

# 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 LOYD GARRISON, Massachusetts  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIET 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, SEPTEMBER 18, 1908.

No. 546

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

## CONTENTS.

### EDITORIAL:

In the Republican Camp.....	577
Mr. Roosevelt's Belated Appeal.....	577
The Labor Vote.....	578
Playing at Politics.....	578
Hearst versus Bryan.....	578
Bryan's Fortune.....	578
A Traction Contrast.....	579
The Foundations of Our Prosperity.....	579
Our "Revived" Prosperity.....	580
Unexpected Incendiarism.....	580
"Copperhead" and "Grafter".....	580
Negro With a Capital "N".....	580
The Color Tone of Righteousness.....	580
Municipal Telephones in Great Britain.....	580
Giving Work.....	581
"The Servant in the House".....	581
The Case of Dawes vs. Dawes.....	581

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

A Week in London (L. F. P.).....	582
----------------------------------	-----

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

President Roosevelt's Appearance in the Campaign.....	585
Mr. Bryan's Reply to Mr. Roosevelt.....	585
Mr. Taft's Response to Mr. Bryan's Reply to Mr. Roosevelt.....	586
Mr. Bryan's Rejoinder.....	586
Mr. Bryan's Speaking Tour.....	586
Mr. Taft's Campaign Plans.....	586
Organized Labor in National Politics.....	586
The Election in Maine.....	586
Election in Arkansas.....	587
New York State Conventions.....	587
The Campaign in Cleveland.....	587
The Independent Negro Movement.....	587
Distress of the Unemployed in Glasgow.....	588
England and the Roman Catholic Church.....	588
Tolstoy's Birthday Celebrated in Russia.....	588
News Notes.....	588
Press Opinions.....	589

### RELATED THINGS:

The King of Seers (C. J. Buell).....	590
"The Servant in the House".....	591
An Open Letter from Daniel Kiefer to James W. Van Cleave.....	594

### BOOKS:

Crosby the "Humanist".....	596
Pamphlets.....	596
Periodicals.....	597

## EDITORIAL

### In the Republican Camp.

Mr. Roosevelt's letter in behalf of Mr. Taft confirms the reports that the Republicans are scared, and Mr. Taft's response to Mr. Bryan's reply indicates that Mr. Taft has got into a bad temper about it.

\* \* \*

### Mr. Roosevelt's Belated Appeal.

Mr. Roosevelt's hysterical appeal to the organized wealth producers of the continent, begging them to fall in line behind Mr. Taft, as the organized wealth grabbers have already done, is sufficiently answered by Mr. Bryan; for organized labor could hardly accept Mr. Roosevelt's assurances as to Mr. Taft's purposes, unsupported by Mr. Taft's assurances of his own purposes. It might not be superfluous to add that when Mr. Roosevelt neglected to save organized labor from the insulting behavior of the convention by which at his solicitation Mr. Taft was nominated, he lost what he now begs for. At that convention the men to whom Mr. Roosevelt appeals so piteously in his campaign letter, were given a hostile platform and told curtly enough that if they didn't like it they could "go to the Democratic convention where they belonged." It is rather late to invite them back at the present serious crisis in Mr. Taft's political fortunes. Even if these considerations were not so persistently obtrusive, how could a "labor" platform and a "labor" candidate accept-

able to the followers of Van Cleave be acceptable also to the supporters of Mitchell and Gompers?

+

Mr. Roosevelt makes one unfortunate slip. In this appeal to wage workers to vote for Mr. Taft he says that "no responsible labor organization would now hesitate to condemn the abuses against which Judge Taft's injunctions were aimed." Whether this is a good guess or not may be ignored, for it is away from the point. The question is not whether the alleged abuses are worthy of condemnation. It is whether persons charged with such abuses ought to be secure in their right to trial by jury. Can Mr. Roosevelt give organized labor any satisfactory assurances as to Mr. Taft's views on that point?

+ +

#### The Labor Vote.

"Going to vote for Teddy again?" "Not if you mean 'Taffy.'"

+ +

#### Playing at Politics.

In the American Federationist for September, Samuel Gompers explains the reason why the American Federation of Labor is supporting Bryan in the Presidential campaign of this year. His reply to the criticisms of side-party advocates who have urged support of their respective candidates is brief and unanswerable. It is simply this: "The American workers are not *playing* politics." Although that reply will not satisfy the side-party voter who wants to defeat Bryan at any cost, nor the one who doesn't care who is elected, it is conclusive with every rational man who, whatever his primary preference may be, prefers Bryan to Taft for second choice. One of these two men will be elected. That is the only certainty in the campaign. Organized workingmen can choose between these two, but they cannot choose between either one and some one else. By voting for a third candidate they throw their influence with the Van Cleaves, who are supporting Taft. They cannot throw it against the Van Cleaves effectively in any other way than by supporting Bryan. To vote for a side-party candidate for President is to do precisely what Mr. Gompers says the mass of workingmen won't do. It is to play at politics.

+ +

#### Hearst versus Bryan.

Mr. Bryan is accused by William Randolph Hearst of having offered to support Hearst for Democratic candidate for President in 1912 if Hearst would support him in 1908. This revela-

tion from the lips of Mr. Hearst comes late, if it was to have come at all. It is one of those revelations which the longer they are withheld the less probable they are reasonably regarded to be. A virtuous man whose virtue had been thus assaulted would have denounced the infamy on the spot or forever after have held his peace. Nor is this the only reason for doubting Hearst's revelation. It is altogether improbable that Mr. Bryan would have refused his support to Hearst in 1904, when he could have won his favor cheaply, if there could have been any possibility of his ever making such a proposal as Hearst's belated revelation describes. But the matter does not rest upon improbabilities alone. To Mr. Hearst's accusation Mr. Bryan responds with a prompt and unequivocal denial, saying it is absolutely false. When William J. Bryan denounces as absolutely false a statement by William Randolph Hearst, the antipodal character of the two men necessitates corroborative evidence in support of the statement as an imperative condition precedent to its further consideration.

