The Public

Sixth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1903. Number 294.

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 Chicago street car strikers or any of their friends to condemn Mayor Harrison for his use of the police force to preserve the public peace and protect private property is folly and worse than folly.

—

It is worse than folly, because the public peace must be preserved and private property must be protected. This is Mayor Harrison's first duty, no matter how much he might be inclined to shrink from it nor whom he may offend. The question is not even debatable, except with men who deny the utility of government altogether. Whoever believes in government at all, must believe in utilizing its powers to the fullest for the preservation of the peace and the protection of property. Peace and security are the primary conditions of prosperity and progress, and without these conditions personal rights of all kinds would be frequently destroyed and perpetually in jeopardy.

—

This does not imply that the use of policemen as servants of the street car company should be tolerated. If it is true that policemen have collected fares, adjusted trolleys, or otherwise taken the places of the strikers, both they and their superiors who have ordered or permitted it, are culpable. The city authorities have no right to furnish "strike breakers," in the guise of policemen, to employers who cannot or will not come to terms amicably with their men. Peace and protection, not "strike-breaking," are what the police are bound to secure. But this they must secure at all hazards and at all costs.

—

Even if it were not worse than folly to condemn Mayor Harrison for using the police to preserve the peace and protect property, such condemnation would be nothing short of folly. By condemning him for this performance of his manifest duty, a weak attack upon the street car company is substituted for a strong one. The Chicago City Railway company has a right to call upon the authorities for police protection when its property is assailed by mobs. The public have a right to call upon the authorities to preserve the peace when riot threatens. No condemnation of the authorities for responding to those demands can appeal with any force to a sane public opinion. But what shall be thought of a public service corporation which provokes the necessity for such action on the part of the authorities, as the Chicago City Railway company has wantonly done?

—

In a great street car strike ill temper is inevitable on both sides. On the side of the corporation it finds vent in subtle ways. Professional "strike breakers," the hired thugs of detective agencies, are imported to play in the role of "honest workingmen" seeking "honest work for an honest living" and being denied this natural right by "vicious strikers,"—a trick of corporations which furnishes material for platitudinous editorials in plutocratic papers. Other tricks even less excusable and more subtle may be played by that party to a strike which fights with money instead of numbers. On the other side, strikers or their friends are apt to vent their temper with bricks and cobblestones. That these violent attacks are expressions of momentary temper and not of malice or deliberate lawlessness, is evident enough. If the strikers were deliberately lawless, they could wreck car lines beyond possibility of restoration for weeks. That they confine their disorders to personal assaults and petty obstructions makes it clear that they are irritated rather than malicious. But the real point is that disorders of this kind are inevitable in a great strike, while human nature is as it is, and that public service corporations which permit strikes that they can prevent, betray such reckless defiance of public rights as to be unworthy of any favorable consideration from public opinion.

—

The only possible excuse for permitting a strike, which can be pleaded by any public service corporation, is that the strike could not be prevented without concessions that would be unjust or unreasonable. But that is an excuse which the Chicago City Railway company cannot plead with reference to the strike of its employes now in progress. Of the merits of the controversy between this company and its employes, the general public cannot judge. But of one thing the general public can judge. The fact is undisputed that the men offered to submit the controversy to arbitrators. That offer the company rejected. The offer still stands, and the company still rejects it. In no other way can the public ascertain the merits of the controversy than by the decision of arbitrators. Yet the company has persistently refused to arbitrate. Had it agreed to arbitrate, there would have been no strike, no violence, no rioting, no calling of the police from their ordinary duties of holding the criminal classes in check, no discommoding of the public. But the

Digitized by Google

company refused to avert the inconveniences and dangers that are inevitable in a strike, though it could have done so by the reasonable and fair expedient of submitting its controversy with the men to arbitration.

—

The employer who refuses to arbitrate differences with his men must be presumed by public opinion to be conscious of having the weaker side of the controversy. If his business is a private one, the fact that he prefers to fall back upon the strength of his position as employer rather than the merits of his controversy as a man, is none of the public's affair. It may have its own opinion of him and there an end. But if his business is charged with public obligations in return for special privileges, the case is different. He has no right to involve the community he has contracted to serve, in the inconvenience, the disorders, and the dangerous disarrangements of a strike, merely to gratify his own pride of power. He must either be in the right and ready to prove it before arbitrators, or he must bear the odium of having wantonly caused the strike.

—

That is the position of the Chicage City Railway company. As the matter now stands, public opinion must hold this corporation responsible to the public for its strike and for all that the strike has naturally involved or may involve. By refusing to arbitrate, this company has been recklessly indifferent to the rights of the public, and under no circumstances should the public ever trust it again. It should be trusted with a new franchise no more than an exposed "grafter" should be trusted with a new office. The alderman or other public official, from Mayor down, who even negotiates voluntarily with a public service corporation so indifferent to its public obligations, for an extension of its privileges, may be justly suspected of disloyalty to the public interests. Wholly irrespective of all other considerations, the action of the Chicago City Railway company with reference to arbitrating the controversy with its employes should be considered as a sufficient reason for discharging it from the public service at the earliest possible moment.

The Turner case (p. 498) is revealing the anti-anarchist law which Congress enacted last Winter as a menace to personal liberty of the most extraordinary character. The old "alien and sedition laws," which have been a hissing and a by-word for a century, were very pearls of liberty in comparison with this so-called anti-anarchist law. To doubters we commend a perusal of the procedure in the Turner case, which we quote in another column from the New York Daily News. It is doubtful if even in Turkey, much less in Russia, the material for a story so significant of absolutism could be gathered.

—

But the worst is not told there. Besides what is told there and what we described last week, we find this law a complete reversal of the American theory of arrests. Except in time of war, or when the writ of habeas corpus is suspended, the executive department of the general government is supposed to have no power of arrest. Think of the anomaly of a Presidential order of arrest in time of peace! Orders of arrest are judicial writs, issued upon proof duly made, and subject to judicial investigation. But under this law the order of arrest is issued by a member of the President's cabinet. It may be issued by him against any alien who has not lived in this country more than three years. The person arrested can be immediately taken from any part of the country to Ellis Island; be there examined privately without witnesses or counsel, by three men who are appointed and can be dismissed by the cabinet officer issuing the warrant; and if two of them report to this cabinet officer that they believe the arrested man "disbelieves in all organized government," the cabinet officer can send him back to the country of his birth without allowing him to see friends or family or to settle his business affairs. From this decision there is no appeal to any court or jury. The practical result will be to put every alien who may take part in political or trade union agitation against the policy of the Administration, at the mercy of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor for three years after arrival, and open a door to blackmail by Federal officers.

—

We have called this cabinet officer's order of arrest a "lettre de cachet," something the use of which helped mightily to bring on the French Revolution. Is it badly named? When the President can arbitrarily arrest and deport any alien of not more than three years' residence, seizing him anywhere in the country and depriving him of every legal right except a habeas corpus hearing before a judge whose hopes of promotion depend upon the President's good will, how long before he will be able arbitrarily to arrest citizens, and deport or incarcerate them at his own pleasure? Since Destiny began to determine Duty in this country, we have traveled far and fast toward the Gehenna of popular liberties. Each stage has made the next one easier to reach, for Gehenna lies at the bottom of a hill.

A brief and very clear statement of the present extraordinary attitude of the United States toward Panama has been made by Charles Francis Adams, the eminent publicist of Boston. We reprint it in the Miscellany department. All that Mr. Adams says is true and sound. But he needs to make a further explanation. He states that the action of our government "is avowedly exceptional—that is, something that this nation will not justify by any of the rules of law, of international usage." This implies not only that the case is admitted by

Digitized by Google

the Administration to be exceptional, but also that the Administration offers no reasons which, under international law, would justify it as an exception. But that is not the fact. The Administration does seek to justify, and it offers reasons that are plausible. What men like Mr. Adams should do is to expose the flimsiness of those reasons.

—

The "avowed exception" is justified, according to the Administration, by the exceptional circumstances. As the argument runs, the obligations and rights of the United States with reference to Panama are different from those of any nation with reference to any other territory whatever; consequently, no precedent can be cited nor can this case make a precedent. It is absolutely exceptional; and not arbitrarily, but out of the peculiar circumstances.

—

And what are the circumstances? Simply these. The United States are bound by treaty to preserve the peace along the Panama railroad. This peace was threatened by the seceders. If they had fought the general government of Colombia, the United States would have been obliged to interfere against them. But the general government of Colombia did not resist, and the seceding government has gained full control of Panama. This reverses the duty of the United States. If the Colombian government should now invade Panama, it would itself be the peace breaker; and against it the power of the United States government would have to be exerted in order to preserve freedom of traffic on the trans-Isthmian railway. Meanwhile, no government exists in Panama except the seceding government, and the United States has been obliged to recognize it in order to secure protection for Americans and their property. Of course this enables the United States to deal with willing Panama instead of reluctant Colombia, in the matter of the Isthmian canal; but that is only a fortunate incident. It might have been otherwise. Suppose Colombia had been willing and Panama reluctant; nevertheless the United States would have been obliged to recognize Panama in order to protect the railway.

—

With any other Colombian territory that might have seceded we should have been bound by international law to withhold recognition until Colombia herself had agreed. But not so with Panama, where we are bound by treaty to protect the railway. This peculiar circumstance imposes upon us the necessity, not in defiance of international law but in harmony with it, of making an exception to international usage in the matter of recognizing the secession of Panama as an accomplished fact. The peace of the railroad is the point.

—

What has Mr. Adams to say to that explanation which the Administration makes? Does it bring the "avowed exception" within the purview of international law? Is the case different from that of seceding South Carolina, because foreign nations had no railroad to protect in South Carolina and we have one to protect in seceding Panama? If so, would it make any difference if the Panama secession happens to have been organized under the inspiration and encouragement of the United States? Or would that fact also be only a fortunate incident? We trust that Mr. Adams will not continue to ignore the explanations of the Administration. He must not be allowed to evade its defense of this "avowed exception," namely, that it is exceptional in practice only, but entirely harmonious with international law in principle, under the circumstances—there being a railroad to protect.

