

AUG 18 1908

# The Public

**A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &  
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making**

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR  
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Massachusetts  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY P. RING, Texas  
WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia  
HERBERT S. BIGLOW, Ohio  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIST TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
BOLTON HALL, New York  
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware  
HERBERT QUICK, Iowa  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
LEWIS H. BERENS, England  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, Scotland  
MAX HIRSCH, Australia  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XI

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1908.

No. 540

Published by Louis F. Post  
Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents      Yearly Subscription One Dollar  
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at  
Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879

## EDITORIAL

### Mr. Taft's Acceptance Speech.

It is significant, and a hopeful sign for Democratic success that the Republican candidate for the Presidency devoted most of his speech in accepting the notification of his nomination, to a discussion of the Democratic platform, rather than to an analysis of the one on which he is himself to stand. The speech was a characteristic one. Dignified in tone and manner, plausible and compromising in matter, it presented in style of expression and method of thought a great contrast to the somewhat ill-tempered and impetuous denunciations characteristic of Mr. Roosevelt, and to the evidently sincere and clear-cut declarations of Mr. Bryan, when they have had the same subjects to discuss. For all Mr. Taft's promises "to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor," he would be quite as unlikely to do it as Mr. Van Buren was when he used that phrase in Jackson's administration. The vested "big business" interests would have little to fear from Mr. Taft. By temperament, by habit of thought, by intellectual bent and training, he is a tactful, suave, able apologist for things as they are. His speech shows this to one who can read between the lines.

+

Take, for example, his discussion of the injunction planks in the respective platforms: He makes much of the recommendation of the Republican platform that injunctions in labor disputes should not generally issue without notice, and declares

### CONTENTS.

#### EDITORIAL:

Mr. Taft's Acceptance Speech.....	433
Mr. Taft's Notification.....	434
The Importance of the Primaries.....	435
A New Party Without a Reason for Existence.....	435
Suppose, Now, That the Democrats Had Nominated Mr. Hearst .....	435
Incidents of Mr. Hearst's Convention.....	436
History as Made by the Campaign Orator.....	436
A Monopoly Cartoon .....	436
And We Have an Expressman Senator.....	437
The Instruments of Social Service.....	437

#### NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Democratic Campaign .....	442
Indorsements of Mr. Bryan and the Platform.....	442
Mr. Bryan on the Independence Platform.....	443
Independence Party Politics.....	443
Oklahoma's Guaranty Banking Law Held Illegal.....	443
The Cuban Elections .....	444
A Forest Conflagration in Canada.....	444
In the British Parliament.....	444
The International Free Trade Congress.....	445
The French General Federation of Labor in Conflict with the Government.....	445
A Bloodless Revolution .....	445
News Notes .....	446
Press Opinions .....	447

#### RELATED THINGS:

Prometheus (H. L. Koopman).....	448
Don't Stop the Game Now (A. J. Gray).....	448
The Public Ownership of Railroads, X (Erik Oberg).....	449
Practical Politics (E. J. Salisbury).....	451

#### BOOKS:

The Feminine Principle in Evolution.....	451
Spiritistic Exposures .....	452
Pamphlets .....	452
Periodicals .....	452

that while in some cases they are proper without such notice, it is only infrequently. One would think from the stress that he puts on this plain proposition, and his comment on the silence of the Democratic platform about it, that it was a new proposition which would remove all danger of injustice to the workingman in the use of this autocratic process. The fact is, however, that all courts and all codes of equity practice have always recognized this fundamental rule. Sometimes, undoubtedly, it has been flagrantly violated in labor disputes, but the occasions have been rather rare. It has not been want of notice or postponements of hearings that have been responsible for most of the grievances complained of by workingmen. It has been the matter which Mr. Taft insists it is important *not* to change—the trial of alleged violations of the injunctions granted on *ex parte* affidavit testimony in which all the safeguards thrown by enlightened experience around the liberty of the citizen have been disregarded. Men accused of offenses against the law—men to whom the mass of their fellow workingmen were looking at the time for guidance and leadership—have been imprisoned on the most general statements of their former employers or employers' agents or detectives, without any opportunity for a sifting of those statements by cross-examination. If there are cases in which the intervention of a jury in such a case would be disadvantageous, they are, as Mr. Taft says of injunctions which should be granted without notice, "very few." There are none, at all events, where the hearing should not be in open court, with the power of cross-examination given to the defendant. The suggestion of Mr. Taft that "the intervention of a jury" would give greater advantage only "to the wealthy and unscrupulous defendant able to employ astute and cunning counsel and anxious to avoid justice," has a humorous sound to it when one thinks of the repugnance to jury trials which the great corporations markedly show.

✦

Then there is the tariff. Mr. Taft would revise it—certainly. But how? The "protective" principle must be preserved, the cost of production must be "equalized," a "reasonable profit" must be given to the American producer, and indeed "there are a few schedules in which the tariff is not sufficiently high to give the measure of protection which they should receive upon Republican principles." Even as to these latter, Mr. Taft does not advocate a change! Only "they should not be reduced." But above all, trust-produced articles must not be put on the free list as the Democratic

platform demands. That would "utterly destroy business," and is "ruthless and impracticable." We agree with Mr. Taft, that a tariff revised on his principles would not disturb "business," as he uses the word. It would only continue to disturb the welfare and happiness of almost a hundred millions of consumers!

✦

Mr. Taft treats also of the Philippine question. He is a kind-hearted man, and a just man according to his lights. But after all he is a shallow optimist, and as we have said, "an apologist for things as they are." One looks in vain in what he has to say on the Islands and the population in which he has been so deeply interested, for anything of the spirit which animated Mr. Bryan's wonderful address in Indianapolis in 1900. Mr. Taft is incapable constitutionally of feeling it. He belongs to the class of those who think "good government" means government by the good. That is aristocracy. Mr. Bryan believes that "good government" in any true sense means "self-government." That is democracy. And Mr. Taft has nothing to propose but "partial" self-government, even for the educated and intelligent portion of the Filipinos, until the lapse of "two generations" has completed "our great missionary work." Does Mr. Taft really believe that at the end of two generations of American exploitation of the material resources of the Philippines for the benefit of "protected" American "business men" we shall be willing to turn over the government of them to their inhabitants? We hardly think him so credulous. The Spaniards did "a great missionary work" in the Philippines. The conversion of millions of natives to Christianity by their efforts was the wonder of the world. But it did not prevent other Spaniards from oppressing, pillaging and enslaving their descendants.

✦   ✦

#### Mr. Taft's Notification.

The press reports of Mr. Taft's notification of his nomination by the Republican party for the Presidency (p. 417) gave a pretty picture of the tumultuous rejoicing of a happy people over the exaltation of their eminent townsman. But a private letter from Cincinnati presents another view. "The Taft notification," says our correspondent, "was a howling farce. One more such, and Bryan will carry Ohio, and Hamilton Co. The Roosevelt Republican Club, of which Taft is a member, was conspicuous by its absence. The sixty per cent Negro part of the parade was paid one dollar a head, and the house of refuge boys

and policemen made up a large part of the balance."

\* \* \*

### The Importance of the Primaries.

It is earnestly to be hoped that the primary elections in Illinois, and especially those in Cook County and Chicago, which will all have taken place before the next issue of *The Public*, will justify the expectations and desires of the friends of direct primaries. Strenuous efforts have been made by the organization "bosses" practically to nullify the law; but they have been met by public-spirited and earnest attempts in the opposite direction, to aid the voters in the selection of the best candidates.

\*

This has been especially true in relation to the municipal judgeships and other local offices in Chicago. The primary election which takes place Saturday, August 8, is as to these offices more important than the final election in November. If the best men who offer themselves as the candidates of the respective parties are nominated as the result of the primary balloting, the offices will be well administered, whichever party wins in November; if the worst should succeed in each party, the community would be reduced to a very pitiful choice. Nor can the advantages of a strong local ticket to the national candidates, be overestimated. We advise our friends in Chicago, be they Democrats, Republicans, Prohibitionists or Independence Leaguers, to make all possible effort to vote on Saturday, and to use care and deliberation in the selection of the names they mark.

\* \* \*

### A New Party Without a Reason for Existence.

The plutocratic press is very kind to Mr. Hearst and his "strictly private" Independence party. It chooses to forget all the hard and violent things it and its heroes—Root, for example—said about Hearst when he was candidate for Governor of New York and represented a real cause and genuine movement. Some of the plutocratic papers are quite frank, others are diplomatic, but it is plain that the gentle handling of Hearst and his party is prompted solely by the hope that on election day Bryan will suffer far more than Taft through the existence of this new factor. We are inclined to think that the event will disappoint them. We are also inclined to think that the created-to-order party will cut a sorry and insignificant figure on election day and the day after. Why should any advanced Democrat vote for the Hearst ticket? What does it promise him? A vote for

Hearst's ticket is a vote against Bryan and his platform, and a vote against Bryan is a vote for Taft and the colorless, shifty, hypocritical Republican platform. There are some good planks in the Hearst platform that are not to be found in that of the Democrats. But they are not things that are immediately important, vital or ripe. They are not "issues" in any sound sense of the term. On the issues of the day the Bryan platform is clear and strong—sufficiently so, at any rate, to satisfy Democrats. For Socialists there is the Debs ticket; for Populists there is the Watson ticket. The Hearst party undoubtedly means something to a small number of sincere men, but they do not realize that it was conceived in spite, pique, thirst for "revenge" and the moral littleness of Mr. Hearst and a few paid lieutenants. The bitter and deep curses in which Hearst himself indulged, against Bryan, betrayed a purely personal and ignoble animus. The reference to the Bryan following as "Falstaffian" is as silly as it is dishonest. How was Bryan nominated, and by whom? Was he the preferred candidate of bosses and spoils-men? Had he offices, plunder, power with which to impose himself on the masses of disinterested Democrats? Even plutocratic editors have been compelled to recognize the legitimacy, the spontaneity, the inevitableness of Bryan's nomination. Never was a new "Jefferson-Lincoln" party less needed than this year, and never was a greater absurdity perpetrated in the name of reform than when the Hearst party was called into artificial existence. The only "use" its creator has for it, is to punish Bryan for alleged ingratitude—in the Guffey sense—and for true independence. Hearst once had a fine opportunity; he threw it away, and since then his decline has been rapid. His latest performance should prove his undoing.

\* \* \*

### Suppose, Now, That the Democrats Had Nominated Mr. Hearst.

Mr. Hearst's "keynote" speech at the Independence Party convention (p. 417) was full of very high sounding professions. It was very severe, too, on both the "old parties." But some questions arise spontaneously to the mind when reading it. Is the Democratic party any nearer "an Ali Baba's band of boodlers and braves," now that its almost unanimous voice has recalled to its leadership the man who has for more than a decade stood for all that was finest, greatest and most high-minded in its membership, than it was when in 1904 its control had fallen into the hands of its "boodlers and braves," and Mr. Hearst was nev-

ertheless extremely anxious to be its standard bearer in the national campaign? Again, if Mr. Hearst were actuated by no nobler motive than that with which we have heard him credited—a desire to “get even” with Mr. Bryan for refusing to support his candidacy for the nomination in that year—would he have acted differently, or made any other kind of a speech?