+ +

#### Bryan's Fortune.

Mr. Cannon's relations to the present campaign, as the second most powerful man in the Federal government hereafter as heretofore if the Republicans win, raises him to the level of a personage whose accusations may be met by a Presidential candidate without loss of dignity or waste of energy. It is therefore something to be grateful for that Mr. Cannon's partisanship has led him to put into the form of a scandalous accusation a lot of gossip about Mr. Bryan's wealth; for Mr. Bryan takes prompt advantage of the opportunity to advise the people of the facts, and goes fully into detail. It is now known, therefore, that he possessed \$3,000 when he went to Congress; that after two years in Congress his fortune had risen to \$7,000; that his book, "The First Battle," brought him a profit of \$3,400, of which he gave half to the national Democratic committee; and that he has a fortune now of probably \$125,000, and certainly not more than \$150,000. This is not a very large fortune for a man of Mr. Bryan's abilities to have accumulated in twenty-five years, as fortunes go in these days, but the important thing about it after all is not the size of his fortune but how he got it. It appears that he got it all by earning it,—earning it by the only practicable standard of what constitutes earning, namely, that it was freely given to him by people who asked for what he offered them in exchange for it. Mr. Bryan touches the core of the question when in his reply to

Speaker Cannon he says: "My lectures have been profitable and my writings have paid me well; but no one attends the lectures unless he wants to do so, and no one buys what I write unless he is interested in reading it."

\*      \*

### A Traction Contrast.

The Chicago Daily News, one of the traction corporation organs of Chicago, insinuates that the traction settlement in Cleveland was less favorable to the public than the Chicago settlement. Without bothering to question its figuring from which the Daily News draws forth this insinuation, we think it worth while to direct attention to facts it had to ignore. Even if it be true that the purchase price in Cleveland is nearly \$100,000 per mile, as the News figures it, the highest price the city will have to pay on this basis if it takes over the lines will be \$110,000 per mile. In Chicago it may run up to \$125,000 or \$130,000 or even more. Meanwhile, in five months after the settlement Cleveland is getting a good and increasingly better service; whereas Chicago, seventeen months after the settlement, is getting a service which in only a few places is slightly better than before and in the others as bad as it ever was. While much has been said in traction papers about new cars, it is doubtful if the car supply is as large as before the settlement, and it is certain that the strap hanging evil is as bad as ever. Another difference between the Chicago and the Cleveland settlement is in the fare. In Cleveland the fare is three cents and in Chicago it is five. Other differences relate to the future. The Cleveland system is operated by a non-profit-making company which can retain only 6 per cent on its actual investment, the city getting surplus earnings or the passengers getting reduced fares out of any excess; whereas the Chicago system is operated by profit-making companies which, after a multiplicity of profits under other names, retain 5 per cent on their investment and in addition 45 per cent of surplus earnings—the city getting only 55 per cent and the passengers getting no reduction at all in fares. Furthermore the Cleveland company is bound to turn the system over to the city upon demand at bottom cost, plus ten per cent, and without reservation; whereas the profit-making corporations of Chicago, though bound to sell to the city under certain circumstances, is so protected by conditions and reservations that no sale can be effected if any considerable financial interest opposes it. Still other differences in detail could be pointed out, but the whole subject may be summed up in the one incontrovertible fact that

the Chicago settlement was controlled, contrived and supported by and in behalf of private financial interests; whereas the Cleveland settlement, controlled and contrived by and in behalf of public municipal interests, was opposed by the same kind of financial interests that supported the settlement in Chicago.

\*      \*

### The Foundations of Our Prosperity.

"Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity." This is the shibboleth of the "Conservation League of America," of which Mr. Roosevelt is honorary president, Mr. Bryan and Mr. Taft honorary vice-presidents, and Walter L. Fisher of Chicago the active president. Although the immediate purposes of the League relate more to the preservation of our great natural resources from destruction than to the conservation of their benefits for the whole people, the latter purpose is within the scope and even the terms of the scheme. In its statement of principles, the League distinctly declares that the natural "sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated."

\*

The importance of this declaration has become quite manifest in consequence of the monopoly of irrigation benefits that has already set in through absolute ownership of arid lands which public irrigation has made valuable, and the history of our national development is full of analogous instances. Had common rights in connection with public improvements been conserved in the past, we should have a far more prosperous people now than our most enthusiastic optimists describe them to be. This basis of prosperity is not yet out of reach; but whenever it is proposed to restore to public ownership the benefits of former improvements, conservatives cry out that it is now too late. It is clearly not too late, however, to guard those of the future that will attach to the conservation of such of our public resources as the Roosevelt-Bryan-Taft-Fisher League has undertaken, and there is encouragement in its declaration against the monopoly of natural resources. What the League purposes in the way of conservation of these resources is of great importance; but any such conservation, without concurrent steps for the security to all the people of their interest in the resulting financial benefits, would only strengthen the present tendency in our country toward class stratification. This League should be encouraged in every reasonable way, so long as its efforts at securing equitable distribution of common benefits from natural resources keep pace

with its work of physical conservation of the resources themselves.

