

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1903.

Number 260.

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.

A remarkable decision of the United States Supreme Court, delivered about a month ago (p. 744), seems to lay down a principle of constitutional law which gives to Congress unsuspected powers over all business done across State lines.

The decision was made in a lottery case. When Congress had legislated against the use of the mails for transacting lottery businesses, and the Supreme Court had sustained this legislation, the managers of lottery concerns resorted to express companies. Congress thereupon legislated against this mode of inter-State transactions in lottery tickets, intending thereby not only to prohibit the use of the mails for such purposes but to suppress the business altogether. It did so in assumed pursuance of its Constitutional power "to regulate commerce . . . among the several States."

Regarding this act of Congress as unconstitutional, upon the theory that forbidding the transportation of goods from one State to another by means other than the mails is not regulation but prohibition, lottery agents have disregarded it. The decision under consideration is a result. One of these agents, Champion by name, recently delivered a box of lottery tickets to the Wells Fargo express company in Texas for transportation to California. Upon that fact criminal proceedings were instituted against him in the Federal courts of Texas and his extradition from Chicago, where he was found and arrested, was sought. The Federal courts

refusing him a writ of habeas corpus, he carried the question of his extradition to the Supreme Court at Washington, where the decision in question was made. Five judges decided against him, namely, Harlan, Brown, McKenna, White and Holmes. Four dissented—Fuller, Brewer, Shiras and Peckham. The decision of the court was rendered, therefore, by a majority of one.

In delivering this decision Justice Harlan clearly defined the position of the majority of the court as follows:

We decide nothing more in the present case than that lottery tickets are subjects of traffic among those who choose to sell or buy them; that the carriage of such tickets by independent carriers from one State into another is therefore inter-State commerce; that under its power to regulate commerce among the several States, Congress—subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution upon the exercise of the powers granted—has plenary authority over such commerce and may prohibit the carriage of such tickets from State to State; and that legislation to that end, and of that character, is not inconsistent with any limitation or restriction imposed upon the exercise of the powers granted to Congress.

It is obvious, then, that the transportation "by independent carriers from one State into another" of anything which is an article of traffic, is subject to the plenary authority of Congress, even to the extent of prohibition, provided there are no express Constitutional limitations upon the exercise of such power in the particular case. In the case of lottery tickets there are no limitations, and their sale across State lines may be absolutely prohibited by the Federal government. How would it be with other articles of traffic?

Newspapers could not be suppressed by Congress, because the first

amendment of the Constitution forbids any abridgment of the freedom of the press. Neither could books, for the same reason. And as the free exercise of religion is Constitutionally secured, no inter-State traffic in articles connected with religious worship could be prohibited. Thus far the decision is innocuous. But outside of these narrow limits it would seem that Congress might freely prohibit any kind of inter-State traffic. Either that is true or else the anti-lottery decision in question rests upon no principle at all, but is an application of mere arbitrary legislative and judicial power.

There would seem, for illustration, to be no room to doubt the power of Congress to restrain and criminally punish the shipment from one State into another of beverages of any or every kind. This opens up a wide field for the activity of prohibitionists. At present alcoholic liquors can be shipped even into prohibition States, and so long as the original packages—barrels, kegs or bottles—are unchanged, even the State authorities cannot interfere. But if Congress could be induced to pass a restraining law, these liquors could not only be kept out of prohibition States but also out of all States except those in which their manufacture is allowed. Thus the way is offered for making the prohibition question a national issue.

Neither is there any reasonable cause for doubting the authority of Congress, under this astonishing anti-lottery decision, to restrain the trusts in any one or all the ways that have been proposed, but for which it has until now been supposed that a Constitutional amendment would be necessary. The tobacco trust, for instance, could be legislated into frag-

ments, by forbidding inter-State commerce in tobacco and cigars, a measure that would probably have the support not only of independent tobacco dealers, but also of that large number of people who regard the use of tobacco as a vice to be suppressed by law. The beef trust, the steel trust, and numberless other trusts might be shackled in the same way.

These possibilities suggest another—an opportunity for protectionists to carry their doctrine to the logical conclusion to which in some States they have tried by boycotting to carry it without Congressional aid; to the point, that is, of “protecting” the industries of each State against those of the others. If, for example, Congress should forbid inter-State commerce in hams, California would be protected against the cheap hams of Chicago, just as some of her citizens tried a few years ago to protect her by boycotting Chicago hams in the interest of the California product.

The possibilities of this anti-lottery decision are indeed far-reaching. Well may the Hartford Times ask in connection with it: “How long will it be before Congress will assert absolute power over all the affairs and interests of the people of the United States?” The question is not answered, as some papers try to answer it, with assurances that Congress would not avail itself of an opportunity afforded by the courts to “arbitrarily destroy a great part of the commerce of the nation.” Our protection experience affords ample proof of the disposition of Congress to legislate for private and local interests regardless of the commerce of the nation. Should a preponderance of local and private interests conclude that they would be advantaged by the suppression of inter-State traffic in anything, a protection Congress would not be slow to suppress that traffic. The majority of one in the Supreme Court has so amended the Constitution by judicial construction as to put every local business at

the mercy of Congressional legislation. Nothing else has done quite as much to obliterate local sovereignty and extend the national authority.

There is evidently at work in the West an active branch of some literary bureau or other, the especial function of which is to make gullible Democrats in the East believe that Grover Cleveland has recovered his lost popularity to the west of the Alleghenies. A specimen of the work of this inspired bureau of misinformation appeared in the Boston Herald of the 17th, in the form of a “special dispatch” from Chicago which went into ecstasies over the reception it reported the mention of Mr. Cleveland’s name to have received at the dinner of the Iroquois club (p. 785) in Chicago, at which Edward M. Shepard was the principal speaker. Read it:

It was not Mr. Shepard who set off the vocal fireworks, but the exhibit was none the less striking on that account. No sooner was the name out of the mouth of the speaker than the feasters rose in a body, climbed on chairs, threw their napkins into the air and let forth such a series of cheers as has not come from an evening party here in a long time. The sincerity of the demonstration was all the more noticeable when, a minute or two later, the name of Bryan was spoken. Some cheering ensued, but it was not nearly so convincing as that which complimented Mr. Cleveland. Two years ago there would have been a different tale to tell.

Except for the fact that the names of Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Bryan were decorously cheered, and that there was much more cheering for Cleveland’s than for Bryan’s, that report is grossly misleading. There was no rising in a body, no climbing on chairs, no extraordinary waving of napkins. Nor was there any demonstration for Cleveland of any kind which would not have been made for him by the same men at any time these six years past. It is safe to say that not one hearty cheer for him came from anybody at that banquet who would not have cheered as heart-

ily in 1896. It is also safe to say that some of the cheers for Bryan came spontaneously from men who in 1896 would have been more inclined to hiss him. The assemblage was a mixed one politically, and as the price of admission was \$10, it may be reasonably supposed that Cleveland’s admirers were in the majority. In the nature of things Bryan, whose work is chiefly for the expropriated classes of this republic would not be fully represented at a meeting to which the admission fee was considerably more than the average income of a vast majority of the mechanics and farmers of the country for a week’s hard work. The preference for Cleveland shown at such a meeting is hardly indicative of a turning of Western sentiment toward that distinguished leader.

The Boston Herald’s dispatch is woefully wicked in its sins of omission. Not only does it neglect to say that the occasion of this mythical uprising for Cleveland was a \$10 affair, and to explain that the majority in attendance had been Cleveland men all along, but it withholds the truth about the comparative cheering. Mr. Bryan did not get all the cheers that were left over after the Cleveland demonstration. He came third, not second. The second honors of that occasion were bestowed upon William Randolph Hearst. Next to Cleveland, Mr. Hearst bore off the spectacular honors of the occasion.

Dr. Parkhurst, of New York, is reported to have assailed “the honor of the army” in his sermon last Sunday—“the honor of the army” being in this instance the chivalrous Gen. Funston. Dr. Parkhurst’s sermon was on “Liars,” and he unfolded Funston for exhibition as an extraordinarily interesting specimen. “Funston disguised himself and his men in the uniforms worn by Filipinos,” said Dr. Parkhurst, “crept upon Aguinaldo stealthily under that guise, tricked him by a forged

letter, pretending his men were hungry, made capital out of the holy rite of hospitality, then flung Aguinaldo to the ground and made him a captive. They violated the laws of war, the laws of hospitality, and the laws of God; and the people of the United States, instead of mutinying against this act of damnable lying and perfidy, thought it a shrewd trick on Funston's part and the Senate promoted him." Those are plain words and true ones. But why credit the Senate with promoting the spy? The Senate only confirmed him.

If Tom L. Johnson is a "boss," as the Hanna party of Cleveland call him, he is the kind of "boss" that American municipal politics have long needed. Without secret wire pulling or promises, but open-and-above-board, within sight and hearing of the whole people, he has "bossed" his party into nominating a Republican for high office because in a lower office that Republican has been loyal to the public interests in spite of the opposing pressure of Mr. Hanna's street car ring. Another of Mr. Johnson's acts of "bossism," if that is the proper name for it, is as unique and encouraging. He has "bossed" all the Democratic candidates for seats in the city council of Cleveland, into signing a written promise—not a platitudinous promise, but as specific as words can make it. Following are its terms:

We, the Democratic candidates for the city council, appreciate the widespread public interest in questions which are being discussed in this campaign, and believe that the people have a right to know our views upon these questions. To that end we indorse and commend to the voters of this city the following statement: We will vote for any measure necessary to secure three-cent cash street railroad fare with universal transfers and possible municipal ownership, and we will oppose and vote against any measure for the renewal or extension of existing franchises or the granting of any new franchises without all of these provisions. We will vote for and support all measures the purpose of which is to bring about a just and equal system of taxation as advocated in the platform of the Democratic party of Cuyahoga county. We will vote for and support any meas-

ure providing for a municipal lighting plant for our city. In addition to this expression of our views upon specific questions we pledge ourselves to the people to carry forward the improvement of the city in every way consistent with a due regard for economy and to exercise such supervision of the expenditure of public money as will secure for the people a fair return for every dollar invested.

This new style of political "boss" is something to wonder at as well as to applaud.