\* \*

#### Incidents of Mr. Hearst's Convention.

When Clarence J. Shearn, Hearst's New York lawyer, had finished reading the platform at the convention of the Independence Party, which platform was really an address consisting of long denunciatory preambles and short demands, and when he had moved its adoption, a score of delegates were on their feet clamoring for recognition; but Permanent Chairman Charles A. Walsh could see none of them, and like all other committee reports at this convention, it was declared carried, without discussion or opportunity to discuss or question. One of the delegates who were endeavoring to get the floor was John I. Sheppard, of Fort Scott, Kansas. He had left his seat and gone to within a few feet of Chairman Walsh, and was trying most earnestly to secure the floor. He afterwards stated that the preamble in favor of nominating only Independence Party men was supplied after the platform had left the committee on resolutions of which he was a member. Still later another member of this committee made an affidavit to the same effect.

\*

When Kansas was reached on the roll call of States for nominations for President, Mr. Sheppard took the platform to present the name of William J. Bryan, but was not permitted to do so. He was ruled out of order and somewhat roughly hustled from the hall. During the confusion and uproar which preceded this ruling after his purpose was divined and points of order raised, his calm courage and dignified candor and self-possession presented a marked contrast to the factitious enthusiasm and frenzied fear of the bulk of the “delegates.” So undone was the convention at this, the only semblance of an attempt at deliberation throughout its sessions, that it interrupted the progress of the roll call for nominations, to “dishonorably discharge” Mr. Sheppard from membership in the national committee of the Independence Party to which it had elected him “for the ensuing four years” but a few hours before. During this interruption of the very orderly and unanimous proceedings another delegate

yelled, “Hurrah for Bryan,” and was thrown out with even less ceremony and more brutality than attended Mr. Sheppard's exit or expulsion. Before the roll call was resumed Judge Waterbury and a Mr. Fowler of Kansas took the platform and stated that Mr. Sheppard did not represent the sentiment of Kansas, though they were as still as death as long as Sheppard was in the hall.

\*

During the roll call, after nominations had been made, the vote of one of the Southern States was challenged on the ground that that State was not represented. The man who announced the vote admitted that he was from another State, but said the man who was present from that State could not announce it, and the twenty-four votes were counted. Matthew F. Ryan, of Wilkesbarre, Penn., has made oath that he was the only man present from Pennsylvania, but that the seats in the Pennsylvania section of the hall were filled with Chicago thugs, who yelled lustily and cast Pennsylvania's sixty-four votes when the signal was given.

\* \*

#### History as Made by the Campaign Orator.

The statement of Mr. Wm. E. Mason, in his speech of a few days ago, that President Roosevelt “fought against the seating of Senator Smoot,” is somewhat astonishing. Did not Mr. Roosevelt, on the contrary, declare himself in favor of that action by the Senate, on the ground that Utah had a right to choose its own representative? History would be a strange thing if it was written “as she is spoke” by campaign orators.

\* \*

#### A Monopoly Cartoon.

Back in 1883, October 10 of that year, our wise jester Puck published a cartoon in three scenes, on the dangers of the then growing “mania for monopoly.” Dogs equally sharing in the right of feeding from a trough, represented “Business as It Once Was.” A second picture showed two or three of the larger dogs growling at and driving back the smaller ones, with the legend, “As It Is.” In the third, two were in possession of the trough, with the others crouching back, cowed and emaciated. This bore the legend, “As It Will Be—If *Something* Is Not Done Pretty Soon.” Last week Puck's large middle-page space was filled with a corner reproduction of the three pictures of 1883, and a big picture showing a reality worse than the prophecy prognosticated. It is now “Twenty-five Years After,” and “Something

*Wasn't Done.*" The emaciated dogs are as helpless as in the prophetic picture, but they are more furious than cowed; while the meat-filled trough of "Business" is wholly dominated by one hideous monster bulldog. And the name of this evil beast is simply "Monopoly."

\* \*

#### And We Have an Expressman Senator.

A postal treaty between the United States and Bolivia and Peru has just been adopted by which merchandise may be sent from the United States to either of those countries at the rate of twelve cents a pound. It will be remembered that our domestic postal rate for merchandise is sixteen cents a pound. But the Herald, of Reading, Pa., reminds us that we have domestic express companies to be protected.

\* \* \*

### THE INSTRUMENTS OF SOCIAL SERVICE.

The last time we talked about social service, Doctor, we made a brief analysis, you will remember (vol. x, p. 1180), of the instruments of production and distribution. We spoke of them, however, as instruments of production,—of production only. For we agreed that distribution, as we were using the word, means delivery; and delivery, you know, is one of the productive processes. The boy who brings you a newspaper, isn't he producing newspapers as truly as is the editor or the printer?

Yes, the word "distribution" may be used in contradistinction to "production"; but then it refers not to delivery of products, but to division of profits. The members and employes of a business firm, for instance, are engaged in production, not only as they shape objects for sale but also as they sell and deliver them. They are engaged in production though they do nothing but sell and deliver. Storekeepers are producers as truly as farmers and mechanics. But in the special sense of the word "distribution" to which you allude, employers and their employes are engaged in distribution only as they divide among themselves the profits of their shaping and selling and delivering,—such a share for the wages of this man, such a share for the wages of that man, such a share for the work of this member of the firm, such a share for the work of that member, such and such shares pro rata for those who furnish the artificial instruments, and such a share for those who furnish the land.

The customs of old whaling voyages afford an

extra good illustration; for on those voyages the profits were divided by shares, according to the "catch," somewhat as we divided those fish at Green's Pond when you and I were boys. So we may say—don't you see?—that whaling crews were engaged in producing oil when they harpooned whales, and when they extracted the oil, and also when they transported the oil in their vessels to the point of delivery; and that distribution among them took place when their respective shares of oil were estimated and assigned at the end of a voyage. Consider the analogy, Doctor, and you will see that our old Professor Rutley was right—and yet without my being wrong,—when he distinguished between "production" and "distribution." For what he meant by distribution wasn't delivery; it was calculation, assignment, or division of shares—among the workers in wages, the capitalists in interest, the land owners in rent, and so on. I say "and so on" because he used to have several other shares.

Let me see, there was "insurance" for one of them. But I never could understand how insurance could be a distinct share in distribution. What he meant by insurance was a sort of general evening up, the high profits of lucky ventures and the low profits or the losses of unlucky ones making an average when production as a whole was considered. You may call this "insurance" if you wish to, but all the same I don't see how the social service system as a whole can insure itself any more than you can propel your sailboat with a blacksmith's bellows in the stern. Particular workers may insure by selling out in advance to a speculator, who takes the risks. But insurance against risks in production is no more an element in distribution than insurance against fire risks. In a fire risk the owner of the house either carries the risk himself or hires some one else to. In the risks of production, producers either carry the risks themselves, making for themselves the larger wages of good seasons, or bearing with lower wages if the season is poor; or else they hire speculators to guarantee them against low wages from possible bad luck by letting the speculators have the extra high wages from possible good luck. The insurance to which Professor Rutley referred was really nothing but wages. You can't make any other category for it. Producers as a whole cannot insure themselves as a whole. The aggregate of production cannot be made any greater in seasons of bad luck, nor any less in seasons of good luck, by means of insurance. Insurance can readjust or equalize individual shares; but the total fund distributed is neither

more nor less, either in value measurements or in utility measurements, on account of insurance.

There was also "wages of superintendence," in our old college days, you will remember. Professor Rutley dwelt on this as a knock-down argument against those "com-mew-nists" that grandfather used to rail at in his good natured way, without knowing much of anything about them except that they were trying to make strange rules for a business game in which he played in a modest way. But isn't superintendence work? Well, then the wages of superintendence must be wages for work. So why classify the "wages of superintendence," except as a sub-classification, unless it be to confuse? Of course Professor Rutley didn't mean to confuse. He was the soul of honor. But he was also a very type of guileless simplicity. He was himself confused by his authorities. The words "superintendence" and "wages of superintendence," so evidently indicating mere phases of labor phenomena, confused him, just as some of our rich business friends hereabouts are confused by the word "ability," which the agile Mr. Mallock has supplied them with. The share of production which they claim for "ability," is Professor Rutley's old "wages of superintendence" in a new guise. Our rich business friends around here thank Mallock for his hint, for it enables them to attribute their greater wealth to their greater "ability." They want to distinguish themselves from workers who are not rich, by implying that while they themselves have "ability," the mere workers lack "ability." And indeed the latter do lack the ability to get rich. If they didn't, they'd be rich. But the truth is, Doctor, between you and me and the lamppost, that if our complacent friends are not rich from ability to work, then they are rich from ability to plunder. You understand what I mean. If their "ability" isn't productive, like the ability of the foreman who causes his subordinates to co-operate effectively, then it is furacious, like the ability of the burglar, the forger, or the bunco man. If they are not laborers they are parasites; and even if parasites are not parsnips, fine words won't butter them.

When men boast in this way of the faculty which they call "ability," they ought to explain what kind of ability they mean. They want us to understand, of course, that the "ability" they mean is ability to increase the aggregate of wealth. Now, that kind of ability is fine, provided it is used for that purpose. But that kind of ability when used is labor, nothing but labor; and its compensation, no

matter how large, up to the point of its productiveness, is wages, nothing but wages. If, however, the "ability" be merely unused ability to labor, or if it be ability to appropriate without productive labor any of the products that others produce by their labor, then the boasted "ability" of our over-wealthy friends is something to be ashamed of. They are in that case living upon the labor of others, as truly as ever a slave-owning cotton planter was. If they are doing that, they are not paying their way in the world.

Another of Professor Rutley's superfluous categories of distribution was "profits." But what are profits but the total increase out of which all shares are carved? You and I have talked this over before, and we won't say much more about it. But to regard profits as a distributive share of production is like dividing a mince pie into mince-meat, crust, and pie, or into two halves and the whole.

Let's get back now to our whale-ship illustration. The greater value of that ship coming home laden with whale oil, over its value when it left home to catch whales, is the profit of the voyage; and this profit is to be distributed, that is, divided, among the voyagers and their backers. So with the social service market. Its increased volume of products at any time is profit to be distributed or divided; according to service if under just conditions, according to powers of mere appropriation if under unjust conditions. To say that some of these products go to some of the inhabitants of the earth as "profit," is to tumble into verbal confusion. To say that some of these products go to some of the inhabitants of the earth for "ability" or in "wages of superintendence," is merely to make a sub-classification, or else to "duck" or dodge. To say that some of these products go to some of the inhabitants of the earth in "insurance," is merely saying that some of them go to folks who speculate in social service uncertainties. But to say that some of these products go in earnings to some inhabitants of the earth as workers, and that some go to others as beneficiaries of special privileges maintained by sovereign power, is a clear differentiation of a practical and fundamental difference.

And not only is this difference practical and fundamental, Doctor, but there is one part of the special privilege share of production which cannot go to the workers. This is the part or share that Professor Rutley called "rent," when he used to lecture us on Ricardo's famous law. Of course workers might get it, but not as workers; it would be as land owners.

For illustration, there is old Farmer Doe. He owns his farm, and if he gets 20 tons of hay off it, all that hay is his. So you may say, if you like, that he gets the full product of his labor in this respect. But what of Farmer Roe? He also gets 20 tons of hay with about the same work; but he has to give six tons or more to Slim Jim Pulsifer, who owns the farm; and most of that six tons or more is for ground rent, for Slim Jim's improvements don't amount to much. Now the sovereign power of the state compels Roe to do that, for it gives Slim Jim the absolute monopoly of the spot of earth that Mr. Roe farms. No one can use this spot without paying Slim Jim for the privilege. The "laws of the land" say so.

