The Public

Sixth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1903. Number 293.

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.

For the first time since entering upon its career as a world Power, along with the other freebooters which boast that distinction, the American government has recognized a new republic.

—

The Cuban republic begged for recognition in vain. Not until an American battleship was wrecked in a Spanish harbor in Cuba did the American government feel justified in interfering; and then not in recognition of the new republic, but to preserve the peace near our own borders. The republic could not be recognized because it had no government defacto; which meant that it hadn't succeeded in expelling an enormous Spanish army. Even recognition of belligerency was denied it, thus leaving Spain to treat its patriots as criminals instead of soldiers.

—

The first republic of Asia, as perfect a defacto government as history records, one which the people of all the Christianized parts of the Philippine Islands freely recognized and obeyed, also appealed to the American world-Power for recognition in vain. Instead of welcoming that republic to the family of nations, the American government bought its territory and people of a foreign Power which it had expelled; insulted its envoys, ignored its existence, menaced its exposed ports with battleships, fired upon its army, slaughtered its people like rabbits in a royal chase, laid waste its lands, and finally subjugated its country.

—

The South African Republic and the Orange Free State were other little nations which appealed in vain for American recognition. They sent envoys to Washington, and the envoys were entertained, like tourists, with views of scenery from the back windows of the White House; though with this advantage over the ordinary run of tourists, that the President himself condescended to act as guide. The South African Republic could not be recognized because it was only an "autonomous dependency" of Great Britain. Lacking the treaty-making power in its fullness, this republic was not sovereign dejure, wherefore its sovereignty defacto could not count. That was the reason we could not recognize it. Why we could not recognize the republic of the Orange Free State has never yet been explained. For that republic was sovereign, both dejure and defacto, and had been for many years.

—

But if the American government was virtuously averse to recognizing republics in those instances, it has been neither averse nor slow with reference to the infant republic of Panama. Slow! It has been speedier than electricity. Not merely did it act so speedily after the event as to make the American recognition of nationality seem like a postscript to the Panama proclamation of independence, but it prepared for action well in advance of the event if not in advance of the intent. When was a little republic ever before so swiftly internationalized?

—

We should be glad, were the circumstances in harmony with any such hypothesis, to suppose that this reversal of recent American policy with reference to struggling republics, indicates a change of heart. But not the most sublime spirit of charity could tolerate that supposition. The criminal animus is all too plain. Forty millions of loot is directly involved, nearly all of which will go to the Wall street owners of the old Panama canal stock. A ship canal is to be built, in connection with which there will be much graft. Large sections of country adjacent to the canal will be enormously increased in value, to the great joy of land speculators "on the inside." So much for immediate commercial considerations. The patriotic part of the affair involves glorious possibilities in the way of national expansion. With the little republic of Panama down on the northern borders of South America, where it may serve in multiplied degree the leverage purposes that Texas served on the borders of Mexico in the '40's,—with this advantage, a thorough-going patriotic administration, supported by a patriotic Congress and a Wall street clique, would find it almost child's play in politics, diplomacy and war to gather in the whole territory from Colombia to the Rio Grande —Mexico, silver mines, and all.

—

To adjust the Negro race question, Bishop Halsted, of the African Methodist Zion church, proposes the segregation of Negroes in one or more States, where whites would not be permitted to live. If Bishop Halsted's plan were feasible to begin with, it would probably be "knocked into a cocked hat" upon the first discovery of commercial opportunities in the Negro State. From that moment the "extension of civilization and Christianity" among the blacks would rise to be a business, political, religious and graft problem of paramount importance. You couldn't keep white men out of a Negro State with a standing army, after the discovery of rich money-making chances there. The Negro inhabi-

tants would have to "move on" to a new Negro State in the interest of "advancing civilization."

Congressman Baker, who refused the Baltimore & Ohio railway-pass bribe, has put a riddle to the Democratic party in Congress. He has asked them in caucus to refuse these petty bribes. That a majority of the Democratic side of the House indicate a disposition to travel on railroad bribes and pocket as a perquisite the liberal traveling expenses which the government allows them, is not reassuring as to the sincerity of the party in power when it criticises the President for accepting railroad favors. Some officials look upon passes as too trifling to be regarded as bribes. But consider the enormous number of passes the railroads give out. Is it supposable that these free rides are given with no expectation of return—that they are mere courtesies? If they are, then why not give them to ex-Congressmen, ex-legislators, and ex-judges? Why confine the courtesy to men who control legislative or judicial favors? No lawyer trying a case against a railroad would accept a juror who had that railroad's pass in his pocket. Are legislators and judges who have passes any more to be trusted than jurors? It is to be hoped that Mr. Baker will drive his party on to refusing passes. Republican officials cannot be expected to refuse them. What are Republican officials there for? But Democrats, as members of a party in opposition to corporate aggression, if for no better reason, are bound to decline these and all other corporate favors. It may encourage Congressman Baker to know that the Democratic judges of Chicago are now refusing railroad passes, although the custom of giving them has long been common and more or less reputable.

It was a wise warning that Samuel Gompers gave the Federation of Labor at Boston, when he told the delegates to beware of anti-trust legislation, because much of it is aimed at the labor movement. All anti-trust legislation, however sincere, is heavily charged with elements of such danger. The only safe method of attacking the trusts is to undermine their monopoly privileges by repealing the laws that make them. That kind of anti-trust legislation cannot be used against the labor movement. All other kinds can be.

Complaints of the fruit trust are coming in on the score of its increasing the price of bananas. "By this increase in price," says a fruit merchant who is quoted by the daily papers, "the trust has practically stifled the demand for bananas among the poorer classes of people." The same merchant explains the power of the fruit trust in this respect by saying that it "owns all the banana land, all the ships—in fact everything but the water between America and the tropics." If it did own the water it might sell its ships and have even greater power than now. There are people, it is true, who think that monopoly of the land is less important than monopoly of machines, and to them it may appear that monopoly of the ocean would be less important than monopoly of the ships. But they would be in error. Monopoly of the ocean would really be the more important, whether we were in the canoe age or the age of ocean greyhounds.

A promising movement is under way in Cuba to tax unused lands enough to force them into the market. Similar steps are being taken with reference to the building sites of Cuban cities. Crude as the method is, the principle involved and the purpose sought are those of the single tax policy. By still another crude method, but sound as far as it goes, the city authorities of Paris are reported to be encouraging the erection of cottages for the poorer classes by exempting them from taxation. Crude as all these innovations are, they afford good object lessons of both the efficacy of the single tax principle and the advances it is making in actual legislation.

Carroll D. Wright regards the single tax question as "too vast for discussion." He is prepared to say, however, that "when the single tax advocate can demonstrate to us"—not merely demonstrate, mind you, but demonstrate "to us"—"that one-half or even one-tenth of the benefits they claim for their system are possible, we will all become single taxers." The condition is practically impossible. Carroll D. Wright couldn't be convinced of one-tenth of anything that might jar him loose from his job.

Republicans must feel like blushing for their pride in Hanna's Ohio victory, when they read such comment upon it as the following from the Boston Herald, a paper of their own party:

> Hanna and Foraker, Nash and Cox, stand for all manner of political corruption, and all manner of abuse of power. So far as political morality is concerned, they are as unworthy and shameful as any Democrats in the land. Johnson, with his adopted Bryanism and his own peculiar Populism, was defeated; but the defeat was not a victory of right and justice, only the victory of a machine organized to promote criminal politics.

That criticism is almost as withering a comment upon Republican morality in Ohio as are the increasing signs of commercial disaster a reflection upon the good sense of the majority of Ohio voters. They voted for Hanna because he promised to preserve good times; yet in less than two weeks after the election he has allowed stocks to fall, grain to decline, banks to fail, wages to be cut, strikes to be provoked, and workingmen to be turned out of employment with empty dinner pails. Hanna's word may be as good as his bond, but if it is his bond must be somewhat indifferent as a commercial asset.

How nearly the United States have retrograded to the period in their history which is distinguished by the enforcement of the

"alien and sedition laws," and how completely the autocratic principles of the defunct Federal party of Hamilton's day have triumphed in ours, is indicated by the decision of Judge Lacombe in the Turner deportation case. Turner is an English anarchist who arrived in New York a few weeks ago and was arrested while making a lawful speech at a peaceable public meeting (p. 474) in New York. The arrest was made upon a "lettre de cachet," issued by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, under the "anti-anarchist" act of Congress. Turner has been closely confined ever since, being denied to visitors and allowed to consult his counsel only in the presence of a guard. A secret non-judicial tribunal, a mere administrative board of inquiry, has decided that Turner comes within the "anti-anarchist" law and has accordingly ordered his deportation. To test the law, habeas corpus proceedings were instituted before Judge Lacombe, of the Federal court, and that functionary has sustained the law and by dismissing the writ left Turner to be disposed of by the subordinates of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

—

To appreciate the far-reaching importance of this decision, a word or two of explanation may be necessary. Turner is an anarchist; but that does not mean that he advocates violence. Tolstoy is an anarchist; yet he is an absolute non-resistant. Turner is to be deported under the "anti-anarchist" law; yet that does not mean that he believes in assassination. This law provides that—

> no person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching such disbelief in or opposition to all organized government . . . shall be permitted to enter the United States, etc.

Other clauses of this law apply to the assassination of rulers, but they are not involved in the Turner case. His counsel stated to the court that if it could be proved that Turner is a person who believes in and advocates the overthrow of government by force, they would abandon his case. There was no such charge against Turner. The only charge, in substance, was that he disbelieves in and is opposed to all organized government—the same charge that could be made against Tolstoy. And Judge Lacombe decides that the law against this attitude of mind is constitutional and that Turner may consequently be deported!

—

Confronted with the constitutional provision guaranteeing freedom of speech and press, Judge Lacombe made this truly remarkable constitutional distinction:

> As to abridgment of the freedom of speech, that clause deals with the speech of persons in the United States and has no bearing upon the question what persons shall be allowed to enter therein.

