

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1903.

Number 289.

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.

There are three classes of mind—the conservative, the radical, and the lickspittle. The latter usually antagonizes the radical; not because it is conservative, but because radicalism offers few prizes and no comforts to its devotees.

Senator Hanna is an acrobat of transcendent agility. Surely it is not base flattery to say this of a man who can unsparingly denounce the Democratic party for bringing on the hard times in 1893, and then in the same speech praise without stint Grover Cleveland, who was then at the head of that party.

Now that a new group of spots has been discovered on the sun, the prosperity question in Republican newspaper offices will be very much complicated. How can the editors be sure, when this Republican prosperity folds its tent and steals away, whether to blame the sun spots, the labor unions, or Tom Johnson's campaign in Ohio.

The author of the "Bonnie Briar Bush," the Rev. John Watson (Ian Maclaren), predicts the "greatest religious revival since the days when Rome succumbed to the teachings of Christ in the first century." He says the world is on the eve of it. But suppose this religious revival should come. Would it not come now as aforetime, in no halo of glory attracting the better classes, but only as a babe of poverty born in a manger, and a strange man preaching strange doctrines and consorting

with the lower classes? Does the Rev. Mr. Watson suppose he will recognize the revival if it comes in that way? The priests of nineteen hundred years ago did not.

In a public address early this month John D. Rockefeller told his audience that the personal comfort religion had been to him was such that he "sometimes felt like going upon the lecture platform and telling people about it." Mr. Rockefeller could interest the public much more by telling them about the personal comfort he has derived from ruining men in order to establish the Standard Oil trust. Such a lecture might not be without its religious bearings, either.

That Tom L. Johnson has frightened the Republican leaders to the point of desperation is plain enough; and if the intensity of their fears is evidence of the drift of things in Ohio, Johnson must be making headway against their enormous majority there. Senator Hanna's billingsgate vocabulary has been called into play, always a sign that he is scared, and Secretary Shaw, of President Roosevelt's cabinet, has taken the Ohio stump with a mouthful of well-cooked statistics. It is evident that Hanna now realizes he is no match for Johnson in a political contest. From the freedom with which he uses poker terms, however, it would appear that he might make a better showing in the "great American game."

The traction-ring press makes much of the defeat of municipal ownership in San Francisco at the special election on the 8th. They say that the San Francisco voters defeated it, and that the result proves that the people of San Francisco are not yet ready for it. This is untrue. The voters did not

defeat municipal ownership; it was defeated by the legislature, which made a one-third vote sufficient to kill the measure. In other words, it gave to municipal-ownership voters the usual one vote each, but to traction-ring voters it gave two votes each. Nor does the result prove that the people of San Francisco are not ready for municipal ownership, as is asserted. Quite the contrary. Only 10,745 voted against it, while 14,480 voted for it. When 57 per cent. of the voters on any measure vote for it, ordinary candor does not permit it to be said that the voters are opposed to it.

William Randolph Hearst has employed, to boom him through the American newspaper press for the Democratic nomination for President, the distinguished and veteran Republican editor, Murat Halstead, of Cincinnati. The first of Mr. Halstead's articles was released for publication on the 14th, the second on the 15th, the third on the 16th, and the fourth on the 17th. The first is devoted to Mr. Halstead's own interesting experiences in politics, and the second deals generally with the political situation. It is the third that makes the first disclosure of the Hearst boom. The fourth enlarges upon its possibilities. These articles are furnished by Mr. Halstead to the papers of the country for use as "copy" without pay. They are presented in Mr. Halstead's name, for the declared purpose of inviting—

the attention of the country to the fact of the perilous problems before us, among them a phenomenal Presidential campaign at hand, and to awaken to impending dangers the form of socialism that consents to orderly methods and is capable of charity, to stand against that which rushes into anarchy.

When "government by injunction" came into vogue in the United States, under the foster-

ing care of Federal judges, predictions were made that it would yet be extended so as to operate as a press censorship. The idea was hooted, but now the step has been taken. A judge in Cincinnati has just granted an injunction which forbids the publication by a labor paper of a list of "unfair" business places. If an injunction can be used for that purpose, it can be used for any other object of press censorship; and every newspaper is thus placed at the mercy of any autocrat of the bench. For injunctions of this kind make the judge who grants them, at once legislator, judge and jury. He is absolute. The only remedy is to abolish "government by injunction," and that is what the Democratic party of Ohio is pledged to do. If the "injunctioned" workmen of Cincinnati wish to protest effectively against this judicial lawlessness, they may do so on the 3d of November. Should Hamilton county give 30,000 majority against Tom L. Johnson, as the Hanna party predict, that majority would be regarded as an endorsement of this new advance in the art of "government by injunction." Isn't it time for workmen to do more sensible voting before election, and less futile howling afterwards?

The protection movement in Great Britain, which Chamberlain is leading and Balfour is following, draws its strength from the fact that free importing alone is not free trade. Importing into England has been practically free for two generations; but exporting out of England is met in all directions with tariff walls. Thus, while British producers are obstructed in foreign markets, foreign producers freely enter British markets and undersell British producers there. The British producer so affected thereupon appeals loudly to the patriotic spirit; and forthwith those millions of Great Britain whom Carlyle denominated as "mostly fools," rush to the rescue of British industries. If British producers could enter foreign markets

as freely as foreign producers enter British markets, the patriotic spirit would not respond to those appeals.

There is truly an appearance of good sense in the contention of British protectionists that Great Britain cannot keep her markets open to foreign imports if foreign markets are to remain closed against her exports. It sounds wise, even to free traders, to say that although free trade is good, one-sided free trade is impracticable. Yet the plain truth is that one-sided free trade, while far inferior to all-around free trade, is better than all-around protection. There are two sides to every trade—the seller's side and the buyer's side. Consequently, if foreign sellers do take away a British market from British sellers, British buyers are gainers, even if British sellers are losers. The gain as well as the loss is at home. But with free trade, even one-sided free trade, the gain is greater than the loss.

It is conceivable, of course, but sanely speaking it is unthinkable, that the foreigner might undersell in British markets until no markets were left for British producers. But how, then, would the foreign seller get his pay. Buyers must sell as well as buy, and unless they produce things they have nothing to sell. The free trade of England may pinch some kinds of British production—that, for instance, in which Mr. Chamberlain is engaged,—but it cannot harm British production in general, without making the British market a profitless one for foreigners. Even one-sided free trade is better for the country that maintains it than retaliatory tariffs can possibly be.

This has been proved by the experience of Great Britain herself. London is the market of the world; London is the clearing house of the world; London is the capital of the world. It is toward London that the wealth of the world flows. All this is because the English policy of free

trade has thrown down the bars to the commerce of the world. Considered as a whole, as a unit, the people of England have been enriched by free trade, one-sided though it has been. Only when we come to investigate individual conditions do we disclose British poverty—the poverty of England's working classes. Awful indeed it is, though no worse than individual poverty in our own highly protected country. But the poverty of England is not attributable to free trade.

If free trade, which has enriched England as a nation, has failed to enrich her working people, it is not because free trade is prejudicial to labor; nor is it because the free trade of England is one-sided, protection prevailing everywhere else; it is because the principle of free trade in England stops at the seaports. Internal free trade is unknown in England. Instead of the blessings of internal free trade, she is cursed with the blight of landlordism, which is a phase of protectionism. This is the reason the riches that free trade has brought so lavishly into England have not enriched her free working classes. They are grabbed by her protected leisure classes.

In harmony with the Chamberlain-Balfour argument for abandoning free trade in England is that of Gov. Cummins, of Iowa, Republican candidate for reelection, who recently (p. 404) committed his party to the astounding doctrine that "the chief purpose of government is to prevent natural consequences and to restrain the operation of natural law." It was with refreshing bluntness that Gov. Cummins put the protection theory, which prevails in the United States and is being now expounded in England by Chamberlain and Balfour, when he argued in his speech at Des Moines at the opening of the Republican campaign last month, that—

Free commerce is no more sacred than freebooting or free killing. The government is under as high obligation to pre-

vent the capture of our markets by foreign goods, if thereby the general welfare will be promoted, as it is to prevent the capture of our flag by a foreign enemy. It has the same duty to protect its people against unlimited importations, if thereby we are enabled to produce for ourselves, as it has to prevent the general issue of bank notes in order that the integrity of our currency may be preserved.

The latter parallel, that about bank currency, is so weak that Gov. Cummins must have been at a loss for a comparison. But there is no mistaking the import of his declaration that the government ought "to protect its people against unlimited importations." But what people ever needed such protection. If there is anything that any man can fully protect himself against, without the aid of government, it is against being supplied with more goods than he wants. Let him stop paying and the goods will stop coming. But that, of course, is not quite what Gov. Cummins means, although it is a fair inference from his words. What he means is that it is the duty of government to protect some of its people from loss of sales through the inclination of others of its people to buy elsewhere. In other words, he means that it is the duty of government to tax its buying people for the benefit of its selling people. And this is indeed the essence of protectionism. All the talk about "capturing our markets," as if it were the same thing as "capturing our flag," is unadulterated buncombe.

Who can "capture our markets" if our buyers will not buy of them? And what can induce our buyers to buy of foreign sellers unless the foreign seller serves them better than the home seller? Let the home seller give our buyers the best value for their money, and no foreign seller can capture our markets. But if he does not give them the best value for their money, the government cannot prevent the foreign seller's capturing our market except by sinking his goods in the sea or forbidding our buyers to buy of him.

Protectionism adopts the latter method. It puts a tax upon the foreign seller's cheaper or better goods, so as to make them cost more than the home seller's dearer or poorer goods. Thus the buyer is forced to pay more for what he gets than it is fairly worth. And that is described as "protecting our people" and "defending our markets" from capture! In truth, it is protecting our sellers against our buyers, and turning our markets into fighting arenas for our buyers and our sellers, with the power of government all the time on the side of the seller.

Apropos of the assaults upon the single tax theory by Mr. Herrick in the Ohio campaign, the following statement of a Baltimore manufacturer is suggestive: "It is absurd," said he, "for Mr. Herrick to say the single tax is impracticable. Taxes in Baltimore are about \$7,000,000 a year, while more than \$14,000,000 are paid by the citizens of Baltimore in ground rents alone. These ground rents, instead of going into the public treasury to be used for public purposes, as nine-tenths would under the single tax regime, now go all into private pockets." It is curious that it should be impracticable to collect common incomes for public use, but quite practicable to collect them for private use. Bewildering is the magic of "graft."