But you couldn't change the general principle of that division even if you changed the laws and allowed Roe to keep all his hay just as Doe does. Differences in location would still give advantages of location, which would provide a "rake off"; and even if these "rake offs" were disguised by mixing them up with wages as part of the income of working men, they would be "rake offs" all the same. You can see this, Doctor, by contrasting Roe and Doe with Peter Curry over on the side hill farm. Curry owns his farm just as Doe owns his; so he gets all the hay he makes, just as Doe does. And Curry works as hard at making hay as either Doe or Roe. But where they get 20 tons, he'll only get 12 or 13, for the bottoms of that side hill farm are not as good for hay as those of the other farms. They "won't more than pay wages," as grandfather used to say. Don't you see, then, that Doe and Roe would get more hay than Peter Curry, though they all worked alike, even if the laws were to step in and put a stop to Slim Jim's absentee landlordism? They would get more because some of their hay would be for ground rent or location advantage, and Peter's wouldn't. They would be getting something for a location on the planet, while Peter Curry would be getting nothing but wages for work.

Now, Doctor, there is no way, I repeat, of preventing this classification of products into a rent fund and a wages fund,—not so long as we allow land to be privately possessed. Nothing short of land communism would stop it. And I for one don't believe in land communism. I think it is a back number. Our present system of individual occupancy is essentially a good one,—the best we have ever had. It is its abuse, not the thing itself that is bad. But you must understand that with individual occupancy of land, some spots on the planet being more desirable than others, the oc-

cupants of those spots will have an advantage. Premiums inevitably result from private occupancy of specially desirable locations. Consequently, under private occupancy we have two natural shares or funds of labor products for distribution. One fund represents the aggregate product up to the point at which there is no advantage of location—up to the Peter Curry point in hay making, let us say. The other fund is the remainder of the aggregate product—the excess on the Doe and Roe farms, let us say, in comparison with Peter Curry's. The former fund may be conveniently distinguished as "wages" and the latter as "rent." To make this distinction is to recognize a definite natural law of division or distribution. It furnishes the fundamental classification. All other classifications are at the best only secondary. But these two, comprising the entire product to be distributed, point to a great social service fact, to the fact that if there are working interests and landed interests in a community, each will be compelled to yield to the other a share of the general profit. What proportions those shares will be, will depend of course upon the equilibrium of power in distribution.

Some say that at least one of Professor Rutley's other shares in distribution has a place—the share, that is, for those who own artificial instruments. You remember that the old professor called these instruments "capital" and their share "interest." My own view of that matter is that artificial instruments fall really into the category of work or labor, and therefore that "interest" is only a secondary classification and falls into the primary category of wages. It seems to me that if workers were not "fleeced," as our socialistic friend rudely proclaims that they are, their acquisition of artificial instruments would be like their acquisition of skill, and the interest they got for the one would be analogous to the higher wages they get for the other. But inasmuch as workers are "fleeced," again to quote with reluctant approval from our indignant friend, and to an extent which deprives large numbers of them of all interest in artificial instruments of social service, it may be convenient to divide the social service system into three interests. If we did that, we should have the working interest, or "labor" as Professor Rutley named it; the artificial-instrument interest, or what he meant by "capital"; and the natural-instrument interest, or "land" as the technical term goes. In accordance with that classification we should have to distribute profits in three parts—wages for labor, interest for capital, and rent for land. But in

any fundamental analysis, as I think you will agree, we shall be confined to two classifications instead of having three. The artificial instruments, aren't they merely natural materials shaped by human art? Very well. Then in any final analysis, artificial shape must be eliminated as a mere temporary expression of human art; and so the de-shaped material would fall back into the category of natural instruments, pure and simple. If you have workers with the necessary knowledge and skill, and natural instruments and location are available, artificial instruments are easily produced and reproduced, added to, multiplied, improved, and even geometrically progressed.

Not only may this be easily done, but it is done in fact all the time. If labor retained possession of the new instruments it is making hourly it would soon own all instruments of the artificial kind. Think, Doctor, of how little of the volume of artificial instruments that existed ten years ago exists today. Even the buildings and machinery that remain are mightily altered by repairing and keeping up, and for the most part we have new buildings and new machinery. All this has been done in the interval by labor. It is a serious mistake, Doctor, to suppose that there is any great accumulation of capital from the production of the past. There is indeed a constantly increasing fund of knowledge. But each individual has to make this his own by his own hard work. There is no other way.

Glad of your interruption. You are quite right in saying that the term "artificial instruments" does not in verbal strictness comprehend everything that Professor Rutley included in the term "capital." He included money, which is no more capital than a title deed is land, or the bill of sale for your horse is old Dolly herself. But I admit that we must use the term "artificial instruments of production" in a very broad sense to make it include all forms of what is distinctively capital. We must use it so as to include artificial materials as well as artificial tools. And we must not forget, either, that all these things—artificial instruments and materials and the natural ones too—get mixed up with organization, capitalistic organization, market opportunity as you might call it, in most confusing fashion.

But in fact, Doctor, in any reasonable analysis, capital is identical with unfinished objects of consumption, and both artificial materials and artificial tools are such objects. We have already concluded that wheat, to the extent that it is used to make bread, is unfinished bread; and that

flouring mills, to the extent that they produce flour afterwards made into bread, are also unfinished bread. There you have the whole matter, if not in a nutshell at any rate in a bread basket. All production is for consumption, and every artificial thing used in production is simply incomplete production.

These things, from first to last, are usually called commodities. This, I suppose, is because they are objects of trade. Trade consists essentially in the interchange of commodities. Don't you remember the groceries you bought of the grocery clerk away back at the beginning of these talks, and the food we have bought at Joseph's restaurant? All these were commodities. But they do not exhaust the list of commodities. Houses are commodities. So is the land they rest upon. Farm products, farm improvements, and farm land also are commodities. Mines are commodities—even when the titles are divided into stock certificates, they are still commodities. So are railroad cars and railroad rights of way. Air and sunlight are commodities when they can be bought and sold, as in the case of a room with a sunny exposure, or a location where the air is especially refreshing. Water under like circumstances of purchase and sale is also a commodity. If slavery prevailed, slaves would be commodities. This is enough to show that commodities are various in essential character. The only quality that is common to all commodities is exchangeableness and value.

Now, Doctor, isn't it obvious, in view of the variety of commodities, that classification is necessary for clearness. Wouldn't he be a mighty poor reasoner who allowed himself to reason, as if fundamentally, about such fundamentally different things as men, the planet, houses, groceries, clothing and the like, without distinct classification? Have to put men in a different category from the planet? Of course he would. And groceries in a different category from either, wouldn't he? All of them are or may be commodities. That is true enough. But some commodities are natural objects; others are artificial objects. This difference is vital. For artificial objects are human products; whereas natural objects are the ultimate sources and means of human production. The difference is as discrete as that between a spring of water and a pail of water from the spring, between a house and the source of its materials or the site upon which it stands, between a marble statue and a marble quarry.

These essential differences in commodities may be fairly and completely distinguished, I think,

by assigning them to three classes: commodities that are final products, as the bread you have just brought home from the baker's in order to eat it at your table; commodities that are artificial instruments of production, as the flouring mill and the wheat it grinds and the flour it turns out; and natural instruments, as the field wherein the wheat is raised, the site on which the mill is erected, and the mineral deposits and the forest growths from which the material for the mill and its machinery are obtained. But as the artificial are produced from the natural by human labor, I repeat that in the last analysis we have only two social service factors, human energy and natural instruments; and two correlative categories in the distribution of products, the value of work and the value of planetary opportunities for work.

This is what I supposed we had virtually agreed to when we concluded at our last conversation that every instrument of social service in production belongs in one or the other of those two classes—natural instruments or artificial instruments. It is the latter of these two classes that I wish to talk about first. But it's getting late, Doctor, and we'll have to take up that subject when we meet again.

Before I go, however, let me ask you to jot down on that pad upon your desk a little diagram of these distinctions for you to think upon between now and our meeting again. Put down these words in a column to the left of the pad: "Workingmen," "Managers," "Business men," "Promoters," "Professional men." Yes, "Farmers," if you want to; but they are really already named, for a farmer is either a business man or a workingman or both—a farmer, I mean, who farms farms instead of farming farmers; for I have known mere land owners to call themselves farmers. Yes, add "Farmer"; it'll do no harm. Now what does your whole list mean, and what would it mean if you lengthened it out with every kind of industrial class you could think of—what would it mean except that you have here a lot of varieties of "Human Activity"? Very well; now draw a line to the right of your list and put "Human Activity" on the right hand side of it. Let's see your pad. Yes, that's it:

<p><b>Workingmen</b> <b>Managers</b> <b>Business Men</b> <b>Promoters</b> <b>Professional Men</b> <b>Farmers</b></p>	}	<p><b>Human Activity.</b></p>
--	---	-------------------------------

Very good. Now pull off that page and write on the left side of the next one: "Buildings," "Ma-

chinery," "Ships," "Railroad equipment," "Cloth," "Lumber," "Pig iron," "Steel rails." Oh, as many more items of that kind as you wish; but those are really enough, for no matter how long you make the list, you have still got nothing there but "Artificial Instruments of Production." So draw your line as before and put down the classifying words. That's right:

<p><b>Buildings</b> <b>Machinery</b> <b>Ships</b> <b>Railroad Equipment</b> <b>Cloth</b> <b>Lumber</b> <b>Pig Iron</b> <b>Steel Rails</b></p>	}	<p><b>Artificial Instruments of Production.</b></p>
---	---	---

Once again, Doctor. Take the next sheet and write such things as "Soil," "Building sites," "Water supply," "Oceans," "Railroad ways," "Sea shores," "River banks," "Mineral deposits." Won't that be enough? They are all in the category of "Natural Instruments of Production." don't you see? Yes, add more if you want to, and let me see the result.

<p><b>Soil</b> <b>Building Sites</b> <b>Water Supply</b> <b>Oceans</b> <b>Railroad Ways</b> <b>River Banks</b> <b>Mineral Deposits</b> <b>Sunlight</b> <b>Air</b></p>	}	<p><b>Natural Instruments of Production.</b></p>
---	---	--

There, Doctor, you have in brief the essence of all our talk of today. Now sum it up yourself.

<p><b>Human Activity</b> <b>Artificial Instruments</b> <b>Natural Instruments</b></p>	}	<p><b>Produce Consumable Objects.</b></p>
---	---	---

That's all right enough, but why leave Artificial Instruments there? They are necessary, of course, but as a process of labor and not as a condition of labor. No, indeed, I do not forget that they are monopolized. Not for one moment do I forget it. They are monopolized for a fact, and workingmen are put at an enormous disadvantage in consequence. So are business men, if they could but realize it. No, sirree; I am not forgetting the workingman's plight for lack of capital, nor the business man's troubles about capital. There are circumstances in which artificial instruments—"capital," "machinery," as our socialistic friend calls it; "capital," "money," "credit," "cash," as Slim Jim Pulsifer would call it—there are circumstances in which these instruments of production become supremely important. And we are living in such circumstances today, Doctor.

