

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1903.

Number 277.

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.

If any inferences can be drawn from the whining that comes up out of Wall street through the newspapers, the era of prosperity for the prosperous is nearly at an end. "Confidence is at a low ebb," say these reports. That is certainly a telling explanation. No confidence game can survive loss of confidence; and prosperity for the prosperous is most distinctly a confidence game.

It should seem that condolences are due from the "profit-sharing" fakirs who have urged "well disposed" employes of the steel trust to put their little savings into the stock of that generous employer at the marvelously low rate of 80-odd cents to the dollar. Only a few months have passed since this kind offer was made, and now the stock of the steel trust is down to 23 cents to the dollar—caused, no doubt, by labor strikes in Chicago!

Democrats of the democratic variety will note with satisfaction the unanimous disapproval by the plutocratic press in both parties, of Mr. Bryan's indictment of Mr. Cleveland's brand of Democracy. The speech at Chicago on the 18th, in which Mr. Bryan laid bare the plutocracy of Clevelandism, was a timely and well considered notification to the plutocratic elements of the country that if they recapture the Democratic party they must fight for it.

King Edward told a Dublin deputation which waited upon him with an address at Dublin Castle on the

22d that he was there "to learn what can be done to brighten the lot of the poor of Ireland." It would be a safe bet, even at great odds, that if he were to learn what to do, he wouldn't do it. The lot of the poor cannot be really brightened without dealing justly by them—not charitably, but justly—and that necessitates getting off their backs. King Edward has no notion of getting off their backs. If he had, the privileged classes of Great Britain would stop him, for they would have to get off too.

An adjournment of the Chicago traction litigation having been made until winter, to enable the city and the street grabbers to negotiate a settlement, the street grabbers are now giving notice that they will not consider any proposition of settlement that does not rest upon a preliminary recognition of the validity of their 99-year claim. Their notice is in itself of no importance. But what is of importance is a slight indication on the part of some of the city's servant's of a disposition to accept those terms. The public warning should be clear and strong that the validity of the 99-year act must not be recognized by the city except under irresistible compulsion. In a settlement this claim may properly be considered and paid for, simply for the sake of peace (provided the amount demanded is not too extravagant), just as blackmail is often submitted to in lawsuits. But the public official who indicates the slightest disposition to acknowledge the 99-year claim as a legitimate property right, will be, and ought to be from that moment regarded by the people with suspicion. When a claim like this, if valid, is worth millions upon millions of dollars, not only for the enormous profit which it is capa-

ble of yielding, but also for its influence in other cities, where the same or similar financial conspirators are interested in street grabbing, there are temptations that may possibly overcome the scruples of even the best of public officials. Let even the honest ones, then, be watched with extreme vigilance.

Government by injunction is sanctioned as a thing accomplished, by no less a personage than Mr. Justice Brewer, of the Supreme Court of the United States, who, in an address on the 17th before the State Bar Association of Iowa, predicted that the popular outcry against it "will spend itself."

In that dying out of the popular protest against this arrogation of governmental powers by the judiciary, Justice Brewer found reason for congratulation. Never was there a time, said he, when government by injunction meant more to the Nation than in our time. What is needed now, he argued, is prevention rather than cure,—the staying or preventing of wrong, rather than only the punishing of wrong.

That this is a modern need may be conceded without conceding Justice Brewer's conclusion in favor of government by injunction. Even if prevention of wrong is the great need of the time, it does not follow that the courts may take the matter into their own hands and supply the means of prevention, without authority from the people and in total disregard of established safeguards for accused persons. Yet that is what government by injunction, which Justice Brewer approves, actually does.

Government by injunction is more than a preventive substitute for

the penalties of criminal law, as Justice Brewer describes it. It is a device that originates not with the people but with the judiciary; one which has been adopted contrary to custom, even judicial custom, and without statutory sanction; one which enables judges to enact special legislation in their own discretion for each case as it comes before them; and one which deprives persons falsely charged with wrongdoing of at least five elementary rights—the right to an inquiry by a grand jury, the right to be confronted in open court with hostile witnesses and to cross-examine them, the right to know in advance the penalty they incur, the right to trial by jury, and the right to be tried only once for the same wrong.

When a Justice of the Supreme Court sanctions a judicial revolution which involves the abrogation of such rights, especially when that Supreme Court Justice is on record in an address before another bar association some years ago, as having urged the future importance of the judiciary to the privileged classes as their protection against hostile legislation, the progress of government by injunction may fairly be regarded with even more alarm than its own inherent iniquity might warrant. What may be the limit of judicial usurpation? becomes in those circumstances a burning question. If the judiciary may so far depart from its legitimate function of interpreting and applying the laws that the people enact through their law-making representatives—if it may depart from that function so far as to set aside the very fundamentals of laws so sanctioned and to enact a new system to suit its own ideas of what the new times need, then how far in the way of usurpation may it not go? Verily that was long-sighted and wise advice which Jefferson gave to his countrymen when he warned them, over a hundred years ago, that it is of the nature of courts to draw autocratic power to themselves.

In further verification of Jefferson's warning, we are beginning to find that no sooner has the judiciary assured itself that the outcry against government by injunction "will spend itself," than it proceeds boldly to draw to itself further power through receiverships. Originally receiverships were innocuous devices of chancery practice for the purpose of conserving and distributing imperiled funds. They were not intended to involve the courts in the management of businesses. But step by step the receivership function has been extended, until now all manner of businesses are managed indefinitely by the courts,—an evolution which socialists very properly welcome as socialistic. This reaching out for judicial power has gone so far in one direction that the Supreme Court of New York has actually managed a notorious brothel through receivers (unknown to the court, to be sure, though not to the receivers), while in another direction the courts are grasping at the governmental powers of legislation and administration. Now all this extension of judicial authority may be needed by the changed condition of the times. We are not discussing that aspect of the question. The point we wish to emphasize is that if necessary it is an authority that ought to be conferred upon the courts by the people, and not one which the courts should be permitted to wrest from the people.

One of the great evils of this lawless acquisition of power, not to mention any of the others, is the popular discredit it tends to throw upon the courts. So long as judges are impartial, the courts can command popular confidence. But popular confidence for any court whose judges apparently have a one-sided interest—whether from pride of management, or the influence of personal associations, or economic considerations, or what not—in the decision of contests litigated before it, is simply out of the question with an intelligent

people. Intelligent men may for personal reasons profess great respect for courts whose judges are thus interested, but they never feel it. The judges themselves must sometimes experience a creepy sensation regarding their own impartiality in cases like that. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that judges should not have their interests tangled up in questions they have to decide. Yet receiverships of great businesses, especially those which own or claim to own property rights in derogation of public rights, are calculated, as such receiverships are now managed, to make just this entanglement, and consequently to undermine confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary. It is not in human nature for any judge to be the responsible manager of a great business system claiming important property rights in derogation of public rights, and yet command public confidence as a judge with reference to his decisions in favor of that business. It is too much like being a judge in his own case. This is the position, however, of every judge who directs a business of that kind through receiverships.

A striking instance in point is the present plight of Judge Peter S. Grosscup, one of the judges of the Circuit Court of the United States. Judge Grosscup has appointed receivers in a street railway case. The case is notoriously collusive. It was instituted by foreign creditors of a street railway monopoly in Chicago under an arrangement with the owners, a local corporation, for the ostensible purpose of conserving assets of the corporation for the benefit of the creditors, but for the real purpose of forcing the city of Chicago into the Federal courts on a question regarding local street franchises between itself and the local corporation. The suit is manifestly for the benefit of the local corporation. When Judge Grosscup appointed the receivers he became himself the conservator of those franchise interests which the city contests; and in every act he has taken

in the matter since, he has been forced into the apparent position, in the public eye, of a judge in his own case.

How is it possible with any man, be he never so discreet, that the people should not feel dubious of the impartiality of his advice and decisions in support of franchises of which he may thus have become conservator? Some men may be able to serve two masters, but popular faith in agility of that kind is not profound. It is to be noted, moreover, that as to Judge Grosscup, he has not been over-discreet in dealing with this delicate juxtaposition. As conservator of the Chicago street car systems, he has disclosed an appearance of enthusiasm for the interests in his charge, and of indifference for those in conflict with them, which cannot fail to disturb confidence in his judicial impartiality. For instance, in giving *ex parte* advice to the receivers (p. 229) as to the constitutionality of the street franchise in dispute, Judge Grosscup said that the objections "do not merit space for statement, much less for discussion." This is not calculated to reassure a doubting people, when they learn the facts. For the franchise in question was conferred by a private and local law of the legislature, it embraced more than one subject, neither subject was expressed in the title, and this law was enacted under a State constitution that forbade the passage of any private or local law which embraced more than one subject or which failed to express its subject in the title. There may possibly be room for discussion in support of the constitutionality of a law of that kind, under a constitution of that kind; but there is none for an off-hand retort to the constitutional objections which are raised, that they are not only not worth discussing but are not worth stating. It would at least be difficult to avoid the conclusion that a judge who makes this retort has got his impartiality as a judge tangled up in his interests as a conservator.

If there were no other objection to government by receivership, the unwholesome effect it has had upon judges, and the discredit it has tended to cast in the public mind upon their impartiality as a class, would be enough to condemn it. Being only men, judges are too apt, when they are thus forced into acting for one party to a controversy and deciding for both, to get the case into the shape that the distinguished Judge David Davis hinted at when the defendant in a case before him asked an adjournment on account of the absence of his lawyer, and the plaintiff's lawyer opposed the adjournment. Turning to the plaintiff's lawyer, Judge Davis said: "Mr. Smith, if you won't consent to an adjournment the trial will have to go on; and as the defendant has no lawyer, the court will be obliged to look after his interests. Now there was just such a situation in the last county I sat in. The plaintiff insisted on going to trial, although the defendant had no lawyer; so the court kept an eye on the defendants interests. And, do you know, Mr. Smith, we beat the plaintiff in that case." In less degree, perhaps, the same demoralizing effect that is produced through government by receivers upon the judiciary and upon public confidence in it, is also produced through government by injunction. When judges make their own law, apply it in their own way, try accusations under it according to their own standards, fix penalties to suit themselves, and all without other legal sanction than judge-made law and in total disregard of constitutional safeguards, they very easily fall into a line of conduct which fairly brings their impartiality under suspicion. Let that happen and the usefulness of the judiciary is practically at an end. This suspicion has already become so general in the United States, under the regime of government by injunction, that no one any longer expects impartial decisions in labor injunction cases. Workingmen do not, and they are mad about it; employers do not,

and they are glad of it. The demoralizing effect is the same in either case.