Compare it with "Boss" Hanna's style. "Boss" Hanna nominates a lawyer for mayor whose first obligation is to Hanna's street car interests. "Boss" Hanna nominates for vice-mayor a labor leader who was instrumental in getting a committee of his labor organization to report against three-cent fares and in favor of Mr. Hanna's own scheme for adjusting his street car interests—a committee which got curiously mixed up, by the way, with at least two suspicious payments of considerable sums of money. "Boss" Hanna pledges all his candidates to give him his own terms for street car franchises. No wonder "Boss" Hanna's candidate for mayor declines the challenge of Johnson to debate the issues of the campaign, even though Johnson offered to give his adversary all the admission tickets to the debates.

The question of three-cent fares, with municipal ownership as soon as legally possible, is the leading issue in Cleveland; and notwithstanding all the efforts of the Hanna party to shift and confuse it, it is the only issue. One of these attempts at befogging the campaign, a goody-goody movement to attack Johnson for permitting vice and crime to flourish, came to a sudden end when the public attention was called to the fact (p. 537) that "Boss" Hanna's Supreme Court had interfered with Mayor Johnson's attempt to get rid of the incapable superintendent of police, and that Mr. Johnson has had no responsibility in the matter since, the responsibility for such vice and crime as does flourish resting

upon this Republican police superintendent. With the way thus clear for the street car issues, with the the Democratic candidates pledged for 3-cent fares and equal taxation, and with the Republicans pledged the other way, Mr. Hanna's only chance is to convince the people that 3-cent fares are too low to allow a reasonable profit. This is the meaning of his interesting flirtation with labor leaders of easy politics.

It must require a superfluity of hard cheek to assert at this late day that three cents is too low a fare for profitable street car operation. The experience of Glasgow disproves it. So does that of Liverpool. It is disproved by the experience of Toronto. Mayor Johnson has disproved it by actual trial. Even here in Chicago there is a street railway which has proved that even 2½-cent fares yield a profitable return.

We refer to one of the branches of the Calumet Electric street railway system, the branch running from Sixty-third street to Ninety-third, or South Chicago, a distance of nearly four miles. This road has been in the hands of a receiver for several years. The branch in question continues southward from South Chicago to a place called Robey, about four miles farther. Somewhat more than two years ago the destruction of a bridge at Ninety-fifth street cut the branch in two, and the Chicago City Railway Co., a competing line at this point, was requested to allow the Calumet to use its line for the purpose of connecting the severed branch during the rebuilding of the bridge. The request being refused, the receiver of the Calumet road reduced the fare over the northerly section of the severed branch to 2½ cents. Passengers were charged 5 cents, but for this they received a check entitling them to another ride—not a return trip, but a ride either way at any reasonable time. The part of the branch adopting this change was, as already stated, nearly

four miles long. Moreover the patronage was almost exclusively a terminal patronage. That is to say, population along the line was so sparse that almost all the passengers carried got on at one terminus and rode to the other. Thus the hauls were nearly all long hauls. But notwithstanding this disadvantage, the branch made money with its 2½-cent fares. When the destroyed bridge had been restored, the whole eight-mile run was reestablished and fares were raised again to 5 cents. This was done about two weeks ago. But the fact remains that a Chicago street car line four miles long, with none of the advantages of a midway patronage, has been run at a profit with 2½-cent fares. One instance like this is more valuable, many times over, than the testimony of labor leaders who get windfalls of money, or those who have Republican nominations thrust upon them, at about the time when Mr. Hanna needs that kind of testimony and gets it.

A Berlin dispatch which describes Dr. Hermann Klaatsch as "one of Germany's most distinguished anthropologists," tells of having just published a book which "runs full tilt against the Darwinian theory of the descent of man." Darwinism seems to be having a hard time of it these days at the hands of the scientists. It is almost a pity, for there has grown up about it a great body of approving doctrine regarding all sorts of infamy, from the burning of "niggers" to the plundering of "inferiors" of every description. Darwinism has taken the place in credulous minds of the story of Jonah and the whale, and in selfish hearts of the biblical curse upon Ham. It is a new kind of credulity and the common refuge for "scientific" pharisees. What will the credulous and the "superiors" do if Darwinism fails them?

A great many citizens, unfortunately, want only so much honest government as will not interfere with their interests.—Puck.

### A SATIRE ON THE FARMERS THAT FARM FARMERS.

Dean Swift's method for his satires has given way in our time to a method that differs radically from his in only one respect. This difference makes it, perhaps, all the more effective for present needs. The fabulous setting which Swift adopted, while it had the advantage of at once advertising his satires as fiction, thus avoiding the possibility of inadvertently playing a practical joke upon the incautious, had also the disadvantage of interesting readers so deeply in the story as to minimize to their minds, or altogether to conceal from them, the intended lesson. The new method loses that advantage, but it gets rid of the corresponding disadvantage.

It is not in the category of stories at all, but of arguments; and instead of dealing with fabulous peoples and countries, it deals in a very serious manner, excessively so if anything, with real persons and places and the real questions that concern them. Yet in subtle and often quite elusive ways it repeatedly injects the reduction to absurdity.

Vebelin's delightful "Theory of the Leisure Class" is probably the best known example of this style of satire. Love's "Japanese Notions of European Political Economy," though not so well known and varying somewhat as to method, is another example. A more recent one takes the form of a speech reproduced as a pamphlet, and is ostensibly from the pen of a Gilbert M. Tucker, who is described on the title page of the pamphlet as "editor of the Country Gentleman, Albany, N. Y." The speech purports to have been delivered before the "Farmers' National Congress, at Macon, Ga., October 9, 1902, its subject being "The Menace of the Arid Lands."\*

This ostensible speech seems to be a subtle satire on the stock ad-hominem arguments for protection and land monopoly, to which it applies the reductio ad absurdum with consummate skill. We doubt

\*To be had (free, probably) on application to the De Laval Separator Co., at Randolph and Canal streets, Chicago; 1213 Filbert street, Philadelphia; 217 Drumm street, San Francisco; 327 Commissioners street, Montreal; 75 York street, Toronto; 248 McDermot avenue, Winnipeg; and 74 Cortlandt street, New York.

if there is any better instance of an application to either subject of the light touch of restrained satire.

One might venture the guess that this satirical speech was suggested by a series of resolutions adopted unanimously by the National Grange of Patrons of Husbandry at its meeting at Lewiston, Me., in 1901; for the resolutions are quoted at large in the body of the speech and their phrases are freely borrowed. They recite that—

the one great burden on the farming interests of the United States consists of the perpetuation of the superannuated policy of the government in giving away its arable lands to anybody and everybody who will occupy them, thereby constantly maintaining and increasing a most unfair competition with farmers already established, and diverting to the far West thousands of men who would naturally furnish the much-needed force of labor for farmers who have bought their lands and paid or agreed to pay for them.

Also that—

this injury would be continued for many generations longer, should any project be adopted for bringing into cultivable state the immense tracts of the public domain now arid.

After those recitals come the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That this body, representing in large measure the agricultural interests of the whole country, denounces all projects for irrigating any portion of the public domain at the public expense;

Resolved, That an authenticated copy of these resolutions be forwarded by registered mail to the President of the United States, with the request that he refer to the matter in his message to the coming Congress, and that he withhold Executive approval from any bill intended to pave the way for government irrigation should the advocates of such a measure succeed in securing its passage by the two Houses.

When the motive for those resolutions is considered—namely, to restrict agricultural competition, so as to raise the prices of produce, and to maintain competition among agricultural laborers, so as to lower wages—the resolutions themselves read like a satire which some practical joker might have induced the National Grange to father. Yet some persons do regard it as a proper function of government to make business good for them at no matter whose

expense; and these resolutions may have had their source in the absolute good faith of genuine selfishness. Whether they had or not, the satirist in question has made excellent use of them.

He begins attractively with an exposition of the brag and blow in our periodicals about agricultural prosperity in the United States. As he correctly shows, this is usually supported with Department statistics indicating that nearly \$2,000,000,000 was divided among the farmers of the United States in 1902.

"Occasionally," he comments, "it occurs to one of these hurrah writers to do a little further calculation, generally in a foot note, or at any rate inconspicuously and as if the final results, which do not appear to come out quite as expected, must be susceptible of some explanation and could be of no great consequence anyway. One such glorifier of our tremendous agricultural prosperity computes that if the value of the three great cereal crops were distributed evenly among the families engaged in raising them, each family would receive—each family, mind you, each whole family—\$180. One hundred and eighty dollars for a family, as its gross returns, not by any means net profit, for the grain marketed by its working members during a year of enormous abundance."

In this introduction no satire is intended. Its purpose is evidently to draw attention to the deplorable fact, and it is a fact, that farmers as a class are really not very prosperous. With the same purpose the writer quotes a farmer friend, "a man of considerable means, not acquired in agriculture, but a real farmer and the descendant of generations of farmers, occupying ancestral fields of large dimensions in one of the most productive regions of New York, fields that have always been carefully tilled and abundantly fertilized, with due attention to rotation and to the selling of finished products"—in other words a competent farmer of the first class—who said: "The fact of it is, the drift of things in this country is steadily reducing our farmers to the peasantry

of the old nations of Europe; a condition in which sustenance, of a very plain sort, may reasonably be expected, but in which there is positively no hope for anything better than unceasing toil, no opportunity whatever of accumulating even the most modest competence."

Such observations, too pointed to have come from the pen of a genuine protectionist or land monopolist, serve the purpose of warning the reader. They prepare him to apprehend the satirical trend of the argument as it unfolds, in which the writer professes to explain the cause of this retrogression among farmers. Now to the satire.

"Every American has a more or less clearly conceived apprehension," it solemnly begins, "of the fact that all our prosperity rests upon our agriculture, and is, therefore, pretty certain to understand, if he thinks about the matter at all, that our agriculture ought to be fostered."

That is good protection doctrine, even if protectionists don't practice in this respect what they preach.

The writer then remarks that "it is quite possible to foster our agriculture by methods that will certainly degrade our agriculturists," and intimates that this has been done, by reminding his readers that there was a time when "no distinction could be drawn, in the United States at least, between the prosperity of farming and the prosperity of the farmers. Here is a hint that our present agricultural prosperity is not so beneficial to farmers who farm farms as to farmers who farm farmers.