This reminds me that I have here in my pocket

a letter which puts that point very lucidly. The letter is from our friend Oliver R. Trowbridge, the author of "Bi-socialism," you know. Let me read a sentence from it. This is what Trowbridge writes: "While production is fundamentally a matter of human activity and natural instruments, yet when the latter is withdrawn or withheld from the former"—when land is monopolized, don't you see—"the secondary factors, or artificial instruments, are raised to a place of practically fundamental importance, inasmuch as they are made to do duty as a substantial substitute for natural instruments in the hands of all those who are dispossessed of the latter." That's all true, Doctor; and so is Trowbridge's additional comment: "This makes a monopoly of natural instruments all the greater an evil, since it tends directly and necessarily to create a corresponding monopoly in artificial instruments." And now listen to this acute diagnosis of the whole difficulty, which I read from the same letter you see: "The worship of the 'machine' by the workingman, and of 'cash' by the business man, is not really the result of nightmare, but of astigmatism; they simply fail to see things from the right angle. But they see what they see, all the same; and it is useless to try to convince them that they do not." To that also I say, amen. For I am not trying to convince you, Doctor, that capital is not of vital importance. Quite the contrary.

And so, when I ask you to alter the summing up of industrial forces, on your pad, by striking out the item of Artificial Instruments, and explain that they are not necessary as a condition of labor, I don't want you to ignore my further explanation that they are necessary as a process of labor. I am not asking you to ignore the fact that monopoly of capital is a terrible weapon against workingmen. What I am asking you to do is to try to find out the reason why.

In order to find out why, we must make a final analysis of industrial conditions. And in a final analysis, wouldn't you strike out that item of Artificial Instruments? Wouldn't you—merely for the purposes of a final analysis, mind you, of making a good solid basis for future reasoning—wouldn't you for those purposes leave out that item as representing only a part of the process of Human Activity, instead of being one of its primary conditions? Since you would still have Human Activity and Natural Instruments, you would really have every needful condition of production. Aye, aye; that's the way to put it:

Human Activity	} Produce Consumable
Natural Instruments	

You don't think you could analyze any farther, do you? Of course not. You are now at the point of last analysis. If you think you can up-set that last diagram by leaving anything out, try it on against our meeting again. Take my word for it, however, you'll fail. But if you grasp the simple primary truth of that diagram, as a starting point, Doctor, we'll have smooth sailing the rest of our way.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Tuesday, August 4, 1908.

---

### The Democratic Campaign.

Democratic national headquarters are to be opened in Chicago this week at the Auditorium Annex. Mr. Bryan is to be the principal speaker at the Labor Day picnic of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

+ +

### Indorsements of Mr. Bryan and the Platform.

Mr. Melville E. Ingalls, formerly president of the Big Four and the Chesapeake and Ohio railroads, is reported in the press as saying: "If Bryan is elected there will be a — of a time up there in Wall street for a month, and then things will return to normal. If Taft is elected there will not be any disturbance, but in a month after election it will come to the same thing, so far as the railroads are concerned, with either the winner. It is nonsense to say that the election of any man will wreck the country. Andrew Johnson and Theodore Roosevelt put a great strain on it, but they were unable to affect it beyond quick recovery. One of my reasons for supporting Bryan is that I am tired of hearing the panicky talk about his election raising Ned with our prosperity. I don't believe it. Anyhow, I am boy enough still to want to try it and see. Besides, I believe that the moment Bryan entered the White House he would become a sober and conservative statesman."

+

Mr. Thomas M. Osborne, of Auburn, New York, whose article on the future of the Democratic party in the May Atlantic was commented on in The Public of June 5 (p. 221), says in an open letter to Mr. Norman E. Mack, chairman of the Democratic national committee: "It is because I believe that a vote for the Democratic ticket would

be a vote in favor of a return to sanity, to a moral way of looking at matters—national and international; because I see some hope of dealing effective blows at all forms of special privilege from that party and little if any in the other, that I shall accept my party's platform and candidates and cast my vote for Mr. Bryan. And as I opposed him frankly and openly before, so now I shall support him with equal frankness and sincerity."

+

Mr. George H. Shibley, president of the American People's Rule League, formerly the Initiative and Referendum League of America, in an announcement to the members of the League expresses his great satisfaction with the Democratic platform, and states that "in view of this splendid people's rule program, declared to be the overshadowing issue, it becomes my duty to help elect the party's nominees. The Democratic party has come over to our issue while the Republican party opposes it, and it is plainly our League's duty to continue to promote the people's rule."

+ +

#### Mr. Bryan on the Independence Platform.

Mr. Bryan is reported as saying of the platform of the Independence party (p. 417), that—

It contains a number of planks which are identical with or substantially similar to the planks of the Democratic platform. For instance, it demands the election of senators by the direct vote of the people, as the Democratic party does; its tariff plank is quite like our tariff plank; its plank on the trusts, while opposing private monopoly, is not as specific as ours; its railroad plank does not differ much from ours; its plank on Asiatic immigration is quite similar, and its labor plank, like ours, contains a declaration in favor of trial by jury and in regard to the exemption of labor organizations from the operation of anti-trust laws. Like our platform, it condemns the extravagance of the Republican party and demands greater economy. It does not advocate, however, the establishment of a department of labor with a secretary in the cabinet. It does not oppose imperialism, which has been used to justify the increase in our standing army, and its plank as to publicity of campaign contributions is not nearly so strong as ours.

The question that must confront the member of the Independence party is this: Will he assist in the defeat of the Democratic party, which stands for so much that he favors, merely because he can not get all that he would like? Either the Democratic party or the Republican party will win, and the voter, who, preferring the Democratic platform to the Republican platform, joins with the Independence party, merely assists the Republican party, and thus defeats several of the reforms in which he is interested. Take, for instance, the plank in favor of the election of senators by the people—the Democratic party has indorsed that reform in three campaigns; the Republican convention defeated the proposition by an overwhelming vote. If the Demo-

cratic party succeeds its members are pledged to this reform. The Republican party is not pledged to it, and the Republican candidate has gone no farther than to say that he is personally inclined toward it. This reform is necessary before any other reform can be secured. Is not the Independence voter justified in helping the Democratic party to secure this reform?

So in regard to the labor questions. The Democratic party is in favor of remedies demanded by wage earners and a wage earner who votes with the Independence party simply defeats the reforms in which he is interested. And the same argument might be made in regard to those who favor tariff reform, the extermination of the principle of private monopoly, and the remedy of other evils which have grown up under Republican administrations. The question is not whether one can get all the reform that he wants, but how he can get the most reform. The Democratic party offers him the best opportunity to secure that which is obtainable at this time.

+ +

#### Independence Party Politics.

Mr. Hearst was chosen chairman of the national committee of the Independence party, before the convention gathering broke up on the 29th (p. 417). It is announced that in a few weeks Mr. Hearst will begin a speech-making tour of the United States on behalf of his ticket.

+

The Independence party of Illinois held its State convention on the 29th, and nominated the following ticket: For Governor, George W. McCaskrin, Rock Island; for Lieutenant Governor, C. E. Beach, Paxton; for Secretary of State, Frederick Greer, Chicago; for State Auditor, F. T. Lister, Springfield; for State Treasurer, Louis E. Hamburg, Chicago; for Attorney General, Anderson P. Garret, East St. Louis; for Clerk of the Supreme Court, James F. Cronin, Chicago; for Trustees of State University, Mrs. Elizabeth Kirkpatrick, Chicago, Mrs. Winifred Godley, Joliet, and Dr. Willis Stone, Chicago; for United States Senator, Dr. Howard S. Taylor.

+ +

#### Oklahoma's Guaranty Banking Law Held Illegal.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Cortelyou, having requested an opinion from the Attorney General as to the legality of national banks in Oklahoma contributing to the guaranty fund, or availing themselves of other privileges of the State's banking act (vol. x., p. 987), Mr. Bonaparte furnished an opinion which was made public on the 1st. In the opinion he says:

The statute of Oklahoma to which you call my attention creates a State Banking Board, composed of certain designated State officers, and requires the said Board to "levy against the capital stock an assessment of one per cent of the banks' daily average deposits" with certain deductions "upon each and ev-

every bank organized and existing under the laws of this State." This assessment is to constitute what is designated as a "depositors' guaranty fund," and additional assessments are to be levied against the capital stock of the banks proportionately to the amount of their deposits, so as to always maintain the fund at the designated amount. This fund is to be used in paying the depositors of any bank included within the terms of the statute any deficiency there may be in the amount to be received by them from the assets of such bank in the event of its failure. By section 4 it is provided that any national bank in the said State, with the approval of the Bank Commissioner thereto, "may voluntarily avail its depositors of the protection of the depositors' guaranty fund by application to the State Banking Board in writing." So far as I am aware, there is no provision of law or rule of public policy forbidding a depositor in a national bank from obtaining insurance on the solvency of the bank and the consequent payment of his debt in accordance with its legal import; but the business of insuring deposits is a wholly separate business from that of banking, and a corporation organized for the latter business would have no greater right to embarrass its funds and risk its credit in the former than it would have to engage in life insurance or fire insurance, or casualty or marine insurance. Moreover, it is to be observed that the bank and not the depositor pays the premium, or the equivalent of a premium, if the system of guaranty established by the Oklahoma law is to be regarded in the light of an insurance, and upon this assumption, therefore, the question would be whether the stockholders of a national bank, constituting as they do the corporation, are authorized to embark in the business of insuring their depositors against loss through the methods set forth in this State statute in consideration presumably of the increased amount of deposits which they would thus obtain. I find no provision of the National Banking law authorizing any such action on their part, and, in my opinion, a business of this nature would be essentially foreign to the legitimate functions of a national bank as an instrument of government.

Mr. Bonapare is further quoted as holding that "it is illegal for the officers of any national bank to enter into such an agreement as is contemplated by Section 4 of the Oklahoma statute, and that persistent and willful action to this effect on the part of any bank would be just cause for the forfeiture of its charter."

In regard to Mr. Bonaparte's opinion Mr. Bryan is reported to have said: "It accentuates the issue and emphasizes the necessity of legislation framed from the standpoint of the depositor rather than the standpoint of the banker."

#### The Cuban Elections.

The Cuban municipal and provincial elections (p. 420) went off peacefully on the 1st. Provisional Governor Charles E. Magoon cabled to the United States Secretary of War at the close of the

day, his unstinted praise of the manner in which the elections had been conducted, asserting that the orderly manner in which they have proceeded and the vote been cast should remove all doubt as to the ability and desire of the Cuban people to hold fair and peaceful elections. Returns are coming in slowly, but by the 3d the count had progressed far enough to show that the honors had been pretty evenly divided between the Liberals and the Conservatives, although the first reports gave a sweeping victory to the Conservatives, who are the old Moderate party of 1906.

#### A Forest Conflagration in Canada.

Forest fires which had been for some time eating their way among the heavily wooded hills of the Crow's Nest region, near where British Columbia, Alberta and Montana meet, on the afternoon of the 1st appeared over the crest of the mountains on the west side of a valley in which lay the city of Fernie, with 5,000 inhabitants, and many smaller towns. Fanned by a high wind the flames swept down the mountain side, and before a fire guard could be organized Fernie was doomed, and the inhabitants were fleeing for their lives, leaving everything behind. So fiercely did the fire descend that houses ignited merely from the heat, without a touch of flame; and so sudden was the visitation that it is said horses were seen to shrivel and burn to ashes while standing in the streets. By night the valley was a furnace of flame. Two hundred lives are believed, at the least, to have been lost. Those who escaped fled to the hills without food or extra clothing. Relief trains were hurried from the east and from the west to the accessible points nearest the scene of the disasters, to care as far as possible for the 10,000 refugees. The loss is put at \$10,000,000. A Mrs. Forrester who made her way out through almost insurmountable difficulties, one experience being that for hours they were partly immersed in the cold waters of the Elk river, while their heads and shoulders were scorched by the heat of the blazing forest on either bank, said of her impressions: "I do not know that I had any. There are hours of yesterday that I cannot remember, except in a vague way, though I know that I kept my senses throughout. It was not horror, it was not fear; merely a sort of apathy after the first hour."