The idea that the American constitution, which carefully provides for absolute freedom of opinion and expression within the United States, where it could do harm to this country if harmful, empowers Congress to legislate against it when exercised abroad, where it could do no harm to this country, is a novelty in constitutional interpretation. Its absurdity could be enhanced by nothing else than the fact that the astute judge who has discovered it labels himself "Democrat."

—

Under Lacombe's decision, Tolstoy, greatest of Russians and foremost among non-resistants, could not visit this country. Neither could Kropotkin, the famous literary man to whom England affords an asylum against Russian persecution; nor Reclus, the geographer of world-wide fame. Nor is that all. Under the principle of the decision, it would be constitutionally possible to exclude any foreigner who has an opinion on any subject. For "no person who disbelieves in or is opposed to all organized government," read "no person who disbelieves in or is opposed to all competition," and you exclude the socialist; "to all Protestantism," and you exclude the Roman Catholic; "to the Bible," and you exclude the agnostic; "to wars of conquest," and you exclude the anti-imperialist; "to the Pope of Rome" and you exclude Protestants; and so on with variations according to the popular prejudices or fears of the moment. Would these suggested exclusions be absurd? None could be more so than the one that Judge Lacombe sustains as reasonable. Any man may propose an amendment to the American constitution, but if he proposed an amendment repealing the instrument, on the ground that government is bad or useless, he would be an "anarchist" under the "anti-anarchist law;" and if he were a foreigner and made the proposition abroad, he could be deported if he afterwards got into this country and came before Judge Lacombe! If the whole thing did not cast an advancing shadow over the guarantees to free speech and free press within as well as without the United States, it might be humorous enough for a comic opera.

The Socialists of San Francisco have deservedly won a well fought battle for the right to use the public streets for public meetings. They had secured an injunction against the chief of police for interrupting their street meetings, and this injunction has been sustained by a local judge who decides that—

> Unless the socialistic meetings in question are conducted in some manner violative of law, unless they offend against decency, or ferment violence, or disturb the public peace, or otherwise offend against some statutory or local law, it would seem that the assemblages in question are not unlawful.

Since Whitney has pushed McClellan into the presidential lime light, editors are wondering whether McClellan is eligible. For the president must be "a natural born" citizen, and McClellan was born in Europe. Curiously enough lawyers are said to disagree on this question of eligibility. They must be queer lawyers.

There are only two kinds of citizens—"natural born" and "alien born." If McClellan is not of one kind he must be of the other. Since he was born in Europe it would appear that he is "alien born." And that would be true had his father been an alien at the time. But McClellan's father was not an alien. He was a citizen sojourning abroad. This fact gives to McClellan's citizenship the characteristic of "natural born." True, he might have chosen to adopt the country of his birth instead of the country of his parentage, which would possibly have changed the matter. But he didn't. He clung to the country of his parentage, of which there is ample proof, and thereby put his eligibility to the presidency beyond question.

President Roosevelt tells the Washington correspondent of the Vienna Freie Presse that he welcomes "all foreigners who come as farmers or farm laborers," but objects "to those whose coming depresses industrial wages." Why is Mr. Roosevelt so solicitous for "industrial wages" and so indifferent to the wages of farm hands?

JOHNSONISM.

In one of the speeches of his campaign for reelection as a Senator from Ohio—his speech at Toledo on the 27th — Senator Hanna said that the Democratic platform of Ohio stood for "Henry Georgism, socialism, populism and Johnsonism."

Senator Hanna's ideas must have been much confused, or he would not have confounded Georgism with socialism and communism, nor either of these with the other. Intelligent men know that communism is a very different thing from socialism, and that Georgism is radically different from both.

But it requires no intelligence to jumble words pretentiously together, nor to be influenced by that time-honored method of concealing thought. What Senator Hanna wanted in his campaign was opprobrious epithets, not symbols expressive of human intelligence; and the words he chose answered his purpose extremely well—if it was they that influenced the Ohio electorate.

This view of the matter is confirmed by the fact that Mr. Hanna piled up his epithets so recklessly. Recognizing in the Democratic platform of Ohio a sincere and vigorous declaration against plutocratic ideals and monopolistic methods, he drew upon his vocabulary of newspaperisms for every epithet that might convey to the minds of his somewhat dull and rather credulous auditors an offensive significance. Hence, not only his "Henry Georgism," his "socialism," his "communism," and his "Johnsonism," but also his "populism."

Had time permitted and Mr. Hanna's breath held out, he might have supplied his followers with several other epithets with opprobrious connotations. For really there is a considerable collection that could have lent themselves to his purpose; such, for instance, as "Fourierism," "Owenism," nihilism, agrarianism, and anarchism. But for the sacred traditions of his party he might have used "abolitionism" and "black republicanism" with good effect, as did the political leaders who stood for essentially the same thing in the fifties that Mr. Hanna stands for now.

And think of what Mr. Hanna might have done with "Jacobinism"! How did he come to forget "Jacobinism"? But never mind. His majority was big enough without it. Under the circumstances, "Jabobinism" would have been wanton waste.

But if Senator Hanna did indulge freely in epithets, he must be conceded to have perceived, however vaguely, the significance of the campaign that Mayor Johnson was leading.

While the teachings of Henry George were not at issue in this particular campaign, the questions that really were at issue lead directly toward those teachings. That Mr. Hanna really appreciated this appeared from another part of the same speech, where, with much greater reserve of epithet, he pointed out the way in which Tom L. Johnson expects to establish Henry Georgism. "His whole scheme," said Mr. Hanna, referring to Mr. Johnson, is "to put the burden of taxation first on the railways and corporations, but finally on the land."

In saying "land" instead of "land values," Mr. Hanna was able to score a point with his ignorant audience. He made them feel—to say he made them think would be an unwarranted assumption,—he made them feel that Johnson seeks to put the burden of taxation on small home owners and farmers; whereas, had he said "land values," they might have perceived what the truth is, that Johnsonism aims to undermine the monopoly of valuable land, such as business sites in cities, railroad rights of way, rich mines, etc., by putting the burden of taxation upon its privileged owners. Nevertheless, it is evident that Mr. Hanna and his associates in special privilege have some realization of the drift of what he called "Johnsonism."

He sees that it leads toward "Henry Georgism," and he knows that Henry Georgism would be ruinous to all monopoly.

That Senator Hanna's governor-elect, Mr. Herrick, also perceives this drift of "Johnsonism," is evident. He fought his entire campaign against Henry George's single tax idea. On the same occasion on which Mr. Hanna expressed himself as noted above, Mr. Herrick made the significant declaration that the Henry George idea is one of the issues the Republicans must meet.

Mr. Herrick stated the matter mildly. Not merely is the Henry George idea one of the issues the Republican party must meet; it is the issue. And Senator Hanna and Mr. Herrick have made it so.

By forcing it into discussion in Ohio, as the distinctive characteristic of "Johnsonism," they have done what Johnson was not himself in position to do directly at this time—set the people to thinking about it and asking questions.

Had Johnson attempted to make the single tax idea an issue in the Ohio campaign, the attempt would have been met, as all such attempts have been met heretofore, by a conspiracy of silence. But the silence of the opposition has now been broken. They have broken it of their own motion, because they were foolish

enough to suppose that Johnson would dread the single tax issue.

Hanna and Herrick have ploughed the ground all over the State of Ohio, and Johnson and his single tax friends may be trusted to sow the seed. In Ohio the single tax policy is henceforth in practical politics.

And it needs only to be discussed to win. For it is grounded in justice, and like all just policies it would improve the condition of everyone who lives by his own industry. It would injure none but those who live in the sweat of other men's faces. Nor, indeed, would it injure even them. It would make them men instead of parasites.

This is the coming issue in American politics. It cannot be confined to Ohio. Wherever monopoly flourishes, this simple and just method of undermining and abolishing monopoly will be discussed. Let good citizens but familiarize themselves with the question, and the power of the privileged will quickly be dissipated.

Three possibilities present themselves: (1) The plutocratic socialism of the trusts, with their ship subsidies and plundering taxation, their land-grabbing expansion and imperialistic colonies; (2) democratic socialism, with its submergence of the individual; (3) the policy of natural and beneficent evolution proposed by "Johnsonism," with its socialization, as public property, of land values and public utilities, and its more complete individualization of private affairs and private property.

From these three possibilities the choice must be made, and the day for making it is even now at hand.

A CONDEMNATORY CONDONATION.

A man's gift maketh room for him and bringeth him before great men.—Bible.

And thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous.—Ibid.

Mr. Bengough's recent cartoon (p. 464), in which a Janus-faced monopolist is pictured as offering a railroad pass, which "Theodore Roosevelt, as Theodore Roosevelt," on his right, has rejected, but which "the personage who happens at the present time to occupy the position of President of the United States," on his left, is in the act of accepting, is (oh, the pity of it!), a graphic representation of fact.

During President Roosevelt's recent trip it was charged that the railroads were carrying him free.

Instantly Republican newspapers indignantly denied the charge. They repelled with scorn the allegation that the President of the United States of America—"Time's noblest offspring;" the land of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln—should have accepted a gift that even malice might regard as a political bribe.

But now it appears that the railroads did carry him free. Do these Republican editors, so recently shocked at the bare aspersion, now hang their heads in shame when confronted by the undeniable fact?

So revolting was the act charged against the President that his political adherents hastened to assure the country that none but a base demagogue would be guilty of so vile an accusation. Now that the charge is known to be true, do these high-minded sons of a glorious ancestry repudiate the guilty and disgraced offender?

No! (publish it not in Gath!) they seek to exculpate him!

And on what ground? Hear, oh my countrymen! On the ground that the gift-taker is a public official!

Could infamy search out, in the whole realm of sophistry, a more disgusting refuge?

Could political degeneracy find a lower depth?

The very defense offered by his friends defines with inevitable precision the President's act.

When does a gift become a potential bribe? Is it when the recipient is a private individual, and as such merely, incapable of rendering valuable service in return; or is it when the recipient is a public official, and as such, clothed with ample power to reward the donors?

The Lord, instructing Moses, as governor of Israel, said: "And thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous."

