

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1902.

Number 238.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

Ohio has missed a rare opportunity to lead in the great work now opening before the American people of practically developing sound principles of municipal government. She loses this opportunity because her legislature has succumbed to the dictation of Senator Hanna, of Cleveland, and Senator Foraker and "Boss" Cox, of Cincinnati, all of whom are obviously, and Senator Hanna confessedly, governed in their political conduct by solicitude for their own private interests.

The opportunity thus offered and rejected for setting a splendid example, came through a decision of the courts (p. 440) holding that the city charters of the State were unconstitutional for lack of uniformity. It became the duty of the legislature, therefore, to make a uniform municipal code. This work has now been done, under the dictation of the men named above, but they have turned the cause of good municipal government in Ohio backward and not forward. Local self-government is utterly rejected, while merit in the civil service is trifled with, and corporate interests in public property are carefully conserved.

How abjectly this Republican legislature has obeyed the Republican machine of Ohio and its corporation masters, is evident from the comments of independent Republican newspapers. The Chicago Evening Post, for instance, perhaps the best Western exponent of clean Republicanism, criticises these treacherous

representatives of its party in the following scathing terms:

There is no home rule in the new municipal code, and modern ideas of city organization and structure are deliberately discarded in favor of shifty considerations dictated by mere partisanship and "politics." The Ohio legislature has sinned against the light. It has disregarded enlightened precept and approved practice.

Perhaps the anti-home rule character of this code may escape casual notice. It was intended to. But the purpose is plain and the effect inevitable. The bureaus of the bureaucratic local governments which the code will set up in Ohio cities are well calculated to become the tool of a "boss." But their adaptability to that purpose is perfected by making the members appointive and giving the power of appointment, whenever the party "boss" desires it, to the governor of the State. Of course the code does not say so in terms. But he must be a babe in public affairs who does not know that it would be so in fact. For the boards are to be appointed by the mayor only in case his appointments are confirmed by two-thirds of the city council. If the city council fails to confirm the mayor's appointments by a two-thirds vote, as would usually be the case, the governor has absolute power to take the matter out of the hands of the municipality and appoint in his own discretion.

This is not Democratic criticism alone. The same Republican paper from which we have already quoted, characterizes the iniquitous provision in precisely the same way. After describing it, that Republican paper plainly says:

This is clearly an absurd and outrageous violation of home rule. This feature is strictly "political." It is aimed at Johnson and Jones, but it will affect many cities besides Cleveland and Toledo. In few Ohio municipalities

can either party command a two-thirds vote of the council. "Anyone with half an eye can see how the provision will work out," frankly says a Republican senator. Bossism and partisanship have triumphed over political principle and municipal interest and progress. The Ohio code will be condemned by every intelligent student of municipal government. It will react on and injure the Republican party of Ohio.

Whether the prediction of the Post is correct remains to be seen. But if the Republicans of Ohio vote Mr. Hanna's Republican ticket at the approaching election, after that shameless exhibition, they must be hopeless of civic regeneration. They, too, will have sinned against the light, and it would save them trouble to give a power of attorney for voting purposes to Hanna, Foraker and Cox, and be done with it.

In defense of the board feature of government, the Ohio "bosses" argue with unblushing effrontery that it is intended to prevent bossism! The spectacle of Hanna and Foraker as anti-boss men, to say nothing of Mr. Cox, their own boss, is as entertaining as a comic opera. Everyone knows that they are contriving to fasten bossism on their party and State. Without it, not one of the three could figure influentially in the politics of any party. And the board system which they have borrowed from Cincinnati, and imposed upon all the cities of the State, is essentially well fitted to perpetuate bossism. It would be so, even if the boards were appointive by local authority instead of by the governor, and even if they were elective. For boards divide responsibility so that the voter cannot hold anyone to account. At best they dabble in compromises; at the worst they are corrupt; and altogether they are inefficient. The true and only safe principle of local government is to place the ordinance-

making power in the hands of a local body, elected by districts, whose members can be held to responsibility by their respective constituents, and to place the executive power in the hands of an executive who must return frequently to the people for their approval. Such an executive cannot become a "boss" in the bad sense of the term. No one objects to a "boss," if you choose to call him that, who is frequently re-elected. Such a boss is an approved agent of the people. The bad "boss" is one who does not come before the people for approval, but from his private office pulls wires and dominates officials. President Diaz, of Mexico, is the kind of "boss" whom the people confide in because he serves them; "Boss" Tweed and "Boss" Croker were, as "Boss" Cox now is, the kind of "boss" who overrides the people and dictates to their servants.

Strenuous efforts are being made in the East to beguile the people of the country into petitioning for a permanent commission to regulate the tariff. Every man who signs that petition signs away part of his citizenship. "The tariff question should be divorced from politics entirely," is the cry of those who are pushing this movement for disfranchisement. Reflect a moment upon what that means. To divorce any public question from politics is to place it beyond the control of the voters. And this is the design of the plutocratic classes who are agitating for a permanent commission to adjust our taxes for us. Think of it. The most powerful lever of government, taxation, to be taken out of the hands of a people and given over to commissions packed in the interest of special privileges! Nor is the design confined to the subject of tariffs. The poorly concealed purpose of these enemies of democracy is to divest the voters of the country not only of power over the tariff, but of all power in public affairs. They aim to divorce every public question from politics.

Senator Spooner is one of the men

who are leading in this movement for the disfranchisement of the people, and he has declared its design with admirable candor. In a speech which he made at Lancaster, Wis., on the 21st, as reported by the Chicago Record-Herald of the 22d, a Republican paper, Senator Spooner advocated the plutocratic policy of disfranchisement in these frank terms:

If we could elect a good, strong Republican President like Theodore Roosevelt, and a strong Republican Senate and House for a term of twenty years, it would be better for the country. I believe this demagogic tear-up comes too often in this country.

There you have it in all its nakedness. Disfranchise the people! And let it be remembered incidentally that Senator Spooner is one of the powerful leaders of the Republican party as now organized.

When political leaders like Spooner think it politically safe to declare for the election of Presidents and Congresses for twenty years (which could easily be extended to life terms if 20-year periods of irresponsibility to the voters were once secured), it behooves everyone with a particle of democratic blood in his veins to refuse to sign any petitions whatever for limiting the voting power of the people. Government by commission is not popular government.

It is said that the Democratic party of Chicago has made poor nominations for local offices. This criticism is not true in its application to at least one of the nominees. Lyman E. Cooley, the Democratic candidate for member of the board of tax review, has published a letter of acceptance which testifies emphatically to his eminent fitness for that office. It is unfortunate that only one of the daily papers of Chicago should have regarded the question of local taxation as of sufficient interest to spare the space for Mr. Cooley's admirable letter; but it will be found in full on the sixth page of the American of October 14.

While Mr. Cooley recognizes, and properly so, that as a member of the

board of review he would have no right to do otherwise than enforce the tax laws as he finds them, he nevertheless declares his purpose of laboring for changes in the laws where experience shows that important changes are necessary. This is the correct attitude for the incumbent of such an office. That Mr. Cooley would find changes necessary, and that his mind runs in that respect in right directions, is one of the encouraging things about his letter. He recognizes, for example, the most important of all facts regarding taxation, the fact that the character of government is determined by the manner in which taxes are levied. "Whether the tax be laid equitably or arbitrarily," he says, "measures the difference between free government and despotism." Truer words were never written.

Mr. Cooley realizes also that radical changes have taken place in recent years with reference to taxables. The time when property consisted chiefly in agricultural lands has given way to a time when it consisted chiefly of such lands as mines, urban building sites, and rights of way for public service corporations. At this point he is not very clear—certainly not definite—but light is thrown upon the point by his unqualified and evidently intelligent declaration that "fundamental law contemplates unrestricted competition."

In holding that "every citizen should contribute something, though it may be small, to the support of the state," Mr. Cooley may seem to have drifted away from his previous postulate that taxation must be equitable. But it is only fair to assume that he intends the two propositions to be considered together. He doubtless means that the contribution of each should be in equitable proportion to the pecuniary advantages each receives from the state, and that all ought to get some of those advantages. However that may be, Mr. Cooley is the only candidate for a fiscal office in Chicago

who has given any reasonable indication of an intelligent grasp of fundamental principles of taxation, together with a determination to execute the law as it is; and if fitness is to be a determining factor at the election, he ought to be placed upon the board of review by an overwhelming majority of votes.

In naming several single tax men last week (p. 435) who are Democratic candidates for important office, we by no means named all. Among the others are Henry Smith, a candidate for Congress in Milwaukee, and Robert E. Cresswell and Charles R. Eckert, candidates for Congress in Johnstown and Beaver, Pa., respectively. Mr. Eckert is editor of an excellent single tax paper, the Commoner, of Rochester, Pa., and his election is regarded as reasonably certain. Another of these men who are impressing the Democratic party with the growing strength of their cause is J. H. Quick, ex-Mayor of Sioux City, Ia., who is a candidate for a vacancy upon the supreme court bench of his State.

In Chicago, as we have already stated (p. 307), several candidates for the legislature have been put forward, regardless of party, by the Public Ownership league. Chief among these is Clarence S. Darrow, the law partner of the late John P. Altgeld, and who stands for what Altgeld did. Mr. Darrow is a candidate in the Seventeenth district. He is indorsed by the Legislative Voters' league, a body which scrutinizes candidates of all parties and recommends upon grounds of personal character alone. Besides Mr. Darrow, the Public Ownership league names Arthur L. Gettys, of the Third district, who is also recommended by the Voters' league; Julius A. Wesel, of the Eleventh, for whose good personal reputation the Voters' League vouches; George A. Mawman, of the Eighth, the "news-boy" candidate; Paul O. Hazard, of the Fifth; and Albert C. Berndt, of the Second. Under the

"plumping" method of voting for legislators in Illinois, the vote for these men can be multiplied by three, which is believed to make their election probable. Of the desirability of having in the next legislature a group of men committed to the public ownership of public property it is hardly necessary to speak; and all these candidates faithfully represent that principle. Mr. Darrow is, moreover, distinctively a leader in radical politics at this end of the State, and a man whose influence would be felt in any legislative body.

