The Public

Fifth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1902. Number 231.

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.

The mock attack by a fleet of the American navy upon the coast of New England; a comical imitation by the one-vessel navy of Illinois, with the coast of Lincoln park at Chicago for its objective; and arrangements for a prize fight somewhere or other later this month, are among the principal sporting events of the week.

—

That the naval maneuvers off New England are regarded by those in authority as more in the nature of aristocratic sport than as serious preparation for defensive war, was demonstrated by the suspension of an important movement in order to accord a social reception on board the flagship to the American wife of an English duke. It is to the honor of several of the subordinate naval officers that they refused to be dragged into this snobbish performance. They, at any rate, take the naval maneuvers seriously. But they are mistaken. The principal object of this expensive aquatic sport is evidently to edify society folks at Newport.

Observing the ridiculous failure of the Civic Federation's tribunal, presided over by Mark Hanna, at the first test to which its possible usefulness has been put, certain distinguished gentlemen of New York, who are encouraged by Abram S. Hewitt, have set about organizing what they call the National Economic league, with the object not so much of settling as of avoiding "disputes between labor and capital." That is an excellent object. But what hope can there be of accomplishing it through men who confuse capital with monopoly, as the organizers of this movement evidently do. Conflict between labor and capital can be prevented, but the conflict between labor and monopoly is irrepressible. It can neither be prevented nor settled, and can be ended only by the triumph of one of these forces over the other. Either monopoly must be abolished or labor must be subjugated.

—

That is a fact which benevolent labor-pacifiers, who would run with the hare while they hunt with the hounds, either do not see or will not acknowledge. So they bundle monopoly into the same category with capital, and in the name of the latter try to shield the privileges of the former. Whether they know it or not, they are quacks. In the coal strike now in progress, for instance, the quarrel is not between mining labor and mining capital. It is between mining labor on the one side, and mine and railroad monopoly on the other. Because mine and railroad monopoly are erroneously classified with mining machinery and railroad plants, under the common name of capital, and the essential difference thereby hidden, this conflict is mistakenly regarded as one between labor and capital. Let the difference between true capital and mere monopoly once be clearly distinguished, and there will be no excuse for the intervention of your Hannas and Hewitts, who call themselves capitalists, but who are in fact capitalists only in small degree. Their chief interests are in some form as land monopolists, and it is land monopoly that they are anxious to protect.

Out of all the Chicago church pastors who preached on the coal strike last Sunday, only one of those who were intelligibly reported appears to have said anything worth while. This was Frederick E. Hopkins. He sensibly pointed out the futility of arbitration as a permanent remedy, and dwelt upon the necessity of removing the cause. Mr. Hopkins may not agree in all respects with most of us as to what the cause is; but it is always refreshing, nevertheless, to find a preacher who believes in removing the cause of an evil instead of indulging amiably in wise fooling with its effects. But whether he scents the true cause of labor conflicts or not, Mr. Hopkins does put his finger boldly upon one cause of the anthracite strike, for he said:

> **In the state of Pennsylvania an enormously valuable natural product has been allowed to pass into the hands of a few individuals. They own the coal, and upon such terms that they can say we will mine it and sell it as only ourselves see fit. Ought a state ever to have allowed such a condition to be created in respect to a product of nature? If not the remedy is to be found in Pennsylvania correcting its mistake.**

Ohio Democracy, under the lead of Tom L. Johnson, has a better idea of harmony in the national party than that which seems to prevail among the "reorganizing harmonizers." Both Johnson's speech as temporary chairman of the Ohio convention, and the platform afterwards adopted, make it clear that harmony is not regarded by Ohio Democrats as the same thing as officially ignoring the last national platform and officially spitting in the face of the presidential candidate who stood upon it. According to this Ohio idea, it is not within the functions of a state convention called for state purposes to reverse national policies or remodel national platforms. Its duty, on the contrary, is simply to recognize the national platform last adopted, if it wishes to remain in affiliation with the national party; and to pay its tri-

bute of respect to the last national standard bearer unless it wishes to be deliberately insulting. In taking this stand, Mr. Johnson and the Ohio convention over which he presided have set an example that all Democrats who sincerely wish for harmony on democratic principles will be glad to follow. The criticism of those who use "harmony" as a catch word to promote plutocratic schemes can be easily endured.

—

On state issues the Ohio platform is bold and explicit, as was Chairman Johnson's speech. There is no false note or timid tone about it. Only knaves can misinterpret it; only fools can doubt its sincerity. On all the subjects that interest the people, not of Ohio alone but of every state in the Union, it has the sonorous ring of radical democracy. Its principles are summed up in the phrase with which the distinguished chairman characterized the issues of the campaign—"Home rule and just taxation."

Of the candidate whose name leads the Ohio ticket, for the office of secretary of state, but little need be said in these columns. To our readers the name of Herbert S. Bigelow is a household word. It has been objected that he is one of "Tom Johnson's preachers." But that sneer has lost its sneeriness. When Johnson became mayor of Cleveland, he appointed a clergyman to a place in his cabinet as director of charities and correction; and now the people of Cleveland unite in saying that the Rev. Harris R. Cooley is the best director of charities and correction the city ever had. When Johnson had become the acknowleged leader of Democratic politics in Cleveland, he suggested for the director of schools a graduate in theology whom the opposition dubbed "reverend," though he had not served in a pulpit. Nevertheless, the Rev. Starr Cadwallader was elected; and the good people of Cleveland now acknowledge that he is the best director of schools the city ever had. It may not be wise, then, for Republicans of Ohio to say too much about the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow as "one of Tom Johnson's preachers." The good people might all want to try him and see if he wouldn't make the best secretary of state Ohio ever had.

—

Mr. Bigelow, a graduate of Adelbert college and Lane theological seminary, is the pastor of the Vine street church of Cincinnati, which has an enviable record as one of the underground railway stations through which escaping slaves used to pass from Kentucky to Canada, and which cherishes and exemplifies, under Bigelow as its pastor, the spirit of liberty in which it was born. It is a church that knows no distinctions of color or class, and in which the golden rule is taught without apology or modification—a church of the common people. Of Bigelow it is enough now to say, as of Johnson himself, that he is an able, eloquent and devoted advocate of Henry George's concrete application of the golden rule.

Another follower of Henry George —not a preacher this time, but a journeyman blacksmith — whom Johnson is credited with enlisting in the great combat between democracy and plutocracy already thickening, is Edmund H. Vail, whom the congressional convention of the Twenty-first Ohio district has called directly from his anvil to make a contest for Congressman Burton's seat. Mr. Burton is a difficult man to defeat. Not because he has rendered exceptional service to the country as a national legislator. No one would make that claim. But because he has rendered faithful service to the water front proprietors of Cleveland in connection with the river and harbor appropriations. In spite, however, of water front and kindred interests, the district can be carried by the workingmen if they unite; and if they cannot unite upon Vail it is hopeless to expect them to unite upon any one. He has made his way through life as a journeyman blacksmith; has made him a little home; has educated his children in the schools; has educated himself in public affairs; and has done it all in the sweat of his own face and not in the sweat of somebody else's face. In Congress, Vail would not only want to vote right on public questions, and dare to do it; but what is equally important, he would know how.

If the people of Ohio are at all alert, the Democratic candidates will be elected this year by overwhelming majorities, so bold have the Republican leaders become in disclosing their devotion to private in preference to public interests. With them public office is anything but a public trust. Both United States senators—Foraker and Hanna,—who between them manage the state administration, are deeply interested in street car monopolies. These interests evidently come first in their consideration, and Hanna is candid enough to say so. In a newspaper interview at Columbus last week he declared:

"My street railway is my savings' bank. If I cannot look after my street railway interests and politics, too, I'll quit politics and look after my business alone."

This was said in connection with the use he is making at Columbus of his influence as a Republican senator and leader of his party in framing the new municipal code. He wants it framed in the interests of his street railroad, regardless of the interests of the people of the state or even the interests of his party.

Senator Hanna has become either so arrogant or so fatuous that he openly demands perpetual charters for street cars. Not indeterminate charters that can be terminated at any time by the cities, be it observed; but indeterminate charters which the cities can never terminate if the companies perform their agreement, and which they would be powerless to alter except at intervals of 10 or 15 years, and then only with the consent of the companies or by making a case upon which the courts could act.

Some idea of the indignation Mr. Hanna and his ring are awakening may be got from the following editorial extract from the Cleveland Press, an independent daily, having the largest circulation of any paper in northern Ohio, and being one of the Scripps' league of papers:

The corporation pirates of Ohio, led by that battle-scarred veteran of many a piratical cruise—Marcus A. Hanna—have raised their black flag of loot to the peak of their slippery decked craft, and, with guns shotted, are bearing down on the ship Ohio. "Perpetual street railway franchises" is the yell that floats across the waters from the pirate craft, as the bloodthirsty crew and captain brandish their knives and prepare for their devil's work. For years and years this ship, with its crew of corporation pirates, under the same captain, has cruised about, sinking a small craft here and looting another there, dividing the booty among its outlaw band. The craft has not always been recognizable. Sometimes it has been painted one color, sometimes another. Never before has it raised its black flag. Usually the stars and stripes have been prostituted for the purpose of deceiving the victim. But success after success has emboldened the pirates to a point of reckless disregard. No more deception! No more sailing under a false flag! No more stealing up on the doomed quarry under the cover of darkness. The big prize has been sighted by the lookout. Capt. Hanna takes his stand on the bridge. He orders the crew to man the guns. The black flag rises to the peak. "Full speed ahead!" jingles in the engine room. "Take that ship Ohio, loot her of all her treasure and give no quarter!" is the command that is carried from mouth to mouth along the deck. God help the ship Ohio and her crew and passengers unless they have listened to the many warnings and have prepared for this fight to the death.