When Henry George visited Great Britain as a lecturer for the second time, he spoke chiefly in support of the single tax programme, whereas he had emphasized on his first visit the doctrine of the abolition of land ownership. Supposing that these two ideas were essentially different, the British press congratulated Mr. George upon having receded from his former radical position! In fact he had not receded. All he had done was to emphasize method instead of principle, as the British editors would have known had they taken the pains to compare any of his speeches on his first visit with any of those on his second. A similar misunderstanding seems now to have influenced the press of New England, notably the leading papers of Boston.

—

These papers have recently displayed great interest in a dispute between the president of the New England Single Tax league, Mr. C. B. Fillebrown, and some of his associates, as to the meaning of the single tax movement. Mr. Fillebrown takes the ground that the single tax movement does not contemplate the abolition of private property in land, but only the appropriation to public use of ground rent. This is really not a difference of principle but only a difference between principle and method.

—

If all ground rent were taken for public use, private ownership of land would not exist. For ownership of anything implies ownership not only of the thing but of its increment of value. Consequently, to take the increment of value is to abolish ownership of the thing. But to abolish ownership of anything is by no means the same as abolishing possession of it and enjoyment of its use. Land could be possessed, used and enjoyed just as it is now, though the ground rent went not to the possessor and user but into the public treasury. Ownership would be abolished, but not possession and beneficial use. To argue that the taxation of ground rent is not inconsistent with ownership, because some ground rent is taxed now, has in it some dangerous possibilities. It might be applied as well to houses and

Digitized by Google

house rent, and thus amount to an assault upon the private ownership of houses. The essential idea of the single tax is that such things as building sites cannot be owned rightfully by anybody, and that such things as houses are owned rightfully by their producers or by persons deriving title from their producers. Merged in this idea is the further one that although such things as building sites cannot be rightfully owned, they can be held rightfully in perpetuity provided precautions are taken to prevent partiality. This is prevented if the holding of the sites by individuals is subject to the reserved right of the community to ground rent. For, under that reservation, whatever the holder of a superior location gained in position he would pay for in ground rent. It is upon this principle that the single tax would take the ground rent for public use and not tax house rent and the like at all.

—

There are two ways of describing that purpose as to land. We may say that land ownership is wrong, and that tenure should be a mere title to perpetual possession, subject to the payment to the public of ground rent as a tax; or we may say that land ownership is right, provided it be under a reservation that the public may collect the ground rent as a tax. The difference is verbal only. There is no difference in principle or substance. Yet this verbal difference makes it desirable, no doubt, to vary the form of expression according to the prejudices of one's audience. For a single taxer to declare in favor of land ownership before an audience accustomed to regard land as God's gift to all men, would be folly. He could not possibly secure attention, after that, to an explanation of the single tax method of securing equality of rights to the enjoyment of this gift. It would be equal folly for him to demand the abolition of land ownership before an audience accustomed to regard land as legitimate private property. Before such an audience his wise course would be to defend land ownership, with the reservation of ground rent to public use. There would be no deviation in principle, and the variation in approach would be only an exhibition of horse sense.

—

It is true enough that Henry George did not mean land value when he wrote against private property in land. He was singularly apt in expressing what he meant; and with him as with few others his expressions may be safely accepted as declaring his meaning. What he meant was that the institution of property in land, which treats property in land the same as property in other things, is wrong. Yet George clearly preferred individualism in land-occupancy to communism; and to secure that system he advocated a possessory title which should be as full, complete, and perfect as ownership—in every respect but one. Since ownership of anything implies ownership of its increment of value, he differentiated ownership of land from ownership of other things, by assigning the increment of its value to the public. Whether land tenure were called "ownership" or "possession" would have made no difference to him, so long as the ground rent was appropriated by the public in lieu of all other taxes.

Whenever President Roosevelt grows eloquent over the beauties of personal holiness, his enthusiasm recalls, for some reason or other, the story of the little girl who prayed: "O, Lord, make Martha Smith a good little girl, so that I may take her playthings away from her and she won't make any fuss about it."

Extremes meet when Hanna Republican papers and Grover Cleveland Democratic papers unite in abusing William J. Bryan. But they are like the extremes that meet when a dog puts his tail into his mouth. Both extremes belong to the same dog.

THE POTENTIAL CHECKMATE OF MONOPOLY.

The promise of social betterment lies in the disposition of the masses to do right. The fact that we so often do wrong is only a symptom of weakness, not of chronic disease. Given that we know what is right—know it entirely in all its aspects and interrelations with things—we will do it. The undisputed fact of human progress proves the dominant power of conscience; proves that we lean to the side of right.

The opponents of reform recognize and make use of this for the purpose of misleading society into wrong doing; for well they know that "as a man thinketh, so is he." The most heinous offenses against right principles have been perpetrated by sincere, prayerful men, who thought they were doing God service. But the disposition to do right remains, and, with the expansion of knowledge, society corrects its errors. In the light of this fact of history, how foolish to assume that the prevailing, in any field of experience, is to be the permanent.

We think our progress slow. True enough, it is slow. But why? Is it because men do not wish to do right? The psalmist exclaims: "I said, in my haste, all men are liars." So the seer, the reformer, in his impatience, makes sweeping charges against society that, in his sober moments, he knows to be unmerited. It is hard to stand upon the mountain tops, in full view of the promised land, and, beckoning society forward, realize at last that as for you, you must die where you stand!

The fact is that society changes slowly because it must be sure that it is right before departing from the customary. And it takes a long time to fire the beacon lights on all the hilltops; and a longer time still to learn to distinguish between these and the false lights kindled by the beneficiaries of prevailing conditions.

Because these latter know man's disposition to do the right thing, to be fair toward his fellowman, they never fail to denounce each newly discovered truth as false, and its practical application as involving that which is unfair.

Digitized by Google

May it not be best, after all, that this is true? Because it puts upon the reformer the burden of demonstrating the rectitude of his scheme, and so acts as a preventative of hasty, ill-advised change.

Submitting to the conditions thus imposed, let us briefly inquire as to both the potentiality, and the righteousness, from the standpoint of fair-dealing, of the single tax as the means of public defense against the hardships arising from monopoly. If the single-tax plan shall not bear this test we must not expect its adoption, and we ought not to wish it.

The maxim of commerce is: Charge all that the traffic will bear. Is this a righteous maxim? Let us see. Will a man sell his horse for less than he can get for it? Will he work for less wages than he can get? Man intuitively feels that it is right for him to accept all he can get for what he imparts. Not till men generally shall consent to sell property or service for less than this should we expect railroad companies, for instance, to sell their services for less than they can get for them.

In claiming the right to dispose of our property or services to the best advantage to ourselves, we necessarily concede the commercial validity and the ethical character of this maxim, Charge all that the traffic will bear.

How hopelessly futile, then, to plead for mercy to the public at the hands of a railroad company. Why should a railroad company be asked to do what you and I would not do, namely, to serve for a lower price than it can get? If a man, having a soul, will not do a certain thing, will a corporation, which has no soul, do it?

But, aside from this ethical aspect of the question, the undoubted fact is that the railroad companies will always charge all that the traffic will bear. And the railroads are inevitable monopolies. What then? Has the public no means of defense?

After Columbus had stood the egg on end, it was an easy matter for the spectators to do it. A successful example is a pretty good thing to follow.

Why do the railroads charge all that the traffic will bear? If we put the question in another form it will fairly answer itself. Thus: Why do the railroads charge all they can get? Evidently because they can get it.

Let the public, then, profit by the example of the railroads, and tax all that the site will bear—the site, in this case, being the rights-of-way, terminal and other railway land values.

The single tax is, potentially, the sufficient and scientific checkmate for monopoly. Furthermore, the principle is in perfect harmony with the purest ethics—it is a righteous principle; nay, more than that, it is the righteous principle of taxation.

The process of demonstrating the efficacy of the single tax as a defense against monopoly will also manifest its unqualified agreement with moral standards.

At the outset, as an indication of its probable efficacy, we may note that the monopolists, against whom the single tax is aimed, are the most conspicuous objectors to it. And, as an indication of its moral character, the monopolist, who is the originator of that impiously defiant phrase, "The public be damned!" is the most conspicuous of those who denounce the single tax as being unfair!

Now, since the monopolist, when the righteousness of his exorbitant profits is called in question, vociferously devotes the public to damnation, why does he object to the single tax? Is it because he wishes to defend the despised public against injury? In the whole world of industry, the public has but one enemy; and that solitary enemy is Monopoly. Does the monopolist, probably, object to the single tax out of concern for the welfare of his victim, the public?

We rather incline to the opinion that his aversion to the single tax springs from the same basic sentiment that prompts him to charge all that the traffic will bear, and to express his real regard for the public in defiant imprecations when it demurs.

From every standpoint, therefore, the fact that the monopolist opposes the single tax proves that he fears its effect—not upon the object of his contempt, the public, but—upon himself.

His fears are well grounded. Under free competitive conditions the traffic in transportation would not bear a charge in excess of that for equal service in other fields of industry; because, if the charges for transportation should rise abnormally high, additional capital and labor would flow to this more inviting field, and their competition for employment would naturally increase until the special inducement should cease to exist—that is until the profits in transportation should be no greater than in other business. Under these circumstances, to charge all that the traffic would bear would be simply to charge what the traffic was worth.

Thus, human nature, free to act under the constraining impulse of its divine law, would exemplify the perfect ideal of economic righteousness—namely, of value for value, service for service.

To charge all that the traffic will bear is precisely the right thing to do. The wrong that now prevails is in our inadequate taxation of the enormous land values of the railroad companies. Deduct economic rent from the income of the railroads, and there would remain simply wages and interest, which, under the single tax, would constitute all that the traffic would bear.

It is a mistake to suppose that the entire income of monopolies is monopolistic. Only the income from that factor that is monopolized is monopolistic. In other words, that portion of income beyond what would arise under free competition is to be credited to the monopolized factor. Now, the railroads cannot monopolize labor; neither can they monopolize capital. But they can and do monopolize land — that particular land which alone can be economically used in transportation. Therefore, the excessive return to railroad monopoly is land Rent.

Now, since the railroads always charge all that the traffic will bear, any increase in taxation upon their land values would necessarily be paid from that portion of their income arising from rent. They could not advance their tariff, because they are already charging all that the traffic will bear; which means simply that any greater or less charge would result in diminished returns.