All human experience has proved the wisdom of the above words; and "the personage who happens at the present time to occupy the position of President of the United States" may read with profit a part of the twentieth verse of the ninth chapter of Job, which says: "If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me."

Republican editors, in their attempts to justify the President, have but emphasized his condemnation.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 12.

Events in connection with the Panama revolt and the relation thereto of the United States government (p. 486), have come in rapid succession. At the present time the revolutionists have acquired control of Panama, the Colombian troops having departed at the request of the American naval commander; the United States has formally recognized the provisional government of the republic of Panama; and the Colombian government has been authoritatively advised from Washington that it will not be allowed to recover its authority over its seceding member.

—

Panama has been a part of the territory now known as Colombia for two centuries. It was originally part of the Spanish vice-royalty of New Granada, which included Ecuador and Venezuela. Having achieved independence, 1811-24, the vice-royalty of New Granada established the Republic of Colombia. This republic being dissolved in 1829-32, by the withdrawal of Ecuador and Venezuela, the re-

public of New Granada was organized with Panama as one of its Provinces. After several alterations in the constitution of New Granada, one was made in 1858 whereby the Provinces were erected into the States of a federal republic, and in 1863 the name of this federation was changed from New Granada to the "United States of Colombia." Another change occurred in 1886. The domestic sovereignty of the States being then abolished, they became Departments of the general government, with governors appointed by the President. The name of the general government was at the same time changed to the Republic of Colombia.

—

Negotiations between Colombia and the United States for an interoceanic canal through the Department of Panama resulted in the rejection last August by Colombia of the treaty authorized by the United States (p. 311), and immediately thereupon rumors of the probable secession of Panama became current. It was more than hinted, also, that the United Sates would encourage the secession movement with a view to securing canal concessions from the seceding Department when it should have been established as a nation. The United States government, however, is not yet known to have done more at first than to cable the American minister to Colombia late in July, 1903, a message of instructions, made public September 4, the concluding words of which were as follows:

If Colombia neglects to ratify the treaty unamended, the United States will be forced to take measures that will be a source of regret to all friends of Colombia.

—

The treaty having been rejected, signs of a secession movement in Panama were observed about the time of the publication of the above message, and on the 3d of November a proclamation of Panama independence was promulgated from the city of Panama, of which the seceders had then acquired possession. Meanwhile the United States had dispatched several war ships to the Isthmus, and on the 4th Commander Hubbard, of the U. S. gunboat "Nashville," warned the Colombian authorities at Colon that the use of the Isthmian railroad for the transportation of troops to suppress the rebellion would not be permitted. A body of U. S. marines was landed from the "Nashville" on the 5th to prevent a conflict between Colombian troops and seceders at Colon, and on the same day the Colombian troops abandoned Colon and embarked for Cartagena. They did this upon the urgent advice of the American naval commander, Hubbard, of Superintendent Shaler, of the Panama Railroad company, and of Assistant Superintendent Prescott, of that company. Coincidently with their departure the United States government at Washington received a formal announcement by cable, from the city of Panama, of the establishment of the Republic of Panama. This announcement was signed by the three consuls constituting a provisional government—Frederico Boyd, Jose Augustin Arango, and Tomas Arias. Phillipe Bunau-Varilla is accredited to the United States as minister from Panama.

—

On the following day, the 6th, these instructions were cabled from Washington to the American minister to Colombia at Bogota:

The people of Panama, having by an apparently unanimous movement dissolved their political connection with the Republic of Colombia and resumed their independence, and having adopted a government of their own, republican in form, with which the government of the United States of America has entered into relations, the President of the United States, in accordance with the ties of friendship which have so long and so happily existed between the respective nations, most earnestly commends to the governments of Colombia and Panama the peaceful and equitable settlement of all questions at issue between them. He holds that he is bound not merely by treaty obligations but by the interests of civilization to see that the peaceful traffic of the world across the isthmus of Panama shall not longer be disturbed by a constant succession of unncessary and wasteful civil wars.

This recognition of the Republic of Panama was agreed upon at a protracted session of the cabinet on the 6th, with all members in attendance except Root and Wilson. France has since followed the American example, though with a less formal recognition of the seceding government.

—

It appears, however, that the government of Colombia has not yet acquiesced in the Panama secession. Colombian troops are being embarked on British ships to enforce the authority of the general government. Upon learning of this the Washington authorities cabled instructions on the 9th to the American war vessels at the Isthmus to prevent the embarkation, and otherwise to stop any attempt on the part of the Colombian government to despatch troops from any of the Atlantic or Pacific ports of Colombia to Panama. These instructions were soon discovered, however, to be a dangerous blunder. To have carried them out would have been an act of war against Colombia, in which Great Britain would have been concerned on account of its interference with the legitimate traffic of the British merchant vessels which have undertaken to transport the Colombian troops. The instructions were therefore withdrawn on the 10th. In their place instructions are now given to the naval commanders to prevent the disembarkation of Colombian troops in the vicinity of the Panama railroad. The American government rests its right to enforce such instructions upon its treaty of 1846 with New Granada, under which it guarantees peaceable transport across the Isthmus.

—

The government of Colombia has protested strongly to the government at Washington against its hostile interpretation of the treaty of 1846 and its attitude toward the secession of Panama.

Another revolution in Santo Domingo, or more accurately, perhaps, a renewal of the one which ended last Spring (p. 59) in the seating of Wos y Gil as president, appears to have culminated in the return to power of ex-President Jiminez. A manifesto of October 24th, signed by Gen. Calos Morales and others, charged many details of mismanagement as the cause of the revolt, one of them being a project to make "Dominion waters neutral and to make the Republic's ports free in case of war." On the 10th a Cape Hay-

tien dispatch told of a report from Monte Cristo that the city of Santo Domingo had capitulated to the revolutionists, and that General Jiminez, the former president, had been proclaimed president of the republic. Another dispatch of the same date, coming by way of Paris, stated that after three days' of fighting President Wos y Gil had taken refuge in the German consulate in the city of Santo Domingo, the capital, and that the revolution was considered at an end. Later advices indicate that the capital is still under siege, but certain to fall unless foreign interests intervene.

Pursuant to President Roosevelt's proclamation convening Congress in special session for the consideration of the reciprocity treaty with Cuba (p. 458), both Houses of the 58th Congress met on the 9th. At the Republican caucus on the 7th Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, was nominated for Speaker. The Democrats, holding their caucus on the same day, gave the speakership nomination to John S. Williams, of Mississippi.

—

An incident occurred at the Democratic caucus which was not on the regular programme. Robert Baker, of New York, who had already refused the railroad pass proffered him by the Baltimore and Ohio Railway company's lawyer (p. 263), offered the following resolution:

Whereas, it becomes increasingly apparent that the trusts owe their existence in large part to the fact of their having been the beneficiaries of outrageous and illegal freight rate discrimination, and it is also evident that the Republican party is controlled and directed by the railroad and trust magnates; and, whereas, it is both right and expedient for the Democratic party to boldly attack these monopolies, making it clear that no permanent relief from these oppressive conditions can be had until the illicit and criminal relations between the trusts and the railroads is terminated; and, whereas, the time has come to present to the people convincing evidence that no one charged with the formulation or putting into effect of democratic principles is in any way a party to or countenances these violations of law or morals; therefore be it resolved, that, regardless of the practice of the Republicans, it is the sense of this caucus that its members do not accept passes or other favors from the railroads.

Mr. Baker's resolution was referred to a committee of the caucus by a vote of 72 to 24. The committee consists of Baker, of New York; Livingston, of Georgia, and Gooch, of Kentucky.

—

Upon the assembling of Congress on the 9th Mr. Cannon was elected as Speaker in the lower House, the old rules were adopted, and a resolution calling for papers on the Panama situation was passed. No business of importance was done in the Senate. On the 10th both Houses listened to the President's message, which was confined to an argument for legislation necessary to render the Cuban treaty operative. The Senate referred both message and treaty to the committee on foreign affairs; the House referred the message to the committee on ways and means.

Ohio election returns (p. 485), as reported unofficially by the Cleveland Plain Dealer, are as follows for governor:

City of Cleveland:	
Herrick (R.)	36,993
Johnson (D.)	32,314
	4,679
Cuyahoga County:	
Herrick (R.)	45,169
Johnson (D.)	36,649
Plurality (R)	8,520

The plurality for Herrick in the State at large was 114,706. In Richland county, where Johnson defeated the so-called "black sheep" Democrat, Earhart (p. 113), for renomination, the Democratic candidate was defeated by 38 votes in a total poll of 10,652. Johnson carried the county as gubernatorial candidate by 446. On referendum propositions the municipal ownership of electric lighting plant for Cleveland, requiring a two-thirds vote, was defeated. Three of the constitutional amendments were carried and two defeated. Those that carried give the veto power to the governor, limit the liability of stockholders, and give each county representation in the legislature regardless of its population. The other amendments, one proposing classification of property for purposes of taxation, and the other of cities for purposes of municipal legislation, were defeated. In the legislature the Republicans have 29 in the Senate and 89 in the House and the Democrats 4 in the Senate and 21 in the House—a Republican majority of 93 on joint ballot. The Democrats carried four more counties for Johnson for governor than for legislators.

—

From other States and municipalities the following reports are made:

Massachusetts:	
Bates (R.)	199,393
Gaston (D.)	166,554
—— (Soc.)	25,000
Pennsylvania:	
Republican plurality	265,000
Rhode Island:	
Garvin (D.)	30,891
Colt (R.)	29,304
Anguly (Soc. L.)	970
Furlong (Soc.)	422
Jencks (Pro.)	1,166
Colorado:	
Republican plurality	7,000
People's party	10,000
Nebraska:	
Republican plurality	10,000
Kentucky:	
Democratic plurality	30,408
Salt Lake City, Utah:	
Democratic plurality	2,200
San Francisco, Cal.:	
Schmitz (Lab.)	19,621
Crocker (R.)	19,021
Lane (D.)	12,578
Whitney (Soc.)	1,094

NEWS NOTES.