As Mr. Roosevelt goes on, his sympathies with the trust magnates and monopoly interests generally becomes more obvious. Judging from his Fitchburg speech, ignorance of the subject is not improbably the mother of his sympathy; but whether from ignorance or design he certainly does not intend doing or suggesting anything that would interfere with these parasites. When he urged that it is "better that some people (the trusts) should prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough," he swapped good sense for a poor epigram. If the trusts do not prosper at other people's expense, it is nobody's business how much they prosper. The more the better. In that case, why is Mr. Roosevelt meddling with them at all? But if they do prosper at other people's expense it is absurd to say that it is better that they should prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough. Would Mr. Roosevelt say it is better for common thieves to prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough? We do him the justice of presuming he would not—not even if common thieves held the balance of power in his party. What Mr. Roosevelt ignores, thereby exposing his ignorance of the subject, is the point that the trust issue turns wholly upon the question of how the trusts get their wealth and not upon how much they get. If they get it without impoverishing other people, they should be encouraged. If they get it at the expense of other people, they should be condemned. Mr. Roosevelt's policy of trying to condemn them just enough to satisfy public feeling, but not enough to expose or weaken their plundering power, may be discreet but it isn't strenuous.

Sir Edmund Barton, the prime minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, who was in Washington last week, spoke freely of the coal strike and the trusts. To President Roosevelt, his words could not have been particularly grateful; for he said that the President could, if he would, end the coal strike and crush the trusts. Nor did this statesman from the antipodes have autocratic measures in mind, as might be suspected. On the contrary, he declared himself as opposed even to sending the military into the strike regions. This policy he regarded as pernicious, because it tends to lessen respect for civil authority. No more democratic view than that could be asked. It is his opinion that the English common law, as in force in the United States, affords every needed opportunity for checking the aggressions of the coal trust, and that if the coal trust were checked the strike would end. But Sir Edmund Barton overlooks a point or two. In the first place, our Federal courts have no common law jurisdiction, except such as they have usurped to enable them to put down labor strikes; and in the second, President Roosevelt's attorney general and Candidate Roosevelt's friends in Wall street, upon whom he depends for campaign funds two years hence, don't want to crush the trusts. Mr. Roosevelt himself is as tender toward them as a schoolboy toward a nest of turtle's eggs which may possibly hatch out snakes.

The "Public Ownership Party" of Chicago, has wisely changed its name to the "Public Ownership League." As the organization is not a political party, and was never intended to be, its name was misleading, and the change became a necessity. This league is naming candidates for the Illinois legislature wherever there seems to be any hope of breaking the bi-partisan arrangement of the monopoly corporations. It is also indorsing party nominees who are opposed to these monopolies. One of the candidates whom it has so indorsed is Western Starr, the Democratic candidate for the state senate against John Humphrey, a corporation tool whom the Republicans have nominated in the Seventh Illinois district. Another is Frank E. Herdman, an independent Republican, who is running for the lower house against the corporation candidate in the same district. The leading candiate of the league distinctively is Clarence S. Darrow, whom it has nominated by petition for the lower house. With its change of name, which prevents misconception of its non-partisan but anti-monopoly character, the Public Ownership League should place in the next legislature of Illinois a group of men who may be depended upon to expose and fight and possibly thwart the monop-

oly schemers of the non-partisan corporations and their bi-partisan tools in politics.

At last the much mooted and carefully guarded report of Carroll D. Wright to the President on the anthracite coal strike has been released for publication. Mr. Roosevelt was quite justified in neglecting to publish it sooner. There is nothing in it to have made its publication worth while.

"No friends, no money, no work; better to die," were the despairing words which a Chicago suicide left behind him last week. This is one of the few cases of misery that come to light out of the many that exist in these piping times of plutocratic prosperity. Since this man had no money, of course he had no friends. That is the way the world wags on. He thought he had no money because he could get no work. It was a false analysis. Had he been able to get work he might, it is true, have had some money; and then he would have had some friends. The unfortunate man erred in supposing that the way to get much money is to get work. Had he laid his plans to get workers, instead of work, to get control of jobs for others instead of doing jobs himself, he could have had plenty of money and plenty of friends. Only in that case some one else would have died saying: "No money, no work, no friends."

Lord Milner has just imposed a head tax of $10 on the natives of the Transvaal. This is twice as much as the head tax imposed by the Boers, but that is not the important consideration. What is important is the fact that the tax is imposed for the purpose of compelling the natives to seek employment of the whites and thereby glutting the labor market. If they needed no ready money, they could make a comfortable living among themselves without selling their labor. But when, as under this Milner decree, which went into effect on the 1st, every adult native male and every married native woman must pay a tax in money of $10 each annually, the exploiters of labor are assured a superabundant supply of labor from the native tribes for several months in the year. This is part of the process of Christianizing the heathen. Incidentally it fattens the dividends of the Christianizers.

The Rev. Thomas B. Gregory contributes many an interesting and stimulating signed editorial to the Chicago American; and not least among these in interest is one of the past week on the subject of child labor in factories. It rests upon the fact that the Illinois factory law, which prohibits the employment of children under 14 years of age, is in operation a farce. Mr. Gregory quotes in explanation the statement of the chief factory inspector of the state to the effect that "the main obstacle to the better enforcement of the factory law is the habit, on the part of parents, of signing false affidavits." It is discouraging to find that as keen and sympathetic an observer of social conditions as Mr. Gregory can be so far taken in by that explanation as to confine his comment to a futile appeal to parents to make true affidavits and to pastors to admonish parents of the sin of perjury. It is not signing of false affidavits by parents that makes the law inoperative. That is not the cause. It is only an effect of a deeper cause. When industrial opportunities are so restricted by monopoly that parents earn but a scant living when they work, that work is so scarce as to be a boon and the giving of it something like charity, and that the miserable wages of a child are necessary to eke out the poorest kind of a poor living—when these are the circumstances under which hosts of honest people have to live, it seems almost heartless to censure them for lying to employers about the ages of their children. Let us demand the right thing, not the wrong or foolish one. Let us demand that opportunities for productive work be multiplied by abolishing monopoly, and the parental instinct will be enough to keep tender children out of factories. When society ceases to sin against parents by depriving them of natural opportunities to make a living for their families, parents will cease to sin against society by committing perjury to evade factory laws.

ROOSEVELT AND BRYAN.

These two men are preeminent in the United States to-day as personifications of the two great opposing tides that are deeply agitating the political seas. This does not mean, necessarily, that either is the leader of thought on the side with which his name is so conspicuously identified. It does not imply that his views control or that his leadership is acceptable. It does not ignore the fact that one of the two has attained his exalted conspicuity chiefly by official accident. Nor is it intended to be prophetic of the future. It merely states an incontrovertible fact of the moment.

Everyone feels it to be a fact, even those who are never so anxious to have it otherwise. The rush and push of a strenuous national life along the grewsome highways of colonial imperialism abroad and plutocratic evolution at home, inevitably bring up in the popular imagination the name of Theodore Roosevelt. Even Senator Hanna has sunk into a lower than secondary place. On the other hand, whenever and wherever the democratic impulse is felt, the name of William J. Bryan comes uppermost. Nothing could be more spontaneous than the tendency of his enemies in both parties, as well as his friends, to identify all unrelenting opposition to the "going thing" as "Bryanism."

It may not be uninteresting, therefore, to compare the two men.

I.

A comparison was made editorially in these columns four years ago (vol. i, No. 28, p. 5), which we reproduce now, both because it is appropriate and because it is out of print. What we then said, when each had just come out of the Spanish-American war with a military title, still holds good:

"Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Col.

William J. Bryan have often been compared as men of the same type. This is usually done by people who dislike them both. To a partisan of Roosevelt's, it would be in the highest degree offensive to liken him to Bryan; to a partisan of Bryan's, it would be no less offensive to liken him to Roosevelt. Each is a disagreeable character to the partisans of the other. Yet there is good reason for the comparison. They certainly present to the public eye a striking resemblance.

"We suspect, however, that their resemblance is less a resemblance of each to the other, than of Roosevelt as he actually is to Bryan as he has been pictured.

"Bryan is habitually described by the Republican and the pluto-Democratic press, including the professional funny papers, all of which are bitterly partisan against him, as a self-seeking man.

"In his Chicago speech, which rang round the world, this press could see nothing but a bid for the presidential nomination to gratify personal ambition. In his extraordinary round of campaign speeches in behalf of silver coinage, it could detect nothing but overweening ambition supported by a superabundance of animal energy. His courteous telegram to the successful candidate after election, a telegram which at least sounded like a generous expression of patriotic good feeling, was treated as another bid for popular notice, and the reply of scant courtesy as a merited rebuke. When he offered his services to the country without reservation, in any military capacity in which the President thought he might be useful, he was again pictured as a notoriety hunter; and the President, who was at the time appointing callow sons and nephews of political and social favorites to positions in which they have proved more dangerous to our troops than the enemy, was commended for the insulting manner in which he ignored Bryan's offer.

"Then, when Bryan enlisted among the volunteers of his state as a private, he was sneeringly described as a man with an itch to get into the muss somehow, for the sake of attracting attention to himself; and when he was chosen by his comrades to be their colonel, the sneers were renewed in aggravated form. At last, when the war was virtually over, when nothing remained to do, except garrison duty in conquered countries which we had no right to subjugate and the subjugation of which was never contemplated as an object or result of the war; when, in other words, the intention of all patriotic enlistments had been accomplished —when this time had come, and Col. Bryan applied for the release of his regiment, or rather, when it was reported, truly or falsely, that he had made such application, a new variety of sneer broke out. He was now a soldier who wished to lay down the sword of war in order to resume the jaw of politics.

"An ambitious, self-seeking politician, without political principle, and restless for notoriety; such is the picture that Bryan's plutocratic enemies have drawn of him. Whether it is a true picture of the man, we shall not now stop to inquire. We have for the present a different purpose in view. What we wish especially to call attention to is the fact that the picture of Bryan as his enemies paint it, is a perfect picture of Roosevelt as he paints it himself.