But the writer wisely avoids saying anything so translucent. He realizes that it would mar the subtlety of his satire. Instead of giving himself away by indicating the ramifications of privilege which have generated the agricultural specialty of farming farmers, he adroitly attacks the present operation of our public land system, under which, with "insane haste," as he says, the government offers the public land, "practically for nothing, to anybody and everybody who will take it."

He does not dwell, however, upon the competition of these new farms in the markets of the world, with its

tendency to reduce the prices of farm products. An argument on that point would lose its sharp edge, and this satirist is too acute to have made such a blunder. He passes the point with the simple remark that in his opinion "the injury in this direction is rather less than might be supposed, and that it is in fact very far from being the darkest element of the problem." Two other "channels of mischief" lend themselves much better to the story of his ironical dialectics.

The first of these is—

the absorption by the new lands of the men and women who ought to supply, and in the normal condition of things would supply, an abundance of labor at moderate wages for established farmers. The demand for really efficient farm help, at prices that farmers can afford to pay, is left largely unsatisfied—to the injury of the farming interest, and perhaps most of all to the overburdening of the wife of the small farmer with tasks of which hired servants should greatly relieve her—by the facility with which the persons who ought to supply it can go West and become farmers on their own account, your property and mine being freely offered them for that purpose. Why should anybody work for you, except perhaps at extravagant compensation, when the government is willing and anxious to make him a landed proprietor himself, practically without money and without price?

Could subtle satire be more pointed without losing its subtlety? What more could be reasonably asked, even by the most ardent disciple of Henry George, than this apparent simplicity, which confesses that the wages of agricultural laborers depends upon the abundance of free land?

The next bit of irony is like the other, but widens out so as to include a larger class:

Nor is it farm labor alone that is drawn from its natural home by the recklessness of Uncle Sam in giving everybody a farm. A class of people better off financially go West also, and take their money with them, the class among whom the farmer looks for tenants [note the light touch involved here in speaking of a farm landlord as a farmer], if he wishes to let his property, for purchasers if he wishes to sell. Why should a man of some means hire your farm or buy it, if he can get one of his own for nothing. . . ?

The naivete with which our satirist, imitating the kind of argument he is poking fun at, slurs over the fact that what government gives to farmers, when it gives them anything, is not farms but natural sites on which to make farms, is simply charming. The evident spirit of his question would be better rendered, if plain speaking instead of satire were the design, by asking, "why should a man of some means hire the land you have monopolized, or buy it, for the purpose of making himself a farm, if he can get land for that purpose for nothing?" This is a question that probes, but the satirist was right in choosing the more delicate form.

Having thus dealt with the three "objections" to free land—lower prices of products, higher wages for work, and lower ground rents and location prices—our apocryphal speechmaker sums up in this delicious fashion:

Now notice, please, how these three wrongs converge to drain the very lifeblood of the established farmer who has bought his farm and paid for it, or (still worse) owes something on it. The value of his crop is reduced by unfair and illegitimate competition; the supply of labor that he needs is minimized and therefore its price enhanced; and the class among whom he ought to be able to find tenants or purchasers is seriously restricted. The same malign influences act, of course, on all his brother farmers. Their profits, like his, are fearfully diminished, and many of them, like him, are offering their farms to anybody who will pay a decent rent [an indecent rent being, of course, implied as the result of more intense land monopoly] or buy at a reasonable price. . . . The American farmer ought to be not only the most independent being on earth, but one of the most envied. Of all property in this country a farm ought to be the most desired, and the greatest in demand. There should be a dozen would-be purchasers or tenants bidding against each other for every farm that there is supposed to be a chance to get.

It being still understood that by "farm" the writer means a natural opportunity for farming—for, of course, he does not mean farm improvements, since they would not increase in value no matter how extensively farm land were monopolized—the idea of promoting intense competition on the working farmer

side and getting rid altogether of competition on the farm landlord side, amounts to an inspiration in satire.

Nor does the writer spoil his effusion by allowing it to be supposed that he has fallen into the narrow prejudices of a class and really believes these absurd things as related to farms. He perfects his satire by transferring the reader to the neighborhood of cities, where sites grow in value not in consequence of anything the owners do, but of the development of the city. Cleverly assuming that this manifest abuse of all sound principles of land tenure is just and wise, the writer in question puts this morsel into his supposititious speech:

The possession of a farm in the United States, especially in the older settled regions, should be, and under normal conditions would be, like the possession of land in the environs of a great and fast growing city, certain to enrich the owner, or at least his children, by natural and inevitable increase in value from the increasing demand of a multiplying population.

Yet a ray of hope is discerned by our sarcastic writer:

The arable public land has been so recklessly wasted and worse than wasted, so forced upon an already fearfully overloaded market, that it is now nearly gone. I suppose it is within bounds to say that there hardly remains unappropriated a desirable homestead in any State washed by the Mississippi or its affluents; and they are scarce anywhere. As the Year Book of the Department of Agriculture some years ago said: "All the best parts of the public domain have been appropriated, and comparatively very little good agricultural land remains open to settlement." It would seem that we are within sight of the beginning of the end of the mischief, and might hope now for a gradual improvement of farm property [meaning land, of course, as distinguished from improvements], the supply of wild land being nearly exhausted, while our population is increasing by leaps and bounds.

But the irrigationists have well nigh extinguished this ray of "hope" by securing the passage of a law—for the purpose of rendering fruitful by irrigation and then giving away I don't know how many hundreds of millions of acres of land now arid, thus postponing to the time of our great-grandchildren or later the condition of affairs which shall cre-

ate a sharp demand, with constantly rising prices, for agricultural land. Unless that bill be repealed and similar projects defeated for years to come, we have before us only a second stage in the work of spoliation. And that is my objection to the whole irrigation scheme in all its protean forms, to any scheme for increasing the cultivated area of the United States until such time as the land that has been bought and is cultivated by individual taxpayers shall come into such demand, by the growing requirements of our growing population, as to multiply very greatly its present money value.

When our versatile satirist has finished with the question of irrigation as one of public policy, he turns to the equities of it. A great deal having been said, in support of the irrigation project, about "furnishing homes for the homeless," he draws this parallel:

If some of our Western friends were owners of valuable lots in Boston, which they preferred to keep vacant until a growing demand should bring an increase in their selling value, and the Bostonians living around these lots should endeavor to seize them, under color of developing Boston and providing homes for the homeless, one can imagine the indignation of the owners and the opinion they would express of the shameless rapacity of the plotters. Their own plan is precisely the same, except for a difference in the location of the coveted booty.

This is the cleverest touch in the whole satirical speech. The parallel is perfect, and the writer so declares. As he says, the two cases are lacking in nothing but identity of location, and of course that is immaterial. Yet the writer has the self-restraint to go no farther than to assert the parallel. To have said, what he doubtless means, that the Boston case ought in equity to be governed by the principle of the free land policy, and not the free land policy by the indignation of Boston lot monopolists, would have deadened the satire. This inference he could fairly leave to his readers. Only those who are totally devoid of the sense of humor will fail to see the point.

Another light touch in this speech must not escape mention. It is the description of its author as editor of "The Country Gentleman."

Papers with that title invariably represent country people of leisure—not hoboes, but people whose leisure is elegant. Like the hobo, they live in the sweat of other men's faces, but their requirements demand more sweat. Working farmers are not country gentlemen within the connotation of such papers. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that a satirical speech such as we have described, which pretends to advocate a system that would perpetuate the power of farmers of farmers over farmers of farms, should purport to have been delivered by the editor of a "Country Gentleman."

## NEWS

The report of the arbitration commission appointed by President Roosevelt to inquire into the merits of the anthracite coal strike, announced last week (p. 793), has now been published. It occupies 87 printed pages and is signed by all the members of the commission. Following is the commission's own summary of the award it makes:

1. That an increase of 10 per cent over and above the rates paid in the month of April, 1902, be paid to all contract miners for cutting coal, yardage, and other work for which standard rates or allowances existed at that time, from and after Nov. 1, 1902, and during the life of this award. The amount of increase under the award due for work done between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 1, 1903.

2. That engineers who are employed in hoisting water shall have an increase of 10 per cent on their earnings between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903; and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of the award they shall have eight-hour shifts, with the same pay which was effective in April, 1902, and where they are now working eight-hour shifts the eight-hour shifts shall have an increase of 10 per cent in the wages effective in the several positions in April, 1902.

That hoisting engineers and other engineers and pumpmen, other than those employed in hoisting water, who are employed in positions which are manned continually, shall have an increase of 10 per cent in their earnings between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 1, 1903; and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of the award they shall have an increase of 5 per cent in the rates of wages effective in the several positions in April, 1902, and in addition

they shall be relieved from duty Sundays, without loss of pay, by a man provided by the employer to relieve them during the hours of the day shift.

That firemen shall have an increase of 10 per cent in their earnings between November, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 3, 1903, and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of the award they shall have eight-hour shifts, with the same wages per day, week or month as were paid in each position in April, 1902. All employes or company men other than those for whom the commission makes special awards shall be paid an increase of 10 per cent between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 1, 1903, and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of this award they shall be paid on the basis of a nine-hour day, receiving therefor the same wages as were paid in April, 1902, for a ten-hour day. Overtime in excess of nine hours in any day to be paid at a proportionate rate per hour.

3. During the life of this award the present methods of payment for coal mined shall be adhered to unless changed by mutual agreement.

In all of the above awards it is provided that allowances like those made shall be paid to the legal representatives of such employes as may have died since Nov. 1, 1902.

4. Any difficulty or disagreement arising under this award, either as to its interpretation or application, or in any way growing out of the relations of the employers and employed, which cannot be settled or adjusted by consultation between the superintendent or manager of the mine or mines and the miner or miners directly interested, or is of a scope too large to be settled or adjusted, shall be referred to a permanent joint committee, to be called a board of conciliation, to consist of six persons, appointed as hereinafter provided. That is to say, if there shall be a division of the whole region into three districts, in each of which there shall exist an organization representing a majority of the mine workers of such district, one of said board of conciliation shall be appointed by each of said organizations and three other persons shall be appointed by the operators, the operators in each of said districts appointing one person.

