

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1903.

Number 298.

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.

Some judge in New York has granted an injunction against a trade union's forbidding its members to strike for the purpose of compelling an employer to employ union men only—to adopt the rule of the "closed shop." Thus does "government by injunction" advance another step.

One need not sympathize especially with trade unions over this latest move in the direction of their suppression; for they have used their influence pretty freely at elections in behalf of the party that stands for "government by injunction." Even if they had not, the subject is not one for mere sympathy. It goes far deeper. To enjoin workmen from quitting work, whether singly or unitedly, for any purpose whatever, certainly when they are not under contract, is to invade the personal rights of every man, be he a trade unionist or not.

If the courts can grant injunctions against striking for a "closed shop," they can grant injunctions against striking for shorter hours or against longer hours, for an increase of wages or against a reduction, for sanitary conditions or against unsanitary conditions. And when they have gone thus far, they will have laid a foundation for regulating everybody's life by the ready method of injunction orders and contempt proceedings.

The expanding notion that trade unions monopolize labor and that the "closed shop" deprives outsiders of work is not true. What the unions may yet do in that di-

rection is another question. As yet they deprive no workmen of opportunities to work. They simply say that any workman may belong to their organization if he wishes to, and that they will not work by the side of any man who refuses to join them and contribute his share toward checking the aggressions of employers. This they have a right to do. True, they thereby in a sense coerce men who may not wish to pay union dues. But how do they coerce? Merely by refusing to be shop-mates with men who refuse to be union mates with them. To deny this right of coercion to any man is to deprive him of his individual rights. To deny it to him if others join with him in such refusal, is none the less to deprive him of his individual rights. No one can lose any individual right because others with the same right assert their right when he asserts his.

Yet much is made of the "coercion" by trade unions. It transpires, for instance, that some non-union man in Chicago was found in a state of destitution last week. He explained that the union was responsible for his suffering, because he could not find work outside of "closed shops" and the union would not admit him without his paying dues he could not afford. Thereupon the Chicago papers—bound hand and foot with plutocratic gyves—made a loud outcry against the "coercion" of the unions. But in explaining why this unfortunate did not join a union, they itemized his financial resources and liabilities, thereby letting out the fact that he paid \$8.00 a month for three squalid rooms in a dingy tenement house. These rooms would have been dear, probably, at \$2.00, on a valueless site. But the owner was able to exact \$8.00 because of their location. So at least \$6.00

of the rent the man paid was extorted in a much truer sense than any exaction of union dues would have been. It was an exaction by one man from another, not for permission to work as his companion, but for permission to live at all in a location on the earth's surface convenient to his place of work.

The enslaving nature of land monopoly has been neatly illustrated by Gen. Wood in the Philippines. Here is the dispatch from Manila published in the Chicago Evening Post of the 11th, which tells about it:

Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood has proclaimed in Moroland an anti-slavery law, passed last October by the legislative council of the Moro provinces. On the promise of the sultan and dattos to abide by its provisions Gen. Wood has suggested to Gov. Taft the establishment of the native Moros on lands which will be assigned to them by the sultan and dattos at a rate of valuation sufficient to provide the latter with a moderate income from the rentals.

Now, what is the difference, in economic principle, between the slavery that allows sultans and dattos to exact work without wages, and the "freedom" that allows them to confiscate wages in the name of "rentals"?

At a banquet of contractors and builders at the Chicago Auditorium hotel last week, an eminent advocate of the rights of man, yept William D. O'Brien, refused to toast the American flag. He was indignant at the interferences with natural rights under its folds, by—the army in the Philippines? the navy at Panama? the carpet-baggers in Porto Rico? the secretary of commerce and labor at New York with his "letter de cachet" or "administrative" process? Bless you, no! not any of those aggressions; but by—walking delegates in the building trades! Mr. O'Brien rose loftily when he described the rights of

his class. They were so sacred, in his estimation, that no contractor should be obliged to waste his time discussing them with walking delegates. This is a high note. But it is a false note. Those who sing it do not sing it true. They appeal to the doctrine of natural rights when walking delegates bother them; but they forget all about the doctrine of rights at other times. Then they descend from their high note of natural rights all the way down the scale to "vested rights," and finally to no rights at all but to mere might. Natural rights is their plea against trade unions; but "the greatest good to the greatest number" is their favorite doctrine when the "greatest good" is coming their way and they can masquerade as "the greatest number." It is concededly fair to hold trade unions to the rule of natural right; but it is not fair to hold them to that rule without applying it universally. If the law of rights may be pleaded acceptably against the aggressions of trade unions, it must be accepted against all other aggressions. But if the law of might is allowable in justification of wars of conquest, of public utility franchises, of land monopoly, then it must be allowed to trade unions. The law of right is either universal or it is non-existent.

One of the startling dispatches of the week came from Kansas on the 12th and related to Washburn college. Let us read it again:

The faculty of Washburn college today ordered the socialist club of the college to discontinue its meetings. The order is said to be the result of letters from Eastern financial supporters of the college saying they would withdraw aid unless the club was suppressed.

Since these "socialists" are described as followers of the Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, who has asked some pointed questions relative to what Christ might do in various matters if he were among us in the flesh to-day, it is not likely that they were socialistic enough to more than hurt the self esteem of some puffy pharisee or other. But what of it if they were Simon-pure

socialists? Are our colleges endowed for the purpose of forbidding sociological study, or of holding it within plutocratic bounds? Is this one of the strings that educational philanthropists attach to their gifts? If so, well and good. They are within their rights. If Washburn college allows its students to study and discuss subjects which are offensive to Mr. Eastern Moneybags, then it is quite within Mr. E. M.'s right to give to Washburn college no more money. But if, on the other hand, Washburn college taboos studies and discussions to which Mr. E. M. objects, in order to get his money, then the status of Washburn college is defined. It is not a college at all, whatever else it may be.

Under the monarchy of Spain the people of Porto Rico were represented in the Spanish parliament at Madrid by 16 deputies in the lower house and 4 senators in the upper. But under the republic of the United States, Porto Rico has no representation at all. The humiliation to which the Porto Ricans are subjected in consequence of their shifted allegiance from a European monarchy to a Rooseveltian republic is indicated by the insular committee of the lower House of Congress, whose chairman informs the House in support of a bill recommended by the committee providing for one Porto Rican delegate, that—

Under the existing law the resident commissioner from Porto Rico is not permitted to speak on the floor of the House, but if he desires to communicate to the members information of importance to the people he represents he must see them at their apartments or in their committee rooms.

Even one delegate, with the right to speak in Congress but not to vote, is a "come-down" for a country of 1,000,000 inhabitants, which boasted 16 deputies and 4 senators in the Spanish parliament, all with full representative powers equal to those of the Spanish members themselves. But when the Porto Ricans realize that they were citizens of Spain and could be naturalized in the United States

or any other country to which they might migrate, whereas they are now citizens of no nation whatever and cannot be naturalized anywhere at all, they must be curious about the blessings of republicanism.

The widely published reports that Wall street interests oppose President Roosevelt's renomination are not believed by everybody. DeWitt C. Wing, of Chicago, voicing the opinion of those who regard these reports as cunningly deceptive, remarks that—students of Roosevelt's acts and declarations need not be reminded that he is as friendly to the unholy financial interests as any president could be without making himself liable to impeachment. Newspaper reports to the contrary are designed to inveigle an unsophisticated public into the flimsy belief that inasmuch as Roosevelt is unpopular with the trust operators and protected custodians of corporate interests he is entitled to the support, moral and active, of that very large class of voters to whom these unconscionable "captains of industry" are repugnant. Probably the game will work in a limited way, but there is small chance to deceive in this ingenious way those who lay any claim to knowledge of political events.

It is true that Roosevelt is a flighty, self-willed "wild-and-woolly-west" type of man, and inclined because of these characteristics to travel roughshod, in performance of his political duties, over the counsel and opinions of saner men in his circle of advisers; but no one who clearly perceives the intimate reciprocal relations between the present Administration and the security-digesting interests which are reported to regard Roosevelt as "unsafe," can be persuaded for a moment to doubt his contract loyalty to those interests. If nominated next June, as he doubtless will be, Roosevelt will be supported with renewed aggressiveness by the same interests which, looking askance at "Bryan's revolutionary and anarchial programme," left no stone unturned that would aid his successful though nominal opponent.

It is enough to consider that trusts have prospered most under the administration of the chief executive who, for his own political weal, affects "strenuous" opposition to their operations.

Let no one be deceived by the shrewd tricks of the plutocratic press nor the unfortunate errors into which a few opposition organs have been led.

We are not so sure as Mr. Wing evidently is that the reports re-

garding Mr. Roosevelt's relations with Wall street are mere cunning devices. Roosevelt is erratic in principle, and he either can't be influenced or won't stay influenced. Such a President is dreaded by Wall street in times of delicate financial adjustments almost as much as one with principles unvaryingly hostile would be. You can calculate on what the latter will do; the former may at any moment turn the nicest financial calculations into the crudest kind of guess work. This is really Wall street's objection to Roosevelt. This is the reason they wanted Cleveland. This is the reason they would like to have Gorman. This is the reason they are booming Parker. This is the meaning of the Hanna manifestations. Wall street would prefer almost any one to the erratic Roosevelt, except a Bryan, a Johnson, or a Garvin.

Congressman Baker's observations in another column on the suggestion that Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, be urged for the Democratic presidential nomination, will be read with interest and may be favorably considered with profit. Democrats who really wish to unite the party can raise no objection to Garvin. Being a democratic Democrat, he will prove acceptable wherever the party looks to Bryan or Johnson for leadership; and his views on the money question can make no difference to gold Democrats who are for gold as an economic base and not as the root of all evil, for in their estimation the money question is dead. His long and remarkably successful career in politics should commend him to every Democrat who wants to win. There is, indeed, no Democrat in the country to-day who answers better to the needs of the Democratic party for a candidate, than Garvin. As compared with any of those who are being urged by the Wall street newspapers, he is weak in only one particular: he could not and would not raise a campaign fund in Wall street. But if a Wall street campaign fund is a sine qua non, why bother

to nominate any Democratic candidate? Why not let Wall street govern through the Republican party, if it is to govern at all?

Gov. Garvin's character is well described by Congressman Granger, of Rhode Island. We quote from the Washington correspondence of the New York Times, as published in that paper on the 12th:

When told to-night that Democrats were seriously considering Gov. Garvin's name Mr. Granger replied: "Yes, I know it. Several Democratic conferees in the House have approached me on the subject. It of course seems incredible that the Democratic party should ever go to New England for presidential timber. But it could not get any abler, better, or cleaner man than Gov. Garvin. He has been thirteen times in the legislature and all his life has fought official corruption. He is a downright forceful man and stands by principle at any cost to himself.

It is believed, writes the Times correspondent, that—

the Garvin boom originated with a well-known Western man who is himself identified with the issue of anti-graft. Some of those who have been discussing the subject are in the attitude of inquirers eagerly seeking information about the Governor's availability. Others are enthusiastically for him.