\*   \*

### Our "Revived" Prosperity.

An example of the "business rebound" of which our prosperity fakirs are boasting was afforded in Philadelphia last week. John Wanamaker advertised for 1,000 workmen to help tear away part of his old store preparatory to rebuilding, and 5,000 workless men responded. According to press dispatches of the 14th, these 5,000 "unemployed mechanics and laborers thronged around the building, hundreds of them arriving soon after midnight." This sign of the times, though not so exhilarating, is more trustworthy than the factory-opening promises of our political and business seers, and the jubilant outcries of the bunco men of Wall street.

\*   \*

### Unexpected Incendiarism.

Under the signature of "A Bystander," Goldwin Smith's other name for newspaper purposes, we find this apparently anarchistic hint in a recent issue of the Toronto Sun:

The aim of the Socialist, at least of the political and aggressive Socialist, plainly is general confiscation, as Henry George frankly avows; and against this property, there is reason to fear will have to defend itself by other arguments than those of logic.

Goldwin Smith may be freely forgiven for mistaking Henry George for a political socialist. He might be forgiven also for saying that Henry George advocated "general" confiscation, were it not that as a literary purveyor of economics, deservedly distinguished, he must be presumed to have read at least one of George's books. But how can he be forgiven as a great and influential public teacher for advising property owners to defend their disputed titles by "other arguments than those of logic"? Men have been hanged in Chicago for language hardly more incendiary than that.

\*   \*

### "Copperhead" and "Grafter."

To say of a Democratic gubernatorial candidate that his political enemies accused him of being a "copperhead" forty odd years ago, is not the most candid way of defending a Republican gubernatorial candidate whose political associates accused him of being a despicable grafter hardly more than four years ago. But that is the way in which Charles S. Deneen's supporters are trying to defend him in the contest between himself and Adlai E. Stevenson for Governor of Illinois.

### Negro with a Capital "N."

We are sometimes asked why we spell Negro with a capital "N," when so few other publications do so. We do it for the same reason that we spell Smith with a capital "S." Just as "smith" was once a common descriptive term indicative of occupation and came thence to be a family name, so "negro," once a common descriptive term indicating the black color of a certain race, has come to be a race name. This is a kind of transformation through which many words have gone, from common names to proper and from proper to common ones,—as from smith to Smith or reversely from Boycott to boycott. When these transpositions of meaning take place, they ought to be indicated by the ordinary rules of capitalization, simply as matter of good literary form. We should as soon think of writing "mr. smith" as "negro." Capitalization is of course a mere conventionality, but that is not a sufficient reason for disregarding it. In some connections it has a significance of respect which may make its misuse offensive. The spelling of Negro with a little "n" may well be offensive to sensitive persons of that race, and we see no other reason for refusing to capitalize the word than a positive intention to offend or indifference to giving offense, unless it be ignorance of English usage. We are therefore glad to note that at least one periodical of the first class, the American Magazine, habitually follows our rule as to the word Negro. Has not this word become as truly a proper name as German, Jew or Quaker?

\*   \*

### The Color Tone of Righteousness.

To the intelligence and conscience of those of our good white friends who are democrats down to the color line but no further, we commend these true words from a Negro, S. Laing Williams, whose democracy, like Thomas Jefferson's, knows no race limitations: "There are some things about which there can be no compromise. A righteous man is neither white nor black. He is simply a righteous man."

\*   \*

### Municipal Telephones in Great Britain.

The "free-plate matter" which adversaries of public ownership are inveigling careless editors into publishing because it costs nothing, is in many cases costing the papers their readers' confidence. We notice as an example the publication of matter of this kind which attempts to discredit municipal ownership by reporting that British cities have abandoned municipal operation of telephones. If it were explained that they have abandoned it

not to private companies but to the postal service of the British government the statement would not be misleading. Telephones as well as telegraphing, are part of the British postal service.

\* \* \*

### Giving Work.

"The man out of a job," says an unknown writer with brevity and truth, "does not want any one to give him work; on the contrary, he has work to sell." Upon this observation Bolton Hall comments: "If opportunity were left to him, he could use his work himself."

\* \* \*

### "The Servant in the House."

To see this play is to know why it is drawing attention. Both in construction and presentation it is a work of art; and in social and religious significance, it is at once profound and stimulating. The play is complete without its symbolism; the symbolism would be vitally interesting in itself; the play as an exemplification of its symbolism is a sermon. What in another realm of art those pictures are that put the Carpenter of Nazareth into modern settings, such is this play in the realm of dramatic art, only that the artistic skill is better and the conception broader. The servant in the house, a butler from India, is an extraordinarily suggestive character. At one time he personifies without irreverence the Son of Man, at others he is a human conscience visualized; throughout the symbolic allusions he is the servant in the house of the soul, but throughout the play he is the Bishop of Benares disguised as Manson the butler in the service of a clergyman's family. About this principal theme, in which the identity of love of men with love of God is powerfully presented, several minor themes oscillate. The most superficial is the spiritual rottenness of the organized Christian church, which is symbolized by allusions to a deadly miasma proceeding from the foundations of a church building. Its purification is symbolized by the self sacrifice of an awakened clergyman and his atheistic and socialistic and despised brother. It is doubtful if the Christian religion as a religion of the Fatherhood of God and the consequent brotherhood of all men finds better expression in any of our pulpits than through this theater play. The play is not trifling nor in any truly religious sense irreverent; but it holds the mirror up to organized Christianity that its votaries may see as the Pharisees of old might have seen, the spiritual degradation of their paganized worship. When we recall that in the Middle Ages the drama served to popularize profound Christian

truths, we may look upon "The Servant in the House" as indicating a probable return to the drama for the restoration of Christianity to popular confidence.