In such circumstances it is peculiarly gratifying to be able to name a Chicago judge who suggests a better course with reference to public disorder in connection with labor controversies. In charging the Cook County grand jury on the 20th, Judge Edward Osgood Brown called that body's attention to the reports of intimidation and rioting which the local newspapers have been exploiting for several days in connection with a labor strike. Judge Brown instructed the grand jury not in what he thought the law ought to be, but in what it is as the people have sanctioned it; and he advised them to make an investigation into the truth of the reports of disorder and to indict guilty parties. This is the orderly and lawful course. If there has been public disorder, the grand jury is the proper body to bring it formally to the attention of the criminal court. If that body indicts any persons, their guilt can be determined in an orderly and lawful way. They will be confronted by the witnesses against them and be free to cross-examine them; they will be tried by a jury; the law will be that of the people and not the judge-made article; if found guilty they will be punished as the law has prescribed in advance; and they will be immune from further prosecution for the same offense. This mode of procedure is calculated to strengthen public confidence in the courts instead of weakening it.

Judge Brown's charge to the grand jury has been distorted by the agents and detectives of employers' unions so as to make him appear to have advised indictments of trade union leaders for conspiracy. This is a suggestion of an old trick; namely, the prosecution of workingmen who organize or who lead in organizations with a lawful purpose, for the unlawful and unauthorized acts of others in the organization or in mobs out-

side of it. Judge Brown's charge justified no such inference. He instructed the grand jury to indict the men who commit crimes, not peaceable men whom employers would like to have indicted nominally for crime but really for lawfully managing labor unions. As Judge Brown's charge was brief we give it in full:

There are conditions which I learn from sources of public information that demand serious investigation. Offenses are being committed against law and good order. Lawful vocations of citizens are obstructed by means of assault and intimidation. If these are the facts it is a proper subject for your investigation. There can be no advance unless the laws are justly and vigorously enforced against those who interfere with the rights of others in business and private life. Taking the law into one's own hands to satisfy a principle or to secure revenge must not be permitted. Legitimate business has suffered if information I have garnered from the public print is true. Citizens, men in the lawful quest of work, have been intimidated and assaulted. These men who are violating the law, if violations there have been, must be punished.

There is nothing in that charge to warrant indictments of law abiding labor leaders for fictitious crimes on the pretense of unlawful conspiracies.

But Judge Brown is right in advising indictments for intimidation, assaults, riot and other disturbances of the public peace and violent invasions of private rights. If labor leaders commit these crimes they ought to be indicted, they ought to be convicted and they ought to be punished. Much can be said by way of explanation of such violence. Much can be said even in excuse of the guilty. When public opinion and public teachers and statesmen find it so very easy to apologize for mobs that burn men at the stake, and to defend corporations that plunder the public, it is not difficult to conceive of excuses for the outbreaks of hard-working men who know that they are robbed but don't understand the trick. When they see legislators bribed by the rich exploiters of their labor, and judges influenced to make judge-made laws for the privileged

classes; when they are painfully conscious that this use of wealth which is filched in part from them, somehow operates to make their condition harder; when unearned wealth flaunts them on every hand, and the daily products of their own toil are diverted from them by those mysterious processes of power which make opportunities for remunerative work so scarce that drudgery is a prize,—when these conditions confront them, they have an impulse to strike back. Anyone in the same circumstances would have the same impulse. If they could strike back with dollars, they would doubtless do so. But they haven't the dollars to strike back with, so they strike back with bricks. That is all there is to it. They would have no impulse to strike back with bricks if they weren't struck at, below the belt at that, with dollars.

Nevertheless, when they do strike back with bricks they must be punished. Public peace and protection of private rights from violent attack are the first conditions of social life. Until these are secure no advance can be made toward higher levels of public order and higher respect for private rights. It is just as well, however, to remind those "law and order" advocates who think of law and order only as a privilege enabling them to rob peaceably under the forms of law,—it is just as well to remind them, we repeat, that the violent forms of disorder would cease all the sooner, if the cunning forms of disorder by which they prosper were abandoned. They say the working classes are in an ugly mood. But let them pause in their vituperation long enough to ask themselves whether they, too, would not be in an ugly mood if they worked hard for a poor living while a law-favored few lived in luxury upon what work alone can produce.

One unfortunate fact has leaked out regarding the Chicago grand jury which was instructed by Judge Brown as stated above. It appears

to have in it two men who should withdraw, now that this body is to inquire into the labor violence to which Judge Brown called their attention. One of them is the president of the very company against which the strike to be inquired into is being waged. It is due to him to explain that he is reported to have asked the assistant district attorney to excuse him for that reason, and the report has it that this official refused. But the juryman has not gone far enough. The district attorney has no right to keep such a juryman in the panel. The other is an ex-president of the manufacturers' organization which is prosecuting the strikers in other courts by means of the injunction process for alleged violence in connection with the same strike. It is as important that grand juries be as free from suspicion as it is that judges should be. If indictments were found against strikers by a grand jury thus apparently packed against strikers, instead of being composed of impartial citizens, the good faith of its action would be properly discredited.

One more example of the way in which workingmen are pounded with dollars juggled as lawlessly as they are charged with hurling bricks, was revealed by Gov. La Follette, of Wisconsin, in an address on the 18th before the New York Chautauqua Assembly. This exposure came in the form of a letter of February 9, 1903, from a United States Senator (presumably a Republican, for La Follette belongs to that party), a letter for which Gov. La Follette vouched. Following is what he read from it:

It is expecting too much from human nature that senators, whose every association is with the great railroad corporations, and whose political lives largely depend on them should, in good faith, approve a measure that would to an extent make the railroads a servant of the people and to be subject to the decision of the commission when a question of rates is raised. The Senate committee is by a decided majority composed of men who bear those relations to the railroads.

Can anyone explain why the average newspaper has so much more unalloyed criticism for workingmen who lawlessly throw bricks to fetch blood, than for these railroads which law-

lessly juggle dollars to fetch public plunder?

A long dispatch from Newport, published in the daily papers, discloses the highly important news that Mrs. Stuyvesant Fish was about to be cartooned in a local periodical; that Mr. Stuyvesant Fish went to a lawyer for an injunction, but was assured that an injunction would not be "feasible;" that Mr. Stuyvesant Fish thereupon consulted the chief of police; and that the chief of police "succeeded in convincing" the editor that he had better omit the cartoon. Mrs. Stuyvesant Fish appears to have been engaged somewhat ostentatiously in reminding the general public, by her widely advertised social extravagances of the frivolous era of the aristocracy of France which preceded the guillotine. Mr. Stuyvesant Fish is to be congratulated upon having induced the chief of police to "convince" the local editor. But Mr. Fish's lawyer must have been an old fogey if he advised against the feasibility of an injunction. To be sure the law as it exists and the precedents as they are would justify his advice. But so would it have been with a labor injunction less than 20 years ago. Yet corporation magnates are now able to get labor injunctions galore. They had ingenious lawyers to represent them and "progressive" judges to respond. Mr. Fish's lawyer should have risen to his opportunity. He might have brought a suit in chancery against the Newport editor. On the ground of the residence of the parties in different States he might have brought this suit in the Federal courts. In the bill in equity he might have alleged that his client's property rights were imperiled by the threatened cartoon and have proved it by the affidavits of detectives. And thereupon he might have moved for an injunction with a restraining order pending the argument of the motion. By pursuing this course Mr. Fish's lawyer might have won the commendations of some future Supreme Court Justice, in a paper before some bar association or other, for having enabled a progressive judiciary to improve the libel laws so as to make them preventive instead of merely penal.

SOCIAL ANALOGIES.

A Boston daily newspaper recently devoted a goodly portion of its first page to Mr. P.'s denial that he ever called Mr. R. "a laborer." The scare headlines of the article left the impression that both of these political contestants, and the interested public at large, considered the term "laborer" a libelous epithet. From this it may be inferred that the general public is not yet awake to the fact that every man must socially fall under one of three classifications. He is either a laborer, a beggar or a thief.

In resenting the term "laborer" as libelous, Mr. R. probably had no idea of calling himself either a beggar or a thief, and it is equally certain that Mr. P. was not astute enough to clearly perceive the all-inclusive triune choice. It would seem as if ordinary intelligence would spontaneously arrive at this division of the social body into "laborers, beggars and thieves," but alas! times have not radically changed since John Stuart Mill wrote that "on any matter not self-evident, there are ninety-nine persons totally incapable of judging it, for one who is capable; and the capacity of the hundredth person is only comparative, for the majority of the eminent men of every past generation held many opinions now known to be erroneous and did or approved numerous things which no one will now justify."

How may we account for such flagrant misconceptions of fundamentals as makes a man thus insist upon being ticketed in terms of a "devil's advocate?" If we but realize that thought-force is no exception to the universal rule, "all nature moves along the line of least resistance," we shall have the nucleus of the explanation.