"Consider Roosevelt's career. To become a member of the legislature, he pretended for a term to change his residence. His own counsel tells it, by Col. Roosevelt's authorization. And in support of what political principle did he do this? None. There was nothing in the episode to indicate a better motive than personal ambition.

"Then he became a reformer in politics. Here was an indication of his possession of political principle in some sort; but, when the reformers were defeated in national convention by the boss, he abandoned his reform associates. His reward came two years later, in the form of a boss's nomination for mayor of New York. This he accepted at a time when, according to the present authorized statement of his lawyer, he was not a resident of New York. What could have been his motive but personal ambition?

"Next we find him again pretending to remove to New York so as to accept an appointment as police commissioner, returning to his old residence upon vacating the office. And he vacated it, not because his term had expired, nor because there was not as good work to do there as anywhere, but because he had successfully solicited an office at Washington which, while offering him no greater opportunities for usefulness, did offer opportunities for a more ambitious career. At a critical moment he abandoned that office too, in order to take the field in the spectacular role of the most sensational officer of a spectacular cavalry regiment. Here he made a dashing record. It was just such a record as an ambitious and reckless man overflowing with animal spirits might have been expected to make—just such a record as a magazine article which he had published two or three years before, indicated his ambitious desire to make.

"Largely on account of this record, the independent Republicans, regarding him as one of themselves despite his former desertion, hopefully looked to Roosevelt as the man to overthrow boss-ship in the Republican party of New York, by running as an independent Republican candidate for governor. But that would have savored of fidelity to political principle, and Col. Roosevelt ignored his independent friends to dicker with the boss of New York himself, whereby he became the accredited candidate of the machine. Thus, at the present climax of his career he again subordinates political principle to personal ambition.

"Col. Roosevelt has not only never given the slightest indication of any ambition for aught but his own selfish advancement, but he has distinctly shown by his conduct, and though guardedly yet not ambiguously, has at times shown in words, that his own glory is his chief concern in life. Even what he would call his political principles—frequent war to foster the military spirit, expansion of territory to make the nation great, and an enormous navy to make it mighty —are but a magnification of his own personal ambition. He thinks of the nation as his greater self.

"All that Bryan is by his meanest

political enemies described to be, that is Roosevelt proved to be by Roosevelt himself. His whole career testifies, directly and positively, without reference to the judgment of his enemies, without reference to any motives which he has not himself frankly revealed, that, utterly oblivious of political principle, he is dominated by an intensely personal and selfish ambition."

II.

Since that article was written additional information has transpired about Roosevelt's apostasy to the reformers in his own party in 1884. The story appears more completely, in the following paragraph editorial which appeared in The Public a few weeks ago (p. 165):

The following interesting bit of political history is going the rounds:

In one of his essays the late Edwin L. Godkin threw a very neat little harpoon into Henry Cabot Lodge in the following style: "In 1884 I learned of the prospect of Blaine's nomination from Henry Cabot Lodge, who called at the Evening Post office. He told me, with the proper expression of countenance, that there was a serious cloud hanging over the Republican party; that there was danger of Blaine's nomination and that he was on his way to Washington then to see some of the leading men with a view of preventing it if possible. I heartily approved of all that the good young man told me he had in mind and cheered him on his shining way. But I was chastened by seeing him on the stump for the said Blaine by the month of July."

It is a pity that in this connection Mr. Godkin could not have lifted the curtain upon a certain dinner party of three ambitious but baffled young reformers, gathered in conference immediately after Blaine's disappointing nomination and before that chastening appearance of Mr. Lodge upon the stump. He might have shown how two of them, Mr. Lodge and Mr. Roosevelt, decided, for personal reasons somewhat cynically disclosed, to abandon their dinner comrade to his awkward scruples.

The same self-seeking disposition has characterized Roosevelt's career since the close of the war in which he gained his military notoriety.

He put himself into the hands of "Boss" Platt to become governor of New York. After his election he played fast and loose with the "boss" —fast enough to accomplish nothing for the public, yet loose enough to irritate the politicians. They consequently tried to balk his unconcealed ambition for the presidency by relegating him against his will to the vice president's perch, where they believed and he feared that, barring accidents, his career would end.

But an accident came and Roosevelt tumbled into the presidential chair. In the administration of that office his self-seeking qualities have been so unrestrained that one may say they are almost displayed. The story of the shameful atrocities of brutal army officers in the Philippines, and the efforts to minimize and suppress the terrible facts, is a story in which plans for the presidential succession furnish the whole ground work for the plot. Roosevelt and Lodge, with Root in the political firm in place of the too scrupulous third partner of the 80's, are still playing the strenuous game of "get there."

Even the descent down into the dominions of corrupt and corrupting "bossism" has progressed. In 1898 Roosevelt's ambition plunged him into the arms of "Boss" Platt; it has now led him to affiliate closely with the malodorous Quay. If Bryan may be fairly criticized for having once ridden for a few minutes in a carriage with "Boss" Croker, when a political guest of his political party in a city where Croker happened to be its official chief, and therefore under circumstances which made it impossible for him to reject Croker's attentions, what extreme of criticism could do justice to Roosevelt for pushing his way into Quay's political band wagon?

III.

Roosevelt has recently been criticized upon another phase of his character by Bryan himself, with a directness and justness that should command especial attention. While selfishness, though always reprehensible, is too common to be peculiarly objectionable even in a President solicitous for a further term, there is something still deeper in Mr. Roosevelt's character, which he has deliberately adopted and made his own and which marks him as an inferior man. It is to this that Mr. Bryan refers:

President Roosevelt in his recent extemporaneous speech at West Point gave expression to a sentiment which suggests an inherent barbarism that will have to be taken into account in weighing his purposes and predicting his future course. His address on strenuous life delivered some three years ago showed that he gave to virtue the ancient rather than the modern definition, and placed physical courage above mental greatness and moral worth. But when in his West Point speech he laid aside all restraint and in a fit of animal enthusiasm said:

A good soldier must not only be willing to fight; he must be anxious to fight. I do not want to have anything to do with him if he is not—

he turned a light upon his inner self and revealed a moral deformity which must shock such of his friends as are not wholly carried away with the blood-and-brutal gospel of imperialism. If a good soldier must be anxious to fight, then it naturally follows that an administration which desires to develop good soldiers should surround cadets with influences calculated to infuse into them a fighting spirit, an eagerness for blood letting. If the President really means what he says we may expect that his second term, if he has one, will be made forever illustrious by the inauguration of a new regime at the military academy and in the army. The ten commandments and the Sermon on the Mount will be discarded and the yellow-back novel substituted for them; for "thou shall not kill," and "blessed are the peacemakers" could have no proper place in a school designed to train men to be anxious to fight.

In that paragraph is distinctly though unconsciously displayed the essential difference between these two men. It indicates the opposite paths they try to tread, the opposite impulses to which they respond, the opposite ideals toward which their faces are turned, the hostile forces in the irrepressible conflict which for the time they respectively personify.

Such an interpretation of this paragraph Mr. Bryan would doubtless disclaim. Notwithstanding the funny papers and his malevolent enemies, he is far from being an immodest man. To think of him as one while there is a Roosevelt at large is a wanton waste of imaginative energy. What Mr. Bryan means by his paragraph is not to provoke a contrast but to condemn a brutal instinct. Yet the contrast is there.

On the one hand, you behold unconsciously revealed a man to whom brute force is the lowest of all the human energies; while, on the other,

you see most justly censured one to whom it is the noblest.

This difference might be traced by the speculative back to the boyhood of the men, and if it were much might be found in the way of excuse for him of the brutal instincts.

Physically, he was a puny boy. This defect was the one great burden upon his mind, and to remove the defect became his laudable but too absorbing ambition. He removed it, but in doing so acquired the brutal tastes of the prize-fighter, the adventurous spirit of the buccaneer, the bellicose passions of a Napoleon, and the ideals of a catapult.

Bryan, on the other hand, was blessed with such physical perfection that he had no call to surrender his mental and moral faculties to its improvement. He was able to begin where Roosevelt left off—with a strong body, needing no adventurous sports to build it up. This left him free to develop those higher qualitice which so sharply distinguish him from the man whose low ideals he has criticised. No one, not even imperialistic clergymen, can compare Bryan's criticism of President Roosevelt's West Point speech with the speech itself, without being forced to admit the superiority of Bryan's moral ideals thus contrasted. But that admitted, all is admitted so far as moral ideals are concerned. Roosevelt's West Point speech and Bryan's criticism are respectively typical of the men.

Nor is Mr. Roosevelt's character helped out by the ex post facto explanations of what his bellicose language might have meant but didn't. Some apologists think it might have meant that a good soldier should be anxious to fight when the time comes. Even that isn't true. Such soldiers are least to be depended upon. Napoleon had the true conception of a brave soldier in battle when he described him as a man who realized and feared his danger, but nevertheless faced it unflinchingly. But Mr. Roosevelt's language is not open to the interpretation of his apologists. Not only in its terms, but in the light of his whole career, it could have meant nothing but that a soldier should love a fight.

NEWS

The Democratic convention of Ohio closed its session at Sandusky on the 3d, after completely and by an overwhelming majority committing the party in that state to the policies of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland.