\* \* \*

### THE CASE OF DAWES vs. DAWES.

Responding to our quotation of last week from his history of banking (p. 553), Mr. Charles G. Dawes, president of the Central Trust Co. of Chicago and treasurer of the Republican Congressional committee, very frankly admits that in his earlier years and before he got fully into the banking swim, he did advocate precisely the system of bank-deposit insurance which Mr. Bryan has made an issue in national politics. But he explains that he has since realized that he made a mistake then, and has accordingly changed his opinion. For candor in changing his opinion and courage in announcing the change, every man is entitled to full credit. It is too rare a virtue and often too difficult, to be allowed to go without the hearty acknowledgment we are glad to make to Mr. Dawes in this connection. But the public value of a change of opinion hinges not upon the fact of the change, nor even upon the frank and fair spirit in which it is made, but upon the influences from which it springs.

+

A recantation, for instance, which is valueless if made under the influence of threats or promises, whether expressed or implied, may be of more than ordinary value if made freely under the influence of good reasons, or even of reasons that are only plausible. In evident appreciation of this difference, Mr. Dawes bases his recantation upon reasons which he doubtless regards as justifying his change of mind. Of the sufficiency of those reasons for his own purposes, he alone is of course the only competent judge. But we doubt if in comparison with his reasons for his original views, any one else will think the reasons for his recantation strong enough to warrant so momentous a reversal of opinion.

+

Let us make the comparison, referring to Mr. Dawes's book of 1894 for his reasons for advocating the Bryan plan, and to the Chicago Record-Herald of September 13, 1908, for his reasons for opposing it. In his book, Mr. Dawes argues in substance that—

the necessary fund for insuring bank deposits would be created by "a comparatively small tax upon each national bank;" that it "would have a tendency to prevent the mad rushes of small and large depositors

during times of panic," and the effect of rendering "bank deposits more stable under all conditions;" that it would serve most highly not only debtor and creditor, but "the community at large;" and that it would prevent "keen suffering in those localities where bank failures occur and where the hard-earned savings of the community, under our present laws, are often swept entirely away."

Surely that is a forceful argument, whether durable or not, and one from which its author must have found escape exceedingly difficult. But Mr. Dawes thinks he has escaped it, and here in substance are his reasons: Upon coming into office as Comptroller of the Currency four years after falling under the influence of the reasoning abstracted above, he found himself unable, to his regret, to support the proposition, because he learned that—

(1) Insurance of deposits would encourage the offering of unsound rates of interest on deposits by irresponsible bankers; and,

(2) In national banking (though not in State banking) the uniform tax necessary to create a deposit-insurance fund would be unjust "because of the great disparity in the percentage of mortality of banks in different sections of the country."

Inasmuch as the second reason given by Mr. Dawes does not in his judgment apply to State banking, and as the first could in fact be easily obviated by banking supervision of a degree of efficiency that ought to be provided regardless of the deposit-insurance question, Mr. Dawes appears to have been won over from the deposit-insurance idea, as a national measure only, and in that respect only, because it wouldn't be fair—and for no other substantial reason whatever. And this unfairness would consist, be it observed, in raising the insurance fund by a uniform tax upon banks regardless of whether they are in States where the percentage of bank failures is low or in States where it is high. Mr. Dawes regards that as unfair, even though the banks are all in one system, and under one governmental supervision, and their depositors are so interlinked in exchanging interests that losses by bank failures in any State react in other States. Could any reasoning in support of a recantation be more inadequate?

+

Think of it! Mr. Dawes withdraws his support from compulsory deposit-insurance throughout the national banking system because, although the insurance-fund tax would be small, it would weigh disproportionately against the safer banks in the richer States! He withdraws his support because, although the fund would prevent panicky "runs" upon all banks, the small tax burden necessary

to insure this great benefit would weigh disproportionately against the safer banks in the richer States! He withdraws his support because, although the fund would render bank deposits "more stable under all conditions," the small tax necessary to secure that stability would weigh disproportionately against the safer banks in the richer States! He withdraws his support because, although deposit-insurance would be of most important service to the community at large as well as to debtors and creditors, the small tax necessary to create the insurance fund would weigh disproportionately against the safer banks in the richer States! He withdraws his support because, although the insurance fund would prevent "keen suffering in those localities where bank failures occur and where the hard earned savings of the community, under our present laws, are often swept entirely away," the small tax necessary to prevent that suffering would weigh disproportionately against the safer banks in the richer States!

The kind of financial experience which has such an effect upon the mind of a well-meaning man can hardly make good citizens, though it may possibly make shrewd bankers.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### A WEEK IN LONDON.