Out of the ethical night wherein might made right came deeply graven channels into which the cerebral fluid gushed all too easily. The mailed fist which held aloft the torch of rapine and plunder wrote with its fire the word "right" against the social blackness of the long night. The cowed populace saw the new handwriting on the wall and noted in the sweat of their own faces and the ache of their own bones that the "superior"

class did not labor. The continued arrogation of superiority by these brawling loafers established among the masses a thought-habit, a physiological line of least resistance, by virtue of which it became intellectually easier in terms of sheer force-units to look upon labor as degrading than to stem the firmly set current of opinion in an opposite direction. Thus by a parsimony of thought has come down to our own time the error that labor is degrading. True most of us have driven the heresy out of our cerebrum only to find it dragging its serpent length through our subconsciousnesses like some superstition which dominated the formative period of our lives and has since been reasoned down.

We have the advice of no less an authority than Voltaire to begin polemics with a definition of terms. Let us consider for a moment just what we mean by the words "labor" and "laborer."

At the very outset it seems advisable to make a distinction too often overlooked. Labor may be either personal or social. The single savage on a desert island scratching with naked fingers in the sea sands for edible mollusks labors in a personal but not in a social sense. The fat plutocrat lolling lazily on his silken cushions labors thoracically as he draws his apoplectic breath or changes with his hands the position of a gouty leg, but the effort is not a social labor.

The body physical is a very close analogue of the body social. When the physical body is in perfect health every organ to the farthest cell labors socially. When an organ begins to labor merely individually, disease at once sets up its kingdom and we call the rebellion by various names, all of which might be summed up under the term "organic selfishness" or hypertrophy—a sort of physiological trust which stifles, in whole or in part, the competition of the other organs for their just part of sustenance.

The Morgans, as social cells, are in an advanced stage of elephantiasis; while the Rockefellers as social organs have that marked enlargement, resulting from greatly increased absorption without counterbalancing waste, already referred to as hyper-

trophy. Indeed the specially privileged class is rapidly becoming the class of fatty degenerates. The cause is as patent as the trunk on an elephant. These privileged social cells have tapped the great aorta of social life to its utmost limit. They are cancers and tumors that "feed fat" at the expense of all surrounding tissues.

A society, like an individual, has at any one time only so much life, and, as Olive Schreiner has so wisely said, "where one channel runs over, another runs dry." In this thought inheres the most vital of all truths, viz., that as in biology, hypertrophy of the one part implies relative atrophy of some other, so in the social body the piling up of immense wealth in the hands of a few, the tapping of the great arteries of commerce by the special privilege of a few favored cancers, inevitably results in the more or less complete devitalization of the other organs of the social body. They whose ignorance of life permits them to believe that the race is best advanced by the massing of the corporate wealth in the hands of a few in order that they may, by an enlightened philanthropy, judiciously give back to society a little of their thieving, should sow the seeds of cancer in their own weak vitals in the hope that when the said cancer gets powerful enough at the expense of the other tissues it will suddenly change its nature and revivify and re-strengthen all the organs which it starved that it might gormandize and grow great.

The absolute truth of this analogue needs to be insisted upon to prevent the partially imbecile from thinking these cancers wax great by their internal productivity, and not by sapping the blood intended for other social tissues.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

If the strength of a chain be measured by that of its weakest link, he does well who judges of the grandeur of a nation by the social status of its lowest stratum. Where the laborer, the real producer, is a slave, economic or chat-

tel, the mighty chain of Christian civilization, with its nineteen ponderous links, is somewhere held together by a wisp of thread. The sentimental optimism of the purblind cannot save it. The fashionable mould into which each college pours the intellectual jelly of our young men can but slightly postpone it.

Cursed be the social wants that sin against the strength of youth!
Cursed be the social lies that warp us from the living truth!
Cursed be the sickly forms that err from honest Nature's rule!
Cursed be the gold that gilds the straitened forehead of the fool!

It is not a social labor, then, for the heart, as if imagining itself a captain of industry, to steal itself into fatty degeneracy, nor is it social labor when a scheming Standard-Oil brain saps the blood that was intended for its stomach. These are merely cases of physiological trusts in the body personal endowed with the special organic privilege of levying tribute upon everything within the skin.

In this connection we may perhaps be pardoned for calling attention to another instructive biological fact bearing upon the subject in hand.

When protoplasm becomes bioplasm, when a tiny bit of it begins to whirl itself away from the parent mass, if one may be allowed the term, it acquires an individual existence inbounded by its own viscosity, but limited without only by the confines of nature.

Later, segmentation sets in, and we have two protoplasmic cells each acting and reacting upon its environment, and each, so far as the other is concerned, forming a part of that common environment. The saying "self-preservation is Nature's first law" is but a popular way of asserting that all Nature, even to the lowest cell, tends naturally to take to itself the largest possible portion of its environment which it can use in its own upbuilding. In the higher domain of ethics we say the same thing, thus: "Power is the most corruptive of all influences."

When, however, protoplasmic segmentation has progressed to the stage where there is a large society of cells it will be readily seen that the

most immediate environment of any cell is the other cells of the same society. Here, then, begins the struggle and the counter-struggle; the struggle of each to absorb as much as possible, and the counter-struggle of the other to do the like, which becomes, under natural conditions, a bar to the hypertrophy of either; and this process of cellular competition is the exact correspondent of social competition.

For an organ to live near a great artery may be, under improper conditions, the exact analogue of a man living by a railway under similar unjust conditions. The pathological condition in which certain capillaries are able to secure an unjust and discriminative over-service from the great circulatory trunk lines results in a vascular hypertrophy ending in what is called varicose angioma; just as railway discrimination, dishonest schedules, rebates and a service specialized in favoritism lead to those dread tumors in the political body of which the Standard Oil Trust, the Steel Trust and the other great predatory commercial carnivora are alarming examples of social decay, doubly dangerous in that the disease has reached the stage where its toxin, in barter for endowment, is redistilled by the so-called educational institutions, into an opiate intended to narcotize into inaction any individual capable of sane thought.

Even now the soul of true Americanism, hasheesh-drugged in commercialism, slumbers in its long hempen drunk. Better had it been for Uncle Sam had the hemp been knotted about his neck as a martyr than that its tinctured, gold-laden slime should trickle inanely down his throat into a stomach bent only on an undemocratic, disorganizing and tumid expansion. The passage from Washington to Roosevelt is an intellectual trip that turns the healthful soul stomach-side out.

In the lives of most earnest thinkers there inevitably comes a time when the crying political ignorance of the masses is so borne in upon them that they instinctively exclaim: "Down with this absurd autocracy

of noses; up with the standard of grey matter! Better the rule of the enlightened few than of the ignorant many. Let us have a suffrage of weight instead of the absurd suffrage of numbers. Let us measure citizenship, not count it."

There are few social pitfalls more seductive than this one. It promises the unwary foot a security of tread that not only disarms suspicion but converts assurance into gross negligence.

It is customary on the part of those who think differently to waste time in raising bars to the practical conduct of such a system—as: "Who shall decide who is enlightened and who not?" "What shall be the test?" "What will you do with the 'uneducated' whose social perceptions are excellent and the 'educated' who have no real social perceptions of any kind?" etc., etc.

We may safely dismiss all such considerations if we correctly perceive a single natural law—the one above referred to as instanced in the common sayings: "Self-preservation is Nature's first law" and "Power is the most corruptive of all influences." The very tendency that enables a cell to exist at all is a tendency which will inevitably cause it to trench upon the existence of neighboring cells if not curbed by external influences. To this law the social cell is no exception. The very vis viva which a candidate uses to secure his office, he will tend subsequently to use as a vis inertia to keep out the adversary who would unseat him.

Is not the law simple enough? Does the monkey develop a prehensile hand only to let go of things? The strength which secures is father to the strength that retains. From the struggle with others for equality to the struggle against others for supremacy is but a short step, and toward this goal Nature invariably extends a man's foot and as invariably he makes the stride if similarly extended feet do not crowd him back.

What, then, in this light, becomes of the plea for the government of the many by the enlightened few? Simply this. It is seen to be a plea, made usually in the best of faith, which would result in the exploitation of

the many in the interests of the few, without even the assurance that the aforesaid few would, in the last analysis, be the most enlightened. Free competition is as absolutely essential to the social, as it is to the bodily, cell.

That there is an apparent heavy wastage here, as in commercial competition, is only another way of showing what anyone of sense ought to perceive, viz: that the "economy of Nature" is profligate. Our great common mother is a wasteful world-housewife. On every hand she employs tragic forces to accomplish farcical results. Her horn of plenty, the Universe, has no taper toward its lower end.

As a corollary of this belief in the rule of the so-called enlightened few, we have the service of the so-called ignorant many, and this brings us, by another route, back to the question of labor, individual and social.

When the economic slave protests against the long-enforced and arduous toil,—the incessant routine of which is making a mere machine of him, and the reward whereof is the pittance necessary to a continuance of the struggle,—it is customary to show him how hard his master labors. True, it is admitted that the master's labor is not enforced, and that the returns are much larger. Sophistry is taxed to its breaking point in the attempt to show that, by some weird alchemy, an ounce of blood which rushes to that little commercial maelstrom known as the financier's thinking bulb deserves a thousandfold the reward of a pint of the red life-fluid gushing through the brawn that wields the pick. The subconsciousness of the race subscribes to this position, without, for the most part, even so much as asking itself, Why?

Let us remedy at least that defect. Why? What constitutes just claim to reward socially considered? Is it not the rendition of social service? If so, should not the reward run *pari passu* with the service? It is because of the fact that man has advanced in the precise ratio that he has mixed his brain with his work,—because the brain of one man has often accomplished the labor of thousands of men, that so many of us have come

to look upon brain work as so immeasurably superior to brawn work, utterly regardless of their respective social results.

Nor is this all. Society has been cajoled by privilege into another grave mistake,—that of looking upon individual labor as if it had a social value and merited a social reward. Thus it comes about that those fatty degenerates of society known as "financiers," "industrial captains" and the like, rotting themselves into tumid hypertrophy by cupping their environmental tissue at every pore, are yclept "laborers worthy the largest wage," when, for the most part, they should be muled by society to the uttermost limit of convention. They only labor socially whose production benefits society.

This proposition falls into two portions. First, there must be production. Second, society must derive a benefit from it.