—A strike in the coal mines of Colorado was begun on the 8th.

—William J. Bryan sailed for Europe from New York on the Majestic, November 11.

—Wages of the employes of the steel trust are to be reduced ten per cent.—about $15,000,000.

—A conference of Negro leaders on the race question has been in session at Washington during the week.

—The American Federation of Labor began its annual convention at Boston, in Faneuil hall, on the 8th.

—Fall River (Mass.) cotton mills announce a ten per cent. reduction in wages, to take effect November 23.

—William L. Elkins, one of the traction magnates of the United States, died at Philadelphia on the 7th at the age of 71.

—What promises to be a bitter strike was begun at four o'clock in the morning of the 12th by the employes of the Chicago City Railway company.

—Judge Holdom, of Chicago, sentenced three trade union men on the 9th to fines of $100 and imprisonment for 30 days on charges of violating a labor injunction. The specific accusation was assault and battery.

—The Philippine Commission at Manila has confirmed an anti-slavery law passed by the legislative council of the Moro provinces October 5. The law

prohibits slave hunting in all the Moro territory and provides for the confiscation of all vessels engaged in the slave traffic.

—Gov. Peabody, of Colorado, has set aside the verdict of the court-martial sentencing Gen. Chase to dismissal (p. 487), holding that while the verdict is just, the previous good record of the accused warrants his reinstatement as commander of the national guard of the State.

—A memorial meeting to the late Henry Demarest Lloyd is to be held at the Auditorium, Chicago, November 29, at three o'clock, at which the speakers are to be Mayor Jones of Toledo, John Mitchell, Clarence S. Darrow, Edwin D. Mead, and Mayor Johnson of Cleveland.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 425) for October shows on hand October 31, 1903:

Gold reserve fund	$150,000,000.00
Available cash	228,637,402.53
Total	$378,637,402.53
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903	384,394,275.58
Decrease	$5,756,873.05

—In the Bennett will case at New Haven, in which a bequest to the widow in trust for William J. Bryan, in accordance with the terms of a sealed letter, was attacked as having been procured through undue influence by Mr. Bryan upon the testator (p. 483), the probate judge decided on the 7th that there was no undue influence, but that for technical reasons the letter cannot be admitted to probate with the will. Mr. Bryan has qualified as one of the executors.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 442) for the month ending October 31, 1903, shows the following:

Receipts:		
Tariff	$94,763,258.70	
Internal revenue	81,261,310.33	
Miscellaneous	14,372,716.54	
		$190,397,285.57
Expenses:		
Civic and misc.	$48,309,854.30	
War	48,004,775.02	
Navy	32,290,890.80	
Indians	3,650,845.28	
Pensions	47,828,297.75	
Interest	9,642,353.92	
		$189,728,017.07
Surplus		$ 669,268.50

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE PANAMA FILIBUSTER.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Nov. 9.—It may be a good thing for the United States to obtain virtual sovereignty over the canal zone, but though effort is made to make it appear that the Administration has acted properly and not invaded the rights of Colombia, its real defense is that the United States "needed the territory."

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Nov. 7.—What Colombia will do now no one knows. It is, clearly, her right to deal with the rebellious province as the United States government dealt with the South at the time of the civil war. It is no part of our duty to suppress the Panama insurrection; but neither is it part of our duty to protect or shield the new republic. Congress must carefully and thoroughly review the proceedings and convince the world that the United States has maintained a correct and honorable attitude.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Nov. 11.—It remains to be seen whether the Democrats in Congress—and especially in the Senate—will support the government, or whether they will oppose it—will even oppose the ratification of a canal treaty with Panama—in an effort to make party capital. It is to be hoped none of them will pursue such an unpatriotic course. Were they to do so they would only add another item to the long catalogue of Democratic blunders. The people support the government as regards Panama, and whoever opposes it opposes them.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Nov. 8.—President Roosevelt has been "rushing things" with his boasted strenuosity, and if the United States is not involved in another war and with ugly complications with several South American powers, and possibly some European, it will not be his fault. Without consulting the people or Congress, and acting in hot haste, the administration is having such defense as it deems necessary telegraphed broadcast. Looming up in the future are expenditures of hundreds of millions, with French, American and South American speculators and adventurers. And to add to that, as Senator Morgan declares, war with the Republic of Colombia.

BENNETT'S BEQUEST TO BRYAN.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Nov. 7.—The attacks on Mr. Bryan have been senseless and malicious. They could not fail to offend the American sense of fair play. There was absolutely nothing in the evidence to warrant the charge of undue influence. As Judge Cleveland says, the testator had ample opportunity to change his will at any time during the last three years of his life and without the knowledge of Mr. Bryan. . . . The suit has disclosed no fact in the slightest degree discreditable to Mr. Bryan. . . . The decision should silence his detractors and cover them with confusion. Let us be fair, especially to opponents. Why should politics make bigots and libelers of otherwise worldly men?

OHIO POLITICS.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Nov. 7.—Tom Johnson rises to remark that he's been buried before and knows the way out.

Salem (O.) Daily Herald (Dem.) Nov. 7.—And so, in the name of reason, of justice, of humanity, of clean government and of future brotherhood, we declare that Tom L. Johnson, in the very hour of his alleged defeat, is infinitely greater, grander and more glorious than Mark Hanna, in the hour of his alleged triumph.

Seattle Mail and Herald (Dem.),—The sum and substance of the Ohio election result is that by a desperate campaign, arousing every phase of partisanship, employing every means known to brains and boodle, Mr. Hanna has carried Ohio by the normal Republican majority, plus the now uncovered treachery of the McLean masquerade Democracy.

Cleveland (O.) Press (Scripps' League), Nov. 5.—Mr. Johnson has shown his sincerity by devoting a great deal of his money, labor and time to educating the people in respect to home rule, cheap transportation, and just taxation, and he is by no means "a dead one." Indeed, it will be surprising if Cox and Hanna do not so use their tremendous majority in the next Assembly as to make Tom Johnson and the highly important popular principles of which he has been the chief exponent more conspicuous than ever before.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), Nov. 5.—The Republicans won a victory, 'tis true, but it was the most expensive victory ever won in Ohio. And don't imagine for one moment that Tom L. Johnson is out of politics. He will sit in the game to the finish, and there will be no finish for Tom until the clods rattle on his coffin lid—and Tom is still a young man. He isn't going to die, and he isn't "broke." He has the best set of principles that can possibly be injected into a campaign; he has brains, he has money, and he has the tenacity of a bull-dog. He is in politics to stay, and no Republican majority will ever be large enough to put him out.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (ind.), Nov. 6 (weekly ed.).—What is the true meaning of this cataclysm? Is it all a Republican or a Hanna victory? By no means. The overwhelming defeat of Johnson for governor and of Clarke for United States senator is in part a Democratic victory, that is to say, a victory for the McLeanites, the Zimmermanites, the Kilbourneites, the Clevelandites, and all those Democrats who desire the complete overthrow of "Johnsonism" as much as they have desired the overthrow of Bryanism. A survey of the field after the battle indicates that more Democratic knives and tomahawks were gleaming in the sunshine of November 3, seeking the destruction of Democratic candidates, than ever before in a political contest in the State of Ohio.

San Francisco Star (Dem.), Nov. 7.—Of the result in Ohio we may say this much—that it was looked for with especial interest, because of the gallant fight which Tom Johnson, the candidate for governor, was making single-handed against the enemy within as well as without his own party, and because mark Hanna forces, from Wall street to Washington, were determined to accompiish his personal defeat and the apparent defeat of the principles for which he stood. They not only spent unlimited money, but pressed into service almost every prominent Hanna Republican east of the Rockies—from the President and members of his cabinet down—to "convince" the people that Johnson's election and Hanna's defeat would mean an empty dinner pail, a hungry belly and the defeat of the Republican party nationally next year.

Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), Nov. 4.—Tom Johnson has not been eliminated from politics. He has met his Bull Run. He has lost his first battle. But the war will go on and the great principles for which he stands will continue to challenge the thoughtful attention of patriotic men. . . . Plutocracy hastens to its fall. Its very victories make for its undoing. The triumph of Hanna will inspire it with fresh insolence. It will be encouraged to new aggressions and to more daring assaults upon the liberties of the people. Wall street will respond with new orgies of speculative brigandage to the Ohio invitation. But the stars in their courses fight against Sisera. Sooner or later the citadel must fall. And whether soon or late, whether in his time or in another's time, it will make no difference to Tom Johnson. His fight will go on.

We permit absolute possession of the soil of our country, with no legal rights of existence on the soil to the vast majority who do not possess it. A great land holder may legally convert his whole property into the forest or hunting ground, and expel every human being who has hitherto lived upon it. In a thickly populated country like England, where almost every acre has its owner and occupier, this is a power of legally destroying his fellow creatures; and that such a power should exist, and be exercised by individuals, in however small a degree, indicates that as regards true social science we are still in a state of barbarism.—Wallace.

MISCELLANY

THE WORLD'S WAY.

He wrote
His soul
Into
A book.

The world
Refused
To turn
And look.

He made
His faith
Into
A rhyme.

And still
The world
Could spare
No time.

But on
The day
When, dumb
And dazed,

Despair-
Condemned,
And blind,
And crazed,

By means
Most weird
His life
He took,

Behold,
The world
Bought out
His book!

—New Orleans Times-Democrat.

A PROBLEM IN ETHICS.

Jones—Neighbor Smith, I am out of a job; how am I to make a living?

Smith—I have a proposition to make to you. Provide yourself with tackles and go to fishing, and I will give you half you catch.

Jones—I'll do that; thank you; you are very kind, indeed.

And the people laugh at Jones' foolishness and ask: "If he provides his own tackles, what claim has Smith on the fish he takes? Ought not all the fish belong to the man who catches them?"

We think so. But while about it, suppose you tell us the difference between this proposition and the one that Brown made to Wilson when he said: "Get your teams and plows and go to work raising potatoes, and I will give you half the potatoes you raise."

Now, don't answer this question until you have thought over it just a little.—Living Issues.