One of the most important books of the present industrial era—in some respects the most important—is just announced by the Moody Publishing Company. This house is well known for its "Manual of Corporation Securities," the four annuals of which so far issued have placed the house in a high position in financial circles in the East. Recently it has extended its business into the West and enlarged its line of publications. Chief among its new publications is the book in question, "The Truth About the Trusts," of which John Moody, the head of the publishing house and editor of the Manual, is the author. Some idea of the importance of Mr. Moody's new book may be gathered from an outline of its contents. It classifies the different groups of trusts as "greater industrial trusts," including descriptions, histories and analyses of the copper, the smel-

ters', the sugar, the tobacco, the shipping, the oil, and the steel trusts: "lesser industrial trusts," comprising descriptions and analyses of nearly 150 trusts with capitalizations ranging from \$5,000,000 to \$100,000,000; "industrial trusts in process of reorganization or disintegration," "the greater franchise trusts," such as the Bell telephone, the Western Union Telegraph, the United Gas, etc.; "the greater railroad groups," with complete descriptions of the railroad systems of the country and the six combinations of capitalists that control them; and "the American coal combination." Following these classifications is an analysis with full statistics of the trust movement, of suggested remedies, and of large scale production and monopoly. What gives special value to Mr. Moody's forthcoming book is the fact that he writes as a Wall street man, familiar with all the facts and not hostile to financiers, yet appreciative of the attitude of the public toward trusts. The book grows out of the author's experience of nearly five years in accumulating data bearing on trusts with a view to securing an authentic and authoritative record of facts. In this pursuit he has gained much information not easily accessible and never before published, embracing not only financial data, but masses of facts and figures throwing light on the trust subject as well in its industrial, social and political as its financial aspects. It is easy to see that such a book, so compiled and edited, must be invaluable to everyone who is seriously interested in the trust question whether with hope of profit or purpose of criticism.

"Charity revives Louis XV's court." So reads a newspaper headline to a report of the lavish charity ball given in Chicago this week. It is painfully suggestive. With a revival of the Court of Louis XV, a revival of the Court of Louis XVI becomes more than a hint, and with that there looms up the shadow of a possible revival of the Terror.

Social conditions which afford excuse for charity balls create a bad background for pictures of the old French courts come again.

A daily paper submits this dialogue, ostensibly as a joke:

Professor of Rhetoric—Here is an item of news I would like in the paper.

City Editor (to office boy)—Here, Bennie, rewrite this—fix it up to print.

But where's the joke? Doesn't the office boy really set the standard of literary style for most daily papers?

#### THROUGH ROSE-COLORED SPECTACLES.

A so-called "philosophy," briefly suggested in the title of this article, is made the basis of an appeal to readers of a little book, entitled "Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch," published about two years ago. And the appeal has not lacked response, if the number of times that the book has been reprinted is an indication, and the flattering press notices are to be trusted, and the enthusiastic expressions of approval from those whom we hear discuss it, are a guide.

The "philosophy" of "Mrs. Wiggs," as it is called, is not new; it is only newly emphasized, and more subtly treated, in this little story of the "Cabbage Patch."

As announced at the opening of the book, this "philosophy" "lay in keeping the dust off her rose-colored spectacles." This is not the whole philosophy, but it is the foundation of the whole.

Now a prettily-turned phrase is so powerful to still the mind that many persons adopt and endorse such a phrase without inquiring its exact meaning; and thus often adopt and endorse propositions which they might reject if fully understood. This is also true of many phrases adroitly worked together into books.

Doubtless many who use the phrase here quoted understand no more by it than a purpose to be as cheerful as possible, and to see as clearly as possible the good that life holds; and they question its meaning no further. Possibly many understand the book to teach no more than this, and question it no further.

If this were all that could reasonably be meant by the phrase, and if it were all that the writer of the book gives us to understand by her interpretation of it, there could be no other criticism to make of either than that the phrase says too much and the book too little to be a truthful expression.

Concerning the phrase, however, the full and accurate interpretation involves seeing life by artificial aids rather than by natural means, and seeing it all of one color. And as the writer of the book has worked out the life and character of "Mrs. Wiggs," she has given the phrase this full meaning.

The important question why anyone should wish to see the varied experiences of life by artificial means, and to see them all of one color, any more than they would wish to see an oil painting so or nature itself so, is not raised by the writer of the book, nor apparently by the readers of the book. Yet it is an important question. And it would be interesting to inquire how this "philosophy" differs from that of the "red-light" district of New York, or kindred districts elsewhere; why it is not the same disregard for rightness, or righteousness.

Supposing this to be the right way to look upon life, "Mrs. Wiggs," with her rose-colored glasses well adjusted, is unable to see any relation between the requirements of the body and the varying qualities of food, and regards soup that has been indefinitely watered as still soup,—appetizing and nourishing;—at least, so the writer of the book would have us believe. One of her children makes an objection to the watering process, in the natural way and for good reason—not yet possessing a pair of artificial glasses; but the objection is quickly silenced by the superior "goodness" of her rosy-spectacled elder. The hospitality that offers such soup to others, and the generosity that sends rotten peaches to a friend,—knowing that they are rotten and therefore "cheap," the red glasses being laid aside for the moment,—this hospitality and this generosity look like the genuine things through the rose-colored glasses.

The neighbor who has his dinner at home a little earlier on purpose to come in for a share of her own and her children's scant portion, looks like a genuine neighbor, and deserving of that share.

As we see it, her life needs her, most careful thought;—food is scant and rent unpaid. We wonder that she does not ask herself the natural question why this is so, since she is both able and willing to work, and that she does not set herself to the task of answering this vital question. But her rose-colored glasses, we find, show the rosy light only when turned upon her own miserable life. They work as the eyes of hypocrites work. Turned toward the lives of others they sometimes do, and sometimes do not, show rose colors. So now she sees no need to solve her own problem; she sees nothing wrong with her own life; but looking upon the "Patch" outside of her own poor home, she sees very dark colors. She sees other people's children in sore need of enlightenment, and herself called upon to gather them together in what she is pleased to call a Sunday-school. Without power or qualification in herself to give to them anything adapted to satisfy their natural craving for mental or physical occupation—though she does not see this,—she confusedly thrusts upon them, as a maxim of good manners and of morals, the injunction, "Don't fuss! \* \* \* It's sinful to fuss!" and leads them in the prayer that they may be "made thankful for whatever they've got, even if it ain't but a little." In this petition of course her own gratuitous teaching must be included; for why should bad teaching be examined without the red glasses, if nothing else is to be so examined?

Upon the shoulders and in the mind of her fifteen-year-old "Jimmy" rests all the responsibility that would have rested upon herself, had she looked through her natural eyes. And while she is doing the artificial thing—playing at Sunday-school—this boy, "head of the family," "with shoulders of a man," "bent with work," "in his anxious eyes the look of a breadwinner who had begun the struggle too soon," and "to whom life had been a tragedy," is selling his coat to help pay the rent.

Upon "Mrs. Wiggs" the responsibilities of life rest, as she says that they rest upon her other boy, "Billy," "lightly as the freckles upon his nose." Why should it be otherwise? How can there be any responsibilities in such a rosy-colored world where "ever'thing \* \* \* comes right, if we jes' wait long enough!"? Therefore she says to the little thinker and truer observer of the nature and relation of things: "Don't you worry so, Jimmy. Mebbe I kin git work to-morrow, or you'll git a raise, or somethin'; they'll be some way."

When the way comes, through "charity,"—which "Jimmy," looking through his natural eyes and hence seeing it for what it really is, had hoped to avoid,—a basket containing less than ten days' food-supply for the actual needs of a family of their size,—"Mrs. Wiggs" sees in it a supply sufficient for the entire "Patch" for nobody knows how long.

With the death of the thoughtful "Jimmy" she lays aside the rosy glasses for a short space and suffers the natural pain of a natural woman. And what relief we feel to find the writer able to give us a true touch of nature!

It is only a touch, however; for further days of extreme poverty follow, and these are lightly passed over. Though they cause the rosy glasses to droop a little on "Mrs. Wiggs's" nose, in spite of herself, as soon as the most pressing physical needs are again relieved through charity, the rosy glasses are again carefully and cheerfully adjusted.

She is now asked, one day, by the bestower of the charity: "Don't you ever worry?" and she answers (with the tendency to forgetfulness induced by the rose glasses), "Some folks goes right under when trouble comes, but I carry mine fur and easy." Under pressure of the questioner the rose color fades a little, and she is brought to confess that she has worried once at least in her life,—to her credit! From her account of that experience we learn that the "worry" consisted in trying to think how she might plan to raise a small sum of money for her little children in the event of her death. But as she didn't die, she reasserts her philosophy, triumphant, and exclaims: "You mark my words, it ain't never no use puttin'

up your umbrell' till it rains." What she means by this remark it is a little difficult to interpret. It may express a confusion of thought between the value of having an umbrella at all and the practice of keeping it raised all the time; or it may mean that after one is dead it is time enough to provide for the helpless ones left here. But if we look with her through her rose-colored glasses we shall see that it means that there is never any need for "umbrells" in this rosy world where it never really rains!—for where it never really rains, of course, no one ever really dies!

Our wonderful philosopher believes in "gittin as much good outen life as you kin;" but adds, "not that I ever set out to look for happiness; seems like the folks that do that never finds it."

Here we have an addition to her philosophy. We learn, now, that not only are we to look through rose-colored glasses, when we look at all, but that for one thing—happiness—we are not even to look! This one thing can be found only by reversing another natural process; to find this we must either not look at all, or find it by looking for something else. To her way of seeing there is, therefore, nothing unmoral or uneconomical in getting by indirect means that which might be had by direct; nor in getting as much as possible of something that you want, without working at all for it; nor in being wholly defrauded of that for which you have put forth true effort.

In response to this wisdom of hers, the little charity-dispenser says to her, impulsively, "You have taught me lots of things; you are one of the best and happiest women that I know." (The little charity-dispenser was very happy just then herself, in the hope of getting at her "Bob" through her visits to "Mrs. Wiggs"—visits which, in the simplicity of mind induced by her red glasses, "Mrs. Wiggs" credits entirely to a disposition to "go clean out of their way to be good" to her!)

And she replies: "Well, I guess I ain't the best by a long sight, but I may be the happiest. An' I got cause to be; four of the smartest children that ever lived, a nice

house, fair to middlin' health when I ain't got the rheumatiz, and folks always going clean out of their way to be good to me!"

And she sums up her life to the time when we parted with her, under the same old shanty roof where we first made her acquaintance: "An' they're going to get married (referring to the two lovers who have 'gone out of their way' to dispense charity to her while in search of each other), an' Billy's got promoted, an' Asia's got a place, an' Chris'll have a new peg stick. Looks like ever'thing comes right in the world, if we jes' wait long enough."

There is no direct improvement in her own life, and no addition to her own purely individual happiness; but this does not offend her sense of justice, nor raise a question in her mind. And here we have subtly impressed upon us a further characteristic of her philosophy,—that self-abnegation is right and beautiful and necessary; that we should find our happiness entirely through the happiness of others. This fits in perfectly with the second characteristic of her philosophy, already noticed.