This extraordinary victory was won, not at the convention by the manipulation of delegates, but at the primaries by an appeal to the rank and file of the party. Three elections had made the Johnson policies secure in his own county of Cuyahoga. Mr. Johnson's election 18 months ago as mayor of the Republican city of Cleveland; the election a year ago, under his leadership, of the entire legislative delegation from the Republican county of Cuyahoga, the first time in twenty years that this county had elected a single Democratic legislator; and the election last Spring, also under his leadership, of the director of public schools,—all this, coupled with his record of fidelity as mayor to his declared principles of "home rule and just taxation" and to the merit system in the public service, made the task of defeating Mr. Johnson at the party primaries in his own county a hopeless one. Yet it was attempted. Opposition tickets were filed for use at the primaries, but most of these were discredited by the discovery that they had been filed and the filing fee paid by a Republican holding the place of confidential clerk in the Cleveland post office. Not one opposing delegate was elected; and in the mayor's own ward, where it had been confidently predicted that he himself would be defeated, he was elected by 349 to 14. Though his leadership in the party had been fully assured so far as his home county was concerned, Mayor Johnson was not supposed to be in favor in the Cincinnati county —Hamilton. This county had long been under the control of John R. McLean, proprietor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, whose chief lieutenant is Lewis G. Bernard. Mayor Johnson had refused from the beginning to make terms with the McLean faction, taking the ground that it acts regularly in collusion with Mr. Cox, the Republican "boss" in Cincinnati, and cannot be trusted by the Democratic party of the state. At his suggestion, therefore, the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of the Vine street Congregational church, of Cincinnati, organized an opposition. Heretofore, the Democratic committee of Hamilton county had been self-perpetuating, each committee naming its successor. Delegates to state conventions, also, were named by the county committee and not at primaries. But under Johnson's influence, the state committee this year decided that no delegates to the state convention should be admitted who were not chosen either at primaries or at delegate conventions elected at primaries. Since this requirement brought Bigelow's contest in Hamilton county directly before the people, the McLean faction was defeated. Meanwhile, at nearly all the contested primaries in other parts of the state Johnson's followers were successful.

The delegates so elected to the state convention met at Sandusky on the 2d. Under the rules of the party in Ohio, they immediately came together in groups, one from each congressional district, prior to the meeting of the convention in a body, and selected members of the various committees, which forthwith organized to prepare the work for the convention. The committee on resolutions adopted Johnson's suggestions as to platform by a vote of 16 to 5, and the state central committee named Johnson men exclusively on the executive committee. In the state committee itself, 14 out of the 21 members are suporters of Johnson.

When the convention assembled in a body on the 3d, Mr. Johnson was elected temporary chairman by acclamation. His speech upon taking the chair is printed in full in the Miscellany department of this issue, under the title of "The Ohio Keynote." The temporary officers were made permanent, and the following state ticket was nominated:

Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, for secretary of state, without opposition.

Judge Michael Donnelly, of Napoleon, for supreme court judge.

Philip H. Bruck, of Columbus, for food and dairy commissioner.

Joseph J. Pater, of Hamilton, for member of the board of public works.

The platform adopted by this Ohio convention is of national interest and importance, and we give it in full:

In state convention assembled, we, the Democrats of Ohio, hereby acknowledge and declare our continued allegiance to the Democratic party of the nation, and on national issues reaffirm and endorse the principles laid

down in the last national platform adopted at Kansas City and faithfully and ably represented in the presidential campaign of 1900 by William Jennings Bryan. Regarding those principles as opposed to imperialism and colonialism, as opposed to government by injunction, as opposed to trusts and trust-fostering tariffs, as opposed to financial monopoly, and as opposed to all other legalized monopolies and privileges, we condemn every effort to repudiate or ignore them.

In state and municipal affairs we pledge our party to a faithful application of those democratic principles, to the end that the burdens of taxation may be equalized and home rule and local self-government be established and preserved.

Under the long-continued control of the Republican party in this state, monopoly has been fostered and protected; the farmer and the small homeowner have been burdened with excessive taxes, that the beneficiaries and favorites of that party might be permitted to escape their just share of the public burdens; our public institutions have been wastefully and inefficiently managed, and in them scandalous and cruel wrongs have been practiced upon the defenseless wards of the state; the farmers and small shippers continue to suffer from unjust discrimination at the hands of unregulated monopoly; the entire system of municipal government has been wrecked and the credit of cities destroyed, thereby producing a spirit of insecurity and unrest in all public affairs. The people can no longer trust the administration of their affairs to a party thus recklessly devoted to interests adverse to the public welfare. As a more specific statement of our principles upon these and other public questions we declare:

1. That all taxable property should be appraised by assessing boards, which should be in session for at least a part of each year and whose proceedings and deliberations should be open to the public; that power should be given to employ a representative to present the interests of the public in hearings before these boards, and that in making assessments all properties should be appraised at not less than its saleable value.

2. That the present laws for assessing the property of steam railroads and other public service corporations should be so changed as to compel the assessment of those properties at not less than their saleable value as going concerns and to prevent their evasion of just taxation.

3. That to prevent evasion of state taxes by discriminating valuations, a separation of the sources of state and local revenues should be made. And to that end, we heartily endorse the constitutional amendment now pending before the people and to be voted on next year, which will permit classifications of taxable property.

4. That all public service corporations should be required by law to make sworn public reports and that the power of visitation and examination over such corporations should be given to the proper auditing officers, to the end that the true value of the privileges held by such corporations may be made plain to the people.

5. That the acceptance of free passes or other favors from railroads by public officers or employes should be adequate ground for their removal from office.

6. That the denial of the right of peaceable persuasion in times of labor disturbances is a denial of the right of free speech, and that government by injunction, if persisted in, will wreck the liberties of the people.

7. That we demand the enactment of a code which provides absolute home rule for municipalities; which shall include the right to establish the merit system with civil service, under which that system, as now in use in fire and police departments, may be strengthened and perfected and be extended to other municipal departments, particularly to water and lighting plants now operated by municipalities, and to street car and all public service plants as they may hereafter be established under municipal ownership and operation.

8. That we condemn the vicious and corrupt bargain between the boss of Cincinnati and Ohio's United States senators to force through the legislature a code that, on the one hand, will foist upon the municipalities of Ohio Cincinnati's form of government in order that the power of its Boss may be preserved, and on the other hand will perpetuate existing street railway franchises which Ohio's United States senators represent.

9. That the municipal code should protect the public against all clauses which may be clandestinely placed therein in the special interest of public service monopolies, by requiring that all ordinances granting, renewing, extending or modifying franchises shall be inoperative until confirmed by a majority vote of the people of the municipality. And we are unalterably opposed to the granting of any perpetual franchises.

10. That until United States senators are required by amendment of the Federal constitution to be elected by popular vote, nominations of candidates for United States senator should be made by state conventions.

And we hereby direct that in the official call for the next Democratic state convention of Ohio there be embodied a clause providing for the nomination at that convention of the Democratic candidate for United States senator; and a clause providing for action by said convention upon all the amendments to the state constitution then pending before the people.

Upon these principles of Home Rule and Just Taxation, and to the accomplishment of these purposes in municipal and state affairs, we invite the cooperation of all citizens of Ohio, regardless of their party affiliations on national questions, hereby solemnly pledging our candidates to the faithful observance of this declaration, both in letter and spirit.

—

A dispatch from Sandusky to the Cleveland Plain Dealer outlines the method of making the Ohio campaign for the Democrats as follows:

Mayor Johnson will make the opening speech of the campaign in Lorain, the little city he made with his steel plant and in which he is by no means forgotten, and from Saturday night until the ballots are counted there will be no let up in the fight. And this campaign will be the most unique of any ever conducted in Ohio, for Mayor Johnson will carry his circus ten plan, made familiar in every one of his Cleveland campaigns, into execution throughout his tour of Ohio. Plans for doing this were completed here to-day, after the arrival of the Cleveland party. A representative of the Wagner Manufacturing company of Cleveland called on Mr. Johnson soon after his arrival this afternoon and the final contracts for the equipment to be used on this tour were drawn. A big tent with a seating capacity of 3,500 will be the movable auditorium into which the crowds of voters will be gathered to hear Mr. Johnson's views on code, franchises and taxation reform. Ten wagons, drawn by as many teams, will transport the great canvas and the gang of men needed to handle its unwieldy folds. A cook will accompany the outfit and the tent gang will sleep in the wagons that carry them, and eat in the roadside camps pitched at and between stops. One stand a day will be made by this traveling political caravan. The mayor will not depend on local chairmen to introduce him to the people he will address. Some Cleveland man will accompany him throughout the tour, and probably Echo M. Heisley will act as aid-de-camp and anouncer. The itinerary arranged for this trip begins as stated at Lorain Saturday night of this week; Monday evening he will speak at Norwalk; Tuesday evening he will be at Bellevue; Wednesday will see him at Green Springs; Thursday at Tiffin; Friday at Fremont, and the first week's engagement will come to a close at Oak Harbor in Ottawa county. The following Monday will see a revival of the campaign at Geneva, a rock-

ribbed Republican town in a rock-ribbed Republican district. From Geneva the tent will be jumped to Toledo, where the mayor will speak Tuesday. From Toledo he goes to Columbus to tell the lawmakers his opinions on franchises on the day set for hearings on that subject, the first instance on record, probably, where a political leader in the midst of a campaign has addressed members of that body on questions he is discussing on the stump. After his hearing at Columbus Mayor Johnson will invade the northwest section of the state, renewing hostilities probably at Celina or Cold Springs. He will make several speeches during the campaign in Cincinnati, the stronghold of two of his bitterest enemies, George B. Cox and John R. McLean.

In Iowa also the Democratic state convention met on the 3d. There the question of endorsing the Kansas City platform was disturbing. The "reorganizing" or "gold" faction refused an overture on the 2d for a compromise clause reaffirming the platform but declaring that the silver question is no longer an issue, and succeeded in securing the adoption by the resolutions committee of a platform ignoring the whole subject. A minority report was made, however, and the question came before the convention, where the "gold" faction won by 384 to 344. The platform as adopted merely reaffirms "the fundamental principles of Democracy as promulgated by the fathers of the republic at its birth and interpreted by the great leaders from the foundation of our government to the present time." On the tariff issue it demands tariff for revenue only. Richard Burke was nominated for secretary of state, the highest office on the ticket.

Still another Democratic state convention was held on the same day—that of Wisconsin. Here the subject of national issues was wholly ignored, neither the national platform nor Democratic principles even in the abstract being mentioned. Ex-Senator Vilas, who opposed the party in 1899 and 1900, was a conspicuous and influential member of the convention. Like the convention of Iowa, this of Wisconsin is regarded by the press as having been controlled by the "gold" faction. It nominated David S. Rose for governor.

