

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1903.

Number 257.

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.

President Roosevelt's recourse to a personal letter in explanation and justification of his policy regarding the appointment of Negroes to office, is an encouraging sign. It recalls his dignified manifestation of the true American spirit when he refused a body guard upon his accession to the presidency.

He might have stood upon the false dignity of his office and pursued his Negro policy in silence, as an official too exalted to be questioned; or he might have reserved his explanation for a ponderous state document—a speech from the throne, as it were. Either course would have been conventional and monarchical. But he preferred the democratic method of a personal letter addressed to a private citizen, for general and ordinary publication in a provincial newspaper.

Shocking as this doubtless is to some sensibilities it implies a recognition of the American principle that officials are not rulers but servants, which is peculiarly refreshing at a time when the current is running swift and strong in the other direction. Instead of calling for criticism, the President's adoption of a simple, man-to-man method of apprising the people of his purposes and motives demands a cordial acknowledgment. It conveys a lesson that should not be forgotten, and affords an example which we trust may not be ignored.

The tone of the letter itself is fully in keeping with the democratic spir-

it that seems to have prompted it. It is simple, frank and direct, and singularly free from even a touch of bombast; and it lays down as his rule of conduct regarding official appointments a principle so truly democratic that no one claiming to be a Democrat should be capable of contesting its righteousness without blushing with shame to the roots of his hair. "I certainly cannot treat mere color," he writes, "as a permanent bar to holding office, any more than I could so treat creed or birthplace—always provided that in other respects the applicant or incumbent is a worthy and well behaved American citizen." And to that he adds this proper correlative: "Just as little will I treat it as conferring a right to hold office." The man who denies the soundness of that policy is not a democrat, no matter what political label he may wear.

True, the man who utters it may not be a democrat, either. He may be talking for effect. And it must be confessed that Mr. Roosevelt's fine sentiment would be more acceptable to genuine democrats the country over if he were as devoted to it in his appointments in the North as he appears to be in those he makes at the South. He is right—or, at any rate, he is not wrong—in appointing a Negro to the collectorship of the port at Charleston. But why does he appoint no Negro to important Federal office at the North? It is certainly not because the Negro population is small. Take away the Negro vote of Ohio, for instance, and that State would be permanently and hopelessly Democratic. And even though the Negro population is small in the North in comparison with the South, that difference loses all importance when it is considered that a race prejudice exists at the South, which is naturally intensified when it

seems that enforcement of the principle of equality is for the South alone.

Neither is the neglect to appoint Negroes to high public office at the North explained by lack of competent men. Able Negroes are numerous at the North. Some of them have been appointed upon missions to "inferior" peoples over seas. But none have been appointed to responsible office at home. This could hardly be so if President Roosevelt were wholly devoted to the principle he professes with reference to appointments. It is not probable that he has been as indifferent to color in his Northern appointments as in those he has made in the South or as he has been to creed and birthplace in both sections. Would it be ungenerous, then, to suspect that he may have been influenced by the fact that the North is as intolerant of the Negro race as is the South, and that a prominent Negro appointment in the North would expose this anti-Negro feeling in the President's own party? We do not charge Mr. Roosevelt with such hypocrisy, but the facts need an explanation which nothing short of an appointment of at least one competent Negro to important Federal office at the North can adequately give. Senator Tillman's suggestion that Booker T. Washington be appointed to a place in the cabinet would, if adopted, be the best possible kind of assurance that political equality is a genuine principle with Mr. Roosevelt's administration and not a mere whiplash for one section of our people.

But it is unhappily true that a generation has come upon the stage in the Republican party which "knows not Joseph." The noble spirit that Lincoln infused into that party in its

youth has departed. The splendid work in the direction of equal political rights and duties which it accomplished under the leadership of democratic-Republicans in the epochal days that followed the civil war, has just been declared by a member of President Roosevelt's cabinet, one of his closest personal and political friends, if not his very closest, to have been a failure and a mistake. The change in Northern feeling is too obtrusive to be ignored. Mr. Roosevelt may conjure with sentiments that once thrilled the North, but there is no vitality in them. They are good for nothing but conjuring. Those were sentiments which couldn't hold their strength through the era of Manifest Destiny into which McKinley inveigled us and of which Roosevelt has boasted for us. Like "Good-deeds" in the mediæval play of "Every-man" they are beautiful to look upon, but too weak to walk alone. Equal rights for the Negro are now flauntingly denied, not only at the South, where the old prejudice against his race could not be expected to die out so soon, but also at the North, where he had reason to regard them as secure. Senator Tillman's latest speech in New York has fared differently from his previous speeches in the North. Where once he would have been denounced, he is now applauded. It is only a question of time—and no long time either, if the impulse of Anglo-Saxon domination which rose like a dark wave with our wretchedly fatalistic war upon the Filipinos does not subside—when the American Negro will be even more completely without a country than the Filipino or the Porto Rican. And it will be part of the irony of fate to have forced upon him the reflection that he himself has hurried the climax. When with amazing fatuity he cast his ballot as a citizen and enthusiastically used his rifle as a soldier to shoot down the little brown "niggers" of the Philippines, he helped to vitalize the undemocratic sentiment that now makes his own race at home its victim.

Nor will the Negro be alone in his dilemma and his reflections. The same impulse that is carrying him down will carry white men with him. White Americans as well as black ones will some day awake to the reflection that they are without a country, and that they owe their plight partly if not altogether to their share in degrading their black brother. The wave of hostile sentiment that is rolling over "inferior" peoples is spoken of as a wave of Anglo-Saxon domination, but in truth this is not a race movement. That manifestation is only superficial. In perfect accord with our new doctrines that there are "inferior" peoples in the islands of the sea whom it is our destiny to govern, the South has always believed that the Negroes are an inferior race whose voice in a common government with white men must not be tolerated. And now Northern sentiment accepts that political heresy. How soon will it be before this notion of "inferior" races will reach out to "inferior" classes?

Already we hear from such men of "light and leading" as the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that "the ballot—the right of franchise—has been given all too freely." He was speaking expressly with reference to the Negro, and his utterance was in harmony with what may now be heard on every side regarding Negro suffrage. But he did not confine the application of his remark to any race. He carried it to its logical climax, to the result that will be inevitable if the process of disfranchisement once gains popular sanction. "In my opinion," he added, still referring to the franchise, "it is out of place in the ranks of the ignorant no matter what complexion the man may be." An elastic word is "ignorant"—as elastic at least as "nigger." It is so elastic as to be meaningless in fixing the limits of disfranchisement. If his idea were adopted the whole question would come to be one of power. And the power to disfranchise, weak as it ordinarily is, would gain in strength with its exercise. The American Ne-

gro without a country is ominous of American white men without a country. The sooner "inferior" white men realize this, the better will it be for all concerned. They can't promote the disfranchising process up to a certain point agreeable to themselves, and then stop it. It is as impossible, to quote Wendell Phillips, as to "jump part way over Niagara Falls."

But is there no higher ground of appeal for the integrity of manhood suffrage in America than that which may be addressed to the self interest of voters or classes of voters? Is all sense of duty dead? Surely there is a deeper reason for defending Negro suffrage than the certain menace its abrogation would be to the suffrage rights of everybody who might be classed as "inferior" in race, or education or property, or religion, to a strenuous majority. There is a duty involved which no one can shirk without degrading his own civic standards and moral character. It is the very first duty of citizenship to defend all rights of citizenship—not one's own rights alone, but those of his fellow citizens as well. And the less able any class of citizens may be to defend their own rights, the more pressing is it the duty of others to help defend them.

It will not do to say that the Negro has no rights of suffrage which may not be revoked. We would not say this of our own rights of suffrage. Then we cannot in good conscience say it of his. The man who does say it is deceiving his intelligence and trifling with his conscience. To the extent that suffrage is limited, to that extent the government rests upon might and not upon right. It is nothing but an expression of physical force, and what man of moral purpose would argue in the forum of his own conscience that physical force is a synonym for right. The man without a voice in the affairs of his country is truly a man without a country; and who can help to expatriate men with natural rights equal to his own, upon some fanciful theory of their in-

feriority, yet feel in his conscience that he has done his duty?

When our country is assailed we are told that it is our duty to defend it with our lives. When a countryman, however humble, is wronged in another land, we are told that it is our duty to pour out blood and treasure to the fullest extent necessary for his vindication. Have we then no duty to defend (at home, with our influence and vote) the principles of political equality upon which our national fabric rests? Have we no duty to defend the rights of even the humblest of our countrymen as valiantly against domestic aggression as against wrongs abroad? If there is no such duty, then let us stop prating of morality and religion and the civic conscience, and candidly live out the brute life that belongs to creatures with no duties to perform nor rights to enjoy. But if there is such a duty, let those who are conscious of it realize that this advancing movement for the disfranchisement and subjugation of the Negro race in America furnishes the occasion for devotedly performing it. Wholly regardless of the evils which neglect of that manifest duty will bring upon ourselves, let us stem the tide of this wave of unrighteousness.

Nor let us be deterred by fear of sectionalism. The Negro question is no longer a sectional question. North as well as South is now heaving with hostile sentiment. A vicious hatred of the Negro as a Negro is sweeping over the entire land. By common consent he is to be put down. In the country of his birth he and his children are to be outcasts forever. In a land of equal political rights he is to have none that white men need respect. What the Jews were in Europe in the middle ages (save their skill in finance) such the Negroes are to be made in the United States in the twentieth century. And this is to be done by a "superior" race. God save the adjective! Where is the courage, where the chivalry, where the sense of duty of white men who stand

silently by while this second great stultification of our national ideals moves on to its shameful consummation?

City and State, of Philadelphia, has published as a supplement Senator Carmack's telling speech in the Senate in exposure of the strenuous efforts of the administration and its senatorial supporters to suppress the facts regarding army atrocities in the Philippines. This speech should be a familiar document in every village in the country—not that the shame of the nation should be exploited wantonly, but that her shame should be made widely known to the end that it may be duly atoned for.

The St. Louis scandals are paralleled by Fort Wayne. Some forty arrests were made last week, under seventy odd indictments found in connection with the corruption of the city council by franchise seekers. Corruption of this kind speaks eloquently of the impropriety of granting franchises for the performance of public functions. It points directly to the difference between public business and private business. A grocery store, for illustration, is a private business. Whoever would engage in this business does not need to procure the consent of a city council. But the street car business is a public business. No one can engage in that without the consent of the city council. This difference distinguishes the two businesses, not accidentally but in their very nature. And it explains why corruption characterizes the conduct of the one kind and not that of the other. Since the consent of the city council must be obtained in order to carry on a street car business, corruption is almost inevitable. If the councilmen do not insist upon being corrupted, franchise seekers tempt them. But the important lesson of the whole matter is this, that when a business is such that in its nature it cannot be carried on without public consent, it is a public business and ought to be publicly managed. There might be some corruption in public

management, but it could not compare with the corruption that is bred by private management.