Under the first head it should be remarked that gamblers, whether in Wall street, at Monte Carlo, or the more commonly detected thieves who rob with a jimmy instead of an act of legislature, are not producers in any economic sense. There is a vital distinction between translation and production. He who surreptitiously removes my piano does not deserve the wage of a piano maker. This sounds self-evident, yet how many of the great business names to whom the largest of rewards is, for the most part, ungrudgingly yielded, designate men whose whole effort is to juggle like another Houdin, with the labor of others until the product of that labor's effort is deftly landed upon the servante of their own selfishness.

Take the second part of the proposition. Where labor is actually performed by these privileged classes does society always derive a benefit therefrom? By no means. What would a farmer think of a horse which, with the aid of a modern mowing machine, could not cut hay enough to feed himself? Would he consider him a farming benefit? It would not alter the case though he mowed twice that of any of his fellow beasts of burden if his inordinate appetite still showed a deficit. The

bee that garnered two portions of honey and consumed ten would socially be the equivalent of eight drones in the hive and would probably die as many deaths were they necessary to stop the deficit. If now, the bee gathered ten portions of honey and hoarded them for his own gluttony outside the hive, would he be any the less a social drone?

Society is properly constituted on the principle of a reciprocal gain between the whole body and each individual. The plutocrat, therefore, who labors entirely for himself, or who draws from society more than he gives to it, is a social drone. If, then, one must cut more grain than he consumes, what is to be said of those whose wealth and whose consumption is beyond the power of any mortal to legitimately produce? Are they not drones in the social hive?

He whose consumption disorganizes product at the rate of a hundred thousand dollars of value a year, whose labor is he expending? Can it possibly be his own? Is he not tapping the social reservoir? Be sure of it.

Man's powers are limited and these so-called "giants of finance" are usually men of peculiarly limited attainments. Examine the money kings of to-day and in nine cases out of ten,—and oftener than not the lonesome decimal, too,—their success is traceable less to the ability they possess than to the honesty they lack. It was not merely that others did not see the road they traveled, but that they held the goal as insufficient reward for the slough of filth and degradation through which they must wade to attain it. On the theory, so often asserted, that all men are purchasable, it may be said that it did not offer them their price. Compared with such the future monopolist was a cheap and insignificant fellow. Too much emphasis cannot be laid, at this juncture when great wealth makes little heads assume balloon-like proportions to the popular eye, upon the fact that the acquisitive, money-making intellect is of a very low order, and that such cheap success quite as often follows lack of conscience as it does stress of ability.

He labors socially then whose pro-

duction, minus his consumption, shows a net gain of which society secures the benefit.

He is a social drone whose consumption does not leave a balance of production which finds its way into the social sinking fund.

As a laborer he is the greatest benefactor the ratio of whose production to his consumption shows the largest gain to society.

It is the money drones that sap, en passant, the reward which society would confer upon labor as they also take, in process of rendition, the larger part of what labor intends for society.

If you would have better things, look to the fatty degenerates.

MELVIN L. SEVERY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, July 23.

The traction agitation in Chicago (p. 229), which has taken a slant that bids fair to affect most seriously the problem of municipal ownership throughout the United States, has advanced another stage.

Notice was served by the city authorities on the 17th upon the receivers of the insolvent company, which came immediately from the superintendent of streets and read as follows:

You are hereby notified that all permits issued to the Chicago Union Traction Company to do any work or make any repairs upon any street, alley or public belongings to the city of Chicago will be revoked July 30, 1903.

The date mentioned in this notice derives its significance from the fact that it is on July 30th that the street franchises here in question expire, unless "the 99-year act" is valid. It was explained at the time by Edwin Burritt Smith, the special counsel for the city who advised this notice, that it had not been given for the purpose of precipitating hostilities, but simply to preserve the status of the city pending negotiations for settlement. "Permits are issued," he said, "to street railway companies as a matter of course, and this notice is for the purpose of making the city's case clear."

The response to the notice from the city quoted above, was a restrain-

ing order from Judge Grosscup, of the United States Circuit Court, whereby the city of Chicago and all its agencies are forbidden to interfere with the receivers in their present "peaceable and exclusive possession, operation and enjoyment" of the street railways, equipment, appurtenances and franchises claimed by them, in respect to the street railway system belonging to either the North Chicago City Railway Company, or the North Chicago Street Railroad Company, or the Chicago West Division Railway Company, or the West Chicago Street Railway Company, or operated by the Chicago Union Traction Company as their lessee. This restraining order is to be in force until the further order of the court, and the time fixed by the order for a hearing upon a motion for an injunction to the same purport as the restraining order was July 27th. In consequence of that proceeding the City of Chicago is supposed to have been brought within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

These are the circumstances under which the whole matter, so far as open hostilities are concerned, has been postponed until next Winter. Arrangements for this postponement were made between John S. Miller, as counsel representing Judge Grosscup and the receivers on the one side, and the counsel for the city on the other. On the 20th the arrangement was confirmed by the city council. Under this arrangement, the hearing of the motion in the United States court for an injunction against the city is postponed until November 30th, without prejudice to the existing rights of either party. Of course the restraining order remains in force meanwhile. A similar arrangement was made also on the 20th between the city and the Chicago City Railway Co., which (p. 198), is not involved in the Federal court litigation. These postponements are publicly stated by all parties to be for the purpose of affording time for negotiations with a view to an amicable settlement; and the city law department announces that when the time comes for argument on the motion for an injunction, if no settlement has been made in the meantime, the city will contest the controversy to the limit, beginning with attacking the jurisdiction of the Federal court and proceeding step by

step, and that no agreed case will be made up under any conditions.

In Cleveland the traction agitation, which is proceeding along the line of 3-cent fares with ultimate municipal ownership (pp. 154, 209), has passed another stage. The bids for 3-cent routes were opened on the 18th. To the surprise and disappointment of Mayor Johnson, as reported by the Associated Press, only two bids had come in. One was for a cross-town line on Denison avenue, an isolated route having no connection with the down town district. The bid for this line came from J. B. Hoefgen, of New York, the same man who has been prevented by injunctions, etc., from building a complete 3-cent fare system. The other bid was for a line on Seneca street, the bidder being J. R. Zmut. No bids were received for the remaining nine routes for which the city council had provided (p. 154) in separate ordinances. When interviewed on his disappointment at Hoefgen's failure to bid for all the lines, Mayor Johnson said:

This thing will have to be fought out in the courts any way, and we will make a test case of the Denison avenue line. If the city wins, it will not be necessary to bid on any more lines, for this one franchise will suffice for all, the city council merely granting extensions.

From the tenor of that interview it has been shrewdly suspected that Mayor Johnson was not so deeply disappointed as the Associated Press reporter at Cleveland supposed. When it is observed that the Ohio municipal code makes it very difficult to get new street franchises, but very easy to extend old ones (a provision made for the benefit of the 5-cent fare companies), the inference from Mayor Johnson's interview is an obvious one.

A personal reception was given to Wm. J. Bryan at Chicago on the 18th by the Chicago Democratic Club. For the reception of a private citizen who has never held high office, it was a public ovation of extraordinary magnitude. A special committee of the club met its distinguished guest at Evanston, and upon their arrival in Chicago they were escorted by a marching committee of the club, 300 strong, to the Auditorium and thence to Brand's park, where the speeches were made. The welcome along the line of march to

the Auditorium recalled those of the days of a presidential campaign. Among the speakers were Samuel Alschuler, Democratic candidate in 1900 for governor of Illinois; Jeremiah B. Sullivan, Democratic candidate for governor of Iowa; T. E. Ryan, Wisconsin member of the National Reed Democratic Committee; James A. Reed, mayor of Kansas City, Mo.; Congressman Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois; W. A. McInerney, of Indiana; and Wm. J. Bryan, of Nebraska. Congressman Trimble, of Kentucky; Congressman Williams, of Illinois; and D. J. Campau, of Michigan, had been scheduled to speak, but failed to appear. Tom L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland, who had been invited, was obliged to decline on account of the pressure upon him of affairs in Ohio.

Mayor Harrison introduced Mr. Bryan to an audience of not less than 3,000 people. It was probably much larger, for it was one of the audiences that friendly head-line writers usually estimate at 10,000 or 15,000. Mr. Bryan's subject was "The Democratic Ideal." "If you know a man's ideal," said he, "you know the man," and then he urged that an "ideal is as important to a party as to an individual, and must in the end determine not only the party's character but the party's destiny." With this keynote he proceeded:

As in the case of the individual, so with a party—the character is formed not by a few decisions, but by a multitude of acts all in harmony with a general purpose and all influenced by the ideal. As in the case of the individual, it is impossible to follow one ideal a part of the time and an opposite ideal the rest of the time, so with the party there must be a constant effort to apply the same principles and the same methods to all questions and issues.

The distinguishing feature of any party, that deserves to be known as a democratic party, is its faith in the people, its desire to advance the welfare of the people, and its willingness to have the people control their own affairs. A democratic party seeks to administer the government according to democratic principles, and its ideal of a free government is a government in which every department, legislative, executive and judicial, is administered according to the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Never before in the history of the country has there been greater need for a democratic party with a truly democratic ideal. The aristocracy which Hamilton led against the Democracy of Jefferson's day, and the plutocracy

which Nick Biddle led against the Democracy of Jackson's day, have combined to assault the Democracy of the present day, and these assaults are supported by a metropolitan press more subservient to capital, more widely read than the papers of 1800 or 1832.

In 1896 the Republican party, under the leadership of Mark Hanna, became the open ally of organized wealth, and a victory was secured by the use of means which, when known, must be repugnant to every believer in the doctrine of self-government. The purchase of votes and the coercion of employes—all these things were resorted to with an audacity never known in this country before.