*In recently describing the autocratic municipal government of the District of Columbia (p. 386), we spoke of it as being governed by the President and a committee of Congress. That is what it amounts to. The method in detail, however, is explained by Frederick L. Siddons, a prominent lawyer of Washington, who writes:

Congress, under its constitutional grant of exclusive legislative power over the District, created for its government, nearly thirty years ago, a municipal corporation, the chief administrative officers of which are three Commissioners, two civilians, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and one army officer detailed from

the Engineer Corps. These men, constituting a Board, are charged with the administration of municipal affairs. Congress is the local Common Council and Board of Alderman. Under their rule, autocratic rule, as the President of the Board, Henry B. F. Macfarland, loves to call it, public spirit and civic pride have about departed from the inhabitants of the District. It is a government for favorites. The rich and the influential citizen has it all his own way. Gross inequalities in the matter of taxation are one of the striking incidents of this government by the "best citizens," as Macfarland continued to call it until this Summer, when a defalcation in the Auditing Department revealed a delightful disregard of the most ordinary safeguards, and several smaller-sized scandals dampened the ardor of one of the "best citizens," and for some months he has not piped his little tune. Fortunately the tide of public resentment against our municipal monstrosity is rising, slowly perhaps, but still rising, and one of these days, many of us hope and believe, will see the end of this paradox in local government.

It is fortunate for the national administration, which is trying so hard to re-elect Senator Hanna in Ohio, that the opposition press is weak. Think of the ill-smelling scandals in the post office department, to say nothing of the war department, and consider the wretched disclosures of the ship building trust, one of the "business interests" the Republican party has been conserving. A Democratic administration one-tenth as rotten within and without as the present Republican administration would be driven into political bankruptcy before the next national convention.

PEACE IN THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD.

In an article entitled "The Prospects of Industrial Peace," in *Colliers' Weekly* for August 22, Mr. Charles P. Neill, the assistant recorder of the Anthracite Arbitration commission appointed by President Roosevelt, began and ended his discussion of the subject by a denial that industrial peace is, or can ever be, a possibility. "The world of industry is not naturally a world of peace and amity," he declares, but is and will ever remain a world of clashing interests, of antagonism and of strife.

Mr. Neill claims that his conclusion is not pessimistic because it is based upon "facts."

His fundamental "fact" is "the nature of things."

If Mr. Neill's knowledge of the "nature of things" is true, we must no doubt join the ranks of those who believe as he, and accept his conclusion.

Let us inquire into the truth of his knowledge of the nature of things, and into the validity of his facts.

He asserts:

1. "Labor and capital are each alike pitiably helpless without the co-operation of the other. They are mutually and equally dependent upon one another for opportunity to engage in productive enterprise."

It follows that their interests are to this extent harmonious, and not antagonistic. Nevertheless—

2 There is absolutely nothing in the nature of things to furnish a just basis for the measure of the individual labor value, in co-operative enterprise.

It follows that labor can never get a fair proportion of the results, and labor and capital must, therefore, always be at strife for the largest share.

3. The interest of the consuming class is in the nature of things antagonistic to that of the producing class, and vice versa.

4. Competition is natural and inevitable. But competition is industrial warfare; it is a deadly tool which consumers delight to see producers use among themselves, and producers rejoice to see in use among consumers. It has, therefore, no ethical value.

It follows that the world of industry cannot in the nature of things be a world of peace and amity.

5. Human nature being what it is—every man's hand against every other man's—the world of industry cannot in the nature of things be a world of peace and amity.

6. These facts admitted, our only hope is a moral revolution—a change in human nature itself.

Does Mr. Neill truly understand the nature of things, when he supposes it to be a fact that labor and

capital are each pitiably helpless without the co-operation of the other—that they are mutually and equally dependent upon one another for opportunity to be productive?

It is indeed true that capital is in this helpless condition with reference to labor. Without labor it wastes. Capital has no power of volition or of motion; it can do nothing of itself. The capitalist, as far as he is a capitalist and nothing more, is in the same helpless condition.

Labor, on the other hand, has within itself, the power of self-activity and self-employment. Given land (the third factor in all production), and labor becomes with that co-operation the maker of all wealth, and so of all capital, and need own no dependence upon capital. For, in the true nature of things, the producer cannot be dependent upon the things he produces for the opportunity to engage in productive enterprise.

In the true nature of things that which labor is dependent upon, in order to use its productive power, is the natural opportunity—Land.

With every productive effort which labor puts forth it makes capital.

Capital is brought into existence by labor; capital is made productive only by labor.

There is, therefore, no such dependence of labor upon capital as Mr. Neill supposes.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he supposes that there is nothing in the nature of things to furnish a just basis for the measure of the individual labor value, in co-operative enterprises?

Has he any better ground for this assertion than that to the best of his knowledge and belief no such standard has yet been discovered?

Of course nothing can be a fact to the consciousness of any of us, that has not come within our individual knowledge. Yet we reasonably infer from things which have come within our knowledge that others which have not may yet be possible.

Standards of just measure have been found for many things as intangible as the labor value which constitutes a fractional

part of co-operative enterprises. They have been found for gases, liquids, heat, light, and electricity in every manner of combination, and for the weight and pressure upon the different parts of complex machinery; for almost everything, indeed, that the human mind has set itself to the task of finding. Without danger, therefore, of being the victim of that too "optimistic faith" which Mr. Neill so fears, we might infer that a standard could be found for the just measure of individual labor, in whatever combination it might occur.

And this standard has indeed been discovered, and by the same methods that have been adopted for ascertaining other standards.

The method is the simple one of addition and subtraction—of including and of eliminating.

Wherever labor has been free to withdraw itself from or to put itself into a co-operative enterprise, it has never been impossible for any man who has desired the co-operation of another man's labor service, to ascertain the just value of that labor service in the co-operative enterprise.

But labor is never really free to withdraw itself where the capitalist is also the monopolizer of nature's resources and where the laborer must therefore starve if he does not co-operate. Hence the test has only been possible where natural opportunities have been free.

But in the nature of things natural opportunities should be free; for no man has made them and no man should own them.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he assumes that it is possible to divide the world of industry into a producing class and a consuming class?

Outside the true industrial world we may, indeed, make such a division—in the mixed world of industry and idleness. But in the true world of industry, every man is both a producer and a consumer; and the division into two contending factions, with hostile interests, can no more be made without destroying the industrial world itself, than the child which was brought to test the wisdom of Solomon could have been cut asunder without destroying its life.

In this world of industry every man does, by his production and his power over his product, both satisfy the wants of other men and make an effective demand upon other men to satisfy his own wants. And every man in this same world does, by his consumption and by the obligation which he assumes through his consumption, both make an effective demand upon other men to satisfy his wants and place himself under the necessity to produce something to satisfy the wants of those whose products he consumes.

Because in this world of industry every man is in the nature of things both producer and consumer, it is impossible in the nature of things that there should be strife between producers and consumers.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he sees no ethical value in competition? Competition is strife for justice in exchange. It is an effort to effect an equation between services—a balance and harmony of interests. Its function is to bring out true value and the measure of value. If it is allowed freedom it can only result in peace. For where free exchange is permitted no one need compromise. Or, if we prefer the expression, "sane compromise" will be that adjustment by which all are equally benefited, and the claim of justice fully satisfied. Otherwise there need be no exchange nor bitterness.

It is true that in this world of industry competition, or strife for justice in exchange, is unremitting. It is for this very reason, however, not an unfriendly world, or a world of hostile interests, but a world in which the tendency is toward peace, because toward justice.

But this ethical value in true competition is denied by Mr. Neill and apprehended but by a few others, because in the industrial world of the present time competition is not true, because not free. One party in the strife—the monopolist of natural opportunities—enjoys an advantage which makes the competition "jug-handled," as it has been happily termed. Though posing as in the contest, the monopolist of natural opportunities is not a competitor

at all. He takes no part in the race. But the prize is his before the race is begun; and the race is the laborer's alone.

This is unethical; but this is not competition.

Does Mr. Neill understand the nature of things when he holds human nature responsible for the lack of peace? Does not every schoolboy know that human nature naturally takes to commerce? And has not commerce been the great peacemaker of the world?

And what is at the base of all people's making of things? If it is primarily the effort at self-expression and self-satisfaction, and therefore not wholly free from selfishness, yet is it not in large measure also the desire to serve or to please others?

What manufacturer, what agriculturist, what laborer on bridges or tunnels, what operator in any of the countless industries of our modern industrial life does the things which he does solely for himself? The man who should insist upon making things for himself alone would be the man who would never trade. Such a man can scarcely be found even among savages.

We have no need for a "moral millenium," as Mr. Neill supposes, to supplant selfishness as a "ruling motive" in men's lives. Human nature is far less selfish, in the narrow sense of the term, than we are taught to believe it is, even under conditions so unfavorable to its best manifestations as are those of the present time.

It is not a moral revolution that we need, but an intellectual awakening. We have no need to pray to God to make over again, and make better, the thing he has made and pronounced "good." We need only to gain a truer knowledge of our own nature and of the nature of things outside of ourselves, in order to discover the harmony of adaptation which, in the nature of things, is and must be between man and man, and between man and his environment.

Yet like that other nature outside of man, human nature has long been made the stalking horse behind which we have sought to conceal our inability to solve those problems which, while we have been in a stage of develop-

ment unequal to their solution, have appeared to us insoluble.

If now we have found the nature of things to be other than Mr. Neill has apprehended it to be—if, indeed, it is as it was pronounced at the outset, good, we shall not look as he does to a change in the nature of things, or to a moral revolution in man, to bring peace. We shall not rely upon prayer to God to do the work for us. We shall look to our own growth in knowledge and in power, through our own activity.

If we have found,

1. That labor's dependence is upon land; that capital's dependence is upon labor's free access to land;

2. That laborers need only free and equal access to natural opportunities to learn the value of their labor service, and to be in a position to command that value as against any who would usurp it;

3. If we have found that the consumer and producer being everywhere and always one and the same man, in the world of industry, cannot be at war with himself;

4. If we have found that competition is the natural agent of justice in exchange, and so the natural agent of peace; that its function is to bring out and to measure true Value.

If we have found that we have misinterpreted the true nature of competition, through not having seen it, but only something which seemed to resemble it, in operation.

If we have found that in the darkness of our intellectual night, which ignorance of the right use of land has made, we have allowed the real enemy of both labor and capital—the monopolizer of natural opportunities—to withdraw from the field, and that labor has thus been left to struggle with labor, not in healthy and friendly competition each to produce their best, but as deadly enemies to destroy each other, and that the monopolizer of natural opportunities has returned to the field only to reap the spoils;

5. If we have found that in the nature of things man's best friend is man; that it is no more necessary that human nature should be changed in order that we shall

have industrial peace than it is that it should be changed in order that babies should refrain from crying when they have pins stuck into them. That, at least, if human nature is to be changed we can't change it; but that we can change those conditions which call out its protests.