The State Federation of Labor of Illinois, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, took important action at its recent session in adopting the following resolutions on the subject of taxation:

Whereas, labor organizations in New York, Colorado and other states are agitating for changes in the present system of taxation; and, whereas, taxation has a vital effect upon the demand for labor and the rate of wages; Resolved, that a committee of nine be appointed to investigate the relation of wages to taxation and report to the next convention of the Illinois Federation of Labor.

These are the same resolutions that were offered at the international convention of the Typographical union at Cincinnati last Summer (p. 308), and for some unaccountable reason defeated. They are the same that were adopted by the Stereotypers and Electrotypers' union at that time (p. 309), and the same that have been adopted by the most important labor body of New York State. It was Mr. L. P. Straube, of Chicago, who proposed them unsuccessfully at the typographical convention, and who now has the satisfaction of having seen them adopted by the Illinois Federation of Labor. Even here he had to fight for them on the floor of the convention to overcome the adverse report of the committee to which they had been referred. Mr. Straube was made chairman of the committee appointed to carry out the resolutions. This opens the way for him to accomplish a work that at no dis-

tant day will be freely recognized as the best that can be done in labor interests.

The London conference of British municipalities which met this week and adopted the principles of land value taxation for local purposes, was an epoch-making body. Although the rate of tax on land values which it proposed is low—probably not more than half of one per cent.—the reasons given make it of special importance and peculiarly significant. When taxes on land values are urged on the ground that land values are public property, the reform takes on a very different color from what it would have if it were urged on the ground that all property ought to be taxed. And this is the character of the British agitation for the taxation of land values. It is made because those values belong to the public. Since, therefore, scores of British municipalities are demanding this fiscal reform, it is evident enough that a movement has begun in Great Britain which will lead on to the full taxation of these public values and the consequent exemption of all private values.

The recent street car strike in New Orleans has revealed a condition regarding the capitalization of the company which it was worth all the strike has cost to learn. It is stated upon excellent local authority and as the opinion of an expert that "the plant operated by the New Orleans Railways company in its entirety can easily be reproduced new and in better condition than it now is, for about \$30,000,000." Yet this New Jersey trust which owns the plant is capitalized at \$80,000,000, and is striving to earn an income on that extravagant valuation. This is one of the effects of allowing private corporations to own public property. The private property of the trust in this case is only \$30,000,000. Its public property—right of way—is capitalized at \$50,000,000.

Ex-Senator Pugh, of Alabama, is

authority for the statement that when the Dingley bill was under consideration in the Senate, Senators Allison, Aldrich and Quay came over to the Democratic side of the chamber and appealed to the Democratic Senators to permit them to attach to the bill, without publicity, a number of amendments, not with a view to making them law, but purely for the effect on the protected interests in Quay's and Aldrich's States. These amendments, it was explained, included the duty on anthracite coal (p. 418) and several others, and, according to the programme, were to be "yielded in conference." To this proposition the Democrats assented. Similar tactics were followed in the House, duties being inserted which it was expected to use as a "trading basis" with the Senate conferees. The Representatives of the extremely protected interests, however, saw their advantage and, for the sake of their own proteges, accepted the bill as passed in the Senate. These "fake" schedules became in consequence a part of that measure on which the country is urged to "stand pat" because its schedules are too sacred for revision. The point to which we would call attention in this connection is the culpability of the Democratic senators who made themselves parties to this form of deception, which, as it turns out, has cost the coal consumers of the country thousands upon thousands of dollars. Such methods are to be expected from the promoters of the policy of protection. Representing a fraud, they naturally enough support it fraudulently. But the Democrats who help them in their frauds are worse than they. The startling thing about it is that Democrats admit these facts without any apparent appreciation of the moral turpitude involved in their own conduct.

In one of the editorials which the statistical bureau of the treasury department at Washington is sending out regularly for consumption by Republican editors, the boast is made that "the export figures for

September are extremely encouraging." By this it appears to be meant that they have risen. Yet nothing is said about pay for these exports; and if the treasury figures are correct they never have been paid for, are not being paid for now, and there is no reasonable probability of their ever being paid for in the future. What encouragement is there, pray, in increased exporting under those circumstances?

THE PROSPEROUS FARMER.

Much is being said during the present political year of the great prosperity of the farmer, census statistics being quoted as proof of the unprecedented increase in farm property during the past decade.

According to the Republican campaign text-book, "The 'Man with the Hoe' is the man with the 'dough.'" The same idea we find expressed in the Literary Digest of August 9th, in an article headed "The farmers the richest class in the United States."

As there is probably no class that contributes so much to the welfare of the community as the agricultural class, it would seem but just that this should be in fact our wealthiest class. But is it?

After quoting census statistics as showing that the wealth of our farmers amounts to over twenty billions of dollars, the Literary Digest quotes the New York Financier, as follows:

The farmer, so far as actual wealth is concerned, is the capitalist of the United States. The census bureau report on the value of farming property of the country, issued last week, estimates that the 5,739,657 farms of the United States are worth \$16,674,690,247. Of this amount \$3,560,198,191, or 21.4 per cent., represents the value of buildings, and \$13,114,492,056, or 87.6 per cent., represents the value of lands and improvements. Farm implements and machinery are worth \$761,261,350, and live stock \$3,078,050,091, making the total farming wealth over \$20,514,000,000."

As further quoted, the Financier compares farming property with railway property, saying:

"The railway industry was in its infancy in 1850, so that comparisons extending back 50 years are unfair; but taking 1890 as a basis, it is found that

railway property, as indicated by total capitalization, rose from \$10,029,000,000 in that year to \$11,892,000,000 in 1900. This is an increase of 18.5 per cent., or nearly 10 per cent. less than the increase in the value of farms."

The foregoing quotations are fair specimens of the manner in which statistics are used by those who are anxious to demonstrate the prosperity of our industrial classes.

Neither the Literary Digest nor the Financier seems to have thought it worth while to inquire how much of the agricultural property reported by the census belongs to those who farm farms and how much to those who farm farmers.

According to the census, less than 60 per cent. of the farms are owned by those who operate them, and of these over 31 per cent. are owned subject to encumbrance. In the census tables the proportion of those operating their own farms is given as 63.7 per cent., but this includes "part owners," and "owners and tenants," among the owned farms. These classes belong as properly in the tenant as in the owning class. "Part owners" are those owning part and hiring part of the farm they operate, and the class "owners and tenants" includes farms operated by an owner and tenant conjointly. It seems fair to assign one-half of these classes to the owning and the other half to the tenant class.

On page 144, volume v. of the census reports, may be found the value of farm property of the different classes, and also the value of products and the amount expended for labor and fertilizers. The total value of all farm property of farms operated by "owners" is given as \$11,029,293,472. That of farms operated by "part owners," as \$2,477,915,092, and of farms operated by "owners and tenants," \$249,400,935.

Taking the amount reported for the first class together with half the amount reported for the two other classes, we have \$12,392,951,485 as representing the value of the farm property of farmers who operate their farms.

The tenant farmers own some part of the stock and implements of the tenant farms, but it probably will not equal the indebtedness of

those owning the farms they operate. Regarding this we have no data except that obtained from the population schedule, which indicates that 31 per cent. of the owned farm homes are encumbered. The amount of encumbrance is not reported.

Our agricultural workers constitute over 35 per cent. of those having gainful pursuits, and should possess that proportion of the property of the community instead of about 13 per cent. According to the estimate of the Bureau of Statistics the total value of property in the United States amounts to \$94,300,000,000. From this it would appear that our agricultural class are the possessors of only about one-third of the amount of property that they are justly entitled to.

There is no more industrious class than our farmers, and none less given to extravagant expenditures, and the fact that farmers have so small a proportion of the property of the country would seem sufficient evidence that they are not well paid for their labor.

Let us see what the census shows regarding that. On page 145, vol. v., of the report for 1900, we find the average value of farms and farm property reported as \$3,574, of which \$2,285 represents land and improvements except buildings; \$620 represents buildings, \$133 implements and machinery, and \$536 live stock. The value of products not fed to live stock is given at \$656. The expenditures reported are labor \$64 and fertilizers \$10. These, however, are not all the expenditures, though they were all that were called for by the census schedule. Now, if we estimate 6 per cent. interest on the investment and 15 per cent. of the value of machinery and implements for renewal and repairs, and nothing at all for repairs of buildings and fences, and nothing at all for taxes, and deduct these with the costs of labor and fertilizers from the value of the product, we find that the operator of the average farm obtains but \$357.51 as the reward of his year's labor, supplemented by that of his wife and children.

This product of \$656 not fed to live stock included that part of the product which has been consumed

by the family. Thus the \$357.50 is not the amount obtained over and above living expenses or any part of them, but the entire value realized for the year's labor.

If the cultivator of the farm owns it free of encumbrance he may obtain part of his support from the return on his investment. But even in this case he is hardly on a par with the railway capitalist in his ability to invest in steam yachts.

But we have seen that less than one-half of our farmers are the owners of farms free of encumbrance; that is less than 60 per cent. own their farms and over 31 per cent. of those who do own own subject to encumbrance.

On this average farm the value of the buildings is reported as but \$620. So that if the dwelling is worth as much and no more than the barn and sheds, the cultivator of this average farm dwells in a palatial mansion valued at \$310.

There are doubtless many farmers whose condition is far superior to that of the operator of the average farm, but it must be remembered, as we are dealing with averages, that for every farmer that is more fortunate there must be others that are correspondingly less fortunate.

Having seen what the census shows as to the average farmer of the United States, let us next take the statistics for a State where conditions might be expected to be more favorable. Let us take the statistics for the State of Ohio.

In this State the value of the average farm, together with improvements, implements and live stock, amounts to \$4,333. The buildings are valued at \$793, implements at \$132, and the value of product not fed to live stock at \$726. Deducting interest on investment \$259, repair and renewal of machinery and implements \$19.80, the amount paid for labor \$52, and the amount for fertilizers \$10, we have remaining \$386.22 as the earnings of the farmer operating the average Ohio farm. This is nearly \$30 better than the earnings of the cultivator of the average farm in the United States, and we find that he dwells in a still more palatial residence; for the value

of the farm buildings in Ohio averages the princely sum of \$793.

Perhaps these figures are not altogether reliable, but they are those of the census, which are being cited as proof of great agricultural prosperity, and that the farmer has become the real capitalist of the country.