The board of conciliation thus constituted shall take, up and consider any question referred to it as aforesaid, hearing both parties to the controversy and such evidence as may be laid before it by either party; and any award made by a majority of such board of conciliation shall be final and binding on all parties. If, however, the said board is unable to decide any question submitted or point related thereto, that question or point shall be referred to an umpire, to be appointed, at the request of said board, by one of the circuit judges of the Third judicial cir-

cuit of the United States, whose decision shall be final and binding in the premises.

The membership of said board shall at all times be kept complete, either the operators' or miners' organizations having the right at any time when a controversy is not pending to change their representation thereon.

At all hearings before said board the parties may be represented by such person or persons as they may respectively select.

No suspension of work shall take place, by lockout or strike, pending the adjudication of any matter so taken up for adjustment.

5. Whenever requested by a majority of the contract miners of any colliery, check weighmen or check docking bosses, or both, shall be employed. The wages of said check weighmen and check docking bosses shall be fixed, collected and paid by the miners in such manner as the said miners shall by a majority vote elect, and when requested by a majority of said miners the operators shall pay the wages fixed for check weighmen and check docking bosses out of deductions made proportionately from the earnings of the said miners, on such basis as the majority of said miners shall determine.

6. Mine cars shall be distributed among miners who are at work as uniformly and as equitably as possible, and there shall be no concerted effort on the part of the miners or mine workers of any colliery or collieries to limit the output of the mines or to detract from the quality of the work performed unless such limitation of output be in conformity with an agreement between an operator or operators and an organization representing a majority of said miners in his or their employment.

7. In all cases where miners are paid by the car the increase awarded to the contract miners is based on the cars in use, the topping required and the rates paid per car which were in force April 1, 1902. Any increase in the size of the car or in the topping required shall be accompanied by a proportionate increase in the rate paid per car.

8. The following sliding scale of wages shall become effective April 1, 1903, and shall affect all miners and mineworkers included in the awards of the commission. The wages fixed in the awards shall be the basis of and the minimum under the sliding scale.

For each increase of 5 cents in the average price of white ash coal of sizes above pea coal, sold at or near New York, between Perth Amboy and Edgewater, and reported to the bureau of anthracite coal statistics, above \$4.50 a ton f. o. b., the employes shall have an increase of 1 per cent. in their compensation, which shall continue until a change in the average of said coal works a reduction or an increase in said additional compensation hereun-

der; but the rate of compensation shall in no case be less than that fixed in the award. That is, when the price of coal reaches \$4.55 a ton the compensation will be increased 1 per cent., to continue until the price falls below \$4.50 a ton, when the 1 per cent. increase will cease, or until the price reaches \$4.60 a ton, when an additional 1 per cent. will be added, and so on.

These average prices shall be computed monthly by an accountant or commission named by one of the circuit judges of the third judicial district of the United States and paid by the coal operators such compensation as the appointing judge may fix, which compensation shall be distributed among the operators in proportion to the tonnage of each mine.

In order that the basis may be laid for the successful working of the sliding scale provided herein it is also adjudged and awarded: That all coal operating companies file at once with the United States commissioner of labor a certified statement of the rates of compensation paid in each occupation known in their companies, as they existed April 1, 1902.

9. No person shall be refused employment or in any way discriminated against because of membership or non-membership in any labor organization, and there shall be no discrimination against or interference with any employe who is not a member of any labor organization by members of such organization.

10. All contract miners shall be required to furnish within a reasonable time before each pay day a statement of the amount of money due from them to their laborers, and such sums shall be deducted from the amount due the contract miner and paid directly to each laborer by the company. All employes when paid shall be furnished with an itemized statement of account.

11. The awards herein made shall continue in force until March 31, 1906; and any employe, or group of employes, violating any of the provisions thereof shall be subject to reasonable discipline by the employer; and further, the violation of any provision of these awards, either by employer or employes, shall not invalidate any of the provisions thereof.

It is generally conceded that the award is a victory for the strikers. All the employes get an increase of wages, or a reduction of hours, or both; and the conciliation plan is substantially what Mitchell proposed to the operators, and they rejected. Comparing the demands with the award, Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent whose observations are usually acute and his reports exceptionally accurate, writes

in the Chicago Record-Herald as follows:

Though the men demanded a 20 per cent. increase of wages, it is well known they never expected a greater increase than 10 per cent. or a corresponding reduction of hours. During the efforts to settle the strike last summer Mr. Mitchell more than once proposed to accept a 10 per cent. increase. It is known beyond peradventure that if the railway companies had been willing to make a settlement last Spring, before the strike was ended or had been long under way, they could have secured peace with a 5 per cent. advance and recognition of the union. They were not willing to make any concessions, no matter how small, and refused to arbitrate. The terms which they now secure after all the losses of the battle are less favorable than they could have secured had they taken up the question of a settlement in a businesslike way nearly a year ago. All the mine workers asked was an agreement for a year. Under the terms of the award the companies are bound for three years from the end of this month, and must pay out a very large sum of money in a lump to give the miners the 10 per cent. increase dating from Nov. 1 last.

Another industrial decision of general interest and importance is embraced in the news of the week. It relates to the meat packing trust and was rendered on the 20th by the Supreme Court of Missouri. This decision is made against five of the largest packing houses in the world—The Armour Packing company, Cudahy Packing company, Hammond Packing company, Swift & Co., and Schwarzhild and Sulzberger, all having branch establishments in Missouri. Proceedings against these establishments were begun in Missouri about a year ago upon charges of conspiring to maintain prices, and thereby violating the anti-trust laws of that State. The charges are now sustained by the Supreme Court, and each of the defendants is fined \$5,000, to be paid within 30 days. In case of failure to pay, the defaulting concern will be forbidden to do business any longer in Missouri. The decision was made by a unanimous court.

Along with the news of the Missouri decision against the meat packing trust, come reports of the organization of the National Packing company, under the incorporation laws of New Jersey. It was incorporated on the 18th (pp. 52, 231), with a cap-

ital stock of \$15,000,000, for the purpose of doing business in Chicago, where the principal office is to be. This corporation has acquired control of the following subsidiary companies: Omaha Packing company, Omaha; Hammond Packing company, St. Joseph and Omaha; G. H. Hammond company, Chicago; Hutchinson Packing company, Hutchinson, Kan.; Anglo-American Provision company, Chicago; United Dressed Beef company, New York; Fowler Packing company, Kansas City. The directors of the blanket company are: J. Ogden Armour, P. A. Valentine, G. F. Swift, L. F. Swift, E. F. Swift, Edward Morris, Ira N. Morris, Arthur Meeker and Kenneth K. McLaren. According to a Chicago report, this new company will centralize the management of its scattered plants, which will be operated in thorough harmony with the larger concerns that have long dominated the meat trade; and when the time comes for a combination of these houses, it will be found that the formation of the National will have cleared the way materially for the accomplishment of that end.

As agreed (p. 792), the Senate came to a vote on the 19th upon the question of ratifying the Cuban reciprocity treaty; and, as amended, the treaty was ratified by a vote of 50 to 16, whereupon the Senate adjourned sine die.

Under this treaty manufactures of iron and steel, cotton goods, whiskies, fish, pottery, and all articles of glass except window glass, would be admitted into Cuba at a reduction of 25 per cent. from the established tariff rates there. Butter, window glass, malt liquors in bottles, musical instruments, tobacco wrappers, cutlery, pasteboard, boots and shoes, common soap, and nearly all wines would get a reduction of 30 per cent. Knit goods and other manufactures of cotton, cheese, woolen goods, fruit, glucose, watches, silk manufactures and rice, would be entitled to a reduction of 40 per cent. On the other side, Cuban sugar, tobacco, and some other products would be admitted into the United States at a reduction of 20 per cent. from the Dingley tariff rates. But, as stated last week, in consequence of the Bacon amendment, intended to recognize the right of the lower house of Congress to participate in revenue measures.



the treaty cannot take effect until approved by a joint resolution of both Houses. Another amendment provides for a reduction of 40 per cent. from Cuban rates upon American cattle. A third amendment has reference to the 20 per cent. reduction from the Dingley rates upon Cuban sugar imported into the United States. It requires that no change be made in the American tariff on sugar from other countries so long as the Cuban treaty is in force. The latter amendment is supposed to have been injected by beet sugar interests.

As a consequence of these amendments, the treaty must be again ratified (p. 776) by the Cuban Senate; and on the 21st President Palma called it to meet in extra session for that purpose on the 24th. Upon convening, the Senate listened to a message from President Palma, in which he explained that he considered the treaty advantageous to Cuba, and that as the time for ratification would expire on March 31, he had felt obliged to call the special session in order to submit the amendments adopted by the American Senate. After discussion it was unanimously decided to submit the treaty to the committee on foreign relations, which will report on the 27th.

Over in Santo Domingo, the revolution that was suppressed last Fall (p. 472) has again broken out. Or, maybe it is a new one; for the news records are not very precise. At any rate reports of successful revolutionary operations under Gen. Zeno began to reach this country in February. These reports told of Zeno's capture of Guayubin, in the northwest, and of his advance upon Puerto Plata. A month having elapsed, the rebels were reported on the 23d to be in possession of San Domingo, the capital city, having gained this advantage after furious fighting. On the 24th quiet had been restored in the city and the rebels were in control of the government offices. Vague news of fighting at San Carlos was reported on the 24th.

Venezuela has been in the midst of another crisis. President Castro delivered his resignation to the president of the Venezuelan congress on the 21st. On the 22d the resignation came before that body, which by a unanimous vote refused to accept it

and requested Castro to reconsider it and remain in office. This he refused to do, but at the earnest solicitation of his political supporters he consented to deliver one more presidential message to the congress. His motives for resigning are not known and are the subject of many conjectures. In his message, however, delivered on the 23d, he seemed to intimate that he wished to deprive the revolutionists of their excuse for fighting, namely, that they objected to him as president. These are his words:

I now deliver my abdication in order that you may proceed legally to call on him who should take my place so that there may remain to no Venezuelan the slightest pretext for hostility to his country or for connivance with foreigners who, without any other right than their might, fell upon unfortunate Venezuela.