A fourth Democratic state convention to meet on the 3d was that of California, which nominated Franklin K. Lane, a radical democrat and a free trader even to the extent of being a single taxer, for governor. This convention, too, ignored the national platform, and on national questions denounced the protective tariff. It also denounced government by injunction.

The New York convention of the Socialistic Labor party, which met at Utica on the 3d, nominated Daniel De Leon for governor.

Two state elections have occurred since our last issue, one in Arkansas and the other in Vermont, and both on the 2d. Neither is of more than local importance.

In Arkansas, Gov. Jefferson Davis, the regular Democratic candidate for Governor, was reelected by a majority of from 35,000 to 45,000, and the congressional delegation is all Democratic.

In Vermont, where a majority vote is required to elect, no governor nor lieutenant governor was chosen, and the selection must be made by the legislature. This condition is the result of a split in the Republican party, primarily on the liquor question and incidentally on the alleged corrupt methods whereby the nomination of the regular Republican candidate was secured. Gen. McCullough defeated Percival W. Clement for the nomination. Clement charged fraud and corruption, and made an independent canvass on the question of local option and high license, which he had represented in the convention. He was evidently strongly supported by the Democratic vote, which, as compared with two years ago, fell off 65 per cent. McCullough's vote was about 31,000 and Clement's about 28,000. All the Republican ticket except governor and lieutenant governor having been endorsed by Clement's faction received about 55,000. The comparison with the state vote of two years ago is as follows:

	1900.		1902.
Gov. (R.)	48,441	{about / about}	31,000 / 28,000
" (D.)	17,129	(about)	6,000
" (Pro.)	950	(about)	2,000
" (Soc.)	567		?
" (Scat.)	12		?
Total	67,099		67,000

It would appear, therefore, that a full vote was polled, and that local issues had drawn two-thirds of the Democratic vote over into the Republican factional contest.

At the Democratic primaries in South Carolina, where the struggle for supremacy is always settled in that state, the elections being only a proforma endorsement, none of the contestants have won. The struggle must, therefore, be decided at the second primaries, at which only the two highest candidates for each office at the first primaries are eligible to be voted for. For governor, the candidates at the second primaries will be D. C. Hayward and Congressman W. Jasper Talbert; and for United States Senator in place of Senator McLaurin, Congressman A. C. Latimer and ex-Gov. John Gary Evans.

President Roosevelt continues his speaking campaign (p. 325) through New England. He was in New Hampshire on the 28th, and also on the 29th. He spent part of the latter day in a hunt for big game in the forest of the Corbin game preserve, and after making several speeches on the 30th, passed Sunday at the country place of Dr. W. Seward Webb, of the Vanderbilt family. On the 1st his tour carried him through Vermont, on the eve of the state election, which took place on the 2d. His principal speech on the 2d was made at Fitchburg, Mass. On the 3d, while on his way from Pittsfield, Mass., to Lenox, in a carriage and accompanied by Gov. Crane, his carriage was struck by an electric motor car and he was slightly injured. His driver was very badly hurt, and a secret service officer who sat by the driver was killed, as was one of the horses.

What is widely regarded as President Roosevelt's Philippine policy was outlined by Gov. Taft, at a banquet given by the American Chamber of Commerce of Manila. The banquet had been given in honor of Gov. Taft's return (p. 326) and he was the principal speaker. He spoke at length, saying among other things that the Americans are there—

to benefit the Filipinos and not for selfish exploitation. The investment of American capital, however, is a very important factor, and the commission will support the business men. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that the merchants must rely upon the Filipinos as laborers and also to work out their own salvation. It is possible that representations will be made to the committees of the House and Senate of the Congress that will result in a moderation

of the stiff exclusion act. The commission will again recommend the gold standard. I repeat that the merchants must rely on the organization of the Filipinos for their labor.

But the most significant part of his speech was that wherein Gov. Taft discussed the future of the islands, saying that the United States will retain them indefinitely with a view to educating the natives in the principles and practice of self-government, so as to enable them to decide whether they desire to become independent or to be made into a province like Canada or Australia under Great Britain. He thought they would need a generation of instruction.

The Ohio situation demands further attention with reference to the construction of a municipal code now in progress in the special session (p. 325) of the legislature. The special committee of the lower house began its sessions on the 27th. First to address it was Wade H. Ellis, one of the governor's advisers in framing the pending administration measure. On the 28th the committees of both house and senate were addressed by T. H. Hogsett, Democrat, and James R. Garfield, Republican, both of Cleveland. The latter, a son of President Garfield, is now United States civil service commissioner. They are reported to have "riddled the governor's code," and to have joined in urging the adoption of what is known as the federal plan. Several proposed codes have been introduced, including one which would allow each municipality to make its own charter (p. 305), and an amplification of this, intended to avoid constitutional objections, which is distinguished as the Democratic measure.

NEWS NOTES.

—[illegible]onal Association of Mail Clerk[illegible] Kansas City on the 1st.

—T[illegible]ture of the Indian territor[illegible] Tishomingo on the 1st.

—[illegible] has appointed Mgr. Gu[illegible]tolic delegate to the Phil[illegible]

—[illegible]onal Association of Letter [illegible] met in annual convention [illegible]er on the 1st.

—[illegible]h annual meeting of the Am[illegible]athematical society began at [illegible], Ill., on the 2d.

—[illegible] Eggleston, the author of the "Hoosier Schoolmaster," died at Glen Falls, N. Y., on the 3d.

—Alderman Patrick Dowd, the labor candidate, was elected lord mayor of Dublin, Ireland, on the 1st.

—The answer of the defendants in the railroad merger suit pending in Minnesota (p. 42) was filed on the 1st.

—The Republic of Cuba (pp. 121, 172) was formally recognized during the week by Greece, Austria and Brazil.

—King Victor Emmanuel of Italy, entered Berlin in state on the 28th upon a royal visit to the German emperor.

—Theodore F. Seward, well known in the East as a musical student and composer, died at Orange, N. J., on the 1st.

—Another eruption of Mt. Pelee (p. 87), which occurred on the 30th, destroyed Morne Rouge and killed hundreds of people.

—The French government on the 29th transferred Jules Cambon from Washington to Madrid and M. Jusserand from Copenhagen to Washington.

—Wu Tingfang, the Chinese minister, was the Labor Day orator at Binghamton, N. Y., on the 1st and the guest of the Central Labor union of that city.

—On the 1st the Thirty-fifth Trades Congress of Great Britain convened in London with 500 delegates. The American Federation of Labor was represented by Harry Blackmore and Patrick Dolan.

—A receiver for the bicycle trust, the American Bicycle Co., of New Jersey, which controlled 70 per cent. of the output, was appointed on the 2d, the company having passed the payment of interest on its bonds.

—The Illinois petition, circulated by the Referendum League (p. 282), had been signed on the 3d by 140,000 voters, more than enough to compel the submission of the question proposed to an advisory vote of the people at the next election.

—An extension of the British crimes act in Ireland (p. 41) was proclaimed on the 1st, so as to include 17 counties—nearly the whole of Ireland—under the suspension of jury trial and the inhibition of public meetings. Dublin city is included for the purpose of reaching the principal newspaper of the United Irish league.

—A landslide in Russia, which occurred near the hot springs of Tmenkau, on the northern slope of Mount Kasbek, on the 17th of August, but is just reported, destroyed some 20 villages and caused a loss of hundreds of lives. It was due to subterranean disturbances which gave rapid movement to the glacier at the summit of Mount Kasbek and to the whole northern slope below. The entire valley, nearly 12 miles long, was devastated in a few minutes by the moving wall of rock, ice and earth, and by the mountain stream swollen to a torrent.

PRESS OPINIONS.

OHIO POLITICS.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), Aug. 30.—The Republicans are having a great deal of trouble to catch their breath after the announcement made by Hanna that he is in favor of having a clause in the municipal code which provides for perpetual franchises for street railroads. They might have imagined that Hanna favored something of the sort, but they could not come to the point of thinking that he would come out boldly and declare his ideas.

ROOSEVELT'S TOUR.

Albany Argus (Dem.), Aug. 27.—President Roosevelt shows his insincerity and desire to mislead the people, when he rejects the obvious, effective and immediate means of putting the trusts out of business, and theorizes vaguely about constitutional amendments, publicity, and other remedies repeatedly discussed, and as repeatedly rejected by Republican Congresses.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Sept. 2.—The President says nothing that puts him out of touch with the politicians and managers, or the trusts that the European papers with a lack of knowledge advertise he is entering on a crusade against. We have no instance that the presidential crusade on trusts has abated their demands or their power. They are going ahead increasing the one and cementing the other.

Kansas City World (Dem.), Aug. 29.—One of the planks in the platform of the Social Democratic party in 1900 declared for "the revision of the constitution to the end that the powers of the Federal government be enlarged so as to deal with the question of corporate monopolies." With Mr. Roosevelt, the party of Debs agrees that state interference with trusts is practically useless. The Socialists also agree with the President that it is futile "to rail at the growth in the industrial centralization of the last half century." It is a question whether the Socialists will feel complimented over the adoption of their ideas by the President, or whether they will regard him as a plagiarist.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Aug. 31.—Coming events have cast their shadows before in all the history of the world; and those "trustees of God" who object to government ownership of public utilities will do well to profit by the lessons of the past. The shadows lengthening in this land to-day are not without substantial meaning, and the good citizen will do well to make intelligent interpretation. Public ownership of the mines, public ownership of the railroads, public ownership of the trusts may come before many of us are prepared for the charge, unless private ownership of the people and private control of the people's necessities are abolished by the restoration of popular government in the purest meaning of the term.

THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Aug. 26.—For all sorts of persons who call themselves Democrats we have kindly feeling, and a good word, but we would state the case thus: The first thing is to have the truth to fight for; the next is to have a true man to lead the fight. Platform and man must match, otherwise both will be nothing worth. This is not original, nor brilliant; it is simply true.