During the coal strike last Fall, the Pennsylvania militia was called out to protect non-union miners from assaults by strikers. The non-union miners were anxious to work, so it was represented, but were prevented from doing so by the wicked strikers. Thereupon a great sigh of sympathy went forth over the land—sympathy for those industrious miners who really wanted to work for their good employers but dared not because the naughty strikers threatened them with personal injury. Now for the sequel. News dispatches of last week from New York tell of lawsuits begun by 22 Italian laborers against the Pennsylvania Coal company and the Erie Railroad company in which the plaintiffs assert that they were forcibly transported from New York city to the mines and there imprisoned in the mines and forced to work in the places of the strikers. They further assert that when they were taken into the mines they were not allowed to leave, but were compelled to work in the pockets against their will, and that their protests were not listened to when they demanded to be set free. It would seem that the militia was used to protect non-union men against the wrong persons.

It is gratifying to be able to quote from so representative a Republican paper as the Chicago Inter-Ocean the following just criticism of the Federal injunctions in West Virginia which have provoked a bloody conflict in the mining regions of that State. After discreetly condemning the men who defied the injunctions to the death, the Inter-Ocean of the 27th says:

Yet in fairness it would seem that some blame for this deplorable conflict should rest upon the Federal judges granting the injunctions that these men were resisting. Their resistance was wholly unjustifiable, but was the intervention of the Federal courts justifiable? . . . Practically all the popular agitation against "government by injunction," so called—practically all the widespread feeling that the Federal courts are used to oppress labor—is aroused by Fed-

eral judges, who virtually load 13-inch guns against sparrow hawks. That what amounts to an army should be mobilized to put down what is little more than a barroom brawl is such evident absurdity—such glaring disproportion of means to ends—that popular resentment is often excited. . . . Federal judges who forget these facts of human nature—who even hurry from vacations, as in this city not long ago, to hurl the menaces of the United States against disorderly men whom a police squad could easily control—are doing the nation ill service.

But "government by injunction" is too tempting a power for the Federal judges to abandon it easily. So long as Congress refuses to check them, as the Republican Congresses persistently have done, they may be depended upon to carry "government by injunction" as far as the corporations want it carried. It is natural for the judicial branch of government to draw power to itself under any circumstances; but when the judicial branch is pretty thickly populated with corporation lawyers, the temptation to draw to itself the kind of power that corporations need is greatly augmented. The latest judicial exploit in the way of "government by injunction" has just occurred at St. Louis, where a Federal judge has, at the potent request of the Wabash railroad, granted an injunction against strikers before a threatened strike had begun. This prematurity is a novelty even in the novelty of "government by injunction." The Federal judge who improves upon this injunction must grant one not merely before a strike begins, but before it is threatened. He will have to do it on the ground that, although the defendants are not striking nor threatening to strike, they are thinking of threatening.

#### NATURAL RIGHTS.

It is fashionable in certain quarters to speak of human rights as if they were merely arbitrary, having no relation to nature. Certain things, it is said, are right or wrong, according to circumstances. Slavery is wrong, now, say these reasoners, but there may have been a time when it

was right. Suffrage is every man's right, because we have adopted that fashion; but no man has any inherent right to vote. People who happen to be deprived of these privileges may well strive for them, but have no reason for complaint. When they get strong enough they can succeed, and until they have the strength to win by force if necessary, they have not proven their title. Right really is founded upon might.

Let us examine this position.

Men's rights have relation to other men. Any question of rights is a social question. If there were no society, no such question would arise.

If it be a natural thing for human beings to associate, then their relations fall within the scope of natural law. That human societies are as natural as brute societies cannot be doubted. If every hornet were killed, leaving only larvae to replenish the earth, their progeny would form societies just like those of their ancestors. If every human being except one pair of year-old babies were destroyed, together with all memory and all records of past events, and were this couple to live and repeople the earth, their descendants would inevitably develop societies practically identical with those now existing. Societies are determined by the nature of man, just as the form of the cell is fixed by the nature of the bee.

Societies, therefore, are as natural to man as to other social animals. There must be a natural state of these societies, a natural order of development, and natural rights as between their members.

Social animals lower than man live together in conformity to law under the directive influence of instinct. Each bird, bee, or ant accords to each other member of the society, and to the society as a whole, its rights without the trouble of thinking about it. If man is to have a perfect social organization, he must think it out—just as he must think out a perfect dwelling if he ever has one. Bees naturally make approximately perfect homes; and birds and ants practically perfect nests; and all of them apparently perfect societies. Man alone, starting upon a low plane, must rise by the

power of mind, from bestial conditions toward perfection by the discovery of and conformity to natural law.

Societies being natural growths, they are subject to conditions of health and disease. When we examine the history of extinct societies in the light of this principle we must conclude that, in the absence of some destructive force from without, they died from disease because they failed to find and obey the law of social health. This does not imply a natural period of growth, and a natural time of death for societies; for, though individuals must die, the society which conforms to natural law, may live forever.

Social health seems to depend upon conformity to natural law in securing to every individual his rights as against his fellows and the society, and to the society its rights against the individual. If the society trenches too far upon, or fails to protect individual rights, or if individuals invade the rights of their fellows of the society, social disease results.

Disease in an individual organism is shown by pain. Social disease is shown by unrest, discontent, seditions, tumults, strikes, the arraying of class against class, and other social pains. When the people complain it is always with reason; when they are not wronged they are incapable of social discontent.

In every part of the world the society prevents the individual from acquiring knowledge, or from moving from place to place, or from transporting his property, or robs him of his product, or denies him, or permits his fellows to deny him, land upon which to labor, or allows a class to own the highways, or forbids or hinders trade, or compels or permits large numbers to cease labor so that others must support them, and does and permits other wrongs. And social disease results.

All over the world men occupy the land and highways belonging to the society, and make private property of them, and thereby rob the society and their fellows. And social disease results. When these violations of natural rights accumulate so that the units making up the society become enslaved, degraded and weakened, social death results. Had the Greeks

known as much of the nature and rights of man, as they knew about art, Greece might have soared from height to height until now. Had the Romans found out as much concerning man's natural rights as they learned of modes of enslaving men, the poorest people of Italy might now live in palaces, instead of running mad of hunger in caves.

Society being a natural thing, government is natural. Is there a natural form of government? Clearly, there must be. Otherwise we should have a complex organism with no natural provision for a head. The natural government must be one of three things: an autocracy, a democracy, or an oligarchy. An autocracy cannot be natural; for nature has provided no way of constituting the autocrat; and for one to impose obedience upon all violates the law of equal freedom. An oligarchy cannot be natural for the same reasons, and because no number larger than one can rightfully possess more rights over their fellows than can one.

The natural government of reasonable beings must be the democracy. The natural mode of its exercise must be that in which the individual reason acts directly upon its institutions by the exercise of the voting power. The natural and healthful state will be reached when a just balance shall be established between the respective areas of individual and collective action. Neither an autocracy nor an oligarchy can accomplish this, because the governing body will always act in the interests of the person or class composing it. A pure democracy is the only form of government in which the governing body is selfishly interested in knowing the right and doing right by all.

Man has natural rights. He has a natural right to labor, to move from place to place, to transport his property, and to highways provided by the society for his use. He has a natural right to think freely and speak freely. He has a natural right to so much of the earth as he needs on such terms as shall be just to the rest of society whom he excludes from it. He has a natural right to vote. These and other rights are as essentially present in his nature and in the nature of so-

ciety, as the peculiar attributes of bee-life and hive-life are inseparable from the nature of bees and hives. And among these are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." There never was a time or a condition of society when the denial of these rights was not a wrong and the cause of social disease and pain.

HERBERT QUICK.

### LAND, LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Humanity has from time to time been subjected to various classifications. One of these, the dictum of a wag, was that mankind fell naturally under three heads, "Men, women and French." Indebted doubtless more or less to this suggestion, an American in lieu of it wrote that the human race was divided into "saints, sinners and the Beecher family." Our humorous sage, Josh Billings, declared that humanity was divided into two kinds of people, "the wise and the otherwise," and the writer of this article invites the reader's attention to a still further division of the "wise" as distinct from the "otherwise."

Among intelligent men are to be found two distinct orders of intellect which might fitly be called the mathematical and the logical, were it not for the popular conception that the mathematical mind is the logical mind. Does it not even seem heresy, then, to question it? Let us consider it a moment.

If we call mathematics the logic of quantity, we may as well call logic the mathematics of quality; and in both instances we shall hint at a distinction which, though usually overlooked, is most vital, viz.: the distinction between the quantitative and the qualitative perceptions.

Who does not remember those provoking school examples in the attempt to solve which he was ignominiously detected subtracting oranges from apples and dividing tables by chairs? Was not the "12" which formed the coefficient of the "tables" a most seductive invitation to you to divide it by the "3," serving the like purpose in the case of the chairs? And the result! It was neither tables to be sat upon, nor chairs to be eaten off of.

The quantitative order of intellect

is most plentiful, in comparison with the much higher qualitative order in which both poetry and humor have their rise—as much more plentiful as mathematicians are than poets.

For an historical illustration, take Francis Bacon. Although "Baconian logic" owes its name to the "wisest, brightest, and meanest of mankind," and notwithstanding the fact that his name in this field of learning is at least co-luminous with that of Aristotle, he had such a "plentiful lack" of the sense of qualitative proportion as to be absolutely destitute of humor—that subtle perception of qualitative incongruity. Indeed, to such a remarkable extent is this true that the theory of Baconian authorship of Shakespeare's plays is met by the insuperable fact that in all the brilliant, scintillant wit of Bacon's admitted writings is not to be found one solitary glimmer of genuine humor, if we may believe high authorities; while, as we all know, Shakespeare's plays abound no less in inimitable humor than in surpassing wit. Had Bacon had a sense of humor it would assuredly have saved him from being the "meanest of mankind."

Recall all the long line of historic villains who have scourged the race from Cain to—well, never mind the living example. What one was endowed with a sense of genuine humor? It is not contended that both these orders of intellect may not, upon rare occasions, be found in one and the same person. The immortal bard, whose cosmical mind enveloped the universe like another ethereal ocean, is a case in point. So too, nearer our own time and place, is Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. But such instances are notably conspicuous by their dearth.