THOSE BOY DIRECTORS.

Not the least interesting testimony introduced before Special Commissioner Oliphant with respect to the shipbuilding trust was that relating to the "boy directors."

It seems that five boys being used as the stool pigeons for some of these sharpers to whom Mr. Roosevelt has referred as "captains of industry," actually organized the $80,000,000 shipyard trust.

Horace S. Gould, in his 'teens and a clerk for a New Jersey company, was chosen to be one of the directors for the shipyard trust. It was thought that the name of Gould would attract prospective investors, although it seems that this particular Gould is in nowise related to the famous Gould family. Louis P. Dailey, another New Jersey clerk, and two other clerks, Seward and Newman by name, together with Gould, comprised the directory of this "great industrial enterprise."

Young Gould, appearing as a witness before Special Commissioner Oliphant, testified that he was a director and stockholder in 50 large corporations, having an aggregate capital of $400,000,000. Dailey and Gould confessed that neither of them had a bank account and yet they were, so far as the record is concerned, the leading spirits in the organization of a "great industrial enterprise." According to the testimony, these boy directors, acting under the inspiration of Wall street speculators, organized the shipyard trust with $3,000 capital. The boy directors then voted to increase the stock to $45,000,000 and bonds were also issued in the sum of $26,000,000.

Behind these lads stood J. Pierpont Morgan, Charles M. Schwab and other "captains of industry." Morgan, Schwab and their associates seem to have reaped a large profit from this unholy enterprise and although Republican editors are not, in these days, pointing with pride to the Morgans and the Schwabs, it cannot be forgotten that less than a year ago Mr. Morgan was referred to by Republican editors as a fine model for the American youth.

In a newspaper interview, Bishop Huntington, speaking at Syracuse, N. Y., October 14, and referring to the disclosures made with respect to the shipbuilding trust, said: "It is my opinion that the men mixed up in the deal are pagans. They have no conception of religion or Christianity." And yet we have heard that these men seriously contend that they are the trustees of God, and that because of their ability, their integrity and their enterprise, they have been delegated by the Creator of all to control and manipulate the property of the country.—Editorial in The Commoner of October 30.

JUNIOR CIVICS.

The naturalness of the child citizen is delightful. The Little Chronicle tells of a small girl who seemed to be scrubbing the back fence. She was asked:

"What are you doing, dear?"

"Keeping the city clean," was the prompt answer.

"Who told you to do it?"

"Why, nobody told me, but I found out in my civics class that I ought to help, and they say the place to begin is right at home."

"What class did you say?"

"Civics—where we learn to be good citizens, you know."

"How old are you?"

"Eight and a half."

"Eight years old—and you study civics?"

"Eight and a half. Why, civics, yes. They have that in the baby room at our school."

"Civics in the baby room! Where do you go to school?"

"Right around the corner. Oh, civics is the most fun of anything! It's great! You just ought to visit our school."

So it has come about that many people have visited this school and other schools and clubs where the men and women of to-morrow are "learning by doing" many of the things which go to make up the larger and better life in either city or country. . . .

Lewis-Champlain and Forrestville have been exceptional among Chicago schools in their treatment of the civil government courses. Inaugurated in the first named school and amplified in the second under the efficient direction of Mrs. Elsanor Eckel, the "civics" idea has enriched the school programme; offered a new avenue of approach to the overgrown "left-over" bad boys; provided new and fascinating "busy work;" given the teachers an added link to the everyday life of the pupil; brought teacher and school into closer relations with many of the homes, and led the children into a sympathetic knowledge of the city and State.

The method is simple and elastic. The civil government hour, a busy work session, or any period of five minutes or more is given daily or weekly to a study of the child's immediate environment. He learns his dependency upon city, State and nation for safety, comfort, health, pleasure and education, e. g., for safety through the police and fire departments of the city, the militia of the State and the army and lighthouses of the nation. Newspapers, city and government reports, home interviews, talks by officials and experts, correspondence, "personally conducted" visits, and original experiments and observation provide endless variety.

In this plan the usual civil government text book becomes merely a work of reference. There is little or no memorizing of definitions.

The "baby class" studies the fire department and some elementary matters in the direction of health and cleanliness. The near-by fire station is visited and a special exhibition enjoyed. All manner of interesting things are learned about the men, the apparatus, the horses, the alarm system, causes of fires and how to avoid them.

As one enthusiastic student has written, the water system is "one of the most interesting works to study." "If possible, it is interesting to study it from the faucet in your own house to the crib." A host of instructors help the student of civics. Plumbers, firemen, aldermen, policemen, the health officer and others give instruction. One investigating girl discovered to her astonishment that the plumber understood "the use of civil government in schools." He had said that civics "teaches people to help themselves, so they probably could save the plumber's bill if they only understood how to take care of the kitchen sink."

In such truly practical fashion the home becomes the center. Fire, water, postal and other departments all exist to serve the home and the interests of the home group. In turn, there comes a truer understanding of the mutuality of interests and the interweaving of responsibilities which make up society. —E. G. Routzahn, in The Chautauquan for August, 1902.

AN EARLY DEMOCRAT.

Extracts from an Argument on United States Citizenship, by Isabella Beecher Hooker, presented with a Memorial from the Connecticut Woman's Suffrage Association to the Constitutional convention assembled in Hartford January 1, 1902.

All fundamental principles have their birth in germ cells of human thought. The main business of all branches of science is to discover these cells, study them, and draw new conclusions from age to age as experience has proved the value of the successive theories when practically applied. The main thoughts underlying a democratic form of government are the freedom of the individual and his duty to society; personal liberty and personal responsibility.

These had their first expression in definite form and practical exemplification in the State of Connecticut, so long ago as 1636, and the agency was Rev. Thomas Hooker—a man born in England in 1586 and who came to this country to join the Massachusetts colony with 160 of his followers in 1635, and left that colony in 1636 with his church to found a new home on the banks of the Connecticut, because of the prevailing aristocratic idea of the Massachusetts colony that "the best part is always the least, and of that best part the wiser part is always the lesser." These were the words of Winthrop, the distinguished governor of Massachusetts, of whom it was truly said that he was one of the noblest souls that ever lived, transparently brave, strong, high-minded, gentle, unselfish, caring for nothing but the honor of God and the best good of man—a genuinely great man.

Continuing the discussion of the great question whether the people should make the laws and elect the magistrates, or only a select body, Winthrop wrote to Hooker in 1638, affirming the "unwarrantableness and unsafeness of referring matter of council or judicature to the body of the people, because the best part is always the least, and of that best part the wise part is always the lesser. The old law was: Thou shalt bring the matter to the judge."

To which Hooker rejoined "that in respect to matters referred to the judge and the sentence left to his discretion, I ever looked at it as a way which leads directly to tyranny and so to confusion; and must plainly profess if it was in my liberty I should choose neither to live nor to leave my posterity under such a government. Let the judge do according to the sentence of the law. Seek the law at its mouth. The heathen man said by the light of common sense, 'the law is not subject to passion, and therefore ought to have chief rule over rulers themselves.' It is also a truth that council should be sought from councillors. But the question yet is, who those should be. In matters of greater consequence which concern the common good, a general council chosen by all to transact business which concerned all, I conceive most suitable to rule and most safe for the relief of the whole." . . .

To Connecticut belongs the conceded honor of giving the world its first formulated and written Constitution, and the germ of this has lately been discovered and deciphered in a few notes taken from a sermon of Thomas Hooker by one of his parishioners. They are as follows:

Doctrine 1. That the choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people, by God's own allowance. 2. The privilege of election, which belongs to the people, therefore, must not be exercised according to their humors, but according to the blessed will and law of God. 3. They who have power to appoint officers and magistrates, it is in their power also to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them. Reasons. 1. Because the foundation of authority is laid firstly in the free consent of the people. 2. Because by a free choice the hearts of the people will be more inclined to the love of the persons chosen and more ready to yield obedience. 3. Because of that duty and engagement of the people (viz., because they will be in the position of a party to the contract.)

Uses. The lesson taught is threefold. 1. There is matter of thankful acknowledgment in the appreciation of God's faithfulness towards us and the permission of these measures that God doth command and vouchsafe. 2. Of reproof, to dash the councils of all those who shall oppose. 3. Of exhortation—to persuade us as God hath given us liberty, to take it. And lastly, as God hath spared our lives and given us them in liberty, so to seek the guidance of God, to choose in God and for God.

Of this sermon Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, one of the greatest preachers and statesmen of this century, says: "It is the earliest known suggestion of a fundamental law enacted, not by royal charter nor by concession from any previously existing government, but by the people themselves, and which not only provides for the free choice of magistrates by the people but also sets the bounds and limitations of the power and place to which each magistrate is called."

Some two years later the Constitution of the State of Connecticut was launched, and of this Constitution a late distinguished historian, Prof. Johnston, of Princeton, has this to say: "It is on the banks of the Connecticut, under the mighty preaching of Thomas Hooker, and in the Constitution to which it gave life, if not form, that we draw the first breath of that atmosphere which is now so familiar to us." And Bancroft says: "They who judge of men by their services to the human race will never cease to honor the memory of Hooker."

AFTER ELECTION.

In Cincinnati, November 8, at the Vine Street Congregational church, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, gave an "After Election" talk, in which he discussed the lessons of the recent Ohio campaign.

The election in Ohio is over. Senator Hanna's indorsement was so overwhelming as to make his nomination for the presidency the logic of events.

The defeat of Mayor Johnson was so complete and decisive as to inspire the prophecy of his enemies that Johnson and his issues are buried forever.

These enemies may be right in believing that the Mayor and his cause have been eliminated from Ohio politics. But until the Mayor himself is convinced of the fact they are not likely to get the full benefit of his demise.

At midnight, after the election, I received a long-distance message from the defeated candidate. There was the same happy ring to his voice. There was that never-failing optimism for which those who know him love him:

"Give the friends my love, and tell them that the next fight will begin to-morrow." Those who are singing requiems over his political grave do not know the man nor the principles which guide him. Senator Hanna declared on the stump that he was a man of "morbid ambition." I know he is a man who holds certain political principles in his heart with all the force of religious conviction. It is no more possible for him to acknowledge defeat for those principles than it would have been for Garrison to have given up the struggle for abolition.