Next let us see as to agricultural labor as a whole, taking the estimate of the agricultural statistician, presented on page cxxxi., of volume v., of the reports of the present census. Here we find the various items for the whole country given as follows:

Gross farm income, including additions to the value of farm property	\$4,187,892,706
Product not fed to live stock.....	8,742,129,867
Annual income in value of farm property	445,763,349
Interest on the value of farm property at 6 per cent.....	1,226,334,070
Number of persons engaged in agriculture	10,273,770

From these items the statistician figures out the average earnings of those engaged in agriculture as \$288.26. Nothing is here deducted for renewal or repairs of any kind, while there is a large item added as representing the increase in the value of farm properties.

The absurdity as well as impropriety of including this item of \$445,763,349 as a part of the farm income is apparent, when we discover how this item is obtained. Omitting this item and deducting for renewal and repairs of machinery and implements, we obtain an amount \$54 less than that computed in the census, making the average labor income of those engaged in agricultural pursuits \$234 instead of \$288.

This estimate is subject to further reduction because the census statisticians' calculation fails to include the entire number of persons engaged in agricultural industry. The occupation tables report a large body of labor as "laborers (not specified)," with this explanation in a foot note: "In agricultural districts agricultural laborers, and similarly in manufacturing districts unskilled workmen, are often reported simply as laborers." Of the number thus reported, 2,640,420, a large proportion must have been engaged in agriculture. If we make the very conservative estimate that one-third of this number were thus employed and include

them with the number reported as engaged in agriculture we shall have to reduce the estimated average earnings by something over \$20, making the average labor income of those engaged in agriculture less than \$214. This would be still further reduced had we considered the amount paid as taxes on farm property.

To obtain the annual increase in the value of farm property, the census has taken one-tenth of the amount representing the difference in the value of farm property as reported in the censuses of 1890 and 1900. As there was no increase but a decrease in the value of farms and improvement from \$21.31 an acre in 1890 to \$19.82 in 1900, the increase in the value of farm property at the last census is the result of the inclusion of property not enumerated in 1900. According to the census there was an increase in the number of farms from 4,564,641 in 1890 to 5,739,657 in 1900, with an increase in acreage from 623,218,619 acres in 1890 to 841,201,546 in 1900. This unprecedented increase forms the only basis for the claim that the census indicates unparalleled agricultural prosperity.

Much of this increase results from the settling of new lands, but a very large proportion is fictitious. According to the census there was an increase in farm acreage in Illinois of 2,296,451 acres. In Ohio the increase shown is 1,149,577 acres. Here in Cook county, which is practically Chicago, according to the census there is also a remarkable agricultural development, the increase in farm acreage amounting to 19,718 acres. This is over 30 square miles of territory, and if in one tract would occupy an extent of over 6 miles long and 5 miles wide. How do they get it? Why, by enumerating as farms all the potato and cabbage patches on city lots. Even the Pingree potato patches in the district in which the writer resides were enumerated as farms. Enumerators were paid 18 cents for each tract thus enumerated, while they received but 4 cents for each death reported and were required to hunt up the attending physician and obtain his statement of the cause of death. They seem to

have got in everything that could possibly be enumerated as a farm, though their report as to mortality was very defective. The census schedule of 1890 did not admit the enumeration as a farm of any tract of less than 3 acres unless there was a product to the value of \$500 actually sold from it. Larger tracts were also excluded unless they required the labor of at least one able-bodied man for the year.

It is absurd to suppose that there could be any considerable increase in farm acreage in old settled States like Ohio and Illinois. On the contrary there must have been an actual decrease through the growth of cities and towns and the appropriation of land for residence and manufacturing purposes.

The inclusion of a larger number of small tracts as farms at the present than at the former census tends to decrease the average size of farms, and the fact that this average has increased from 136.5 acres in 1890 to 146.6 in 1900 is accounted for by the increased number of "bonanza farms."

The census reports 47,276 farms of 1,000 acres and over—the average size being 4,237.3 acres—making a total of 200,324,045 acres in farms of 1,000 acres and over, and almost one-fourth of the entire farm acreage of the United States, which is reported as 841,201,546 acres. In 1890 there were but 31,546 farms of 1,000 acres and over. The average size was not reported.

While there seems to be no reason to question the correctness of the census reports as to great farms, the reported increase in the small ones is largely fictitious. If there is prosperity among the farmers, then, as the census figures are said to show, it must be among the bonanza farmers, and not among the small ones. Not the land farmer, therefore, is prospering, according to the census, but the land monopolist.

HENRY L. BLISS.

NEWS

To perfect the arbitration agreement in compromise of the anthracite coal strike (p. 438), a delegate

convention of anthracite coal miners' unions met at Wilkesbarre, Pa., on the 20th. The convention had been called on the 15th for the purpose of acting upon a unanimous recommendation of the executive boards of districts 1, 7 and 9 of the Mine Workers' Union of America, "that all mine workers now on strike return to their former positions and working places and submit to the commission appointed by the President of the United States all questions at issue between the operators and mine workers of the anthracite coal fields." When the convention met there were 662 delegates in attendance, the basis of representation being one delegate from each local union for every 100 members.

Mr. Mitchell opened the proceedings with a speech, in the course of which he made the following significant suggestions with reference to reciprocal relations between the coal miners' union and the coal trust in the future:

For our opponents we entertain no feeling of malice. While they have maligned our characters, impugned our motives and sought the victory by methods which we should scorn to use, yet on this day when we have secured an avenue of redress, on this day when the realization of our hopes and ambitions seems near, when the prospect of a brighter and happier future seems assured, we should hold out to them the hand of friendship and ask them to join us in providing for such business relations as shall for all time establish peace and tranquility in the coal fields. The day is past when great organizations of capital can maintain the false position that their employes shall be denied the right to organize into compact bodies and speak through the organization of which they are members. We recognize the right of capital to consolidate, to federate and to speak and act through its organization, but in according these rights and privileges to capital we demand and shall assert the same privileges for those who toil. Between the combination of capital, on the one hand, and the organization of labor on the other, there should be and need be no irreconcilable conflict; each is a factor in the economic development of our civilization and the application of business judgment and plain common sense by each would enable them to work in harmony.

No definite action was taken by the convention on the first day of its session, but on the 21st, after a long debate over a minor question, the convention accepted the proposed

compromise. The resolution, which was adopted unanimously, is as follows in full:

The Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Washington, D. C.—Dear Sir: We, the representatives of the employes of the various coal companies engaged in operating mines in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania, in convention assembled, having under consideration your telegram of Oct. 15, 1902, addressed to John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America, which reads as follows:

I have appointed as commissioners Brig. Gen. John M. Wilson, E. W. Parker, Judge George Gray, E. E. Clark, Thomas H. Watkins, Bishop J. L. Spalding, with Carroll D. Wright as recorder. These names are accepted by the operators and I now earnestly ask and urge that the miners likewise accept this commission. It is a matter of vital concern to all our people, and especially those in our great cities, who are least well off, that the mining of coal should be resumed without a moment's unnecessary delay.

We have decided to accept the proposition therein embodied and submit all questions at issue between the operators and mine workers of the anthracite coal region for adjustment to the commission which you have named. In pursuance of that decision, we shall report for work on Thursday morning, Oct. 23, in the positions and working places occupied by us prior to the inauguration of the strike. We have authorized John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America, with such assistants as he may select, to represent us in all hearings before the committee.

The compromise agreement having been now accepted by both sides, President Roosevelt issued a call to the arbitration commission to meet at Washington on the 24th at 10 o'clock.

Coincident with the settlement of the coal strike in the United States came news of the end of the civil war in Hayti. Since our last previous account of this convulsion (p. 362), several battles have been reported. One occurred at Limbe on the 17th of September, in which the government troops under Gen. Nord were said to have been defeated. Gen. Nord subsequently recovered his position at Limbe, but on the 11th of October was said to have been again defeated and to be retreating. In a battle on the 12th at Montroiuc, the revolutionists successfully resisted an attack; and on the 16th government troops were marching on Gonaives, the revolutionary headquarters, while the revolutionary leaders were evacuating the place and fleeing the country. This is regarded as marking the end of the

revolution, but its sudden collapse is wholly unaccounted for by the dispatches. There may or may not be significance in the news reports from Washington about a month before the collapse, which were to the effect that the American government had decided to intervene and insist upon an immediate declaration of peace. It seems, furthermore, that on the 14th the American minister to Hayti took the initiative in securing a concert of action on the part of the diplomatic corps in proposing a cessation of hostilities in order to arrange for peace. About the same time the United States cruiser "Cincinnati" arrived, and three days later the revolutionary leaders abandoned their capital apparently without resistance and left the country.

When we last reported the revolutionary conflict in Venezuela (p. 377), President Castro was believed to be in a serious position and retreating from Ocumare, in Bolivar, before the insurgent troops after defeat in battle. On the 14th, however, it was reported that he had routed the insurgents at La Victoria and saved Caraccas. This report was followed by others of a highly sensational character, which told of the prolongation of the battle from the 13th to the 18th, and of the flight of the revolutionary army under Gen. Matos. The insurgents were said to have suffered casualties to the number of 3,000. But later advices, though from insurgent sources as the others were from government sources, are to the effect that the insurgents had merely abandoned the field after finding that they could neither capture La Victoria nor draw President Castro into open fight. That the battle was not decisive is vouched for by the American minister.

On the other side of the ocean and across the African continent the "mad mullah," whose mysterious title appears frequently in the newspapers, has won a victory over the British in Somaliland. British Somaliland lies on the southern coast of the Gulf of Aden and touches Abyssinia on the northeast. It is a British protectorate with a consul general. The "mad mullah," Haji Mohamed Bui Abdullah by name, is a native Mohammedan priest, the son of a Somali shepherd, who claims to be the successor of the Mahdi whose following Gen. Kitch-

ener slew at Omdurman (Vol. i., No. 23, p. 9; Vol. ii., No. 87, p. 8). The "mad mullah" had assumed a hostile attitude toward the British protectorate, announcing that he intended to rule the interior of the country himself, while leaving the coast to the Europeans. Thousands of natives joined his standard, and in March, 1900, he attacked an Abyssinian expedition which had been sent against him. His attack was so ferocious that although the Abyssinians repulsed him, they feared to follow up their victory. But in the Spring of 1891 the British arranged a joint expedition with Abyssinia against the "mad mullah" under the command of Col. Swayne. After several engagements Col. Swayne encountered the mullah near Hassan Ughaz, July 17, 1901, and defeated him with severe loss, effectually scattering his forces as was then supposed. About the middle of November of the same year it was reported that the mullah had fled with some of his followers into Italian Somaliland. But it now appears that he had not left the field to his British enemy. On the 6th of the present month he completely routed Col. Swayne at Erego, killing 50 of his men and wounding 100 more. Swayne was, at last reports, trying to retreat, but was in a trap. The British government have ordered troops from India to relieve him.