The present ascendancy of the quantitative intellect is productive of dire results, since, among other things, it tends to consider facts merely as numerical units, and fails to duly recognize that qualitative value which inheres in their particular degree of generality. That a magnet attracts iron, nickel, etc., is just as true as that all bodies attract other bodies, but the two truths are not of the same size—not of the same generality.

Take a most common example

from economics. Land, labor and capital are the three factors of all production, we are told, and many of us think all of these of the same degree of generality; and many more, it is to be feared, mistaking capital for money, think the least the greatest in this respect. The apotheosis of the dollar is of daily occurrence. Justly did a great American say: "The ancients worshiped the golden calf; we worship the gold of the calf; even the calf is beginning to see the difference."

It has been truly said to be an impossibility to live down a falsehood when it is immortalized in a witty bon mot or a clever adage and we have not so far to look to find instances of "wise saws" which, misinterpreted by the masses, result in continual error. Two examples will suffice. In "feed a cold and starve a fever" we have what is usually taken for a command, though the author meant to say "Feed a cold and you will have a fever to starve." "The exception proves the rule," is the weak reply of many a disputant when the fallacy of his contention is pointed out in a single instance. One would think, from the common acceptance of this adage, that exceptions were corollaries or that they tended to increase the generality of the rule. Of course the meaning intended to be conveyed was: the exception proves that there is a rule to which it is an exception.

In like manner the intimate collocation of "land, labor and capital" seizes upon the public mind with an aphoristic power much to be deplored since these three factors are by no means equally basic.

To say "land, labor and capital" is to the qualitative or logical mind like saying: "Oxygen, hydrogen and water;" or, "Chlorin, sodium and salt."

Let us go back of society for a moment. The principal religious cosmogonies start the universe with chaos, to which is later added Divine labor, while the agnostic nebular hypothesis assumes an homogeneous nebular mist and motion-producing energy. In each theory, gnostic or agnostic, we have chaos, plus work, the only difference being that the gnostic assumes the work to be the result of Divine Personality, and

may, therefore, call it "labor;" while pure science postulates work and then stops. We see, therefore, that labor, or at least work as measured in foot-pounds, whether personal or impersonal, is even antecedent to the universe ("land") as we know it.

The minute organisms whose life temples make our coral reefs, the earth worm that fits the soil for tillage, and those multifarious erosions which feed continents into Neptune's insatiate maw to be elsewhere precipitated as some new-born Atlantis, are as truly exhibitions of that "labor" of forces which science calls "work" as is that personal work of the coal-heaver which we call "labor."

The scientific triad, "matter, ether and motion," seems likely in the light of the vortex theory to undergo a similar curtailment into ether and motion with matter as a result. Was it not that great economist who is said, upon the evidence of a bishop, to have translated Greek at the tender age of four, who justly contended that where two things are necessary to a result one cannot be said to be more necessary than the other? And may we not hold, conversely, that where a thing is not absolutely essential to a result it cannot be of a same degree of generality—of the same importance, or of the same qualitative size, as those factors which, as antecedents to a desired product, are primary indispensables?

We have seen that land itself breaks into two factors, one of which is work measurable in foot-pounds, or "labor," according as our beliefs may incline us to name it, and we now are able to premise two alternative triads as follows:

1. Chaos, Divine Labor, human labor.
2. Chaos, impersonal work, personal labor.

And from either of these the laboratory of grey matter can produce all the rest, as easily as the chemist can synthesize water from oxygen and hydrogen, or produce salt from chlorin and sodium.

What becomes then of "capital"? It is relegated to a lower degree of generalization, a far less status of importance, than either "land" or "labor." The factors "land," "labor" and "capital" are not therefore all of a qualitative size and do not all be-

long to the same category. The first two are immeasurably the more important and belong to an order of generalization different from the last. Of these first two but one is personal, but one is human, and that one, labor, the grand mundane paraphrase of ultramundane creation.

Is not, then, the toiler his own sublimest monument? And need Labor, steering the economic craft of the universe, seek to acquire dignity from the seductive drivel of monopolistic stowaways stealing free passage in the first cabins of life?

MELVIN L. SEVERY.

## NEWS

The last session of the 57th Congress, which began in December (p. 551), came to an end at noon on the 4th.

In the lower House a fight against rushing appropriations through without debate under the previous question had been maintained for several days. It was caused by the decision of a contested election case from St. Louis—the case of Waggoner, Republican, against Butler, Democrat. On the 24th the committee on contested elections reported two resolutions, the first declaring that Butler had not been elected and was not entitled to the seat he occupied, and the second declaring that Waggoner had been elected and was entitled to the seat. A minority report was presented to the House on the 25th, which sustained Butler's claim, showing that he had fairly received 16,844 votes, while Waggoner's vote was only 10,551. The matter came before the House on the 25th, and after a brief debate the Republicans carried a demand for the previous question, 151 to 112. The Democratic resolution in favor of Butler was then defeated, 153 to 112. A motion to recommit being made, the previous question was ordered on that by 146 to 12; and upon a division the motion to recommit was lost—ayes 5 and noes 165. Thereupon the point of no quorum was made by the Democrats. The speaker overruled it as dilatory, and, putting the motion on the resolution to unseat Butler, declared it carried. He refused to entertain a demand for a division. This decision was followed by his putting the resolution to seat Waggoner, on which he allowed the demand for a division and

announced the resolution as having been adopted by 161 to 2. Upon this the point of no quorum present was again made and the speaker overruled it, declaring the resolution agreed to and administering the oath of office to Waggoner. That did not end the episode. On the 27th the following resolution was offered:

Whereas it appears from the Congressional Record of February 26, 1903, that by actual count and announcement by the speaker pro tempore a quorum of the House was not present when the resolutions were voted upon declaring that James J. Butler was not elected, and that George C. R. Waggoner was duly elected, a representative in the Fifty-seventh Congress from the twelfth Missouri district, and that the point of no quorum was duly raised upon the vote on each of said resolutions, and that the same in each instance was overruled by the speaker pro tempore in violation of the Constitution, the rules of the House, and the practice of all parliamentary bodies: Resolved, that the announcement by the speaker pro tempore that said resolutions were adopted was in fact untrue, and that said James J. Butler is still entitled to his seat in this House, and that the said George C. R. Waggoner is not now entitled to the same.

The Republican leader, Mr. Payne, promptly moved to lay the resolution on the table. His motion was carried—161 to 109.

In consequence of this action of the Republican majority in connection with the Waggoner-Butler case, the Democratic minority refused to agree to suspensions of the rules for expediting appropriation bills, and to meet those tactics the Republicans adopted on the 27th the following special rule:

Resolved, that immediately upon the adoption of this rule, and at any time thereafter during the remainder of this session, it shall be in order to take from the speaker's table any general appropriation bill returned with Senate amendments, and such amendments having been read, the question shall be at once taken without debate or intervening motion on the following question: "Will the House disagree to said amendments en bloc and ask a conference with the Senate?" And if this motion shall be decided in the affirmative, the speaker shall at once appoint the conferees, without the intervention of any motion. If the House shall decide said motion in the negative, the effect of said vote shall be to agree to the said amendments. And further, for the remainder of this session the motion to take a recess shall be a privi-

leged motion and take precedence of the motion to adjourn.

This rule enabled the majority to force through legislation without debate, the minority having no other recourse than to demand roll calls upon every vote, which they did. The appropriations of the session amounted to \$753,484,018, and for the two years of the 57th Congress to \$1,554,108,514, or \$19.42 per capita of population.

The most important work accomplished by Congress at the session just closed was the establishment of a commerce and labor department with a cabinet officer at its head. Included in the act establishing this department are provisions for securing statistics regarding trusts. Another measure affecting trusts is known as the Elkins law, which has for its purpose the prevention of rebates in inter-State transportation. One other on the same subject enables the attorney general to expedite suits brought against trusts under the Sherman law. But the Littlefield anti-trust bill, which was originally heralded as the administration measure, failed of enactment. It passed the House, but the Senate refused to consider it. The President is understood to have withdrawn his sanction. Other important bills to fail were the Aldrich bill and the Fowler bills (p. 650), both designed to expand bank note currency. The army staff bill was enacted, as were the militia bill, both measures promoted by the war department. They are objected to as tending to the creation of a large standing army. The Statehood bill (pp. 90, 550) did not come to a vote, and the anti-anarchist bill dropped out of sight. A bill authorizing the construction of the Isthmian canal was enacted, but the Isthmian canal treaty with Colombia, together with the Cuban treaty, was held back.

Just before the adjournment of Congress the President issued his proclamation, dated the 2d, convening the Senate in extraordinary session on the 5th at noon. No reasons are given, but it is understood that the purpose is to secure the ratification of the Isthmian canal treaty (p. 680), the treaty with Cuba and several other treaties which had been ignored by the Senate during the regular session.

Possibly of vastly more importance than Congressional proceedings (but

of that, only time can tell), is the labor injunction issued on the 4th against a railway union by a Federal judge at St. Louis. The conductors, firemen and trainmen engaged on the Wabash railroad running west out of St. Louis, part of the Gould system, had demanded an increase of pay ranging from 12 to 15 per cent. The wages of conductors are from \$90 to \$125 a month, and of trainmen from \$50 to \$72. In reply the president of the Wabash company offered an increase of about 5 per cent. This was accepted by the conductors, but the trainmen and the firemen decided by a vote, the result of which was announced on the 2d, to strike on the 3d unless their demands were acceded to. It was estimated that about 1,200 men would go out as soon as the strike order was issued, and that the company would be unable either to replace them or to run trains without them.

But before the formal strike order had been issued, and while the grievance committee of the firemen and trainmen were awaiting its answer to their demand, the Wabash company applied to the United States Circuit Judge at St. Louis, Elmer B. Adams, for an injunction. The application was forthwith granted and an injunction issued. This injunction order names the appropriate labor leaders and recites that—

it has been represented to the Judges of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eighth circuit, in the Eastern district of Missouri, in chancery sitting, on the part of the Wabash Railroad company, by its certain complaint against you, and each of you, that you are combining and confederating together to order and cause a strike on the part of the employes of the said railroad company, engaged in and about the operations of its trains, as brakemen, switchmen and firemen, and in interfering with, hindering, obstructing and stopping the business of said railroad company as a common carrier in the United States.

