toward the new company that we are now toward the old ones. Perhaps they could not afford to give us a three-cent fare 20 years ago, but they can now."

"I grant you," said the mayor, "that if money can be made now on the basis of a three-cent fare more can be made ten years from now, but nothing like as much as you think. Fifty-five per cent. of the cost of operating a street railroad is in the labor. You do not think there will be much chance for economy in that direction, do you? The natural tendency is for labor to increase in cost. That is certainly the history in street railroad matters. Wages have gone forward but never backward."

"Possibly, you think there may be room for economy in the matter of motive power. The cost of the electricity to operate a street car line does not amount to quite one-twelfth of the total cost. It is the smallest item in the list of expenses, so there won't be much chance for reducing the cost of that."

"Another point which we have to consider is that we must not burden this measure down so that bidders will not be able to finance their road. While they probably will make more money out of the line the second ten years than they will the first, why should they not be allowed to do it? Won't the city be getting the benefit of the reduced fare? You must also remember that after ten years the item of betterments and repairs will also be very large."

"As a practical street railway man, I say that the suggestion you make is a vital point in this ordinance. If you put it in, two bidders that I have in mind will not come in, I believe. If at any time the city believes that the company is making too much money out of the road it can buy it and run it itself."

Howe suggested that there were obstacles in the way of municipal owner-

ship which it might not be possible to remove. The mayor said that he did not agree with him on that, but, if it were true, he was still opposed to the proposition, as it would endanger the success of the whole scheme.

"We mustn't try to get everything at oncè," continued the mayor, "or we won't get anything. This is in the nature of an experiment, and, while I firmly believe that a three-cent fare road will be a paying institution, and I know of others who think as I do and will back their opinions with their money, I also know that I would never make a bid if I had to face the probability of the city stepping in at some time and reducing my fares for me. If I were not in office and wanted to go into business I would like nothing better than to prove my faith in my opinion than by making a bid for this franchise if you leave out that clause."

"I guess we can release you so you can do it," remarked Councilman Springborn, laughingly.

"I have no doubt a lot of you would vote to do that," answered the mayor, "but I am not going into business, Mr. Springborn, in office or out of office."

"A majority of the people refused to release him," interjected Director Lapp, looking at Springborn.

"I was only joking, Mr. Johnson," said the councilman.

The discussion on Howe's amendment, which Springborn favored after a fashion, continued until the close of the meeting, but without a definite understanding being reached.

"I believe I am satisfied with the ordinance in every way excepting as to the proposition which we have been discussing," was Howe's parting shot. Mayor Johnson is anxious to have the substitute go to the council, Monday night, but he will never consent to the amendment proposed, and unless the point is agreed on Monday, when another joint meeting will be held, the ordinance will be held out another week, or it will go to the council, and the discussion continued there. As the original ordinance was introduced a week ago, and this is a substitute, only one more week will have to elapse before it will come up for passage, if it is reported back Monday night.

Mayor Johnson would not be sur-

prised if, when bids are opened, it is shown that there are some people willing to build a new street car system in Cleveland and give nine, and possibly ten tickets for a quarter.

"I don't look for anything less than a three-cent cash fare," said the mayor yesterday, "but there are chances for all kinds of propositions on the question of tickets. I know this much: I will veto any ordinance to give a franchise to any company that bids more than a three-cent cash fare. Under the terms of this ordinance the successful bidder is not the 'lowest and best bidder,' as is ordinarily provided, but the 'lowest' bidder. Prospective bidders have warning in advance that there won't be any chance for an argument unless there are two or more 'lowest bidders.'"—Plain Dealer of December 21.

CHRISTMAS ANTHEM.

For The Public.

Hark! the herald Angels sing:
"Gatling guns to you we bring;
Hear our dum-dum bullets singing,
Freedom to poor Tagals bringing!

"Peace, good will, with shot and shell
To all who do on Luzon dwell—
We bring to you, ye small brown men,
From Uncle Sam! Amen, amen!"

T. W. LODGE.

Ha Ha Tonka, Mo., Dec. 26, 1901.

"Is a diplomat ever justified in using prevarication?" asked his friend.

"Well," said the diplomat, "he is certainly not justified in calling it by that name."—Puck.

"Let me but own the earth," said the financier, with characteristic bravado, "and I care not who writes the people's songs!"—Life.

BOOK NOTICES.