MISCELLANY

THE STRENUOUS LIFE.

For The Public.

All cozy and snug, in an elegant home,
With never a thought of worry or care,
He thrills with the story of Greece and of Rome,
As he lolls in a soft-cushioned chair.

He swells with the thought, what a glory to stand
Full in the light of the calcium glare,
With helmet upraised, a sword in his hand,
The breeze of applause blowing fresh through his hair.

Away, then, away with contentment and ease;
There's glory and fame in turmoil and strife;
No calm for him, but a foam tossing breeze;
He preaches the creed of the strenuous life.

But when he grows languid, retires for awhile,
His spirit revives in the cool mountain air;
And then he returns as fresh as a smile,
All laden with trophies of wild cat and bear.

And calls the poor devils who toil in the smoke,
All to quick step to the tune of his fife;
No limping old laggard, no slow going moke;
For his is the creed of the strenuous life.

He leaps in the saddle, is off with a shout;
He rides a big horse, at a rattling good gait.
Who can't keep the pace, we muster them out;
We're all in a hurry; there's no time to wait.

Step sprightly; keep moving, plan, scheme and contrive
Ten hours every day for potatoes and flour;
For judges, I'm told, who only work five,
Earn more in a minute than you in an hour.

Out early, work late and arduous strive
To gather the golden honey.
So preaches the master who owns the hive,
The gospel of glory and money.

ATRABILARIOUS.

THE INDIANS SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO CITIZENSHIP.

There is strong evidence of two essential truths having an evident practical value in relation to the solution of our present Indian problem.

First. The comparative willingness of the Indian to accept civilization when it is offered to him by those whose character and methods win his confidence.

Second. The great—and I must admit the hitherto insurmountable—difficulty of attaining those conditions under which the work of civilizing a barbarous people can be carried to mature success on account of the greed, violence or prejudice of our own race.

Our work is to bring to bear upon the Indian the essence of Christianity—that power which alone has benefited him in the past—the gospel of right thinking and right doing, of charity and of the moral law, with, of course, the necessary sequence of an intellectual and physical development in industry of the mind and of the body.

At the same time our even more important and difficult work is to persuade a majority of the American people that the Indian has rights which the white man is bound to respect, and that the great boon of life, law and education shall be granted him.

If the public sentiment of the country will say "aye" to this second proposition then a place, albeit a humble one, is assured to the red man in these United States, hitherto the home and refuge for all people—him only excepted.

It is our simple duty to bring the Indian to citizenship and citizenship to the Indian, and by couching my subject in these terms I endeavor to intimate that the problem is quite as much of bringing ourselves to the point of willingness to grant the boon of civilization as it is of inducing the Indian to accept it.

The work is twofold in that it contemplates infusing new life into the Indian, arousing him to a perception of the critical position in which he is placed as the white man thunders at his gate, and at the same time it involves constant watchfulness and restraint upon the white man who wishes the Indians' land, and the best portions of it, at once.—Herbert Welsh, in Philadelphia North American.

TWO HORRORS THAT PASS ALMOST UNNOTICED, AND WHY.

In a tenement fire in one of our great cities five human beings perished, two women and three children.

This horror does not stir the community in the least and will be forgotten by the public in a day.

Had the fire been in a palace, and the lives lost been those of a millionaire's family, the whole country would be reading the tragedy with shocked interest and sorrowful sympathy.

When the French Revolution comes up in your mind, what is it you first think of? The guillotine, of course, and the beheaded King and Marie Antoinette, and the graceful, dainty nobles who went so gallantly to the knife while the Terrorists had their few months of power.

Mark Twain, who is much more than a humorist, reminds the world in one of his books that there were two Terrors in France—one, the long, slow Terror that lasted a thousand years, in which the lives of whole generations of men and women were made not worth the living, and the short, sharp Terror, when the blood shed, measured against that squeezed and tortured from humanity in the Long Terror, bore the proportion of a drop to a hogshead.

The death of a monarch or a nobleman on the scaffold is ever so much more dramatic and picturesque than the death of a peasant in his hut from want. That is why, in part, the one death makes an ineffaceable impression while the other is unnoted. Besides, the noble's exit under the guillotine has the striking quality of rarity. Myriads of peasants have died of hunger for every noble that has ascended the scaffold.

A nation of twenty-six million people were starved in order that Louis and his court at Versailles might glitter in luxury. The Revolution wiped out Louis and his court, but it gave France and the fruits of France's soil and of their own industry to the French people. Yet mankind has not recovered from the tremors that shook shuddering society when the Revolution, with its guillotine and furious massacres, freed France and emancipated the civilized world from the superstition that subjects were made for kings and not kings for their subjects. Ever since "the ever-blessed French Revolution," as Mark Twain calls it, gave the race the sunshine of liberty in exchange for the night of tyranny the pens of the literary caste have been asking sympathy for Louis and Versailles and loathing for all cor[illegible]ned in destroying the hideous a[illegible]d murderous ancient regime. For the literary caste is by instinct parasitic. It plays by preference the role of lackey to wealth, and its power to influence the habitual modes of thought of nearly all of us is enormous and [illegible]tinuous.

Democracy, which [illegible] spc[illegible]tianity, and so is no respec[illegible]her th[illegible]ersons, grows slowly. We s[illegible]are the[illegible]ne of us, that human life is s[illegible] and no[illegible] we don't mean it. If we did m[illegible]e investn[illegible]ld not have plenty and com[illegible]wever, is[illegible]rselves when we looked at [illegible]nd the c[illegible] tenement, nor could we [illegible]he busi[illegible]hildren into factories or set[illegible] my con[illegible] work in the coal mines. We[illegible]s must [illegible]ly democratic, really Chris[illegible]aborers [illegible]n salvat[illegible] should feel one human life t[illegible]esentati[illegible] red as any other. Five lives[illegible]ittees [illegible] tenement fire would be as[illegible] the C[illegible] to us as five lives lost in a [illegible]oderati[illegible] fire,

the death of a starved peasant in his hut as dreadful and impressive as that of a king on the scaffold.

It will take a long, long time to leach the snob, the lackey, out of us, to transform us from wealth and rank-worshiping creatures, inheriting our abasement of soul from endless generations of subservient ancestors, into self-respecting, self-owning democrats, valuing other men for what they are and not for what they have in the way of either property or position.

Do you think for a moment that the life of each of those tenement women and children was not as dearly prized by the woman and child as King Edward's life is prized by him, or Mr. Rockefeller's by Mr. Rockefeller? And can you doubt that the death of the poor women and hapless children wrenches the hearts of those who were near to them and loved them quite as sorely as the death of King Edward or Mr. Rockefeller would wrench the hearts of those to whom they are near and dear?—Editorial in Chicago American for August 22.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

HE REPORTS THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT SPEECH.

(From the Original Manuscript.)

Dear John: I'm havin' lots of fun; been goin' around with Theodore, "curbin' the trusts." We went down to Providence last week, and Theodore made 'em a great speech; f-i-n-e, I tell ye!

It looks as if Theodore was a-runnin' ag'in fer President, and I don't know but he'd get it if he'd show he was a-lookin' out for my interests—had his eye on me instead of on the trusts. But he's wilful, Theodore is—slow takin' a hint—not clear in his words, and gets his feet tangled in the reins sometimes; but he made a great speech at Providence on the trusts.

"Publicity is the first step," says Theodore.

"Pshaw! Theodore," says I, "that's Dave Hill's thunder, and Russell Sage approves it. Give 'em something fresh or western! Give 'em the niggers at San Juan hill! Whoop 'em up!"

"Publicity is most important," persisted the President.

"Hurrah!" says I, catchin' on. "We'll have the sun to shine all night next term, as well as all day. We'll illuminate 'em till they all shine out like beef and coal and Standard Oil. Hurrah!"

"The nation must take control," says Theodore.

"Knox!" says I. "He's the boy! He's got it now! Hurrah fer Knox!"

Here the President called for a drink of water.

"But the power must be exercised with moderation," says he.

"Knox again!" yells I. "Nixie Knox! He'll do it with moderation. He's the gentlest Attorney-General we ever had. Eats nothin' sharper than pumpkin pie. Knox is the man!"

I don't think the President liked all my responses, though I certainly did put lots of ginger into his speech, for he paused now, and requested the gentlemen on the platform (that meant me) to put the floral horseshoe on the locomotive. Theodore is a good advertiser.

"Shoe the iron horse," says I.

"That's it," said Theodore, smilin'; "you did hit it once."

"The state is no good after trusts," resumed Theodore. "The nation must assume control, but the nation has no power yet. Big combines are inevitable, and I see no promise of a complete solution—"

"But, thunder!" says I, "Theodore, what am I a goin' to do for meat and coal? Must I starve and freeze?"

"The best thing to do," says Theodore, "is to hoe corn like the mischief, and have nobody meddle, particularly people who are least well off in the world's goods—who don't have anything; for if people who don't have anything would lose all they have, they'd come to direr prosperity yet."

"Scat!" says I. "Theodore, you are gettin' mixed up. How could meddlin' hurt a man who has nothing? What has he got to lose?"

"All people are living better," says Theodore.

"Or strikin' to do it," says I.

"It's true, some of the rich have grown richer, but I deny the poor are poorer—"

"Where did the rich get it from, Theodore?" says I.

And so we ran along, but we made a great speech at Providence.

UNCLE SAM.

JUSTICE AND BENEVOLENCE.

"I believe," said Mrs. Dillingham, in her most judicial manner, "that you are really proud of it."

"Of being a Democrat? Of course I am."

She looked at me curiously. "You admit yourself that every horsethief is a Democrat?"

"Approximately."

"And you know the party is always wrong?"

"It certainly has the gift for doing the right thing at the wrong time."

"And you surely cannot approve of that horrid Tammany?"

"Not altogether."