But seeking happiness for ourselves through seeking happiness for others is still seeking happiness for ourselves. "Mrs. Wiggs's" pretense thinly masks the truth. And seeking happiness through seeking happiness for others is an indirect, uncertain, and often costly pursuit, with as often an unsuccessful issue; this is well illustrated in "Mrs. Wiggs's" own life. Further than this, if we close our eyes to our own needs what guide have we to the needs of others or they to ours?

"Mrs. Wiggs" has not been trained to use her natural powers of observation and comparison and judgment, and is unacquainted with her own power of reason. She has been trained to suppose that she sees only roseate hues through the glasses that have been imposed upon her, and has been taught to accept "without fussing" and with "thankfulness" whatever has come her way—red glasses and the instruction accompanying them, included,—as she prays the Lord to "make" her Sunday-school children do.

Yet she has in reality not looked at all through rose-colored glasses, but through smoked

glasses;—glasses darkened by all the errors of the past.

If the simplicity of ignorance is philosophy, then this is worthy of the name.

Such a philosophy could not fail to affect her religion, unless indeed the religion should be held responsible for the philosophy. Seeing as she sees, juggling superstitiously as she juggles for happiness, pretending to ignore herself as she pretends, how should she know God as a God of law, and order, and justice, and as "no respecter of persons?" She does not so know Him. Though she has been taught by word of mouth to give Him these attributes, she has been taught more effectively by the practices of her teachers and by the practices of her own life to see Him as erratic; as arbitrary; as unrelated to her directly, but related to her through "chosen ministers," human beings like herself; she sees Him resolved not to give happiness where it is worked for, but where it pleases Him to give it,—for apparently He gives nothing as a reward for labor; she sees Him bringing everything out "all right" if you "wait long enough" and "make no fuss," and when all goes to those who do nothing, and all is withheld from those who toil, this is the "right" that satisfies her.

Transplant "Mrs. Wiggs" to Phenicia, and she would worship Moloch as readily as she now and here worships a being whom she is taught to call God. It is indeed Moloch whom she does worship, though she does not know it.

That all the want, and misery, and joylessness of her life should appear "right" to her is due to the fact that she has looked through the eyes of the "scribes and pharisees;"—those teachers, preachers, kindergartners, high priests of special privilege,—under whatever name they go as busy now as ever, who, charging others to "be content" and "not to fuss," thus "bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on other men's shoulders."

The demand for patience under wrong has ever come from those interested in gaining or in retaining unfair advantages over their fellows.

The patient acceptance of

wrong has never been endured by an enlightened man or woman.

One unspoiled stamp of nature is indeed revealed in "Mrs. Wiggs." She loves joy. But her false training makes her do that which honest men and women have been unable to do,—ignore the fact that the social order in which she lives, by restricting her freedom to employ herself usefully and naturally, and by meanly rewarding her toil when she labors, has denied to her the just grounds for joy. It has made her consent to wear a mask instead of her true face.

For "Mrs. Wiggs's" life is not the happy one that she and Miss Hegan pretend that it is. The best pages in the book give proof enough of this to satisfy the careful and sympathetic reader, and to remove the false mask.

Yet in harmony with the false teaching of the whole book Miss Hegan attempts the deception that in this "mud and scum of things" "Mrs. Wiggs" did actually "sing!"

"Mrs. Wiggs" is unfortunately a fairly true character, or true in the main lines. Hers is the life of a slave to traditional errors of belief that fasten her down to poverty with chains which she alone cannot rend.

She is, moreover, a slave who does not know that she is a slave. This is her additional handicap. This prevents her from taking that individual part in the progress of mankind which is given to every man and woman to take,—and even to the little child—the part of natural protest. Because of this, she acquiesces in and so supports wrong. The spirit of revolt, which Mr. Ernest Crosby, in his splendid verse, has called "the spirit of life," is dumb in "Mrs. Wiggs."

Had the writer felt the degradation of such a life as this which she has, not without some skill, painted for us; had she known the degrading power of the ideas which were responsible for it; had the need for truer and higher ideas dawned upon her mind, and had she known the possibility of the redemption of such a life through freedom and justice, she might have given us a book which would have been worthy to stand in the

company of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and "David Copperfield." But there is no hint that she sees either the life to be degraded or the ideas to be degrading.

Has she not been wearing other people's glasses, and very old people's at that?

This little story, we are told, was written "simply to amuse." It has been advertised as "a sure cure for the blues;" as "full to the brim of wit, wisdom and humanity." The publishers are said to have received a much-worn copy of the book from a Sunday-school missionary in the Colorado mining district, who believes that the writer "deserves to be ordained as a minister of the Gospel!"

But if we look for "Mrs. Wiggs" in actual life,—and we shall find her if we look—and if we are capable of discriminating between the things which tend to the uplifting of human life and the things which tend to its degradation, we shall see even less cause for laughter in the life held down by such bonds as hold "Mrs. Wiggs," than we find in the victims of the unfree institutions of the era of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and of "David Copperfield."

The gospel of the "Cabbage Patch" is not the gospel of truth, or of love, or of light; but the gospel of sham, and artificiality, and unrighteousness. It offers a righteousness superior to Nature's righteousness; and how many have fallen victims to its tinselly glamour!

Red glasses and "red lights" are both intended to deceive. There can be no righteous substitute for our own natural sight if we would know the true nature of things, and so learn how to deal with them.

To consent to wear the mask of happiness is to degrade truth. There is no better reason for pretending that we are happy, than for pretending we are rich, or virtuous, or anything else that we are not. And none who are prevented from receiving their just share of the provisions of nature, through the excessive appropriation of others, should in righteousness be content until they have compelled a restoration to themselves of their rightful share. But this compulsion should be the compulsion of the power of truth. It should come

through the education of ourselves and others in the knowledge of the cause of the unequal distribution of the resources of nature. Let our "Mrs. Wiggsses" be educated in this knowledge, rather than encouraged in an ignoble content with injustice, and they will soon cease to bar the way to their own and the general progress.

To allow ourselves to believe that "happiness is the one door which to him that knocks is never opened;" the one thing which, if we openly and directly seek, we shall never find, is to distrust the natural order and to let ourselves into a quagmire of sophistry. We may seek for happiness and miss it by seeking it through the acquisition of things which have no power to impart it. This does not prove, however, that we must not seek it; but that in order to seek it successfully, we must know what things have power to impart it.

To imagine that we must efface self, that we must put ourselves out of our own thoughts, or put ourselves last in the order of thought, is to take from under our feet the foundation stone of service to others. "Know thyself." "To thine own self be true." "As ye would that others should do to you." These maxims of wisdom call for the profoundest self-consideration, to the end that we may justly and truly consider others.

If intelligently read and consciously indorsed, therefore, no book is better adapted to retard the progress of the world than this seemingly "little" story of the life of "the Cabbage Patch."

LIZZIE NYE NORTHPROP.

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, Dec. 12.—In the search for a Democratic presidential candidate the eyes of Democrats have, at last, been turned towards Rhode Island. To-day's New York Times, Louisville Courier, Journal, and other newspapers state that Governor Garvin's name has been under serious consideration for several days by a number of Democratic Congressmen and that the speech of Congressman Granger, of Rhode Island, yesterday was but part of a plan to formally launch a boom for Governor Garvin.

The reasons publicly advanced in his favor are:

First—"He is the only Democrat, except Judge Parker, who has carried a

Northern or Eastern State since Bryan was first nominated for President."

Second—"While Rhode Island's electoral vote is small, if Governor Garvin is satisfactory to the State he may be supposed to be satisfactory to New York and other Eastern States," and it might be added that the Democrats have never before carried Rhode Island twice in succession.

Third—"He is conspicuously identified with the issue of anti-graft, and if the Democratic campaign cry for next year is 'Turn the rascals out,' he will be a platform in himself."

Fourth—"He has always been regular and should be satisfactory to the West and the South."

It could also with equal truth be pointed out that both in 1902 and this year when he was the Democratic candidate for governor he ran way ahead of every other candidate, last year receiving 4,000 more votes than the candidate for lieutenant governor, 5,000 in excess of the candidates for treasurer and for attorney general, 6,000 in excess of the candidate for secretary of state, and 4,500 more than the combined vote of the Congressional candidates in the two Rhode Island districts.

It is gratifying to observe that at last attention is being directed towards him as the logical candidate. The issues that L. F. C. Garvin has made his own in Rhode Island are those which should particularly commend him to the so-called conservative element of the party. His fight has been one against the shocking debauchery of the suffrage which has made Rhode Island almost a by word, while he has also exposed the grossly unequal and unjust apportionment under which the legislature of that State is elected.

If the conservatives really want a "safe" candidate it would seem that Gov. Garvin should fill the bill. In the extremely conservative State of Rhode Island (whose conservatism is shown in the failure of the people to rise as one man and unanimously demand that its infamous apportionment which continually nullifies the popular will shall no longer continue), he has been elected either to the Assembly or the Senate 13 times, was the Democratic candidate for Congress on four successive occasions, and has finally been twice elected Governor.

On the other hand, L. F. C. Garvin having for a score or more years upheld in season and out of season the standard of human liberty, of equal rights, and of opposition to special privileges, would be a candidate whom every progressive Democrat in the nation should feel proud to work for, conscious that if he were elected a steady progress would be made towards the ideal which radical Democrats have in mind—the complete extirpation of monopoly through the repeal of every statute law which favors the few at the expense of the many and

denies the Jeffersonian principle of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

It would seem the latter class in particular should be delighted at the consideration which is being given to Gov. Garvin as the Democratic presidential candidate, and should be willing to do all that is possible to acquaint the people of their respective communities (by letters to their leading newspapers and by enlisting the support of prominent Democrats of their locality—all of whom want a candidate who has demonstrated his vote-getting capacity) with his characteristics and his record, laying special emphasis upon the fact that his opposition to the grosser forms of political corruption and debauchery has in two successive years brought to his support thousands of men who did not vote for any other Democratic candidate. The defeat of Tom L. Johnson, in Ohio, discouraging as it was, will not have so depressing an effect on progressive Democrats when they realize that the governor of Rhode Island, an exponent of the same principles, is seriously considered as the Democratic nominee for the presidency.

That many people are groping around to discover the means of reserving for actual home seekers the small amount of the public domain which the great land and cattle companies have not yet fraudulently acquired, is shown in a bill introduced by Senator Hoar (by request), providing for the appropriation of a billion dollars and the setting aside of one hundred and forty million acres of the best public land to "provide homes and employment for the homeless poor and to make them self-sustaining home owners."

Meritorious as the purpose of the bill is, it discloses an entire lack of comprehension of the reasons why, even in so called good times, hundreds of thousands if not millions of able bodied men are unable to find work. At the same time it exhibits the paternalistic instinct to a remarkable degree, the author evidently being imbued with the idea that the government must act as a stepfather to everyone desirous of establishing a home on public lands. Nor has the author any doubt of his ability to arbitrarily decide in advance what proportion of the 140,000,000 acres should be devoted to various uses. With wonderful prescience he has determined that exactly three-fourths of this land must be of the best quality arable lands; 32,000,000 acres (not 33,000,000 or 35,000,000) must be of the best timber land; 1,000,000 acres (no more nor less) to contain coal deposits sufficient to supply 20,000,000 people (no more nor less) with coal forever; an equal number of acres to supply "stone" forever, and a third million acres to supply all the needed "metals" forever.