#### In the British Parliament.

The House of Lords passed on the 31st the old age pensions bill (pp. 395, 411) in the form adopted by the House of Commons. The bill will become operative next January. For the first full fiscal year the ministers estimate that about \$30,000,000 will have to be allowed. A bill to check the wanton slaughter of plumage birds, which passed its second reading in the House of Lords in

May, and was referred to a committee, was reported on favorably on the 1st, with recommendation that the government endeavor to secure international action in this matter. On the 1st Parliament adjourned until October 12.

\* \*

#### The International Free Trade Congress.

The International Free Trade Congress was opened in London on the 4th, with Lord Welby in the chair. Delegates were present from France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Italy, the United States and Great Britain. "Free Trade and Its Bearings on International Relations," the subject for discussion at the first session, was introduced by Winston Churchill, who argued, according to the press dispatches, that Great Britain was an object lesson. She had pursued the free trade policy, yet she remained prosperous and powerful, and it had been found that British goods entered all other countries on as good terms as were secured by any nation by the most elaborate use of fiscal weapons. Harvey M. Sheppard of the American Free Trade League urged the need of continuing the influence of education in the direction of economic disarmament as a prelude to military disarmament, and said he thought this education was particularly needed in the British colonies, where protection had many adherents.

\*

Delegates to the Congress were given a dinner by the Cobden Club at the Hotel Cecil on the evening of the 4th, at which the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, was the chief speaker. Reviewing the history of free trade, and examining the records of those nations where protective tariffs exist—the United States, France and Germany—Mr. Asquith said it would be found that America's foreign commerce was a comparatively insignificant factor, but who could deny that a large share of the credit for its abounding productiveness was due to a wise foresight which secured a complete freedom of interchange between the cotton-growing States of the South, the corn fields of the middle West and the manufacturing communities of the East? John De Witt Warner, president of the American Free Trade League, Dr. Theodore Barth of Berlin, and Yves Guyot, the French political economist, also spoke. Among the American delegates present were Professor William G. Sumner of Yale University, Franklin Pierce and Lawson Purdy of New York, and Louis F. Post of Chicago.

\* \*

#### The French General Federation of Labor in Conflict with the Government.

Strike troubles (p. 38) at Vigneux, near Paris, in which many workmen lost their lives at the hands of the government troops, brought on a general twenty-four hours' strike as a demonstration

of the strength of labor. The strike began on the evening of the 29th and ceased on the morning of the 31st. The general secretary of the Federation, Mr. Griffuelhes, explained in an article in the *Matin* that this short general strike was intended to habituate the workers to collective action and train the proletariat in solidarity, just as an army is trained by drill maneuvers. This strike was not as complete as the Federation desired, though 50,000 men are reported as having left their work in Paris. Thousands of workmen, especially from the building trades, made their way to Vigneux, and in a march to the cemetery, where their comrades lay buried, suffered clashes with the troops. This renewed rioting precipitated a still more serious situation, for the government, threatening to suppress the entire organization of the General Federation of Labor, on the 1st arrested the leaders of the Revolutionary Labor party, Messrs. Bosquet, Yvetot and Merrheim, and officers of the General Federation of Labor, including Mr. Pouget, secretary of the official organ of the Federation of Labor, Mr. Griffuelhes, general secretary of the Federation, and Mr. Maucolin, secretary of the Laborers' Union. On the 31st the officers of the Federation had called for a second twenty-four hours' strike, to come off on Monday, the 3rd.

\* \*

#### A Bloodless Revolution.

What is in effect a revolution has come to Turkey with the re-granting of a constitution by the Sultan on the 24th (p. 419). That the orderly working out of a new polity is still in the future, and that much disorder is likely to intervene before it is worked out, does not hamper hopes and ideals.

\*

It was reported from Constantinople on the 27th that Persian subjects in that city had informed their Shah by telegraph that the Sultan had granted a constitution to his subjects, and that if the Persian constitution were not restored (p. 395) they would become Ottoman subjects. On the 28th, in the presence of the Sheik-ul-Islam, the head of the hierarchy in Turkey, the Sultan took the oath of allegiance to the constitution on the Koran. On the 30th the following message was transmitted through the Turkish legation at Washington to Turkish citizens in the United States:

Inform all fugitive Turkish citizens in New York City and in all the United States, including political fugitives, without regard to race or nationality, whether Greek, Armenian, Turkish, Albanian, everything, that, after promulgation of a constitution for the Turkish Empire, his majesty, the Sultan, upon request of the government, has granted general amnesty, and all political fugitives may go back to Turkey, after having the necessary passports veri-

fed at the office of the Turkish counsel general, 59 Pearl street, New York City.

This message to political offenders in exile was accompanied by amnesty for political prisoners at home; and this was followed by a "jail-delivery" of all convicts who had served two-thirds of their sentences, with an addition of many others. This clemency to criminals aroused the protests of citizens, who feared in it a readiness on the part of the constituted authorities to produce disorders which would demand wide and generally inclusive repression, and moreover might furnish to the authorities material for the organization of "black hundreds," like the dreaded bands of mercenary Jew-baiters of Russia. On the 31st the Sultan appeared in public in his carriage, and was acclaimed by the populace and the troops. On the 1st, for the first time since his accession to the throne in 1876, he walked among his people on the streets, unrecognized as he went. But as the news became known, crowds gathered at the palace to cheer. On the 2nd a proclamation was published declaring the equality of all Ottomans, and their liberty. Announcement was made that all appointments with the exception of the ministers of war and marine, and the Sheik-ul-Islam, will be made on the advice of the Grand Vizier, or prime minister. And announcement was also made of a remodeled ministry.

+

This remarkable revolution, not yet, of course, consummated, has filled foreign observers with amazement. It is laid to the energy and resourcefulness and long campaign of preparation of the Young Turkey party. Whatever reactions and counter-actions are in store, the qualities and preparation which have brought on so stupendous a change, are certain to win out in the end.

---

## NEWS NOTES

---

—There can be no open election betting in New York this year on account of the new betting law (p. 276).

—Tom L. Johnson II, oldest grandchild of Mayor Tom L. Johnson of Cleveland, died on the 31st at the age of four years.

—A disastrous typhoon devastated south China early last week. The loss of life runs well into the hundreds, and the first estimate of a thousand lives lost, may be correct.

—George A. Pettibone, acquitted last January of complicity in the murder of Governor Steunenberg (vol. x, p. 962), died at Denver on the 3d after an operation for cancer.

—The President of Honduras, Mr. Davila, charging the foreign consuls at Ceiba, Honduras, with "unlawful intervention in the political affairs of Honduras," in connection with the revolutionary movements in progress in that state (p. 371), on the 28th

ordered the revocation of their official relations with his country. The matter is now under discussion with the United States government.

—By unanimous vote the Chicago Federation of Labor decided on the 2nd to allow politics to be discussed in the meetings of local unions affiliated with the central body (pp. 369, 418).

—Hamlin Garland has been writing a play to be called "Labor." Donald Robertson plans to produce it at Fullerton hall in the Art Institute, Chicago, during the coming winter. Mr. Robertson says it is the greatest American play yet written.

—A domination of the Gould railroad interests by the Harriman interests has been deduced from certain transactions between George J. Gould and E. H. Harriman which reached their crisis on the 1st. This leaves Mr. Harriman master of trans-continental transportation.

—The next monthly gathering of the Women's Trade Union League, on Sunday, August 9, will take the form of a summer outing and basket picnic in Jackson Park. All members and their friends are invited to meet in the pavilion near the German Building at three o'clock.

—The present system of leasing convict labor in Georgia will be very considerably modified for the better, if a bill passed by the State lower house on the 29th, is also passed by the senate. Under the proposed law the present system is to expire on Jan. 1, 1911, until which time short term leases would prevail. The working of convict laborers more than ten hours a day, or underground, is prohibited by the bill.

—The seventeenth Universal Peace congress (p. 420) came to a close in London on the 1st. Resolutions were adopted advocating an international governmental congress on education with the object of informing teachers regarding the best methods of inculcating a love of peace in their students, and in favor of the exemption of private property from capture at sea. The next congress will be held in Stockholm.

—On account of the declination of Martin R. Preston to accept the nomination for President from the Socialist party (p. 370), it having been tendered to him while he is serving a term in the Nevada State's prison, August Gillhaus, an engineer residing in New York City, has been nominated for President as a "proxy" for Mr. Preston. Mr. Gillhaus has agreed, if he is elected, to let Mr. Preston select the cabinet.

—Samuel Erasmus Moffet, a member of the editorial staff of Collier's Weekly, died of apoplexy while bathing in the surf off the New Jersey coast on the 1st. He was in his forty-eighth year. Mr. Moffet was widely known as an editorial writer, having done important work on San Francisco and New York newspapers and periodicals. He was a nephew of "Mark Twain," and a believer in the economic teachings of Henry George.

—Freight rates between New York and Chicago on sugar and coffee were increased on the 1st, on the former from 26 to 28 cents a hundred, and on the latter from 27 to 30 cents a hundred. Other advances in rates are to go into effect on the 15th. Mr. W. C. Brown, senior vice-president of the New

York Central, is reported as insisting that these increases in rates will be a benefit to the general public, and will be a long step in restoring normal business conditions.

—A bill for "two years' rent of air at five dollars a year" was sent by the selectment of Attleboro, Mass., to the N. Y., N. H. & H. R. R., on the 23d. The charge is made because the railroad switch tower, located on top of the Park street railroad arches, projects two feet over the edge of the masonry marking the property line. The action was taken, according to the Boston Globe, "because the railroad has repeatedly sent charges to the town 'for use of air' over its tracks at Oak street where the Attleboro fire alarm wire crosses the railroad property. Each year the town has received a bill for \$1 and the selectmen have always ignored the same." At last the board decided to turn the tables on the railroad.

---

## PRESS OPINIONS

---

### The Tariff That is Privilege

Puck (New York), June 10.—One of the first steps in the conservation of our national resources is a removal of the tariff on certain raw materials. Then the strain on the home supply will be visibly relieved and conservation will have a chance. Our resources cannot be conserved on a stand-pat basis. Neither can we eat our cake and "conserve" it too. Unless as a people we are prepared to sacrifice somebody's "special privilege," some infant industry's special pap, we may as well quit the whole conservation game; and give it up, not as a bad job, but as a job that mustn't be done, because it would hurt some vested graft.

+ +

### Mr. Hearst's Vanity Fair.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), July 29.—William Randolph Hearst's Independence League has nominated its national ticket. The party stands squarely for private ownership—the Mr. Hearst ownership; the platform will receive the unanimous indorsement of the press—the Mr. Hearst press, and the candidates will receive the solid vote of the party—Mr. Hearst's vote. What does it all signify? Nothing. Who is going to be hurt or helped? Nobody. All Mr. Hearst's days have been red-letter days. He has experienced another in larger type; for Mr. Hearst capitals, for the country agate. The Vanity Fair has been held. Acclaim marked its closing hours, but no plaster will be shaken from the ceiling at Lincoln nor will the porch at Cincinnati tremble.