The order then proceeds to command the labor leaders named, "and each and every one of them," "individually and as representatives of the Order of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen," and all their "clerks, agents, and attorneys, and all others who may be aiding and abetting" them or "acting in concert" with them or "under their direction"—

absolutely to desist and refrain from, in any way or manner, ordering, coerc-

ing, persuading, inducing, or otherwise causing, directly or indirectly, the employes of the said the Wabash Railway company, engaged in or about the operation of its trains within the United States as brakemen, switchmen, or locomotive firemen, to strike or quit the service of said company, and from in any way molesting or interfering with said railroad company's said employes, or with the operations of its trains or the conduct of its business as a common carrier, and from molesting or interfering with said company, its officers, agents, or representatives, in respect to the operation of its trains or employment of men for or in connection therewith, and from preventing or interfering with said railroad company in the carrying out of its contracts of employment with its employes and its contracts with shippers for the transportation of property, and from interfering with or preventing said railroad company from offering reasonable, proper, and equal facilities for the interchange of traffic between its lines of railroad and other lines of railroad connecting therewith, and the receiving, forwarding, and delivery of passengers and property to and from its lines of railroad with other railroads connecting with such lines and making a continuous carriage of freight from the place of shipment to the place of destination and from preventing or interfering with said railroad company's connecting lines and their employes in the like interchange of traffic and facilities with said complainant railroad company, and from ordering, advising, or otherwise influencing employes of said connecting lines to refuse to interchange traffic and afford facilities therefor as aforesaid, and from interfering with or preventing said railroad company and its connecting lines from complying with the requirements of the inter-State commerce act of the United States, and with their agreements with each other respecting said facilities for the interchange of traffic, and from interfering with or preventing said railroad company in the carrying of the mails in accordance with its contracts with the United States and the laws relating thereto, to the end that by any of the acts or means aforesaid, the said defendants, their agents, or servants, shall not interfere with said railroad company from discharging its duties and obligations with respect to inter-State commerce, or prevent it from performing any or all its duties or obligations imposed by the act of Congress of February 4, 1887, and amendments thereto in relation to inter-State commerce.

This is regarded as the most advanced labor injunction yet issued, since it forbids not only inequitable acts in connection with a strike, but

even the act of cooperative striking itself.

Upon receiving notice of this injunction the strike order, which had been authorized by a vote of the men, was withheld, the grand master of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, P. H. Morrissey, making the following explanation:

To this command, as law-abiding citizens and organizations, we bow in submission. We will respect it because we recognize that until dissolved it is the law. While we view the action of the court as subversive of American rights and privileges, and we believe contrary to common justice and fairness, we utter no defiance to its mandates and indulge in no heroics. We will, however, contest the proceeding to the end, for if Judge Adams's order is written into the laws of our country, organization of labor, which is to-day the hope and protection of those who toil, can no longer contribute its beneficent influences in bettering the condition of the working people. In this effort we believe we will not only have the support of organized labor everywhere, but all right thinking citizens who are lovers of human rights.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The national congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution closed its sessions at Washington on the 28th.

—The twenty-fifth anniversary of the coronation of Pope Leo XIII. (p. 743) was celebrated at Rome on the 3d in the presence of 75,000 people.

—A labor union of farm hands in Illinois is reported by the secretary of the Chicago Employers' association, who has been making an official tour of the State.

—A conference of the representatives of the anthracite mines and of the employers, with the arbitration commission (p. 729) has been ordered by the commission to take place at Washington on the 5th.

—A sharp contest between advocates of the bill prohibiting employment of children under 16 years of age, and representatives of the glassblowing interests in opposition, took place on the 3d before the labor committee of the lower house of the Illinois legislature.

—Among the names signed to a series of petitions presented to the United States Senate last month and calling for an investigation into conditions in the Philippines are 57 presidents of American colleges and 400 college professors. The number of different educational institutions represented is 42.

—The senatorial deadlock in the Delaware legislature (p. 664) was broken on the 2d by the election as United States senators of J. Frank Allee, an

Addicks Republican, for the long term, which expires in 1907, and L. Heister Hall, an anti-Addicks Republican, for the short term, ending in 1905.

—Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace, the famous evolutionary scientist, announces his conclusion, from scientific data, that our solar system is the center of the stellar universe, the supreme purpose of which he infers to be the production and development of a living soul in the perishable body of man.

—The full bench of the Massachusetts Supreme Court decided on the 26th that the giving to customers, under pledge of secrecy, of information collected as a business, is not a dedication of it to public use, and that the collector has a valuable right of property in the information he collects which a court of equity will protect.

—Upon a referendum at Ithaca, N. Y., on the 2d the people voted almost unanimously (there being only 30 negative votes) in favor of municipal ownership of the water works. This overwhelming expression of public opinion was due to the typhoid epidemic in Ithaca, which is charged to bad management of the water supply franchise.

—On the 23d the Germans restored to Venezuela, pursuant to the treaty between that country and the European powers (p. 728), the gunboat *Restaurador*, which they had captured; and on the 3d the British restored the *Zamora*, the *Veintitres de Mayo* and the *Zumbador*. The *Bolivar* was to be returned on the 4th, but the fact is not yet reported.

—Mabini, who was Aguinaldo's chief supporter in the Filipino republic, and president of its supreme court, and again minister of foreign affairs, took the oath of allegiance to the United States on the 26th on board the transport *Thomas*. He was then permitted to land at Manila. Mabini had been an exile on the island of Guam. His companion in exile, Ricarte, refused to take the oath and was sent to Hong-Kong.

#### PRESS OPINIONS.

##### THE ST. LOUIS INJUNCTION.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), March 4.—Labor is free and will remain free, and neither malevolent nor benevolent feudalism will ever be established in this republic. The freedom of labor, among other things, implies the right to strike for any reason whatever, just as the freedom of enterprise implies the right to dismiss employes for any reason or without any reason or explanation. What legislation has not done and will never attempt, courts of equity will hardly be permitted to accomplish by indirection.

##### THE NEGRO QUESTION.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), March 3.—So long as the Negro is barred from commissioned office in the army and the navy and from important Federal offices in the North, including cabinet positions and similar preferment, the appointing of Negroes to Federal office in the South may be expected to result in such unpleas-



ant episodes as the present "race problem" agitation.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.), Feb. 27 (weekly ed.).—The run from Negro disfranchisement to the disfranchisement of white men is very swift in logic, and it will be easily taken in practice, if the anti-Negro movement is quietly acquiesced in by both the great parties of the North. Nothing can be clearer than that the Democratic party will be paralyzed as a party of the masses if it is to be dominated by the Southerners who deny to the colored citizens the right to vote.

### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 36 of that publication.

Washington, Feb. 23-Mar. 1, 1903.

#### Senate.

After listening on the 23d to the reading of Washington's farewell address, the Senate received the report of the Philippine committee reporting back the resolution calling for information regarding court-martials in the Philippines (p. 2724) with approval, and it was adopted. The same committee reported adversely on Senator Carmack's resolution requiring the committee to sit for purposes of investigation during the Congressional recess.

On the 24th Senator Quay asked unanimous consent for a vote on the Statehood bill to be taken on the 25th, but objection was made (p. 2768).

The House amendments to the Philippine currency bill were concurred in on the 25th (p. 2848), and on the 26th Senator Quay again asked unanimous consent for a vote upon the Statehood bill, but his request was again met with an objection (p. 2911).

The same request met the same fate on the 27th (p. 2963). On this day also the Senate refused to consider the Littlefield anti-trust bill (p. 2965). But it discussed and passed a bill providing for the government of the islands of Guam and Tutuila (p. 2963), and began consideration of the House bill for the regulation of immigration.

On the 28th, after again refusing to consider the Littlefield anti-trust bill by a vote of 41 to 30 (p. 3018), the Senate resumed consideration of the House bill to regulate immigration and, after amending, passed it (p. 3031).

#### House.

Appropriations work was done on the 23d and 24th, and on the latter day the Philippine currency bill (p. 2778) and the Fowler currency bill (p. 2789) were discussed.

On the 25th the contested election case from St. Louis, Waggoner vs. Butler (p. 2825), was taken up, and on the 26th Butler (Democrat) was unseated and Waggoner (Republican) seated, in the absence, as the Democrats claimed, of a quorum. This matter was brought to the attention of the House on the 27th by a resolution reciting that according to the Record there was no quorum present and that the point was duly raised but overruled by the speaker, and declaring that the speaker's decision in stating that the resolution unseating Butler and the one seating Waggoner were adopted was untrue. The resolution was immediately laid on the table by a vote of 261 to 109. From this time forward the Democrats demanded roll calls on all motions and the Republicans responded by cutting off all debate with a special rule.

The legislative day of February 28 was devoted to the rapid passing of bills under the previous question, and was carried over into Sunday, the 1st, when appropriation and other bills were passed.

#### Record Notes.

Speech of Representative Fowler (p. 2834) on Fowler bill. Speeches of Senators Tillman (p. 2791) and Carmack (p. 2801) on the race question. Opinion of Judge Grosscup in meat trust case (p. 2866). Speeches of Representatives Prince (p. 2887) and Pugsley (p. 2939) on circulation of national bank

notes. Text of conference report on anarchy bills (p. 2915). Text of President's message on tariff in the Philippines (p. 2965). Speech of Representative Jones (p. 2993) on Philippine currency bill. Speech of Senator Depew (p. 3063) on Statehood bill.

## MISCELLANY

### A MISUNDERSTANDING.

For The Public.

"An 'unimproved' or unused piece of land, even if appropriated and held for speculative purposes, will . . . yield no ground rent, although it may be gradually increasing in value, or accumulating economic rent. . . . 'Land capital' is produced or fashioned by human labor out of land surface . . . just in the same manner as other forms of capital are produced by human labor out of other materials nature affords."

"Ground rent . . . is in every essential particular a form of interest."—Prof. C. C. Plehn's address before the Massachusetts Single Tax league, in Boston, December 8, 1902, as reported in The Single Tax Review for January 15, 1903.

I studied on Prof. Plehn's oration quite a bit,

And the fact is that in places I could make no sense of it;

"Unimproved land yields no ground rent!"—so I think his language states—

Though "economic rent" it all the same "accumulates."

But when he said that "labor"—here was surely no mistake—

Out of common, raw "land surface" good "land capital" can make,

I thought in giving to the world this clever new idea

The professor had particularly obligated me.

Too long in making butter I had let my talents waste,

And making this "land capital" I felt would suit my taste.

It could be manufactured, just like any other kind,

Free raw material all around, and endless, I could find,

'Twas a simple thing of carting and dumping on the spot,

And there would lie eternally my town or city lot.

So different from the care of cows and growing grain and hay,

Where the work is always heavy and always light the pay.