Herbert Quick has tried the experiment, with "In the Fairyland of America, a Tale of the Pukwudjies," (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. Price \$1.20 net), of introducing to readers whose fairy lore is of alien origin a fairy realm distinctly American. The little Pukwudjies of one of Hiawatha's tales are with light touches transformed by Mr. Quick into mischievous but not malicious elves inhabiting our western ravines, with native birds and beasts as their familiars; and this whole fairy outfit gets into friendly relations with a healthy American boy. The book is one of those best of all children's books, books which children live in and their elders enjoy. It is dignified without density, youthful without childishness, and humorous without horseplay. Breaking through the story here and

there are touches also of good-natured satire, the application of which is so artistically concealed that while no reader is likely to appropriate it to himself none will fail to see its admirable fitness for some of his neighbors.

M. M. Mangasarian, lecturer of the Independent Religious society of Chicago, offers "A New Catechism" (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co.), as an effort in the direction of expressing "the thoughts of men and women and children living in these new times." Doubtless this catechism will meet the wishes of those who have escaped from the trammels of conventional piety but have not yet awakened to the truths of the spiritual universe. It is a catechism of the new credulity—faith in materialistic "science" and external morality.

PERIODICALS.

—The Direct Legislation Record for December (Newark, N. J.) has begun a new department in which proportional representation is to be the specialty, under the editorship of Robert Tyson, of Toronto.

—The Pilgrim for January (Battle Creek, Mich.: Willis J. Abbot, editor. Price 10 cents) includes in its varied collection of readable matter two articles on Chinese exclusion, one by Wu Tingfang, and the other by Henry George, Jr.

—When so much respectable ignorance about anarchy finds expression in high places, some good may be looked for from Heber Newton's leading article



CHINESE EXCLUSION

The editorial article of THE PUBLIC entitled,

"The Chinese Exclusion Act,"

has been put in pamphlet form. For price, etc., see list of PUBLIC LEAFLETS on next page.

DEAR READER: Would you like to know more about the Peoples Independent Party (Populists)? The party that holds the balance of power in twenty states in the Union. If so, send your name and address and we will send you the leading Peoples Party paper FREE OF CHARGE FOR FOUR WEEKS. Sample copies for four weeks ABSOLUTELY FREE--no conditions. Address: THE NEBRASKA INDEPENDENT, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

in the Arena for January. The average man who reads it will be astonished to discover how little he has known, and how false that little is, about a subject which he has presumed to treat with great familiarity.

—"The Free Trade" Almanac for 1902 (Boston: American Free Trade League, Tremont building. Price 5 cents) is the first number of what it is to be hoped will be as good an annual for many years to come. Besides the matter common to almanacs of the old style, there are in this one several excellent articles bearing upon the vital issue of free trade. William Lloyd Garrison writes of trusts and tariffs, Osborne Howes of free ships, Louis Windmueller of wool, shoddy and sheep; T. W. Davenport of protection as a means of fooling farmers, Prof. Dillard of special privilege, Richard H. Dana of civil service reform, and A. B. Farquhar of our export trade. An extract from a speech before the league in 1893 by Henry George is among the selections. We have enumerated only a

few of the many valuable and readable things which this free trade almanac contains.

Mr. JOHN Z. WHITE
WILL LECTURE ON
"The Rights of Man,"
Sunday, January 5, at 3 p. m.,
17th Floor of the Masonic Temple,
Under the Auspices of the
HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

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).

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE TRUSTS

Moody's Manual of Corporation Securities, 1901 Edition.

gives more practical information regarding corporate industry in this country than all the essays, treatises, reports of investigating committees, hearings of industrial commissions, gropings of college professors, journalistic misstatements of facts, or any other literature of the "trust problem" which has appeared in a decade. The book is an encyclopaedia of American industrial progress.

Price, bound in cloth, \$7.50 per copy

In flexible leather \$10.00 per copy

For sale by leading booksellers, or will be sent prepaid by the publishers

JOHN MOODY & CO.
35 Nassau Street, New York City

TO COMPLETE A FILE OF

"THE PUBLIC"

The undersigned will pay

TEN DOLLARS

for one complete copy, in good condition, bound or unbound, of the

FIRST VOLUME.

To avoid duplications, do not forward the volume but communicate by letter, offering same for above price. The first offer received will be given preference, subject to approval by the publishers of THE PUBLIC as to completeness and condition. Address: A. W. WRIGHT, Care of "THE PUBLIC," Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

The Public

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

Subscriptions, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS,
Chicago.

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

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

LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1080 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago

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

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

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

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1253 Cortlandt. Rooms 211-212.
NEW YORK.

THE PUBLIC WILL BE SENT **ON TRIAL** to new readers, for the term of six weeks for **10 CENTS**