Peaceable warfare over the tariff question has been in progress in the German reichstag (p. 280) since it reconvened on the 6th, and is now approaching a climax. The discussion of the tariff bill proposed by the government began on the 16th, and test votes were taken on the 21st. The government on these votes suffered defeat by 194 to 145 on one proposition and 187 to 152 on another. The minority was composed of National Liberals, Socialists and Radicals, while the victory was won by the landed interests, which demand a high protective tariff on grain.

The British parliament reassembled on the 16th after the Summer recess (p. 295), and the opening scenes were marked with much disorder over the Irish question. Patrick O'Brien moved that one day be devoted prior to Christmas to the discussion of the Irish crisis caused by the suspension of civil rights in many Irish counties (pp. 362, 377, 433). His motion was opposed by

the premier, Mr. Balfour, who said that such a request from the Liberal party would be granted, but not from the Irish party. A violent controversy ensued, and John O'Donnell, one of the Irish members, for refusing to obey the speaker, was suspended by a vote of 341 to 51. The premier's motion that the session be devoted to ministerial business was then carried by 262 to 145. Under this decision ministerial business will have precedence at every sitting and at the conclusion of such business each day the speaker is required to adjourn the house without putting the motion to adjourn. On the 20th Mr. Wyndham, the secretary for Ireland, asked leave to withdraw the Irish land bill (vol. iv., p. 809), and his motion was granted. He explained that in the course of the next session he intended to introduce a new measure for voluntary arrangements between Irish landlords and tenants. The Irish controversy was renewed on the 22d, when the Liberal leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, supported the request of the Irish members for a day on the Irish crisis. Mr. Balfour responded that he would comply only if the request were adopted by the Liberal party as a whole and made a party question on a vote of censure. As this could not be done, the day was not granted. William O'Brien exclaimed during the discussion that if the Irish members were not given a day they would take one.

Outside of parliament the most important British news relates to the action of the conference on the taxation of land values held at London on the 21st. This conference was called by the town council of Glasgow (p. 378), by an overwhelming majority, to meet for the purpose of considering how best to formulate a general parliamentary bill for the taxation of land values for local purposes. There were 160 delegates in attendance representing 124 British councils—county, urban district and borough. Two resolutions were adopted. One approved the principle of taxing land values for local purposes, the same principle that is distinguished in the United States by the term "single tax." This was adopted without dissent. The other resolution, adopted with only four dissenting votes, provided for carrying the first into effect through a parliamentary bill. The specific demand made was for a tax of 2 shil-

lings to the pound of annual land value, whether actual or potential, which would be about $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. on the selling value of all land, whether in use or vacant, and without considering the value of improvements. As land values now escape taxation, this proposal, light as the suggested tax would be, is regarded in Glasgow, where it originates, as a pronounced advance in the direction of the land reform advocated by Henry George.

Apropos of the Irish question in the British parliament, an Irish agitation has begun in the United States. It was started under the auspices of the United Irish League of America. John Dillon, Edward Blake and John E. Redmond, members of parliament, and Michael Davitt, landed in Boston from Queens-town on the 17th to attend the convention of the league, which met on the 20th in Fanueil hall. The league pledged \$100,000 to the cause, and John F. Finerty, of Chicago, was re-elected president. The night before the convention two immense mass meetings of sympathy with the Irish was held. Mayor Collins presided at one and William Lloyd Garrison at the other.

A long expected breach has occurred in the ministry of the Canadian dominion. Minister Laurier's party was elected as a free trade party, but the minister of public works, Joseph I. Tarte, turns out to be a protectionist. During the absence of Mr. Laurier in Europe last Summer Mr. Tarte, without consulting his colleagues, began an active campaign in favor of an immediate revision of the Canadian tariff in the direction of high protection. For this Mr. Laurier demanded his resignation, and on the 21st it was given. In tendering his resignation Mr. Tarte said:

You are leader of the government, and your opinion, as far as my attitude is involved, must prevail. Entertaining the opinion that the interests of the Canadian people make it our duty to revise, without delay, the tariff of 1897 with the view of giving a more adequate protection to our industries, to our farming community, to our workmen. I cannot remain silent. I prefer my freedom of action and of speech, under the circumstances, than the great honor of being your colleague.

In reply Mr. Laurier described Mr. Tarte's conduct, and wrote as follows:

I regret having been obliged to ob-

serve to you that this attitude on your part constituted a self-evident violation of your duty toward the government, of which you were a member. If you had reached the conclusion that the interest of the country demanded without delay an increase of the customs duties, the first thing for you to do as a member of the government, before addressing your views to the country, would have been to place them before your colleagues with the object of obtaining that unanimous action of the cabinet which is the very foundation of responsible government. If you had not been able to obtain from your colleagues their assent to the new course which you recommended, you would have been obliged then to sever your connection with them, and then, for the first time, you would have been free to place your views before the public.

It is understood that Mr. Tarte will make an aggressive campaign against the ministry of which he has been until now a member. Back of the protection movement he is leading is the Canadian Manufacturers' association. The premier of the province of Quebec, Mr. Parent, has been called to Mr. Tarte's place in the Laurier cabinet.

Johnson's campaign in Ohio remains the subject of special interest in American politics. After his Youngstown meeting on the 13th (p. 440) Johnson went on the 14th to Warren, the county seat of Trumbull county, where Mr. Bigelow rejoined the party after a tour in the southern part of the State. Although the night was bitterly cold and the locality strongly Republican, the audience at Warren numbered 4,000. Ravenna was the meeting place for the 15th. It is the county town of the strongly Republican county of Portage, but the tent was packed. On the 16th the tent was pitched in Akron, where the Republican convention had been held. Though Akron is in the Republican county of Summit, the meeting there is reported to have been much larger than that which listened to the speakers on the occasion of the Republican convention. The sides of the tent were removed and 7,500 people crowded within hearing distance. But the largest of all of Johnson's meetings was on the 17th, at Cleveland, where 15,000—10,000 within an enlarged tent and 5,000 without—gathered to hear him and Bigelow. Two large meetings were held in Cleveland on the 18th and again on the 20th, the beginning of next to the last week of the campaign.

Senator Hanna, whose illness caused him to cancel his speaking engagements in Ohio on the 10th (p. 439), resumed his campaign on the 15th at Xenia, appearing at Greenfield on the 16th, at Dayton on the 18th, and at Cleveland for his first meeting there on the 20th.

The work of the special session of the Ohio legislature (p. 440) was completed on the 21st by the enactment of a municipal code providing for the uniform government of all the cities and villages of the State. The plan adopted is what is known as the "board plan." Home rule principles were ignored and all home rule propositions discarded.

NEWS NOTES.

—A combination of independent steel manufacturers is reported to have purchased iron ore tracts in Michigan and Minnesota at a valuation of \$68,000,000.

—The trustees of the University of Chicago decided on the 22d in favor of separate instruction for men and women (pp. 267, 292) at the university. The vote stood 13 to 3.

—In the French chamber of deputies on the 17th, attacks were made upon the ministry for its enforcement of the associations law by closing Catholic schools (p. 362); but the ministry received a vote of confidence in the matter of 329 to 233.

—Women claim the right to vote on the referendum questions to be submitted in Illinois at the approaching election. They base their claim on the ground that all registered voters are entitled to vote on these questions and that women registered to vote for university trustee are registered voters.

—The King of Sweden and Norway, to whom was referred in 1899, as arbitrator, by Great Britain, Germany and the United States, all claims of private individuals growing out of military operations in Samoa (Vol. i., No. 42, p. 11; No. 50, p. 9; No. 52, p. 7; Vol. ii, No. 54, p. 9; No. 90, p. 10), has reported in favor of Germany.

—A decision was rendered on the 22d by the United State Supreme Court in favor of a Chicago saloon-keeper who had sued the Federal government to recover 50 cents for an internal revenue stamp which he had been required to place on his bond. In so deciding the court sustained Judge Tuley, who had held that the Federal government cannot tax documents required by the States in the exercise of their functions. The decision involves the refunding of several millions.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE OHIO MUNICIPAL CODE.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Oct. 18.—The plot has been carried out in every detail. Cleveland has been made an attachment to the Boss Cox machine, the wires of which run through the State offices at Columbus to those of the Republican managers here. The citizens of Cleveland will have an opportunity at the polls next month to show their opinion of this successful conspiracy to rob them of home rule and good government.

THE COAL STRIKE.

Chicago American (Dem.), Oct. 17.—Arbitration has won. The end of the coal strike seems in sight. Nevertheless the coal trust still lives. And the coal trust lives in defiance of the laws of the United States. What the American thus affirms the American has proved, and the American's attorneys will continue to press the criminal proceedings against the coal trust until the criminal conspirators have been brought to justice.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Oct. 17 (weekly ed.).—Either these coal mines must be taken over by the State or nation for operation on public account or they must be subjected to the closest public control, including compulsory measures for avoiding strikes, lockouts and all other controversies between employers and employes which endanger the continuous operation of the business.

St. Louis Mirror (Ind.), Oct. 16.—The differences involved in strikes are not matters to be adjusted as a political "play" to the groundlings for votes. The settlement should be provided for along the lines of general economic principles, and those principles must finally be based upon the restriction of privilege from tyrannizing over the common man's natural rights in the earth and its contents.

Milwaukee Free Press (Ind. Rep.), Oct. 13.—If the mineral lands are not owned by the government and leased to operators on royalty, as an increasing number of people believe they should be, then why should not all land, whether used for manufacturing, trading, offices and hotels, railroads, farms and dwellings, be treated in the same manner? Instead of royalty, call it tax, and then make this tax in lieu of all other taxes, and we have the misunderstood, the scorned and flouted single-tax theory, no longer a theory at all, but a practical, working accomplishment. It may and it may not be a good thing in the end, but single-taxers are being made very rapidly this year, and the coal kings of Pennsylvania are furnishing arguments in favor of the theory of one tax, and that upon land values, that convinces people to whom the fervid eloquence of Henry George did not appeal.