It is not likely that Senator Hanna would dissent from Mayor Johnson's explanation of the result. Senator Hanna, in his canvass, repeated this declaration: "The result of the election in Ohio this fall will absolutely and beyond question of a doubt determine whether the present condition of prosperity in this country is to continue or not." Mayor Johnson says it was this kind of talk, coming from a man who could speak with authority as one of the "captains of industry," and coming at a time when there was almost universal dread of an approaching panic, that led many to ignore local issues in order to prevent the shock which might come through the defeat of a man so prominent in the national councils.

This is an explanation not at all uncomplimentary to Senator Hanna, and if it is correct it justifies Mayor Johnson's hope for next year, which he expressed in the following declaration: "The ultimate success of the principles of the Democratic platform is but postponed by this defeat, and I urge the people of Ohio to begin now the campaign for the election of the next legislature, the selection of which will not involve the election of a United States senator or any other national question, but which can be chosen with reference to the questions of home rule and just taxation in which an overwhelming majority of the people of Ohio now believe."

On the Democratic side it was a "penniless" campaign. On the Republican side nothing was left undone which money could do. The last candidate for governor on the Democratic ticket spent $10,000 in Cincinnati. Mayor Johnson did not give a penny to the Cincinnati organization. That the use of money would have brought out a large vote, there is no question. That Mayor Johnson could have afforded to have spent the money, there is no doubt.

But he says that if the power of money is to be relied on in elections no victories can ever be won by the people, for privilege and monopoly can always contribute the largest campaign fund. By the use of money in politics temporary gains may be made. But permanent victories cannot be purchased. They come only through the aroused sentiment and the changed thought of the masses. If Mr. Johnson's ambition had been to become governor, he suffered defeat. If his ambition was to do an educational work certain of bearing fruit in the future, he has not been defeated in his purpose; on the contrary, he has succeeded magnificently. Mayor Johnson believes it is better to make ten converts to a just cause than to get a thousand unreliable votes by the customary methods. The cynicism of the public is so great that many will not believe it possible that any man in politics will do as he has done, namely, to sacrifice his hope of a personal victory for the nobler ambition of advancing among thoughtful men the truth which he believes. The man who takes this course in politics will have to look for his reward, very often, to the silent approval of his conscience, while his enemies jubilate with the blare of horns. But he who believes in the power of truth and the teachableness of the people can well afford to wait; patient in the face of passing defeat, and happy in the confidence of final and abiding victory.

To those who, with a mighty truth in their hearts, can be discouraged by adverse majorities, forgetting both the fickleness of the multitude and the endurance of the truth, the following parallel may be instructive:

In October, 1903, Mark Hanna said: "The insidious doctrine championed by Henry George is as venomous as the fangs of a snake."

In May, 1850, James Gordon Bennett said: "Never in the time of the French revolution and blasphemous atheism was there more malevolence and unblushing wickedness avowed then by this same (William Lloyd) Garrison."

Within two years from the date of Gordon Bennett's utterance the name of the then dominant Whig party was blotted from the pages of American history, and with the largest electoral vote ever cast for a president, the slave party returned to power. The voice of the multitude was Bennett's. But the voice of God was Garrison's. Within 13 years the voice of the people became the voice of God, and Lincoln in his immortal proclamation gave effect to the teachings of Garrison.

The generation that has been on the eve of great changes, has never been conscious of it. The triumph of abolition did not seem more preposterous to Bennett than the triumph of the Single Tax now seems to Hanna in the flush of victory.

Hanna is the Gordon Bennett, George is the Garrison, and Johnson is the Lincoln of the battle that is now on for industrial freedom. Hanna stands for the ideas that are dominant; Johnson for the truths that are vital. Hearts that know the truth are like the stars that hold serenely to their course, unmindful of the changing clouds.

A CITY "FINDING ITSELF."

Extracts from an article in "The World's Work" for October, 1903, by Frederic C. Howe, on the City of Cleveland.

The average community is deficient in the cooperative spirit. Politically, our cities are still looked upon as places in which to live and make a living. Probably Cleveland has come nearer to "finding itself" than any other large city on the continent. It is becoming organized. It is acquiring a capacity for political sacrifice. It is learning to think as a municipality. It has come into possession of belief in itself wholly aside from the spirit which delights in large figures, increased bank clearances and splendid tonnage. It has already developed powers of defense. As time goes on this power will become aggressive as well. . . . Cleveland is a center of political and industrial unrest. It has been looked upon as a Republican center. It is now a Democratic one. For years the Democratic party was moribund. Two years ago Mr. Johnson became a candidate for mayor and was elected. His two-years' term of office ending May 4, 1903, was one of the most strenuous in the annals of American cities. He is not only a Democrat, but probably the leading exponent in America of the philosophy of Henry George. Further than this, he is an advocate of the public ownership of all public utilities, local, State and national, and would include in the programme not only street railway, gas and electric lighting properties, but steam railroad service as well. He has conducted a campaign for the taxation of such utilities at their franchise value, according to the principles of the Ford franchise tax enacted by New York while President Roosevelt was its governor. He has also sought to introduce competing street railway lines on a three-cent fare basis. Further than this, he has aimed to secure, through legislative action, a larger degree of home rule in municipalities, making the city the unit and

giving it power to formulate its own charter and to determine its own activities. True, none of these things have been accomplished, but the hands of the city were tied by quo warranto proceedings, which destroyed the charter of the city and incidentally brought down to ruin every other city in Ohio. Thirteen injunctions were brought against the actions of the administration, by which tax reforms, street railway legislation and many other similar changes were prevented, and local government was for the time being paralyzed. . . .

It is a significant thing that in Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit, wherever politics have been shaken down, the dominant note in campaign after campaign has been the relation of the city to the public service corporations. Wherever this is true, wherever these corporations are subject to the scrutiny of the public year after year and are made the issue in recurring municipal campaigns, it is safe to say that any adjustment which is not right will not stand, and that the only possible solution of the situation outside of municipal ownership is one that satisfies the people as to its fairness and honesty. And in Cleveland, as elsewhere, there is one issue that does not change. There is a third unknown party that is always active. Sometimes it works with one of the regular parties, sometimes with the other. It stands for private interests, against the public. Were the element of public franchise removed from local affairs, honest administration would be a much easier thing. The petty "grafts" of contracts, spoils and partisan advantage would sink before the innate sense of honesty and the growing desire for municipal reform were it not for the privileges worth millions of dollars which are to be had through machine organization, campaign contributions, the election of dishonest men, and the subversion of the city to private ends. And the insistent and growing belief in municipal ownership is largely due to the conviction that honest government is well nigh impossible because of the profits to be made through corruption in public grants.

Mr. Johnson has approached the street railway issue in a new way. Instead of attempting to regulate or reduce charges by legislative action, he has sought to bring about the same result by inviting competition. New street railway routes have been laid out and bids asked for a competing line on a three-cent fare basis. These advertisements brought forward last year a bidder willing to construct and operate at this rate. But the city was not permitted to make use of its highways for this purpose. Injunctions and quo warranto proceedings were used to prevent it; for nearly a year the city was not permitted to move.

Cleveland enjoys a 75-cent rate per thousand for artificial gas, and a 30-cent rate on natural gas which is brought to the city from West Virginia and is largely used for fuel. At the same time, vigorous action is being taken by the city to erect a municipal electric plant to light the streets and furnish light and power for private use.

As a matter of fact, the question of municipal ownership has had for more than a generation a practical demonstration in the Cleveland waterworks, which has been owned by the city since 1856. At the present time the system is valued at $10,000,000 and has a bonded indebtedness of only $3,250,000. From this source the city enjoyed a revenue in 1902 of $858,780 in addition to free water for all public departments. It yielded a net revenue, after the payment of all operating expenses and fixed charges, of $483,900, which, if added to the free water supply, would show an annual net earning capacity of $683,900. During the past two years the department has been free from politics and has been conducted on a merit basis. As a measure of reform, the administration has undertaken the universal metering of the city, by means of which all will pay according to their consumption instead of according to their waste. . . .

On the whole Cleveland is and has been, relatively speaking, a well-governed city. It has an inadequate police and health force, and is blackened with smoke. It has made some engineering mistakes, is governed by the spoils rather than the merit system, and is far from being a finished product. But its appropriations for these purposes are inadequate, and public service of an efficient sort requires large expenditures. The lives, property, health and well-being of a community of 400,000 people cannot be adequately safeguarded at $16.75 per head. Little or no complaint is heard of police blackmail, so prevalent an evil in other cities.

It will probably be a long time before the people of America are convinced that municipal administration can be honest and efficient. There is such an accumulation of evidence against such an hypothesis. And yet, when one considers the array of forces against good government, the wonder is not that it is so bad, but that it is so good. And many departments of Cleveland's life are conducted as honestly and efficiently as any business concern. This is now unquestionably true of the schools; it is and has been true of the libraries. The treasurer's and auditor's departments are beyond reproach. The waterworks is on a merit basis, and earns annually one-fourth as much as the total revenue from direct taxation. The fire department is efficient; the streets are now clean and well lighted. The parks are conducted to secure a maximum of enjoyment to the people, and small playgrounds and public baths are bringing the opportunity for healthful recreation to all the people. The police force has been reorganized; blackmail is almost unheard of, if it exists.

And the cost is lower than almost any large city in America. The per capita expenditure for all purposes was but $16.68 in 1900. For New York in the same year it was $30.35, and for Boston $45.37. Cleveland stands seventh in size in American cities, and is somewhat below the average of the ten largest American cities in its net per capita debt.

It is not to be inferred from this that Cleveland has solved the problem of municipal administration. But it is a striving city, seeking by conscious action to correct one evil after another, and to enlarge the sphere of human life by offering greater opportunities for comfort and happiness. It is filled with an alert political and industrial sense, is aided by an independent press, and gives promise of being one of the great centers of the world from an architectural and industrial point of view. And in the matter of those great economic and political reforms centering about taxation, municipal ownership and home rule, it is likely to lead the way in demonstrating the possibilities of local cooperative political action, even at the point where American institutions seem to have most completely broken down.