In the midst of these agreeable reflections I was brought

On a sudden to a standstill by a most unwelcome thought;

Of difficulties technical I felt nowise afraid, But where was I to locate my "land capital" when made?

The more I cogitated the more I had to think

That the professor's clever scheme lacked an important link.

Or more likely he was joking, and thought we would understand

That "land capital" interpreted means capital and land,

The value of the latter being thus to "interest" turned,

To eliminate the question as to whether it is earned.

And I find, since being taken in by this transparent hoax, That orthodox "Economy" is full of just such jokes.

JAY HAWKINS.

### WHAT'S IN A NAME?

For The Public.

The conversation previously reported, (Public of February 28), which some readers of The Public may perhaps remember, occurred at the Rennert Hotel, in Baltimore. The next day we separated and in about a week I received from Buffalo the following letter and inclosure:

Dear —: You remember our discussion and dispute at the Rennert. Well, it seems to have been on Alcorn's mind. Yesterday I received the inclosed from him, and send it to you, thinking it may be of interest, and may win you to my name.

I found out yesterday accidentally that one of my bosses is a free trader at heart, though he has made his pile on the tariff, which is an indication what a mix-up things are in politically. Shall be here a week, and then go to Cleveland. Write me there. Yours,

JORDAN MILNER.

The inclosure was from Alcorn, as follows:

Springfield, Mass., Jan. 22.

Dear Jordan: I had a dream last night which I shall have to tell you. I dreamt I was in the gallery looking down on a big convention. There was great excitement and confusion, a dozen speaking at one time. All at once, over the stage, there flashed out a big electric sign, with the words: "ISOCRAT—EQUAL RIGHTS." Then there was such a yell that it woke me up. Never had such a vivid dream before. May see you in Cleveland next week. Yours truly,

HENRY ALCORN (ORTHOCRAT).

What particularly interests me is the intense feeling that these two young fellows show about political conditions. Their chaffing of each other over names is only an incident; but it shows, in a way, how interested they are in real issues. Alcorn has heretofore been a Republican, but now says that he sees the impossibility of the Republican party ever being again the party of freedom and progress.

MEDIUS.

### CHILDHOOD'S GOLDEN DREAM.

Kenneth Grahame's stories of child life have titles like "Dream Days" and "The Golden Age." Good titles! For no one who has read the stories can fail to have fallen under the spell of the golden dream which Mr. Grahame's childhood must have resembled. A golden dream is what all childhood ought to resemble.

But think of what childhood really is in the Pennsylvania anthracite district! The New York Evening Post has not been particularly favorable to the miners. Its animus has been in

the other direction. Yet "K. D.," who has been sending special correspondence to the Post from Scranton, has been allowed to print stories which, if they had appeared in certain other papers, would have been denounced as "attempts to inflame the populace." One of these stories will serve as an illustration. "K. D." interviewed a little girl working in a silk factory. The little girl was hypothetically and by affidavit 13 years of age. Her observations are worth more than many sermons. She said:

When I first went to work at night the long standing hurt me very much. My feet burned so that I cried. My knees hurt me worse than my feet, and my back pained all of the time. Mother cried when I told her about it. So I didn't tell her any more. It does not hurt me so much now. But I feel tired all the time. I do not feel near so tired, though, as I did when I worked all night. My eyes hurt me, too, from watching the threads. The doctor says my eyes will be spoiled if I work at night. After I have watched the threads I can see threads everywhere. When I look at other things there are threads running across them. Sometimes I think the threads are going to cut my eyes.

This little girl is not likely ever to be much impressed by the sentiment: "Make me a child again just for to-night!"

Mr. James Campbell, the chief factory inspector of Pennsylvania, spent three hours at the last national meeting of factory inspectors proving that by the age of 13 children were quite strong enough mentally and physically to begin factory work. Any further leisure was a mistake. So was any further education. It is under the beneficent eye of such a man that the children of Pennsylvania are being offered up to that modern child-eating Moloch, commercial efficiency.

Fortunately persons of Mr. Campbell's opinions are becoming fewer. It is coming to be seen that while the employment of children is not necessarily in itself an evil, and while the value of leisure and of education may be by some persons grossly exaggerated, still the concrete truth remains that modern factory conditions make it necessary to surround the employment of children with many restrictions. It is one thing to take a child and teach it business, giving it practical experience and developing its native powers. It is another thing to take a child and work it for 12 hours a night at a clattering machine, which forces the child to keep pace with its own cruel speed, which teaches the child nothing but a single mechanical movement, and which in the course of a few years changes the child, de-

spite all original possibilities, into a shaken, rickety, unskilled incompetent. It is this latter thing that has to be stopped. The papers of all sections show that the people of the United States are aroused. It is a case of Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted till something is done for them.—Chicago Tribune of Feb. 22.

#### "PUBLICITY."

Portions of the address of Hon. Robert Baker at the dinner of the Credit Men's association in New York, January 29, 1903.

We hear much of "publicity" as a cure for the evils of the trusts. So far as it is a sincere demand it is based upon an entire misconception of the proper functions of government. Governments are instituted among men for the purpose of preventing aggressions upon the weak by the powerful. But government itself has no moral right to be an aggressor, any more than it has to permit aggression by others.

Whence comes the demand that the government throw out a universal drag-net to reach all who engage in inter-state commerce, to pry into the affairs of all who sell goods across an imaginary line, or even to compel combinations of capital to expose the inner workings of their business? Who is to determine in advance of the exercise of this detective power, which are, and which are not, trusts? It is well known that the manufacturers and merchants who engage in inter-state commerce far exceed those who do not. Is all private business to be subject to an official espionage because a few rob the people? If the demand is based upon the presumed fact that somebody had bought stocks which they now believe to be inflated, then I answer that it is none of the business of the government to compel one party to a contemplated transaction to expose his affairs to the other. If the evidence of value is not satisfactory and conclusive, then he need not buy. If one of the parties to the transaction is so reckless of his wealth that he is willing to exchange it for a share of stock of whose value he is ignorant, it is no more the function of the government to guarantee him against loss than it would be to declare that a purchase of goods from a mercantile house should be null and void because the anticipation of profits by the buyer had not been realized. If there had been misrepresentation of the property or earning power such as constitutes fraud, the courts are open to the injured party for redress. But if he

will gamble on the stock exchange he must take his chance with other gamblers that the cards have not been stacked by those who control the pack. There is no obligation for him to engage in this any more than other kind of gambling.

The demand for publicity as a remedy for the oppression of the trusts would be comical if the matter were not so tragic to many concerned. We are told that the government should require schedules showing in detail all the property owned by a trust, so that we may know whether the capitalization is excessive or not. Who is to determine that ever disputed question of value? Upon what is it to be based? Is it to be the cost of reproduction of the plants, or is it to be earning power? If the total capitalization is to be only the cost of reproducing the plants then there will have to be a startling scaling down of book values and a corresponding reduction in the face value of the stock. But it will not make a particle of difference as to its salable value, which depends upon the average opinion of its earning power.

Even if the courts were to decree that no more stock should be issued than would represent the cost of reproducing the plants, it would not affect the aggregate selling price—so long as there was no interference with the power of the trust to exact exorbitant prices due to its possession of monopolistic power. The Steel trust might be directed to scale down its share issue to \$1,000,000—the probable value of the plant after deducting the face of the bonds—yet that \$1,000,000 of stock would have the same earning capacity and would sell for as high an aggregate price as the present issue. If anyone doubts this let him ask the price of the shares of the New River Water company, of London, selling, if I remember aright, at a quarter of a million (\$250,000) dollars a share, and which is dealt in in one-hundred parts of a share. The value of a toll-gate on a highway to its possessors is not the cost of reproducing the house in which the toll-gatherer resides, but is determined by the number of people who use the highway and therefore must pass the toll-gate. So it is with a trust; the value of its stock is not the cost of reproduction of its plants, but is due chiefly to the letters-of-marque which have been issued to it to levy toll upon an entire nation. Publicity will not deprive any of them of their tariff privileges; of their patents; of railroad rebates or discriminations; nor of their monopolization

of oil, iron-ore, copper, coal or borax beds, and therefore will not reduce the toll they collect, consequently the aggregate value of their privileges will not be reduced.

You can protect the public from being fleeced, not by reducing their capitalization, but by abolishing their privileges. When they sell goods abroad (including railroad and ocean freights and insurance) at two-thirds the price they charge for the same in this country, you get a glimpse of the privileges which they have capitalized, and incidentally how much the American people are being robbed. In the case of the two most gigantic corporations—the Standard Oil company and the United States Steel corporation—the privileges they possess are partly national and partly State. They are among the largest beneficiaries of the tariff system, but a large part of their capitalization is based upon the ownership of immense areas of land wherein their raw material is deposited. Because nine-tenths of these deposits are held out of use, the States in which they are located (following our own idiotic policy of permitting the fore-stallers of land to almost entirely escape taxation) do not assess them at even one per cent. of their value, the consequence being that the output is restricted and the consumers are charged all the traffic will bear. If they were assessed at their full value and taxed regardless of whether used or not, it would not pay to hold immense tracts of coal, iron, copper, oil and other lands out of use; the result would be a larger production with its consequent reduction of price. There might be less private building of libraries and endowment of universities, but there would be a more equitable distribution of wealth, prosperity and happiness would be more general, because most of the wealth would be retained by those who create it, and I have no doubt the libraries and universities would be provided—but out of the public treasury.

If any of us lived in a region where wolves abound, we should laugh to scorn the suggestion, however high the source from which it came, to appoint a commission to go out and examine the age, size and strength of the wolves' teeth. And that would be no more farcical than the assertion that "publicity" is the remedy for the trust evil. If we do not desire to kill the wolves, let us at least pull their teeth, so that they can no longer ravage our flocks. And we shall pull their teeth the moment we deprive them of

their privileges. Then they will thrive only to the extent that they perform the useful function of producing and distributing more economically than their competitors.

\* \* \*

The Standard Oil company did not attain its position as the industrial octopus because publicity has not disclosed the number and structural value of its plants, or the prices its oil was sold for at different places. It dominates and controls the oil business, and its masters have absorbed other large industries, because of its infamous conspiracy with the Pennsylvania and other railroads under which for years its competitors were charged three times as high a freight rate, one-half of the excess being given to the Standard Oil company. History records no more scandalous transaction, no more shameful perversion of governmental powers; and no amount of publicity can prevent like results, unless we strike at the root of the evil—the use of governmental functions to favor some and oppress others.