As a result of that election mammon was enthroned, the manufacturers were permitted to write the tariff schedules without regard to the interests of the consumers, the financiers were allowed to dictate the policy of the treasury without regard to the interests of the country at large, and the trust magnates were permitted to bankrupt rivals, stifle competition and extort without limit. When the Spanish war occurred, the syndicates in complete possession of the United States reached out for new fields to conquer, and they are now using the American army and a carpet-bag government to exploit the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, whose reverence for our institutions has thus been converted into hatred for our flag.

Surely if there ever was a time when the preaching of the democratic gospel ought to be opportune now is the time.

Will our party hesitate or take counsel of its fears? Will it abandon its championship of the people's interest in the hope of conciliating relentless foes or of purchasing a few offices with campaign contributions that carry with them an obligation to be made good out of the pockets of the people?

It has been said that no principle is worth living for that is not worth dying for; and so it may be said that no political principle is worth fighting for that is not worth suffering defeat for; and, as a matter of fact, one's devotion to a principle must be measured by what he is willing to suffer in its behalf, not by the reward that he is willing to accept for supporting it.

The Democratic party must appeal to the democratic sentiment of the country, and this sentiment is far wider than any party. Wherever the question has been submitted in such a way that it could be acted upon independently, there has always been an overwhelming majority in favor of that which was democratic; and our party can appeal successfully to this democratic spirit if we only convince the people of our earnestness and of our fidelity to these principles.

We are handicapped just now by the fact that the last Democratic administration that we had was more subserv-

ient to corporate dictation than any Republican administration that had preceded it, and the record of that administration has been a millstone about the party's neck ever since. The influence exerted by Wall street over that administration's policy, the use of patronage to reward those who betrayed their constituents and the employment of the most reprehensible of Republican methods made the administration a stench in the nostrils of the people and kept in the Republican party many who were disgusted at that party's course. The odium which Mr. Cleveland's second administration brought upon the party which elected him did more to defeat the party than any one plank of the Chicago platform, or even than all the planks that were most severely criticised. But for the repudiation of the administration it would have been impossible to make any campaign at all, and even the repudiation, thorough and complete as it was, could not completely disinfect the party.

The greatest menace that the party has to meet to-day is not the probability but the possibility of the party's return to the position that it occupied from 1892 to 1896. This danger is not so imminent as the corporation-controlled papers make it appear, but in so far as it at all threatens, it paralyzes the energies of the party and nullifies its promises. Such a return would indicate a degradation of the party's ideals and a perversion of its purpose.

It ought not to be necessary to remind you that our last experiment with a commercialized Democracy changed a Democratic majority of 380,000 in 1892 into a Republican majority of more than a million in 1894. It ought not to be necessary to appeal to history—a knowledge of human nature and a faith in the integrity of the people ought to convince us that both principle and expediency lead to an honest fight waged by honest methods for the support of those honestly desiring the restoration of justice and equity in government. If the Democratic party will stand erect, face the future with confidence, defend the rights of the people and protect their interests wherever attacked, whether the attack comes from the financiers, the monopolists, the tariff barons or from the imperialists, it can look with confidence for a revolution of sentiment that will give us a victory worth having; and this victory when it comes will not end, as the victory of 1892 did, in the demoralization of the party, but in the building up of a Democratic organization which will deal aggressively with all of the evils of government, and find its bulwark in the affections and confidence of the masses.

Further indications of a possible business collapse (p. 23) have been coming up from Wall street during the past two weeks. There

was a general slump in stock values on the 15th, second only to that of May 9, 1901 (vol. iv, p. 88), when Northern Pacific Railway stock bounded up to \$1,000 a share and fell again, creating a collapse in all Wall street values. An out and out panic is reported to have been prevented on the 15th by the prompt action of a combination of bankers who came to the support of the market. On the 16th a "bear" raid was made on copper trust stock and it was forced down several points; while other stocks fell even more. These depressing conditions were not sporadic. They seem to have been typical, rather, of a general condition of many months duration. For on the 17th it was reported that as compared with the prices of 1902 there had been an aggregate shrinkage in railroad and industrial stocks of \$1,766,799,000. Nearly one-quarter of this shrinkage was attributed to three of J. Pierpont Morgan's enterprises—the International Mercantile Marine trust, the Northern Securities trust, and the United States Steel trust. The figures as to these enterprises were stated as follows:

Mercantile Marine—1902.	1903.	Shrinkage
Bonds, \$50,000,000	4½	
per cent.	103	97½ \$ 2,750,000
Com. stock, \$48,000,000	30	4½ 12,240,000
Pfd. stock, \$52,160,000	75	17 30,160,000
Northern Securities—		
Stock	118½	87 118,582,035
United States Steel—		
Com. stock, \$508,496,200	46¾	25¼ 109,325,468
Pfd. stock, \$510,314,100	97¾	75½ 113,544,887

Shrinkage for three companies...\$386,602,390

In the aggregate, \$1,122,091,000 of the shrinkage in stocks is attributed to railway stocks, and \$644,708,000 to industrials. The depressing tendency continued. On the 21st a further violent contraction in steel stock values—the common stock touching 22, the lowest price in its history, and the preferred falling to 70, only one point higher than its lowest—cast over the entire market a cloud of gloom which has not yet floated away. But on the 22d there was a slight reaction under which steel trust stock rose, the common going to 23 and a fraction and the preferred to 71 and a fraction.

Outside of the United States, Venezuela's contribution to the news of the week is the capture by the government of a revolutionary stronghold—Ciudad Bolivar, on the Orinoco river. Since the government victory at Guatire in the Spring (p. 38), no definite or important news from the Venezuelan war was received un-

til the 16th, when a delayed dispatch from Soledad, an Orinoco town near Bolivar, reported a contemplated attack by government troops upon the latter city. A dispatch of the 17th told of the complete investment of this rebel city by Gen. Gomez; and on the 20th came the announcement of a bloody battle. The revolutionists had opened the battle at 5 o'clock in the morning of the 19th. At 6 o'clock the smoke over Ciudad Bolivar was so thick that it was impossible to see the city; at 7 o'clock the government troops, after a terrible fight, in which they lost more than 100 men, captured the cemetery; at 8 o'clock the Venezuelan fleet, consisting of five men of war, shelled the government building; at 10 o'clock the revolutionists' flag had disappeared from the government building; and at 11 all the streets near it were captured by the government forces. At 2 o'clock in the afternoon a block of houses opposite the government building was captured by storm, and when the smoke cleared away there were more than 200 dead revolutionists in the streets, besides scores of the wounded. Twenty-four hours afterwards, according to the next dispatch, the battle had continued to rage madly. Block after block was disputed, as the government troops slowly entered the city. The old custom-house and the waterworks were taken in turn, and the Dalton block, property of the United States consul, where all the leading German and French firms reside, was then under attack; while the jail was the center of a terrible resistance, all the defeated revolutionists having concentrated there. The artillery of the revolutionists was meanwhile fiercely replying to the attack of the fleet, which for two hours had been shelling the neighboring city of Soledad. The capitol was still in the possession of the revolutionists, but the complete success of the government forces was even then assured. The city appeared as if struck by a cyclone. At 7 o'clock in the evening the government forces, which were advancing from all directions, arrived near the center of Ciudad Bolivar. For two hours previously firing had diminished, but it was renewed with greater vigor at 10 o'clock at night and illuminated the sky. At 3 o'clock in the morning of the 20th, when the inhabitants of the commercial and foreign parts of the city near the alameda the public

park of Ciudad Bolivar, saw the advance of the government troops, they abandoned their homes and sought refuge in other parts of the city, crossing the streets in a hail of bullets and shells, the women carrying their children and the strong helping the weak. Many men in trying to protect the women, fell, struck by bullets. With the firing and the cries of the wounded and of the women and children, a terrible scene was presented in the streets. The government troops, however, acted with humanity, especially the forces of Gen. Rivas, who was the first to order the attacking force to be merciful. At 8 o'clock in the morning of the 20th, the government generals, having effected a junction of their forces north and south and having received further supplies of ammunition, decided to push the attack on the center of the city. At 10 o'clock the government troops had captured the north side of the alameda, which had been defended by a double row of barricades. Behind one of these were found more than thirty dead soldiers, and wounded men were seen on all sides. The soldiers on both sides had had no food for two days, and ambulances were not being used. The fighting continued until 8 in the morning of the 21st, when the government troops, according to a dispatch of that date from Caracas, made their capture of the city complete.

Another battle report comes, strangely enough, from Manila, capital of the Philippine islands, where peace is supposed (p. 121) to have been long ago established. The report refers to a battle with 250 natives in the streets of Albay, capital of the island of Albay, under the leadership of Simeon Ola, who is described in the dispatch as "chief of the Albay rebels." Col. H. R. Banzholz commanded the American scouts and constabulary. The casualties reported were 1 scout killed and 2 wounded, 15 "rebels" killed and 15 wounded, and four non-combatants killed.

In contrast with these reports of slaughter we have the long delayed news of the peaceful death of Pope Leo XIII. He died at Rome on the 20th, having passed four months into his 94th year, and been at the head of the Roman Catholic church over 25 years.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Epworth League was in session during the past week at Detroit, Mich.

—Gen. Cassius M. Clay died at his home in Marion county, Ky., on the 22d, aged 94.

—The International Retail Clerks' convention was in session at Zanesville, O., on the 17th.

—The annual convention of the American Osteopathic association closed its session at Cleveland on the 18th.

—The headquarters of the reform conference at Denver, July 27-29 (p. 232) is to be the St. James hotel.

—Morris B. Belknap, of Louisville, was nominated on the 16th by the Republicans for governor of Kentucky.

—James Abbott McNeill Whistler, the celebrated American artist, died on the 18th at his residence in Chelsea, at the age of 69 years.

—In the British House of Commons on the 22d the Irish land purchase bill (p. 169) passed its third reading by a vote of 317 to 20.

—At Montgomery, Ala., on the 17th, the Federal grand jury returned 99 indictments against 18 persons for enslaving Negroes under the recently exposed peonage (p. 232) system.