"And you are always quarreling among yourselves."

"Usually."

"Then why," she asked, "why did you say you are proud of being a Democrat?"

"For very much the same reason, madam, that I am proud of being an American citizen. The Democratic party would carry American citizenship to its logical conclusion."

"Broadly speaking," I told her, "the Democratic party is founded on the instinct of justice, while the Republican party is based on the impulse toward benevolence."

"And that's why you are a Democrat," she cried. "I thought you men were supposed to be logical."

"That is our weakness, we flatter ourselves."

"But surely," she argued, as one who states a poser, "benevolence is higher than justice."

"On the contrary, justice is the higher virtue and the one that is most needed in the state, the virtue that is last to develop in the individual or the nation.

"A two-year-old child has benevolence highly developed. Your little Tommy insisted on rubbing a smudge of sticky candy into my face only a few minutes ago out of pure benevolence. Possibly he has that trait to a marked degree by inheritance from his mother. But that does not prevent him from trying to pull kitty's tail out by the roots in total disregard of justice—justice requiring a recognition, if you please, of pussy's right to the pursuit of happiness, which in pussy's case is the undisturbed enjoyment of its own members."

"Children are little savages," she frankly admitted, "but you are altogether wrong when you say that justice is the later development in a nation. Haven't they always had laws? And yet you say yourself they are only just beginning to show Christian tendencies?"

"It would seem so, and yet as far back as you can go in history you find benevolent kings, kings who were good to their subjects, kings who relieved their distress, kind masters to their slaves. But kings who recognize the rights of their subjects have always been a scarce article.

"Most of the slaveholders," I went on, "were kind to their negro chattels.

The patriarchal system was a benevolent institution."

"Yes," she broke in with an annihilating glance, "and who abolished slavery? I have always heard it was the Republican party. I suppose you will say now it was the Democrats."

"That illustrates the very point I had in mind"—I hadn't thought of it till that minute, but it pleased me to pretend to have anticipated her stroke. "There was a handful of abolitionists who were for freeing the slaves as an act of justice, and they were the most unpopular people in America. All a man had to do was to say he was an abolitionist to get mobbed on the spot, whether it was in Massachusetts or Illinois, as well as further south. They were for justice, and they were the most lonesome people in America because the popular idea of justice had not developed to that point yet.

"The Republican party was presently swayed by the impulse of benevolence, compassion, pity—and under that impulse, complicated with federal questions, they freed the negroes. The nation was not ready then nor even yet to do it as an act of justice to the negro in recognition of his rights."

"And where was your Democratic party all this time?"

"The Democratic party was hopelessly involved on the wrong side of the slavery question. There was no party in the United States except the despised and hated abolitionists who could comprehend that anything was due to the negro in justice. Even then the Democratic party was following its instincts for justice in its poor human way, laying so much stress on the rights of the states that it never perceived the other rights. The mind of the party had not developed far enough to comprehend the rights of the negroes, and for not being able to see it the party got jolly well licked. And served them right.

"I regret to say that there are many Democrats who do not to this day appreciate the rights of the negroes. There is an inherited prejudice against our black brethren that I can understand though I may not approve of it. It is not easy to acknowledge the equality of a man whom we regard as an inferior. It is much easier to be kind to him than to be just to him. And therefore the Republicans are fairly successful in living up to their ideal while the Democrats are very far from fulfilling theirs. I suppose Mrs. Dillingham, for instance, would do anything in the world for old Dinah—except accepting to recognize her as an equal—say to sit at table with her?"

"Then the Republican party did accomplish something while the Democrats were waiting for that ideal of theirs to arrive," she suggested, "and you say it hasn't come yet. And still you are proud of being a Democrat. Oh, you men."

I was supposed to be completely floored. Happily for me I am so obtuse that I never know when I am vanquished in argument. I ventured to call her attention to the fact that this happened nearly forty years ago. The Republican party was then doubtless a decade in advance of the Democrats. The Democrats were facing to the rear, dwelling on the past phase of the question, which in a political party is a moral sin. Whereas it is now the Republican party that dwells on its glorious past and is serenely oblivious to the good time coming in the reign of justice—

But I fell into that very error right there. For the discussion to Mrs. Dillingham's mind stopped with her last word. For as a woman is entitled to the last word, whatever a foolish man adds to that is but labor and sorrow.

I am not allowed to get beyond the admission that the Democratic party was wrong forty years ago—not even by reminding her that that was before she was born.—John Stone Pardee, in Red Wing Argus.

THE OHIO KEYNOTE.

Speech of Hon. Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, as temporary chairman of the Democratic convention of Ohio, at Sandusky, O., September 3, 1902.

The principles of democracy, always old, but never obsolete, confront us to-day, both in local and in national questions.

One of these national questions relates to trusts. For this evil our adversaries advise publicity as the remedy. Publicity! That might protect investors against fraud; but how could it protect the public against monopoly, which is the basis of trusts? Men whose incomes have increased but little or not at all, but whose living expenses have increased enormously—why should they care for publicity? What is needed is not examinations of the account books of the trusts; it is the sweeping of monopolies from the statute books of the people.

The money question also is national. And let me tell you this is no dead issue, as some would have us believe. Dead though it may be in one form, it is alive in other and more radical forms. So long as Wall street interests dictate our financial policies, the money question cannot die. You know that I have never accepted the doctrine commonly known as "sixteen to one." I have worked with those who do accept it because I have believed, as I believe yet, that the free silver fight was the first great protest of the American people against monopoly—the first great struggle here of the masses against the privileged classes. It was not free silver that frightened the plutocratic leaders. What they feared was free men.

We have in national politics also the vital question of self-government. Shall we continue to govern distant colonies from Washington, as distant provinces were governed by imperial Rome before her fall, and as crown colonies are governed by the British empire to-day? That question also is at bottom a monopoly question. There would be no subject colonies if colonies could give no monopoly franchises.

But national questions are not for us to deal with in this state convention. Great as is Ohio in territory and population and wealth, important as she is in the sisterhood of states, influential as her Democracy is capable of being in the counsels of the national party, she is not great enough, nor important enough, nor is her Democracy influential enough, to warrant this convention in dictating national policies or remodeling national platforms. We have not been elected for that purpose. The function of revising national platforms belongs with conventions chosen for national purposes. Our function, so far as national questions are concerned, begins and ends with an unmistakable identification of the Democratic party of Ohio with the Democratic party of the republic. That can be done in good faith only by acknowledging the authority of the latest national expression of party doctrine on national questions. In my judgment, therefore, this convention ought to recognize the Kansas City platform. It ought also to pay the tribute of its respect to the great Democrat, who has in two national campaigns brilliantly led us against the Republican party and its allied hosts of nonpartisan monopolists.

Having done that, it is our duty to turn to the affairs of our own state. Let us be fair to our adversaries. They are in the majority in the legislature, and at the last session of that body they passed the Longworth bill which makes it easier in the future to amend the state constitution. Under that law we of Ohio shall no longer be tied down by the narrow ideas of half a

century ago. The dead hand has been lifted. This is probably the best law that has been put on the statute books of our state in the last 30 years.

But on the whole that same Republican legislature has lent itself to the service of the monopoly corporations. Most of its members carried railroad passes in their pockets while they buried the bill to reduce railroad fares to the people; and they suppressed the bill to tax steam railroads on the same basis of valuation as homes and farms. The board of equalization for railroads, all Republicans, had decided that the present laws are so defective that steam railroads cannot be assessed for taxation as high as homes and farms. The Supreme Court had sustained them in that decision. Every Supreme Court judge is a Republican, and some of them were railroad attorneys. Respect for the court precludes our suggesting that it was influenced by these facts, though we all know how difficult it is for any man, even though he be a judge, to escape the influences of association. But notwithstanding the defect in the tax laws, the legislative committee gave but scant consideration to the proposed remedy and the measure was not allowed to come to a vote.

Now note what this Republican legislature did to cover its tracks. It reduced state taxes on real and personal property more than one-half. But how did it make up most of the consequent loss to the state revenues? By taxing monopolies? No. By taxing other interests that were paying less than their share? No. It did it principally by taxing the stock of corporations that have no monopoly privileges but do a competitive business. This stock is owned almost entirely within the state. At the same time the legislature exempted corporations owning rich monopoly franchises in Ohio, the stock of which is held almost entirely outside of the state. The Ohio stockholders in a sawmill company, doing business in Ohio, are to pay taxes, called license fees, on their capital stock; but stockholders in monopoly corporations, who live in New York, are exempted from that form of taxation. Nor is that all. There are gross discriminations between the owners of stock in Ohio business corporations. And these discriminations favor the rich. Whether stock is worth $10 a share or $800 a share, it must pay the same tax per share. So the former must pay higher taxes than the latter, in proportion to value, by 80 times—or nearly 8,000 per cent.

If the legislature had taxed steam railroads and other public service corporations fairly, it could have abolished the state tax on real and personal property altogether, without taxing the stock of competitive business corporations at all. But the Republican leaders could not consent to that. They had made a bargain with the steam railroads to permit no hostile legislation if the railroads would submit to a slight increase of taxes. Pursuant to that bargain, the governor proposed and the legislature adopted a law increasing the tax on steam railroads $400,000 a year. That is less than ten per cent. of what the increase would be if steam railroads were taxed as much in proportion to the value of their Ohio property as Ohio farmers and home owners are. A fair proportion for the steam railroads would be an increase of $4,000,000 a year instead of $400,000.

By such unmistakable signs the leaders of the Republican party in this state have exposed their willingness to guard and defend the interests of privilege and monopoly at the expense of the unprivileged people. I say Republican leaders, because I do not believe this partnership with Republican monopoly is approved by the Republican masses. Acting for monopoly interests, the state officials and the members of the dominant party in the legislature have defeated all legislation looking to the correction of inequalities in taxation. Incontestible proof was furnished them that the steam railroads and the other public service corporations together are evading payment of their just share of taxation, as compared with home owners and farmers, to the extent of not less than $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 a year. The facts are conceded. Yet every attempt to correct this manifest inequality has been defeated. State boards, composed of Republicans, stand in the way under the present law, and the Republican majority in the legislature stands in the way of making remedial laws.