Digitized by Google

To tax all that the site would bear would have the effect to place all traffic upon an equal basis.

If the returns to general competitive industry are 100, while the returns to transportation are 200, it must be because of the greater land values of the railroads. We say it must be because of this. The reason that we know this, is, that we know that the rolling stock, rails, ties, brick and mortar, etc., etc., can be duplicated at the price paid for those now in use, and that, if these were the only things needed, capital and labor would flow to this highly profitable field until competition should have cut the returns down to the point that would render this industry no more inviting than others; and we know, furthermore, that the land cannot be duplicated at the same price.

To compete successfully, a complete duplicate of the system would be necessary, which would far exceed the demand for service, and the result would be destructive to one or both railroads. This the existing road knows, and it knows, also, that so obvious is the fact that no competition would be attempted.

It is, then, the values of the terminal points, right-of-way and other lands enjoyed by the existing road that enable it to realize its excessive returns. Under free competition, as it prevails in other business, the returns are 100; but under the monopoly made possible by its ownership of the right-of-way, the railroad gets a return of 200. The extra 100 manifestly measures the value of its land in excess of that employed in general competitive industry; and if this extra value be taxed away from it, the railroad business will still be upon an equal footing with competitive business.

The public is the potential master of the situation. The railroads will, and of right ought to, charge all that the traffic will bear, because it is a step toward equity; and, besides, human nature can do no otherwise. The state ought to tax all that the site will bear, because it is the final step in order to equity: for this would land the railroad upon an economic equality with competitive business—which would be just.

We are apt to forget that rent is something that arises independently of the land-owner's will. The owner of a valuable piece of mineral land, for instance, could not prevent its rent-value even if he wished to. The advantage is there, whether the owner makes use of it or not. Somebody is willing to pay its value for the use of his advantageous land. The owner may let the land lie idle, but that does not destroy its value. He may give away the land, but that is merely a transfer of ownership; the rent-value remains attached to the land, appropriable at any time, and if the land were to be sold at public auction the unsuccessful bidders would compel the successful one to pay for the rent-value.

Now, the rent-value accrues inevitably, whether the owner uses the land or leases it to another. If the owner does not get the rent, it will be because he refuses what is offered him. Rent-values are marketable, the same as corn and cotton are marketable, and we cannot expect men to accept less than the market price for any of them. Now, the price of industrial products, as a whole, is made up of rent, wages and interest, and is modified by supply, relative to demand, rising as demand gains on supply, and falling as the supply increases relative to demand. Labor and capital increase with great rapidity, while the supply of land, relatively, diminishes rapidly; and as labor and capital cannot exist without land, they must inevitably pay, for the use of the latter, the rising price incident to declining supply in the presence of ever-increasing demand.

The steel monopoly, by buying outright a 60 years' supply of the limited area of accessible ore lands, in effect exhausts the supply instantly, to the extent of enabling it to charge the public for rent-values that otherwise would not arise for many years.

We make no complaint against the steel company; it is simply following a natural and righteous law—accepting the highest bid for the values that it controls. But we call the attention of the public to the obvious fact that unless the public accepts the highest bid made for the privilege that it imparts, the steel company will profit by the neglect, and the public will suffer accordingly.

The steel company ascertains how much the traffic will bear by means of advancing the price of its product as far as it can without incurring loss as the result of diminished consumption.

The public can ascertain the value of the privilege that it confers by means of raising the taxation as far as it can without incurring loss as the result of diminished use.

The steel company exerts the power that it finds itself possessed of, to the utmost limit consistent with its own interest, in total disregard of any other interest, and flings defiance in the face of the whining public, to boot.

The public should exert the power wherewith it is clothed, to the utmost limit consistent with its (everybody's) interest, and fling defiance in the baffled, beaten faces of all would-be monopolists, instead of whining in puerile impotency about "soulless corporations," while pusillanimously immolating its birthright upon the altar of archaic custom.

The single tax is the potential checkmate of monopoly, and precisely because it is so, all monopolists oppose it.

Of course, the monopolists alone cannot withstand "the onward sweep of truth and right." Their sole reliance is in dishonestly appealing to the public's sense of honor. So long as they can make the public believe that to defend itself against exploitation by the only potentially effective means to which it can possibly have recourse would be dishonorable, monopoly will thrive, for the public will not do what it believes to be dishonorable. But the public believes that no question is finally settled until it is settled right; and, furthermore, sooner or later, it solves its own problems. It will, by and by, reach the single tax problem; and then—"Attention Monopoly!—Checkmate!"

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

The old Filipino statesman spoke deliberately and in a tone of conviction. "There seems to be only one way to induce the Americans to recognize our government," he said, "but, unfortunately, it is impracticable for us to move to Panama and take arms against the Colombians." G. T. E.

Digitized by Google

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 19.

The Chicago street car strike (p. 503), which began on the 12th, has reached a critical stage—critical not alone to the parties to the controversy, but also to the general public.

—

This strike is the culmination of long drawn out negotiations between the Chicago City railway, controlling all the lines to the south and east of the Chicago river, and its employes. The employes claim that the corporation has taken advantage of the so-called "open shop" policy to undermine the union of street car men, and to enforce onerous rules which are not only oppresive but operate also to extend hours and depress wages. On the 1st the negotiations were brought to an issue by the positive refusal of the directors of the company to consider specific demands made by the men. Thereupon the union officials decided on the 3d to take a referendum vote on the question of going upon strike, and on the 5th and 6th this vote was taken. The polls closed at 4 o'clock on the morning of the 6th, showing a vote of 1,605 for the strike, 153 against it, and 345 neutral.

—

Upon ascertaining this result, President Mahon, for the union, employed William Prentiss as counsel, and under his advice the contemplated strike was delayed with a view to securing a further conference with the officers of the company. A meeting with the manager was acordingly arranged for the 9th. At this meeting the union offered arbitration. The manager of the company asked time until the 14th, five days, to consider this offer. Believing that the request for time was to enable the company to import "strike-breakers," the union refused it, demanding a reply on or before the 11th at 6 o'clock in the evening. Compliance with this demand being refused, the strike began at 4 o'clock in the morning of the 12th.

—

Meanwhile, the State board of arbitration had endeavored to prevent the strike by means of arbitration. The chairman of this board and another of its members, having first secured the assent of the president of the union, conferred with the manager of the company on the 7th with a view to arranging a conference between the board and the disputants. The reported interview was as follows:

Chairman of the Board—"The State Board of Arbitration has come to you to learn if a meeting cannot be arranged between the board, the officials of your railway and the union men in the interests of peace."

Manager of the Company—"There is no reason for such a conference. I have already arranged a meeting with the men for Monday. I do not understand, however, what business it is of the State board of arbitration to interfere in matters of this kind. You are outside parties and we cannot recognize you."

Chairman—"But you must understand, Mr. McCullough, that we are officials of the State of Illinois, and under the law it is our duty to offer both parties to the controversy our services as conciliators."

Manager—"But you have no business in this matter."

Chairman—"I presume you know that the law provides that in the event of a strike such as this would be that we are empowered to make an investigation."

Manager—"The law does not apply to street railways. It only applies to steam railroads. Furthermore, this controversy is between the Chicago City Railway company and its employes, and no outsider has any right to interfere."

Member of the Board—"But we represent the public. The public has an interest in this matter, and if a strike occurs we will certainly make an investigation. At the present time we can only plead with you to hold a conference with the men to see if the trouble cannot be averted."

Manager—"As I said before, I have already arranged such a meeting."

The subsequent meeting referred to by the manager was that of the 9th, noted above, at which the union proferred arbitration and the manager asked five days' time in which to reply.

—

When the strike began on the 12th, 2,200 employes quit work, and the attempt of the company to operate its lines completely failed. The people of the south side were consequently without transportation facilities except as they were able to reach the elevated road and the Illinois Central. Some blockading was caused by incompetent motormen and some rioting occurred. It was then decided by the city authorities to man the cars with policemen. This was done on the 13th. It was irritating to the strikers, because, as they assert, the policemen were used not merely to preserve the peace, but to aid in the operation of the cars. Little advance was made, however, for the cars were run only at irregular intervals and with few or no passengers other than the uniformed policemen, whose presence in such large numbers on the street cars had left the city without police protection elsewhere. This unsatisfactory situation continued through the 13th and 14th. On the 15th, with a large party of "strike-breakers" housed and guarded in barracks, the company undertook to run its cars regularly, but as yet it has not succeeded. The strike is still on in full force.

—

The question of using police in connection with the street car strike came before the Chicago city council on the 16th. Alderman Johnson offered a resolution calling for an opinion of the corporation counsel as to the legality of placing "a dozen or more" policemen on the street cars and leaving "great stretches of city territory without protection." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 36 to 29. Corporation Counsel Tolman has replied in an opinion in which he says:

There is no statute, nor any principle of the common law, nor any decision of any court, holding that the police may not escort a street car, nor ride thereon for the purpose of preserving the peace or preventing the destruction of property. Street cars operating upon public streets partake of the public character of such streets. Such cars are public places within the meaning of that term as used in the law. If the mayor deems it necessary to put the police force on street cars operating on the public streets the existence of the necessity affords him a power as broad as the need.

—

At the same session of the city council, November 16th, the following resolutions relative to the strike situation were adopted:

That this council heartily indorses the measures adopted by the Mayor to preserve order and protect property in the city.

That it is the sense of the City Council of Chicago that the public welfare of the whole community will be best pro-

Digitized by Google

tected by a speedy settlement of the present Chicago City Railway strike.

That His Honor the Mayor use his best endeavors, either in union with influential citizens or with members of this Council, to secure a submission to arbitration of the questions at issue between the Chicago City Railway Company and its striking employes.

That the Mayor is hereby requested to prepare a statement or proclamation setting forth the facts with reference to the amounts of money paid or to be paid by the City of Chicago for claims for destruction of property during strikes or riots in the past years and that the Chicago newspapers be requested to publish the same, with the opinion of the Corporation Counsel as provided for in the Johnson resolution.