If we have learned these things, we shall not believe that peace in the industrial world is an impossibility, a "Utopian dream." But we shall know that we may realize it at any moment, when we agree to destroy that enemy of free competition and of the freedom of man—Monopoly of Nature's Resources.

This can be done with perfect justice to all, and, therefore, with injury to none, through taxation of land values, and exemption from all other taxation.

LIZZIE NYE NORTHROP.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Toledo, O., Oct. 13.—The unqualified endorsement of Johnson and Clarke by Mayor Jones, of this city, and the fusion of the Nonpartisan and the Democratic tickets in this county insure a solid county delegation to the legislature in favor of home rule and of Clarke for United States Senator. The uprising of the citizens of Toledo some weeks ago to prevent the extension of a public-service corporation franchise, in the face of Mayor Jones's veto, has aroused a local sentiment in favor of home rule which will be irresistible at the polls this year.

But even if the Democrats hold every senatorial and representative district they now have, and carry this county's entire delegation, they will still need thirteen additional districts now held by the Republicans. Three representative districts can be carried by a change of one vote in a hundred from the Republican to the Democratic ticket. Two senatorial districts can be carried by a change of two votes in a hundred. Three representative districts and one senatorial district can be carried by a change of three votes in a hundred. Five representative districts can be carried by a change of four in each hundred votes. As it has been the policy of the Democratic managers to concentrate their efforts in these close legislative districts, and as their meetings are better attended and more enthusiasm is manifested than in any other campaign of recent years, they feel quite confident that the close districts will be carried.

John H. Clarke says he has participated in all the principal campaigns of the last twenty years, but never has he seen the same interest manifested as he

finds everywhere he goes this year. Mayor Johnson says he finds the interest increasing from week to week, and that all indications point to a decisive victory.

D. S. LUTHER.

Pittsburg, Pa., October 11.—The closing of "a busy life with its fluctuations and its vast concerns" in this city recently occasioned more than ordinary notice. Here the dead man's name had been for a generation a household word, and because of his commanding position in the business world and at one time a leader in the councils of the dominant political party, tributes of respect and esteem from many sources seemingly gave expression to that "one touch of nature" which is said to make the whole world akin.

Having been the head of a great steel corporation, the younger generation of "captains of industry" had found in this patriarch a counselor and guide in the ever increasing complexity of commercial life. The career of the dead was held up as an example to be emulated by the American youth by those teachers of the gospel of "success," who with florid eloquence pointed to the pathway ever open to all and which leads to a gilded goal.

The career of the late steel king differed little from any of those beneficiaries of special privilege who have amassed colossal fortunes in our republic. Beginning many years ago with a single furnace, the dead man left a private fortune, as certified by his published will, of \$60,000,000, while furnaces and mills and coal and ore lands belonging to the vast steel plant are held, by the surviving family and partners, at a valuation of \$80,000,000.

The accumulation of property seems not to have changed the naturally benevolent character of this modern Croesus. It is said of him that he gave largely to the poor and without ostentation; that to his army of employes he was considerate, merciful, and just. What the world terms triumphs were his in many forms; the evening of his life was bright with the glow of abundant possessions, and at the ripe age of nearly four score years, in the hour of planning the observance of the anniversary of his wedded life, with all the delight of happy anticipation, Death came and whispered low.

Among the many messages of condolence received by the family one stands apart by reason of its sender and because of its suggestively worded conclusion. From his castle home in the Highlands of Scotland Andrew Carnegie sent words of sympathy to the widow, assuring her that "While we had been competitors, your husband and I were friends always," closing with a quotation from a speech delivered by Edmund Burke, at Bristol, in

1782: "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

If the rich man to whose death reference has been made placed the acquisition of material things above all else, measured by the standard of eternal life he had, indeed, grasped at shadows. It is known that great economic truths were held by him to be but vagaries of disordered minds. For many years he had been one of the strongest advocates of the "highest protection to the American workingman," and his arguments in printed form against the "dangers" of free trade and his pleas for the extreme protective tariff system are among the archives of his political party, while during the presidential campaign of 1884 he became prominent as chairman of the national Republican executive committee.

It is undoubtedly true, as Mr. Carnegie said, that the dead steel master and himself, while competitors, were always friends, for between these two in practically monopolizing the steel and iron industry, and enriched at the expense of the American people, there was neither room nor occasion for personal antagonism.

As a world-wide figure, posing as simply a trustee of vast resources Mr. Carnegie is a Nimrod in the pursuit of shadows. The toilers at Homestead build, but they do not enter in. Through the agency of their trustee they have filled hall and sanctuary with melody, yet to their humble homes and dreary lives no music comes.

Mr. Carnegie sets aside a million or more for a palace of peace at The Hague, and almost simultaneously with this announcement is printed in leaded type and black headlines of display an item detailing the arrival in this city, en route to the Homestead mills, upon a car specially constructed for the purpose of its transportation, one of the largest castings ever made, to be a part of machinery for the manufacture of enginery of war—to mangle and kill the children of God.

A noble impulse was that which animated this pseudo-philanthropist when he so largely endowed the Tuskegee institute, for the destiny of the freedman is the same as that of the Caucasian, but Mr. Carnegie cannot see that beyond the dark shadows of violated law, for the members of an emancipated race whom he seeks to further uplift, new shackles are even now being formed which ultimately will bind with greater cruelty than those of a Legree. The dispatches from the Southland and the West within a few weeks have told of the acquisition by Pittsburg and other capitalists of thousands of acres of land underlaid with coal and iron ore. What, then, will confront the graduate of Mr. Washington's school as he steps out

mentally equipped for the battle of life? To the monopolist of natural resources and opportunities the representative of a people once held as chattel slaves becomes a dependent and an industrial serf. Still in bondage. The problem which is termed "The Negro Problem" is also the white man's problem—the problem of the human race.

To this city Mr. Carnegie has apportioned millions for the building of a technological institute, and this is regarded by a certain class here and elsewhere as the Scotchman's greatest benefaction. The plan and purpose of this seat of learning is to provide young men with an education without cost to the student. Newspapers have printed columns in describing the magnificent opportunities that will thus be opened to young men. Railroads and other corporations, they say, are constantly in need of young men to fill positions whose requirements demand technical knowledge and skill. This is a siren's song. In the employ of corporations here, numerous as they are, there are thousands of young men engaged as clerks, draughtsmen, designers, and civil engineers, whose hope of advancement, despite their ability, is as distant as a star, while the "want" columns of the great dailies in our large cities show an ever increasing appeal for work from men who recite their qualifications for positions demanding high mental attainments.

Every year there is an army of graduates from our common schools, and it is the majority of these of both sexes that drop their diplomas and the bright associations and memories of the classroom to engage in the pathetic struggle for bread. However, as combination of capital and centralization of effect in all lines of industrial activity is the tendency of the times, it cannot be forgotten that one of the strongest arguments of trust defenders is that combination, while bringing larger dividends, also lessens the cost of production. In other words, there will be more idle men and women.

Mr. Carnegie's technical school may be outwardly a thing of beauty; its faculty include teachers whose wisdom is profound in the realm of physics; but the curriculum will not intentionally convey to the student a single gleam of truth to show him his relation to the planet and the natural order of life, whereby he (as are all men) is entitled to the use of the earth—an equal participant of the bountiful provision the Lord hath made. "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

Shadows are we all, indeed; as spiritual beings, in earthly tenement for a brief sojourn, a reflection of the Infinite. Any quest which leads us from

a fulfillment of the divine laws and a living testimony to the glory and majesty of the Creator is a search for phantoms and a defilement of the soul. As we leave the artificial atmosphere of the city to listen to the throbbing of Nature's heart in all the beauties of earth and sky we but see and hear the manifestations of the Father's endless love. The Lord is in His Holy Temple. Let all the earth keep silence before Him.

Yet, in full view of this divine harmony, a spiritually dead church with solemn dictum, to which bonded doctrinaires assent, declares that the monstrous misery, shame and want in the crowded centers of social life is also according to God's will.

Only to the morally perverted, to those who worship at the shrine of Mammon, those whose obsequiousness to the power of money is a confession of their degeneration—to these alone does the pitiable figure of Mr. Carnegie, as a mere almoner of other people's substance, appeal. The spirit of adulation breathed forth so widely at every so-called gift of beneficiary of special privilege and of monopoly shows the decline of that pure and lofty patriotism which inspired our sires to deeds of heroic sacrifice that posterity might be free, and with this decline must slowly fade the real liberties of a republic.

The last years of the past century saw two figures prominent in the affairs of men, although the aims of one were a perfect antipodes to the other's purpose. One stood upon the Mt. Olympus of human thought, listening to the harmonies of God's voice; the other in the flickering shadows of the valley, delving with a muck rake; one saw the glory and beauty of his Creator's plan through all the dark clouds of injustice in the defiles below; the other's vision opened only to the gleam of gold and its enervating power; one touched the keys of the great organ of universal law and mankind was thrilled and exalted by the master's symphony; the other sounded a fanfare from the brazen trumpet of vainglory, and thoughtless, fawning sycophants bent the knee; the one remains, resting upon his rake while watching shadows; the other, whose great soul is beyond mortal ken, still speaks, and from beyond the tomb we may hear the message, now fraught with greater meaning: "Strong soul and high endeavor, the world needs them now. Beauty still lies imprisoned, and iron wheels go over the good and true and beautiful that might spring from human lives."

JAMES A. WARREN.

Nankin, China, Sept. 5.—It may interest some readers of The Public to know that our great health resort of central

China is partly under the single tax system. Let me explain.

Seven years ago the top of Bull's Head Peak (Ku Nin Ling), near Kiu Kiang, was secured as a health resort. The land cost a mere song. It was divided into over 100 lots of nearly an acre each. These were sold to missionaries at \$150 a lot and to business people at \$200. Thus some \$20,000 was secured which was all put into making the necessary improvements—roads, ditches, etc.

Unfortunately a heavy land tax was not imposed at once, and there was considerable land gambling. Lots ran up to \$600 and later to over \$1,200.

It was known that a constitution for the place was to be voted on, and some of our "best citizens" met and designed a constitution of rather medieval type, with a vote for each lot a man held and one for each house. I protested, but was hooted down. The crowd followed the influential ones and their constitution was established.

Next year, however, some of us got together in political meetings and easily changed this system to a "one man one vote" plan.