That the homeseekers could deter-

mine for themselves whether they were better adapted to putting "arable," "timber," "stone," "coal," or "mineral" land to the best use never occurs to this, paternalistic individual.

That the homestead and other land entry laws afford unlimited opportunities for fraud recent exposures of land frauds show, but no one other than Republicans and socialists (both paternalistic) assumes that any government possesses the wisdom to allocate the identical one-quarter section and the identical quality of land best adapted to the capacities of varying individuals—even if justice could be done in such a manner. That the existing laws require amendment in the direction of securing to every applicant equal opportunity, there can be no doubt. Whether a bill can be framed which will insure this is not quite clear, but it is hoped that the best equipped minds on this subject, those most fully informed thereon, will endeavor to formulate a bill which will mitigate the evils of the existing system, more especially the preventing of the corraling of immense tracts under one ownership—whether of an individual or a company. One of its provisions should probably provide for a reappraisal of the land every fifth year; and also, should any territory containing land so rented to individual homeseekers paying an annual rental value of say four per cent., based upon such five-year appraisements, be admitted to the Union, that the constitution of the newly admitted State shall provide for a continuance of this method of land tenure, thus insuring the perpetuation of the system after the State is formed. One of the suggestions is that a small loan should be made by the general government to each homeseeker repayable in ten equal annual payments.

A glance over the bill drawn by ex-Commander Richmond P. Hobson, to appropriate an aggregate of \$2,500,000,000 between now and 1925 shows that I missed the real motive underlying this measure. Two of the reasons enumerated are "to establish its supremacy upon the navigable waters of the world in order to promote the welfare of the United States . . . and advance everywhere the cause of peace and justice among the nations of the earth." The latter is a most laudable object.

In order to aid in promoting the welfare of individuals in the United States, I am considering the advisability of introducing a bill appropriating \$750,000,000 for the purchase of a rapid fire rifle of the latest model, two self-acting revolvers, a bowie knife, and the requisite ammunition, for every adult male in the country; my idea being, that if the best way to promote the welfare of the United States among the nations of the world is by the expenditure of two and a half billion dollars for the navy, it must be equally true that it is the most effica-

cious way to promote the welfare of individuals. Therefore, no expense, not even \$750,000,000 is too large a price to pay for private weapons to advance the cause of peace and justice among our eighty millions of people. In order to insure the very best results the measure should provide that heavy penalties be imposed upon those who fail to carry these messengers of peace on any and all occasions.

How strange that the meek and lowly Jesus did not think of this plan to advance peace and justice. Perhaps he was deterred by its cost! They did not have billion dollar congresses in those days. The Sanhedrin, however, doubtless would have welcomed such a Christian plan. How fortunate the United States is in having this young Richmond spring up with so simple a plan to establish universal peace and justice. Some foolish people have said "the pen is mightier than the sword." It is, but only when wielded in a cause like that which has inspired Hobson to formulate so magnificent a solvent of international jealousies—and then only because it inspires people to turn their ploughshares into swords and their steam-engines into gatling guns.

ROBERT BAKER.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 17.

Public hearings on the traction question (p. 567) have continued during the week before the local transportation committee of the Chicago city council.

These hearings relate to the tentative ordinance proposed by the sub-committee for granting a 20-year charter to the Chicago City Railway (the south side system), which is owned by local capitalists, in settlement of all franchise claims, including the claim to a 99-year grant.

The interests of the Union Traction Co. (controlling the north and the west side systems), which is owned by Eastern capitalists, have come to a hearing in the Federal court before Judge Grosscup, upon application of the receivers of the company (p. 535) for permits to change the character of their motive power. Argument began on the 10th. At its close on the 11th Judge Grosscup announced that he would not consider the 99-year grant at this time, but would defer that point until the termination of the truce, January 16 (p. 535), when, in view

of the magnitude of the interests and the importance of the questions involved, he would ask another Federal judge to sit with him. It is inferred that this judge will be Associate Justice Day, of the Supreme Court. On the minor question Judge Grosscup preserved decision.

## NEWS NOTES.

—The Panama junta on the 12th convoked a constitutional convention for January 15.

—William L. Johnson, brother of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland, died at Detroit on the 13th.

—The body of Herbert Spencer (p. 568) was cremated on the 14th, Leonard Courtney, M. P., delivering the funeral address.

—Wm. J. Bryan, in the course of his tour abroad (p. 568), was received in private audience by Pope Pius X on the 13th.

—Dr. Frank Burr Mallory, of Harvard Medical school, is credited with discovering that the germ of scarlet fever is of animal and not of vegetable origin.

—The German reichstag, which convened on the 3d (p. 568), took a recess on the 15th until January 1, after an acrimonious debate on Socialistic politics.

—On the 12th William R. Hearst added to his New York, Chicago and San Francisco daily newspapers one at Los Angeles, Cal.—the Los Angeles Examiner.

—At a meeting of the national committee of the Prohibition party on the 16th it was decided to call the national convention to meet at Kansas City June 29.

—The London Daily Mail reported on the 14th the invention of a successful combination of the telephone and the phonograph, whereby telephonic messages are automatically recorded.

—The Rev. Edward Everett Hale, the distinguished writer and Unitarian clergyman of Boston, has been appointed chaplain of the United States Senate and has accepted the appointment.

—At the municipal election in Boston on the 15th Mayor Patrick Collins was reelected by 48,851 to 22,286, or 26,565 plurality, the largest plurality ever received by a mayoralty candidate in the history of the city.

—The first national conference of building contractors was held at Chicago on the 10th. It organized the National Building Contractors' Alliance. In framing the constitution the "open shop" policy was voted down.

—By a vote of 57 to 18 the bill to carry into effect the Cuban reciprocity treaty (p. 537) was adopted by the United States Senate on the 16th. This bill having been adopted by the House at



the special session, now goes to the President.

—At a meeting of the Republican national committee, held at Washington on the 12th, it was decided by a vote of 43 to 8 to hold the next national convention of the party in the Coliseum at Chicago, on Tuesday, June 21. Chicago capitalists pledge \$75,000 for expenses.

—After negotiations extending over a period of three years (vol. v, pp. 199, 215 and 235) the Philippine friars agreed with Gov. Taft on the 17th to sell all their lands but 12,000 acres to the Philippine government. The area to be transferred aggregates 403,000 acres, and the price agreed upon is \$7,250,000.

—The central federation of labor unions of New York city has united with the Free Speech League to support the latter's efforts to secure the release of John Turner (p. 563), the Englishman charged with "disbelieving in organized government" and now awaiting deportation at New York.

—Governor L. F. C. Garvin, of Rhode Island, will deliver an address on "The Mistake of Modern Civilization" at a public meeting under the auspices of the Massachusetts Single Tax League at Union Hall, 48 Boylston street, Boston, on Monday evening, Dec. 21. William Lloyd Garrison will preside.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (see p. 522) for the five months ending November 30, 1903, as given by the November Treasury sheet, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	\$612,282,814	\$465,156,594	\$207,126,220 exp.
G	11,545,937	34,000,881	22,454,944 imp.
S	16,616,390	11,860,613	4,755,777 exp.
	\$640,445,141	\$461,018,088	\$189,427,053 exp.

**PRESS OPINIONS.**

**NATIONAL POLITICS.**

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 10.—If New York is to designate the man, she should put forward one whom democratic Democrats can support without apology or reservation. He need not be a free silver man, since the silver question is no longer paramount and hosts of democratic Democrats never laid deep stress upon it. He need not have gone as far as some have done in certain other directions. But at least he must now be in sympathy with an open and unqualified and aggressive champion of the deep underlying principles of Democracy. He must stand utterly for the Declaration of Independence. He must have no part nor lot with imperialism abroad nor with despotism at home. He must be against privilege in every one of its essential forms. He must stand for unfettered trade. He must be at war with plutocracy in all its guises. He must have no apology to offer on behalf of the trusts. He must be outright and forthright for the liberty of the individual and for the destruction of every force which threatens it. And he must be able to command the confidence of the 6,500,000 Democrats who refused to be bought, coerced or frightened into supporting the candidate and the policies of the party of privilege either in 1896 or 1900. Such a man we believe is Edward M. Shep-

ard. Were New York in good faith to raise his standard we feel convinced that the democratic Democrats of the nation would flock to it with one accord. He is all that Parker can be and much more than he seems likely to prove.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Dec. 12.—There is one man that is recognized by the great majority of Democrats as the leader of their party, but he has twice led them to defeat, and has emphatically declared that it is his desire to step aside and give another the post of honor. Yet when the rank and file of the party turn from him, they find no man to take command. . . . In Bryan the new Democracy is typified. He is the Non-hearted leader whose call to arms would awaken the now listless hosts of Democracy and inspire them with zeal and courage that would lead on to victory, if victory be possible. He is the greatest, the strongest living Democrat—the ideal of the masses, the man to whom the rank and file turn as the French turned to Napoleon in exile at Elba. Another Waterloo may face Democracy, but if it must go to defeat, let it go to defeat with honor. . . . Mr. Bryan has twice led the party to defeat. True, but could any man have led it to victory? . . . Circumstances, the logic of the situation, the current of affairs, inevitability, if you please, mark William J. Bryan, whether he will or no, the most available and strongest leader for the Democracy in the presidential campaign upon which American people are about to enter.

**THE ANTI-ANARCHIST LAW.**

Liberty (an.), Dec.—It is not generally known that the new anti-anarchist law not only authorizes the deportation of aliens disbelieving in organized government, but provides long terms of imprisonment for American citizens inviting such aliens to these shores. If I were to invite my friend John Henry Mackay to this country to pay me a social visit, I could be imprisoned for years under this law. But John Henry Mackay, residing in Berlin, can invite me to visit him there without danger of interference on the part of Emperor William, provided always that during my sojourn I do not speak with unseemly levity of the emperor's mustache. Which is the freer country, the United States or Germany?

Springfield (Mass.), Republican (Ind.), Dec. 11 (weekly ed.).—The ability of the anti-anarchist clauses of the immigration law to make martyrs to free thought is being signally illustrated in the agitation that has arisen in New York city over the deportation of John Turner, the English labor organizer. . . . The conclusion cannot be avoided that in prohibiting the presence in this country of men simply because they "disbelieve" in the government which exists in this stage of civilization, Congress acted without realizing the effect and bearing of its legislation. A man like Turner cannot be driven out of America, as Roger Williams was driven out of Massachusetts two and one-half centuries ago, without increasing his influence and importance a thousand-fold, and thus defeating the very purpose which Congress had chiefly in mind.