But we are told that is ancient history, and is no longer practiced. Gentlemen, the leopard has not changed his spots. It may be that such brazen discriminations are not practiced now, if so, it is because the culprits have discovered more skillful and cunning ways of accomplishing the same ends. One of those methods is for the trust or other favored shipper to wait until his stock of goods at some important point is almost exhausted, then to secretly arrange with the railroad that on an agreed upon date the freight rate on that class of goods shall be slashed nearly to zero. In preparation therefor it accumulates its goods, and at the agreed time ships sufficient to replenish its stock. Immediately this is done, and almost before its competitors are aware of the reduced rate, the railroad announces a restoration of the old rate, offering some plausible excuse, such as an error; the practical effect being the same as if a discriminating rate had been made in the interest of the trust.

\* \* \*

To those who assert that "publicity" is the cure of the trust evil, I ask: How will publicity lessen in the slightest degree the tariff bounties, the railroad privileges, the patent rights, or loosen the monopolization of oil, coal or iron ore deposits of the Standard Oil company and the United States Steel corporation?

Every freight discrimination is an abrogation of the right to equal service to which all are entitled, this equal-

ity being involved in the very grant of the franchise under which the railroad operates. Not even so corrupt and boss-ridden a legislature as that of Pennsylvania would have ever dared to grant a franchise for a railroad, if those applying for it had even suggested the possibility of varying freight rates to different shippers. All who have been parties to such discriminations, either as grantors or beneficiaries, should be rigorously prosecuted, no matter how rich or powerful they may have already become. The vigorous prosecution of even one of these millionaire malefactors would do much to restore a respect for law among the mass of the people, and would of course prevent any repetition of such practices.

There is scarcely a monopoly that does not get some of its power to plunder the people from these freight rate discriminations. State railroad commissions may exist. Interstate commerce commissions may have their powers broadened and extended, but these practices will not stop nor this form of robbery be thereby curtailed. Nothing short of national ownership of the railroads can secure equal service to all shippers.

Public ownership and operation of the railroads will destroy some and curb all trusts, but the final solution of the trust problem will only come when the people abolish the most fundamental of all monopoly, the monopolization of land. Then, and not till then, will free competition really exist, and men find their reward determined by the value of the service they render to their fellow men.

#### "LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET. MARK'S EASY MARK.

For The Public.

We had just passed the Canyon of the Royal Gorge, in Colorado, when a big, good natured looking fellow entered the smoking compartment. I was the only occupant when he came in. We talked about the scenery, and then about business; finally he handed me his card, and I gave him mine. His card read: "John C. Morrassy, Promoter," and he certainly looked the part.

"Promoter, eh?" I said, as I looked at it.

"Yes, I'm a promoter," he replied. "Know what a promoter is?"

"Why, I have a general idea," I answered, as I looked up at two other men who had just come in.

"Well, there's only one real definition of a promoter," he declared, as he sized up the newcomers critically.

"What's that?" I asked.

"A promoter," he began, with a twinkle in his eye, "is a well-dressed gentleman who is trying to sell nothing for something to another well-dressed gentleman who is trying to buy something for nothing."

"We all laughed heartily as he concluded, and the porter came running in to see what was up. I may say that, in crossing the Rockies, the porter mingles quite freely with the passengers. In fact, passengers frequently hunt him up to inquire about points of interest.

"I thought you fellows were all in the employ of the government?" one of the men—a drummer—remarked, after quiet was restored.

"How's that?" he asked.

"As a rule, when a man wants to work off a gold brick he runs for Congress, or bribes a legislature to send him to the Senate," the drummer replied, much to the amusement of the darky.

"They have to work in the name of patriotism?" queried the promoter.

"Sure thing."

"Well, that lets me out; I wouldn't sail under false colors."

"You fellows talk as if law-makers were a lot of bunco men," injected the man who had come in with the drummer.

"That's so near it that when a decent man is sent among them, they call him a crank or disturber—"

"Or an anarchist," interrupted the promoter.

"I can't see it that way," said the mark.

"Take this ship subsidy bill," observed the drummer. "The government pays the shipping trust \$250,000,000. What for? To build up our merchant marine! Sure. Our merchant marine—that's what they say. But any man that's got as much brains as a rabbit knows that's a bum steer. The merchant marine will belong to Morgan, Griscom & Hanna. The government will put up the stuff, and these guys'll get the marine." This brought out a laugh from the darky, in which the others joined.

"I don't believe a word of it," declared the mark, indignantly, as we made room for the conductor and two more passengers who had just come in. "Mark Hanna is behind that bill, and I think it's a good thing for the country."

"Of course," replied the drummer, "when Mark gets behind anything you can bet your life the country's in for a Christmas present. That's what he's in politics for. He's so full of the

milk of human kindness that when he wants an egg-nogg he only has to swallow an egg and jump up and down a few times." This afforded another opportunity for a laugh, and it looked easy for the drummer.

"Do you mean to say he's dishonest?" demanded the mark.

"That depends. He wouldn't rob a church or cheat his butcher, but apart from personal matters like that, he's the end of the extension."

"You seem to know him."

"I do. I used to live in Cleveland, and I know his history from soup to nuts. He began as a tin soldier. He helped organize the 'Perry Guards,' when the civil war broke out, and was made lieutenant. When the governor called on his company to go to Washington, the time it was threatened by the Confederate army, Mark wouldn't leave his business, and never did any rough work as lieutenant. Between getting an occasional street car franchise, through friends he helped elect alderman or mayor, and buying boats and things, he got to be a pretty hefty gazabo. In 1881 he was at the head of the Vessel Owners' Association, when the Seamen's Union struck for more pay. Now, to read one of Mark's friend-of-the-laboring-man speeches you'd think he proposed arbitration, but he didn't. Not on your tin-type. He sent to the city hall for a prize fighter, named Rumsey, who was on the police force. He told Rumsey to hire a lot more of the same brand, and made him shipping officer—"

"And he imported a lot of cheap labor to take the strikers' places," broke in one of the passengers.

"Yes, a lot of poor devils were imported to take the strikers' places," assented the drummer, "and Rumsey's bunch formed a peaceful blockade. And maybe they didn't do things to the strikers. Mister! Many a poor hod got it where the lady wore the beads. The Typographical Union got after Hanna and roasted him to a turn. The papers took it up, and Police Commissioner Bradner called on Rumsey to ask why he was acting as shipping officer for the Vessel Owners, while drawing policeman's pay from the city—"

"And Rumsey handed him a bunch of fives and threw him downstairs," prompted the other passenger again.

"Yes, and he was fined \$100, and sentenced to the workhouse for 30 days," continued the drummer. "Hanna's attorneys were defending Rumsey, and they took an appeal. At the same time they gave it out that Hanna would spend a million, if necessary, to beat

Bradner. Bradner didn't follow it any further, and Rumsey was discharged—"

"Well, I never kept close watch of Hanna," interrupted the mark. "But I know he couldn't be where he is if he wasn't all right. Most people have it in for rich men on general principles, and I suppose Hanna has to take his dose the same as anyone else."

"That may be a comfortable view to take, if you're determined to support your prejudice, but you can't defend his record," replied the drummer, as he settled back in his seat. "See what he's done lately. Tom Johnson ran for mayor of Cleveland two years ago. He promised, if elected, to give the people three-cent car fares. Hanna came out as the people's champion—that's his long suit. He said Johnson was a demagogue, that he was insincere, and couldn't give three-cent fares, anyhow. But the people knew them both, and Johnson won with his hands off the handle bars. No sooner was he elected than he proceeded to make good. He secured signatures for a car line along streets paralleling Hanna's lines, and advertised for bids. The conditions involved three-cent fares and a 25-year franchise—"

"After ten years," interrupted the other passenger, "the company was to divide all over eight per cent. net earnings with the city, but the city reserved the right to at any time buy the road, at the cost of production, plus ten per cent., without estimating the value of the franchise."

"That's right," admitted the drummer. "Well, only one bid was received, and the council voted the franchise. What did Hanna do? Did he tell the people he had become convinced Johnson was on the level? Did he? Well, I guess not. He told his lawyer to get busy. The judges didn't want to lose their meal tickets, so they helped a little. They called strikes from the start, and the franchise—"

"Tree strikes an' out," interrupted the darky, and we all laughed at the look the promoter gave him.

"Then came the State campaign," continued the drummer. "Johnson controlled the Democratic convention, and made home rule and just taxation the issue. He pointed out that the big corporations were not paying their share of taxes—"

"He quoted figures from the assessor's books," put in the other passenger, "and showed that small property owners and business men were paying on a valuation of 60 per cent., while the railroads were paying on only ten per cent."

"That's what he did," agreed the drummer. "But how about Hanna; what did he do? Did he meet the issue? No fear. He went up and down the street preaching prosperity, pro and con—principally con. He dealt the people a bob-tail flush, told them everything was all right, to let, well enough alone, and stand pat. A lot of them took his advice; when they're called—"

"They'll get aftah Hanna wit' a razah," interrupted the darky.

"Or an axe," put in some one else.

"Throughout the campaign," continued the drummer, "Hanna declared Johnson was a liar and a hypocrite, a demagogue and a fool. Do you think he believed it? If he did, wouldn't he want him to win out? Talk to me about Hanna! I tell you he ain't a right guy."

"Dat's no summah josh; he's a two-spot," put in the darky. "If he evah rides 'ith me ah'll put tacks undah the spread."

"Well, I don't take any stock in Johnson," responded the mark. "He made his money out of franchises, and now he's knocking everybody else for doing the same thing."

"That's where you're off," persisted the drummer. "I have known of Johnson for 20 years, and I never knew him to jump a man for profiting by the law. Since the day he read George's books, away back in '84, he has condemned special privilege legislation. He has taken the position that while laws granting special privileges are unjust and should be repealed, every man must be either a victim or a beneficiary. He had his choice and wasn't chump enough to choose to be a victim. I think you or I would have done the same thing."

"Give me a chance and see," interrupted another passenger.

"Well, if I did, I wouldn't squeal after I'd made my pile," cried the mark, heatedly.

"When would you squeal?" asked the other.

"Well, I wouldn't squeal after I'd made my money."

"Then you ought to squeal now," shouted the drummer. "Johnson squealed while he was yet a comparatively poor man. As soon as he found out what the people were up against, he put them next. He told them it was a raw game, that the cards were stacked, and they wasn't gettin' a square deal. I was present at a debate he had with Burton in '86, when Burton accused him of being a monopolist. Johnson acknowledged it, and said he believed the people ought

to own the car lines, but if they didn't, he'd take the job."

"An' all the tips that go with it," broke in the darky.

"Well, if he thinks he made his money in a brace game, and his conscience hurts him, why don't he give it back?" demanded the mark.