The old constitution fixed the taxes at \$10 a lot and \$24 for a house. We, with our new franchise, changed this to \$20 for a lot and \$14 for a house. I wanted the taxes levied entirely on the lots, but could not get everything our way. The \$20 a lot is equal, I think, to 2 per cent. and is very effectual. It has compelled the sale and use of all idle land, or practically so, and there are \$200,000 worth of houses now. This object lesson gives me great encouragement.

It seemed to me strange that a lot of missionaries should in the first year vote to establish a George III enfranchisement, but a rich man led in the matter. I have learned that the love of money is a root of all evil, but the love of a moneyed man (toadyism) is surely of the devil himself.

Americans at home are working for the single tax. We in China have it in the German colony, Kiaochow, and a half application in this health resort of Bull's Head Peak. I was talking with Count P—, just returned from Kiaochow the other day, about the colony there and the single tax, and he told me it was working well.

Before our Viceroy Liu died we memorialized him on single tax lines and he appointed a commissioner to look into it. The commissioner, though an old conservative, reported favorably, but the old viceroy died before anything was accomplished. I hear, however, that waste land is to be taxed as well as arable land. This will open up employment for labor and do good in other ways.

Kang Yu Wei, the adviser of the Emperor in his reforms before he was snuffed out, is now recommending the single tax. He must have read the translation of Progress and Poverty, which is in the second edition.

Li Wei Yuen, a magistrate, was work-

ing the Mayor Pingree plan of putting the poor on the land. But he was an honest official and did not steal enough to purchase another office, and I fear he is stranded. If he gets another office he hopes to put an end to poverty and brigandage by enabling the people to make a living on the land.

Every large city is full of reformers and revolution will come soon. The reformers are the brightest of the people, but rather indiscreet—barking before they can bite.

W. E. MACKLIN.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 15.

The first of Mayor Johnson's meetings last week in the Ohio campaign (p. 424), outside of Cleveland, was at Kenton on the 6th. Kenton is the county seat of the Republican county of Hardin. A Hanna-Herrick meeting had been held there the night before (p. 424). Johnson's audience was estimated to number 3,700. Senator Hanna had advised his audience, in his speech of the night before, to ask Mayor Johnson two questions, and Mayor Johnson invited the asking of them. But no one responded. Mayor Johnson consequently asked the questions himself and answered them. He is reported thus by the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

"Mr. Hanna last night left word with you to ask me a question. I will now give you a chance to ask it."

A long pause.

"Has Mr. Hanna no friends here?"

Another pause.

"I do not wish to ask the question myself."

A third pause:

"Well, this is the question: 'Why are the farmers going to support the Democratic platform this fall.' In the first place the farmers are going to support the Democratic platform because they wish to have 2-cent steam railroad fare. This is one very good reason. Even Senator Hanna does not oppose this plank, and I do not know of a man who has opposed it, unless he were in some way connected with the railroads.

"But there was another question that Mr. Hanna told you to ask me when I came to Kenton. 'What has Johnson done for the laboring man or the farmer?' I will answer that question. I have done nothing. I am trying to help the laboring man and the farmer to help themselves. The laboring man and the farmer do not want charity, either from me or from Mr. Hanna. What they want is a fair chance. What we are

trying to do is to help one another. Mr. Hanna's question implies that they want charity. It implies, too, perhaps, that he has given much charity to the laboring man and the farmer in the past. But instead of charity the laboring man and the farmer desire justice and fair play. Clear away monopoly and special privilege, and injustice will be eradicated and all men will have an equal chance before the law."

Mayor Johnson's next meeting was at Ada, also in Hardin county, where he spoke first on the 7th at the court house, and again at the Ohio Normal University, before 1,000 students, nearly all Republicans. The latter meeting was unique, and we give a trustworthy report of it in the Miscellany department of this issue. During the same day Johnson was at Lima in the Democratic county of Allen, and at Piqua in the Republican county of Miami. On the 8th he spoke at Paulding in the Republican county of Paulding, at Van Wert in the Republican county of Van Wert, and at Delphos in the Democratic county of Allen. The Van Wert meeting was impromptu, but the attendance was fully 2,000; meetings at Paulding and Delphos were attended respectively by about 2,500 and 4,000 people. Two large meetings were held on the 9th, one at Montpelier in the Republican county of Williams, and the other at Bryan in the same county, the attendance being respectively 1,200 and 4,000.

At the huge meeting at Bryan, Mr. Johnson spoke on the single tax, doing so in answer to a question from the audience. As reported by Carl T. Robertson, the staff correspondent of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, he said:

They say that Johnson's doctrine is to put all taxes on land so that the burdens of taxation will bear with great injury upon the farmer. This is not true, and the men who are making this charge, who are sending out boiler plate to the country newspapers, know that it is not true. If they really believed what they are charging, they would be in favor of the single tax, for they are the owners of the valuable privileges and franchises and not of the farm lands. Instead of single tax these men believe in double tax, they believe that you should pay your own taxes and the taxes of the steam railroads as well. The single tax does not propose to tax land. It proposes to tax land values. The steam railroad right of way is the most valua-

ble of all land, made valuable by the people of the State. Under single tax the farmers would pay less than one-third as much in taxes as they pay now, while the railroads would have to pay a good deal more. But the single tax is not in this campaign. I wish to God it was! You will never settle the labor problem, you will never learn how to live most happily, till you learn that it is franchises and valuable privileges and monopoly rights that should bear the burdens of taxation now borne, unjustly, by the masses of the people.

Toledo, in the Republican county of Lucas, was the place of meeting on the 10th. The meeting there was comparatively small,—only about 2,000 being within the tent; but it was made notable by a speech from Mayor Jones. As outlined in Robertson's report to the Plain Dealer, Mayor Jones concluded his speech as follows:

I have come here to say that I stand for the same principles of political independence which I have advocated for years. This election is a mere incident in the campaign which I am waging. In this State has been set up a government which is part of the machine of the Republican party, and has been used as a tool to enrich a few men who have gained ascendancy in that party. It would be the same with the Democratic party if the Democrats had been in power in this State for ten years. I want to destroy all parties, and to this end I want to start now by destroying the party which is in power in this State. I would not ask a single man to vote for Tom Johnson, even if I knew that it would ensure his victory, neither would I ask a man to vote against the legislative candidates pledged to Mark Hanna even though I knew that this would secure his defeat, though I dearly desire both results. I know, too, that my request would be more potent with many of you men than dollars. I want each one of you to think and act and vote independently. I am merely trying to tell you why I am going to vote for Tom Johnson and against Mark Hanna. (Great applause.) Unless I change my mind. (Laughter.) You know this is quite possible. A few years ago when I was carrying a banner and yelling for the Republican party and protection I was just as honest as I am now. Now I am more intelligent, that's all. I guess you all know about where I'm at this Fall. I don't know where you are standing. I hope you all are as free as I am. From now on I expect to tell you more of my position. I shall speak frequently before the end of the campaign.

Johnson and Monnett were both among the speakers at Toledo. At a subsequent meeting at Toledo.

at which Mr. Clarke, the Democratic candidate for United States Senator (who has been speaking to large meetings in other parts of the State), was the principal speaker, Mayor Jones said, as reported by the local press:

"I am going to vote for Johnson because I think he's the freest man in partisan politics in the United States of America. But I don't think the party will hold Johnson long. They say he's after the Presidency. He is after a principle, which is higher than the Presidency. . . . I am going to vote, unless I change my mind, for Clarke, because I know Clarke is not for the things Hanna openly announces he's for—the ship subsidies and protective tariffs, which have built up vast private fortunes."

Mayor Johnson has been obliged, under the advice of physicians, to rest his voice. His engagements scheduled for Ottawa and Findlay have consequently been cancelled and John J. Lentz, of Columbus, has been asked to fill them.

Senator Hanna's meeting (p. 424) on the 6th was held at Piqua, in the Republican county of Miami. At this meeting Mr. Hanna declared:

The importance of the election in Ohio this Fall is of the gravest, as bearing upon national issues. The legislature you will select will be called upon to choose a successor to your 'Uncle Mark' if you please. If anything comes as a result of this election to disturb the captains of industry, what will happen? . . . There is already visible a hesitancy that is creating a lull in business because of the little fear over the political situation in this State. What would the fulfillment of that dread be if it should be announced on the morning of November 4 that Johnson had captured the legislature? God forbid—for then not only Ohio but the whole country will have to suffer. . . . I want to go on record on this proposition: The result of the election in Ohio this Fall will absolutely and beyond the question of a doubt determine whether the present condition of prosperity in this country is to continue or not.

On the 7th Senator Hanna's meeting was at Mansfield, in the Democratic county of Richland, and on the 8th he returned to Cleveland, where a large tent meeting was held on the 10th, the first time the Republicans have ventured to use a tent since Johnson's introduction of that style of

campaigning. At the Cleveland meeting there were glee club songs followed with speeches by Mr. Herrick, Mr. Hanna, Secretary Shaw, head of the United States treasury department, and some minor speakers. Secretary Shaw has entered into the Ohio campaign by permission of President Roosevelt. He had written to the President stating his wish to participate, and the President replied as follows:

Oyster Bay, N. Y., Aug. 31.—My Dear Secretary Shaw: I am glad you are going to Ohio, and I agree most heartily with all that you say. The return of Mr. Hanna to the Senate and the triumph of the principles for which he stands in the present contest are things that concern not merely Ohio, but our country as a whole, and I congratulate you upon having the chance to do your share to secure not merely the triumph but the decisive and overwhelming triumph of Senator Hanna and the cause which he represents.

Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. Shaw spoke first at Akron during the day of the 10th.

An anti-Johnson Democratic organization has been formed in Cleveland, with Samuel Holding as its president. Mr. Holding is the law partner of Harvey Goulder, the Republican candidate for mayor (p. 5), whom Johnson defeated last Spring. Coincidentally Mr. Herrick has effected a union with the anti-Hanna Republicans of Cleveland, who are under the leadership of ex-Mayor McKisson. Republican leaders are confident that through this union their party will recover control of Cuyahoga county, not only securing the gubernatorial vote of that county for Herrick as against Johnson, but also electing a Republican legislative delegation.

In British politics Chamberlain's tariff proposals concentrate all interest. An expression of opinion on the subject was elicited from organized labor on the 8th at the convention of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, composed of delegates representing a membership of 347,000, which was in session at Glasgow. A resolution declaring with reference to the views of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour that—the Federation believes that the policy they foreshadow in regard to protection

would be a great mistake and would ultimately lead to the ruin of this country, and hereby resolves to protest against any alteration of the free trade policy which has existed for the last sixty years—

was, after a heated debate, carried by 89 to 5.