—P. M. Arthur, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, dropped dead at midnight on the 17th, while speaking at Winnipeg on the occasion of the reunion banquet of the Brotherhood.

—The Cuban senate on the 16th confirmed the treaties with the United States (p. 215), giving to the United States certain naval and coaling stations and recognizing the sovereignty of Cuba over the Isle of Pines.

—It was reported from Washington on the 16th that the State Department had been officially notified that Russia would decline to receive the petition concerning the Kishineff massacre (pp. 214, 228) which President Roosevelt proposed to forward.

—The committee appointed by the Commonwealth parliament to select the site for the new capital of the federated Australian States, has recommended Tumut, New South Wales, 264 miles southwest of Sydney. Tumut is situated in a rich agricultural district and in 1899 had a population of 1,500.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (see p. 171) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, as given by the June treasury sheet, are as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

M	\$1,419,991,290	\$1,025,619,127	\$394,372,163 exp.
G	47,090,595	46,982,027	108,566 exp.
S	44,245,259	24,163,491	20,081,769 exp.
	\$1,511,327,144	\$1,096,764,645	\$414,562,499

—Fletcher Turner, whom an Alabama jury failed to convict of Negro peonage (p. 232), pleaded guilty on the 20th to the indictment upon an agreement that

two other indictments for similar offenses should be dismissed. He was thereupon sentenced to pay a fine of \$1,000, and three-fourths of the fine was subsequently remitted.

—All the members of the Spanish ministry resigned on the 18th (vol. v., p. 586; vol. vi., 60), and the king called upon the Marquis Villaverde to form a new ministry. On the following day the following ministry was approved by the king:

Premier, Marquis Villaverde; foreign minister, Count San Bernardo; minister of justice, Senor Buganal; minister of finance, Senor Besada; minister of war, Gen. Martitegui; minister of navy, Senor Estram; minister of the interior, Senor Garcia Alix; minister of public instruction, Senor Osmá, and minister of agriculture, Senor Gassot.

—King Edward and his queen, accompanied by the Princess Victoria and their suites, left England for Ireland on the 20th on board the royal yacht. They arrived at Kingston on the 21st and proceeded to Dublin. On the 22d they were at Dublin castle, where the king held a levee, receiving various deputations. In reply to an address from Dublin citizens he said he had come to get acquainted with the conditions under which the Irish people live and to learn what can be done to brighten the lot of the poor.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PUBLIC COMPENSATION FOR STREET CAR MONOPOLIES.

Chicago Chronicle (Ind.), July 14.—In granting to traction companies a practical monopoly of a certain kind of use of the streets there are two things which the city should not surrender. One is the right to require from the companies good and adequate service. The other is the right to require that the service be rendered for reasonable return. The city should not only do nothing to impair these rights, but it should exercise them to such an extent that the companies cannot afford to make "compensation," as it is improperly called, for the monopoly granted them. . . . The compensation should be made to the riding public. That part of the public should not be compelled to contribute in high fares and poor accommodations to the city treasury. The very best compensation, if you choose to call it that, is low fares and good service. It is compensation made with absolute certainty and without cost or waste in the collection or after. It is compensation made every day and every hour and it goes to those who are entitled to it—to those for whose use the whole service exists and who are entitled to the full benefit of competition in the service rendered them or the equivalent of such competition in reasonable regulation of service and fares. It is compensation to those who are entitled to it in the form of commodious and comfortable and wholesome cars, in reasonable speed, in reasonable transfer rights and frequency of service. The city has no moral right to deprive them of any part of this compensation to put money in the city treasury, where it is pretty sure to meet the fate of money that comes easy.

PUBLIC OPINION AND LABOR.

Chicago Examiner (Ind.), July 21.—From time to time newspapers mention the fact that in this or that labor disturbance the working people are running counter to public opinion. As a matter of fact, public opinion means several things. It means

in the estimation of the newspapers opposed to organized labor what they happen to say editorially. But the sort of public opinion that really counts is the turning away of the head of one's personal friends and acquaintances. There is already so wide a social breach between employers and employed that it is safe to say that the workman cares only for the good opinion of his fellow workmen. But there is still another sort of public opinion—that based on the writings of the great thinkers and teachers through the ages. It need not be said that these mighty forces in the spiritual world of thought are all, unanimously, on the side of the poor, the suffering, the oppressed—in short, of all that class to-day that is seeking justice and equal opportunity under the law. The workman knows these thinkers are on his side. Why, then, should he bother about the opinion of an anonymous editorial writer hired by his opponents in the labor struggle?

OUR GOLD EXPORT.

Cleveland (O.) Wächter und Anzeiger (Dem.), July 14.—Our gold is going out of the country. Director of the Mint Roberts is trying to explain that this does not harm us, as we produce gold and Germany and France, which get our gold, do not produce any. This may be so, but that is not the question in this connection. The question is, how does it come that our country, while exporting much more than it imports, and therefore should be receiving gold from foreign countries in payment, must nevertheless send out gold. Director Roberts should explain, though it is not exactly in his line, where the celebrated "Balance of Trade" theory, which our Republican prosperity touters have used at every election since 1898, fetches up. That the theory disappears into a hole is evidenced by the gold export.

STREET CARS AND LAND VALUES.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), July 17.—Street car lines . . . as a rule . . . add to the rental value of property on the streets in which they are operated. The owners would be the first to protest if it were proposed to take up the tracks, for the excellent reason that their buildings would rent for less.

MISCELLANY

THE WRONG MAN'S "BURDEN."

(A suggestion for a much needed additional stanza.)

For The Public.

"London, July 15.—A rumor was current in the lobby of the house of commons to-night to the effect that some United States warships had seized about twenty small islands off the coast of Borneo, which, it is understood, belong to Great Britain, and had planted the American flag on them. It is probable that a question on the subject will be asked in the house.—Cable to Chicago Tribune.

Take up the right man's burden.

That little rhyming boost

I sent you, *re* the Philippines,

Must not come home to roost.

Take up *the* white man's burden;

For 'tis a task divine;

But not *this* white man's burden;

Because *that* burden's mine.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

THE ABSENT-MINDED BEGGAR.

The War Department holding that the marriage of an American soldier to a

Philippine woman is as binding as any marriage makes it reasonably certain that the obligation to rudimentary manliness also followed the flag.

But how was the ordinary fighting man (*miles vilis*) to know this in advance of authoritative definition?—Life.

RACE HATRED.

Even United States soldiers at Fort Leavenworth [have] attempted to lynch a negro who had been in a fracas with one of their number. Where is this thing to stop? The fact that their regiments had seen service in the Philippines, and had there acquired the notion that "niggers" have no more right than wild animals, should furnish food for thought to startled Imperialists who are wondering where the new ferocity against an "inferior" race got its fresh impulse.—New York Nation of July 16.

Race hatred is as real and as frightful in its results in America as in Russia. Only by justice is it to be escaped by any nation unfortunate enough to have within its borders two numerous and unassimilating races. . . . Alabama has disfranchised the negro. The next step in degradation after disfranchisement is physical servitude, and the one result is certain to follow the other soon or late in every case where the departure from democratic principles once begins. This is the point which is always overlooked by those who would disfranchise the inferior in order that government may be improved. The result is always that government is made worse, because the strong, finding the weak at their mercy, mould the laws into instruments of oppression.

The way out is easy if we are good enough to take it. We must trust democracy, respect the law, and protect the rights of even colored criminals. If we cannot find the virtue in ourselves to do this, then we are certain to suffer all the horrors of mob-law and anarchy on every occasion of public excitement. Unless the law protects the rights of black men, it will quickly cease to protect the rights of white men. Those who burn negroes are destroying the safeguards of their own liberty.—San Francisco Star, of July 11.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

HE WANTS TO KNOW WHY HE SHOULD TAX HIMSELF TO SUPPORT A EUROPEAN NAVY.

Printed from the Original MS.

Mr. John Bull—Sir: You are a plowin' with my heifer! Here you and Japan send a note to Russia, and at the same time my warships move toward China. Same thing happened at the start of the

Boer war. One of my warships was sent toward the coast of Africa. What fer? Why to make Europe believe I was with you, when I wasn't, and was a hopin' all the time you'd get licked. You would a been, too, if I'd had Americans on guard instead of British. I'd have notified you brief and quick: "Hands off Republics!" You'd have come down early, too, for Russia would back me against you any minute; and every Latin nation would have dropped in behind us for they came near shoulderin' you as it was, and I don't need backin', anyway. But there I was, tied up by this British Republican administration. What do you pay 'em? Darned if I can get any such service out of 'em!

I would not care that you owned Hay and Roosevelt, if you'd only take 'em home; but I don't like a British administration at Washington. I'd rather have the one you sent over in 1812 that burned the town. It would do me less harm. The land I was so proud of has come to be but a satrapy of the British Empire, and I'm a gettin' tired.

I give notice, too, that I'll send Hay back to his muttons if he don't quit tryin' to quarrel with Russia to help roast your chestnuts. Statesmanship ain't his forte, anyway. Russia was one time nigh about my only ally in trouble—Russia and France. Russia helped me with a fleet off New York in '61, when you was agin me, and France back in '76; and now this little modern Republican administration, "eight by ten and an entry through," is tryin' to make us bad friends. I won't stand for it! You can't get me into any war with Russia just to help you play your game—not this time.

How would it do, Mr. John Bull, for you to set Russia an example? Get out of Egypt, which you hold by no better right than Russia's in Manchuria, and see what effect it'll have on the Bear.

I notice that King Ed gave my navy boys a supper the other night. That's right so far as it goes. Hope the boys got a good meal. But King Edward should pay my navy bills entire, if he's going to use the ships. That's the way it looks to me. That's the way I feel.