**MEANING OF TRADE UNIONISM.**

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 14.—Granting that unionism is the cause of labor disturbance, what is the cause of unionism? What is the force which has driven workmen to combine and against whom or what are they organizing? Is their drawing together in solid bodies a mere whim, a caprice, a fantastic bit of tomfoolery? Or is it the result of outside pressure? Do working people give up a certain part of their independence and become subject to rules and orders simply for the fun of the thing? Or are they driven to this resort as the pioneers were driven in earlier days by the savage foe

who lurked in every valley and infested every mountain fastness? It is just as well to understand the situation and to face what it means. Organized labor means war on the part of labor a war of self-defense; on the part of the foe against which it is arrayed a war of aggression. It is idle to blink the truth.

**THE RACE QUESTION.**

Unity (rel.), Dec. 10.—The other day the editor of Unity encountered a stalwart looking Indian, who, in dress, manners and speech bespoke a man of culture, a successful man representing a liberal profession, who promptly proceeded to plead for the liberation of the Indian from the fetters of the "reservations," the "Indian school" and the "missionary camp." He said: "Let the Indian shift for himself. Give him citizenship. Put him into the public school. Make him earn his bread as if he were a white man. Give him a chance by letting him alone, and those of his race who deserve it will hold their own and those who must go to the wall will go." How about the Negro? we asked. "Give him the same chance, 'simply a man's chance.'"

**RESPECTABLE CRIME.**

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Dec. 15.—A Chicago clergyman in his sermon Sunday classified John D. Rockefeller and the trust magnates with highway robbers. There is no difference, he declared, between a monopolist and a footpad. In expressing this view of the monopolist, the Chicago clergyman gave utterance to an opinion that is quite generally shared by the public.

**IN CONGRESS.**

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 33 of that publication.

Washington, Dec. 7-14, 1903.

**Senate.**

The special session convened on the 7th at 11:30 and adjourned without day at 12 o'clock noon (vol. 37, p. 424).

Immediately thereafter and at the hour of 12 noon, the regular session began. Senator Frye, of Maine, being in the chair (vol. 33, p. 1) as president pro tempore. After a brief recess President Roosevelt's annual message was read (pp. 2-11), whereupon the Senate resumed consideration (p. 13) of the measure (H. B. 1921) to carry into effect the Cuban treaty.

On the 8th the postal department investigation and the Cuban treaty were considered; and consideration of the latter subject was continued on the 9th (p. 58), 10th (p. 97) 11th (p. 120) and 12th (p. 154).

**House.**

The House assembled in regular session on Monday, December 7 (p. 15) at noon, and after listening to the reading of President Roosevelt's message (p. 13), and transacting some routine business, adjourned to the 8th, when a resolution regarding the Isle of Pines (p. 46) was adopted (p. 48). No business of general interest was done on the 9th, nor any on the 10th beyond directing the judiciary committee to consider the impeachment of Charles Swaine, United States district judge for the northern district of Florida (pp. 99-107). After desultory discussion on the 11th, adjournment was taken to the 14th.

**Record Notes.**—President Roosevelt's message in full (pp. 2-11). Text of treaty with Republic of Panama, as reported by New York Sun (p. 64). Speech of Senator Teller on Cuban reciprocity (p. 80). Resolution for inquiry into Colorado labor troubles (p. 117).

Crawford—I notice they are all the time eliminating studies in the colleges.

Crabshaw—Yes, and finding new things to teach in the public schools.—Puck.

## MISCELLANY

### O, GENERATION OF—?

For The Public.

Soon Christmas chimes will peal again,  
And Christendom catch up the song  
Of "Peace on earth; good will to men,"  
Which burst from the lips of the angel  
throng;  
But how shall it fit the lips of those  
Who count the rest of mankind as foes?

O, shame! that humanity's great love-  
feast  
Should be kept with the leaven of greed  
and hate;

With base indulgence of ravenous beast,  
While Lazarus starves beside the gate;  
While the "White Man's burden" breaks  
the back  
Of helpless Yellow, and Brown, and Black.

O, shame! that after all these years  
Of Pharisaic prayer and song,  
The world is yet full of blood and tears—  
The hellish vintage of greed and wrong:  
Earth's toiling millions—O, what to them  
Is the song that was sung o'er Bethlehem?

Was that glad evangel of One who saves,  
That song of peace and good-will to men,  
But a cruel mocking of Mammon's slaves,  
But a gleam of hope—and despair again?  
Did that light shine forth for a little space  
Just to make earth darker for Adam's  
race?

B. J. RADFORD.

Eureka, Ill.

### PRIVILEGE IN CRIME.

"Run, Jimmy! De cop's comin'," one  
street urchin shouted to another in an  
alley between Clark and La Salle  
streets the other afternoon.

"Run, nothin'!" said Jimmy. "I ain't  
done nothin' but what other fellers does,  
an' I'm goin' to stick."

The two boys had been playing craps  
in the alley and the one who had got  
alarmed had been on the lookout for  
policemen. At the approach of the blue-  
coat he fled, but his companion held his  
ground.

"I saw you boys shooting craps," the  
policeman said to Jimmy. "You had  
better come with me."

"What do you want to take me for?"  
Jimmy answered. "Is it against the law  
to roll dice?"

"It certainly is."

"Well, why don't you pinch a few  
dozen guys w'ats playing in the saloon  
here?" the boy retorted, pointing to the  
back door.

"What's that got to do with my taking  
you?"

"It's got a lot. 'Cause if you takes me  
I'm going to prefer charges against you  
for allowing dice in these saloons. I've  
seen playing in a lot of 'em."

The policeman walked away and left  
Jimmy in undisputed possession of the  
ground and his dice.—Chicago Chronicle.

### THE VIRTUES OF "BARBAROUS" PEOPLES.

Apropos of the article entitled "An  
Indian Virtue," in The Public of Nov. 7,  
I wish to draw attention to an article, or  
rather a letter, that appeared in The  
Evening Post (New York) about 1892,  
and which may have been printed in  
The Nation also. The letter was written  
from Lexington, Mo., by a George—  
(King, my memory is), and was about  
the virtue of the women of the Northern  
Cheyennes in the fifties, before those In-  
dians had come in contact with the  
white man. It was to the effect that in  
a village of over 2,000 persons of this  
tribe, not one woman was unchaste. It  
seems that the writer of that letter was  
on the plains in those early days and  
wintered with that particular tribe.

Barbarous nations appear always to be  
examples to more "civilized" nations in  
matters of personal honor. Thus I have  
always read that the Zulus were on a  
par with the Northern Cheyennes as to  
chastity so long as they were uncon-  
quered by the English. The Turk al-  
ways kept faith (treaties) until Cardinal  
Julan persuaded Ladislaw, king of  
Hungary, to the perfidy of breaking a  
twenty-year truce within a few months  
after it was concluded, in the hope of  
catching the Turk unawares; but they  
were not quick enough, and both re-  
mained on the field of the most disas-  
trous battle, that of St. Martin's Eve,  
that the Hungarians ever fought with  
the Turk. The rout was so complete  
that their bodies could not be carried off  
the field.

R. W. BARKLEY.

### OUR "RACE PROBLEM" PUZZLES A FRENCHMAN.

An extract from an article by Booker T.  
Washington, entitled "Observations and  
Comparisons Abroad," published in the In-  
dependent of November 19, 1903.

Some very intelligent Frenchmen,  
notably one of the editors of the  
Figaro, have been traveling lately in  
America. The more this class of peo-  
ple see of America, the more puzzled  
they are over what is called the race  
problem, and they ask some very in-  
teresting questions. For example, this  
editor of the Figaro asked me why it  
was that in the District of Columbia  
all races could ride on the same seats  
in the street cars, but in Alexandria,  
only six miles away, they had to occupy  
separate seats. He also asked me why  
in certain railroad restaurants the Ne-  
gro could stand at the counter and eat,  
but would be put out if he sat down  
to eat. For the life of me I could not  
make him understand that to stand up  
and eat was not regarded in some sec-

tions as a social act, while to sit down  
was so regarded. Then he asked me  
why Chinamen or Indians could ride in  
a first-class car anywhere in America,  
and Negroes could not. He also asked  
me why Negroes could as mechanics  
build houses in Atlanta, the home of  
Robert Toombs, and could not erect  
houses in Boston, the home of Garrison.  
Then he asked me why white men and  
black men drank liquors in the same  
barroom, but could not, in many parts  
of America, drink the communion wine  
together in the same church. The  
average Frenchman is mighty interest-  
ing. Color prejudice is especially dif-  
ficult for him to understand in the face  
of the fact that one of their greatest  
literary characters, Alexandre Dumas,  
whose works can be found in nearly  
every private and public library in the  
world, was a colored man.

### MR. MULLIGAN PAYS HONOR TO WHOM HONOR IS DUE.

For The Public.

"How are ye, Donovan? Sure, Oi see  
be the poiper that John D. Rockyfelly,  
joonyer, is a greaat interpreter av th'  
Scriptures. He says it is betther to give  
sympathy than money. It's a good mon  
that wud choose the hardest job—and  
Rockefelly has done it. It wud be no  
trouuble fer him to give money; sure,  
he has schlathers av it. But to give  
sympathy, there's the rub, fer a mon  
loike Rockyfelly. He near bankroopted  
hisself in that raygard whin he was  
performing the arjuous labor av argan-  
oizing the Sthandard Ile thrust. Ivery  
toime he crushed an indepindint consarn  
his greaat heart wud schwell oop loike  
to burst, and the bitter tears wud suf-  
fuse his laarge sympathetic eyes, and he  
wud trow his arrums around hissself in  
a lasht, sad, fond imbrace, and cry:  
'Alas! Alas! man's inhumanity to man  
makes countless thousands mourn!  
Wurra! Wurra! would that Oi moight  
lavish the raydoondant affictions av me  
tinder hearrt upon the bankroopted  
stockholders av the bushted instichoo-  
tion!' An' nothing wud console this na-  
ture's nobleman but delivering an ad-  
dress to his Soonday-school class!  
Shure, Donovan, there is the pint av dis-  
tinction achune a gud mon and a wicked  
wan. A gud mon'll always go to Soon-  
day school av a Soonda, while a wicked  
wan'll go fishin'. Don't tell me, Dono-  
van, that so pious a gintlemon as Mis-  
ther Rockyfelly isn't intoitled to live  
in several palaces; sure, hasn't he been  
collectin' raybates from the soulless  
railroad corporations this many a year,  
in order to rayjuice the price av ile to  
the suffering consumer?"

"He is the frind av the widdy and orphan, is Rockyfelly. Luk at the coal barons—they have permitted their stheck to git into the hands av widdies and arphans, well knowing that the strokers wud raise the divil and rayjuice the meager rayturnns to the inny-cint holder. Not so wid the Sthandard lle company. The widdy has none av its ile in her cruse—barrin' a half-gallon canful thot she paid tin cints fer; but she has Misther Rockyfelly's sympathy—an' phwat more cud she ax?"

"A loaf av bread moight answer, fer a change, Mr. Mulligan."

"A loaf av bread, is it, Donovan? Shure, a loaf av bread is gone in no toime, but Misther Rockyfelly's sympathy is iverlashting! Ye can buy bread wid money, but ye can't buy sympathy—it's priceless!