"Don't think for a minute his conscience hurts him," replied the drummer, scornfully, "make no mistake about that. He knows if he didn't take the money, some one else would, and the chances are about a million to one it would now be used in defending special privileges."

"Well, why don't he give it back to the people he's so solicitous about?"

"What good would that do? They'd get a few square meals, and be deprived of the influence large means gives to a leader. Not only that, but they'd be deprived of their leader, too. He'd have to devote his time to getting a living, instead of doing what he is. You know when Bryan ran for president the plutes said he wasn't such a much, or he'd be rich. I don't take any stock in the argument, but if they do, they'll have to invent some other objection to Johnson; that'll help some."

"Well, it's a great question. I confess I have never given much thought to it. My father was a Republican, and most of my friends are; I suppose I'm too old to be changed. It's hard for me to conclude Johnson is sincere, though."

"Well, suppose Johnson was all his most ardent champions believe him to be, how would you find it out?"

"I'd expect him to leave the Democratic party, for one thing."

"And then?"

"Then I think he ought to support the principles he made his money by."

"Suppose he knows they are vicious from stem to gudgeon?"

"Well, I don't think they are."

"What you think don't cut any ice; Johnson's acting on what he knows."

"How does he know?"

This question disgusted the drummer, and I thought he'd lose his temper, but he didn't. He hesitated a moment, then, looking his man squarely in the eye, he said: "Look here, old man; were you ever in a joint where they run a brace game? Yes? Well, do you think the guys on the inside ain't wise?" He paused for a reply. The other nodded, and the drummer continued: "Then what makes you ask how Johnson knows the people are getting the worst of it?"

"You'll have to pardon me, my friend, but really I don't see the analogy," re-

plied the mark, as innocently as a seven-year-old boy.

Everybody laughed except the drummer and the mark. The mark didn't know what it was about; the drummer was clearly out of patience. Finally he exclaimed: "You know the boys that are in on a queer game make their money out of suckers, don't you? Well, that's the way promoters of street railways make theirs. They're just the same, only one has marked cards and the other hot air."

"That's right, that's all the difference," shouted the promoter, and everybody laughed.

"Do you mean to say that Johnson took an unfair advantage of the people?" demanded the mark, ignoring the promoter.

"Not at all. He had to pay fare or collect, so he collected. Long before he came to Cleveland the people had granted a franchise to the Brooklyn Street Railway company, to run cars from the corner of Pearl and Lorain street to Brooklyn village. This company leased its privileges to the Mark Hanna railway. In 1878, when the lease had yet two years to run, Johnson bought a controlling interest in the franchise for \$1,200. In 1880, when the lease expired, he took possession. The road consisted of about two and a half miles of track, but there was no equipment or real estate of any kind. Johnson put on six bob-tailed cars and 24 mules. Hanna's company owned the right of way from Lorain street to the business part of town, so that passengers bound for the city had to pay another fare. Johnson couldn't stand for that, so he put on a line of busses, and carried passengers all the way for one fare."

"Tha'h wasn't no flies on him," laughed the darky.

"He certainly wasn't overlooking any bets," put in the conductor.

"Well, about that time," continued the drummer, "Hanna's company wanted to renew its franchise. Johnson had tried to arrange with Hanna to run over his lines to the viaduct, but it was so much like trying to get milk out of a cash register that he gave it up. He had the people with him though, and the best Hanna could do was to have his franchise renewed, on condition that Johnson get what he was after. Once over Hanna's tracks, it was easy mutton to the Public Square. This gave him a line about five miles long. When Johnson bought the Brooklyn line the fare was 16 cents for this distance; the lowest fare had been six cents; Johnson made it five cents from the start—"

"And he was there with his goods, too," said the other passenger.

"You bet he was," went on the drummer. "He had the finest cars in town. In 1888 he extended the road through Ontario, Central and Scoville, after agreeing to pave Scoville avenue with stone, from curb to curb, and carried passengers over ten miles for five cents. Hanna's crowd had been charging 25 cents for the same thing. Does that look as if Johnson took an unfair advantage of the people?"

"I should say not. And I don't see where you've improved your case, either."

"Neither did Johnson up to that time. He thought he was giving the people all the best of it. But he got hold of George's 'Progress and Poverty,' in '84, and saw a new light. He saw that the people could have done for themselves all he had done. Not only that, but they could have kept the profit he had made. He had started out with a few hundred dollars, and in about three years he became a millionaire."

"Well, he worked hard, didn't he?"

"To be sure he did, and he worked intelligently, too. But suppose that instead of having a franchise he had been working for the city, could he have gotten a salary of \$300,000, or so, a year?"

"No, I don't suppose he could."

"There ain't any supposin' about it," cried the drummer. "They're only paying him \$6,000 as mayor. Why, there'd be a holler if it was proposed to pay \$10,000 a year. But call it \$10,000. In three years they'd pay him \$30,000. The difference between \$30,000 and what he got, the people paid for bein' nutty."

"Do you think Johnson would have furnished as good service if he had been working for the city as he did working for himself?"

"Would he?" shouted the drummer. "Say, if he could have built lines where they were needed, with no Hanna injunctions to bother him, do you think it would have taken him three years to lay ten miles of track? Would it have taken him five years to introduce electricity over the right of way Hanna was compelled to lease him? Well, I guess not. He'd have had it done in six months."

"Was he the first to introduce electric cars in Cleveland?"

"I should say yes. And he had almost as hard a time doing it as Hanna'll have getting to heaven."

"He, he," chuckled the darky. "If he evah gets to heaven, he'll have to tip Petah a pow'ful lot."

"He'll never get near enough to do that," said another.

"He'll go to hell, and get a corner on brimstone," shouted some one else.

"Or form a shovel trust," put in the conductor, amid great laughter.

"Well, you fellows don't seem to think much of Hanna," interrupted the mark. "I'd like to ask my worthy friend here just one more question."

"Go on," said the drummer.

"You said a moment ago that Johnson gave a ten-mile ride for five cents. Isn't he claiming now that it could be done at a profit for three cents?"

"That's what he is, and if electricity as a motive power had reached the state of perfection and economy it has since, he'd have made it three cents then."

"Just to be a good fellow, I suppose?"

"No, not to be a good fellow," replied the drummer, impatiently; "Johnson never mixed philanthropy with business. He would have reduced the fares because there is more money in a three than a five-cent fare."

"That's all right for him to say after he's sold out," sneered the other, as he got up to go. "I take notice he didn't say it when he was in the business. That proves what I've contended all the time; he's a fakir."

"Just a minute," cried the drummer, "don't go so fast. Johnson has advocated three-cent fares on every line he has been interested in during the last five years."

"Advocated three-cent fares? Why weren't they adopted?"

"Because the directors didn't agree with him. He didn't own a controlling interest, and had to abide by the vote of his associates. The best he could do in this direction was in Detroit, where he gave eight tickets for a quarter. He still owns an interest in a Lorain line, where the fare is three cents, and about a year ago he submitted a three-cent fare proposition to the city council of Columbus, O. That was along lines similar to those now pending in Cleveland. It looks as if he was willing to back his opinion with his money."

"Oh, that's the way he made it appear; he knew he wouldn't get the franchise, so he was safe in making the offer."

"Well, say, now, what could he have done that would have convinced you he wanted the franchise?"

"Nothing. He couldn't have convinced me, no matter what he'd done," replied the mark, as he walked toward the door.

"The New York & Pennsylvania

Traction company, in which Johnson's brother's estate is interested, has begun work on a line in Trenton, N. J., where the fare is to be three cents. Tom Johnson is manager of his brother's estate. How does that strike you?"

"It, don't strike me at all; that's just another one of his schemes to make believe he's sincere."

"Well, suppose we admit he never did a thing in his life for three-cent fares, are you willing to admit he is trying to get them for Cleveland now?"

"No, I'm not," he returned, as he faced the drummer again. "I think he's just trying to be elected again on that issue. That's all."

"Why is Hanna so bitterly opposed to him, then?" laughed the drummer.

"It isn't Hanna alone," interrupted the promoter, "but every great corporation in America. They say he is the most dangerous man in the country. Why, I don't believe there are a thousand men they fear as much as they do him. Of my own personal knowledge, they are being appealed to by Hanna for money on the ground that this is their fight. They are told that Johnson is a dangerous man, and means to put an end to their graft, and if he ain't defeated, the jig's up. Why, they are going to spend millions to knock him out next spring."

But the mark only shook his head, laughed, and went out.

M. J. FOYER.

### "THE SOCIABLE SNOW."

For The Public.

Oh, the beautiful snow, the beautiful snow! It hurries and scurries and how it does go. It falls on the housetop, softly and slow. It makes such good coasting, and sets us aglow,

And "turkey," and "tracking," and skating, but no!

We can't skate on this pond till it's clear of the snow.

To "Merwin's" we go on our bobs and our sleds,

And at night we come back with our poor bruised heads,

But our heads make no diff'rance, although they aren't nice,

We've had lots of fun and our heads "cut no ice."

To-day is the Sabbath and we're not on our sleds,

But we're all writing letters and using our heads.

But to-morrow is Monday, and to "Merwin's" we'll go,

To play in the beautiful, sociable snow.

H. C. (12 years old).

Things move along so rapidly nowadays that people saying: "It can't be done," are always being interrupted by somebody doing it.—Puck.

Rev. Dr. W. S. Rainford, of New York, when asked how he regarded the action of Vermont in repudiating prohibition, said: "I would rather see a man free than sober."

Sydney Smith once wittily remarked: "The British army ought never to leave England except in case of actual invasion."—Argonaut.

**BOOKS**

**PASCAL AND THE PORT ROYALISTS.**

It does not necessarily follow, because a book is published in good style by a leading house, that it is a first-class book. The noted publishing houses undoubtedly exercise some discretion, but the weight of position and prestige seems at times to sway the balance. And besides, a man may have learning and a brace or two of degrees, and yet not have the gift of style or the knack of putting a book together. His own reputation, or that of some institution with which he may be connected, gets the book printed and bound in aristocratic style, and sent forth with all the eclat that would befit a work of genuine merit.

There are many such books, and we mean no special disparagement to the present volume, "Pascal and the Port Royalists," by Prof. William Clark, D. D., LL. D., D. C. L., F. R. S. C., published by Charles Scribner's Sons. In fact, this volume, in the series of the World's Epoch-Makers, is perhaps the best available means of getting in brief compass a general idea of the work of the great Pascal. But the volume is dull and poorly constructed. The reader gets no connected view either of Pascal's outer life or of the wonderful experiences of his inner life.