You can always be sure that your judgments are right if your standard is small enough. A tape measure is easy to handle, a celestial meridian is more difficult to apply. Only, when it is the universe to be measured, it is bad work trying to reduce things to the capacity of the tape measure; since what you succeed in diminishing is yourself, and not the universe as you had intended.—Jane Dearborn Mills, in *The New Christianity*.

Why not have international war games? Would it not be a triumph of civilization to settle every casus belli by a contest with soft gloves for points?—Puck.

MISCELLANY

PENNSYLVANIA.

For The Public.

Beloved land! whose rock-ribbed heights
Spurning the fair horizon's blue,
Weave romance round the days and nights
Of vales in autumn glory sleeping,
With far-famed rivers winding through;
Wild Indian legends in their keeping,
Wild music with their names upleaping.

I yearn for thee, when sunset glows
On level landscape round me spread,
I weary of the tame repose
That sets my errant memory straying
Among the pine clad hills instead;
Where mystery with strange shadows playing
Dallies with twilight's long delaying.

I grieve for thee, whose mother care
Its precious secret could not keep,
Nor give each nursing equal share
Of profit, in that ebon treasure
That nevermore may rest or sleep;
But minister to robbers' pleasure
And leave the toiler meager measure.

I blush for thee, whose olden name
With sylvan echoes musical,
Is darkened now by deeds of shame;
Thine ear attuned to martial thunder—
To finer sound grown strangely dull,
Thy greed made drunk with legal plunder
By brute force holding justice under.

And yet I hope for thee, through all;
I can but hope, for thou art mine;
My spirit heeds the autumn call
That comes from green woods softly sighing,
From maple's flame, and crimsoned vine,
From youth's ideals, time defying,
From graves on eastern hillslope lying.

D. H. INGHAM.

TO THE HOME OWNERS AND RENT PAYERS OF DENVER.

We republish from the *Denver Daily News* of October 12 the following address issued by the executive committee of the friends of the Bucklin Australasian Tax Amendment.

To the Home Owners and Rent Payers of Denver: The matter of very greatest importance at the coming election, November 4, is the Bucklin Australasian tax amendment. Some have gotten a mistaken conception of this amendment. Others do not recognize its great importance. Permit an explanation of its bearings upon the interests of all who own or rent homes or business houses in this city.

The land gamblers, franchise grabbers and monopolists have organized an "Anti-Bucklin Amendment league," to delude the people into defeating the Bucklin Australasian tax amendment, and thus fastening the present detestable collar-button system of taxation upon the people of Colorado.

The interests of all home owners, all honest merchants and manufacturers, and all men and women who pay rent, are diametrically opposed to the self-

ish interests of all mere speculators or gamblers in social values.

The amendment will, of course, not interfere with legitimate real estate transactions, but good, healthy growth of Denver in particular, or of Colorado in general, is not what the land gamblers want. They want men tumbling over each other to buy, or tumbling over each other to sell—they don't care which—so that they may get big commissions. It is "exchange" they want, not secure possession, not steady growth. But the great mass of the people want neither "booms" nor "panics," but secure possession of their homes, reasonable rents and the steady growth and assured prosperity of Denver and the whole state.

The Australasian tax amendment comprises one "must" and one "may." Under its workings the owners of special privileges must pay taxes on the social values they possess, and the people may exempt personalty and improvements, in whole or in part, from taxation. In other words: 1. Privilege must pay for itself. 2. The people may exercise the local taxing power.

The Australasian tax amendment, with the power it will grant the people put into operation, will benefit everybody except land gamblers, franchise grabbers and monopolists. To-day the board of county commissioners decide what taxes the tramway, the railroads and like corporations shall pay. The amendment gives the people power to decide what taxes these corporations shall pay. To-day, these corporations are paying no taxes whatever on their franchises of rights of way. The attorney of the Denver Gas and Electric Light company has just admitted that the franchise of said company is worth more than all its real estate and personalty put together. The amendment gives the people power to compel these privileged corporations to pay full taxes on their privileges. Do you wonder that the tramway is opposed to the Australasian tax amendment, or that the common people favor it?

Every home owner must to-day pay more taxes than he will when, the Australasian tax amendment being put into effect, the tramway and other favored corporations must pay the taxes on their special privileges, which they now escape.

Every small home owner possesses more personalty and improvements than he does land values. So, if the former were exempt from local taxes, as under the amendment they might be, every small home owner would profit thereby, while every speculator who owns a multitude of vacant lots, and

like the dog in the manger, neither uses them himself nor lets others use them, would not be specially favored for engaging in the vacant lot industry.

If the merchant's goods were exempt from taxation or his rents were lower, you would pay less for the goods you or your family consume, for the merchant must get back from the customers all the taxes and rents he pays or else go out of business.

If men were not fined for building houses, nor favored for keeping lots vacant, the vacant lot industry would not be as much encouraged as it is today, but other industries would be encouraged more. Vacant lots buy no groceries, dry goods, boots or shoes, employ no carpenters, engage no teachers, pay, neither preacher nor physician, patronize no places of amusement, help neither labor, housekeeper, merchant, manufacturer nor professional man or woman.

If you are a rent payer, you know that rents, either for homes or business places, are outrageously high in Denver. This city has gotten the bad name of being the city that oppresses renters more than any other in America. The Denver real estate exchange has given it this bad name. Population and conditions being taken into account, rents in Denver are double what they are in Detroit, Mich.; Minneapolis, Minn., and other cities of 250,000 inhabitants.

If the Australasian tax system is adopted in Denver, and men are not fined for erecting buildings, more buildings will be erected, and rents will be lower. The Australasian tax system will give the city of Denver and the state of Colorado the excellent reputation of being the city and state which invite people who wish to rent, people who wish to own homes, workingmen and women, men and women with capital, because our motto will be forward, our maxim of taxation the wise words of Enoch Ensley:

"Never tax anything that would be of value to your state, that could and would run away, or that could and would come to you."

Of all men the real estate owner is, or ought to be, most interested in this maxim of Enoch Ensley. Movable property always seeks and locates upon real estate whereon it best thrives and most multiplies. Any tax imposed upon movable property lessens its prosperity and tends to drive it elsewhere, or at least to keep more from coming.

Let Denver real estate say to personal property in other cities and

states: "Come, locate with us; I will not oppress you. Come to me, for I cannot go for you and we must get together or else I cannot prosper, though you might prosper elsewhere. Knowing this, I will not fine nor tax you for coming to me. Other cities make you pay local taxes. I will exempt you from this burden, hence I offer you this great advantage along with others, over personalty that lives with other cities. Come." Do you suppose that personalty could or would resist such an appeal?

Instead of spending immense sums of money in advertising Denver, all that we need to do is to pass the Australasian tax amendment, and then exempt personalty and improvements from local taxation. Then the press all over the United States will do our advertising for us, free of charge. Soon men will come here and invest their capital—not in vacant lots to be held out of use till the toil and enterprise of others than their owners make them more and more valuable; but in manufacturing, stores, houses, all sorts of productive enterprises—giving employment to labor, encouragement to business, endowment to Denver.

Here is a truism you may not have thought of: The renter or lessee of real estate must prosper before the owner can prosper. This applies to all kinds of realty. The renter may not prosper more, but he must prosper first. The Australasian tax will therefore help both renters and owners to prosper.

All home owners and rent payers who are in sympathy with these views are requested to communicate with the undersigned for the purpose of organizing the rent payers and home owners in this city.

RICHARD WELTON, 219 Grant Ave.
 MARCUS L. DAY, 738 East Florida.
 GEORGE W. PATTERSON, 1406 Champa.
 M. L. DOWLING, 3350 Franklin.
 ALEX E. HELMLE, 2065 Clarkson.
 J. G. FOLEY, 1819 Pennsylvania.
 DR. FRANK W. STAHL, 1272 Columbine.
 SIDNEY HOLMES, 1256 South Tremont.
 W. J. NESBIT, 715 Santa Fe.
 CHARLES T. WYGANT, 2752 Larimer.
 JAMES STEELE, 1955 Larimer.
 T. P. LYON, 533 Charles Building.
 CHARLES N. MONAGHAN, 1125 Larimer.
 J. B. BLANCHARD, 2330 Hooker.
 Executive Committee.

"What is your rule of business—your maxim?" we asked of the Wall street baron.

"Very simple," he answers. "I pay for something that I can't get, with money that I haven't got, and then sell what I never had for more than it ever cost."—Life.

THE PROBLEM INVOLVED IN THE COAL STRIKE.

For The Public.

The situation in Pennsylvania consequent upon the miners' strike is in no way exceptional or peculiar. The strike is one more evidence of widespread and deep-seated discontent with industrial conditions, that is all.

What are the industrial conditions?

To get a clear idea we must recede from the immediate question for a moment, and consider certain facts which affect and may even determine the situation.

Who owns the earth, and what will be the effect of the ownership of the earth by some, upon the fortunes of the others?

Let the situation in Pennsylvania answer.

These six men (named by the President) own the coal fields of Pennsylvania, do they not? "An infeasible estate in fee simple." What are the rights of the owner of such an estate? The legal rights, I mean—those conferred by society. His taxes being paid, he may do with it as he will, may he not? Sell it? Yes. Refuse to sell it? Yes. Employ labor on it? Yes. Refuse to employ labor on it? Yes. Whose business is it, and what are we going to do about it, so long as we recognize in him an infeasible estate in fee simple?

Condemn the mines under the law of eminent domain, and buy them back from the owners? Has the state of Pennsylvania money enough, or can it get money enough to consummate such a purchase, involving as it would, the purchase of the mining machinery and all the coal roads and their equipment? Admit for a moment the practicability of what I believe a wholly impracticable measure, and what is then the situation? The state of Pennsylvania, in exchange for an enormous bonded debt, would be in possession of her coal mines. What would she do with them? Is there political wisdom enough, integrity of character enough, sagacity, fidelity and experience enough among the rulers of Pennsylvania to discharge the trust involved? Who believes it for a moment? Who would not be appalled at such an undertaking by men, whose unscrupulous character, whose cupidity and venality are the by-word and hissing of the nation.