"It do tooch me heart, Donovan, whin Oi do be contimplatin' the jinnyrosity av Misther Rockyfelly. Wud ye lind me tin cints, Donovan? Oi'm dhry, and Oi hoven't the price av a whisky wid me."

"Oi will not. But Oi'll do better nor thot, Misther Mulligan."

"Phat'll ye do, Donovan?"

"Oi'll give ye my sympathy."

HORACE CLIFTON.

CONUNDRUMS.

For The Public.

Now that that fearfully absorbing and intensely interesting mathematical puzzle, "How Old Is Ann?" has been editorially, and, therefore, definitely decided by the editors of the funny picture newspapers, perhaps some of your serious-minded readers may think it worth while to scratch their heads over at least a few of the following conundrums, which, if not so popular, are, at least, as important to humanity, and especially to the city dweller: To wit:

Why is it that rents are the first thing to go up, and the last thing to come down?

Why is it that wages are the first thing to come down, and the last thing to go up?

Why is it that when ice is cheap, coal is dear; and vice versa?

Besides wages, mention something that has been reduced by the trusts.

Name one thing (except the ocean and the atmosphere) that is not, at present, owned and controlled by these Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given control of these United States.

When Jesus said: "The poor ye have with ye always," did he mean: "The poor ye will always have with ye?"

Why are the building trades' mechanics so anxious to strike in the summer, when wages are high, while in the win-

ter they would cheerfully shovel snow from their bosses' stoops to keep themselves and their families from starvation?

Why do the trades' unions limit the number of American apprentices (their own children) who are anxious to learn a trade, while they cheerfully admit any foreigner into their local assemblies who is willing to put up the initiation fee?

Why does Theodore Roosevelt insist on digging that canal by hook or by crook (especially crook), to facilitate the exchange of foreign commodities, while both he and his party foster a prohibitive tariff to exclude them?

Why is it that the industrious builder and farmer who improves his property, gives employment to labor and benefits humanity, is taxed more than the fellow who is just holding his equally desirable location, for a rise? Why? Why?

Why is it that articles manufactured in this country are sold cheaper in Europe than they are here?

Why is it that the men who do useful things for their fellow-men get so little, while the fellows who do nothing get so much, of the good things of this earth?

If, as the socialists proclaim, "the capitalists and machine owners are the despoilers of labor," why is it that according to Bradstreet, who ought to know, 95 per cent. of the business men and manufacturers (machine owners) bust up?

Why don't the people join one of Andrew Carnegie's 57 varieties, and read the works of Henry George, John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer, and, for dessert, tackle the bonny Scotchman's "Triumphant Democracy," and find out why it is that despite the wonderful improvements in machinery, the producers get a bare living?

DAN CAVANAGH.

New York City.

SAFEGUARDING THE PRESIDENT'S LIFE.

The Boston Herald's report of a sermon on the above subject, preached on Sunday morning, November 22, before the First Congregational society (Unitarian), Jamaica Plain, Mass., by the minister of the society, the Rev. Charles F. Doie.

Mr. Doie's address was, in part, as follows:

"It is a strange sight to witness the people of a democracy rushing with a sort of blind panic to undermine the principles upon which their own government rests. The anti-Anarchist laws which Congress passed after the death of Mr. McKinley illustrate what we mean. Make whatever laws are needful against actual crime, but recollect that free speech and free thought

and the independent character of the citizen are the very life blood of the republic. Shall we who assert religious freedom begin to prosecute or exile men for their political heresies? Would we really be unwilling to let Tolstoy come here to live?

"The proposal to make special legislation in favor of the life of the President seems another instance of what one is tempted to call the mob spirit, that acts, or votes, in passion or fear. The idea is to lift the person of the President into a special class above others. The idea is to have immediate vengeance on the murderer of a President. We must have lese majeste proceedings here in America! Will they pass a law next that every one must take off his hat as a president passes in the street?

"Every one ought to know that nothing is so futile as such special legislation. Life insurance for rulers is highest in Russia and Turkey, where cordons of soldiers guard the sovereign's person, and lowest of all in England, where political refugees of all shades of opinion have the right of asylum. The world has tried the experiment of a speedy death penalty for centuries, only to discover that the louder the threat of vengeance the more crime is produced. As for the criminal insanity which has proved so fatal to American Presidents, we can trace it to that same hysteria and sensationalism which demands to read all the sickening details of crime and tragedy, and delights to see the pictures of insane criminals in the morning newspaper. It is also a part of the exaggerated publicity of football games!

"It is not my wish, however, to treat our subject in a negative spirit, but to point out one democratic and hopeful way of protecting our Presidents and other precious lives. It is the opposite way from that which men are now considering. It is, in brief, to pass laws, and keep laws, for the safeguarding of all the humblest people in the land, and even of 'the stranger within our gates.'

"The President's person is as safe as the average citizen's, and he cannot by any device be rendered more secure than this. He must share in the risks of that stage of imperfect civilization in which all live together. If there is lynching committed in America, if unoffending Chinamen can be assaulted without process of law in the streets of Boston, without even an apology from the offending Massachusetts and federal officers, it is evident that the President's life is not, and cannot yet be, safe from violence. Let us believe that he would

not wish his life to be more secure than that of the man on the street."

The speaker went on to show that the same principle applies everywhere. The few have tried again and again to secure special protection for their property. The experience of the world is that no rich man can ever safeguard his property when the humble have no property to be safeguarded, or have no stake of their own in any common property interests.

"Riches, held only by the few, 'take to themselves wings.' The eternal laws command, in some form, what we in Massachusetts love to call a 'commonwealth.' Shall those who possess property, then, seek to hold it with a closer grip? The very reverse! They shall contrive that the fortunes and the interests of the many may be lifted to larger and larger opportunities. What else is at work in economic society to-day, but the inevitable and beneficent pressure of this law?

"The very essence of your 'gospel' or religion is here. Life is certainly not in trying to get all that one can, or to fence one's self about with special precautions and safeguards. Even the bodily health is much enfeebled with this fatal regime. Much more does the moral health of man depend upon his complete obedience to the vital law of the universe."

#### MR. BAKER AND THE NAVY FETISH.

Robert Baker, newly elected congressman from Brooklyn, has been jumped upon by all classes of newspapers because he refused to name a candidate for the naval school, at Annapolis, asserting as his reason that there is no excuse for training men in the art of murder. Mr. Baker is no soft-hearted, effeminate sentimentalist, nor is he a man of defective logical powers, as these journals would have us believe. I have known him for years, and I know him to be a man of peculiarly keen observation and intellect. And the fact is that he told the simple truth. There is no excuse whatever for teaching our promising young men the best way of slaughtering their fellowmen. The idea that somebody might "attack" us, is the product of an unbalanced brain. There is a well-known disease (I think they call it paranoia) which ends in softening of the brain, and death, and which presents as its first symptom the belief that people are conspiring against the victim. A man of this kind came into my office some months ago, thinking that I was practicing law, and after

carefully shutting the door, and looking round suspiciously to make sure that there was no spy present, he explained to me in whispers that he was pursued by conspirators, and appealed to me for protection against them. I saw at once what the matter was, and I told him frankly that I believed that he was suffering from hallucination, and this belief of his was a common symptom of mental derangement. He smiled at me in a patronizing way (precisely as our patriots do when I tell them the same thing), and assured me that he was well acquainted with the delusions to which I referred, but that his case was quite different. Seeing that I could make no impression upon him, and having no desire to add him to the list of my regular callers, I advised him to move to some other city, leaving no trace of his whereabouts behind, and especially not to let me know where he was going, and I have not heard from him since. An acquaintance of his told me afterwards that he was hopelessly insane. Now, our statesmen are suffering from this form of paranoia, but, unfortunately, it is not so easy to get rid of them. Nobody in the world is going to attack us. They may cite the fact that men usually have revolvers in their houses as a protection against burglars, and that nations should take similar precautions. It would be easy to prove from the newspapers that the household revolver kills ten innocent people for every burglar; but let that go. The cases are absolutely dissimilar. We arm ourselves against burglars, but we do not arm ourselves against Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown, who live next door, and dine at our tables, and sit opposite us at church. Now, there are no burglar nations, but we actually arm ourselves as a nation against our friends and equals. Imagine a man setting up a battery along his neighbor's fence and practicing to find the range of his house, and yet pretending to be on good terms with him! The thing is, of course, ludicrous in the extreme, and only explicable on the hypothesis of incipient insanity. Mr. Root has been paying visits abroad, and he has been a guest at the country homes of English statesmen. He might have gone in the same way to the homes of the rulers of France and Germany. How he would have resented the imputation that Mr. Balfour or President Loubet or the German chancellor might be lying in ambush for him, and preparing to kidnap him or assassinate him! And yet, when it is suggested that these same

people as statesmen intend to "attack" us as a nation, at once we begin to pile up \$5,000,000 battleships and beat the woods for recruits. Clearly, the whole thing is pathological.

And one of the most amusing arguments brought against the common-sense objections to this crazy militarism is that such objections are sentimental, and that the militarists are stern, clear-sighted, matter-of-fact individuals, who meet real conditions with real business-like wisdom—while the fact is that they are all daft with shadowy sentiments. Patriotism, Old Glory, the union, the army and navy—they are ready to lose their heads over anything that can be written with a capital initial, without ever onethinking of analyzing the truth or falsehood for which the epithet may stand. Patriotism, flags, unions, armies and navies—were made, like the Sabbath, for man, and to worship them, as ends in themselves, is sentimentalism run mad. Mr. Baker has been analyzing this navy fetish, and he has come to the conclusion, as every other unprejudiced man must, that it is the focus of extravagance, pride, bluster, hatred and murder, and that the sooner we are delivered from it the better. He may have the satisfaction of knowing that at some time in the dim future the rest of the world will catch up with him. Meanwhile I doubt if the attacks made upon him by the whole lunatic asylum disturb him much.—Ernest Crosby, in The Whim.

#### IF THE SALT HAVE LOST ITS SAVOR.

We had an evangelist at the Brattle street church last week, and I went to please the folks. I always do when she asks me that way. He is a good man, and he said a lot of good things, and I was glad I went for what I got out of it, besides the fact that it pleased the folks.

I remember where he was talking to the business man who is a pretty clean fellow, and does about what he thinks is right, and guesses that is as near as a man can get. He gave the business man full credit for his fine, moral life, but no credit for inventing it; all he has in that way he inherited from centuries of Christian influences. And that's true. But when he absents himself from church he is cutting himself off from the foundations of his virtue. It can't last more than one generation without going back to its source. In a word, he condemned the self-sufficiency of the merely moral man of the world. Self-sufficiency—it struck me all at once there

is the answer to the question why men don't go to church.

Not the self-sufficiency of the men, but the self-sufficiency of the churches.

Come, they say, and we will show you the Christ! And they lead us to his empty tomb.

Now, I have no right to find fault with the church for its shortcomings, and I do not. I agree that it is silly to criticize the church, simply because not all who profess and call themselves Christians are perfect.

But I do submit that when the church offers to show us the Christ it ought to do it. And it doesn't.