+ +

### Hearstism Without Hearst.

The (Cleveland) Plain Dealer, July 30.—Had William R. Hearst consented to take the nomination, it is conceivable that the entrance of his organization into the national political arena might have figured in the result. It might have diverted enough radical support from the other candidates to influence the vote in certain States. But Hearstism without Hearst cannot be taken seriously. . . . The platform will presumably appeal to much the same class of voters

who will be attracted to the Populist ticket, with this difference, that the Populists have a Presidential candidate widely known, while merely a local importance attaches to the titular head of the Hearst movement. Consideration of candidates and platform lead inevitably to the belief that Hearst takes his party much more seriously than the public can.

+ +

### The Declaration of Independence Was Not a Revenge Document.

The Nashville Tennessean (dem. Dem.), July 30.—Mr. Hearst is surely right when he says that there are no factions within his party to pacify. Except when Mr. Hearst's own bosom is torn with conflicting emotions, there is no room for discord in the ranks of the Independence party. When he has made up his mind the thing is unanimous; when he has resolved his own doubts there is harmony in the party counsels. The boastful declaration, therefore, that Mr. Hearst's party is united and harmonious simply asserts the fact that Mr. Hearst is satisfied with himself. For this fact we truly rejoice. There is so much trouble in this unquiet world that every addition, however small, to the sum of human contentment communicates a kindred pleasure to the sympathetic soul. Thus the self-sufficient contentment which pervades the multitudinous ranks of the Hearst party beguiles our sad soul into smiling, and as we pass the smile along to other sympathetic spirits, Mr. Hearst's state of mind becomes a genuine contribution to the gaiety of nations. But for all that, we cannot regard the fact upon which we have thus remarked as having any relation to the Declaration of Independence or the Fourth of July. Everything that Mr. Hearst says of this great document and of the greater occasion that gave it birth, we most potently believe; and as for the Fourth of July, our pleasure in the same, while less obstreperous than of yore, is still genuine. But if we have not misread our history, Thomas Jefferson did not write the Declaration to proclaim the quietude of his own spirit, nor to swat old King George with gnarled and knotty epigrams. If the great convention which proclaimed the American colonists free and independent had had no better business than to call the king of Great Britain and Ireland a "sordid sister," and the government of the time a "band of boodlers and braves," it would never have made history for Mr. Hearst to misread.

+ +

### On Third Parties.

The New Haven Union (dem. Dem.), July 29.—We assume that Mr. Hearst's only object in politics is to hasten social progress. If he imagines that he can better do this in 1908 by fighting outside the Democratic party he is greatly mistaken. He may or may not defeat that party by taking from it support it logically ought to have. He certainly will not aid it. His independence movement can do no good, and it may do great harm by electing reactionaries and centralizationists for four years more. It will not be the first time in American politics, if Mr. Hearst pursues his present course, that a third party movement has defeated its own ends. In 1844 the abolitionists, who were bent on destroying slav-

ery, really helped to elect Polk—the very candidate they were most opposed to—by also opposing Henry Clay. Mr. Hearst, in fact, will find little to reassure him in the history of third party movements in the United States. All our political history shows that these movements have been, on the whole, pronounced failures. Mr. Hearst is constantly referring to the Republican party as a third party movement. A glance at the facts will show how false is this assumption. The old Whig party was dead when the Republican party replaced it. When the Democratic party dies there may be a chance for Mr. Hearst's Independence League. But not until then can he hope for success, and from present diagnosis the chances of longevity of the party are more than good. The strongest third party movement in this country was populism. Yet its more than 1,000,000 votes never affected the result of any national election. Most of the Populists are now members of a radical Democracy. Mr. Hearst would well emulate their example. Moreover the Republican party was not forged out of the brain, nor created by the fortune of one man. It grew out of an agitation carried on by many public men in different parties. The Populist party grew up from the people. It had its inception in discussions at crossroads blacksmith shops and country stores. The strength of Populism was due to its essential democracy, using that word in its nonpartisan sense. The fact that the Independence League is known as Mr. Hearst's creation is enough to show that its members are independent only in name.

+ +

#### What Is It That Wall Street Is Insuring Against Bryan?

(San Francisco) Star (dem. Dem.), July 18.—What are these men insuring? Anything that will be hurt by sane, safe, honest administration of public affairs? The farmers are not insuring their crops against Bryan's election. The labor unions and laboring men are not rushing to Lloyd's to insure their jobs against Bryan's election. The railroad companies are not insuring their cars and roadbeds against Bryan's election. W. L. Douglass, the shoe manufacturer, is not insuring his plant and business against Bryan's election. Then what are these wise men of Wall Street paying a rate of 10 per cent to insure? Nothing but the water in the stocks of special privilege corporations. They are insuring their stocks of water against damage by Bryanism. That is what they are insuring, and that is all they are insuring. And they are paying 10 per cent for three months and a half, or almost 35 per cent a year! They are paying, for this insurance on the water in their stocks, premiums of ten per cent. In other words, they know that the public service, special privilege corporations, are so much overcapitalized that they are willing to pay, as insurance premiums, \$100 on stocks with a face value of \$1,000! Could there be more candid admission of all that Bryan and La Follette have charged in regard to overcapitalization and stock watering? Paying \$100 on \$1,000 worth of stocks for three and a half months' insurance! These men, be it remembered, are not insuring property; they are insuring privilege—the privilege of forcing the public to pay big dividends on inflated valuations, and they are doing that because they fear that Bryan will be elected. They

fear Bryan, and they fear the Attorney-General that Bryan will appoint. They are not insuring against Taft, for they know he will do nothing to hurt special privilege or to relieve the people of the tremendous burden placed on them by monopoly's right divine to water stocks. Those brokers and "financiers" believe that Bryan will be elected, and they see in his election a menace to special privilege—not a menace to honest business. Only a week ago dispatches from New York said that Bryan's nomination had no effect on the stock market because his nomination was discounted in advance, and Taft was sure to be elected. And now the brokers and gamblers and owners of special privilege are standing in line to pay a rate of 10 per cent on what last week they said was an absolutely fireproof building. This beats the Emeryville race track crime factory.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### PROMETHEUS.

For The Public.

A traitor to thy fellow gods, to man  
 A savior; first in love and hate thou art,  
 As one acclaim thee with man's grateful heart,  
 Or scorns, in heaven, thy pity, which outran  
 Allegiance to celestial kin and clan,  
 And moved thee, an Immortal, to impart  
 Heaven's fire to brutish man, and so to start  
 His groping feet on paths Olympian.

Oh! fatal love to men, which wrought thy doom—  
 Nailed on a flinty crag to burn and freeze  
 Through cloudless eons, which had else been filled  
 With heavenly joys! But thy foreknowledge,  
 skilled  
 To pierce the future's rosy gloom, there sees  
 Not gods nor men, but god-men in their room.

HARRY LYMAN KOOPMAN.

+ + +

## DON'T STOP THE GAME NOW.

For The Public.

One Fall when I was engaged in running a threshing machine in the prohibition State of North Dakota, we had a male cook, and I slept with him in the cook car. Wet weather had stopped threshing for a few days, so the crew went to town, and most of them were somewhat intoxicated when they returned. Three who were more or less under the influence of liquor, and another who was sober, engaged in a game of draw poker. They played on one end of the dining table, which had been pushed back to one side of the car to make room for our bed which was made upon the floor. From where we were lying we could see the cards of the player who "knew just what he was about," and could see he was not playing a square game. The noise they made kept us awake, and when it was late the

cook told them they would have to end the game and leave the cook car as we wanted to sleep. Then the player who sat with his back to us—he who was cheating and winning, he who “knew just what he was about”—turned round and in a low voice, addressing the cook, said: “Oh, don’t stop the game now; I’m making good money.”

The industrial game—now being supplemented by presidential politics—reminds me of that game of cards. The great majority—believing the game to be a square one, although they know it to be ethically wrong, and economically unsound—intoxicated with the idea that at some time they will be the winners, consent to have the game continue; while the few, as they stack the cards, in many an aside are saying: “Oh, don’t stop the game now; we’re making good money.”

A. J. GRAY.

\* \* \*

## THE PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

For The Public.

X.

### General Observations and Conclusions.

#### 4. Summary.

That public ownership of railroads is a political issue we may consider as a conclusive fact; not necessarily an active political issue, but one which is slowly but surely working its way from its passive into its active state. The general dissatisfaction with the manner in which the railroads have discharged their duties has been so pronounced that even from conservative quarters we have heard utterances to the effect that whatever the faults of public ownership, it would be an improvement on past and present conditions.

In our present inquiry we have therefore endeavored to answer the question whether public ownership of railroads has been successful elsewhere. We have made but few attempts to consider the outcome of a public ownership policy in the United States. If this policy has proved successful, and in some cases eminently successful, elsewhere, why should we doubt its success here? Are we not equally capable of doing what other nations have done?

All we have therefore sought has been the facts. And we have found, by quoting authentic statistical figures, that government ownership of railroads in foreign countries has not proved to be a financial failure. We have seen that the majority of state railways have given returns of from 3.5 to 7 per cent on the capital expended for construction and equipment of the roads. We have found that government railroads are not recent experiments, and that the tendency, after seventy, sixty or fifty years of application of the public ownership policy in the respective countries, is toward more, rather than less, state rail-

roads. We have seen that in the country where the public railways have in all respects reached the highest development, but 8 per cent of all the railways are now in private hands, and that this percentage is constantly growing less. We have found that the bulk of the world’s railways, those of our own country excepted, are operated as government railways; that this has made it possible to render service cheaply, and with financial success. As examples of this we have found that on the largest state railway system in the world the average passenger fare is less than a cent a mile; that in another country a thousand-mile journey can be undertaken at an expense of less than seven dollars; and that at an expense of slightly more than ten dollars the same journey may be made with accommodations far superior to those offered by the coaches in America. We have found that the accommodations offered by existing state railways, particularly in Northern Europe, are of a kind comparable to any, and that the service is rapid and punctual.

We have seen further that freight rates, contrary to current opinion, based on misleading figures, offering no true comparison, are not higher on government railroads, except in very special instances, than on the private railroads in the United States, and that, comparing European state railway systems with European private systems, the public railways invariably furnish cheaper service. And last, but not least, we have found that the safety of travel is greater, and in countries with highly developed state railway systems, far greater, than in our own country. We may add, to complete our statement, that discriminations in rates are unknown, and that the public railway administrations follow the progress in their respective fields fully as closely as do our private managements. Many of the developments and improvements in the railway field have been originated and first adopted by governmental railway systems in Europe.

In short, we have found from our investigation that the claim referred to in the introduction of this series, that “existing government railroads are not managed with either the efficiency or economy of privately managed roads, and the rates charged are not as low, and therefore not as beneficial to the public,” is *absolutely false* in regard to most of existing state railways; and in regard to the rest of them it contains only a half truth.

The facts quoted, however, not only permit us to reject the statement made by the present Republican candidate for the Presidency, as having been uttered either out of ignorance of real conditions, or in subservience to “vested interests”; they also permit those of us who believe in government ownership of public property to claim that government ownership of railroads has proved highly successful everywhere where it has been fairly tried. This, we claim, is because

public ownership of public highways is the only reasonable and logical condition of ownership—in a word, because it is the only condition of ownership which fills the demands of true, genuine democracy, in the deep and real sense of this word.