London, August 10.—The first thing you have to do in London is to learn how to cross the streets without getting killed. Like getting hanged, it is an art that can be learned only by experience. No matter how expert you may be in threading your way across congested thoroughfares in the United States, your skill avails you nothing here. For the vehicles pass one another to the left instead of the right, and your American street-crossing skill only serves to get you run down from the right or the left while you are instinctively on guard at your left or your right. And you would probably be literally run down if you happened to be in the way too long. In the United States, where street vehicles wind in and out to right and left in order to make headway, though with a bearing to the right in passing, they will stop rather than run a foot passenger down. But here the vehicles pass in a steady stream, one stream in one direction on one side of the street and the other in the other direction on the other side; and while drivers give you notice, they make no indication of according you a right of way. I have learned that if you look in the direction of your right shoulder as you start to cross a street, and in the direction of your left shoulder after you reach the center line, you may go from curb to curb with a somewhat greater sense of safety than if you were a civilian crossing a busy battle field. At any rate it is the safest way. But Londoners don't encounter the difficulties and terrors of the stranger, and no one really does get killed, so far as I know.

After you have learned to cross London streets without a tremor, your next lesson is to learn how to do without drinking water. It is quite possible to get drinking water—even ice water, if you are urgent. You have only to ask for it and you get it—about twice out of a possible three times. But you never get it without asking, unless in an American hostelry or a friendly household. You will find at table drinkables in abundance: tea, coffee, cold milk, hot milk, hot water, wine it may be, or beer it may be, or lemonade or mineral waters, or all; but never a drop of God's own water unless you ask for it. To ask for it at my most excellent boarding house has much the same demoralizing effect that you might expect if you asked for a rum punch in a hospitable Prohibition home. You have plenty of water in your bedroom for ablutions, and a tin pitcher of hot water is piously put at your door every morning along with your blackened boots; but there is never a drop of water to drink. As a substitute I keep seltzer by the half dozen in my room.

Yet I insist that all this is matter of difference merely, and not a sign of inferior or superior modes of living. The people here follow their customs because they are used to them and like them, just as we do with our customs; and no doubt they are just as good customs for them as are ours for us. There is nothing about it all to find fault with; it is simply something curious to observe, and curious because and only because it is some one else's custom instead of our own.

✱

That remark applies also to the English omnibuses and underground (or "tube") systems of traction service. There are no street cars in the thickly populated parts of London, but the streets are alive with "motor" busses (meaning automobile stages), and horse busses,—all "double deckers" and all covered with advertisements. These are so thick that you can't tell the busses of one route from those of any other, unless you know them in a friendly way. With the stranger, a bus is away beyond his hail before he knows whether it is the one he wants or not. But this exasperating difference in custom makes no difference to the Londoner. He recognizes in the distance the bus he wants, as he would recognize a chum. It is easy, therefore, for him to take care of himself. But strangers are as helpless as babes in a wood. The underground stations also are so covered with advertisements that only experts can pick out their names. You want to get off at a particular station, but you are apt to mistake it for "Bovrill," or some other station that you don't want. And so with the busses. All of them seem bound for "Bovrill," "Fels-Naptha Soap" or "Stoutandale," instead of the place you are looking for.

But the fares are reasonable, though regarded in London as high. Two cents takes you any ordinary distance, and four takes you long distances. For six you almost make a journey. I did on one occasion. Quite involuntarily, I made the circuit of London underground for six cents, when I could have kept an appointment and been happier for only two. All this service in London is under private operation; but he must be a bold man who would dare

call it better than the publicly owned and operated traction service of Liverpool.

✱

In mentioning transportation the super-excellent cab system must not be overlooked. Wherever you are in London you have only to whistle two or three times with a shrill twitter, and a cab comes out of nowhere to pick you up. Or it may be that you see a long line of cabs waiting for custom, and select one without whistling. They carry you promptly and accurately to any place you wish, thereby saving you much walk and worry; and at the end you pay at the rate of 25 cents for two miles or less, and 12½ cents for each additional mile or fraction, with from 6¼ to 12½ cents extra as a "tip" to the driver. And they carry your baggage besides.

Speaking of "tipping," there is "tipping" everywhere. But it is reasonable and regular—about 10 per cent of your bill being the "proper caper." One of the stories current here illustrates the universality of this "tipping" habit. A Yankee was washing his hands in one of the lavatory bowls that turn upon pivots for emptying purposes. While using the towel he noticed a printed request to "tip the bowl," whereupon he remarked that he'd "be hanged if he would;" he had tipped every servant in the house, and "the bowl could go without a tip." In clubs where "tipping" is prohibited, a waiter's "tip" is definitely charged in the bill.

✱

In coming to London for the first time an American whose memory goes back of the Civil War is vividly reminded of his first trip as a boy from his country home to New York. Recollections spring up of odors and noises and bustle and confusion and muddleheadedness and strange things to eat and strange things to see, and the general impression of a pleasant dream streaked with nightmare—sensations which had been long forgotten. And if the boy had then in New York a Barnum's Museum to make him feel unreal, the man has now and here a London Tower, and a Guildhall and a Madame Tussaud's. It's no use trying to tell about them. The guide books do it better. The sensation is the thing. To stand in the same places where historic characters were imprisoned and executed centuries ago, and amidst the same surroundings, is to feel with them and for them, as if one were witnessing their sorrows and death. To look upon the old French guillotine knife, is to sense the tragedies of which it was the bloody agent. And in the Guildhall, with its quaint wooden figures, Gog and Magog, and its long history of London labor and plutocracy, one may realize, what American economic history suggests, that your plutocrat with his contempt for working men is after all only a narrow minded working man with a bank account.