If further proof of this corrupt partnership be desired, turn to the experience of the city of Cleveland during the past year and a half. The city board of equalization raised the valuation of the local public service corporations nearly $20,000,000. This brought it up from 6 per cent. to 60 per cent. of its market value, which is the customary basis of valuation in ordinary cases. But a state board, composed of the governor, the attorney general, and the state auditor, wiped that assessment out, leaving these corporations to make their own assessments; and the Republicans in the legislature legislated the faithful city board out of existence. In place of that board a new city board has been appointed by the same state officials. It is composed of men who can be trusted to guard monopoly interests. The old city board of equalization was not alone in offending the monopolists. The city council offended also. It provided for a street car system with three-cent fares and ultimate ownership by the city. Government by injunction was thereupon brought into play. The Cleveland council is now enjoined from granting street car franchises with low fares, while every other city in the state is at liberty to grant street car franchises with high fares.

When it was discovered that the city government of Cleveland could be neither bought nor browbeaten, the Republican attorney general was appealed to by the frightened monopolists, and he brought an ouster suit. We have heard of ripper legislation; this was ripper litigation. Cleveland had confessedly the best city charter in Ohio. It had been granted by a Republican legislature of a dozen years ago, to whom the credit belongs, and both the Republican and the Democratic masses of Cleveland approved it. No attempt was made to break that charter until the people elected an administration that dared question the privileges of the public service corporations. Then it was assailed by Republican politicians, spurred on by monopolists, and the attorney general asked the Supreme Court of the state to declare it unconstitutional. That court did so. But it did not stop there. It also declared the whole charter system of Ohio invalid. For that reason the legislature is now convened in special session to frame a general municipal code.

Insofar as the Republican leaders aim to make a proper system of municipal government, they should have the cordial support of every Democratic member of the legislature. But if, as now seems certain, they try to foist upon our municipalities a system of board rule, their work ought to be condemned by good citizens of all parties. For board rule means boss rule in its worst sense, as everybody must know who knows how Cincinnati is governed. Board rule, divided responsibility, control from the state capitol, that is the system that creates and maintains hopeless civic conditions in Cincinnati. The little finger of the boss is stronger than the loins of the people. But un-

der home rule, under the federal plan, which Cleveland had until ripper litigation had done its work, no boss has been able to hold out against public sentiment. In Cincinnati, under their boss and board-ridden government, a 50-year franchise was boldly granted to the street railways, and the same men are still in power; but the mere attempt to make a 25-year grant in Cleveland swept from office every man who favored the proposition from the chief executive down. This illustrates the difference between a political leadership through the manipulation of boards, and a political leadership directly subject to the will of the people.

In framing our municipal code there should be extraordinary vigilance regarding franchises, especially those of street railways. The fact that the street railway grants in Cleveland are about to expire and that the latest judicial decision declares unconstitutional the 50-year franchise in Cincinnati, makes the temptation great for all the powerful public service corporations of our cities to unite in an effort to slip into the municipal code provisions hostile to the public interests. A cunning and well-paid lobby is at work, and the only sure way of bringing its clandestine schemes to naught is to provide in the code that no franchise, and no renewal of franchise, shall be operative in any city until the ordinance granting it has been ratified by a majority vote of the people of that city.

The opportunity opens before the people of Ohio to engage in a noble work. If they choose, they may take their place in the van of the great moral as well as politcal movement that is making headway wherever the English language is spoken. They have only to say the word, and our state will set an example in human progress such as seldom falls to the fortune of any state to offer. They have only to say the word, and every city within our borders will govern itself in local affairs, and throughout the whole great commonwealth the principle of just taxation will prevail. Home rule and just taxation! Let us adopt those ideals of all good government, and we shall solve "the riddle which the Sphinx of Fate puts to our civilization" and which it must answer or be destroyed. These are the issues of this campaign. These are the shibboleth of the Ohio Democracy to-day, and my prayer is that they will continue so to be until they are realized. Home rule and just taxation! Fellow-Democrats, under that banner let us fight, and by that sign we shall conquer.

WEDDED BLISS.

"O come and be my mate!" said the Eagle to the Hen;
"I love to soar, but then
I want my mate to rest
Forever in the nest!"
Said the Hen, "I cannot fly,
I have no wish to try.
But I joy to see my mate careering through the sky!"
They wed, and cried: "Ah! this is Love, my own!"
And the Hen sat; the Eagle soared, alone.

"O come and be my mate!" said the Lion to the Sheep;
"My love for you is deep!
I slay—a Lion should!
But you are mild and good!"
Said the Sheep, "I do no ill,
Could not had I the will,
But I joy to see my mate pursue, devour and kill!"
They wed, and cried: "Ah! this is Love, my own!"
And the Sheep browsed, and the Lion prowled alone.

"O come and be my mate!" said the Salmon to the Clam;
"You are not wise, but I am!
I know sea and stream as well;
You know nothing but your shell!"
Said the Clam, "I'm slow of motion,
But my love is all devotion,
And I joy to have my mate traverse lake and stream and ocean!"
They wed, and cried: "Ah! this is Love, my own!"
And the Clam sucked, the Salmon swam, alone.

—Charlotte Perkins Stetson, in The New Century Journal.

A story is told of a juryman who outwitted a judge, and that without lying. He ran into court in a desperate hurry, quite out of breath, and exclaimed: "Oh, judge, if you can, pray excuse me. I don't know which will die first —my wife or my daughter!" "Dear me, that's sad," said the innocent judge. "Certainly you are excused." The ladies mentioned are still in excellent health and the juryman hopes that the solution of the problem may be long deferred.—Chicago Chronicle.

"I should like," said the man, "to get a position as proofreader."

"Sorry," said the publisher, "but we've laid off all our proofreaders; don't need 'em."

"You don't?"

"No; we're publishing nothing but dialect stories now."—Philadelphia Press.

To be natural, however artificial the circumstances, is the perfection of good manners.—Puck.

"Is Mr. Fusse much afraid of microbes?"

"Well, I should say; he washes the antiseptic gauze gloves he wears in an antiseptic fluid before he even handles the sterilized glass that contains the boiled and filtered mineral water he intends to drink!"—Baltimore Herald.

BOOK NOTICES.

EDUCATED WORKING WOMEN.

This book, written by an English woman and published in England (King & Son), deals with conditions in England, but most of the author's conclusions and suggestions apply as well to "women workers in the middle classes" over here. It is written in a straightforward, confident style, as if by one who has had experience whereof she speaks.

One of the subjects discussed is, of course, that of salary. "Women never will," she says, "and never can become highly efficient and continue so for any long period on the salaries which they at present receive, or even on the salaries with which, as a rule, they would be contented if they could get them. Vitality and freshness of mind, when youth is gone, cannot be maintained within the four walls of the class room or office, on incomes too small to admit of varied social intercourse or of practical beneficence."

In speaking of the falling-off in the quality and quantity of a woman's work, after she has been some years engaged in it, she advances the idea that women need interesting work more than men.

"All that the average man demands is that his work should be honest and remunerative. It need not be interesting, or elevating, or heroic. Most women, on the other hand, who look forward to a long working career must have an occupation to which they can give heart and mind. The woman is living an isolated life. Men, on the other hand, whatever be their employment, are generally husbands and fathers."

There may be some point in the distinction made, for there are probably more women workers than men workers who are isolated in their lives outside of the environment of work; but surely the average man falls off and wears out, just as the average woman may do, whose work arouses no progressive interest.

J. H. DILLARD.

"Eminent Respectability," by William R. Pedrick (Philadelphia: Alfred M. Slocum Co., 718-724 Arch street), which is described on the title page as "a tale of love, politics and adventure," tells of the career of an eminently respectable man of much wealth and no character — except a very bad one. The interest of the book depends entirely upon the plot, which is woven out of such materials as suppressed wills, marital and parental infidelity, criminality in high life, and frustrated conspiracies. It is an interesting novel for a summer afternoon in a hammock or a short journey on a railroad train. While it preaches no sermon, the characters and incidents are suggestive of the unwholesomeness of the plutocratic atmosphere in which modern American society flourishes.

The Democratic campaign book for 1902 (Dem. Cong. Com., 736 15th St. Washington, and old Inter Ocean building, Chicago. Price 25 cents) has just been issued. The principal subjects it discusses are imperialism, tariffs and trusts, labor questions, and subsidies. As it opens with the national platform, making that the text for what follows, there can be neither complaint nor jubilation at any supposed departure on the part of the Congressional committee from the principles of the party as declared by the latest authoritative convention.

PERIODICALS.

—An article of very exceptional interest is "The Reminiscences of a Chartist Tailor" in the Outlook of August 9. The writer is

THE RISING TIDE IN OHIO.

His Majesty, Mark Canute, up against a tempest that is going to overwhelm him before long.

a Mr. Robert Crowe, who is introduced as an old tailor now living in New York. It seems that the article is an extract from a book which Mr. Crowe is to publish, which will surely be a valuable addition to chartist literature. No lesson in all history is more valuable than that of the Chartist movement, which began about 1838. Its six points were:

1. Universal suffrage.
2. Vote by ballot.
3. Annual parliaments.
4. Payment of members.
5. No property qualifications.
6. Equality of electoral districts.

Mr. Crowe rejoices at the prospect of a "new Chartist movement," with a more advanced programme:

1. Nationalization of land and railroads.
2. Adult suffrage.
3. Triennial parliaments.
4. Old age pensions.
5. Eight-hour day.
6. Municipalization of monopolies.

7. Payment of members and of election expenses.

If we may judge from the extract in the Outlook the tailor-author will give us one of those fresh, first-hand books which come forth now and then as well-springs in a dry land.—J. H. D.