Pursuant to the authority conferred by these resolutions Mayor Harrison has appointed a mediation committee of eight aldermen, as follows: Palmer, Finn, Jackson, Maypole, Eidmann, Scully, Bradley and Ruxton. The company was invited by the Mayor on the 17th to send representatives to meet this committee at his office. A meeting was accordingly held, and others have followed it; but no result is yet reported.

Greater impetus has been given by the street car strike to the movement in Chicago for immediate municipal ownership (p. 486) of the street car system. The chairman of the sub-committee on franchises of the transportation committee of the city council, Alderman Bennett, having announced that the sub-committee would report the "tentative" Chicago city railway ordinance (p. 486) to the full committee at the city hall on the 14th, and that all civic organizations would be invited to participate in a public discussion of its provisions, the Chicago Federation of Labor issued the following call:

In compliance with the request duly made by delegates to the Chicago Federation of Labor, there will be a special meeting of the Federation in the corridors of the council chamber of the Chicago city hall at two p. m., Saturday, November 14, for the purpose of conveying to the local transportation committee of the Chicago city council the repeatedly expressed demands of Chicago organized labor that no street railway franchise whatever shall be either granted or renewed by the Chicago city council; that the local transportation committee shall therefore confine its efforts to the devising of means for the bringing about of immediate municipal ownership and operation; and that, in the meantime, the street railway cars shall be operated under revocable license only. The legislative committee of the Federation will be on the floor to take special charge of the presenting of the above views and demands.

This call was responded to by a large number of people, but no public meeting of the transportation committee was held. The report of the sub-committee was made informally and an adjournment was taken without discussion. Arrangements have since been made by the committee for subjecting the proposed ordinance to public discussion during the coming two weeks. At the meeting of the council on the 16th a resolution of the Chicago Federation of Labor urging the council committee on local transportation to advertise at once for bidders to operate the lines of the Chicago City Railway company, a resolution that no franchise be granted which does not provide for a lower fare between 5 and 7 o'clock morning and evening and for a reduction of fare by tickets, and an ordinance for licensing each street car, were referred to the committee on local transportation.

While the Chicago Street Railway company is thus seeking an extension of franchise and struggling with a labor strike, the Union Traction company, controlling the northern and western lines, is planning for legal advantages under the 99-year franchise (p. 468), under which both the Chicago City Railway and the Union Traction companies claim extraordinary privileges not expiring until 1958. The Union Traction company is in the hands of receivers appointed by Judge Grosscup of the Federal court. The city having refused permits to the company to do work on the streets (p. 248), Judge Grosscup granted an injunction restraining it from interfering with the company, and the hearing on that injunction is set for the 30th. This raises the question of the validity and effect of the 99-year franchise, for the shorter franchise expired July 30th. Further in assertion of their claims under the 99-year franchise, Judge Grosscup's receivers applied to the commissioner of public works, as for a right, for permits to equip some of their lines with electric power, thus challenging the contention of the city that even if the 99-year franchise is valid it authorizes the use of horse power only. Their application was referred to Corporation Counsel Tolman for an opinion, and on the 16th he transmitted his opinion to the city council. Mr. Tolman holds that the 99-year act did not extend the companies' franchises in the city streets, but at most only extended the life of the companies, and that consequently the application of the receivers cannot be granted except as a favor from the city council. The commissioner of public works accordingly notified Judge Grosscup's receivers on the 17th that he could not grant their application. Following this refusal the receivers asked that the permits be granted pending a legal determination of the legal questions involved, the proposed new construction and equipment to come down if the courts decide against the receivers and their claims under the 99-year act. The corporation counsel repeated, in answer, his previous suggestion that the receivers go to the city council with the matter.

In Cleveland the traction reform which Mayor Johnson has been promoting in the face of many injunctions for nearly three years has been confronted with another injunction. The question there has taken the form of a franchise for a road to be operated for a 3-cent fare, the city having no legislative authority to adopt municipal ownership. When last we reported the progress of this low fare movement (p. 393) Mayor Johnson spoke of the possibility of further injunctions. None were applied for, however, while the election was pending. But within a fortnight afterward the threatened injunction came. More than half of the 3-cent fare road had been completed, and work was still going on, when it was stopped on the 12th of November by a restraining order from Judge Dissette, granted in the suit of a resident of Denison avenue. Hearing was set for the 16th. On that day the parties arranged to postpone the hearing to the 30th. an injunction to issue meanwhile, but with the reservation that 2,000

Digitized by Google

more feet of track might be laid in the interval. The company's answer in this law suit shows that the company has expended $30,000 on the Denison avenue 3-cent fare line, and is under a bond of $25,000 for completing it; that 7,240 feet of double track has been laid, and 2,000 more of single track; and that 3,700 linear feet of pavement has been laid to a width of sixteen feet.

A further step in the process of transforming Panama into an independent nation (p. 501) has been taken. On the 13th President Roosevelt formally received Philippe Bunau-Varilla as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary from Panama to the United States. Bunau-Varilla was likewise received by the French ambassador at Washington on the 17th. On the same day two special commissioners from Panama—Dr. Manuel E. Amador and Frederico Boyd—arrived at New York. J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. have been appointed fiscal agents in the United States for the Republic of Panama.

—

The Colombian government has addressed the following protest to the United States Senate:

The government and people of Colombia have been painfully surprised at the notification by the minister of the United States that the government at Washington had hastened to recognize the government consequent upon a barracks coup in the department of Panama. The bonds of sincere and uninterrupted friendship which unite the two governments and the two peoples; the solemn obligation undertaken by the American Union in a public treaty to guarantee the sovereignty and property of Colombia in the Isthmus of Panama; the protection which the citizens of that country enjoy and will continue to enjoy among us; the traditional principles of the American government in opposition to secession movements; the good faith which has characterized that great people in its international relations; the manner in which the revolution was brought about and the precipitancy of its recognition, make the government and people of Colombia hope that the senate of the United States will admit its obligation to assist us in maintaining the integrity of our territory and in repressing that insurrection which is not even the result of a popular feeling. In thus demanding justice, Colombia appeals to the dignity and honor of the American Senate and people. It is to be hoped the petition for justice which Colombia makes to the American people will be favorably received by a sound public opinion among the sons of that country.

—

On the 16th an address upon the same subject was cabled by the Colombian government to Great Britain. As cabled back to this country from London on the same day, the gist of this address is as follows:

"The main responsibility for the secession of Panama lies on the United States government, in the first place by fomenting the separatist spirit of which there seems to be clear evidence, then again by hastily acknowledging the independence of the revolted province, and finally by preventing the Colombian government from using proper means to repress the rebellion." The address goes on to say that President Marroquin has energetically protested to the United States and wishes that his protest should be known throughout the civilized world. Colombia contends that the United States has infringed article 35 of the treaty of 1846, which it is asserted implies the duty on the part of the United States to help Colombia in maintaining her sovereignty over the Isthmus, and adds that the "Colombian government repudiate the assumption that they have barred the way to carrying out the canal." It is asserted that since 1835 Colombia has granted canal privileges to different people no less than nine times. After giving the previously stated reasons for the Colombian senate's failure to approve the Hay-Herran treaty, and asserting that the delay in the negotiations had not affected the ultimate issue of the canal project, the protest concluded: "The hastiness in recognizing the new government is under these circumstances all the more surprising to the Colombian government, as they recollect the energetic opposition of Washington to the acknowledgment of the belligerency of the Confederates by the Powers during the civil war."

—

This diplomatic action of Colombia appears to have been preliminary to action more energetic. At any rate it now transpires that the Colombian government had already communicated with the American minister at Bogota in hostile terms. Following is the tenor of this notice:

By the recognition of Panama and the warning that the United States will not allow Colombia to put down the rebellion, the heretofore friendly relations between the two governments have arrived at such a critical state that it is absolutely impossible to continue diplomatic relations unless the Washington government immediately gives notice that it has no intention of preventing Colombia retaking the Isthmus or of extending recognition to the belligerents. A prompt reply is awaited from Washington, as the Colombian army is ready to march on Panama at once.

—

But the Washington government treats this warning lightly, regarding the threat of war as (we quote from Walter Wellman) "almost too fantastical to be deemed worthy of serious consideration by the Administration or its naval or military advisers." No delay has intervened, therefore, with reference to the acquisition of canal privileges. A treaty in that regard was signed on the 18th at 6 o'clock in the evening, at Secretary Hay's house in Washington, by Mr. Hay and the Panama minister, Bunau-Varilla. As Panama had no seal, Mr. Hay improvised one for Mr. Bunau-Varilla's use. This treaty—

grants to the American government a lease in perpetuity of a canal zone ten miles in width, over which the United States is to exercise complete control for all purposes, save that within the cities of Panama and Colon the authority of the United States is limited to the necessary operations of the canal construction and maintenance. Within these cities the Panama police are to maintain order, and local courts are to administer justice, but if at any time the United States deems the administration of the police and the judiciary unsatisfactory it may enter with its own authority, preserve order and try offenders against the peace. Within and near the canal zone the United States is empowered to exercise the right of eminent domain, through judicial process, for the necessary works of the canal, and for sanitation, drainage, water supply and so on.

Four islands lying in or near the Bay of Panama are included in the canal zone and leased in perpetuity to the United States. In addition the Republic of Panama grants the United States the right to take possession of other islands lying within the jurisdictional waters of the Republic. Panama transfers to the United States all its rights in the Panama railroad and authorizes the new Panama Canal company to sell to the United States all its shares in that corporation, amounting to more than 79,000 shares out of a total of 80,000 issued. The United States stipulates to pay the Republic of Panama the sum of $10,000,000 in gold on ratification of the treaty and an annuity of $250,000 a year after the expiration of nine years.

Digitized by Google

The news reported last week (p. 502), of the end of another revolution in Santo Domingo was at least premature. The Wos y Gil government is still in possession of the capital, which was under bombardment by the revolutionists on the 16th. Marines were landed from the United States cruiser "Baltimore" to protect American interests.

NEWS NOTES.

—Andrew H. Green, a well-known citizen of old New York, was shot on the 13th in front of his house, 91 Park avenue, New York city, by an insane man. Instant death resulted.

—Senator Dietrich, of Nebraska, was indicted on the 16th by the Federal grand jury at Omaha upon charges of selling an appointment of postmaster at Hastings, Neb., to Jacob Fisher.