Mr. Balfour has made the following additional ministerial selections, reported from London on the 11th:

Lieutenant Colonel William Bromley-Davenport, M. P., as financial secretary to the war office; Ernest G. Pretzman, secretary to the admiralty; Major Arthur H. Lee, M. P., civil lord of the admiralty; Lord Balcarras, M. P., junior lord of the treasury; the Marquis of Hamilton, treasurer of the household.

NEWS NOTES.

—The extension of the American railroad across Porto Rico, from San Juan to Ponce, was opened on the 10th.

—An experimental car on the Berlin-Zossen electric railway attained the speed of 125 miles an hour in a trial trip on the 10th.

—John Alexander Dowie ("Elijah the Restorer") left Zion, near Chicago, on the 14th at the head of 3,000 followers for a missionary trip to New York city. They made eight train loads.

—Mrs. Lucy Rider Meyer, principal of the Chicago Training School for Missions, was chosen on the 9th to represent the Methodists of northern Illinois at the General Conference of the M. E. Church at Los Angeles next April.

—Ex-President Cleveland arrived in Chicago on the 14th to be the guest of the Commercial Club (p. 300), and at a banquet on that evening he spoke on "American Good Citizenship" to a gathering of about 200 of the richest men of Chicago.

—The National Sociological Society—an organization for the study of the condition of the colored people of the United States, and to suggest plans for improvement—has called a conference to be held at Washington, D. C., November 9-11, 1903.

—The only action of the Chicago City Council on the subject of municipal ownership (p. 425) on the 12th related to an ordinance, prepared by the corporation counsel, upon the order of the Council (p. 425), for the submission of the Mueller act to popular vote. The ordinance was made a special order for the 19th.

—By a decision of the New York Court of Appeals, the highest of the State, it was held on the 13th that it is a criminal offense in that State for the custodians of children to deny them medical attendance in sickness, though the custodian sincerely believes in faith cure and de-

nies the efficacy of drugs. This was a "Dowie" case.

—At the Henry George association, Hanzel hall, Chicago, the following speakers are announced: October 15, at 8, Edward M. Winston, on "Social Influence as a Factor in Judicial Decisions;" October 18, at 3:30, John Z. White, on the "Single Tax;" October 22, at 8, Hon. Francis W. Parker, on "Law Making and Law Makers."

—The 60-foot steel-built flying machine, the climax of years of exhaustive study in the efforts of Prof. Samuel P. Langley, secretary of the Smithsonian institution, to solve the problem of mechanical flight, was launched on the 7th. The immense airship sped rapidly along its 70-foot track, was carried by its own momentum for 100 yards, and then fell gradually into the Potomac river.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 378) for the month ending September 30, 1903, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$71,903,296.32
Internal revenue.....	60,447,458.87
Miscellaneous	11,083,317.19
	\$143,434,072.38
Expenses:	
Civic and misc.....	\$33,421,514.90
War	34,742,518.75
Navy	23,684,221.66
Indians	2,873,024.96
Pensions	57,670,650.61
Interest	5,471,766.34
	\$137,843,697.28
Surplus	\$ 5,590,375.10

—A sweeping injunction against the Cincinnati Typographical union and the Trade and Labor council was granted on the 13th by Judge Belden. It forbids every union man in the city from taking part in a boycott against the Republican News or any of its advertisers or patrons, and restrains the publication of an "unfair" list of business houses in the labor organ. This is the first injunction which has gone so far as to regulate newspaper publications. Legal decisions heretofore have without exception denied the right to issue injunctions restraining the freedom, or even the license, of the press, holding that publishers must be free to publish what they will, being answerable therefor before a jury.

PRESS OPINIONS.

RHODE ISLAND POLITICS.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Oct. 9 (weekly ed.).—Gov. Garvin's unanimous re-nomination by the Rhode Island Democrats is a deserved indorsement. The platform is confined to State issues, as it should be, in order that the supreme question of government by the people and reform in the constitutional and administrative system may be brought as forcibly as possible to the attention of the voters. The Governor's speech before the convention was keyed to this issue, and there is every indication that he will make a powerful appeal for support in the coming campaign. Surely Rhode Island has a governor whose defeat would be a calamity to the cause of reform and purity in politics. Independent Republicans have an exceptional opportunity to strike

a blow at misgovernment and an exceptionally degenerate bossism by supporting Dr. Garvin in November.

OHIO POLITICS.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Oct. 9 (weekly ed.).—"We have planted the flag in the Orient and we are going to keep it there," says Senator Hanna to an Ohio audience. So much for the pretensions of his crowd as to our being there only to educate the people in self-government, etc. Hanna stands for as rank an imperialism as is known anywhere in the world, not excepting the government of the Czar.

The Commoner (Dem.).—Strange world, this. When some one wrote a letter to Mr. Hanna demanding \$500, secret service men were put on the track of the correspondent. But when Mr. Hanna's campaign manager writes to Federal officeholders demanding 3 per cent. of their salaries for the g. o. p. campaign fund it is merely hailed as "good politics."

EQUALITY OF SUFFRAGE.

The American Hebrew, Sept. 11.—Dr. Lyman Abbott believes that the Negroes are an inferior, separate and distinct race. Of course he holds that the white are superior. Dr. Abbott believes, strenuously, in the failure of universal suffrage, and would place the black race outside the pale of political rights. If we were dealing with a race territorially homogeneous, or equal in the inferiority of its members, Dr. Abbott's view might be allowed with us as much justice as was shown to the American colonists before the revolutionary war. Even then, with the Negroes set apart, there might be equality in suffrage rights, for of course, as between the Negroes, there would be no superiors or inferiors. Dr. Abbott's view might open the way to further limitations of rights; why not seek out the white man who shows a falling off from the white standard? We might make a new classification, and put our "poor white trash" down as inferiors not deserving of the suffrage owing to ignorance, shiftlessness or degeneracy. The law at present safeguards the suffrage. We need no further eliminations. A democratic government has no right to insist on the quality of its citizenship, aside from those necessary precautions which have already been taken. Dr. Abbott's advocacy of the limitation of the suffrage is a danger to democracy; but democracy does not seem to be to the liking of those who are reasoning themselves into a belief in the rights of the majority to tyrannize over the minority.

MISCELLANY

DEBT AND PROTECTION.

(The British taxpayer soliloquizes.)

Mr. Chamberlain's proposed tariff would, according to his own figures, as stated in his speech at Glasgow on October 6th, increase the British revenue by about \$35,000,000 a year, which, at 2½ per cent., would pay the interest on a debt of \$1,400,000,000. The enormous expense incurred by the British government during the war in South Africa suggests the probability that this increase in revenue is partly the object of the proposed tariff.

There's a terrible suspicion,
Keeps arising in my mind,
Though I never was a person
Of an apprehensive kind;
And the thought of that suspicion
Makes me dreadfully afraid,
When I read about the government
Abandoning Free Trade.

For it's possible. It's probable,
Let's hope it isn't true,
That the books we all have heard about
Have balanced up so blue;
That the debit's so prodigious,
They must have some cash or "bust,"
That they must tax something soon—no
matter what—
Because they must.

That their cry about "our colonies"
Is meant to be a blind;
That they go, because Gehenna's lord
Is hounding them behind;
That the ministers are driven
To the verge of desperation,
And the only course that's left them
Is to fool the British nation.

That they know Free Trade's no "failure"
But the finest thing on earth;
That their "facts" to prove the contrary
Are fitting food for mirth;
That the wolves are close upon them,
And there's nothing left to fling 'em;
That, in short, they need the money,
Which Protection's got to bring 'em.
BERTRAND SHADWELL.

PATRIOTISM.

Before we enter on the business of teaching patriotism in the public schools, should we not choose once for all as between the various styles of patriotism?

Certainly it would seem well to avoid, if possible, having our children's patriotism fall into the chaotic state of their handwriting, which by reason of infirmity of pedagogical purpose is neither vertical nor slanting.

Shall it be the strenuous patriotism of Mr. Roosevelt, or the reposeful patriotism of Mr. D. B. Hill, or an eclectic patriotism?—Life.

THE LETTERS OF A FOREIGNER.

One of the most impressive things in this glorious and misgoverned country is the happy condition of the laboring people who are in constant trouble with their employers. Everywhere the workingman is happy, prosperous and either on a strike or getting ready to strike about the first of May. I find that almost all of the American laborers own their homes and are constantly being evicted by greedy landlords who hold their tenants in practical slavery. Here freedom and equality exist in the fullest measure. The schools are open to all. Every child has an opportunity to secure an education at the expense of the state. The result is that everybody is educated and striving for better, higher things, while the factories are full of little children for whom there is no hope. I have been looking carefully into industrial conditions and reading up on both sides, the result being that I can truthfully say that the working people of America were never so well off as they are at present, while in the poor-

er districts of the great cities the state of affairs seems to be about the worst on earth.

The poorest boy in the land still has the happy knowledge that he may some day be President, but the recent great changes in industrial conditions make it practically impossible for those at the bottom to ever get up hereafter, except through miracles. Everywhere I find contentment and subdued murmurs of hatred for the ruling classes. The working people go about with happy, smiling faces and an eager longing to throw a few rocks just for luck. It is very interesting and instructive. Every man, however poor he may be, feels that he is a part of the body politic and fully realizes that the machinery of the government is run by a few bosses in the interests of those who have money to pay for such legislation as they want. The result is a united and homogeneous people rapidly drawing toward a bloody revolution.

Trusting that I have been fair to both sides, I beg to remain as ever your obedient servant.—Theophilus Fitzmaurice Garmoyle, Benson, Iowa.

WORDS OF CHEER FROM SOUTH AFRICA.

A letter written from East London, Cape Colony, South Africa, under date of August 26, by A. Kirkland Soga, editor of "Izwi Labantu," a Kaffir-Sesutho English weekly, published in East London.

The accompanying lines are my tribute of esteem for William Jennings Bryan, and also to those Single Tax men and women, white and black, everywhere, who are striving for the cause of human freedom, and the social emancipation of all.

Personally I am satisfied that as far as it is within the power of human effort to accomplish the amelioration of the social condition of the white people, and thus through them the Negroes and other colored races who are less advanced on the highway of progress, the solution politically lies along the lines of true democracy.

There is a true democracy, and there is also a false and spurious article which is masquerading under that title at the present time, much to the inconvenience of the Stalwarts, and the masking of the real issues, which are struggling against many adverse conditions to assert themselves. Like all great causes, true democracy has a long pull before it; but it also has a strong and most encouraging party espousing its principles, which, because of their transparent truthfulness, must overcome in the long run.

Your cause may not be hopeful for the next Presidential election, but what of that? It is not for Presidential elections that this battle is being fought, but for the election of Man to his proper place in the existing order of things. How soon, or how long, therefore, appears to me insignificant, the platform being what it is, and the men being willing and able to advance it at all times and seasons.