The revolutionary leader, Gen. Matos, lent color to this interpretation of Castro's resignation by cabling from Willemstad to the vice president of Venezuela as follows:

Gen. Castro has resigned the presidency. Considering that his being in power renders impossible all peace and prosperity in Venezuela, if Congress will accept his abdication I will promise you to use all my influence with the commanders of the revolutionary arms to put an immediate end to the war.

The matter was temporarily settled on the 25th. Congress having again refused to accept Castro's resignation, he addressed to that body a second message in which, after reciting the circumstances and stating his conviction that his resignation was necessary he withdrew it with this explanation:

I bow before the desire of Congress and resign myself to the new obligations imposed by my country, but only until the work of pacifying the nation shall be complete and order reestablished in the public administration. Remember it well, senators and deputies, I believe my separation necessary; you think otherwise. I hope the future will prove you right. Accept an expression of my supreme thanks for the generous demonstration of which you have made me the object.

The news of the withdrawal of the resignation was hailed with enthusiasm in Caracas.

Regarding the rebellion (p. 695) mentioned by Gen. Matos and alluded to by President Castro in his message, there has been no news since about the middle of the month, when two fragmentary reports were

received. One of these told of the defeat of a body of revolutionists under Gen. Riera at Coro prior to the 13th. The other told of another revolutionary defeat, this time at Carupano.

A remarkable address from American Negroes to the emperors and kings of the old world was made public at Cleveland on the 21st. It had been adopted at a secret session of the Equal Rights association at Cleveland on the 9th of February. This address is an appeal for foreign intervention in behalf of Afro-Americans in the United States, who are described in it as being—

brutally and barbarously maltreated and basely compelled, for no crime or misdemeanor, to suffer every indignity, cruelty and murder that inhuman, fiendish nature can invent, by some of those who once held the Afro-Americans in bondage and slavery, or the descendants of those who once held the Afro-Americans in slavery and bondage in the United States, and who still without cause harbor in their hearts a deadly hatred against the Afro-American race.

Becoming specific, the address asserts of Afro-Americans that from— one to five or more are either tortured, hung, shot or butchered and driven from their homes daily, while others are burnt to death at the stake. . . . And while the victims are writhing in pain in the fire, their ears, eyes and fingers are cut out and off for souvenirs, and pieces of their sizzling, frying and burning flesh are slashed from their burning bodies and are auctioned off to the highest bidder after this fashion, holding it up: 'Who wants a piece of nigger meat? Who wants a piece of nigger meat?' 'It is sold at 10 cents.' The heart is divided into quarters and is sold at 25 cents each.

For these atrocities the address asserts that there is no redress in their own country:

We have time and again pleaded and appealed to Presidents, to Congresses of the United States, to enforce the laws and to stop that inhuman wholesale murder, that discrimination and slaughter of an innocent people, but every plea and appeal has been ignored. Then comes the appeal to Europe for intervention:

We, therefore, now, in the name of God Almighty, do hereby appeal to the Powers of Europe and to every civilized nation of the old world, through their representatives at Washington, D. C., to interfere in some way in behalf of the poor, downtrodden, outraged Afro-

American of the United States. The Americans intervened, so they claimed, for humanity, because of Spain's barbarous treatment to the Cubans. They drove the Spanish army from that island at the cost of many lives, censured the Spanish throne for wholesale murder, butchery and torture of innocent Cubans. . . . The foreign powers have the same and a better right to interfere in defense of 10,000,000 people that are liable to be murdered at will by prejudiced classes. . . . In God's name, will the king of England, will the emperor of Germany, will the czar of Russia, will the sultan of Turkey, will the shah of Persia, will the emperor of Austria, will the king of Italy, will the king of Greece, will the president of Switzerland, will the king of Portugal, will the president of France, will the king of Sweden, will the king of Siam, will the emperor of China, will the emperor or the mikado of Japan, will the rulers of Belgium, Roumania, Luxemburg, Montenegro and all other foreign powers interfere in some way in behalf of the suffering, outraged and murdered Afro-American people of the United States and thus save the name of Christianity from reproach, mockery and derision and the name of humanity from shame, ridicule and contempt, and civilization, with all of its dear amenities, from disgrace, scorn and ignominy?

Toledo is another city to be included with Chicago and Cleveland (p. 790) among those in which the approaching municipal elections are of general interest, for here Mayor Jones is to make another "no party" campaign for reelection. Mr. Jones was elected mayor of Toledo originally as a Republican. That was in 1897. He has been twice reelected as an independent, and now allows the use of his name as an independent for the third time. In his letter of acceptance he says:

Having been nominated a nonpartisan candidate for the office of mayor by a large number of citizens, by petitions which have been duly filed with the board of elections according to law, and obtained absolutely without any sort of connivance on my part, it is now incumbent on me to accept or to decline the service to which I am thus called. Had the people nominated any other man in this democratic manner, which I have advocated for years, the way would have been clear for me to yield to my own desires and those of my family and retire from the field in this campaign. Under such circumstances I would have had opportunity to stand for the principle to which I am committed by working for the election of a candidate who was nominated by petition, with the advantage of be-

ing free from the charge of personal ambition. No other candidate having been so nominated, there are but two things left for me to do, namely, accept the nomination and plead for the cause to which I have given the best efforts of my life, or decline and turn a deaf ear to the petitions of the people who have repeatedly manifested their love for me and their belief in the cause for which I plead; and as they, like myself, do not believe in the aristocratic methods of party machines, they would be without a candidate to vote for who represented their ideal. The true man, standing for a vital principle, cares not for results; he seeks only to know his duty and is neither exultant in victory or depressed in defeat, "for I have seen that defeat is greater than victory."

As surely as I believe that I live, I believe that we can never know the meaning of democracy and the equal brotherhood of all men in government until we abandon political machines, and the people, the sovereign power, select their own candidates through nomination by petition, or some better method yet to be discovered, that will take this important duty out of the hands of the political bosses, the aristocracy of our day. Believing this to be truth, there is but one course open to me, that is to live according to it, for "to know the truth and fail to regulate our actions according to its teachings, is a crime condemned alike by Heaven and earth."

I, therefore, again accept this nomination direct from the hands of the people, as a sacred trust for the safekeeping of which I am accountable to God, the people, and my own conscience, and I shall at once enter actively into this campaign of faith that has had my heart, my affections and my unremitting efforts for the past four years. I have faith that the people do not need political guardians to "get out the vote" and "watch the count," and will, therefore, have none of the organized machinery of party campaigns. I will, however, hold public meetings, inviting the cooperation of all, to the end that we may "proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

The letter of acceptance is signed "Samuel M. Jones, a man without a party." Its publication was refused by the daily press of Toledo, except by a German paper.

The ministerial land bill for Ireland, a measure which has for several months been under discussion in Great Britain and Ireland, and which is expected to bring the Irish parliamentary party over into the ministerial camp (see p. 697), was introduced in parliament on the 26th, by George Wyndham, chief secretary for Ireland, with the consent, of

course, of the British ministry, of which he is a member. The bill provides in substance that—

1. The British government will raise from \$500,000,000 to \$750,000,000, by the sale of 2¾ per cent. 30-year treasury stock, to be lent to tenants in Ireland for the purchase of their holdings under the direction of a government commission.

2. In congested districts the limit of the loans will be \$2,500, and in other districts \$5,000.

3. A free gift of \$60,000,000 will be made by the government to Irish landlords, to make up the difference between the price the tenants are able to pay and that which the landlords demand.

4. Tenants borrowing from the government must repay with interest in yearly installments.

The bill is to take effect November 12, 1903. It passed its first reading on the 26th, and is to come up for a second reading April 12.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—William D. Farrar, dean of Canterbury, died at London on the 22d, at the age of 72.

—The National Woman's Suffrage Association met in annual convention at New Orleans on the 19th.

—An American burial ship, the Proteus, arrived at Manila on the 23d from Sulu, carrying the bodies of 300 American soldiers.

—The town of Surigao, in Mindanao, Philippine Islands, was captured from the Americans on the 22d by so-called "ladrones." The town was recaptured on the 24th.

—John J. Lentz, of Ohio, and Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago, both well known over the country, have formed a law partnership with their headquarters in Chicago.

—An equal suffrage bill enacted by the Arizona legislature was vetoed by the governor of the Territory on the 19th upon the ground that it violated the act of Congress organizing the Territory.

—A special report of the Federal grand jury at Charleston, W. Va., made public on the 20th, exonerates Deputy United States Marshal Cunningham (p. 776) from criminal responsibility for the killing of strikers whom he was trying to arrest.

—It was reported on the 24th that the control of the New York Central Railroad had been voluntarily transferred by the Vanderbilts to the Morgan-Rockefeller-Pennsylvania combination; but on the 25th W. K. Vanderbilt denied the report.

—Reports received at Auckland, N. Z., on the 25th from the antarctic exploring steamer "Discovery," record

that this expedition has penetrated as far south as latitude 80 degrees and 17 minutes, longitude 163 degrees, the southernmost point ever yet reached.

—Mrs. Florence Maybrick, the American woman who was convicted of murdering her husband in Liverpool, England, in 1889, and has been serving a life sentence upon this conviction, will be released in 1904, the British home secretary having so notified her lawyers at Washington.

—With C. M. Rothschild, a well-known Cincinnati capitalist and philanthropist, for president, the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow for vice president, and Daniel Kiefer for treasurer, a company has been formed in Cincinnati, under the auspices of the Vine Street Congregational church, for the utilization of vacant lots in that city, upon the general plan of the Pingree "potato patch" of Detroit, which has been so successfully repeated in Philadelphia. Dr. Adolph Leue is the superintendent.

### PRESS OPINIONS.

#### THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY.

The Commoner (Dem.), March 20.—The fight begun in 1886 was not so much a fight between gold and silver as a fight between the beneficiaries of class legislation on the one side and the advocates of equal rights on the other, and that fight still continues. It would be fortunate if that fight only manifested itself in the contest between the Democratic and Republican parties, but we might as well face the fact that to a lesser degree it manifests itself in our party, and there is the more reason why the friends of the Kansas City platform should be on the alert. Instead of retreating, the party must go forward and meet the new questions that are pressing for solution. Until the reform element regains control of the Democratic organization in the Senate that body will not only not help, but will actually hinder the party's progress.

#### DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), March 21.—Mr. Bryan may be making himself mighty disagreeable to those Democrats that are desirous of sharing with the Republicans the campaign contributions of the trusts, but he is not disturbing those Democrats that do not draw their political inspiration with their quarterly dividends.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), March 24.—As a Republican newspaper the Inter Ocean has only one interest in the next Democratic Presidential candidate—that he shall be a man able to unite his party and lead it back to sanity, in order that it may become at least worthy of public confidence, and so offer to the Republican party a wholesome opposition. Looking at the situation from this viewpoint, we see but one man of national dimensions who would seem able to lead the Democracy back to its historical position. He has opposed the frenzies of Populism, but has preserved the regularity of his Democracy. He is, in fact, in the position of a logical candidate. The Democratic party has rather lost the habit of being logical, but it might well return to it and choose as its Presidential candidate in 1904 the Hon. David B. Hill, of New York.

The Commoner (Dem.), March 20.—The senator from Maryland is a man of great force and extended legislative experience. Probably no other man in Washington is so well acquainted with public men and

parliamentary procedure. Besides this, he is a man of exemplary personal habits, of indefatigable industry and perfect self-control. In other words, he has most of the qualifications considered necessary for leadership and if his sympathies were only with the people he would be an admirable man to speak for the Democrats in the Senate, but he falls at the crucial point. His record shows that he is too close to the corporations and organized wealth to be commander in chief of the Democratic forces in the most influential branch of the national legislature.

#### THE SINGLE TAX.

The Arena Sun (Melbourne, Vict., Aust.), Feb. 12.—Since in the course of the budget debate Mr. Irvine [Victorian premier] made a guarded statement to the effect that he still believes in land values taxation, hope has been rising among those who see in that form of taxation the only chance of a return to prosperity. Mr. Irvine apologized for not making a land values tax part of his financial scheme on the ground that there was no time to bring it into operation to meet the deficit, and that in the House and Ministry as at present constituted there was no chance of carrying it. He used other words, but such was the practical effect of what he said. As to the first plea, that time did not permit the introduction of a land values tax to meet the present needs, those who know the simplicity of the machinery required, will not agree with Mr. Irvine. As to the second plea, it may be a fact that a majority of the ministry are not to be persuaded into such a commonsense measure, but it is certain that had the government brought it forward the House would have passed it. On the government side there are members, by no means friendly towards the tax, who would nevertheless vote obediently for anything Mr. Irvine proposed, while both on the opposition and government benches there are a number of keen land taxers who would have given him every possible assistance.

#### PENNSYLVANIA SLAVERY.

The Tribune (Johannesburg, So. Afr.), Feb. 14.—The conditions that exist in the mining districts of Pennsylvania have a terrible significance for the Rand, for they are the result of the importation of cheap European labor. In Pennsylvania there are districts with a teeming industrial population in which scarce a word of English is ever spoken, where only Slavonic dialects are heard—the language of the Hungarian miners. The white slaves of Pennsylvania are not, for the most part, free-born American citizens, the child slaves boast no Anglo-Saxon origin, their fathers have been imported from continental low-wage countries to reproduce similar conditions beneath the Stars and Stripes. Where the labor is not wholly foreign, the competitive influence of the latter has been sufficiently strong to bring industrial degradation upon all like. Nor are these terrible conditions a phase of to-day. Ten years ago the Special Commissioner of the United States Labor Bureau reported: "Show me a country in Europe where human degradation has reached its lowest depths and I will match it in Pennsylvania."

#### THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN.

India (London, Eng.), March 6.—It is high time that the British public grappled in earnest with the various symptoms of a return to slavery or semi-slavery. Assam has for a long time provided a bad example, and South Africa seems to be on the point of providing another. We are glad, therefore, to see that the Committee of the National Liberal Federation have within the past few days adopted a resolution adverse to the principle of all such schemes. We wish the Federation would take in hand this Madras planters' bill. The spirit which

animates it is just the spirit which animates so many of the South African mine owners. No doubt there is always a nucleus of such men ready and eager to exploit their fellow creatures, especially where a white race is engaged in what is called a "great and beautiful civilizing mission" among races that are not white.

### 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. 37 of that publication.

Washington, Mar. 16-21, 1903.

Senate.  
(Special Session, 58th Congress.)  
No report of executive business appears. Adjourned sine die on the 19th (p. 139).

Record Notes.—Speech of Senator Morgan on Panama Canal treaty (p. 33).

### MISCELLANY

#### THE DISTURBERS.

Acts 17:6.

They have turned earth upside down,  
Says the foe;  
They have come to bring our town  
Wreck and woe.  
To this never-ending cry  
Boldly here we make reply:  
Yea and no.

Upside down the world has lain  
Many a year;  
We to turn it back again  
Now appear.  
Will ye, nill ye, we will do  
What at last no man shall rue;  
Have no fear.  
—Stephen T. Byington.

#### SAID THE CHILD.

"The dear Lord Christ stood at my side last night," said the Child.  
" 'Twas but a dream," said the Father.

"The dear Lord Christ stood at my side last night," said the Child. "And the wounds in His hands and feet were dripping red—"

"How weird the fancy!" shuddered the Mother.

"And the wounds in His hands & feet were dripping red and a crimson stain grew wide and wider over His shining robe. I was so sorry and I cried and kissed the dear hands and feet," said the Child.

"Hush, you know not what you say," said the Father.

"I kissed the dear hands and feet," said the Child.

"And I asked the Blessed Jesus: What has torn the wounds afresh? And the dear Christ answered: 'In Africa were my feet torn, in China they rent anew the nail prints in my left hand & in the Philippines was my right hand torn. The injustice of the world tears open the gash in my side. The cry of the miner's child, hungry & helpless, and the wail of the wasted lives of the

little ones woven in miles and miles of accursed cloth by the roaring mills bows me again beneath a heavier cross than I bore up Calvary. Oh, these little ones who are of my Kingdom, whose white soul-flowers are defiled by man-made trade for gain! More bitter than the scourging & buffeting is the loss of these to me. And out of the gain wrung from wrecked child-lives they dare build churches in my name! In my name, who said: It were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones! And I pleaded, Blessed Lord, take me with you, that my love may comfort you."

"O, my child, think of this no more!" said the Mother.

"And I pleaded, Blessed Lord, take me with you," said the Child. "But the dear Christ said: 'O, little child-heart so near to me now—so near to me now; some day for the love of the world & the lust of success, you will make still heavier the burden of the cross.' And I said: Take me now, that I may never leave you or harm you. And the dear Christ said: 'It may not be, but this lay to your soul, He who sanctions wrong has blood upon his hands—blood of the wronged and my blood, also; and he who stands silent in the presence of evil is not guiltless.'"

"The child is surely ill," said the parents.

"And he who stood silent is not guiltless," said the child. "And it seemed to me that all men had blood upon their hands—blood of the innocent and blood from the five sacred wounds. And I asked: Dear Christ, is there blood upon my father's hands? But the Christ was gone."

"How ghastly!" said the Mother.

"I must send for a physician," said the Father.

"The dear Lord Christ stood by my side," said the Child.—Frank Stuhlman, in *The Whim*.

#### A DEMOCRATIC TREND IN EDUCATION.

A condensed extract from an article on "Education's New Trend," by Laura McAdoo Triggs, published in the Boston Evening Transcript of February 25.

In the autumn of 1902, tired of appealing to the "good citizens," complacent taxpayers, and hopeless of influencing the corporations which have regularly opposed any increase of expenditures for education, the Chicago Teachers' Federation joined the Chicago Federation of Labor, trusting that the personal interest of its members, as parents of school children, would give them support. . . .

The immediate aim of this union with labor is to defeat measures for a system designed to repress the individual. The effort to better their own condition is naturally a primary consideration with the teachers. But the most advanced among them believe also that their protest marks a step in social progress. . . .

The episode has a large and wholesome meaning for social advance. The movement unquestionably is a triumph for social sincerity. Although sustained, as must constantly be remembered, by a comparative few, it marks the first move toward a reconstruction in certain class bearings, with all their implications. By tradition, the teaching profession is an appanage of the leisure class. In those earlier times, when education concerned itself solely with the accomplishments of scholarship, this relation was unavoidable. But today, when education is in the train of every vital interest, nay, rather in the van; when its object is the training for a work-a-day career, and when the economic necessity controls the very character and extent of its efforts—now to make the educator an ornament of the leisure class is an anomaly, not to say an absurdity. In point of fact the teacher is a laborer, hired under a system of wages, subject to dismissal at pleasure. Yet by a species of conventional classification, a place is assigned teachers on the outskirts of leisure; their profession is assumed to be "honorific" employment. In so far as this brings prestige to the intellectual pursuit, it is praiseworthy. But the effect on the teachers is not altogether fortunate. To be classed with leisure induces a certain passive attitude on their part toward their material interests. It acts to perpetuate a formal instruction and nurses a faith in the superiority of the polite arts, to the detriment of a more practical education. In so far as education is removed from the modern activities there is bound to be dilletanteism on the one hand and materialism on the other.

But a small number of teachers in the middle West have become pioneers of a new order. Their union with the workingman may do more than increase their wages and efficiency. It may mean that the industrial forces will be quickened, and a truer correlation will be effected with the everyday work of the community. Distant though this goal may yet be, despite the progress of

American education, if the Chicago movement even points the way to it, it is justly to be classed among the important achievements of our time.

#### THE LIMIT OF REACTION.

For The Public.

Let us understand that what Buckle called the protective spirit was not, and is not, averse to the welfare of the masses of the people. It is simply the theory of those who either consciously or unconsciously maintain that this welfare depends upon the fostering, benevolent care of a superior class.

But there has arisen within the past quarter of a century, a theory which goes far beyond this protective attitude. What this theory is has been so clearly and boldly proclaimed by one of its chief apostles that we are saved the trouble of restating it. He will do this for us.

In the New York Times Saturday Review of March 7, Mr. C. R. Miller gives us in four well-written columns an account of the work and philosophy of the great German writer, Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche went insane, as many readers know; but before this sad calamity befell him, he left a great body of work, in which he stated with undaunted and unconventional candor the result of modern atheistic philosophy. In doing so he has rendered the world a great service. It is well to have the veil drawn aside and to see the ultimate conclusion.