Let me here repeat, that it should be understood that when we attack private ownership of railroads we attack a condition; we do not attack personalities. If private ownership is a wrong condition, if it has been fruitful of corruption and public degeneration, it is not the past and present owners or managers who are the only ones responsible. We, the people of the United States, who permit this condition to continue are responsible. Let us not as cowards blame others for what in the last instance is due to our own inactivity, apathy, and lack of appreciation of the ideals of a true republic. There are railway officials in the United States who, as men, are of the highest type. It has been said before, and it may well be repeated, that there are in this country able railroad men who, if serving the interests of the whole people, rather than the interests of a private monopoly, would raise the railway system of this country to the foremost place in the world. There are men in the service of the railroads, occupying the seats of directors, who realize the inequity and the attendant evils of private ownership. There are others, in managing positions, who denounce as strongly as anyone the depravity of their stock-gambling superiors. But these men will not come to their own until our railway system is operated for public benefit rather than for private gain. Let it therefore be fully understood that it is the present inequitable system of monopoly we denounce, not the men who are the victims of our institutions.

The railway system of America has an opportunity ahead of it not equaled anywhere in the world, but only the ignorant boaster of his country would claim that we have as yet reached the goal. It is true that America has placed itself foremost in the world in many respects, due to industry, skill, persistence, and energy; and our practical railroad men have carried out a wonderful work. They have proved themselves equal to any occasion where their ability has been permitted to freely exercise itself. Let the fullest opportunity be given to these practical railway men—not to exploit the public for private gain, as many of them have been compelled to do against their will in the past, but to bring the railroads of America up to the highest standard attainable.

This opportunity the people of the United States have in their power to sooner or later give to their practical railroad men; for we can place our transportation systems on the same equitable basis as have our European sister nations. This,

however, we can do only by studying what these nations have accomplished. No prejudice or false patriotism should be permitted to enter into our sincere endeavors to establish the true functions of our government.

It is not intended to here present arguments in relation to the current objections to public ownership. It has been the aim to simply present the facts. But there is one objection to public ownership so frequently offered, and of such a character, that it should never be permitted to remain unanswered. This objection is offered by those who disbelieve in American honesty in public affairs—those who claim that public ownership would be a failure because our public officials would not perform their duties honestly. This claim is an insult to every true American; it is an insult to the highest conception of American manhood, and as such it should be met. Should we, as Americans, whether we be born under the stars and stripes, or have from free choice linked our future with the destinies of the Republic, should we admit that as honest men cannot be found among us as can be found among the individuals of our sister nations? Should we be so forgetful of the highest ideals of true citizenship as to be able to make such a statement without shame?

If in the past public honesty has not been as conspicuous in our various governments as in the European governments, what has been the cause? Is not the cause the very existence of the corrupting influences created by our fostered monopolies? European representatives of the people, it is said, guard their honor jealously; so do also American representatives—of the people. Representatives of private monopoly, of vested interests, however, are, as a rule, not so jealous of their public honor. But, were we free from the corrupting influences, would we not also be free from their representatives? If we eliminate special privileges accorded to vested rights we shall find that even among us there are true, honest, upright men, proud of public confidence, who would place their integrity above all else, and would regain for America one of its nearly lost treasures—the faith in democratic government.

When Americans as a nation lose their faith in American honesty the word "American" will have lost its significance. It will be a misnomer. It had better pass into oblivion. For the American nation was founded on conceptions of freedom, justice, and honesty; and whenever these attributes shall be lost sight of, then let us no more be proud of our country, and let us admit that the prophecy of half a century ago, that republican government would prove to be a failure, will come true.

And still, why do we picture this condition? For this prophecy shall never come true. Whatever be the opinions of the few who have lost sight of the high ideals of Americanism, Americans still have faith in American honesty. Let

the dead bury their dead. But let us who still believe in the future of America, sow the seed of truth. The one reform previously inquired into is but one of the many which shall carry our country and our people forward and upward. It is required of us that we fulfil our duty. Let us shake off that spirit of indifference that holds us down, and let us fearlessly, but intelligently, take one forward step at a time. Let the prejudice of false patriotism be powerless in preventing us from expressing and acknowledging the true state of affairs, and let us not be foiled by the over-estimation of the power of opposition. Then our efforts will create a freer and better America than the America of today, and we shall be able to develop a spirit of true patriotism, of real progressiveness, of justice for the many as well as for the few, and for the few as well as for the many. We shall, in a word, be able to raise our country to that plane where we shall have a right to proudly and justly call it "the land of the free."

ERIK OBERG.

\* \* \*

## PRACTICAL POLITICS.

For The Public.

### Before the Election.

Now Voter is blithe as a robin in June.  
 "Put salt on my trail," is the turn of his tune.  
 (The weather is warm, and the Voter is dry,  
 And Candidate-Candidate cometh nearby.)  
 And Candidate-Candidate bucketh the game,  
 And Voter, so blithe, singeth ever the same;  
 For be he like robin or jaybird or goose  
 He knoweth a thing when a Candidate's loose.

Now Candidate goeth abroad in his might;  
 With his wad and his smile he's a beautiful sight.  
 His horn he can blow, and a horn he can drink;  
 To Him-That-Wears-Two-Horns he tippeth a wink.  
 Saith: "Hurry along for the time is at hand  
 When Candidate-Candidate saveth the land!"  
 But the land of a loser is lost on the day  
 That Candidate-Candidate maketh this play.

\*

### After the Election.

A Candidate croucheth alone in his lair,  
 And the look on his face would put kinks in your hair.

He diggeth in pocket and findeth a sou;  
 He findeth some bills—they are bills overdue—  
 He muttereth prayer—of a heathenish kind—  
 And is glad, very glad, oh he is—in your mind!—  
 For Candidate-Candidate fell off the roof,  
 And ye that were "friends" of his, hold ye aloof.

A Candidate cocketh his hat on his ear  
 And crieth triumphant: "Oh, look who is here!"  
 "Skedaddle!" he saith to those holders of place  
 Whose Candidate lost in the Candidates' race.  
 "You're nix cummarouse; I have friends of my own."  
 And, he addeth, aside, in a quieter tone:  
 "I've spent all I had, every God's blessed bean,  
 But what I'll get back will make Boston look green."

Poor Voter is gay as a frolicsome wind.  
 He bloweth how easy were Candidates skinned.  
 He swelleth his chest and he puffeth cigars  
 Until urchins hang on, thinking he is the cars.  
 And prouder he groweth, and lighter in weight,  
 And faster he speedeth to ultimate fate,  
 Where things that he getteth will teach him to reck  
 That Voter's whole body consisted of neck.

E. J. SALISBURY.

## BOOKS

### "THE FEMININE PRINCIPLE IN EVOLUTION."

**The Cosmic Procession, or the Feminine Principle in Evolution.** By Frances Swiney, London. Ernest Bell, York House, Portugal St. W. C. Price, 3s 6d.

These "Essays of Illumination" contain the theory of an "eternal truth" which the author feels called to announce in very positive terms.

"To comprehend fully the deep and sublime significance of the oneness of sex the soul must rise above the personal plane," says Frances Swiney. "We do not say there are two Electricities, negative and positive, but that electricity manifests under a dual aspect. So it is with sex."

Taking for her argument, that the basic source of all phenomena is the eternal creative feminine principle by which all exists, she proceeds to prove her ground by the support not only of the high priests of materialism, but by all the occult and religious legends of every race and time. By a very subtle analysis of the symbolism of every sacred scripture, including the Hebrew, it is shown that the feminine principle is the spirit and substance of all creation. "Thus the word 'Lord' in the original includes the Supernal Mother, but this deeply significant fact has been systematically ignored by the translators and commentators of the Bible, who have been at great pains to suppress every reference to the Divine Feminine throughout the Hebrew Scriptures."

The author draws largely on ancient and theosophic myths and legends for the wisdom and force of her reasoning, but the whole story of the creation, fall and redemption of the human race, as recorded in Jewish and Christian faith, is brought to the proof of "the Divine Feminine as the true beginning, as the true center of manifestation, as the true consummation; for the Divine Mother is designated as the fount of all truth." And we are charged to remember that wherever the word "God" is used by the translators of the Old Testament, the word Elohim, the Supernal Mother, has been thus mistranslated.

The idea which the author of the "cosmic procession" very ably and persistently advocates throughout her well-written "Essays of Illumination," is the oneness of sex, with the feminine as the will force, the creative power, the leader un-

til man constituted himself the master, and thereby brought upon the human race the evil and disorder from which we are beginning slowly to evolve. And this evolution, in the writer's view, hinges on the elevation of woman—"With the mothers is bound up the true forces of progress."

In bringing her strongly supported argument to its close, Frances Swiney says: "I would ask of my readers patience, consideration and thought. Let there be no hasty criticism, no biased judgment on the thesis herein presented. . . . I would, moreover, beg of my readers to verify the statements made by using their own powers of observation, discrimination and analysis."

And it might be added: Let the spirit of domination in both sexes be wholly cast out.

A. L. M.

### SPIRITISTIC EXPOSURES.

**Behind the Scenes with the Mediums.** By David P. Abbott. Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co. Price, \$1.50.

In a well-arranged and substantially bound volume of 328 pages, Mr. Abbott gives a very thorough exposure of the tricks of the commercial medium, in which he seems to have had a personal experience that enables him to show the method to any ambitious aspirant to the arts of legerdemain.

While tiresome to read, the practical demonstration of these famous tricks which have deceived so many gullible seekers after the unknown could not fail to have a wholesome use.

Mr. Abbott has performed a sane office in exposing the frauds practiced in so-called "spirit manifestations;" but would he believe though one really rose from the dead?

A. L. M.

For as the material of a carpenter is wood; of a statuary, brass; so of the art of living, the material is each man's own life.—Epictetus.

## PAMPHLETS

### A Character School.

The modern all-around educational system is delightfully presented in the beautiful yearbook of the Interlaken School at La Porte, Ind.—the most beautiful school year book we have ever seen; and better than that—a story of the most promising school experiment we know of. Dr. Edward A. Rumely is the president of the school, and Dr. Wm. N. Hailmann, late of the Chicago Normal school, is the superintendent.

+ +

### The World-Movement Toward Peace.

From the Association for International Conciliation, American Branch (Sub-station 84, New York City), come two interesting little pamphlets: one entitled "The Possibilities of Intellectual Co-operation between North and South America," by L. S. Rowe; and the other, "America and Japan," by George Trumbull Ladd. Forthcoming articles will be sent free, upon publication, to those persons who shall have made written application therefore.

A. L.

## PERIODICALS

James H. Barry announces that as there is now no Democratic daily in San Francisco he will furnish *The Star* until next January for fifty cents. The editorial quoted in the Press Opinions of this Public is a fine example of Mr. Barry's brilliant editorial pages. (212 Leavenworth St., San Francisco.)