The American Negroes, in whom, being an Afro-Anglican, I am of course especially interested, are being led by a sentimental regard for old associations in the Republican party, to support what was once but is now no longer, able to fulfill their ideals. But that is a long story, and it does not alter my high regard for President Roosevelt who would, if he could, but unfortunately cannot, and never will be able to grant the Negroes as a race the full social and political amelioration they seek.

My opinions count for nothing, nor do I desire to force them on anybody, but I ask the opportunity of expressing them with the liberty involved in freedom of the press, by your good will. There will probably come a time in politics when the Negro will call a halt, and will reconsider the whole position. That time is not yet, but there are already Negroes of prophetic insight who look far ahead; men like Bishop Henry Turner, of Atlanta, who can see a little further through a brick wall than some of his countrymen are prepared to give him credit for; and he is not alone, either. Time, sir, time and patience—much against our will, perhaps—but yet again patience, and those sun-glints of which Macaulay speaks, which touch the tops of the highest mountains first, will break out in their full effulgence, overspreading hill and valley with the fullness of light.

HAIL TO THE STALWARTS.

Ho! for the Stalwarts who swear by the soil,
For the Gallants who labor, and struggle and toll;
True patriots, and freemen, who fear not the frown
Of tyrants, who seek but to trample them down.

The powers of Misrule shall yet quake at the tread
Of the hosts of the army of Liberty's cause;
And Anarchy struck by the panic of dread
In vain seek to shelter 'neath Tyranny's laws.

Ho! for the Stalwarts, the pride of the bold,
The hope of their country, the strength of their race,

Who scorn to be bought, sold, or tempted with Gold
And sternly resist the foul taint of disgrace.

Who scorn to cry—Hold! who disdain to surrender
To the haughty demands of proud kinglets uncrowned;

But whose shout of defiance shall peal forth like Thunder,
Or the blast of the Trumpet of Victory's sound.

Hail! to the Stalwarts who lead in the World
'Gainst the strongholds of avarice, drink and despair.

The curses of Sin from their thrones shall be hurled;
And man shall rejoice in his freedom from care.

Brutality's chains shall no longer enthrall!
From the wrists of the Bondsman, the shackles shall fall.

And Afric! whose Sorrows cry loudly to Heaven.

Shall "stretch out her hands"—and be Blessed and Forgiven.

Our wives and our children shall break forth in Song

In the fullness of joy at the End of the Days;

And mankind released from Oppression and Wrong

Shall "sound the loud timbrel" in peans of praise.

Ho! for the creatures of envy and greed;
Ha! for the Plutocrat's merciless rod!
From the curse of oppression the Helots are freed;

Jehovah shall Triumph! Hosanna to God!
A. KIRKLAND SOGA.

CUBAN RECIPROCITY.

President Roosevelt has determined to call Congress in extraordinary session November 9th for the express purpose of ratifying the Cuban reciprocity treaty. When the last Congress adjourned without ratifying this treaty, although the President had used all the great power of his office to force it through, he declared in one of his speeches that the treaty would be ratified, "as sure as fate." The fated day will soon be here, and the forces of the rival factions of the Republican party are buckling on their armor for the fight. The ground work of the squabble is sugar and the Sugar Trust. Whatever reduction the treaty finally contains on the tariff on raw sugar, is an increased profit to the Sugar Trust, except any slight advance the Cuban sugar grower may obtain over the price now paid by the trusts. The Trust wants to have Cuban sugar on the free list, but is willing to take any discount that it can get Congress to allow. The present duty on raw sugar amounts to \$36 per ton; and as the Cuban crop is about 900,000 tons, which would give the trust the enormous bonus of \$32,400,000 annually, if the Cuban treaty should only allow a dis-

count of 25 per cent. from the present duty on raw sugar, the saving to the Sugar Trust would approximate or perhaps exceed \$8,000,000.

It is rather startling to have President Roosevelt so anxious to see this bonus given to the Sugar Trust, and yet pose as the great trust fighter. But it must be remembered that no trust has been prevented from its extortion by the Republican plan of fighting them, and that "words are good only when backed by deeds."

The faction of the Republicans that is fighting Cuban reciprocity is the ultra-protectionists, who declare that no letter or word of the sacred tariff must be changed; and they are backed by the money of the trusts and the protected organizations and monopolies. The Protective Tariff League, the organization of the manufacturers who are benefited by the tariff, is the center around which all monopolists gather, and is supported by the money of monopolists. Its organ, the American Economist, is fighting Cuban reciprocity tooth and nail, on the ground that the Republican party is pledged to protect the domestic sugar growing interests. In its issue of September 11 it appeals to the Republicans to stand firm for those interests, and says:

There are some things which even Congress cannot do, and one of these things is to enact a revenue measure which originates with the Executive, is ratified by the Senate, and finally "approved" by the House of Representatives. Article 6 of the Constitution prescribes a procedure precisely the reverse of this. It requires that all laws relating to the revenues shall originate in the House, be concurred by the Senate and approved by the President. From the foundation of the Republic up to the present day this procedure has been followed. No revenue measure has ever been enacted into a law that did not originate in the House of Representatives.

Thus this faction of the Republican party takes issue with President Roosevelt and his faction by declaring that a reciprocity treaty which reduces the tariff is unconstitutional because, "all laws relating to the revenues must originate in the House of Representatives." As this reciprocity treaty with Cuba will be the most important political issue that will come before Congress, the position of the Democrats, who hold the balance of power between the Republican factions, is significant. At the close of the last Congress, after Cuban reciprocity had been defeated, the Democratic members held a caucus and declared:

Resolved, First: That we condemn the Republican majority in Congress for their failure to pass a measure providing reciprocity with Cuba.

The bill which passed the House of Rep-

resentatives was heartily supported by the Democratic minority after the protection to the sugar trust had been removed by the solid Democratic vote, aided by a small minority of the Republican members. As it passed the House, the bill carried relief to Cuba, reduced the price of sugar to American consumers and struck a heavy blow at the notorious and obnoxious sugar trust. The refusal of the Republican senators to consider this measure unless the protection to the sugar trust should be restored gives evidence that the President and the Republican party in Congress are willing to refuse relief to Cuba and totally ignore American consumers, rather than abandon their alliance with the trusts.

From these declarations it will be seen that the Democrats favor Cuban reciprocity, but demand that at the same time the protection to the Sugar Trust of one cent and upwards a pound on refined sugar, known as the differential duty, should be abolished. That proposition was passed by the House of Representatives, the vote being: Yeas, 199; nays, 105; 61 Republicans voting with the Democrats. (See Congressional Record, April 18, 1902, page 4610.)

The minority faction of the Republicans thus voting with the Democrats made the majority for the abolition of the protection to the Sugar Trust. The bill then passed the House as amended: Yeas, 247; nays, 52; but the Senate refused to adopt it.

The whole fight will be repeated when Congress meets, and it will be interesting to watch the votes of the Republican members, and see how they line up, for or against the Administration programme. The Democrats will offer the same amendment to abolish the differential duty on refined sugar which gives shelter to the Trust, and adds at least one cent a pound to all sugar consumed in this country. * * *

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

AS AN ADMINISTRATOR.

A committee of three men connected with the city government of Montreal were in the city yesterday investigating the methods of street cleaning and other work in charge of the board of public service. They are on a tour through several cities of the Middle States. The visitors were very favorably impressed with the condition of the city's streets and were surprised to learn the relatively small cost of the work.

"We pay a good deal more than that," said one of the men, "but our streets are much dirtier than yours." They considered the Cleveland street cleaning service the best they had seen. They left for Detroit after a tour of the city.

The night work on the paved streets

is to be stopped for awhile. More men are needed for day work in cleaning the leaves off the streets. About 50 men have been laid off who have been doing night work. This will result in a saving of about \$80 a day.—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Oct. 9.

AS A CAMPAIGNER.

This morning [Oct. 7] Mayor Johnson faced a howling mob of Republican students of the Ohio Normal University at Ada. This meeting was not on Chairman Salen's programme. It was arranged by Mr. Johnson himself before leaving Kenton. He was informed by W. L. Finley and other Hardin county leaders that it was the Republican student vote at Ada which made Hardin county doubtful, and that without this student vote the county would be safely Democratic. The mayor at once decided to go to Ada and talk to the students.

A telephone message was sent just before the mayor started and the meeting was arranged upon an hour's notice. It proved to be one of the most interesting incidents of the campaign. . . . As by a preconcerted plan the boys, as soon as they had become well settled in the hall, sang in chorus a doggerel rhyme, a compound of pointed anathema for Johnson and Democrats in general and of praise for "Hanna, Herrick, Harding, rah, rah, rah." The student body is Republican ten to one and the personal consignment of Johnson to the nether regions was bellowed forth with a thunder of strong lungs which made the ancient building tremble.

"That was a fine song," said Mr. Johnson, smiling at the crowd, and heedless of the grins of derision which met him on every side. "I wish you boys would sing it again so that I could receive the full benefit of it."

No further invitation was required, and again the lusty Republican throats expressed their unqualified contempt for Johnson and the "Demmes" and their everlasting faith in "Hanna-Herrick-Harding, Rah! Rah! Rah!"

"That's a fine song," repeated Mr. Johnson, still in the very best of good humor. "A mighty fine song. I'd like to know the man who wrote it. Of course there is not much argument about it, but it is a good song, nevertheless."

Then the mayor spoke for 45 minutes upon subjects which were most calculated to appeal to the students. He dwelt mainly upon Senator Hanna's past record. Instead of attacking Mr. Willis [professor of political science in the University, and a Republican representative to the last legislature from Hardin county], as

the students had evidently expected, Mr. Johnson took occasion to praise him in the highest terms for his vote against the "curative act," for Willis was one of the nine Republican legislators who "bolted" their party on this measure. In perfectly respectful language the mayor criticised Mr. Willis for fathering the "Willis bill," to levy a fixed tax upon corporations regardless of the value of stock. At the outset Mr. Johnson was received with entire coldness. Toward the end, after he had worked in two or three apt stories, the students became much more friendly and even applauded occasionally. When the speaker had finished he was given a rousing cheer. Mr. Willis, who had been in the hall throughout Mr. Johnson's speech, took occasion to thank the students for the respectful manner in which they had listened to the Mayor.