He comes to loose the prisoner's chains,  
To set the captive free.

That was true for 18 centuries before the church found it out. I suppose Christians have sung hymns something like that ever since they hid in the catacombs. But it was only a few years ago that the church learned that the spirit of Jesus made slavery impossible.

In all those years the spirit of Jesus has not penetrated the consciousness of the church.

I do not blame the church for that; do not even criticize it. It has been seeking the Christ always, coming nearer to him always. And if it had been confessedly seeking him it would have had inexpugnable claims to all it professed.

But it has believed that it had Jesus caged in its shrines. And that was not true.

Now the evangelist would say that slavery has been abolished some forty years and that the church did after all lead in abolishing it, wherefore my criticism is picking flaws that do not exist.

That is my very complaint. Slavery is not abolished. And the church is as blind to its prevalence as it was all the eighteen centuries during which chattel slavery flourished.

Pious Massachusetts to-day is engaged in the murder of childhood in the cotton mills of the South. If the spirit of Jesus had penetrated the church that had been impossible.

I do not say that hideous crime is the fault of the church; I do not blame the pious men who commit it. Individually they are doubtless as charming and chivalrous as the old slaveholders. But they do not know Jesus or they could not tolerate this crime. And the church to which they belong is not penetrated by his spirit or they must have known him.

He maketh wars to cease.

You cannot imagine Jesus giving sanc-

tion to a war of conquest. We do see the church give its sanction. We have heard Te Deums sung to the god of battles—who was a heathen god—for the victories of a war of conquest. If the spirit of Jesus had penetrated the consciousness of the church that had been impossible.

One has no right to blame the church for its imperfections. But one must say the church is self-sufficient proclaiming the Christ when it does not know him.

For the defense of his home all of us would fight. We do not pretend to be Christians to the extent of believing that all who take up the sword must perish by the sword. We don't believe that. But we do pretend to have been affected by the spirit of Jesus so far that we will not do willful murder. War of conquest is willful murder. And by the way, since I began writing this line a Minneapolis preacher has anticipated me on that ground. He must be a follower of Jesus.

Mind you, I am not criticising the church. I have no right to criticize the church. It is ever so much better than anything I could make in its place, and is doing more good than any other thing in the world. Except possibly the trade unions, there is no other institution comes so near conveying the spirit of Jesus in the world. It is only its self-sufficiency.

The business man who has any sense realizes well enough that a code of morals is not all he wants in this world. He is as restless as the rich young man in Palestine eighteen centuries ago. Something else is wanted to make life complete. Perhaps—for he is vague about his thinking—it may be the gospel of Jesus.

Well, he goes to church, say. And there he finds exercises in charge of the gentleman mentioned in the New Testament who shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, neither entering themselves nor suffering them that are entering to go in.

They lead him to an empty tomb and tell him to contemplate that. And he is not interested in tombs.

But, oh, my friends, if the messenger met him at the door with the tidings, Jesus is alive, he is alive! He is walking the streets of this very town to-day. Come, let us go find him!

Then would the church work and pray for the coming of his kingdom on earth as it is in heaven.—The Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

The first thing which the democracy will write upon the slate will be the nationalization of the land.—Hughes.

#### SPURIOUS OPTIMISTS.

Extracts from an article entitled "Are We Worse Than Our Fathers?" by a member of the Jonhstown (Pa.) high school, class of 1905, published in "The High School Spectator," Thanksgiving number, 1903.

Political apologists who attempt to justify the corruption of their own age by exhuming the crimes and follies of the past . . . advance the fatal optimism which breeds indifference to actual conditions and silences the demand for light on the wrongs of society. Their optimism is that of the slave holder and the buccaneer. If the people can be made to believe that everything is as it should be all effort at reform will stop. Progress comes only through a conception of something better. And the creed of the apologist springs from the belief that conditions are as good as can be hoped for. In order to advance the doctrine "let well enough alone," he will emphasize the corruption of the past and ignore that of the present. What though we torture Filipinos? Did not the Assyrians skin their captives alive? What though bribery, flibustering and gerrymandering are practiced to-day? Did not our fathers put them into practice also?

The fact that our fathers were as bad as we are reflects no credit upon us. Crimes of the past do not excuse present wrongs. We have had the benefit of education and experience, and a tolerance of what was known to be wrong in the past is all the more inexcusable in us. We at least pride ourselves on being an enlightened and highly civilized nation. We say we are a people of progress. Yet there are men who maintain that, because we are as good as our fathers, we have no reason for complaint. Such doctrines are advanced by some of our leading statesmen. But the role played by them is certainly not creditable to their reputation as exponents of advanced education and enlightenment.

Despite the wonderful difference between the civic principles of our fathers and those of the present day, there is a still greater difference between the ideals of our fathers as a nation and those of the present generation. Internal degeneracy cannot be compared with the change in our existence as a nation. Within the last few years we have changed the principles of our government completely. Our moral relationship with the world has been revolutionized. Either our fathers were wrong or we are wrong. We have repudiated the principles on which our government was founded. While we once believed in the consent of the governed,

we now believe that might makes right. And while we once commanded the respect of the world as the refuge of the oppressed and champion of liberty, we are now looked on as a newly-awakened monster, ready to take the place of the tyrants against which we formerly rebelled and to act the bully toward the weaker peoples of the earth.

The intention of the founders of our government was certainly that America should be more than this. The principles laid down by Jefferson were only the foundation of what the nation should be. The history of mankind up to that time had been but the record of ambitious and deluded kings, and of the attempts of one race to subjugate the other; of the stronger to crush the weaker. The defenseless were consigned to slavery or the grave. Liberty was a lie and justice a mockery to the masses of humanity. But we would make a nation that would be a haven and not a curse to the downtrodden of the earth. We would glorify the arts of peace and justice and not of war. We would not build our state on the skulls of fallen millions, nor pitch our camp by rivers of human blood. We would not build as the nations of the past have built. We would not plant the spirit of hate and revenge in the hearts of neighboring peoples who at the earliest moment would trample us in the dust. But we would gain the allegiance of the world in one grand endeavor to lift humanity upward and to bring them forth into the light of liberty. Nor did we dream in vain. The Greeks, the republics of South America and the smaller nations of Europe have good reason to be grateful for our championship of their cause. We were trusted and revered in every land. Our banners made tyranny tremble and our statues of liberty enlightened the world. We were working out the national ideal and had secured the confidence of all the world; but our ideals were blasted, our principles repudiated and our triumphs worsted by one of the blackest betrayals recorded in history.

Since then we have gloried in our infamy. We have cast aside our ideals as nursery rhymes, and have assumed the role of a world power. We have become conscious of our strength; but rather than uplift the needy we will join the tyrants of the earth. We ask not what is right, but what dare oppose us. From the words of Lincoln that "those who refuse liberty, to others deserve it not for themselves and under a just God shall not long retain it," we turn to the policy of imperialism, which plants the flag over conquered peoples and asks:

"Who shall haul it down?" Militarism follows quickly in the wake of imperialism, and thus frantic exhortations for a larger army and more powerful navy are being constantly forced in our ears. The plea of patriotism, which Dr. Samuel Johnson so truly characterized as "the tyrant's last resort," has been intoxicating the younger minds of the nation with its pictures of the glories of war and world exploitation. The American Man with the Hoe must not only suffer betrayal as a disciple of freedom and a friend of the republic, but he must carry the soldier of imperialism on his back.

But with all these wonderful changes in our history we still may not be worse than our fathers. There may be other silent but potent forces that counterbalance our retrogression as manifested on the surface of modern events. Nowhere is liberty more vigilant than in the presence of despotism and tyranny. And who can say but that truth and sanity are on the verge of awakening, and that the forces of a new political revolution are already fomenting and making ready to restore the republic as effectively as it was overthrown?

#### A VERY NICE PAIR.

Two magpies sat on a garden rail,  
As it might be Wednesday week;  
And one little magpie wagged his tail  
In the other little magpie's beak.

And, doubling like a fist his little claw-hand,

Said this other: "Upon my word,  
This is more than flesh and blood can stand,  
Of magpie or any other bird."

So they picked and they scratched each other's little eyes,

Till all that was left on the rail  
Was the beak of one of the little magpies,

And the other little magpie's tail.  
—Nursery Nonsense.

"What is your definition of 'graft'?" said the inquisitive person.

"Graft," answered Senator Sorghum, "is made up of the perquisites that come to some other fellow's office and to which you cannot lay any claim."—Washington Star.

"Do you think Skinner can make a living out there?"

"Make a living! Why, he'd make a living on a rock in the middle of the ocean if there was another man on the rock."—Exchange.

#### BOOKS

##### HUMAN HISTORY THROUGH SYMBOLISM.

Peculiar stress is laid by modern school men upon the importance of history in connection with psychology and

sociology. Not only is history regarded as a story of past events, serving the race as each individual is served by the memory of his own personal experiences, namely, as a guide for the future; but it is appealed to as the record of race impulses which determine future events as irresistibly as do the stars according to another fatalistic "science." Human experience is thus offered us no longer as a teacher from whose lessons we may learn, but as a master whose decrees we must obey.

In keeping with the pretentious character of this fatalistic philosophy, its outlook is extremely narrow. For history, in its contemplation, is confined to the story of events. The primary perceptions of the race do not enter in. While, for example, the story of Jove's love for Leda is considered, this is merely because the existence of such a story is a fact. But the wonderfully precise symbolism of the story, so suggestive of human perceptions which depend upon intuition rather than history, is thrust out as unscientific. Nothing more profound or sensible is inferred from this story than that the prehistoric imagination from which it sprang must have been immature and fantastic.

To this lop-sided philosophy, an able and devoted student of myth lore, one who is familiar also with the modern form of fatalism, contributes (*Symbol-Psychology; a New Interpretation of Race-Traditions*. By Adolph Roeder. New York and London: Harper & Brothers) a balancing weight. Mr. Roeder distinguishes between race intuition and race history. In doing so he uses several illustrations, one of which will make his point very clear even to the least reflective reader. We quote it:

Read our modern American historically-fashioned records of Uncle Sam, John Bull, the Russian Bear, Tammany Tiger and other types, correctly, according to race-intuition, and you have instructive history; read them with too much literalness, and you have rather serious historic and ethnologic results.

It may thus be seen that Mr. Roeder's idea of symbolism is that its value "resides in its meaning, and not in its historic origin." For a further example, "the value of the American flag lies in the fact that it symbolizes American institutions and citizenship, and not in the fact that once upon a time a lady named Betsy Ross, in a town called Philadelphia, did sew a few red strips of bunting on a white cloth and a few white stars into a blue field." The moral of which is this: "If we should some day find out that the lady's name was not Ross, but possibly something else, or that the house where it was first made was not on Arch street, but down Laetitia street way, or any other set of facts, it will in no wise invalidate the efficiency of the American flag as a symbol."