—Dispatches of the 15th tell of the killing of a sergeant and three privates of the Twenty-eighth United States infantry in the neighborhood of Lake Lano, Mindanao, Philippines (p. 394) in a battle with Moros.

—At the convention of the Federation of Labor at Boston on the 18th a series of socialist resolutions, reported upon adversely by the resolutions committee, and vigorously debated for two days, was defeated by a representative vote of 11,282 to 2,185.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (see p. 458) for the month ending October 31, 1903, as given by the Treasury sheet, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	$451,827,224	$328,094,788	$123,732,436 exp.
G	10,552,787	22,640,538	12,087,751 imp.
S	10,548,628	9,304,187	1,244,441 exp.
	$472,928,639	$360,039,513	$112,889,126 exp.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE DEMOCRATIC REORGANIZERS.

The Congregationalist (rel.), Nov. 14.—The vote in Ohio and Massachusetts shows a reaction against that which is openly called socialism or that which borders on it, the defeat of the Democrats in Ohio standing on a radical platform being unusually severe, and the falling off in the Socialist vote of Massachusetts being marked. This, in our opinion, cannot be interpreted as indicative of anything more than a temporary reaction. The Democratic party sooner or later will fall into the hands of its radical wing, and the party's platforms will become more rather than less radical.

Kenton (O.) Press (Dem.), Nov. 15.—There once was a vast differnce between democracy and the Democratic party. Thank God, there's little if any difference now. The plutocratic Democrats will march under no banner now—the election in Ohio proved it—unless one of their number carries the pennant and they are awarded the first place in the parade. The democratic Democrats will not charge the ballot box under such leadership. And what does it avail to deny truth. Let's admit it and go on. Oil and water will not mix; plutocratic and democratic Democracy will not mix. Why not disillusion ourselves. The olive branch withers in our hands, the red beads of fraternity crumble to dust, the pipe of peace will not burn. Why not recognize facts? Why talk of getting together? We can't coalesce. Plutocracy and democracy occupy the opposite points of the sociological compass, and it's folly to seek to get the needle to point two ways at the same time. . . . Wealth shall rule or the people. Which shall it be, dollars or men? That's all there is to the problem.

The Commoner (Dem.), Nov. 13.—Before the reorganizers claim a victory in Ohio, let them explain the defeat in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Iowa, where the Kansas City platform was not indorsed. An examination of the files of the corporation papers will reveal the fact that they rejoiced greatly over the "conservative victory" in Iowa. They predicted great things for the party, but in spite of the very able and energetic campaign made by the Democratic candidate, Mr. Sullivan, and in spite of the wobbling of Gov. Cummins on the tariff question, the Republicans carried the State by a large majority—and the reorganizers can now see nothing but Ohio. In so far as a lesson can be drawn from the election returns, it is this: The party can make no progress while it spends more time trying to reconcile irreconcilable elments than it does in trying to make converts. The party cannot succeed while it is wasting its strength in internal wars. If it is going to be a positive force in the country it must stand for Democratic principles and fight for Democratic principles—not for one campaign, but all the time—not just before election, but all through the year. If it is going to be a national party, it must stand for the same things in all the States. As long as it indorses in one State what it denounces in another its various platforms will be used to answer each other. The election shows the necessity for a homogeneous Democratic party nation-wide and true to its principles everywhere.

OHIO POLITICS.

(Lincoln) Nebraska Independent (Peo.), Nov. 12.—Hanna is claiming all the glory of the Republican victory in Ohio, but the glory does not belong to him at all. It belongs to the gold Democrats. That is to say, it was a victory for the McLeanites and the Clevelandites.

Kenton (O.) Press (Dem.), Nov. 12.—A Republican speaker would denounce Johnson as a socialist and in the same breath an anarchist. That was a play on ignorance. Briefly stated, the socialist wants the government to have all the say about everything while the anarchist wants the government to have nothing to say about anything. The socialist wants all government, the anarchist wants no government. Yet the Republicans coupled the two words together with a smile of ignorance mixed with cupidity.

Goodhue County (Minn.) News (Dem.), Nov. 7.—The plain people, the honest farmers of Ohio, decided the election. They were not ready to accept Johnson. He frightened them. It wasn't spellbinding drew out a full Republican vote in an off year. Johnson did it with his advocacy of justice for all. It is so simple that it is no more understood in one campaign than Christianity in nineteen centuries. Johnson's Democracy is so vital and virile that he not only consolidated the Republican vote against him, but he scared out of the Democratic camp a lot of flabby followers who supposed they were Democrats till they came in contact with a man whose democracy means something.

Youngstown (O.) Times-Democrat, Nov. 17.—It was precisely a month Sunday—October 15—that Senator Hanna spoke in this city and declared that the election of Johnson and Clarke meant reduction of wages and closing of mills, but that the election of Herrick and Hanna would bring greater business prosperity. He threatened the return of the experience of 1893 if he was not elected. But we have it now. . . . If Mr. Hanna were to speak in Youngstown to-night with the experience of the past 30 days fresh in mind, the same audience that cheered him on October 15, would receive him with hoots and jeers, false prophet that a single month has proved him to be. Mr. Hanna deliberately deceived the people.

THE SINGLE TAX IN BOSTON.

Boston Daily Advertiser (Rep.), Nov. 10.—The single taxers make a distinction between a land title and a title to the land. That value comes from the improvement of the land itself partly, but also from other improvements in the neighborhood on that street or near that street or in that section of the community. Of course the possession of title to land has in the past carried with it the title to the value of the land. It is the single taxers who want to separate the two things. They are willing that the owner shall retain his private title to the land, but they want the public to get the benefit of ownership of the land values which the public has paid for in one way or another.

Boston Evening Transcript (Rep.), Nov. 10.—It is apparent that the single tax, as interpreted by President Fillebrown, means simply the taxation of the element of special privilege attaching to land ownership. He does not propose even to take the entire ground rent by taxation, but only to increase the land tax by slow degrees in such way as to draw into the public treasury the future unearned increment of land values. This proposal is in no sense alarming. It involves no revolutionary assault on property rights, no radical alteration of social institutions. It is likely, therefore, to commend itself to public favor more genrally than the scheme of land nationalization pure and simple.

SPREADING CIVILIZATION.

Goodhue County (Minn.) News, Nov. 7.—One of the difficulties of conveying to the Filipinos the blessings of civilization is that the vessels in which they are conveyed are so easily corruptible. Collier's estimable weekly says there are 30 conveyors in Bilibid prison now, and more due there, and that the grief of the Philippine Commission is that it cannot get honest servants.

A PRONOUNCED OPINION.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Nov. 14.—While all the cars which the traction company tried to run on the Wentworth avenue line made their trips in safety, they had practically no passengers. The people who ordinarily use them are not reassured yet, and it may take a few days of effective police supervision to put them at ease. They, like most south siders, would like to see an immediate settlement of the trouble. They would like to see the employes who went out admit that they were too hasty, and return to work at once, or see the company consent to refer to arbitration the disputed questions which can properly be settled in that way. If bad weather should come before the strike is ended the public will suffer more acutely than it has thus far.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the offical report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 37 of that publication.

Washington, Nov. 9-14, 1903.

Senate.

Pursuant to Presidential proclamation, the Senate assembled in special session at

Digitized by Google

noon on the 9th (p. 1), and after listening to the proclamation and notifying the President, adjourned for the day. On the 10th the President's message (p. 21) relative to the Cuban reciprocity treaty was read.

On the 11th a resolution calling upon the President for the documents relative to the revolution in Panama, introduced by Senator Cullom, was referred to the committee on foreign relations.

No business of general interest was done on the 12th, and on the 13th and 14th the Senate was not in session.

House.

The House assembled in special session on the 9th (p. 2), and after electing Joseph G. Cannon as Speaker by 197 votes (p. 3) to 165 for John S. Williams, 22 not voting (p. 4), together with the other officers, appointed a committee to notify the President (p. 5). The rules of the Fifty-seventh Congress were adopted (p. 5). On motion of Mr. Hitt (p. 7) the following resolution relative to the recognition of the Republic of Panama was adopted:

That the President is requested to communicate to the House, if not in his judgment incompatible with the interests of public service, all correspondence and other official documents relating to the recent revolution on the Isthmus of Panama.

On the 10th the President's message (p. 22) on the special object of the special session, Cuban treaty legislation, was read, but no other business of general interest was transacted.

No business of general interest was done on the 11th or 12th.

On the 13th the House bill, 1921 (p. 94), to carry into effect the reciprocity treaty between the United States and Cuba (signed December 11, 1902), was reported to the House by the committee on ways and means and referred to the committee of the whole.

There was no session on the 14th.

MISCELLANY

THE GUESSING CONTEST.

For The Public.

There were six smart newspaper men,
To learning much inclined,
Who Tom L. Johnson went to see—
Though all of them were blind,—
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind.

The first, on learning of the big
"Red Devil" fine and gay,
In which Tom scoured the countryside
Two hundred miles a day,
Wrote, "He is just a plutocrat,
Whatever he may say."

The second, when he heard about
The mammoth circus tent
Wherein Tom packed the multitude
Who to his meetings went,
Remarked, "He is spectacular
To a scandalous extent."

The third, when Tom, who must have known
He'd not one chance to win,
A canvass long and arduous
In person did begin,
Wrote, "His conceit and vanity
Are nothing short of sin."

The fourth, on hearing Tom declare
His "secret aim" to be
To show his fellowmen the path
That leads to liberty,
Said, "Such an arrant demagogue
Is truly sad to see."

The fifth, who thought the single tax
Was but a thing to chaff,
And saw its expert speakers called
To work in Tom's behalf,
Observed, "Such utter foolishness
Would make a donkey laugh."

The sixth, election being past,
And Johnson having said
The righteous war would be renewed
Before one day had sped,
Wondered that "such a clever corpse
Should not know he was dead."

And thus these smart newspaper men
Expatiated long
On what they guessed Tom Johnson was,
In language large and strong;
While all, so far from being right,
Were utterly dead wrong.