After Mr. Willis had thus done the graceful thing Mr. Johnson again addressed himself to the students and smilingly requested them as a grand finale to repeat once more the political doggerel with which they had received him. But a great change had taken place. Not a single voice took up the song. Instead, the entire body, including those who had "rah, rah, rah" most lustily for Hanna-Herrick-Harding, joined in a mighty cheer for Johnson. The real ovation came at the Mayor's departure. Nearly a thousand students gathered at the campus about the "Red Devil" and yelled themselves hoarse. A big cannon was called into requisition and was fired three times as a parting salute. Never has Mayor Johnson better displayed his ability to turn an intensely hostile crowd into a friendly and enthusiastic gathering.—Carl T. Robertson, Staff Correspondent, in Cleveland Plain Dealer of Oct. 8.

WHY SHOULD WOMAN "OBEY"?

When Miss Ethel Clement, of Rutland—that charming Vermont town in the heart of the marble region—objected to utter the word "obey" in the marriage service of the Protestant Episcopal church, and elected rather to be married by a Congregational minister, who was not compelled by any ritual to require it, she had no notion of waging a general dispute over the matter. But so great is the power of tradition, so pervading the superstition of the subjection of woman, that the incident has received much attention. We read the most scathing comments on the conduct of Miss Clement, who is certainly a woman of character and conscience, and also of cultivated intellect and social standing. Nevertheless here is what an emi-

nent journal like the New York Tribune allows one of its juvenile editors to say:

She embarks upon her conjugal career with the buoyancy and light-heartedness of one not vowed to "mind" anybody. The number of these headstrong and insubordinate brides is happily never large enough to cause a social revolution, but about so many are sure to appear during each pairing season, and it is just possible that the records of most of them may show forth a sweet docility instead of that kicking in the harness which might not unreasonably be looked for.

The contrary is the fact. This woman starts honestly on her wifely duties. They must be the same for husband and wife, and not otherwise. The word and the idea "obey" as applied to the woman alone are wrong. They would be no better, but just as right, if it were the man who should say "obey." They belong to an age which passes as the higher conception of marriage prevails. Neither should obey, neither should command; the husband and wife are equal partners in the life of the family, and they meet on equal terms; they are to reason together, and in mutual love to determine the course of their life. The husband may be the stronger and the wiser—the wife may be the stronger and the wiser—and if the union be based on anything more permanent than mere attraction of sex or sordid business conditions, the essential qualities of the pair will find their own power, and be recognized, to the gradual arrival at a true coworking, such as fulfills the fit idea of marriage. A stricture like that we have quoted is not worthy of utterance in this day and this stage of perception of the equality of man and woman.

The legend of Eden, the doctrine of Paul, the tyrannic notions of Milton (which he so hatefully exemplified in his treatment of one of his wives), these are of the past. Woman was never the inferior of man; indeed, it is well known that the earliest growths of civilization were from woman. In the ages of violence, of barbarism, of feudalism, she was crushed under the iron hand, and at the best was an exponent of "sweet, attractive grace." This is not so to-day. As a matter of fact, woman has ruled the household, and not infrequently the state, by indirection. She should not rule so, but frankly, by her brain and heart, which work together with man's brain and heart for the best results, and when this is the case, there is the honorable and high motivated family and the noble community. The community yet lacks this great element in its legislation and its political life, because woman is not yet come to her own station of equal rank. She should vote with man, as she labors with man; and so united, they would make a different and better world.

We find in the Windham County Reformer of Brattleboro an excellent declaration on this particular instance, which we shall quote as gospel truth:

Miss Ethel Clement, of Rutland, who objects to the word "obey" in the marriage service, is probably a woman to whom a promise means something. She does not wish to cheapen her word by giving it unnecessarily or where she has no idea of keeping it. And she is quite right. In the old days, before woman had been given educational privileges, and when custom kept her closely in the home, dependent upon the exertions of father, brother or husband, there was some significance to the word "obey" as applied to her. In those times women obeyed their husbands, or were supposed to. If they had their own way then, it was only through the unexplainable wiles of femininity, as old as the world. But now it is different. Woman is no longer dependent, subservient, clinging. She is an individual, thoughtful, reliant, resourceful. She is her husband's companion, comrade, partner—not his shadow and echo. Sometimes in the affairs of the family over which the two preside, the wife has obviously better judgment, better skill in management, and the husband of to-day, if he recognizes this fact, is very glad to defer to his partner's ideas for the good of the firm. We are more sensible in these matters than we used to be. And in the present state of human development it is surely enough if one promises love and consideration in the marriage relations. If there were love and consideration on both sides, could there be any question of obedience between husband and wife?

No one has said it better than Tennyson in "The Princess"—words often quoted, never staled, but open to the grandest interpretation that can be conceived of the perfect working together of the complements of the race of man, so evolved out of the divine spirit, and growing slowly, as all growth is, from age to age, until the fulfillment.

The prince says to the princess:

The woman's cause is man's; they rise or sink
Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free;
For she that out of Lethe scales with man
The shining steep of Nature, shares with man
His nights, his days, moves with him to one goal,
Stays all the fair young planet in her hands,
If she be small, slight natured, miserable,
How shall men grow? but work no more alone!
Our place is much; as far as in us lies
We two will serve them both in aiding her—
Will clear away the parasitic forms
That seem to keep her up, but drag her down—
Will leave her space to burgeon out of all
Within her—let her make herself her own
To give or keep, to live and learn, and be
All that not harms distinctive womanhood.
For woman is not undeveloped man,
But diverse; could we make her as the man
Sweet love were slain; his dearest bond is this,

Not like to like, but like in difference.
 Yet in the long years liker must they grow;
 The man be more of woman, she of man;
 He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
 Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw
 the world;
 She mental breadth, nor fall in childward
 care,
 Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind;
 Till at the last she set herself to man
 Like perfect music unto noble words;
 And so these twain, upon the skirts of
 Time,
 Sit side by side, full summed in all their
 powers.
 Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be,
 Self-reverent each and reverencing each,
 Distinct in individualities,
 But like each other even as those who love.
 Then comes the statelier Eden back to
 men;
 Then reign the world's great bridal,
 chaste and calm;
 Then springs the crowning race of human-
 kind.
 May these things be!

It was said in preface that the words of the prince were familiar; but very seldom do the first 16 lines we have quoted appear, and yet they are essential to the poet's thought. In "The Princess" Tennyson was the vates, the seer, to a degree he never equaled in aught else. "The woman's cause is man's; they rise or sink together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free." They should each be free, as Emerson has written in memorable words. In true union, they are free, and therefore one.—Springfield Republican of September 18, 1903.

A TRIAL WHICH SHOULD NOT BE FORGOTTEN.

An extract from an Argument on United States Citizenship by Isabella Beecher Hooker, presented with a Memorial from the Connecticut Women's Suffrage Association to the Constitutional Convention assembled in Hartford, Jan. 1, 1902.

In 1872 Susan B. Anthony was able to persuade the inspectors of election in her own State of New York, three in number, to duly register her name, and in November she was allowed to vote for the U. S. Presidential electors and for members of Congress. This short triumph, however, became a new sorrow, for in 1873 Miss Anthony was arrested and held to trial for having "knowingly voted without having a lawful right to vote," and Judge Hunt of the Supreme Court of the United States, to his eternal dishonor, ordered the jury to find her guilty without submitting the case to them, and imposed a fine of \$100 and costs for this pretended crime.

That you may more fully understand and appreciate the level of iniquity to which a judge of our highest court was willing to descend in this refusal to submit the case to the jury who had listened to able arguments of counsel

on both sides and were prepared to render an intelligent verdict, I will read you a few pages from the printed report of the trial:

"Judge Hunt—(Ordering the defendant to stand up)—Has the prisoner anything to say why sentence shall not be pronounced?

"Miss Anthony—Yes, your honor, I have many things to say; for in your ordered verdict of guilty, you have trampled under foot every vital principle of our government. My natural rights, my civil rights, my political rights, my judicial rights, are all alike ignored. Robbed of the fundamental privilege of citizenship, I am degraded from the status of a citizen to that of a subject; and not only myself individually, but all of my sex, are, by your honor's verdict, doomed to political subjection under this, so-called, form of government.

"Judge Hunt—The Court cannot listen to a rehearsal of arguments the prisoner's counsel has already consumed three hours in presenting.

"Miss Anthony—May it please your honor, I am not arguing the question, but simply stating the reasons why sentence cannot, in justice, be pronounced against me. Your denial of my citizen's right to vote, is the denial of my right of consent as one of the governed, the denial of my right of representation as one of the taxed, the denial of my right to a trial by a jury of my peers as an offender against law, therefore, the denial of my sacred rights to life, liberty, property and—

"Judge Hunt—The Court cannot allow the prisoner to go on.

"Miss Anthony—But your honor will not deny me this one and only poor privilege of protest against this high-handed outrage upon my citizen's rights. May it please the Court to remember that since the day of my arrest last November, this is the first time that either myself or any person of my disfranchised class has been allowed a word of defense before judge or jury—

"Judge Hunt—The prisoner must sit down—the Court cannot allow it.

"Miss Anthony—Of all my prosecutors, from the 8th ward corner grocery politician, who entered the complaint, to the United States Marshal, Commissioner, District Attorney, District Judge, to your honor on the bench, not one is my peer, but each and all are my political sovereigns; and had your honor submitted my case to the jury, as was clearly your duty, even then I should have had just cause of protest, for not one of those men

was my peer; but, native or foreign born, white or black, rich or poor, educated or ignorant, awake or asleep, sober or drunk, each and every man of them was my political superior; hence, in no sense, my peer. Even, under such circumstances, a commoner of England, tried before a jury of Lords, would have far less cause to complain than should I, a woman, tried before a jury of men. Even my counsel, the Hon. Henry R. Selden, who has argued my cause so ably, so earnestly, so unanswerably, before your honor, is my political sovereign. Precisely as no disfranchised person is entitled to sit upon a jury, and no woman is entitled to the franchise, so, none but a regularly admitted lawyer is allowed to practice in the courts, and no woman can gain admission to the bar—hence, jury, judge, counsel, must all be of the superior class.

"Judge Hunt—The court must insist—the prisoner has been tried according to the established forms of law.

"Miss Anthony—Yes, your honor, but by forms of law all made by men, interpreted by men, administered by men, in favor of men, and against women; and hence, your honor's ordered verdict of guilty, against a United States citizen for the exercise of 'that citizen's right to vote,' simply because that citizen was a woman and not a man. But, yesterday, the same man-made forms of law, declared it a crime punishable with \$1,000 fine and six months' imprisonment, for you, or me, or any of us, to give a cup of cold water, a crust of bread, or a night's shelter to a panting fugitive as he was tracking his way to Canada. And every man or woman in whose veins coursed a drop of human sympathy violated that wicked law, reckless of consequences, and was justified in so doing. As then, the slaves who get their freedom must take it over, or under, or through the unjust forms of law, precisely so, now, must women, to get their right to a voice in this government, take it; and I have taken mine, and mean to take it at every possible opportunity.