ENGLISH ANTI-IMPERIALISM.

"Paragraphs" published in "The Positivist Review" (London) for October 1, 1903.

FROM FREDERIC HARRISON.

We shall have to go back to our history in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries for a record of government so blundering, so perverse and so evil as that which has afflicted our country for the last few years. Ministers of the Stuarts and of George III. may have shown equal folly, arrogance and bigotry. But even they did not rely entirely on a system of bluster and trickery. A great party, resolved to enter on a policy of grab abroad and clericalism

at home, obtained a free hand from the nation by resorting to the arts known to financial swindlers. They then put themselves and our country into the power of a tradesman who had won reputation for skill in the art of puffing his own wares, cornering his trade rivals and humbugging the public.

Having encouraged and abetted a dirty act of brigandage on an inoffensive neighbor, they eluded their responsibility for its failure by mendacity and protected their guilty agents by tricks. They then intrigued to bring about a war—the most infamous which has ever stained British annals. Rank falsehoods and blatant promises deluded the nation into abetting this criminal adventure, into which they plunged with ludicrous ignorance of all its conditions and systematic falsification of all the real facts. They gave themselves over blindly to gangs of commercial swindlers, who bribed the press and bought up agents to boom their schemes. Our countrymen were made in effect the the blindfolded shareholders in huge swindling syndicates; the ministers of the crown, some of them to their own knowledge, figuring as the titled decoys who swagger in a rogue's prospectus.

From first to last the war was carried on with recklessness, ignorance, jobbery and muddle which, when exposed at last, has made England the laughing stock of foreign nations, and has made decent Englishmen sick with shame as they read the record of the blood and treasure wasted by blundering and arrogance, as they count up all the ruin, debt and confusion that the future of our country has to face. The folly, the fickleness, the mess of the whole black business, revealed to us too late, reads like a tale of Turkish or Chinese misdoing rather than the acts of European ministers. The only sign of intelligence they exhibited was in the petty tricks by which detection was delayed until parliament had risen and politicians were dispersed for the holidays. If the muddle of it all reminds us of the ways of pashas and mandarins, the stealthy way in which secret and unavowed agents are employed to embroil us with weaker neighbors and ultimately to grab their land, reminds us of the underground machinations of Russian chanceries.

Peaceful opposition to these intrigues was violently suppressed. Ministers of the crown encouraged mob outrages; and the gentlemen of England paid the blackguards of England to get up disgusting orgies, which were pretended to redound to the honor of the empire, but were in fact vulgar electioneering tricks. In the meantime the law was strained or violated in ways which have never been attempted since the days of the Stuarts, unless it were in Ireland during the rebellion of '98. A party lawyer, whose name will live in history along with the creatures of Charles and James, induced the court of appeals to break up the traditional safeguards of personal liberty, and then to rescind by a gloss acts of parliament which had been accepted as a settlement of ancient class disputes.

Having embroiled their country in a disastrous war, having increased the national debt by more than a third, having handed over the laborer to the capitalist, having bribed the great beer interests, ministers proceeded to use their temporary majority, snatched by a trick in the war fever, to gratify the priests of the established church. The interests of education were only a pretext. Education was working fairly well; and required nothing more than subordinate amendment and simplification. The people were satisfied with the system, which could easily have been enlarged and improved.

The only people who were seriously dissatisfied were the clericals, who insisted on exclusive schools of their own, but for which they objected to pay even a small fraction of the cost. The education acts were forced on parliament by the mechanical majority which seemed to take a positive delight in jumping upon dissenters and in outraging all their prejudices. The acts of last year and of this year might have been turned into useful reforms, if they had not been made a means to parade the triumph of the church, and at the same time to rouse the most bitter hostility of conscientious men, who for the first time in their lives began to defy the law in the name of religion. I have not myself opposed the acts, and I scout the idea of "passive resistance." But I feel that English statesmanship must have sunk low indeed when we see a prime minister, personally an avowed skeptic, pandering to the appetites of clerical monopoly and treating an outburst of lawless indignation with the feeble sneers by which some weak pedagogue tries to put down a school rebellion.

The situation in the last session was this. An ignominious war had produced nothing but misery, ruin and chaos in the colony. The national credit had sunk 20 per cent. The fixed wealth of the nation had decreased, we are told, by a thousand million sterling. The military organization was found to be more that of Turkey than a European power. A series of tricks, falsehoods and broken promises had been exposed. And a large and stubborn body of zealous men had been stung to fury by insult and injustice. The most adroit member of the cabinet saw the danger; for, having worked that oracle in old days himself, he knew all the consequences of nonconformist wrath. He played a bold stroke. And he determined to draw off indignation against the failures and blunders of the government by setting the whole nation by the ears with a cry which touched every household in its daily life.

I do not propose to argue the fiscal problem. It was never flung at us as a serious policy of reform. It is an obvious trick—a mere subterfuge to divert attention from urgent abuses and to advertise its author as the hero of the day. To discuss the merits of free trade with Mr. Chamberlain would be like urging Lord Roberts to stick to rifles and cannon and not to revert to bows and arrows for the British army. To hear Mr. Chamberlain sneering at Bright and Cobden is as good a joke as if the prisoner in the dock were to assure the jury that the Ten Commandments were "stale shibboleths." There are few men living who more thoroughly understand all the fraud and mischief underlying the protection sophisms. Fraud and mischief which he has himself in quite recent years lucidly explained, and that whilst holding his present office.

Why then has he flung this dynamite bomb into the midst of the public? Well! because he is a dynamiter by profession—a desperate man who, for his own ends and to advertise himself, will take any risk and chance any public calamity. To face the angry nation with all this record of failure and shame was certain ruin. A bankrupt tradesman will set fire to his shop and chance recovering a big insurance. It is possible that, intoxicated with his previous success in gulling the nation and elbowing his rivals, Mr. Chamberlain may have begun to have some hazy idea of doing good business. George IV. swaggered about Waterloo till, they say, he had persuaded himself he had been present. Therese Humbert, perhaps, had got lies upon the brain till she fancied that there had been something in the safe. Per-

haps Mr. Chamberlain, after all his twistings, prevarications, thimble-rigging and false figures, may have fancied that there is something in protection. But it would be foolish to argue with him seriously. The whole thing is a fraud. It would be idle to prove to a cheap-jack on a race course that the pea is under the other cup, or the card tucked under the other sleeve.

It is a trick—a palpable swindle; and it ought so to be treated. But it is a real danger, and in the meantime a national disaster. Business, politics, reform and progress have been paralyzed by the great scare. The rich, the landed interest, adventurers, beer and church scent plunder in a scheme which must injure the masses and may benefit the few. If the scheme, or rather the heap of schemes, mutually destructive of each other, were actually put into force, it would set all parts of what is absurdly called the empire at loggerheads, and before long would land us at home in a social and democratic revolution. Mr. Chamberlain is too acute a man not to know this. As a born tradesman he understands it far better than country squires. But if it enable him to pose as prime minister for a few years why need he care?

The melancholy part of it for any man who loves his country is to see the first minister of this great nation treat the crisis with imbecile jibes, with cynical recklessness, and helpless arrogance. The first principles of the cabinet system are flouted, the house of commons is silenced, parties, reforms, policies, trade and finance are thrown into confusion. The turbulent republics that are nicknamed the empire, are excited with impossible hopes and tempted with ruinous bribes—and the man who is responsible for the peace and well-being of this mighty congerie of states has nothing for it but party tricks, double-tongued promises, and debating sneers. Mr. Balfour is a man of culture and pleasant manners; but he is no more of a statesman than is any pitiful college Don who thinks that smooth words and academic sniggering form the whole art of governing.

I have written this with my own name, and with a plainness which is not usual in political speeches or in anonymous press, because it is what I feel, what many men feel, but what conventional habits lead them to conceal. I see with disgust the timid propriety with which party leaders and their organs are willing to accept as part of the political game bare-faced trickery, falsification of facts and figures, and a gambling "corner" in the prosperity of the nation. The "fiscal problem" is a colossal swindle, as rank as that of any financial rogues who are serving their time in jail—only it is ten times more criminal, and a thousand times more injurious to the public.

FROM S. H. SWINNY.

The large garrison of British troops in India is already a heavy burden on that poverty-stricken country. It having been found desirable to raise the soldiers' pay, the cost of the garrison is to be increased £786,000 per annum, and the whole of this is to be paid by India. And a further and still more iniquitous charge was in contemplation. It is necessary, as a result of our glorious victory, to keep a garrison of 25,000 men in South Africa. To make England pay the whole expense would be unpopular, to make South Africa pay, would be difficult. It was, therefore, proposed to make India contribute over £400,000 a year to the cost of the South African garrison, on the ground that a part of the garrison may be treated as a reserve to assist India in case of necessity. Now the British troops in India not only may be, but actually have been within the last four years, treated as a reserve for the empire. In the hour of danger, when there was the greatest temptation to attack India, should such a design be favored by any of the powers, thousands of British troops were taken from India for the defense of Natal. Yet, neither England nor South Africa contributes toward the garrison of India.

The case stands thus. On an emergency, India has to send the troops she maintains to any part of the empire that is in danger. Her army is a reserve for all, but she alone supports it. The garrison in South Africa was to be in part supported by India, because she may draw upon it when necessary. But so may any other part of the empire; for it is not to be supposed that if Australia were attacked, help from South Africa would be refused; unless, indeed, South Africa were itself in danger, and then India also would be able to withdraw troops thence, in spite of her payments. The whole of India, Lord Curzon, the official world, the Anglo-Indian press, and the people of the country, united in protest. But the very conception of such an injustice shows the hollowness of our Empire. Australia is to pay what she will, and that is not much, towards the general expenses, and to show her Imperial spirit by the exclusion of her Indian fellow-subjects. India is to pay out of her poverty for the support of an Empire in which her sons are treated as aliens and outcasts. And the people of these islands are to bear practically the whole burden of Imperial defense, save what can be wrung from India, and are even asked to tax the food of the country in order that Australia may condescend to remain in our glorious Empire, whose foundation is equal justice for all.