Their crooked guesswork has a cause
Which honest men may learn:
The light that guides Tom Johnson's course
Their eyes alone discern
Who work for future years, and all
Unworthy triumphs spurn;

Who feel within their souls the zeal
Inspired by Truth alone,
And understand her precious seed
Must yet in tears be sown;
But know the right will win at last,
And Justice claim her own.

JAY HAWKINS.

A CORROBORATION.

Apropos of the article entitled "An Indian Virtue," in the November 7th number of The Public, I wish to confirm the impression there given.

While in Canada this summer, I visited the Indian reserve just above Roberval on the northern shore of Lake St. John. Within this village is a department store of the Hudson Bay company, this being the company's most southern post. From this source the Montagnais Indians draw their supplies and are given credit by the company during the summer and fall, the accounts being collected in the spring when the trappers return with their furs. I asked the storekeeper whether the company did not suffer from losses due to lack of good faith, and he replied that the Indians never failed to pay their dues, the only chance of loss being when an Indian died while hunting and trapping.

CHARLES GARRISON.

Boston, Mass., Nov. 11, 1903.

ADDING HORROR TO WAR.

The war of the future bids fair to be as terrifying from the uncanny manner in which the slaughter will be conducted as by reason of the slaughter itself. Men long distances apart, scarcely visible to one another, pump leaden death into opposing ranks, while not a sign of smoke tells whence the bullets come. This is weird enough and shaking to the nerves, but now comes a German inventor named Berguel, who claims the invention of something which will add greater terror to combat than the invention of all the Gatlings and Maxims. It is a gunpowder which explodes without making the slightest noise, and is yet possessed of the explosive force of the best modern high-power powder. Think of the weirdness, the uncanniness of the battlefield of the future! No smoke, no sound; only a silent and unseen death flying back and forth between two armies and men falling as mysteriously as fell the warriors of Sennacherib.—N. Y. Press.

INDIAN HUMOR.

"It is true that the Indian has a sense of humor," observed the man who had spent several years at one of the reservations, "but it's also true that he has a very queer way of showing it.

"For instance, I had to ride through Chilcoot pass in the Rocky mountains one day, and when half way through, and at its narrowest part, I espied three or four 'tame' Indians high up on the right-hand bank. I identified them as from my own reservation—being bucks who had passes to go out on the hunt—and waved my hand in salute. They waved back, but just as I came under them they set a big mass of rock loose, and it came rolling down to give me the closest possible escape and block the pass behind me with debris ten feet deep. The humorous red men disappeared from sight at once and I couldn't question them, but a week later I cornered one of the fellers and said:

"'Now, then, did you and the others expect to crush me under the rock you tumbled down into Chilcoot pass the other day?'

"'Why, of course not,' was the reply.

"'Then what was your object?'

"'Just to see your horse jump at the noise, and we laughed for half an hour afterwards.'"—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS ON THE PANAMA CASE.

Telegraphed to the Chicago Chronicle from Boston, Mass., under date of November 14.

Charles Francis Adams, the eminent publicist, in an interview to-day on the speedy recognition of Panama, says that President Roosevelt has established a dangerous precedent and his course has been high-handed. "I understand," he said, "that the president himself is unwilling to have our policy in the Panama case regarded as a precedent. For if this policy were to serve as such it would be fraught with the gravest consequences to the new world.

"If this case were allowed to become a precedent for action in South American states there would be slight excuses when European nations, for selfish reasons, would foment revolutions and hurriedly recognize the insurgent gov-

Digitized by Google

ernment, putting their own favorites in power.

"Plainly, it would be unsafe, even dangerous, to have any such cases as a precedent by which this government must be bound later. And the president and the state department, if I am informed correctly, will insist most emphatically that this case must be regarded as exceptional, both as relates to the past and the future."

"Then the case is merely one of expediency?" Mr. Adams was asked.

"Not even that admission can be made safely to future administration interests. The only thing that can be said to the world at large is that the whole case is exceptional; exceptional in violation of international law, exceptional in violating every tradition of the past in this republic."

"What would a parallel have been in the past?"

"To go back 40 years, it would have been just as if Great Britain had recognized South Carolina after the stars and stripes had been hauled down from Fort Sumter. I can remember the time when such action would have been regarded—certainly in this part of the nation—as a violation of right, fair and honor between nations. It would have been unpardonable, of course."

"Is there not some rule of international law to-day that would justify it?"

"Nobody makes such a claim—President Roosevelt least of all. No, it is without any precedent, against all rules. It is avowedly 'exceptional'—that is, something that this nation will not justify by any of the rules of law, of international usage. If any nation had attempted to recognize any of the seceding States in 1861 the recognition would have amounted almost to an act of war against the United States, it would have been so utterly wrong.

"I do not believe President Roosevelt would allow any nation of Europe to do the same thing in any other case. Admittedly what has been done has been a succession of high-handed measures, outside any warrant in international law. No rules apply. No precedent exists. And no similar action would be tolerated in any other power.

"In this case the whole contention is that the United States is doing something that it will not allow other nations to imitate and that it has never allowed other nations to do in its own case, and that it will not allow to be taken as a precedent by anybody, anywhere, hereafter.

"I cannot but regard it as unprecedented. It is truly 'exceptional' in all history. It is high-handed. How the United States can do anything and then refuse to be bound by its own record thereafter I do not profess to explain. It is so 'exceptional' that it is unique. Whither it leads the people must decide."

NEW ZEALAND NOT STAGNANT.

THE ONLY COMPLAINT IS THAT WORKINGMEN ARE TOO PROSPEROUS.

From the Chicago Saturday Blade, of November 14.

After a six years' absence from my native country, New Zealand, I returned there last year for a nine months' stay. I expected to see the industrial situation in a bad way, accrediting the reports of the colony's depression which I had read both in the States and England. But, on the contrary, both money and employment seemed plentiful. I did not investigate the government's financing and the meaning of its huge debt. But the taxes levied in consequence thereof did not seem to be as high proportionately as the wages paid.

Nothing struck me more wherever I went in New Zealand than the prosperity and independence of the so-called "working classes," the plentifulness of employment of all kinds, and the high wages. I heard of much good work literally going begging, and on all hands, in a variety of different ways, my attention was called to the scarcity—I think I might almost say the extreme scarcity—of labor. Most, not all, of my informants were not government supporters.

LABORERS SCARCE.

I jot down, as they occur to me, a few instances for which I can personally vouch. One of the wealthiest flax millers in the North Island complained to me that his garden fence had been unpainted for months; he was willing to pay good wages (at least $2.50 a day, and probably three dollars, or more) to have it done, and yet could get no one to do it. Whenever he wanted an odd job done it was the same trouble. I heard exactly similar complaints from many others in quite different parts.

In the small town where I lived the milkmen recently sent round to all their customers to say that the scarcity of labor was such that they did not see how they could manage to deliver more than once a day. In the same town a large jam manufacturer did not know where to get labor, even girl labor. Where the girls went to no one knew; certainly not as servants, for the domestic servant problem, acute here, is immensely more acute there.

GOOD PAY FOR WORKERS.

Unskilled laborers were generally getting $2.50 a day in Wellington, where, however, wages are higher than in some parts. Laborers, such as flax millers' hands and skilled workers, were getting $3.75 and $5 a day. The harvest before the last one out there I heard of almost incredible wages being paid for harvesters in the North Island, up to five dollars a day in some cases. The total cost of living may be slightly higher for artisans there than here, but this I doubt; for the professional classes I consider it, on the whole, much the same now.

The only people I heard of as asking unsuccessfully for work were obvious tramps, who preferred to beg rather than earn a meal and some money by half a day's work. Let it be clearly understood that I am speaking of New Zealand only, and of artisans, and not clerical labor of any kind. At present it seems to me there is too much work in New Zealand; they are too prosperous, and a little more struggling for life would in some ways be salutary. As for emigrating, I do not hear anything of it. New Zealand is preeminently a workingman's country, perhaps too much so. That the workingman and his interests predominate must strike any observer.

C. A. BARNICOAT.

Chicago, Oct. 27, 1903.

[Wellington collects its taxes from land values only, thus discouraging speculation in land, and giving all a chance to build a home. The taxes for the general government are also raised in part by this method.—Editor of the Saturday Blade.]

THE IRON MONSTER.

From a lecture delivered in Cincinnati Sunday evening, November 15, by Herbert S. Bigelow.

"The Octopus" is the title of a novel by Mr. Frank Norris. The scene of the story is in the California wheat-belt. It tells of the desperate and losing battle which the California wheat growers waged against the railroad and its ruinous rates. Read this story of the havoc wrought and the hearts broken and the hopes crushed by this monstrous monopoly, and see if the metaphor in the book of Daniel does not fit the case.

"A beast, dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly: devouring its victims with great iron teeth; and stamping them to pieces with hoofs of steel—" such is the railroad monopoly.

This book takes us out on the great ranches, which extend as far as the eye

Digitized by Google

can see, and are bounded only by the horizon. There are the huge breasts of mother earth where half the world is suckled. From these wide fallows comes the bread of millions. Once harvested, the wheat is carried by the railroad to tide water, and from there it is carried in ships around the globe.

Water rates are reasonable, for it is easier to build boats than to secure railroad rights of way, and the competition on water is guarantee against extortion. But to get the wheat to tide water, the wheat growers are compelled to deal with the railroad company, and the railroad does not ask: "What can we afford to carry this wheat for?" It asks: "What will the traffic bear?" By virtue of its monopoly of the transportation business the railroad can take the lion's share.

But the railroad was also the great land monopolist of that region. As a subsidy, the government had given the railroad company millions of acres. Farmers were invited to settle upon these railroad lands with the assurance that as soon as the railroad secured its patents to the land, it would cede it to the settlers for the nominal price of $2.50 an acre.

On one pretext or another the actual transfer of this land was postponed from year to year. At last, when the railroad got ready to sell, it demanded $27 per acre. The farmers formed a league which had for its double object the election of railroad commissioners who would reduce freight rates, and a legal battle to compel the road to keep its agreement and sell for $2.50 per acre.

Mr. Norris' novel deals with the fortunes of this league. The farmers are beaten in one court after another, and at last the railroad sells to dummy purchasers, and, with the aid of a United States marshal and his deputies, it undertakes to evict the farmers. Outraged by what they believe to be the shameless corruption of the courts, the farmers resolve to defend their homes by force.