Appoint receivers to take over the property and administer the trust? Under what pretext? What right has society to interfere with the present management? All the rights the operators have in, to and over the coal

deposits have been conferred directly or mediately by society, have they not?

What's the matter with society? It has got just what it bargained for, hasn't it? And yet society doesn't seem entirely satisfied; society has wanted coal, and couldn't get it; society does not like to see its members suffer, and yet 104,000 miners and their families were for five long months in want, and a situation of chronic unrest and dissatisfaction suddenly (as such situations are apt to do) became painfully and pressingly acute, and still the question recurred: What are we going to do about it?

There is no use in skirmishing about this matter, or paltering with it. Whether we know it or not, or like it or not, we are squarely "up against" the institution of private property in land—not private property in some land, not private property in the coal fields of Pennsylvania simply, but private property in land in its widest, fullest, most comprehensive sense. Property in land is property in man, and the question now forced upon us by the logic of events is: Shall this species of slavery continue or not?—a question for every man and woman in this country. It will not down, it is here to stay—to stay until it is settled—and it will be settled only when the natural rights of men in the earth are secured—the equal, eternal and inalienable right of every human being to the bounty of the Almighty, put forever beyond the reach of ignorant or corrupt legislation.

Without a clear conception of the cause of industrial disorder—in other words, a clear conception of the fact that the men who own the earth will control the destiny of those who live on the earth, no measure will be of any avail. We can do nothing that will not add to the difficulties of the situation. The power of land monopoly—or land ownership, if you please—must be broken, or men must make up their minds to submit to whatever terms land owners find it to their interest to impose.

So far as regards the case in point, I do not see that Congress has properly anything to do with it. No interstate question or constitutional question appears to be involved. There has been no interference with the functions of the general government. It is an instance pure and simple of the power which land ownership gives over the lives of men and the welfare of society.

This trouble has arisen in Pennsylvania. Let the legislature and execu-

tive of Pennsylvania deal with it. The commonwealth has made merchandise of the inheritance of the race, and has consequently deprived tens of thousands of her citizens of any means of livelihood except as they may extort it from the beneficiaries of the state. Let her undo the wrong.

She still possesses the power of taxation. It is enough. The power to tax is the power to destroy. She can tax land values, can appropriate ground rent, can take for the public good what belongs to the public, and can thereby compel those who would mine coal to pay labor whatever may be necessary to secure efficient and constant supply, to be satisfied with interest on capital and wages of superintendence, and to turn over the proceeds in excess thereof in taxes to the state. All this she can do and must do if she would promote good order and establish justice.

Let us renounce temporary expedients. Let us espouse that truth which is now struggling for expression, and which will yet—it may easily be in our own time—bring about changes so beneficent and glorious that we shall count it our highest joy to have been its advocates and champions. Make men see that this so-called contest of Capital and Labor is in reality wholly different in character; that Capital and Labor are natural allies, and that their common enemy is Land Monopoly. Challenge the justice of any law or custom by which the heritage of the race has become the possession of a few. The ownership of the Pennsylvania coal mines is just now the matter of public concern. The future of land tenure, not only in this case, but of every square foot of land in this country, is the real question at issue. On the determination of this question hangs, as I believe, the welfare of our people and the perpetuity of our institutions.

Chicago. J. B. JOHNSTON.

LESSONS FROM THE COAL STRIKE, AND WHAT IS STILL TO BE DONE.

A lecture delivered in the Church of the Christian Union, Rockford, Ill., by the pastor, Robert C. Bryant, Sunday evening, Oct. 19, 1902.

What is the cause of the coal strike?

We are told that the companies have imported into the coal regions more men than are needed to work the mines. And this is true, but beneath this as a prior cause is the fact that the conditions of men in different parts of the world are so bad that they can be persuaded to

leave their homes and spend their lives in the coal mines, with the promise of a small advance in their wages. We are told that the miners receive very low wages and have irregular work, while the work itself is unpleasant, unhealthful and dangerous; and it is often assumed that if they receive an advance of ten per cent. in wages and have shorter hours of work, they ought to be forever satisfied, and we should never more hear of the coal miners and their grievances.

But there are causes of the strike that lie far deeper than the mere matter of a 10 or 15 cent advance in wages; causes that will not cease to agitate the world as at present, and will not be truly and permanently remedied until there is obtained for all men a condition of industrial equality of opportunity which they do not have to-day.

A few years ago human industry was very simple. Most men were farmers and raised their own food. They built their own houses and made their own clothes and many of their own implements of agriculture. By working all the time they were able to produce enough wealth to satisfy the limited needs of themselves and their families.

Within the last century we have made tremendous progress, and progress has been largely in the increased power of labor to produce wealth. Four men to-day with modern machinery can plant and cultivate and harvest and mill enough wheat to supply a thousand people with bread. One girl in a cotton factory to-day can turn out enough cotton to clothe a thousand people. One person with a spinning wheel could spin five hanks of twist in a week. To-day, with one or two small children to help, he can spin 50,000 hanks in the same time. Two weeks were required to make a plow by hand, which can be made now in three or four hours. Sawing lumber to-day, one man can do the work of 300 or 400 men sawing by hand. With a planer one man can do the work of 30 or 40 men planing by hand. With a sewing machine one woman can do the work of 20 or 30 women sewing by hand. In making small metal things, as tacks and nails, one man can do the work of 100 or more men working by hand. With a McKay machine a man can sole from 300 to 600 pairs of shoes in a day, to five or six pairs working by hand. A good compositor can set 6,000 or 8,000 ems of

type in a day; with a linotype from 50,000 to 60,000 can be set. Benjamin Franklin printed his paper on a little press with a lever, and was able to make from 60 to 100 impressions an hour. What would he think to see one of our great steam presses that print and cut and fold and paste and count and label from 70,000 to 80,000 great papers in an hour, actually doing in one hour more work than Franklin was able to do in a year? It has been calculated that the mechanical and horse power at work for us to-day are equal to about 500,000 tireless willing slaves, and this may be increased four or five fold during this century.

What does all this mean? It means that the power to produce wealth has increased perhaps fifty fold; that in a given time a man with modern machinery can produce fifty times as much wealth as he could years ago. A small portion of this must be allowed for the use of the machine, but the remainder should be a man's wage.

Whether a man works for himself or for some one else, his wage should be the sum of the wealth he actually produces, less that small portion necessary for expenses. Let us take a very moderate, conservative position and say that the increase of labor power has been in the last few years, over and above all expenses, ten fold. This means that the wages of labor, as represented in money, should be, instead of one to three dollars a day, one to three dollars an hour, with the purchasing power of the dollar the same as at present.

Now the men who are producing wealth are just beginning to understand these things. They see that they do not get the just product of their labor. It is not a question as to the actual improvement of the condition of the laboring man. The poor are not growing poorer. The poor man has free schools for his children, and public libraries, and receives perhaps 10 or 15 per cent. more wages than his father did for the same hours of work. The point is that a large number of men cannot be satisfied with ten per cent. of progress when the world as a whole has made 10,000 per cent. of progress. The man who works wants a comfortable house to live in, and works of art and nice furniture; he wants to be able to take a Pullman car and visit Niagara and the Yosemite valley; he wants to see Julia Marlowe and Joseph Jefferson, and Sousa's

band; he wants time for pleasure, education and religion. All these things progress has made possible to man, and he wants to enjoy them, and will not be satisfied until he is able to enjoy them.

If all this ten fold increase in wealth is produced, where does it go? A good illustration of the answer is before us.

Seventy-five years ago a car load of Pennsylvania coal could not have been sold in Rockford for less than \$100 a ton. To-day it could be sold for three or four dollars a ton with good profit to all concerned. A dollar and a half for mining it, a dollar and a dollar and a half for hauling it, and fifty cents or a dollar for handling and delivering it here, would give good profits to all. As it is, we pay eight or nine dollars for it, the miner gets a few cents for mining it, the dealer gets a small profit, and the owners of the mines and the railroad combination get the rest. It is not difficult to see where the wealth goes. This is but one of a large number of similar holdups in operation all over the land.

Now this is the cause of the coal strike; the products of labor go to monopoly. And this is the cause of the fierce competition and the intensity of all legitimate business. There are some who seem to think that the social problem concerns only the working man in his relations with his employer. But almost every man who is to-day trying to do an honest business, rendering an equivalent for profits received, meeting the competition of others in the same business, aided perhaps by an investment of more or less honestly earned capital, and employing perhaps more or less labor—almost every one is making a hard struggle and putting in all the vital strength he has, to make anything of a success at all. Monopoly is taking the products of business as well as the wages of the workingman; it appropriates wealth, no matter how or by whom produced, and the struggle of the hour is not, as so many people suppose, a struggle between the laboring man and his employer, not a struggle between labor and capital that is not monopoly, but a struggle between labor and all business or capital that is not monopoly on the one hand, and monopoly on the other.

There are three main things that enable monopoly to appropriate the products of labor and business.

The first and least important of all is the tariff and all systems of indirect taxation and licenses.

The tariff I believe to be wrong in morals and in policy. It is wrong in morals because it is an effort to make the foreigner pay my tax, and because it is intended to give certain men a privilege or an advantage over others. It is wrong in policy. If a man should start in business raising hot-house bananas we might put a tariff on bananas to protect an infant industry. But would it not be much better policy for us to make shoes and machines and raise wheat, and exchange these things that we can produce cheaper than others, for bananas, buying them as cheaply as we can? The tariff fosters trusts, enabling some manufacturers to sell their products for much more than the cost of production. And does anyone think the tariff keeps up the wages of men? If so let him ask whether the average employer pays for labor as much as he can, or as little as he can. Wages are determined by the law of supply and demand, and seldom does an employer pay more than the demand, even though protection enables him to make large profits.

But the tariff is one of the least of the evils in the social and industrial world. The Iowa idea is coming into prominence, and I am glad it is, but does anyone suppose that the taking off of the tariff will destroy or even cripple the coal monopoly, so long as the mines and the railroads are owned by the combination?