I own up, John, it grigs me to see all this banquettin' of my navy by you and Billy of Germany, and praisin' of the Monroe Doctrine so soon after the Venezuela affair. I don't enjoy seein' you play horse with my administration just because it's weak. I know it must be temptin', and you know it's very safe; but it is not always so. I mind when old Uncle Billy Seward was secretary of state, he shook his fist under your nose when you got gay, and stopped the deal when you and Louie Napoleon were

joining the Confederacy; and that, too, when he had a big war on his hands. Theodore says: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Fiddle! I could run all my warships in under the shed, dismantle 'em, put a bantam rooster in for secretary of state, and get more dignity, and consideration for it, than this administration gets; but then I ain't got no bantam rooster—not in my Republican party.

Why, law! I never had any trouble when I had no navy to speak of. I could a built one if I wanted, an' I have a long arm and a good memory, and the boys knew it; and besides, I behaved myself when away from home. There's lots in that. I never had no trouble. The fellows always felt good towards me. I never had to carry a big stick. Then why should I pay taxes for a navy for you and Germany to frolic with? I have a boy—Tom Johnson, his name is—says these big navies and armies are used to enslave people who have just as good a right to freedom as you and I. That's what Tom says. I don't believe he could say it in Germany. Emperor William, they tell me, has seized an edition of Count Tolstol's book, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." I've bin suspectin' for a long time there was treason in the Bible as well as in my Declaration of Independence, and of the same kind.

UNCLE SAM.

THE SALE OF JUSTICE.

A portion of a sermon delivered in Cincinnati, July 12, by Herbert S. Bigelow.

"And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth falleth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."—Isaiah 59: 14, 15.

We may not know how accurately these words of Isalah described political conditions in Jerusalem. They are a severe indictment of an evil time. Yet I think few will deny that we have in our American cities to-day precisely that condition of affairs which these words describe.

Illustrations are always at hand, and one does not need to go beyond the borders of his own municipality to find examples of tyranny which are submitted to with amazing indifference.

In Ohio there has recently come to light an example of judicial weakness which would cause an uprising if the public conscience were not seared.

Franchises had been granted for an indefinite period. The street railway companies possessing these franchises claimed that they were perpetual. The people claimed that they were revocable at will. A certain judge in Columbus decided in favor of

the companies. It is not necessarily proof of corruption that judges should so often render decisions in favor of the monopolists. Perhaps the law is more often on their side. It ought to be, since they make the laws for the most part.

But this particular judge was a candidate for the Republican nomination to the supreme court of the State. Mayor Johnson charges against him that this decision in favor of perpetual franchises was written three months before it was announced; that it was shown in advance to the companies; that it was through railroad influence that this judge secured his coveted nomination. Having written a decision favorable to monopoly, having secured as a reward the nomination which he sought, having kept the public in the dark until the convention had been held, he now relies on the indifference of the people and the political handicap in his favor to win the race.

I heard recently a story of a dishonest judge. It was no worse than the things that are commonly believed of judges, but it was somewhat shocking to hear the story from a source that could not be doubted. We are growing accustomed to suspect our judges of corruption, but here is a judge that I know was corrupt.

A decision had been written which was certain to depreciate the stock of one of the public service corporations of the city. Three weeks before that decision was made public it was clandestinely revealed to the attorney of this corporation, so that the favored ones could have an opportunity to unload their stock on "widows and orphans."

It is not difficult to understand why judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off, when we reflect upon the character of the men who dictate the nomination of these judges.

One of the ward bosses in Cincinnati recently gave his annual picnic to the people of his ward. It was estimated that from 12,000 to 15,000 people accepted his hospitality. One paper, in fulsome praise of his liberality, gave this list of articles provided by the host: 225 gallons of ice cream, 400 gallons of milk, 3,750 bananas, 30 barrels of lemonade flavored with 26 gallons of claret, 17,000 free tickets to Coney Island, 25,000 tickets to amusements, seven silver and one gold medal and some money in cash prizes.

Commenting on this picnic a newspaper stated editorially that it would be a good thing for the city if more

ward leaders would follow this example of generosity, and then quoted as applying to this boss the saying of Jesus: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

We remember that before Boss Tweed was sent to prison some of the New York papers were speaking of him as "our noble benefactor." Newspaper editors should be a little more discriminating in their praise.

Can a man be generous who spends only other people's money? I wonder if the editor ever heard the story of the house with a leaning wall? Well, there is such a house in a certain ward in this city the history of which throws some light upon the source of the money which is spent so freely.

This was a four-story stone front house. It was for sale. An individual called on the agent and offered a sum so ridiculously small in the opinion of the agent that it was promptly rejected. Soon the agent received notice from the building inspector that one wall of the house had a bulge in it and would have to be torn down, since it was dangerous. The agent remonstrated, but in vain. Counting the cost of removing the wall he determined to accept the offer which he had rejected.

In the course of a few weeks it became apparent who had been the real purchaser of the house. The ward boss took possession. He lives there to-day in this stone front. The wall has not yet been replaced. It stands as one of many monuments of the tyranny that has grown so common among us. It might not be inappropriate to carve on this monument the words of Isaiah: "Truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter."

It is men who are gorged with that kind of plunder who have more to do with the nomination of judges, than all the preachers, and all the lawyers, and all the school-teachers combined. What then can be expected of the courts? From the judge down to jailer the machinery of justice is responsive to the will of these men who boast that they are in politics for the money they can get out of it.

Recently in Cincinnati it was necessary to go out into one of the townships to find a justice of the peace who would issue warrants for the arrest of men charged with false registration. And when these men were brought to jail the warden refused to receive them and they were set free.

Now what is the moral effect on the community of a government of priv-

ilege and plunder? It makes of every ward in the city a school where young men are taught that knavery is the open door to success. Under the influence of such a government the path of rectitude is covered with thorns and virtue is nailed to the cross. In every boss-ridden city, to use the language of our text, "he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN TORONTO.

Cumulative voting will in future be used to a certain extent in the municipal elections of the city of Toronto.

Cumulative voting is proportional representation; not on as good a plan as the Hare-Spence system, but still proportional representation. It will be used at the next Toronto municipal elections in electing the 12 members of the school board and the four members of the board of control, who are to be elected by the city at large—the mayor being the fifth member.

THE BOARD OF CONTROL.

Cumulative voting, as applied to the board of control, means that the elector will have four votes, but that he need not give each of them to a different candidate. He may do so if he wishes; but he has also the power to give all his four votes to one candidate. This makes "plumping" four times as powerful as it was by the old "block" system, when if you "plumped" for one candidate you threw away three out of your four votes. Now you have the benefit of your full voting power, whether you plump or not. And plumping is the correct thing; in fact, proportional representation is simply effective plumping, with the addition in the best systems of a provision for transfer of votes, so as to prevent wasting too many on one candidate. However, we are dealing now with the cumulative vote. Besides permitting an elector to give all four votes to one candidate, the cumulative plan enables him to give two of his votes to one candidate, and two to another, or he may give three votes to one candidate, and his fourth to another candidate. In fact, he may distribute or cumulate his four votes as he pleases. The controllers being elected by the people at large, instead of by the council, there will be only three aldermen elected in each ward. These will be elected by the old block vote.

Let us see now what can be done in regard to the board of control. First, if one-fourth of the voters give all their votes to one candidate, they

can elect him, no matter what the other three-fourths choose to do. Suppose 24,000 voters go to the polls, then 6,000 of them can elect one controller, if they are sufficiently well organized to plump their four votes on the one candidate; or, if half the voters were so well organized that they could be depended upon to split their votes on the same two men—two votes for one, and two for the other—then they could put in two controllers.

A great deal will depend on the wise choice of candidates and good organization.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The newly amalgamated board of education for the city of Toronto consists of 14 members, two of whom are appointed by the separate school board, and the remaining 12 elected by the city at large. The system to be used in electing these 12 is not cumulative voting to the full extent, but is a mixture of the cumulative vote and the limited vote, because each elector must not cumulate more than three of his votes on any one candidate, although he will have 12 votes at the election of 1904, and six votes at each subsequent election. The reason of this is that the 12 elective members of the board of education have all to be elected in 1904, but after that only six members will be elected every year, to take the places of the six who retire.

The practical effect of this voting method is that one-third of the electors can put in one-third of the board in 1904. That means, if 24,000 voters go to the polls, and 8,000 of them agree on a ticket of four candidates, they can elect their ticket by cumulating their 12 votes on the same four candidates, giving three votes to each. Three times four is 12. We shall probably see candidates coming out in quartettes or tickets of four each; and some careful organization will be necessary. At subsequent elections, when only six are to be elected, the tickets will be in twos, instead of fours.

ONE MAN'S WORK.

There is one man in the legislature who deserves special mention in this connection, and that is Samuel Russell, of Deseronto, M. P. P. for East Hastings. He is a warm friend of proportional representation, and has on three occasions introduced a bill into the house to give municipalities power to use proportional representation in their elections.

This has had the effect of familiar-

izing members with the proportional principle. Besides this, Mr. Russell's quiet and persistent work during the present session in committee and otherwise, has had much to do with the success of the daring innovation—as many consider it—of cumulative voting. The innovation is in imperfect shape at present, but its great value consists in a recognition of the proportional principle and in making a beginning in the right direction.

THE POPULAR VOTE.

Another piece of progressive legislation may be mentioned in this connection. The municipal council of a county, a township, a city, a town or a village of this province may now legally pass a by-law for the submission to a vote of the electors, at any annual election, of any question not specifically authorized by statute. It has been so common a thing to submit questions to a popular vote, that many readers will be surprised to learn that this was illegal, and could have been stopped by a judicial injunction, except in the case of money by-laws and others specifically named by statute. The legislature at its session just closed has removed this anomaly, and given a greater measure of popular self-government.

One effect of the change is that it is now quite practicable to obtain the referendum and initiative—sometimes called direct legislation—in municipal matters. This can be done through an organized system of pledging candidates, which has been tried in Toronto with great success. This is not the place to give details; but anyone interested in the working of the people's veto and direct initiative can obtain details by writing to Mr. James Simpson, 42 Albany avenue, Toronto. Mr. Simpson is secretary of the Toronto Federation for Majority Rule.