Their spies inform them of the approach of officers, and they take a stand in an irrigating ditch with Winchesters in hand. But the shouts of those embattled farmers, unlike the shots at Lexington, did not go round the world, for the railroad controlled the wires and never permitted the world to get the farmers' version of the story. It was a bloody day. On the field of the dead the young bride found her husband, the mother her son. Men were cut off in the prime of life, and children were left without any defense from hunger. The savings of years were confiscated, household goods were thrown into the roadway, and homes ruthlessly invaded. This was the act of a hateful monopoly that got its corporation lawyers nominated for judges, that maintained powerful lobbies and dominated legislatures, that made the law or defied it at will, that levied its tribute upon the industries of a great State, and was feared and placated and hated by all.

With the novelist, we follow these evicted farmers. Madness was the end of one. One simple German woman was found dead in a vacant lot in San Francisco. She had died of starvation, and a little child was crying in her rigid arms. Another, a comely country lass, a stranger in the great city, went the way of those whose feet lay hold on hell. And aloof from the squalor of the hunted and harried victims of monopoly, stood the palaces of the railroad magnates, where beautiful women and imperious men feasted and gambled and made merry amid scenes of royal splendor.

Is it without justification that the agitator, stung with hunger, looks at these palaces from his side of the social gulf, and shouts?

We know them for what they are—ruffians in politics, rumans in finance, ruffians in law, ruffians in trade, bribers, swindlers and tricksters. No outrage too great to daunt them, no petty larceny too small to shame them; despoiling a government of a million dollars, yet picking the pockets of a farm hand of the price of a loaf of bread.

The railroad is an unspeakable blessing. But railroad monopoly is a beast, dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly; devouring its victims with iron teeth, and stamping them to death with hoofs of steel.

OPERATION OF OUR NEW "ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS."

From the New York Daily News of Nov. 12, 1903.

It is a spacious, high-domed chamber, magnificently wainscoted and furnished. In the center stands a massive, imposing desk, equipped with a marvelous battery of electric buttons. At it sits William Williams, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of New York. The scene is the Commissioner's office in the administration building on Ellis Island.

Presently a visitor is ushered in. He is a lawyer—Hugh O. Pentecost—and he wishes to see his client, John Turner, of England.

Mr. Turner has the distinction of being the first prisoner held under the act of Congress passed on March 3, 1903, which provides for the deportation from this country of "persons who disbelieve in organized government." Mr. Turner was arrested while addressing a meeting in this city on the night of the 23d of last month.

Commissioner Williams touches a button and a guard appears. An order is handed to him and he disappears.

Several minutes pass in silence. Although it is the 10th day of November, the air is so balmy that every window of the office is half opened. Through one window can be seen the Stars and Stripes fluttering from the flagstaff on the bay bulkhead. Across channel, flooded in the perfect sunlight, looms the giant statue of Liberty Enlightening the World.

Then the door opens and a rather short, stockily-built, ruddy-cheeked, man of middle age enters. His face gleams with intelligence and is adorned with a thick, sandy beard, trimmed in what is called the Van Dyke fashion. This is John Turner, strenuous organizer of British trade unionism and, as he terms himself, anarchist. He is closely attended by a guard in the person of Captain Weldon, of the Ellis Island Federal police.

Turner and Captain Weldon seat themselves at the desk beside Commissioner Williams and Lawyer Pentecost. Captain Weldon produces a pad of paper and a lead pencil to take notes and Commissioner Williams signals Mr. Pentecost to begin the interview.

This is how Turner, the British subject and United States prisoner, is compelled to hold consultations with the lawyer retained for his defence upon accusations of having violated an Act of Congress.

"Now, Turner," observed Lawyer Pentecost, "Judge Lacombe will hand down to-morrow in the United States Circuit Court his order dismissing our habeas corpus proceedings. You will then be deported unless we appeal the matter to a higher court. What is your wish?"

Captain Weldon grips his paper pad and prepares to take copious notes.

"As I do not seem to be wanted in this country," says Turner at once wearily and sarcastically, "I think it might be best to let the authorities ship me back. I am a trifle homesick, anyway."

"But your friends may think it better for you to fight the matter to the last ditch," suggests Lawyer Pentecost.

"My position is just this," says Turner decisively and between his clenched teeth, "I am a British subject, and as such bow to the mandates of the

Digitized by Google

United States government, under which I have not the rights of a citizen. Personally I prefer to return to England, but if my good American friends think there is a principle involved in this matter, I will stay and fight it. This is an American question, in which, as a British subject, I am not personally interested. It is a question involving the constitutionality of an act of the United States Congress, rather than my personal well being."

"You should remember," observes Lawyer Pentecost, "that if an appeal is taken it may take six months to get a decision. This will mean six very sad and gloomy months for you in a cell on Ellis Island."

"I will gladly stay here till I rot," replies Turner, "if by so doing I can assist my American friends in their fight for the vital principle of liberty involved."

This ends the interview of lawyer and client in the presence of Federal government witnesses. A curt sign is given that nobody else is to be permitted to speak to Turner, and he is led from the room by Captain Weldon.

The scene is grotesquely reminiscent of a drama of the "shocker" variety, where the conspirator against the Czar is hied back to his dungeon after an inquisition before the imperial chief of the Third Section.

While waiting for the boat to leave Ellis Island something more is learned of Turner's treatment by those in a position to know. He is kept confined in a cell, with the exception of the period allowed daily for a brief walk. While walking he is closely guarded by keepers. The general conditions of this imprisonment are worse than any criminal undergoes in a State penal institution. Not a soul is permitted to talk to him except his counsel—and this exception seems to be a matter of courtesy on the part of the Commissioner rather than a right defined by the law. Incidentally it may be observed that a prisoner's consultation with his counsel is hardly of much value in his defense when the interview is held in the presence of prosecuting government officials who take fluent notes of all that is said. It is simply a hollow mockery.

All mail, either received or dispatched by Turner, is opened and read by the Ellis Island officials before delivery.

On the little steamer, as it ploughs its way across the sunlit bay to the Barge Office, Lawyer Pentecost is induced to indulge in a few reflections.

"What appeals to me most," he says, "is the humor of this act of Congress. It is a law which, when some of its aspects are considered, is enough to make an American citizen roll over on his back and laugh uproariously.

"According to the law," goes on Lawyer Pentecost, "that very eminent American novelist, William Dean Howells, would be sentenced to five years' imprisonment if he invited Count Tolstoy to visit this country. Tolstoy, like Turner, is a 'disbeliever in organized government.' "

Mr. Pentecost is asked to elucidate.

"The law," says he, "provides heavy punishments for those who aid and abet proscribed persons in reaching our shores. Say, for example, you had a boyhood friend in the old country whom you had only vaguely heard from in 20 years. Say you decided one day to write to him and invite him to come to this country and offered him your home and your friendship when he got here.

"It might so happen that this friend of yours had once printed or publicly expressed a disbelief in organized government or had indulged in violent anarchistic ravings. You might be entirely ignorant of this and be the most patriotic American who ever drew the breath of life. Yet proof of this utterance, together with your letter of invitation to visit America, forwarded to Secretary Cortelyou of the Department of Commerce and Labor, would be sufficient evidence to make you a Federal prisoner and subject you to the five years' imprisonment specified in the section of the law. You see, the act has some unique features."

Comment was made upon the copious notes made during the interview with Turner.

"The Federal authorities," observed Lawyer Pentecost, "are somewhat candid in admitting that they are extremely anxious to find out who—if anybody—invited Turner to visit this country. There's a nice term of imprisonment awaiting the party if they get him. Then they're mighty anxious to find out what steamship brought Turner to this country. There are heavy penalties for a master, agent or consignee of a vessel who lands a proscribed person on our shores."

In discussing the legal aspects of the case Lawyer Pentecost observed:

"It would fill a few pages of The New York Daily News thoroughly to show the absurdities of this law. We have, for example, a religious sect in this country called the Plymouth Brethren. Its members, I believe, are old-time, dyed-in-the-wool Americans. Their theology teaches them to repudiate organized government. To be consistent, the United States Government would have to ferret them out and ship them all back to dear old London on the same ship with Turner. The law, you see, doesn't go after a man for what he believes in, but for what he disbelieves in, with the accent on the 'dis.'

"Another remarkable and somewhat humorous feature of the law is the absolute and despotic power it places in the hands of one man—Secretary Cortelyou. Mr. Cortelyou has the power to stop any steamship entering this port and dump the passengers—first-class as well as steerage—on Ellis Island and subject them to a secret, star chamber inquiry. It doesn't matter if the passenger is a duke or prince—it's the cell for him if Mr. Cortelyou suspects him of disbelief in organized government. Here's another proposition:

"Suppose some peaceful, lovable humanitarian disciple of Tolstoy had settled in the West some three years ago and now owned a prosperous farm. If Cortelyou caught him he could be first imprisoned and then deported back to Russia, although he had never opened his mouth upon the subject."

Mr. Pentecost seemed to see in the law, above all else, a covert menace to trade unionism in this country which deserved the attention of every thinking man.

This is the paragraph of Turner's speech on October 23, cited in the legal papers calling for his arrest and deportation:

"All over Europe they are preparing for a general strike which will spread over the entire industrial world. Everywhere the employers are organizing and to me at any rate, as an anarchist, as one who feels that the people must emancipate themselves, I look forward to the struggle as an opportunity for the workers to assert the power that is really theirs.

"The trade unions have been growing and have now reached big proportions. The inevitable outcome is a struggle between the two and the general strike offers to advance people an opportunity to demonstrate their power, and to us who belong to the advance movement, an opportunity to help the workers to gain in audacity and courage and thus determine as quickly as possible their emancipation."

The contention thus far successfully made by the Federal attorneys is that in the foregoing paragraph Turner has proclaimed himself a "disbeliever in organized government":

"From these remarks it is apparent

Digitized by Google

that this alien regards a 'general strike' as a means to an end, to wit—the overthrow of the government. Even small strikes are usually accompanied by violence, and a general strike would certainly involve great social disorder and confusion. If anarchy ever come about, even for a short time, it will no doubt be through the disorder and violence of a 'general strike.' A 'general strike,' therefore, cannot be regarded as a peaceful means of establishing anarchy."