"Judge Hunt—The Court orders the prisoner to sit down. It will not allow another word.

"Miss Anthony—When I was brought before your honor for trial, I hoped for a broad and liberal interpretation of the Constitution and its recent amendments, that should declare all United States citizens under its protecting aegis—that should declare equality of rights the national guarantee to all persons born or

naturalized in the United States. But failing to get this justice—failing, even, to get a trial by a jury not of my peers—I ask not leniency at your hands—but rather the full rigors of the law.

"Judge Hunt—The Court must insist—

"(Here the prisoner sat down.)

"Judge Hunt—The prisoner will stand up.

"(Here Miss Anthony arose again.)

"The sentence of the Court is that you pay a fine of one hundred dollars and the costs of the prosecution.

"Miss Anthony—May it please your honor, I shall never pay a dollar of your unjust penalty. All the stock in trade I possess is a \$10,000 debt, incurred by publishing my paper—The Revolution—four years ago, the sole object of which was to educate all women to do precisely as I have done, rebel against your man-made, unjust, unconstitutional forms of law, that tax, fine, imprison and hang women, while they deny them the right of representation in the government; and I shall work on with might and main to pay every dollar of that honest debt, but not a penny shall go to this unjust claim. And I shall earnestly and persistently continue to urge all women to the practical recognition of the old revolutionary maxim, that 'Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God.'

"Judge Hunt—Madam, the Court will not order you committed until the fine is paid."

"Madam, the Court will not order you committed until the fine is paid!"

Susan Anthony in jail for refusing to pay this unjust fine! Judge Hunt knew full well that this would toll the great liberty bell till it was heard all over the land and would rouse all true manhood to the rescue, so he quietly allowed the fine to go uncollected and the penalty unenforced.

Nearly thirty years have passed and the fine and costs have not yet been paid, and never will be. Not only so, but I make the prediction that before many years Congress will make Miss Anthony an appropriation sufficient to cover, with interest, all that she expended in her defense, and probably enough more to make it a testimonial of the public admiration of her grand championship of a great right. She will be remembered with honor when Judge Hunt is forgotten, or remembered only as a disgraceful participant in this great wrong.

The church is an inward feeling of the nearness of God, and the man holds

service in it when he thinks of God and wills good to his neighbor.—Adolph Roeder, in The New Christianity.

AN OLD CORN LAW RHYME.

In view of the food tax proposals, reprints of the old Corn Law Rhymes are becoming popular in England. Here is one which was read in the house of commons just before the final assault on the corn laws.

DIED OF STARVATION—CORONER'S INQUEST.

I met Famine on my way
Prowling for her human prey,
Clogg'd with filth and clad in rags,
Ugliest of all ugly hags.
Lo! a scepter wreath'd of snakes
In her withered hand she shakes,
And I heard the hag proclaim,
"Bread Tax is my scepter's name."
On remorseless mission bent,
Maiming, murdering as she went,
Spreading death from street to street,
Oh! I hear the hag repeat
(Shuddering while I heard and saw),
"Mine is Right and Might and Law!"
Then to solitude I flew,
Gracious Heaven! can this be true?
On my trembling knees I fell.
"God! thou God of mercy! tell—
Can the very fiends of Hell
In Thy name their pandects draw,
And declare their license law?
Dare they in Thy Holy sight
To proclaim their robbery right?
Rouse Thee, raise Thine awful rod,
Lord, how long? How long, O God!"
—Arena-Sun, of Melbourne, So. Aus.

BOOKS

THE BALLAD OF READING GAOL.

Not in a generation has anything stronger been published in English literature than this Ballad of Reading Gaol, by Oscar Wilde (Alfred Bartlett, Boston). It was written in 1896, while the author was himself in jail, in the midst of the horrors which he tells. It is a piece of writing that is sure to live, because it comes hot from a human heart, and is besides in the highest sense of the word, a work of art. It was first published in 1898, but is still little known in America. There is not much story to the poem. A trooper of the Royal Horse Guards had killed a woman—

And blood and wine were on his hands
When they found him with the dead,
The poor dead woman whom he loved,
And murdered in her bed.

After the death sentence, he had three weeks in jail before the hanging. He was there with the others, till he was taken out to "the black dock's dreadful pen"—

And I and all the souls in pain,
Who tramped the other ring,
Forgot if we ourselves had done
A great or little thing,
And watched with the gaze of dull amaze
The man who had to swing.

With a power that cannot be transmitted to prose, the poet tells the musings and the fearful meditation of the fellow prisoners—

I only knew what hunted thought
Quickened his step, and why

He looked upon the garish day
With such a wistful eye;
The man had killed the thing he loved,
And so he had to die.

Yet each man kills the thing he loves,
By each let this be heard;
Some do it with a bitter look,
Some with a flattering word;
The coward does it with a kiss,
The brave man with a sword!

Some kill their love when they are young,
And some when they are old;
Some strange with the hands of Lust,
Some with the bands of Gold;
The kindest use a knife, because
The dead so soon grow cold.

Some love too little, some too long,
Some sell, and others buy;
Some do the deed with many tears,
And some without a sigh;
For each man kills the thing he loves,
Yet each man does not die.

There are bitter lines on prisons and prison life, which are sure to become the classic arraignment of a crude and cruel penal system—

I know not whether Laws be right,
Or whether Laws be wrong;
All that we know who lie in gaol
Is that the wall is strong;
And that each day is like a year,
A year whose days are long.

But this I know, that every Law
That men have made for Man,
Since first Man took his brother's life,
And the sad world began,
But straws the wheat and saves the chaff
With a most evil fan.

—The vilest deeds like poison-weeds
Bloom well in prison-air;
It is only what is good in Man
That wastes and withers there;
Pale Anguish keeps the heavy gate,
And the warder is Despair.

—Each narrow cell in which we dwell
Is a foul and dark latrine,
And the fetid breath of living Death
Chokes up each grated screen,
And all, but Lust, is turned to dust
In Humanity's machine.

There is indeed in the poem a fierce power that takes possession of the reader, holds him throughout, and compels him to read it over and over. The introduction to the present edition says, "the ballad has poetic distinction that gives it rank beside Coleridge's Ancient Mariner in our permanent English literature"—surely neither in power of thought nor in high artistic qualities can it be said to fall below that famous poem, and its purpose is deeper.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"Conquering Success; or Life in Earnest." By William Mathews, LL. D., author of "Getting On in the World," "Words; Their Use and Abuse," "Oratory and Orators," etc., etc. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. Price, \$1.50 net. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

In a leading article in the Arena for October Chief Justice Walter Clark makes a startling statement. "Plain as is the Federal statute," he says, referring to trusts, "this section of the country has known of but one attempt to enforce it. Then the district attorney, a brave, honest, and able man, was on the point of convicting the American Tobacco Company, when he suddenly received a telegram from the attorney general to come to Washington. There he found the attorney general closeted with the general counsel of the trust and a United States senator from that State. On the demand of these two, the attorney general ordered a nol prosequi to be entered, which the district attorney refused to obey till the order was put in writing. The senator had made himself solid with



THE "DEMOCRATIC" CHRONICLE GIVES HIM A LIFT

the people by voting publicly for the statute to make trusts indictable. Then through the back door of the temple of justice he protected the trust from punishment under it. Similar scenes have doubtless occurred elsewhere."

In an editorial a recent criticism of the President for accepting favors from railroads. Life departs from its usual high plane. It says: "A President, for obvious reasons, cannot use the public conveyances, and he cannot afford to pay for the special accommodations which his position makes indispensable." Pray what are the obvious reasons? That he will be stared at or shot at? But Presidents have always gone about Washington pretty freely, and we have read of Mr. Roosevelt's gallops. Nothing but a servile inheritance of the notion about the "divinity that doth hedge a king" keeps a President from using the public conveyances. Another Jefferson is badly needed in the White House.

J. H. D.

When St. Paul spoke of being all things to all men, he was of course thinking of helping, of uplifting, all men. Has the modern newspaper or magazine, in trying to be all things to all men, the same high purpose? The Century for October is a very elaborate number. The variety is striking; but when one reads the contents, there cannot but come the question whether this supply of all things—so radically divergent—is really making for the uplift of all men. Let the reader contrast the tone, for example, of Richard Whiting's Yellow Van with When the French President Goes Hunting, or Two British Game Parks. Surely the modern magazines make strange bedfellows.

J. H. D.

In two recent issues the New York Outlook has been discussing the question, Am I My Brother's Keeper? "It would be difficult," says the writer, "to find in Christ's instructions any utterance from which the doctrine can be legitimately deduced that one man is responsible for another man's life, and is, directly or indirectly, to force his conscience upon another." The spirit of the Outlook's editorial must commend itself to all who have the high conception of true individualism. In the spiritual life there cannot but be freedom, equality, and, if we may use the term, democracy. Compulsion in that realm is an utter contradiction. Now why should not all of man's

life and all of his dealings with his fellows be made to conform to this spiritual method?

J. H. D.

Mr. Howells in the Easy Chair of Harper's for October makes his philosopher say some very wise and earnest things about modern reading and literature; but it seems a real question whether the seriousness of the subject is not somewhat marred by the author's half-trifling and half-satirical way of dealing with it—whether, indeed, he does not go too far in apparently attempting to conceal his personal feelings on the subject is more easily seen by taking out of their setting such sentences as the following: "The philosopher said the actual interior form of non-literary literature was an effect of the thin spread of our literary culture, and outwardly was the effect of the thick spread of our material prosperity."

J. H. D.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PUBLIC

Can all be purchased through the Purdy Publishing Company

- New Book of Kings**, a Republican counter-blast, by J. Morrison Davidson 50c
"The book has been out of print for several years, and this new edition will be gladly welcomed by lovers of the principles of republican democracy"—J. H. Dillard.
 - Toward the Light**, Lewis H. Berens, \$1.00 Post, 10c extra.
"His book is one which, by reason of its sincerity and its fair-minded discussion of a great problem, we should read, mark, learn and inwardly digest. It is a book to buy and lend and talk about."—J. H. Dillard.
- 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

THE FAILURE OF JESUS

— and His Triumph —

An uplifting book for those of little faith. Limp leather, \$1.

THE ARGUS PRESS, Red Wing, Minn.
Sent on approval.

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

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

CONTRACTORS.

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

Clubs of Three

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

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

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

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

DARROW'S

"Resist Not Evil"

is now in its second edition. The people read it not only because its author is a unique and conspicuous figure in American political life, but because it is worth reading. 75 cents, postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & CO., Publishers,
56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.