✱

From St. Paul's with its magnificent dome rising out of the thick of London business, to the griffin that marks the site of Temple Bar which separated London from Westminster, down Ludgate Hill and through Fleet street within the old city, and continuously along the Strand without, by Trafalgar

Square with its four glorious lions and its democratic history, down to Whitehall where monarchs were taught that they also are human, past the statue of Cromwell in front of St. Stephen's, and through Westminster Abbey with its centuries of tradition—this little journey, so quickly outlined but so destructive of time in the actual making, brings into the foreground of his memory all that an American of English ancestry ever knew of the history of the land from which he draws his democratic inspiration. And if he wonders why the democratic traditions, still so sharp and clear in this country where they were bought with a price in blood, are faded in his own land of nominally greater liberty, he asks himself if it may not be that continental immigration to the United States has adulterated the traditions of English liberty with traditions of a different type, until American thought has lost the molding influence of Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus Act and the Declaration of Independence.

At all events, I am sure that our censorship of the mails, our police "sweat box," our arbitrary methods of administration, would be politically impossible in England. Although England is far from having achieved complete freedom or a perfect democracy, she holds tenaciously to the freedom and the democracy that she has achieved. The American who imagines that English democrats would like to become American instead of English citizens, makes a great mistake. They regard England, and often not wrongly, as a freer country than the United States. Although the English tory might find himself quite at home in American official society, the English democrat would not be happy.

+

When I visited Parliament, which was at their last sitting prior to the summer vacation, the old age pension bill was under consideration. The Commons had adopted it, the Lords had rejected it, the Commons had sent it back, and the Lords were in the act of swallowing the bitter dose just as I came into their chamber. They were saying they would ne'er consent, and with their last protest they consented. So the working people of England, whose products of a long lifetime of labor have been subtly drained away from them for the enrichment of a leisure class, are to be given a pension of a dollar and a quarter a week in their old age, plus the same amount for the wife if there be one.

I heard this mentioned to one old farm laborer near Richard Cobden's home and burial place. He was a fine looking though weather-beaten and labor-worn veteran of 77 (with a wife of 82), intelligent and kindly and dignified of face, whose dress told of the institutional robbery which for three score years and ten had turned his hard labor to naught for him. He was of the class that work faithfully, live thriftily and temperately, and spend their old age often in the poor house where husband and wife are separated, and die with nothing. Some one mentioned the poor house—"the Union," I think he called it,—and the old man recoiled as if from the sting of an adder. But when the pension was mentioned his face shone. "You don't get it as charity," said his friend; and the old man replied in a manner that showed how ab-

horrent the thought of charity was to him. "You get the pension," continued his friend, "as Lord Roberts gets his; it is your very own." The thought of getting a pension as matter of right, had evidently been harbored by this labor veteran, but the comparison with Lord Roberts—not as a soldier or celebrity, but as a pensioner,—seemed to give to the matter picturesque authority of right; and the printed word utterly fails to interpret the "Yes! yes!" with which he nervously indicated his exultant appreciation of the fact that his pension is to be charity no more than Lord Roberts' is, but will be belated pay for service.

As I listened to him and looked at him I went back in imagination to the scene in the House of Lords where I heard Lord Lansdowne deprecate the pension provision of a paltry dollar and a quarter a week for veteran workers, off whose industry Lord Lansdowne and such as he live in elegant leisure; and I felt that I should like to know from Lord Lansdowne why it is unfair or unwise to pension aged workers who are unhonored in their work and unrewarded with its results, and yet fair and wise to pension well-paid and highly honored leaders of armies.

The proceedings, both in the Lords and the Commons, are more like deliberative committee work with us, than they are like our legislative proceedings. There is much of the freedom of a social club, and the decorum is unexceptionable. Indignant women have recently disturbed this solemnity; and as I sat in the gallery of the House of Commons and looked across to the other end, where the women spectators were corralled behind bars, or wires, or glass, or some other restraining material, like animals in a show or mice in a trap, I confess to having wondered that indignant women had not disturbed it long ago.

+

Going to a railroad station in London is easy and economical when you get the hang of it. An American does miss the convenience of checking his baggage from his house and thinking no more of it until he presents his voucher for its delivery at the end of his journey; but he has only to call a cab to be carried, baggage and all, to his train, for a trifle. From my boarding house to King's Cross station was a good half hour's ride and more, and when I left London I had four pieces of baggage, including a trunk; yet the expense, inclusive of the usual "tip" to the driver, was only 87 cents. And when I got to the station I hired, for a little more than a dime, an experienced railway porter who pasted the York label on my heavy baggage, which he put into the "luggage van," and carried the rest into a passenger compartment that he chose for me and into which he ushered me. After this I had nothing to concern me until our train stopped at York.

L. F. P.

\* \* \*

"That's the Goddess of Liberty," explained the New Yorker. "Fine attitude, eh?"

"Yes, and typically American," responded the Western visitor. "Hanging to a strap."—Washington Herald.

---

## 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, September 15, 1908.

---

### President Roosevelt's Appearance in the Campaign.

President Roosevelt entered the Presidential campaign (pp. 516, 538, 563) on the 14th through an open letter in answer to a friend, Mr. Conrad Kohrs of Helena, Montana. The letter is dated the 9th. It is a lengthy discussion, the principal purpose of which is to commend Mr. Taft as the representative of President Roosevelt's policies. Regarding the relation of Mr. Taft's candidacy to the railroad question, Mr. Roosevelt writes as follows, after analyzing the question itself:

The man to trust in such a matter as this is the man who, like Judge Taft, does not promise too much, but who could not be swayed from the path of duty by any argument, by any consideration; who will wage relentless war on the successful wrongdoer among railroad men as among all other men; who will do all that can be done to secure legitimately low rates to shippers and absolute evenness among the rates thus secured; but who will neither promise nor attempt to secure rates so low that the wage earner would lose his earnings and the shareholder, whose money built the road, his profits. He will not favor a ruinous experiment like government ownership of railroads; he will stand against any kind of confiscation of honestly acquired property; but he will work effectively for the most efficient type of government supervision and control of railroads, so as to secure just and fair treatment of the people as a whole.