The thing of second importance that enables monopoly to appropriate the products of labor and business is railroad combination. There is scarcely any competition between the great railroads of the country to-day. They rob the producer at one end of the line and the buyer at the other. They prevent natural free trade, and are a large cause of the modern spectacle of overproduction. The toiler in the shoe factory goes hungry, and the farmer at the same time goes barefoot, when there is an overproduction of both wheat and shoes.

It may be said that the majority of railroads have not paid large dividends. This would be difficult to explain were it not for two things; first, the well-known fact that a large portion of railroad stock is water; second, a very large portion of the investment is in valuable land, which must bear interest equal to the rental value of the land, and pay taxes beside.

One thing cannot be disputed, that the railroads are a large cause of the trust evil, in the discriminating rates which, in spite of all law, they have always made to the great trusts, and al-

ways will so long as they have a monopoly of the carrying business.

But the greatest cause of the appropriation by monopoly of the products of labor and business is the private ownership of the sources of natural wealth.

Here are these great coal mines. Who put them there? Not the owners, but the Creator of the earth. Who were they intended for? Not a few owners, but for all the people. We must have coal. But if a few men own the mines they have a right to charge what they please for the coal; they have a right to close the mines if they wish.

But all this is true of not mines alone. Here is a valuable city lot. It was part of a farm. It is as much nature as a mine is. The owner did not put it here, and has done nothing to make it valuable. We must use that lot to take advantage of the opportunities of the city. The owner knows our necessity and charges \$100 or \$1,000 a year for rent for that which cost nothing to produce. It is just as great an injustice as charging an exorbitant price for coal that cost nothing to produce.

The people who, in this country, by labor produce wealth, pay to the owners of land a sum approximating \$1,000,000,000 a year, for the mere opportunity to live and labor. The land values of this country according to the last census are approximately \$20,000,000,000. Estimating the rental of the land at five per cent., it amounts to \$1,000,000,000 a year. This is only the beginning of the evils of land ownership. It is the basis of all great monopoly. It closes up the opportunity for independent labor and business. It takes the profits of improvements. It even appropriates the benefits of religion and charity. If \$1,000 a year should be used in this city for charity, it would make the city more attractive and desirable to the poor; an increased demand for places to live would raise the rent of the land, and the \$1,000 would go eventually to the owners of land.

These three things, Tariff, Railroad Combination and Private Ownership of Sources of Wealth, are the main causes of the appropriation of wealth by monopoly, the causes of the trust evils, the causes of all strikes, the causes of anarchy and all social discontent.

All the trusts are based on one or more of these things. Many of the small trusts that have no land monopoly or tariff to bolster them up, are based almost entirely upon discrimi-

nating railroad rates. The great trusts—the coal trust, the oil trust, the steel trust—have all three to stand on—land monopoly, railroad combination and tariff.

Well, what is to be done about it?

I pass the tariff. The signs of the times are that there will soon be "something doing" with that.

As to the railroads, there are two propositions I think worth considering. The first is that the people, through the government, simply take the railroads and operate them for the public good. The second is that the people own the road beds and make them public thoroughfares under necessary regulations, as wagon roads are.

For myself I favor the latter proposition.

With the mines there are also two things that may be done. First, we may take and operate them for the public good. Second, we may own them and grant short franchises for the use of them with definite regulations.

In this case also I favor the latter view. And I believe that before we can have social justice and anything like industrial equality of opportunity we must do the same with all valuable land—recognize the popular ownership of it all, and grant franchises for its use, determining at short intervals the value of the franchise, but making it permanent so long as the value is paid.

This is the course, the method proposed by Henry George for solving the entire question of taxation.

I believe these to be the only permanent remedies for the conditions in the coal regions, and for all similar conditions wherever they may exist. The coal strike itself is doubtless ended for the present, but so long as social injustice continues at the root of the social order there will be no end to the outbreaks of social discontent.

Now follows the important question: Have we a right to take the coal mines or other sources of wealth?

This brings up the whole question of the rights of property.

There are some things that may be private property and some that may not. A few years ago men held private property in men. Slaves were recognized as property; the owners had paid for them; they had done much to make them valuable, and many slaves, it was argued, had forfeited all rights to liberty. But we decided, as we believe for all time, that it is the natural right of all

men to be free, and they cannot under any circumstances be the property of their fellow men. Now we have no more right to private property in the sources of natural wealth than in slaves. There is little difference between the two. To own that which is necessary to life is to have the power to dictate to men the very terms of existence.

What may be private property? I answer, Anything or any value that is produced by the labor of man.

If by labor and skill I create a value, that which I have created is mine by sacred right. The ability to produce wealth, to create value, is the mark of man's likeness to God; it is the sign of his exaltation above the brute. But this alone can give true title to any material thing. All that has value as nature alone—the air, the sunshine, the water and the land, with all that man needs for life, that lives or grows or exists thereon or therein in its natural state—all belong to the race.

Let us take a brief excursion into the field of political economy.

What is wealth itself? It is not gold and silver, except as these are in themselves useful and beautiful. Money is but the medium of exchange, and the measure of value for wealth. Wealth in the economic sense is food and clothing and all the material things we use to gratify our desires; or, to be more exact, wealth is the value attached to material things because of the labor of man put upon them. All wealth comes originally from the earth. There is not a thing which we use in life that has not come from the earth—the land, the water or the air. All wealth is brought out of the earth and made valuable by the labor of man. It has been dug or cut or cultivated or hunted or caught or changed in its form by the labor of man. Man from the beginning has had capital to help him in his labor. At first the rudest implements of the chase or of agriculture; in later years the most wonderful machines. Capital is that part of wealth which is used to help man produce more wealth.

Now because the earth is the source of all, it is very plain that if men are to have equal opportunity in the production of wealth, they must have equal opportunity in the use of the earth. And because the earth has not been produced by man, but has always been here, we say that the rights and opportunities of man

in the use of the earth are intended by the Creator to be common or equal. The right to absolute ownership of valuable portions of the earth cannot be given away or granted by the state. The owners of the coal mines may say that the state has granted them the right to own the mines. But who is the state? Our fathers were the state yesterday. We are the state to-day, our children will be the state to-morrow. Thousands of new lives become part of the state every day. Their rights are just as good as the rights of those who were here before. The fathers must not give away or sell the rights and opportunities of the children.

It has often been shown that no title to nature is good. If followed back far enough it is always found to be the grant of some king or someone who did not own it, or was obtained by conquest. The story of the tramp and the landlord is familiar. The landlord ordered the tramp off his fields.

"How did you get this land?" asked the tramp.

"I inherited it from my father," was the answer.

"Where did he get it?"

"He inherited it from his father."

"And where did he get it?"

"He inherited it from his father."

"And where did he get it?"

"He fought for it," said the landlord.

"Well, I will fight you for it now," said the tramp.

For these reasons I say we have a perfect right to take the coal mines.

I do not believe that any other remedy will permanently settle the problem in the coal fields and the problem of social injustice elsewhere. The owners believe the mines are their property, and that they have a right to do with them as they please; and if we recognize their property their rights must of necessity follow. They say they are standing for a principle, and, while I believe the principle is wrong, they cannot be blamed for so standing if the world at large acknowledges the principle to be correct. The world says the rights of private property are sacred. What a man owns he may use in any way that does not injure his fellow man, or may refrain from using altogether. Therefore I say the natural sources of wealth must not be owned by individuals.

Now there are many who will say that this is simply socialism. I have

great sympathy with the socialist spirit and the socialist movement. We are all socialists to a degree. Our schools and post office and courts and all public institutions are pure socialism, and if I believed in full the principles of socialism I would not hesitate to declare myself a socialist.

But there is a clear distinction between the socialist position and my own. The consistent socialist recognizes no inviolable right of private property. All that a man produces, and the man himself, are a part of the state and may be taken by the state for the public good, the socialist believes. I believe that what I have created, what I have produced, is mine, and the state has no right to interfere with any use I wish to make of it that does not injure others. I believe that all independent business, not based on privilege or monopoly, is good, not evil, and helps rather than exploits labor, and cannot rightfully be interfered with. I believe that all monopoly and evil trusts, all ability to appropriate unjustly the products of labor and business, rest, not upon the ownership of true property or of capital, but upon the private ownership of nature and upon special legislative privilege.

This case of the coal miners is prominent only because it touches the pockets of the people all over the country. There are tens of thousands of children working hard and long in the cotton mills of Carolina, and we do not hear much about it. There are hundreds of thousands in the lowest poverty and degradation in the slums of the cities, and who talks of them?

But it may be that this coal strike will set us to thinking as we have never thought before, of the needs and sufferings of the millions who toil for a pittance, in this age of progress.

A SUGGESTION TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

For The Public.

The following poem, entitled: "The Owners of the Universe," published some years ago in *Great Thoughts*, London, England, has at present a peculiar significance. I would suggest it as a most fitting Republican campaign song. I should have made this suggestion long since, but I feared the song contained a too frank avowal of fact to permit of its adoption, but now that Mr. Hanna has dared to ask for a perpetual franchise, and Mr. Baer has founded a commercial papacy with

Monopoly as God's vicegerent, and Mr. Rockefeller has found a corner-stone to a castellated "Benevolent (?) Feudalism" in "To him that hath shall be given," etc., it seems as if there were no good reason why this little song should not be adopted as the Republican battle cry.

It should be rendered as a quartette, with choral effects. Tune, "Scatter Seeds of Kindness." Parts as follows: First tenor, Strenuous Theodore; second tenor, "Divine-Right" Baer; baritone, "To-Him-That - Hath - Shall - Be-Given" Rockefeller; basso profundo, "Forever-None-Too-Long" Hanna; concert master (remarkable for his esprit de corps) "The Whole-Thing" Morgan.

Orchestration: First violins by Railroad and Trust Magnates; second fiddles, by Hill and the "Reorganizing" Democrats, led by "Will-O'-the-Wisp" Grover; Metal (solid gold and brass—plenty of the latter—but no silver), by Wall Street and the Banking Monopoly. Other pieces by the rank and file Prices - Up - Wages - Down - Let - Well - Enough - Alone Prosperity Republicans. Chorus by all the Full-Dinner-Pail-Empty-Coal-Hod Dupes led by the Coal Barons. Repeat the last four lines of each stanza for chorus. Now then, all together!

MELVIN L. SEVERY.