This paragraph was written before the announcement in Parliament that the infamous scheme might be reconsidered. It is now printed as it stood, because her Indian Minister and the Government at home expressed their desire to carry it out, and reluctantly and vaguely withdrew it under overwhelming pressure from India and Indian governors. We have yet to see what will be their next Imperial trick.

A KING DEPOSED.

He sat in the darkness, weeping
  By the gates of his empire closed,
A ruler stripped of his purple,
  A king from his realm deposed.

They passed him, going to worship;
  And, wistful, behind he crept;
And coldly they bade him be silent
  Because that the new king slept.

They lifted him up to the cradle,
  Their fingers laid on their lips,
And he touched one baby dimple
  With his own little finger tips.

Then they set him down in the nursery,
  A wan little love-lorn heap;
And he lay with his child's heart breaking,
  Sob-sobbing himself to sleep.

They have taken his baby scepter,
  They have taken his robe and crown;
They have driven him out of his palace,
  And fluttered his house-flag down.

And a new king rules in his kingdom;
  For him are the gold gates closed;
And they think that he does not notice—
  Ah! Poor little king deposed!

—Will H. Ogilvie, in The Century.

A clairvoyant was fined $150 yesterday for telling fortunes. Yet President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay are still at large, notwithstanding the display of second sight that led them to have a naval force all ready for a Panama revolution before it happened.—New York World.

Uncle George—I don't like to say anything, Carrie, against your Mr. Fleeting. He appears to be a nice sort of chap, and there's no denying that he's

got lots of money, but how did he get it? They do say his ancestors were no better than pirates.

Carrie—And left him the money? Oh, I'm so glad! I was afraid you were going to say his father or grandfather worked for a living, or some disgraceful thing like that.—Boston Transcript.

A determined set has been made lately to prove the dishonesty of labor leaders, and it is quite likely that there is politics at the bottom of the move. There is far too much dishonesty in labor unions, and the tone of the average union in this respect is by no means what it should be, but this fact has nothing to do with the main issue between the unions and the owners of capital. Do the workmen get their fair share of the product? that is the question.—The Whim.

Mark Hanna will want a rest for a few weeks, but Tom Johnson will be up and at it in a few days, running for something else, so as to get an early start for the Spring election.—Chicago Evening News.

Farmer Greene—Oh, yes; there are several "gentlemen-farmers" around here.

The Fair Stranger—And what is a "gentleman-farmer?"

Farmer Greene—Oh, a feller that knows enough ter run a farm as it should be run, and rich enough ter stand th' loss!—Puck.

"Fine, wasn't it?" exclaimed Citiman, after the trombone soloist had finished his star performance. "That was really clever, eh?"

"O, shucks!" replied Citiman's country cousin. "He didn't fool me a little bit. That's one o' them trick horns. He didn't really swaller it."—Philadelphia Press.

BOOKS

SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY.

There are socialists, and socialists. This is not admitted, however, by the scientific socialists. They alone are the orthodox. So they claim. And within the sphere of organized socialism their predominant influence must be acknowledged, however reluctantly, by their heretic brethren.

Owing to the great diversity of opinion regarding socialism among people calling themselves socialists, outsiders are often hopelessly confused; and when referred for information to the literature of socialism they are appalled by its volume and apt to be all the more confused by the rich variety of its contradictions. This makes particularly welcome the little volume recently issued by Charles H. Kerr & Company, of Chicago (price 50 cents), entitled "Feuerbach. The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy."

The little book is a translation from Frederick Engels, by Austin Lewis, who contributes a critical introduction. Engels's work is a very compact but lucid review of the philosophy of Hegel as modified by Feuerbach, especially with reference to its development into the materialistic socialism of Engels and Marx. The old Greek theory that there is no Being, but an everlasting Becoming, is here worked out in modern guise, with the inevitable reductio ad absurdum in sight, but unperceived by the author. In this philosophy of infinite becoming without infinite being, of ever-changing form without an ever-present essence, of expression without existence, of manifestation without a dominant idea to be manifested, scientific socialism is shown to be rooted.

To grasp Engels's thought as presented in this little volume is to acquire a clearer understanding of the socialist movement. The tendency of the book is to attract to the movement those minds that trace the intellectual and moral phenomena of the universe to senseless matter and unreasoning motion as their origin, while it will repel those who recognize in these phenomena the immanence of a rational and beneficent force.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"The Brotherhood of Man," a lecture by G. F. Rinehart, of Newton, Ia. Price, 25 cents.

—The Chicago Traction Question, by Henry Demarest Lloyd. Distributing agent, George Waite Pickett, 324 Dearborn street, Chicago.

—"Poor? A New Political Standard for a New Democracy for a Millionaire Age," by A. N. Unknown. New York: Continental Publishing Co., 24 Murray street. To be reviewed.

—"A Short History of Monks and Monasteries," by Alfred Wesley Wishart, sometime Fellow in Church History in the University of Chicago. With an exhaustive note on the Philippine Friars. Pp. 462. Price, $1.50 net; postage 12 cents additional. Trenton, N. J.; Albert Brandt. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

In the International Socialist Review for November, there is an excellent short article on materialism, by Chas. H. Chase. Eugene V. Debs considers the relation of the Negro to socialism.

The opening article of the Arena for November is by B. O. Flower, one of the editors, who asks a question that Americans may have to ponder upon too late if they neglect to consider it in time. "Is the Republic Passing?" is Mr. Flower's question. He does not answer Yes or No; but after a suggestive discussion of the subject he concludes that "the republic is in the balance," and that only self-sacrificing patriotism can save it.

The Single Tax Review, autumn number, begins with an appreciation of Hamlin Garland's literary work, by Grace Isabel Colbron. A reminiscence by James Love; an account of Fairhope Colony, by J. Bellanger; an inquiry into the future of free trade, by Thomas Scanlon, and free trade in money, by Whidden Graham, are among the other contributions which comprise an account by J. B. Vining, of the single tax in Ohio politics. Two portraits embellish the number—one of Hamlin Garland and the other of John Z. White, the single tax lecturer and debater.

In the November number of the North American Review, President Merrill, of Colgate university, writes against football in a different spirit from that of most who attack the game. He asks whether it is good sport, and answers in the negative. "It would seem," he says, "that a word of warning and protest should be heard, and that any game that has so many elements of unfairness and unmanliness should not occupy the first place in the esteem of American youth." President Merrill evidently agrees with those who consider the football debauch to be a positive injury to the promotion of clean and healthy athletics.

J. H. D.

Testimony to the corruption in public life grows apace. Mr. Ray Stannard Baker, in November McClure's, quotes District Attorney Jerome as follows: "Every one who has studied our public life is appalled by the corruption that confronts him on every side. It goes through every department of the national, State, and local government. And this corruption in public life is a mere reflection of the sordidness of private life." In fact, the two most important articles in this number of the magazine bear out the same thought; for in addition to Mr. Baker's article, we have Mr. Steffens writing about New York politics. The number, as a whole, is an excellent one. The Sabbath School by Eugene Wood, cleverly illustrated by Frost, is a delicate piece of humor that will be most fully appreciated by "those who have been there." J. H. D.

The new number of the Edinburg Review, for October, has an article on Modern Spiritualism, which concludes that "we are not convinced that any new revelation, or any scrap of scientific proof of the continuance of human personality beyond the grave, has been brought to light in the last fifty years," and that "one is almost inclined to set aside the whole work of the Society for Psychical Research as baffled by a hopeless fog of imposture and credulous folly." This is of course, the conclusion to be expected from the Edinburgh's review of Myers's extensive work—for the Edinburgh is nothing if not orthodoxly sceptical—and no one need be deterred by this criticism from reading Myers and drawing one's own conclusions. There seems no doubt that the society is painstaking and sincere in its work.

J. H. D.

The Pilgrim for November has a number of good things, the best of course being Mr. Abbot's own part, which contains an appreciative notice of the late Henry Demarest Lloyd, with a portrait. There is also a portrait of J. Z. White, in connection with a notice of his single tax lectures to be given under the auspices of the Henry

NOTICE TO READERS.

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

NOW WATCH THE FEARLESS PRESIDENT.

The Giant—Hum! Here's news for you, Mr. President. Justice Harlan says Congress has power to prohibit inter-state commerce in any kind of merchandise which is not expressly protected by the Constitution. It can therefore prohibit trade in Trust-made goods, you see. Now's the time for those shackles, Theodore. I'm just dying to see you put 'em on me!

George Association of Chicago. "Mr. White," says the editor, "is to be sent through the country, after a series of lectures in Chicago, to discuss current economic topics in the light of the single-tax theory. He goes out, not as a partisan at all, but simply as a popular and logical exponent of a growing economical programme. Indeed, he has never been identified with politics in the partisan sense, having until within a very few weeks worked continually at his trade as a printer. Largely self-educated, he is a most graceful and convincing speaker."

J. H. D.

—

Two articles in the New York Independent of November 5 make this a notable number, Jack London's The Class Struggle, and the leading editorial. Mr. London points out that in America a veritable class struggle is on, all optimistic assertions to the contrary notwithstanding. He shows that we no longer have the safety-valve of an expanding frontier to give something like an equality of opportunity to capable members of the working class. "The gateway of opportunity after opportunity," he says, "has been closed, and closed for all time." It is a pity that he does not show that there is a way to prevent the closing of the gateways for all time—that there is a way in fact to open gateways far this side of western frontiers. The editorial referred to is a strong presentation of the need of a religious revival. "We live," says the writer, "further and further down in the world of physical struggle;" which suggests the question, whether it is not the fearful stress of modern social conditions that is killing the souls of men, and whether therefore the revival of true religion may not be necessarily involved in the great cause of economic justice.

J. H. D.

The Public

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

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

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