A similar commendation with reference to the trusts is made in the letter; after which, turning to the labor issue, Mr. Roosevelt appeals with special urgency to organized labor to support Mr. Taft. On this subject he says in part:

If there is one body of men more than another whose support I feel I have a right to challenge on behalf of Secretary Taft it is the body of wage-workers of the country. A stancher friend, a fairer and truer representative, they cannot find within the borders of the United States. . . . Mr. Taft has been attacked because of the injunctions he delivered while on the bench. I am content to rest his case on these very injunctions; I maintain that they show why all our people should be grateful to him and should feel it safe to intrust their dearest interests to him. . . . His record as a judge makes the whole country his debtor. His actions and decisions are part of the great traditions of the bench. They guaranteed and set forth in striking fashion

the rights of the general public as against the selfish interests of any class, whether of capitalists or of laborers. They set forth and stand by the rights of the wage-workers to organize and to strike, as unequivocally as they set forth and stand by the doctrine that no conduct will be tolerated that would spell destruction to the nation as a whole. As for the attack upon his injunctions in labor disputes, made while he was on the bench, I ask that the injunctions be carefully examined. . . . No responsible labor organization would now hesitate to condemn the abuses against which Judge Taft's injunctions were aimed. . . . Judge Taft was a leader, a pioneer, while on the bench, in the effort to get justice for the wage-worker, in jealous championship of his rights; and all upright and far-sighted laboring men should hold it to his credit that at the same time he fearlessly stood against the abuses of labor, just as he fearlessly stood against the abuses of capital. . . . I have striven as President to champion in every proper way the interests of the wage-worker, for I regard the wage-worker, excepting only the farmer, the tiller of the soil, as the man whose well-being is most essential to the healthy growth of this great nation. I would for no consideration advise the wage-worker to do what I thought was against his interest. I ask his support for Mr. Taft exactly as I ask such support from every far-sighted and right-thinking American citizen, because I believe with all my heart that nowhere within the borders of our great country can there be found another man who will as vigilantly and efficiently as Mr. Taft support the rights of the workingman as he will the rights of every man who in good faith strives to do his duty as an American citizen.

\* \* \*

### Mr. Bryan's Reply to Mr. Roosevelt.

When President Roosevelt's campaign letter was brought to the attention of Mr. Bryan at Baltimore on the 14th he said:

A few, plain, simple sentences from Mr. Taft will be worth more than the eulogy that the President pronounces. The President's indorsement is of no value unless the President will agree to stay in Washington and see that Mr. Taft makes good. . . . If Mr. Taft were dead it would be interesting to know from Mr. Roosevelt what he knew of Mr. Taft's opinions and work, but as Mr. Taft is alive and able to speak for himself, it is hardly necessary for Mr. Roosevelt to tell us what Mr. Taft will do. Mr. Taft is running upon a platform which was so unsatisfactory that he had to amend it in several important particulars, and yet, even as amended it gives the public no definite idea as to what Mr. Taft stands for. Mr. Taft also has made some speeches and promises to make some more. The ones he has already made have not thrown any light upon the political situation, but it is to be hoped that he will yet conclude to define his position with sufficient clearness to enable the public to know what he stands for. It is not sufficient for the President to say that Mr. Taft is a friend of labor. That is a subject upon which the laboring man is entitled to an opinion, and Mr. Taft's friendship is to be determined not by the President's indorsement but by the

measures which Mr. Taft advocates. Mr. Taft believes that the labor organization should come under the operation of the antitrust law, thus dealing with the men who belong to the labor organization as if they were merchandise, for the antitrust law deals with the monopoly of products of labor. Mr. Taft is opposed to trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt, thus denying to the laboring man a safeguard which is guaranteed to every man tried in a criminal court. Mr. Taft does not agree with the laboring man in regard to the use of the injunction in labor disputes. No words of praise from the President can change Mr. Taft's attitude on this question or make that attitude more acceptable to the wage-earners.

Continuing, Mr. Bryan replies to all the other questions raised by President Roosevelt's letter.

+ +

#### Mr. Taft's Response to Mr. Bryan's Reply to Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Bryan's reply to Mr. Roosevelt having been submitted to Mr. Taft at Cincinnati on the 14th, Mr. Taft said:

In my notification speech and in other speeches made since, I attempted to make clear my position on all the issues of the campaign. Mr. Bryan should devote a little time to his own record, from which he seems to be struggling to separate himself with all the adroitness acquired in a twelve years' hunt for an issue on which he can be elected President.

The remainder of Mr. Taft's response is devoted to Mr. Bryan's attitude in previous campaigns toward the gold and silver question, the question of imperialism, and the question of the futility of railroad regulation. He says nothing of the issues raised in this campaign by organized labor.

+ +

#### Mr. Bryan's Rejoinder.

At Philadelphia on the 15th, Mr. Bryan made the following rejoinder to Mr. Taft's response to Mr. Bryan's reply to Mr. Roosevelt:

Mr. Taft is dodging. He cannot escape from the issues. He will not be permitted to run away from them. He has accepted the nomination of his party. Now let him take the people into his confidence and interpret his platform so that the public will know where he stands and what he intends to do.