+

Mrs. Humphry Ward believes that women may not be trusted to vote, and she has trusted herself sufficiently to say so in public, and to write to the London Times about it. Then the sophisticated Mr. Israel Zangwill (may his tribe increase) hauled his own sex before his own bar of judgment, to see how

## THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN: ARISTOCRACY versus DEMOCRACY

**T**HE Presidential Campaign of 1908 has begun, and **THE PUBLIC** will give special attention to it to the end. It will print all the really historical **NEWS** of the campaign—fact and not gossip—impartially; and it will comment in **EDITORIALS** with fairness and vigor from the point of view of fundamental democracy as distinguished from party Democracy. **CAMPAIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS** are invited now. ¶ We will send **THE PUBLIC** to any address in the United States from and including the issue of **JULY 3** (with Bryan portrait supplement) to and including the issue of **NOVEMBER 13** (with full election news and editorial comment)—twenty issues in all—for **TWENTY-FIVE CENTS**, cash in advance. ¶ **CLUBS OF TEN** will be served for the same period for **TWO DOLLARS**, cash in advance.

Address: **THE PUBLIC**, Ellsworth Building, Chicago.

far it might be trusted. Putting his findings with hers leads to a black conclusion. But we anticipate. Let us go over the sad road with him: "Now, strange to say, I, as a male novelist—had the position been reversed and 'votes for men' been the cry of the day—should have drawn the same conclusion

about men. Knowing, as only a male novelist can their boundless vanity, selfishness, and hysterical emotionalism; beholding how two of their greatest professions—law and journalism—are precisely those calculated to promote unscrupulous perversion of judgment; seeing how our Army and our Navy are

**The New Theology Magazine**

is an exponent of the New Theology Movement.  
Introductory price, 10 cents for three months.  
21 Madison Street, Room 10 :: BOSTON, MASS

**ECONOMIC and REFORM BOOKS a SPECIALTY**

TRUTH ABOUT THE TRUSTS, \$5.00, reduced to . . . . . \$2.00  
THE JUNGLE, \$1.50, reduced to . . . . . .65  
CONFESSIONS OF A MONOPOLIST, \$1.00, reduced to . . . . .80  
FREE AMERICA, 75c, reduced to . . . . .45  
FREE AMERICA, paper, 25c, reduced to . . . . .10  
FROM EARTH'S CENTER . . . . .25  
Price includes postage or express.

H. H. TIMBY, Conneaut, Ohio. Catalogs Free

**An Industrial Experiment Station**

To try the Golden Rule on people and see what happens. MAKES NEW PLACES for men and women who need work. Enables them to pay for land, tools and working outfit, and be FREE from rent and profit. Fair returns on capital invested in Straight Edge Extension Bonds. Enroll in the Straight Edge Fellowship (\$1.00 a year) and keep posted. Send 10c for booklets, news letters and "What Prominent People Say." Address

STRAIGHT EDGE INDUSTRIAL SETTLEMENT  
1 Abingdon Square, New York, (and Alpine, N. J.)

**Labor and Neighbor**

ERNEST CROSBY'S Posthumous Economic Message

- I. The Labor Question.
- II. The Plea of a Laborer.
- III. Injustice and Evolution.
- IV. A Diagnosis of Present Conditions.
- V. The Fruits of Monopoly.
- VI. Plutocracy.
- VII. The Church and the Labor Question
- VIII. Remedies: Regulation and Trade Unionism.
- IX. " Restriction of Immigration.
- X. " Communism and Socialism.
- XI. " Justice, Freedom and Co-operation.

Stiff Paper Cover, With Portrait of Crosby.  
One Copy, postpaid . . . . . 25 cents  
Six Copies, postpaid . . . . . \$1.00

THE PUBLIC, Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago

**REAL ESTATE FOR SALE AND EXCHANGE**

**EDWARD POLAK**

4030 Third Avenue - - NEW YORK CITY

Hours: 10 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Telephone Harrison 1037

**CHARLES L. LOGAN, D. O.**  
**OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN**

Office: 45 Auditorium Building

HOTEL WARNER—EVENINGS

**CHICAGO**

**WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE**

**Summer Outing and Basket Picnic**

**JACKSON PARK**

**SUNDAY, AUGUST 9**

Meet in the Pavillon near the German Building at 3 p. m.  
**PLEASE COME AND BRING YOUR FRIENDS**

Tea, Coffee and Iced Drinks can be Had at Moderate Prices  
EMMA STEGHAGEN, Secretary MRS. RAYMOND ROBINS, President

**6% BONDS**

We are offering at 95 (par value 100) the unsold balance of a \$130,000 issue of 6% Bonds of the

**EASTLAND STEAMSHIP COMPANY**

the line to Cedar Point, the Atlantic City of the Middle West. These bonds will net considerably more than 6% and are fully secured by first mortgage on Str. Eastland valued at \$300,000 and insured for full value.

For sale in amounts of \$500 or more.  
Send for Booklet G-1 giving full details.

Have you investigated our new Money Order Plan where your money is always on deposit at 4% and yet cashable anywhere at any time? Write for Booklet G-2.

**THE DEPOSITORS SAVINGS & TRUST CO.**

Tom L. Johnson, President.

**CLEVELAND, OHIO.**

controlled by a sex whose quarrelsomeness may imperil the very foundations of our Empire; and particularly observing the vast masses of semi-illiterate voters nourished on Limerick journalism, what other conclusion can I draw than that my sex is utterly unfitted to be trusted with power? Put Mrs. Ward's and my conclusion together, and that way 'Holy Russia' lies."

\* \* \*

There seems to be a feeling in certain quarters that one of the best things about Sherman is Taft's

remarkable freedom from bodily ills.—Chicago Record-Herald

\* \* \*

Ascum—Did Crittack say something nice about your book?

Riter—I'm not sure, but I'm a little suspicious.

Ascum—How do you mean?

Riter—He said there were "some things in it that are decidedly original, and some other things that are quite clever."—Philadelphia Press.

## The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving 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, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. 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 entitled Related Things, 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 in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

### Terms of Subscription

Yearly .....	\$1.00
Half yearly.....	.50
Quarterly .....	.25
Single copies .....	.05
Trial subscription—4 weeks.....	.10

Extra copies in quantity, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, \$3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders on Chicago, or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

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

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due, or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

### Advertising Rates

One page, each insertion.....	\$20.00
Half-page, each insertion.....	10.00
Quarter-page, each insertion.....	5.00
One inch, each insertion.....	1.20
Half-inch, each insertion.....	.60

Two columns to the page; length of column, 8½ inches; width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.

## OUR LAST OFFER

We have left in our possession only a limited number of the sets of the standard Library Edition of the Complete Works of Henry George, including the Life of Henry George by Henry George, Jr. This set consists of ten 12mo volumes, all uniformly and artistically bound, in a box.

We must dispose of these sets at once, in order to get enough money to meet the few remaining obligations of this Company. So we will let them go at cost.

The regular price of this set is \$15.00 cash with order, or \$17.50 if paid in installments. In fact, this price is too low, as the publishers realized after placing the edition on the market. It was printed from the same plates and with the same illustrations as the Memorial Edition, which sold for \$25.00 the set, but is now out of print.

But we (until our obligations are met) will sell the complete set for \$7.50 cash with order. The cost of transportation is extra. For \$1.00 additional, or \$8.50 in all, we will send the set, carefully packed, by express, prepaid to any address in the United States or Canada. Cash must be sent with the order.

The volumes are as follows:

- Volume I. Progress and Poverty.
- " II. Social Problems.
- " III. The Land Question.  
Contains "The Land Question," "Property in Land," and the "Condition of Labor" (open letter to Pope Leo XIII).
- " IV. Protection or Free Trade.
- " V. A Perplexed Philosopher.
- Volumes VI. and VII. The Science of Political Economy.
- Volume VIII. Our Land and Land Policy.  
Contains the miscellaneous writings, speeches and lectures.
- Volumes IX. and X. The Life of Henry George.

**The Public Publishing Co.**  
Room 205, 357 Dearborn St., Chicago



When the security, the rate of interest and free stock exchange are considered, no investment has ever been offered to the public that is so safe and profitable to the small investor as this.

TOM L. JOHNSON

## EDUCATED PUBLIC OPINION.

As a result of some of the press dispatches that have been sent broadcast over the country by the enemies of Mayor Johnson in his street railway fight, the people in many of the cities outside of Cleveland have an idea that three-cent fare is a failure.

The people of the country are too familiar with the methods employed by the beneficiaries of special privilege to be misled by these reports.

There is more in the street railway problem of Cleveland than the financial benefit to the people of three-cent fare. The success of the street railways under the Municipal Company means the destruction of private monopoly and the triumph of the people.

The fight has been conducted on a fair, open and honest basis. The sale of stock will be conducted on a like basis.

Every statement made can be absolutely relied upon—for to win at the sacrifice of principle is to lose.

When we say we will pay you Six Per Cent interest on your investment and that we will redeem your stock at any time at par and interest,—you know that we mean what we say and that we are in a position to make good our promises.

### THE OFFER:

First, we will sell Cleveland Railway Company Stock at par (\$100.00) and 6 per cent interest. That is, \$100.75 a share until August 15th.

Second, we will at any time redeem in cash, at \$100.00 a share, plus interest at 6 per cent from the payment of the last dividend on it, any stock that has been sold through our free-stock exchange.

Thus it pays 50 per cent higher rate of interest than the savings banks, and the money is ready for you when you want it, with no loss of interest and no 60-day clause. We want Cleveland Railway stock to be a people's savings bank paying 6 per cent interest, instead of 4 per cent. As Mayor Johnson says, this stock is equal in security to a GOVERNMENT BOND.

Address all communications to the Municipal Traction Co., Stock Exchange Department, 450 Electric Bldg., or call at the company's offices. Telephones: Bell Main 28; Cuyahoga Central 1350. Make all checks payable to the Municipal Traction Co.

# The Municipal Traction Company

A. B. DU PONT, President.



## A New, Thin-Model Ingersoll Watch

Here is a new, small size, thin-model, gentleman's watch—an exact duplicate in size and appearance of any of the high-priced, fashionable, thin-model watches made for men. The new Ingersoll "Junior" is the only low-priced, thin-model watch in the world—a *guaranteed* time-keeper, and the latest achievement of the wonderful Ingersoll factories.

*Ingersoll*  
DOLLAR WATCH

The famous "Dollar Watch" is still the most popular watch, and the most practical and inexpensive time-keeper made. Besides the "Dollar Watch" there are other Men's Ingersolls up to \$1.75, and "Midget" models for Ladies, Girls and Boys, from \$2 to \$5.

**Look for the name INGERSOLL on the dial**

Sixty thousand dealers sell Ingersolls—or we will send direct on receipt of price (if by registered mail, send 8c additional). Write today for free, illustrated booklet.

ROBT. H. INGERSOLL & BRO.  
7 Frankel Building, New York



\$ 1

\$ 2

## The Mayor of Cleveland TOM L. JOHNSON

President of this bank, made it possible for us to offer to the public the newest, safest, and most convenient method of handling savings deposits ever devised.

### Our Bank Money Order Plan Of Banking By Mail

safeguards the depositor under every condition, eliminates the clumsy, out of date, unsafe pass-book method and gives you instead, a Certificate of Deposit—a Certified Check, bearing

## 4% INTEREST—Cashable Anywhere—At Any Time

By our method your money is always on deposit, working for you day and night, yet always in your possession ready for instant use when needed.

Can you imagine a more ideal plan for the placing of your savings? We want you to know more about it, and if you contemplate opening a savings account with any bank, you owe it to yourself to investigate our plan.

**WRITE NOW—TODAY, FOR BOOKLET "G."**

**THE DEPOSITORS SAVINGS & TRUST CO., TOM L. JOHNSON, Cleveland, Ohio**  
PRESIDENT