We are here concerned only with that phase of his philosophy which touches social problems. On this line, as well as on other lines, he has simply stated bravely what other more careful and politic philosophers, less honest in professing their faith, really think.

According to one of his interpreters one of his "three fundamental conceptions everywhere present in his writings" is what he calls "slave morality," which is defined as follows:

The application of those beliefs that men are equal, that the lowly must be lifted up, that we must sympathize with misfortune, and that altruism is a virtue, and self-denial noble, beliefs of Jewish-Christian origin . . . responsible for the false and backward-tending modern social system.

Here is a quotation from the philosopher himself:

Sympathy thwarts, on the whole, in general, the law of development, which is the law of selection. It preserves what is ripe for extinction, it insists in favor of life's disinherited and condemned ones. . . . It is a chief instrument for the promotion of decadence.

The writer in the Times, in his closing comments, utters the following pertinent remarks:

Nobody now has the complacency to say what was pretty openly said a century and a quarter ago, that "all men are created equal." Even with the obvious implication that equality of political right was there asserted, not equality in any other sense, it is a political maxim not universally heeded, even by the people for whose benefit it was proclaimed.

These three quotations disclose in truth the limit of reaction. "Liberty, equality and fraternity" was a raving dream. Sympathy, which Adam Smith made the basis of his philosophy, is a foolish, harmful sentiment. Let the mighty reign and the metaphorical devil take the tailenders. Blessed are the self-assertive, for they shall, as they ought to, inherit the earth. Christian ideals have been the curse of the centuries by even calling in question the great gospel of might. The true evolution of society and the true development of the race demand a complete disregard for the people as a whole and for their fancied rights. There is no right but might—the might of a society organized without God, founded upon brute force and the cunning of intellect.

J. H. DILLARD.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### NO CAMPAIGN PERSONALITIES.

Mayor Johnson declared yesterday morning that he would have nothing to say during the campaign as to the personal records of the candidates upon the Republican ticket.

"In politics," said Mr. Johnson, "I have never assailed a man's private life. It is the public records of candidates to which I have invariably given my entire attention."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 19.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON AND THE EAST END.

The successive defeats of the Republican tickets in Cleveland during the past two years have been ascribed to the apathy of Republican voters at the East End, or to their voting the Democratic ticket to mark more decidedly their dissatisfaction with the course of Republican local administration. It is claimed by the opponents of the Johnson administration that the people of the East End have discovered their mistake and will now shake off their apathy and reverse their action of two years ago. "Johnson promised much and did nothing," said one East End Republican when urging his associates to "bury Johnson out of sight" at the approaching election.

Possibly that East End Republican may have forgotten a little matter in which he and others in that section of

the city were deeply interested, and in which Mayor Johnson "did something" to their great satisfaction, and for which they said among themselves they would hold the mayor in grateful remembrance as an official who acted instead of merely talking, as others had done.

For years Giddings brook had worked wide damage by its frequent overflows. Streets became torrents, traffic was stopped, sewers choked, cellars flooded, and the value of property was seriously affected by the escapades of this erratically turbulent stream. Several years ago, in the height of the flood, one mayor and his city engineer visited the district and announced that "something must be done at once." A plan was sketched by which the stream was to be turned either into Doan brook or Kingsbury run, the surface water on the original route below the point of diversion being utilized for flushing the sewers. Beyond that verbal sketch nothing was done by that administration. To divert a natural watercourse needed legislative action, and no such action was attempted. The floods continued through succeeding administrations, and so did the talk of "doing something." There was little progress beyond talk until the damage became so great and increasing that a plan was formulated for diverting the flood waters into Doan brook through a tunnel emerging at Fairmont street and the boulevard. An act was passed by the legislature authorizing the diversion of the stream, the issue of bonds to provide for the work, and the levy of taxes to take up the bonds and pay interest. At last there was an assurance that something would be done. But a new obstacle suddenly appeared. There was an appeal to the courts to prevent collection of the tax and the city was enjoined from further proceedings until the case had been fully decided.

That brought everything to a standstill once more, so far as concerned the city authorities. But the obstacle that brought the city government to a dead halt had no effect on Giddings brook. As if to celebrate its triumph it went on the most riotous rampage in its recorded history, swept houses from their foundations, flooded a wide district of the East End, filled the cellars with disease-producing slime from the overcharged sewers, and besides causing the loss of several thousands of dollars did irreparable mischief that could not be estimated in money.

But there was a new city administration. The East End flood sufferers

appealed to Mayor Johnson against the continuance of the impotency of preceding administrations. Mr. Johnson's response was immediate and effective. The obstacle that had been regarded as insurmountable was swept away so swiftly and thoroughly that work on the tunnel was begun at once. It was pushed with such vigor under continuous pressure from the city hall that it was completed before the expiration of the contracted time, and since then the people of the East End are free from the old dread of Giddings brook in the rainy season.

Administration after administration had talked and promised. The Johnson administration acted. East End citizens should go out to the Woodland Hills end of the Giddings brook cut-off, and see for themselves how Mayor Johnson "did something" for their benefit.—Editorial in Plain Dealer of March 24.

#### THE MAKING OF A CAPTAIN OF INDUSTRY.

A tragic farce in several acts.

##### Act II.

Scene.—Same as in Act I, Library in the Push Mansion. J. Head Push pacing the apartment.

Mr. Push (solus)—Oh, the pity of it! To think that we are powerless to transmit our experience to our children. We lie awake nights scheming; we devise innumerable engines to get riches and power. We make some mistakes—our feet occasionally slip from the colorless, cold, crystal paths of pure business into the blood-red byways of mercy and justice—but in the main we are true to our business ideals, and finally we succeed. We get so much power that the craving for more tears our souls like the restless fang of a cancer, and then we try to transmit our knowledge to our sons—to fill them with that commercial singleness of purpose which is never obscured by love, friendship, justice or mercy, but persists to the end, sublimely pure and undefiled. We strive to keep them from our errors, but in vain. They are like flies. Each one must get on the fly-paper and tear his legs out for himself. He sees his comrades dismembered one after another, and the poor fool thinks he, forsooth, is to be the bright particular exception to the general rule. He will eat his fill of the sweet seduction and fly away jubilantly. Bah! What a pity! And yet, were it not for this perennial idiocy, where would we captains of industry

be? How would we own the country, "bob, hook and sinker," if it were not that the poor voting flies can never resist the molasses of our seduction? Over and over and over again has the race been taught that centralization in government means loss of liberty, even as decentralization vests the power in the people; yet they still elect men to sell them out and strangle their utterance in the muffler of bureaucracy. Well may we sing "Hosanna!" that voters are such hornpouts that they may be caught, half skinned, thrown back again, and again caught on the same hook, with the old bait, in the same wound.

Enter Frank Push, C. D. in F.

"I've been waiting for you. The last talk I had with you regarding your future career left a very unsatisfactory impression in my mind. I found you befogged by childish sentimentality and absurd notions of right and justice.

Frank—Why did you educate me if you did not wish to fit me for independent thought?

Mr. Push—You do not fully understand me. I want your thought to be independent, but I wish it to lead you to my conclusion. Let me, however, answer your question. I myself had a college education, and I meant that you, too, should have one in order that you should not have a vague feeling that there is something better in life than money and the power it brings, and that you had missed it. In my early career I knew a young man who is now a great captain like myself. We were out West then, where thought was young and life was near the earth. My friend—we had no business relations, so we could be friends—had only an elementary education, and the result of this paucity of knowledge was dreadful. I have seen him, after some shrewd business deal, clever enough to be worshiped, literally weep, yea, "Tears in his eyes, distraction in's aspect," at thought of the homes he had wrecked, the widows who would lose their mites, the orphans who would go to bed hungry and cold. I think I have never had anything touch my heart like the sight of this poor, unlettered man, unable, despite marvelous native ability, to rise into the clear empyrean of pure and undefiled commercialism. I registered a vow then that if ever I had a boy I would see to it that all such unbusinesslike sentimentality was educated out of him. I am keeping that vow now.

Frank—He came, I suppose, to your way of thinking.

Mr. Push—Yes, but not through my efforts, and the fatal taint stuck long to him. In the course of events we both drifted to New York. Ah, what a city and what a life! Its atmosphere, boy, is as the breath in my nostrils, the nectar in my mouth, the turgid, red throb in the great aorta of my existence. If heaven is not like Wall street I shall be as homesick as a benevolent-assimilation soldier in the Philippines. Wall street my heaven, and for my harp a ticker! Let my music be leagues of white tape, and all my paens be written in the Morse alphabet and sung in the Morse key! Do not think of New York as a locality, lad; it's a condition of mind like our other heaven. I tell you, boy, it leads the world. Father Knickerbocker already has one foot planted in the middle of the next century. There are no three classes there, only two—two, boy—a prophecy of what is coming in all localities in the great days just ahead of us!

Frank—I do not understand to what two classes you refer.

Mr. Push—I thought not. I'll make it clear. There used, you know, to be three classes. Those who ground, those who were ground, and the onlookers. Glorious New York, with a shackled competition keener than the North wind, sharper than a mathematical line, has eliminated the onlookers, so that now, if you are unable to seize the crank, into the hopper you go! This is what I mean, boy, when I tell you to get money and power. You are a candidate for one or other of these classes.

Frank—I'm not so sure of that, pater. I think I scent a reform that will greatly modify this condition of affairs and inexpressibly benefit the human race.

Mr. Push—Vapors of youth! Dreams of a dreamer who knows not he dreams! Reform indeed! Benefit! Did not Bismarck say no lasting benefit ever came to the human race except through blood and iron?

Frank—"No gun was ever fired in war without contributing to the happiness of mankind." Does not this recent diabolism of Gen. MacArthur sound like a thin, inverted echo of Bismarck's utterance—a little wheeze losing itself in the mimicry of a big pipe? However, your retort if unchallenged is not conclusive. If only through "blood and iron" then, God pity us, perhaps blood and iron!