ROBERT TYSON.

SONGS OF THE SHIPYARD.

"Mother, may I go out to combine?"
"Yes, my darling daughter;
Sell your bonds at eighty-nine,
And fill your stocks with water."

Lewis and Charles went up the Street,
With forty millions of water;
The floods swept Lewis off his feet,
And Charles came grumbling after.

Sing a song of sixpence,
Here's the stock to buy!
Four and twenty shipyards
Baked in a pie.

When the pie was opened
There was no end of troubles;
Nothing in that pretty dish
But iridescent bubbles.
—N. Y. Evening Post.

BOOKS

MR. SHELDON'S OLD TESTAMENT BIBLE STORIES.

There is no question of the fact, which the author emphasizes in his introduction, that the Old Testament furnishes the finest material extant for bringing home the distinction between good and evil to the young mind. The point of the entire narrative from beginning to end is involved in the lesson: "Be sure your sin will find you out." There is no question of the further fact that the children of to-day stand in as great need as children ever did of having such lessons brought home to them, and that their reading-books of to-day are singularly unconcerned about such lessons.

Few who have not looked specially into the subject have any idea how great a change has taken place in the character of the reading provided for schools. Compare a fourth reader of thirty years ago with a fourth reader of some modern series, and you will find that there is now no such ethical emphasis as formerly. The present selections may be more artistic and more given to nature-study but there has been a clear reaction against teaching morals. I was recently called upon, in the matter of a state adoption of text-books, to examine seventeen sets of modern school readers, and nothing struck me so forcibly as the contrast I have mentioned between the old and the new in this particular respect. The compilers of the old readers evidently had almost, if not quite, foremost in mind the idea of character. The new books are of course far more attractive in very many ways, but there is no such emphasis upon attempting to reach the child's moral nature.

There is no need to enter here upon the causes of this reaction; but it may be said, I think, that one cause was the bald and unattractive way in which so much of the preaching was done. We shall doubtless have another reaction—indeed there are already signs—and, as is always the case, out of the loss we shall have a gain. The preaching will be all the wiser and better.

One of the signs is this book by Mr. Walter L. Sheldon (The Old Testament Bible Stories for the Young, W. M. Welch & Co., Chicago, \$1), which might well be introduced as supplementary reading in every primary school in the land. It seems to me to be a model book of its kind. Its language is simple but not babyish. It brings into all the stories the famous sayings, like "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground", "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground", "The Lord seeth not as man seeth, for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart", and all the others, which have for centuries been interwoven into the thought and speech of the world, and are singularly

unfamiliar to children of the present generation. There is enough of these quotations to give the flavor of the Bible style, and they are wrought into the stories, as Mr. Sheldon tells them, with effectiveness.

It is hardly possible for anyone to tell these wonderful stories without being interesting, so there is no special reason for congratulating the author upon this feature; yet it ought to be said that he has succeeded admirably in telling the stories over again in a most interesting way. He says they are told for children of from seven to nine years. He need surely not have put the upper limit; I have tried them with children of twelve, thirteen, and fifteen, and found myself as much interested as they were.

The best feature of the book is the simple way in which the point and the moral are made to appear, and yet without any undue emphasis or savor of cant. Each chapter ends with an excellent hint to teachers with reference to bringing out more fully, if necessary, the ethical value of the stories; but the author has done his work so well that there will be little need of supplement. It would be an improvement if these hints were put at the end of the book, but this is a small matter.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"An Examination of Society from the Standpoint of Evolution." By Louis Wallis. Columbus, O.: The Argus Press. Price, \$1.75 net. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

In Pearson's for August, North Overton Messenger tells the story of the Panama canal, rather too optimistically with reference to the future, but lucidly as to the past; and Albert Bigelow Paine introduces a novelty in fiction writing for the purpose of telling an interesting short story in illustration of the Negro race question.

The Advocate for Peace, Boston, in its excellent July number, contains Governor Garvin's address at the recent dedication of the Rhode Island monument at Andersonville. "When a nation," says the Governor, "embarks upon the work of slaughter, has staked success, and, it may be, its very existence upon the decision of the battlefield, any laws of war—which in their nature are arbitrary—have but slight binding force upon either combatant. In a business where murder, arson, robbery and fraud are counted as virtues, receiving the highest praise and the greatest reward, it is certainly a fine distinction to say that prisoners should be well treated, and that non-combatants, together with their property, should be protected." In the same number there is an extract from a sermon by Dr. Leighton Parks, of Boston, on the subject "Civilization Not Advanced by Armies," Dr. Parks holds "that we have been deceived by the historians," and he deals with the subject in so able a manner that one might well wish he would write more fully along this line. J. H. D.

The Outlook has done an excellent piece of sociological work in investigating the condition of Negro graduates. Complaint having come from a resident of Montgomery reflecting upon the graduates of Tuskegee, a representative of the paper investigated the present condition of the thirty-eight ex-students of this institution residing in the city of Montgomery. He reports in the issue of July 19 that there is not one of these but is earning his living by his industry, and that nearly all of them are financially independent and laying up money. The report is so favorable that some may be inclined to question its accuracy; but the facts are given with quite full detail, and any one in Montgomery who may care to make the investigation can easily find out whether the individual

TEN BOOKS FOR THE PRICE OF ONE

This is Your Opportunity

T

10 for 1

THE following selection of ten books from THE HUMBOLDT LIBRARY OF SCIENCE is given so that the readers of this paper may get an idea of the excellence of the Series, which contains the Best works of the leading Scientists at Popular prices. Others charge \$1.00 to \$1.50 for the same books bound in cloth. Ours are Complete and Unabridged editions, neatly bound in strong paper covers, and sell at the small sum of 15 cents each.

<p>Quintessence of Socialism. By Prof. A. SCHAFFLE.</p> <p>Civilization; Its Cause and Cure. By EDWARD CARPENTER.</p> <p>The Coming Slavery; The Sins of Legislators; The Great Political Superstition. By HERBERT SPENCER.</p> <p>The History of Landholding in England. By JOSEPH FISHER, F. R. H. S.</p> <p>The Soul of Man under Socialism. By OSCAR WILDE.</p>	<p>Utilitarianism. By JOHN STUART MILL.</p> <p>Physics and Politics. An application of the principles of Natural Science to Political Society. By WALTER BAGEHOT.</p> <p>Social Disease and Worse Remedies. By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, F. R. S.</p> <p>Profit-Sharing Between Capital and Labor. By SEDLEY TAYLOR, M. A.</p> <p>History of Science and Politics. By FREDERICK POLLOCK.</p>
--	---

PRICE, 15 CENTS EACH

The ten (10) books for \$1.50, which includes postage

TWENTIETH CENTURY PRESS

17 East 16th Street, NEW YORK

Remember the present editions are positively the last to be issued in cheap form. Order early. Full list of 177 numbers on application



At last Labor has discovered the abiding place of that elusive "Prosperity."

reports be true or false. It is to be hoped that the original complainer will undertake to do this, and will let the readers of the Outlook and others know the result of his search. The subject is one of recognized importance, and the truth can be arrived at only by the method adopted by the Outlook.

In the Westminster Review for July Mr. Franklin Thomasson has an able article on "Property in Land and Poverty." It is a valuable discussion of the relation between private property in land and the level of wages. His conclusion is that "where private land monopoly exists . . . however small the population, however high the state of progress in the arts and sciences of industry, however great the ability and the output of labor, yet the level of wages of unskilled labor will be limited and kept down to the barest minimum by the necessity laborers are under of paying competitive land rent for permission to make use of the natural materials and forces of the globe." Incidentally Mr. Thomasson cites several interesting examples. "The whole problem," he says, "of native labor for the mines in

South Africa turns upon the existence of free access to the 'marginal' land of the economist. The natives there, unlike our working classes, have that access, and are, therefore, in a more or less independent position in dealing with employers of labor—an independence of which, presumably, their less fortunate brethren in this country are to be invited to assist in depriving them, under one pretext or another."

J. H. D.

J. H. D.

Trade

The National Tea Bank

130-132 Water Street
NEW YORK

Since 1874 we have been supplying Banks, Institutions and families in all parts of the Union with

Finest Teas and Coffees

We can supply YOU. Samples sent on application. Write for booklet, "What You Should Know About Coffee."

SOCIALIST TRIUMPH IN GERMANY

At the recent German elections the Socialists have won a victory too notable to be concealed by the capitalist papers of the United States. They therefore claim that socialism in Germany is something different from socialism in America; that it is merely a democratic reform movement. That this is false will be seen by reading THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION, by Karl Kautsky, the leading socialist writer of Germany. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons. Cloth, 189 pages, 50 cents, postpaid. Mention this paper and we will include without extra charge a copy of the Communist Manifesto and a late number of the International Socialist Review. Address CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 86 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO.

TO COMPLETE A FILE OF "THE PUBLIC"

the undersigned will pay

TEN DOLLARS

for one complete copy, in good condition, of the

FIRST VOLUME.

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

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It 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.
Fresley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

CONTRACTORS.

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

Clubs of Three

To extend the circulation of The Public among new readers, and at the same time to relieve of expense such regular readers, or others, as take the trouble to procure us new subscriptions, we will supply three subscriptions for the price of two, on the following terms:

- A Club of Three Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new).....\$4.00
- A Club of Three Semi-Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new).....\$3.00
- A Club of Three Quarterly Subscriptions (at least two of them new).....\$1.00

Any person soliciting new subscribers will be allowed the same terms. For every two new subscriptions for which he forwards us cash at regular rates we will honor his order for a third subscription free.

Make all Checks, Money Orders, etc., payable to
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.,
Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

THREE DAINY BOOKLETS

The Ghost of Murdered Love
Fables and Parables by Avery Quercus
The Straight Edge Cooperative Industries

Sent to any person suspected of interest in this sort of thing. The enclosure of a dime arouses the suspicion.

STRAIGHT EDGE, 1 7th Ave., N.Y.