It is true that Pascal's life was that of a student, and so was without much of exciting incident; but his wonderful spiritual experiences and his vigorous intellectual combats afford ample material for a biography of intense interest. Consider, for instance, what Froude could have made of it, if he had set himself to the task, as he did to his life of Erasmus. Froude, however, would not have sympathized with the most important event in Pascal's life—his conversion; but with what keenness he could have set before us the intellectual contentions of the Jansenists, and with what delightful satire he could have dealt with "efficacious grace" and "sufficient grace" and "proximate power," and the other terms over which such giant battles waged in those days.

Blaise Pascal was born in 1623 and died in 1662, at the early age of 39. Few names, so young, have lived and will live so long. His great works, the famous "Provincial Letters," and the "Thoughts," helped to create the per-

fection of French prose, and will remain a great part of its glory.

What is to-day the most valuable feature for us of Pascal's work? Now that the controversies have passed, and the terms and definitions that seemed so important have vanished into their memories, what is left? First, the element of permanent truth and principles which is found in every controversy. In Pascal's work this abiding element of interest is largely one of theoretical method of reasoning and action into which we cannot here enter. Secondly, Pascal's statement and discussion of the reality of what is known in the religious life as "conversion" may be said to be the classic account of that doctrine. He himself is said to have experienced two conversions—an experience not uncommon in the records of religious lives, as is noticed in Prof. James's new work, "Varieties of Religious Experience." What Pascal understood by conversion is essentially the same as the doctrine popularly preached in orthodox pulpits to-day. He believed in "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," and that this regeneration was accompanied by the consciousness of a union with God, which filled the converted sinner's heart with ecstasy.

The "Thoughts" of Pascal is one of the great books of the world. It may be taken up and read at any part with the certainty that the reader's interest will be immediately enlisted. You feel at once that you are in the presence of a great mind, one that deals at first hand with the mysteries of life and the inmost problems of human conduct.

J. H. DILLARD.

**LITERARY NOTES.**

"What's the Use" is the unique name of a little 50 cent a year monthly magazine published at East Aurora, N. Y., the March number of which has just appeared. Its motto, "A wrong path never leads to a right end," is worthy of serious study by

**ATTORNEYS.**

**Chicago.**

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

**Houston.**

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

**New York.**

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.  
Tel. Call, 4084 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
NEW YORK.

**SINGLE TAX LITERATURE**

Mailed FREE on request, address F. H. MONROE, President Henry George Association, 206 Chamber of Commerce Bldg. Chicago.

good people who want to reform the world instantly, no matter how.

In the World's Work for March will be found a lively but thoughtful paper on the municipal character and achievements of Chicago, by Frederic C. Howe, a member of the city council of Cleveland. He is writing for this magazine a series of articles on American cities at work, of which the Chicago article is the second.

—The Arena for March publishes from the pen of W. S. McRen an account of the adoption of the initiative and referendum by the state of Oregon. Another article of special interest is contributed by Bernard G. Richards. It deals with the conflict between Zionism and socialism that is raging among the poorer classes of Jews.

**"Economic Tangles"**

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

**OTHER ECONOMIC LITERATURE**

BY HENRY GEORGE:

Progress and Poverty; cloth, \$1.00; paper.....	\$ .50
Social Problems; cloth, \$1.00; paper.....	.50
Land Question; cloth, \$1.00; paper.....	.50
Protection vs. Free Trade; cloth, \$1.00; pa.....	.50
A Perplexed Philosopher; cloth, \$1.00; pa.....	.50
Property in Land.....	.15
Compensation.....	.05
Science of Political Economy.....	2.50
Moses.....	.05
The Single Tax; what it is and why we urge it.....	.05
Study of Political Economy.....	.05
Our Land and Land Policy, and other Essays and Speeches.....	2.50

Story of My Dictatorship.....	.10
Socialism, Rev. W. Poland.....	.10
Life of Henry George, Henry George, Jr. Library Ed. \$2.50; cloth, postpaid.....	1.66
Natural Taxation, Thos. G. Shearman; cloth, \$1.00; paper.....	.50
Shortest Road to the Single Tax.....	.10
The Single Tax, Louis F. Post.....	.25
The Case Plainly Stated.....	.05
The Single Tax and Direct Legislation.....	.10
Economic Principles, Twitchell.....	.15
Report of the Revenue Commission of Colorado, Jas. W. Bucklin.....	.05
Success in Life, Louis F. Post.....	.05
Single Tax Catechism.....	.05
Our Juggled Census, Bliss.....	.10
Smaller Profits, Reduced Salaries and Lower Wages, the condition, the cause, the cure.....	.06

**MISCELLANEOUS.**

Resist Not Evil, Clarence Darrow.....	.75
Argument in the Wood Workers' Conspiracy Case, Darrow.....	.10
Wealth Against Commonwealth, Henry D. Lloyd.....	1.14
Crime and Criminals, Darrow.....	.10
Rights and Wrongs of Ireland, Darrow.....	.10
Realism in Art and Literature, Darrow.....	.05
In Memory of Altgeld, Darrow.....	.05
A Persian Pearl and Other Poems, Darrow.....	1.50
The Slavery of Our Times, Tolstoy.....	1.25
Peace and War, Tolstoy.....	3.00
Benevolent Feudalism, Ghent, postpaid.....	1.35
The Referendum, Gen. Lieb.....	.25
Free Trade Almanac.....	.05
How to Get Rich Without Work.....	.05
The Burdens of Local Taxation, and Who Bears Them, Lawson Purdy; cloth.....	.25
Local Option in Taxation, Purdy; cloth.....	.25
Government; An Inquiry into the Nature and Functions of the State; John S. Crosby.....	.25
Oratory, Its Requirements and Its Rewards, Altgeld.....	.50
Better World Philosophy, J. Howard Moore.....	1.00

Economic Tangles reduced to 50 cts.

**PURDY PUBLISHING CO.,**  
McVicker Bldg., 78-84 Madison St., CHICAGO.



**HAMLET AT THE GRAVE OF SLAVERY.**

*Hamlet—Hem! It reads remarkably like one of our own Imperialistic arguments of to-day.*

**The Public**  
 PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY  
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
 1641 UNITY BUILDING  
 CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

**TERMS.**

Annual Subscription . . . . .	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription . . . . .	1.00
Quarterly Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.10
Single Copies . . . . .	.05

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

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

**The International Socialist Review**  
**MONTHLY, 64 PAGES.**

Tells what discriminating readers want to know about the one vital political movement of the 20th century. \$1.00 a year, 10 cents a copy. **Special to Readers of The Public:** For 30 cents in stamps we will send the REVIEW six months on trial and will also mail at once five noteworthy pamphlets, including "Crime and Criminals," by Clarence S. Darrow. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Pubs., 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.

**AN INVITATION TO THE READERS OF THE PUBLIC.**

The Social Committee of the "Henry George Association" has arranged for an informal social gathering of the members and friends of the "Association," to be held in the "Blue Parlors" at Handel Hall building, No. 40 East Randolph street, Friday evening, March 6, at eight o'clock.

An excellent musical programme will be rendered and light refreshments will be served. A small fee of 25 cents, to cover this last item of expense, will be collected at the door.

If the reader has not received an invitation by mail he is requested to consider this as a personal and cordial request to be present on this occasion, as the members of the "Henry George Association" would like to get personally acquainted with every reader of "The Public" who does not already consider himself or herself a full-fledged Single Taxer.

**MISS LEONORA BECK,**

Chairman Social Committee, 30 S. Wood St.

The Henry George Association will furnish speakers on Economic Subjects to any Church, Literary Society, Political Club, Labor Union, or Lodge, without any cost whatever. Address requests for speakers to F. H. Monroe, Pres., 502-356 Dearborn St. Admission free to all meetings.

**A CHALLENGE.**

The young men's branch of the "Henry George Association" hereby issues a general challenge to debate with young men of any university, high school, Y. M. C. A., or political organization in Cook county on the following question:

"Resolved, That the Single Tax on land values, as proposed by Henry George in 'Progress and Poverty,' would if incorporated into legislation abolish involuntary poverty."

This debate to take place in Handel hall, No. 40 East Randolph street, on the third Thursday of March, or on the third Thursday of any other month. Two or three speakers on a side, and the usual rules in regard to judges, time, arrangements of speakers, etc., to prevail. If any organization of young men desires to accept this challenge it may communicate with Mr. A. Adelman, chairman Young Men's Branch, 412 S. Troy St., or with F. H. Monroe, Pres., 502-356 Dearborn St.

**Progressive Religious Literature free.**  
 Apply Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Avenue, Chicago.

**AN OPPORTUNITY**

To get into the parent plants in the center of both of the famous TEXAS and LOUISIANA OIL FIELDS by an investment in the stock of

**THE BIG MOUND OIL COMPANY.**

**Capital Stock, \$1,000,000.**  
**All stock full paid and non-assessable.**

**GEN. J. B. WEAVER, Des Moines, Ia., Pres. A. K. RILEY, Des Moines, Ia., Sec'y.**

**PROPERTIES.**

2,000 acres in the center of the famous Texas oil fields half-way between Beaumont and Sour Lake, to be developed at once. Over 700 acres at Roanoke, Louisiana, midway between the Jennings and Welsh oil fields, on which we are boring at the present time.

- \$50...buys...100 shares, par value.. \$100.
- \$100...buys...200 shares, par value.. \$200.
- \$200...buys...400 shares, par value.. \$400.
- \$500...buys 1,000 shares, par value \$1,000.
- \$1,000 buys 2,000 shares, par value \$2,000.

Etc., Etc., Etc.

We have proven property and a reliable and very promising investment and I would not take several times par value for my stock if I could not immediately replace it.  
**J. B. WEAVER.**

An exceptional opportunity for a big profit as we are only selling a small portion of stock until our wells come in, in order to push the boring for oil. Address all communications to the **BIG MOUND OIL COMPANY, 315-316 Equitable Building, Des Moines, Iowa.**

**References as to value of our properties :**

First National Bank, Welsh, Louisiana.  
 Central Oil and Refining Company, Welsh, Louisiana.  
 S. M. Scott, Vice-President and Manager of the Export Oil & Tankline Company, Beaumont, Texas.

The following telegram just received at the home office from our President who is personally superintending the development :

"154-ex-gg-sa....14 paid.  
 Roanoke, La., 2-9-1903.  
 A. K. Riley,  
 316 Equitable Bldg., Des Moines.  
 At depth Zwick well struck gas and oil came up all afternoon have specimen.  
 J. B. Weaver. 115p."