Mr. Push—Kill the thought ere it become a hope! You delude yourself. What can "blood and iron" do when we captains of industry own the blood and possess the iron, which is to say we have the money, the treasury, the army, the navy, their commander-in-chief and most of the country's resources? An army, lad, is not a windmill just because Don Quixote took up arms against that ponderous engine. Don't you make his mistake. It takes something beside wind to run an army. You've been misled by the "Sampson-Schley" controversy, the "Rough-Riders" exploits and the Philippine peace reports. Who was it said that an army like a snake moved on its stomach?

Frank—Somebody the Great—Frederick, probably.

Mr. Push—Well, you just bear that in mind and don't you get to thinking—unless of course you're paid for it—that any army moves in this country till we captains feed it. I tell you, boy, we have the United States in a bag, and as soon as we get time to draw the strings everything will be settled here, and then we'll join the Morgan of our idolatry in doing the like for the rest of the world. Ye gods, boy! If I could make all New Zealand just like New York city you might use me for a stopper to that troublesome bottle over there in Martinique. New York, the only place on earth where business has no business that is not all business, how I adore thee! It is the—words fail me—what shall I call it!

Frank—You might try "sink of corruption."

Mr. Push—Don't be satirical. New York is the purest thing on earth, using "purity" in its proper sense of unadulterated unity.

Frank—That is to say, homogeneous filth.

Mr. Push—Frank, I wish you'd choose your words a bit more carefully. You will never succeed if you do not learn the value of euphemy. Always strive to give a thing a pleasant name.

Frank—Pshaw! "What's in a name?"

Mr. Push—I'll tell you, young man; there's a whole alphabet of subtlety and deception. (Lowering voice.) Just glance into the hall and see if anyone is listening. (Frank complies. Mr. Push continues sotto voce.) Do you think if "protection" had been called by its proper name—"aggression"—we could ever have taxed the gastric juice right out of

the laborer's stomach without so much as jarring his spleen or stirring his bile? Not a bit of it. Look at the "Grand Old Party"—I'll cut you off with a shilling if you so much as think in public what I tell you—but as a matter of fact it's all in the name. We are now tooth and nail against all those principles which originally gave us that name. We abbreviate it into G. O. P. and don't pretend among ourselves to keep as much as the initials of the good things many a poor fool reads into it.

Frank—Then you admit the president confines himself to "thundering in the index?"

Mr. Push—Will you ever learn moderation? If you would succeed your thought must seem judicial. Take our Mr. Roosevelt's speeches as your example. Plan so to set a thing against its opposite that when you've finished no one can truthfully say you've taken either side. Do you not see the magnificent finesse it takes to allay the people's fears regarding trusts without so much as a syllable that will offend the trusts themselves? I give you good models, boy; if you fail you'll have yourself to thank. Another thing, too, in answer to your irreverent question. Mr. Roosevelt is first violin of the Republican orchestra, but the Money-Power is Conductor. You know in a musical score you sometimes see a few bars of little notes over the usual larger and more showy ones, and the word "ossia." This signifies that one may play the easy, showy notes, or the unobtrusive, difficult ones, at one's option. Our first violin almost invariably takes the lower, easier, more showy part of the score, which you are pleased to call a "thundering" something or other.

Frank—Try "shame," pa, and let it go at that. Apropos of this I want to tell you something I saw the other day. The very swell wife of a captain of industry well known to you, came into the dry goods store where I was shopping. Oh! but didn't she have the "toploftical" air as she marched up to the ribbon counter. You know, one of those I'm-the-best-there-is-and-I-have-to - hang - on - to-the - huckleberry - bushes - to - keep-from-being-translated airs. She was both time and tide, and couldn't wait for anything. The salesgirl was busy. "I want some pink ribbon," said her highness. Salesgirl paid no attention to her, but went on serving her predecessors. Her majesty

repeated the request for the sake of emphasis. Same lack of result. Then she espied a young woman at the other end of the counter conversing with a "nice young man." I think I heard her say later: "He's my steady, Sue. Ain't he awfully nice?" but I can't be sure, dad. Well, Queen Elizabeth just charged at her with lance in rest. "I want some pink ribbon, and I can't wait here all day," she said, irritably. The young woman addressed disentangled her gaze from that of the young man (I almost heard it snap), turned toward the queen and, thrice looking her slowly up and down from mop-board to frieze, said, in a measured, icy staccato: "I'M—NOT—HERE!"

Mr. Push—Rubbish! Where's the application?

Frank—I think Mr. Roosevelt has proved just such an absent-present alibi.

(A long pause. Slow curtain.)

End of Act II.

MELVIN L. SEVERY.

THE LEISURE CLASSES.

There was a little maid  
Who wed a king long, long ago;  
Of course the taste that he displayed  
Was criticised by folk who know  
Just what formalities and things  
Are due to beggar maids and kings.

But straight the monarch made reply:  
"There is small difference, as I live,  
Between our stations! She and I  
Subsist on what the people give.  
We do not toil with strength or skill,  
And, pleasing Heaven, never will."  
—The Washington Star.

Apart from its unofficial designation as "the Quay-Stone State," Pennsylvania has contented herself with letting the "Old Man" have everything but the name, substituting for the obsolete, "Virtue, Liberty and Independence," the more truthful classic, "sine Quay non."—City and State.

The Tourist—Good cigar—cost much wampum.

The Red Man—Wampum? No say wampum now—call him dough!—Puck.

BOOKS

PAYNE'S "VARIOUS VIEWS."

There is something about what we call "essays" that gives a certain distinction to literature. Even more than poetry a book of essays seems to stand for literary refinement. There can be poetry, even the best of poetry, in rude times, when literature is undeveloped, but essays betoken culture.

The same kind of service and distinction which a number of essayists

have bestowed upon English literature is beginning to be rendered to American literature by a few writers such as Mr. Payne. This little volume of his, issued in most attractive form by A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, is a notable addition to genuine literature of this kind. By its clearness and pleasantness of style it appeals to the general reader, and at the same time it maintains a high and healthy plane of thought. There is about an equal division of essays between literature and life, between bookishness and the realm of general thought, and, as it should be, each side somewhat interfuses the other. We have not in a long while, perhaps not since Augustine Birrell's *Obiter Dicta* and *Res Judicatae*, met with a volume of essays so delightful and so sane. The author has not, it is true, the lightness of touch and charm of humor which are so characteristic of Birrell's essays, but he is interesting enough to be serious without being either dictatorial or dull.

The first essay, on Victor Hugo, strikes us as one of the best in the book. It would be difficult to find anywhere a better summary of Victor Hugo's great place in literature which the whole world owns than in these ten short pages. We should be inclined to question the order in which the author ranks Hugo's works, poetry, romance and drama. It would seem to some that the second should be first. It is quite true that Victor Hugo rose "to such a height of lyric expression as had been attained by no French poet before"; but he could not escape the limitations of his language, and French is not the language for poetry. It is too precise and too rhetorical.

The essay on "International Amity" is well worth reading and rereading. It will help us to take in the thought "that even patriotism is selfishness although at several removes from what we commonly call by that name." The essay following this deals in a most healthy way with "Hero Worship," though some of us would object to his classing Caesar with Alexander, and to his naming Goethe among the heroes "whose lives are poems." One may not take the Philistine view of Goethe's life, and yet find much in it that seems by no means heroic.

There are thirty essays in the book, all of which are well worthy of being thus republished in their present form. Some of them, as, for example, "The Revival of Romance," will cause a register of dissent. Others can hardly fail to beget a feeling of personal obligation such as "Idiom and Ideal" and "The Novel and the Library," both of which seem to be admirable, and especially to be commended, each in its own line, at the present day. The same may be said of the closing essay of the book on "The New Patriotic Impulse," which is a



THE CANDLE-LIGHT REMEDY.

The Victim—Yes, Publicity enables me to see just how he does it, but what good does that do me?

noble defense of those who have dared to oppose our latter-day imperialism.  
J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—“Monopoly. The Natural Cure. Political Economy in a Nutshell for the People,” by Martin Hemmy (Chicago: C. W. Eberhard, 66 Plymouth place). Price 25 cents. To be reviewed.

LITERARY NOTES.

In the International Socialist Review for March, May Wood Simons makes a concise and lucid explanation of the materialistic socialists' idea of the “economic interpretation of history.”

An editorial in the Independent of March 11 calls attention to the fact that the gifts of the millionaires do not amount to near so much as the aggregation of the millions of lesser gifts from “the forgotten men.” This suggests the further fact, apropos of “tainted money,” that lesser gifts may come from ill-gotten gains as well as the

larger gifts. Are we not apt in this matter to confuse quantity and quality? A little amount may be just as much robbery as a big amount. The present writer, for example, never “made” any money but once in his life, and is compelled to confess that it was neither as workingman nor as beggarman that he got it. According to Henry George there is only a third category. It was this way: He bought a lot, which he had never seen, for \$5, and after two years, having done nothing to it meanwhile except to walk past it several times, he sold it for \$725. Here was a clear, legal steal of \$670. But perhaps the most numerous little thefts from the community are in the way of avoiding taxes; and these withholdings, which are virtually thefts, have not even the excuse of being legal.  
J. H. D.

DAINTY EASTER BOOKLETS

1. The Philosophy of Toys: How the door of play opens naturally into the life of industrial activity.

2. Before I Came: The true story of how children come into the world as told by a mother to her babies when they are old enough to ask.  
10c each, with prospectus of Play-Werk School.

Straight Edge Press, 1 7th Ave., New York.

Volume V of The Public

Complete Volumes, including Index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$2.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, will be ready for delivery about May 1.

Address,  
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

Clubs of Three

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

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

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

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

The Public

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

TERMS.

Annual Subscription . . . . .	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription . . . . .	1.00
Quarterly Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.18
Single Copies . . . . .	.05

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

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY  
1641 UNITY BUILDING  
CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 4004 Corliand. Rooms 1911-1913  
NEW YORK.

Sombart's Socialism

THE PUBLIC says editorially that it is “a most intelligent and intelligible presentation of the development and character of the socialist movement.” It is a beautifully printed book of 216 pages, substantially bound in cloth. It sells for \$1.00 at the bookstores. You can get it free by sending \$1.00 for a year's subscription to the International Socialist Review, mentioning THE PUBLIC and asking for SOM-BART'S “SOCIALISM” as a premium.  
Address CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.