Let us corner up the sunbeams
Lying all around our path;
Get a trust on wheat and roses;
Give the poor the thorns and chaff;
Let us find our chiefest pleasure
Hoarding bounties of to-day,
So the poor shall have scant measure
And two prices have to pay.

Yes, we'll reservoir the rivers,
And we'll levy on the lakes,
And we'll lay a trifling toll-tax
On each poor man who partakes;
We will brand his number on him
That he'll carry through his life;
We'll apprentice all his children,
Get a mortgage on his wife.

We will capture e'en the wind-god,
And confine him in a cave;
And then, through our patent process,
We the atmosphere will save;
Thus we'll squeeze our little brother
When he tries his lungs to fill,
Put a meter on his windpipe
And present our little bill.

We will syndicate the starlight,
And monopolize the moon,
Claim a royalty on rest days,
A proprietary noon;
For right of way through ocean's spray
We'll charge just what it's worth;
We'll drive our stakes around the lakes—
In fact, we'll own the earth.

A certain learned professor in New York has a wife and family; but, professor-like, his thoughts are always with his books.

One evening his wife, who had been out for some hours, returned to find

the house remarkably quiet. She had left the children playing about, but now they were nowhere to be seen.

She demanded to be told what had become of them, and the professor explained that, as they had made a good deal of noise, he had put them to bed without waiting for her or calling a maid.

"I hope they gave you no trouble," she said.

"No," replied the professor, "with the exception of the one in the cot there. He objected a good deal to my undressing him and putting him to bed."

The wife went to inspect the cot.

"Why," she exclaimed, "that's little Johnny Green from next door!"—Anonymous.

"I warn the slumbering, deluded men who are marching in the ranks of the enemy," exclaimed the fervid orator, "that there are snags and sunken rocks just ahead of them! If they will put their ears to the ground, they will hear the still, small voice of the people whose rising wrath will presently scorch them as with an avalanche, and hurl them from their seats of power!"—Exchange.

"Say, ma!"

"Yes, Reginald."

"Kin any little boy be president when he grows up?"

"Yes, Reginald."

"But, say, ma!"

"Yes, Reginald."

"He doesn't have to be, if he'd ruther be a first-baseman, does he?"—Indianapolis News.

BOOK NOTICES.

FACTS AND COMMENTS.

When, for half a century, one has filled so large a place in the domain of science and literature as Herbert Spencer, he may rightly assume that a peculiar interest attaches to his last words, on whatever subject he may choose to write. Whether he be regarded as "a perplexed philosopher," as he appears to some, or as the great, modern "master of those who think," as he appears to others, his last utterances will be received by all with patient and sincere attention. And whatever else may be said of him, this at least must be said, that he is one to whom it is not hard to give attention. Few men have ever been able to write the English language with a style at once so clear and so pleasing, so apt in illustration, where illustration is needed, and yet so entirely free from meretricious rhetoric.

Of the book before us, "Facts and Comments" (Appleton), the author says in the preface: "The volume herewith issued I can say with certainty will be my last." It consists of 40 essays, averaging about seven pages each. These essays cover a great variety of subjects—education, business, music, government, in fact, pretty near everything that serious people think about, including one essay on religion. In looking over the table of contents we are

inevitably reminded of what Juvenal says of his satires:

Quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor,
Ira, voluptas,

Gaudia, discursus, nostris est farrago libelli.
And so Herbert Spencer, now in his eighty-second year, brings together in this book his final judgments on "whatever men are driving at." It goes without saying that the volume is a most interesting and important contribution to thoughtful literature.

Perhaps the most interesting feature in the book is the evidence it gives of the author's persistent adherence to his opposition to all forms of what may be called state socialism. This may be seen directly or indirectly in the essays on "Regimentation," "Imperialism and Slavery," and "State Education." "I should," he says, "protest once more against that political superstition which has replaced the divine right of kings by the divine right of parliaments."

In writing of "State Education" he asserts his firm belief that the result which "a forced intellectual culture produces on a nation" is evil. He maintains "that immense evils may result if intellectualization is pushed in advance of moralization." His arguments are clear, whether or not we accept them as valid. "We may," he argues, "with certainty say that intellectual culture increases the power which the emotions have of manifesting themselves and obtaining their satisfactions—intensifies the emotional life. Were the higher emotions stronger than the lower, this would be an advantage; or were the two balanced it would not be a disadvantage; but, unquestionably, in average human beings the lower emotions are more powerful than the higher. Hence (Intellectual), education, adding to the force of all the emotions, increases the relative predominance of the lower."

Although Spencer is opposed to state education, he is not, of course, opposed to education, nor to education for all the people. What he wants is not "that the working classes shall be kept in ignorance, but merely that enlightenment shall spread among them after the same manner that it has spread among the upper and middle classes." He contests the right of the state to impose its system of culture upon the citizen; but—he is not opposed to the private aid of philanthropic feelings.

It is evident here that his argument halts; and it halts, we may venture to assert, because of his change of view from his first bold stand for economic equality. If social conditions prevailed in accordance with Spencer's earlier view, by which the ability of men to care for the welfare of themselves and their families would have been so greatly equalized, if, we say, juster social conditions prevailed, then, indeed, would Spencer be consistently strong in upholding the idea that enlightenment shall spread among all classes after the same manner. Is it not due to the very failure of the world in adopting the principle of justice once upheld by Spencer that we are being driven to the many makeshifts of "regimentation" which the philosopher condemns?

Having abandoned one of his early ideals, namely, of the equal right of all men to the natural sources of wealth—in support of which ideal no man, not excepting Henry George himself, ever wrote more convincingly—having given up this ideal of his young authorship, the sage still holds to his other ideal of individualism; and so his argument seems to halt on one leg. As to individualism, which is not being fairly dealt with in the uneven contest, he laments to see it suffering from the false notions fostered by state socialism. But what has he now to offer instead of the socialism which he condemns? Simply this, the hard, unequal struggle of the unprivileged with the privileged, the only modification of the struggle being the fickle alleviations of chance benevolence.

The time will come when Herbert Spen-



"ROUGH ON PARASITES."

A Specific we can recommend to our friends in Colorado.

cer's great name will surely be associated with the regret that in one supreme issue the mature philosopher surrendered the wisdom of his youth. J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

—The Church Standard (Philadelphia) in its issue of Oct. 11 gets into a white heat over the coal strike. "Disregarding the clamor of ambitious clerics, posing as popular champions, and the pretentious platitudes of time-serving politicians, together with the feeble insincerities of sentimental humanitarians, we regard it as a duty in the service of society," etc., etc. And then it proceeds to berate the guilty Mitchell. He is called "the head center of the most tyrannous and unscrupulous trust that was ever organized in this country," "that plausible person," "a professional agitator and practical anarchist," etc., etc. Even the President, who has heretofore been ever worshipful in these religious columns, is taken to task for inviting such a creature "on the same footing with peaceable and reputable citizens." Mr. Baer is praised for putting "the truth of the case very plainly and clearly," and Mitchell is warned that if he does not end the strike in short order "he will soon find himself buried under an avalanche of execration by the working people." We have not seen so strenuous an article in many a day. Clerics posing as popular champions and sentimental humanitarians should secure a copy without delay. J. H. D.

—The Rev. Kemper Bocock in the New Era (Philadelphia) publishes a very able "open letter" to the Governor of Pennsylvania, arguing that the coal companies have plainly broken the laws of the state and could legally be deprived of their charters. He calls the attention of the governor to the following prohibitory provision in the constitution: "The exercise of the police power of the State shall never be abridged or so construed as to permit corporations to conduct their business in such manner as to infringe the equal rights of individuals or the general well being of the state." He also quotes the following: "No incorporated common carrier shall, directly or indirectly, prosecute or engage in mining or manufacturing articles for transportation over its works." Mr. Bocock very pertinently asks why the civil

machinery of the law has not been set to work rather than the military machinery of force. "The coal mining and coal carrying corporations," he says, "have deliberately and systematically violated the constitution and labor laws of Pennsylvania; that is to say, they are law breakers in the first degree." He reminds the governor, who has been advocating a law for compulsory arbitration, that he has abundance of laws ready made—if he will only give them life; for, as Mr. Bocock says, they are "dead letters, very dead." J. H. D.

"Economic Tangles"

by Judson Grenell: deals in popular yet practical way with industrial problems. Cloth, postpaid, \$1.

OTHER ECONOMIC LITERATURE BY HENRY GEORGE:

Progress and Poverty.....	.50
Social Problems.....	.50
Land Question.....	.50
Protection vs. Free Trade.....	.50
A Perplexed Philosopher.....	.50
Condition of Labor.....	.10
Property in Land.....	.10
Compensation.....	.05
Science of Political Economy.....	\$2.00
Moses.....	.05
The Single Tax: what it is and why we urge it.....	.05
Study of Political Economy.....	.05
Story of My Dictatorship.....	.10
Socialism, Rev. W. Poland.....	.10
Life of Henry George, Henry George, Jr.....	1.50
Natural Taxation, Thos. G. Shearman.....	.50
Shortest Road to the Single Tax.....	.10
The Single Tax, Louis F. Post.....	.25
The Case Plainly Stated.....	.05
Six Centuries of Work and Wages, Rogers.....	.25
Economic Principles, Twitchell.....	.10
Report of the Revenue Commission of Colorado.....	.05
Success in Life, Louis F. Post.....	.05
The Single Tax and Direct Legislation.....	.10
Single Tax Catechism.....	.05

COMMON SENSE

Edge. Ask for a small handful. Enclose 10 cents if you happen to have it. Straight Edge Press, 1 Seventh Ave., New York.

"An absolutely blasphemous publication."—J. M. Buckley, D. D., LL. D. One of the series of Squibs and Things from The Straight Edge.

PURDY PUBLISHING CO.,
McVicker Bldg., 74-84 Madison St., CHICAGO.

The Public

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

TERMS.

Annual Subscription	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription	1.00
Quarterly Subscription50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks)10
Single Copies05

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

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:
THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1363 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.
NEW YORK.

OUR JUGGLED CENSUS.

An exposure of the methods adopted at the present census for the purpose of concealing the truth as to Wages and Female and Child labor. Sent postpaid for 10 cents by the author,
H. L. BLISS,
7341 Vincennes Road, Chicago.