This common sense principle Mr. Roeder applies to all symbolism, including that of the Bible. He recommends,

for the mere external history of the Mosaic pilgrimage, Josephus and Herodotus, rather than the old testament. For the old testament is an epic which weaves much of legend and tradition about the historic figure; and its miracles and marvels, the ark of the covenant, the holy of holies, and so on, are traditional symbolism. There is no "effort of a ruthless Deity to thrust incredible things upon his children as history." And so of the new testament. The Peter of symbolism "can go to the sea and gather up a fish and take a bit of silver from its mouth and can perform other miracles, which the historic Peter may lay no claim to."

This symbolic expression of race history is traced by Mr. Roeder through the myths and folk lore of all races—"somewhat over 500 stories of journeys and pilgrimages and wanderings of heroes, of gods, of giants, dwarfs and ordinary mortals." At first these stories look alike, but they fall readily and naturally into four periods which the author calls the "associate animal" period, as Jove and the eagle; the "mass-humanity" period, as Buddha and the listening throngs; the "select humanity" period, as Jesus and his disciples; and the "lone humanity" period, as Moses dying alone on Nebo, or Jesus forsaken and in the custody of his Roman guards. Mr. Roeder's interpretation of these symbolic periods may be condensed into this statement: We start in life an animal, but embodying an incipient humanity—the spiritual germ. Presently the animal nature is thrust into the background as we accumulate human experiences and humanity in multitudes crowds in upon our human consciousness. The human ego next reaches out into the teeming mass of humanity and chooses such associates (men, impressions, traditions, deeds) as harmonize with its inmost desires—as Jesus, for example, chose his disciples. At last we stand revealed in our bare humanity, alone; the curtain of death moves aside, and that central something that was our very self from the beginning, steps out into the further and larger life—a character developed by successive preferences for what is right over what is wrong.

This interpretation may or may not be acceptable. We quote it merely as an illustration of method. But Mr. Roeder's central idea cannot easily be rejected. He holds that in symbolism there is a common factor, of which the myth makers were as conscious as were the mathematicians of their axioms; and that this common factor is not necessarily taught by one race to another, but that it may have arisen independently in different sections of the race mind. He urges in that connection that in the creation of the wonderful figures of gods and heroes, of dwarfs and giants, the ancients acted as intelligently as they did in the perception of geometrical truths and musical harmonies.

This extract from his conclusion suggests the spirit of the book and its importance with reference to sociological science: "There is an evolution of divine things, and there is an evolution of natural things. The evolution of natural things culminates in the production of a human body in which there shall be a soul called the internal man. The evolution of divine things requires the production of a traditionally and symbolically written word in which there shall be a soul called the inner mind or internal sense. Along the pathway of the evolution of the human body there are complete existences, fossils, crystals, plants, animals, each the effort to create or produce parts and sections of the totality presently to be achieved in man. So along the pathway of the evolution of the word, there are stories, complete existences, sacred books and mythologies of the nations of old, each an effort of the race mind to respond in part to the demands of the divine revelator."

Mr. Roeder's book is very interesting and very instructive. Whether his complete submission to the materialistic theory of evolution, which includes the now dying doctrine of natural selection and the lame hypothesis of survival of the fittest, be acceptable or not, his clear differentiation of the animal from the spiritual, as two different things, belonging to different levels, instead of continuous stages of the same thing on the same level, distinguishes him from the teachers of historical determinism. Nor is he a dualist, notwithstanding his free use of that term with favor. By "duality" he evidently refers only to animal and spirit as constituting man in the present state of existence. As to the origin of things, Mr. Roeder is a monist. His book is one of the most useful that has come off the press since the beginning of the battle between a fatalistic "science" and the revived forces of genuine religion.

PERIODICALS.

The Spectator, published by the students of the Johnstown (Pa.) high school, as exemplified by its Thanksgiving number,

**JOHN MITCHELL**, President of the coal miners, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost leaders in the Trade Union Movement in the world. No student of modern economic forces can afford to ignore this movement, therefore get and read his book on **ORGANIZED LABOR**.

Cloth, \$1.75; Blue Seal, \$2.75  
Half Morocco..... 3.75  
Full Morocco, Autograph Copy 5.00

**GEO. A. SCHILLING, Room 519,**  
85 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

**DANCE** On Friday Evening, Jan. 15, 1904, the members and friends of **JAN. 15 THE HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION** will give a dance at Schiller Hall, 108 Randolph Street. Invitations will be issued by Miss Leonora Beck, 30 South Wood Street, Dr. Anna M. Lund, 108 Masonic Temple, Phone Central 391, Miss Nellie Carlin, 1202 Ashland Blk., Phone Central 925.

is a model in amateur journalism, and very far above the ordinary grade of school publications. Not only is the editorial ability of a high order, but the contributions, both humorous and serious, are notably good. That of "W. H., in '05—Are We Worse Than Our Fathers," is especially worthy of notice for its patriotic insight and impressive argument as well as its literary excellence.

In the December McClure's Miss Tarbell opens up the second part of her history of the Standard Oil Company, and Mr. Ray Stannard Baker, in "The Lone Fighter," tells in an interesting way of an incorruptible member of the Illinois legislature. When he says, however, that "socialism is the extremist form of democracy," one would like to ask him to define his terms. Another article in this number which will be read with profit and delight is that by John La Farge, beginning a series on "One Hundred Masterpieces of Painting."  
J. H. D.

The Story of Rose Fortune, a New York Working Girl, is the leading article in Frank Leslie's Monthly for December. The Degradation of Wall Street, preceded by an editorial on Promoters and Morals, tells the history of the Shipbuilding Trust. This article the editor considered of so great importance that the plates of a first-rate story were stripped, he tells us, from the presses to make way for it. The trust story the writer gives is well worth reading, but it may be doubted whether recent revelations will do as much efficient teaching as he hopes.  
J. H. D.

So it seems that its famous schools and kindergartens have not saved even Grand Rapids. The revelations of corruption there, says the Springfield Republican, "equal anything yet displayed in the line of rottenness in municipal government." In going on to speak of the recent revelations of the "carnival of steal in public place," the Republican attributes the condition to material prosperity and "the examples that are afforded of great riches suddenly and easily acquired." If the process of the distribution of material prosperity were more equitable, would we not be spared the demoralizing sight of "great riches suddenly and easily acquired?" The trouble is not with the prosperity so much as with the unevenness of the prosperity.  
J. H. D.

One hears in conversation little mention of the present unpleasantness in the post office department. Most of us perhaps even skip it in the newspapers. Having got some weeks ago a general notion that there had been a certain amount of crookedness, we accepted the situation with more or less indifference, and dropped the subject. But the recent Bristow report is really an astounding revelation which deserves read-

NOW READY FOR DELIVERY

**ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY**

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society.

By LOUIS F. POST

The volume is beautifully printed on high-grade dull-finished paper, neat pages, gilt top, etc., and bound in fine blue cloth with gold lettering. Pp. 396.

Price per copy, \$2.00. (Net, delivered.)

**MOODY PUBLISHING CO., Publishers,**  
25 Nassau St., NEW YORK 1601 Unity Building, CHICAGO

**DEBATE** There will be a debate at Handel Hall, 40 E. Randolph Street, at 8:30 p. m. Sunday, December 27, 1903, on the following question: "Resolved, That the Interests of the Capitalist and Laboring Classes Alike Demand the Immediate Adoption of the Single Tax on Land Values by the Legislatures of the Various States."  
Mr. John Z. White, Atty. Col. W. A. Roberts, Ng.

**REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE**

**Henry George Association**

OF CHICAGO.

Handel Hall, 40 East Randolph Street.

Every Thursday Evening, 8 o'clock.

Every Sunday Afternoon, 3:30 o'clock.



"BARKING UP THE WRONG TREE."

ing. In an editorial on the subject, in its issue of December 3, the Nation too severely says: "Mr. Bristow's report on the postal investigation is one of the most sordid revelations ever made in a public document. He slides under the microscope a cross section of the Department, and shows us in a flash the tissue alive with squirming parasites—a group of public of-

icers without conscience, conspiring with depraved citizens in schemes for plunder." J. H. D.

**BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PUBLIC**

Can all be purchased through the Purdy Publishing Company

New Book of Kings, a Republican counterblast, by J. Morrison Davidson . . . 50c

**BOOKS FOR CHRISTMAS**  
By HENRY GEORGE.

- Progress and Poverty, pa. 50c. cloth \$1.00
- Social Problems, pa. 50c. cloth . . . . . 1.00
- Land Question, pa. 50c. cloth . . . . . 1.00
- Protection vs. Free Trade, pa. 50c. cloth . . . . . 1.00
- Perplexed Philosopher, pa. 50c. cloth 1.00
- Science of Political Economy . . . . . 2.50
- Our Land and Land Policy Speeches, Lectures and Miscellaneous Writings 2.50

Life of Henry George, by Henry George, Jr., \$1.50; \$2.00.

Order anything that has ever been reviewed in THE PUBLIC; will fill order promptly. Henry George's books in paper and cloth binding and other economic literature on sale. PURDY PUBLISHING CO., McVicker's Building, CHICAGO.



**The Henry George Association of Chicago**

has arranged to place MR JOHN Z. WHITE in the lecture field for work in the U. S. and Canada. For dates and particulars address

F. H. MONROE, President, 206—134 Washington St., CHICAGO, ILL.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

**DEBATE**

There will be a debate between the Socialists and the Single Taxers at the West 12th Street Turner Hall, 118 West 12th Street, near Western Avenue, on Sunday afternoon, December 20th, at 2 o'clock, on the following question: "Resolved, That It is to the Interests of the Working Classes to Take Up the Propaganda of Socialism Rather Than That of the Single Tax." The affirmative will be represented by A. M. Simons, Seymour Steadman and Ernest Unterman; the negative will be represented by John Z. White, Louis F. Post and Henry H. Hardinge, thirty minutes for each speaker, the affirmative being allowed ten minutes in closing.

**NOTICE TO READERS.**

If you have been reading The Public on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1904, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1904. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1905; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1904; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1904. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of The Public.

**The Public**

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

TERMS:—Annual Subscription, \$2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

**ATTORNEYS.**

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

**HENRY B. TAWRESEY,**  
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.

1106 Real Estate Trust Building, S. E. Cor. Broad and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt, Rooms 1011-1012,  
NEW YORK.

**CONTRACTORS.**

**G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,**  
JERSEY CITY, N. J.  
Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.  
Trolley Roads Built and Financed.

Now Ready for Delivery

**BISOCIALISM:**

The Reign of the Man at the Margin

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE

An entirely new and original work on economics—

It treats of the positive theory of value, and of an entirely new and palpably correct theory of interest. It for the first time furnishes a scientific means for determining the proper scope of Economic Science, and discusses all its phases and phenomena in a complete and consistent manner.

It points out clearly the distinctive economic principles which dominate the established order, and also those involved in anarchism and in the different forms of socialism. It discusses the economic principles involved in all the leading reform movements since the civil war. A thoughtful, scholarly work. Price, \$1.50 net.

**BISOCIALISM** is a masterpiece. It is a book to make the quibblers squirm. The professors are challenged on their own ground.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

NEW YORK, 35 Nassau Street  
**MOODY PUBLISHING CO.**  
CHICAGO, 79 Dearborn Street