"I have merely skimmed over the subject," said Mr. Pentecost, in conclusion. "It's a decidedly nice question on the whole. In general, I claim that the act is unconstitutional because it, among other things, bars out persons of certain religious beliefs. The law can practically be used against anybody. It will be used against trades unionists as soon as the people most interested get ready, and, from the attitude of things in the Turner case, it looks as if it won't be long before these people are ready."

Such is the situation to-day in the now celebrated Turner case.

Ashley—"Hatley bought Steel common for 50, and sold it for 12."

Hotchkiss—"In which transaction did he make the more money?"

G. T. E.

Congressman Baker, of Brooklyn, bobs up with his anti-pass resolution. It should be amended to provide that "no congressman named Baker and living in Brooklyn shall accept, use," etc. In that form the bill would probably go through with a rush and a whoop. Congress would pass it in no other form—not while congressmen are congressmen.—Utica (N. Y.) Observer.

BOOKS

THE JOY OF LIVING.

It seems to be characteristic of modern literature that while second-rate writers of fiction are giving the world pleasant enough romances that wind up happily, the really great authors are giving us gloomy, hopeless, pessimistic pictures of life, taken mostly from society as they see it to-day. Tolstoy, Ibsen, Hauptmann, Sudermann, Thomas Hardy, are almost overpowering with a sort of calm, pitiless realism, that conceals beneath the calm a fearful intensity, and beneath its pitilessness an awful heartache.

It is true that the great masters of the past have dealt with gloomy, tragic themes; these, however, usually felt the obligation to work out some solution, to show some wise purpose in the action. Not so with the modern masters. They simply tell the gruesome facts.

An illustration of this is found in Sudermann's play, "The Joy of Living," excellently translated by Edith Wharton (Scribner's, $1.25). Sudermann is one of the most powerful of modern writers, and this play is one of the best samples of his power. It grasps one's attention from the start and holds it through its painful course to the end. When the reader has finished it, he will turn away as from a loathsome sty and try to wash the mud out of his soul. And yet there is no exaggerated writing any more than there is any fine writing. One wonders where the power lies, until it occurs to you that perhaps it lies in the plain telling of things as they are. There is no preaching, no explaining—just the bare, natural talks and acts of living people. The only approaches to an exhibition of satire are the title of the book and the name of the heroine, Beata. So far from being "blessed," she spends her 15 years of infidelity in a feverish disquietude, and ends her miserable existence by poison. She is a type of those who vainly imagine that happiness—the joy of living—lies in following passionate instincts and fancied affinities, and overlook the real good of lawful, homely duties and affections. Many a married man or woman probably might by indulging the imagination and harboring selfish introspections, get wrought up to the notion that some other woman or man would perhaps be better suited to their precious ideals; but to such natures the chances are a thousand to one that there would be no more affinity in the one case than in the other. If Beata had been married to Baron Richard, they might, as likely as not, have discovered as much diffinity, as in their occasional intercourse they imagined affinity. But imagination runs riot in women who have nothing to do but society, who have housekeepers to keep their houses, nurses to nurse their children, and no religion except a ten-dollar prayer-book. Beata did not belong to the vainest class, but she apparently had no religion, and if she had had more to do than dream, she would have stood a better chance of finding the joy of living.

Apart from the main action, there are special touches in the play that make it a strikingly modern picture. For example, Baron Richard is an orator, and makes his debut in the reichstag by a great speech on the sanctity of the marriage tie.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"Bisocialism; the Reign of the Man at the Margin." by Oliver R. Trowbridge. Moody Publishing Co., 35 Nassau street, New York, and 79 Dearborn street, Chicago. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

If anything was needed to prove that the real difference between the two wings of the Democratic party was not merely the so-called money question, but lay far deeper, the remarks of many so-called Democratic papers since the Ohio election would prove the fact. "The heartiest rejoicing," says the Springfield Republican, "over the overwhelming defeat of Johnson and Clarke in Ohio may be found in the gold democratic papers. Yet neither Johnson nor Clarke was ever a free silver man."

J. H. D.

Popular magazines and weeklies seem to be more and more venturing to make note that all things are not lovely in our great march of civilization. Now comes Collier's Weekly with the following: "Men most conspicuously desired in society have fattened on bribery and false pretenses. Some of them have been honored with public office. Nothing could be more respectable than they. They are our nobility, as able to ride over the scruples of classes below them as the nobility of birth once rode over plebeian bodies which blocked the street."

J. H. D.

The Springfield Republican has a disagreeable way of speaking plainly, which is quite unsuited to the delicate problems of statecraft and diplomacy. For example, in speaking of recent developments in Panama it says: "The Republican proposes to see things, if possible, as they are, and to call things by their right names. Away with humbug, cant and hypocrisy. We are witnessing what is really a seizure of the Isthmus by the United States government through military force, masked by the fake republic set up Tuesday last at Panama City."

J. H. D.

The Nation well says of Mommsen, the great historian who died the other day, that "he added to the glory of the special student that of the promoter of liberal ideas among his countrymen at large." Mommsen was indeed the very best type of a man of letters, one who in his books did not forget life and his fellow men. He has been a promoter of liberal ideas, not only among his German countrymen, but throughout the world. It was his great history that first discovered to modern readers the true import of Roman politics in their relation to the general progress of humanity.

J. H. D.

The London Daily News speaks in highest praise of the late Henry D. Lloyd, whose life was of the kind that always gets most eulogy after its end: "Born into the finest grade of American life," says the News, "highly cultivated, of most refined taste, fortunate in the external things of life, he made the poor and unprivileged man's cause his own from first to last, and was trusted by the workingmen of America as almost no other. He was beloved no less by scholars. His circle of friends in Europe was almost as large as that in America. No other American was more warmly welcomed in the progressive circles of London."

J. H. D.

Could there be a better illustration of the prejudice of many periodicals against any book that arraigns social conditions than the difference in the way they are treating Mr. Jack London's People of the Abyss, after praising to the skies his Call

---

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.

Digitized by Google

GAGGED AND BOUND.

Mark—Want lower street car fares, do ye? You'd like to spoil my savings bank would ye? Well, I guess not. You'll stand pat! That's what you'll do. See?

of the Wild? Of the latter nothing was too good to say; it was very generally pronounced a veritable classic. But the People of the Abyss tells of the awful condition of the poor in London and England and suggests that it might be well if the four hundred thousand gentlemen of England, recorded in the census as of no occupation, should be set to work plowing game preserves—and the result is that it meets with perfunctory notice or satirical disparagement. The Nation, for example, says that he describes the East End "as Dante might have described his Inferno if he had been a yellow journalist." J. H. D.

There seems no doubt that juvenile criminality is on the increase. Philanthropists in various cities have found it necessary to work for the establishment of juvenile courts, and such courts have proved themselves to be beneficial. But it should not be forgotten that while they mark an advance in the practical dealing with young criminals, they are also a sign of the times. The Journal of Sociology for September contained a brief translation from a French writer, M. Grosmolard, which is of interest on this subject. "After a study of statistics," says the writer, "and from personal observation of the size of the families from which the young offenders came, and of the incomes of these same families, I am persuaded that crime among children is the product of their surroundings and misery rather than of heredity. . . . The wretchedness that is so fruitful of crime may be resolved into lack of good food, and often of any kind of food; lack of clothes; lack of room, light, ventilation, and soap; absence of any moral influence in the home, and no parental supervision. Children are pushed out into the streets to earn a penny; no questions are asked by the parents of their whereabouts." Verily the destruction of the poor is their poverty. J. H. D.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PUBLIC

Can all be purchased through the Purdy Publishing Company

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

Order anything that has ever been reviewed in THE PUBLIC; will fill order promptly.

Henry George's books in paper and cloth binding and other Economic Literature on sale.

PURDY PUBLISHING CO., McVicker's Building, CHICAGO.

DEBATE There will be a debate between the Socialists and the Single Taxers at the West 12th Street Turner Hall, 1168 West 12th Street, near Western Avenue, on Sunday afternoon, December 20th, at 3 o'clock, on the following question: **"Resolved, That It Is to the Interests of the Working Classes to Take Up the Propaganda of Socialism Rather Than That of the Single Tax."** The affirmative will be represented by A. M. Simons, Seymour Steadman and Ernest Unterman; the negative will be represented by John Z. White, Louis F. Post and Henry H. Hardinge. 30 minutes for each speaker, the affirmative being allowed ten minutes in closing.

CONTRACTORS.

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

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

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

HENRY B. TAWRESEY,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,
1105 Real Estate Trust Building, S. E. Cor. Broad and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 694 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

NOW READY FOR DELIVERY

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

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

By LOUIS F. POST

SUBJECTS TREATED: Part One—"The Democratic Optimist." Part Two—"Individual Life." Part Three—"Business Life." Part Four—"Economic Tendencies." Part Five—"Politico-Economic Principles." Part Six—"Democratic Government." Part Seven—"Patriotism." Conclusion—"The Great Order of Things."

This book applies fundamental democratic principles (generic, not partisan) to the greater problems that baffle men as the glowing optimism of their youth gives way before the trials and disappointments of mature life. It holds up the standards and obligations of a rational democracy and a sane optimism to the individual as he emerges from school or college into the whirlpool of business and civic experiences, and leads him on and up toward a realization of the invincible optimistic philosophy of a great and beneficent order in the universe.

CLEVELAND, O., Oct. 26, 1903.—Moody Publishing Co., 35 Nassau St., New York City. Gentlemen: I am delighted to know that you are publishing "Ethics of Democracy," by Louis F. Post. Send me a copy as soon as it comes from the press. Never was the time more opportune for the appearance of such a work, and no writer on ethical, political and economic affairs is more competent than Mr. Post to do justice to the subject.
Very truly yours, **TOM L. JOHNSON.**

The volume is beautifully printed on high-grade dull-finished paper, uncut pages, gilt top, etc, and bound in fine blue cloth with gold lettering. Pp. 398.
Price per copy, $2.00. (Net, delivered.)

MOODY PUBLISHING COMPANY, Publishers,
35 Nassau Street, NEW YORK 1601 Unity Building, CHICAGO

Digitized by Google