Mr. Bryan followed with a discussion of each of the criticisms of his career that Mr. Taft had made. Mr. Taft on the 15th refused a further interview on the subject.

+ +

#### Mr. Bryan's Speaking Tour.

Following his original plan of campaign Mr. Bryan (p. 563) set out from Chicago on the 8th for an extended speaking tour. His first important speech was made on the 9th at the Democratic State convention in Peoria, and after a speech in Speaker Cannon's congressional district he went East, speaking in Ohio, Kentucky and

Maryland. On the 15th he was at Philadelphia and Trenton.

+ +

#### Mr. Taft's Campaign Plans.

The original plans for Mr. Taft's speaking through the campaign have been altered. It was intended that he should receive deputations at his brother's house in Cincinnati (p. 492) as Mr. McKinley did in 1896 at his own home in Canton; but it is announced now that he will follow Mr. Bryan's plan of going directly to the people throughout the country.

+ +

#### Organized Labor in National Politics.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor has taken official action in support of continuing the political policy which Mr. Gompers has announced. At its meeting at Washington on the 12th it unanimously adopted the report of the labor representation committee calling on "the workers of our common country to stand faithfully by our friends, oppose and defeat our enemies, whether they be candidates for President, Congress, or other offices, whether executive, legislative, or judicial." The report recommends that another appeal be issued to procure the election of men "favorable to securing the justice, rights, and equality before the law to which the toilers are entitled and to defeat such candidates as are indifferent or hostile to such legislative reliefs." This means that Mr. Taft will be opposed and Mr. Bryan supported for President, but that it will be upon a non-partisan basis.

+ +

#### The Election in Maine.

Maine, like Vermont, is one of the States that hold important elections two months in advance of the general elections, and toward which politicians are accustomed to look in Presidential years for indications of the drift of public opinion. In Vermont (p. 539) there were no pointed indications either way; but as the Republican plurality rose above 25,000 the Republicans drew favorable influences, whereas the Democrats ignored the result as coming from a State in which public opinion has long been impervious to national political influences. In Maine, on the other hand, the Republicans protest that local issues have overshadowed national issues to such an extent as to deprive the result in that State of national significance, whereas the Democrats regard the result in Maine as much more important than in Vermont because public sentiment in Maine is more in touch with the currents of national sentiment. Whatever its reason or its significance, the result in Maine is much more unfavorable to the Republicans than it has been in any other Presidential year for more than 35 years

except the year of the Democratic Greenback fusion (1880) as the following comparison shows:

Year.	Republican.	Democratic.	Plurality.
1872	71,888	55,343	16,545
1876	75,867	60,423	15,444
1880	73,544	73,713	169
1884	78,318	58,503	19,815
1888	79,401	61,348	18,053
1892	67,900	55,397	12,503
1896	82,596	34,350	48,246
1900	73,955	39,823	34,132
1904	76,962	50,146	26,816

The reported result on the 14th is as follows for Governor:

Republican	73,482
Democrats	65,683
Republican plurality	7,799

This amounts to a Republican loss since 1904 of about 4 per cent and a Democratic gain of about 32 per cent in a vote larger by 12,000 than the vote of 1904. It will be observed that the Democratic percentage was very nearly the same from 1872, until 1896. In 1872, 43 per cent; in 1876, 44 per cent; in 1884 (omitting fusion year of 1880 when Republicans were defeated), 43 per cent; in 1888, 44 per cent, and in 1892, 45 per cent. The slight rise in Democratic percentage in 1892 preceded even if it did not foreshadow the election of Mr. Cleveland. In 1896, the Democratic percentage dropped to 29, rising in 1900 to 35 and in 1904 to 40. It has now shot up to 48. Whether or not this rise so far above the normal is significant must be left to the political prophets to forecast and to the November elections to decide.

+ +

**Election in Arkansas.**

The pre-Presidential election of Arkansas has never been regarded as of national significance, it is so overwhelmingly Democratic. As in most of the other southern States the contests are usually at the Democratic primaries, the elections going by default in consequence of the practical disfranchisement of Negroes. But on the 14th the Prohibitionists made a contest at the election. It was without notable effect, however, for the Democrats carried the State by their usual majority of about 60,000.

+ +

**New York State Conventions.**

The Republican convention assembled at Saratoga on the 14th, and on the 15th nominated Governor Hughes for re-election. Strong opposition to Mr. Hughes had developed in the party, but a pointed hint from President Roosevelt settled the result in his favor.

+

The Democratic convention met at Rochester on the 15th. Nominations were deferred until the

16th. Lieutenant Governor Chanler was in the lead for the gubernatorial nomination.

+ +

**The Campaign in Cleveland.**

Mayor Johnson opened the political campaign in Cleveland on the 9th in one of his big campaigning tents to an audience of 8,000 people. The meeting was presided over by John H. Clarke, and the principal speakers were Mayor Johnson and the candidate for governor, Judson Harmon. As reported in the Plain Dealer of the 10th, Mayor Johnson discussed both national and local as well as State issues. On national and State issues his speech was an elaboration of the following points:

Bryan's campaign centers on one thought, and that is that the people take back the government and not allow it to remain any longer in the hands of monopoly interests. The platform adopted at the Denver convention is the most radical—not as radical as some of us here—but the most advanced and progressive we have had in a lifetime. As to State politics, our platform is probably the best Democratic platform Ohio has ever had. It represents progressive democracy. Judson Harmon was not my choice for governor, but as I have already said, my fights are made before and not after conventions. He stands on the platform and I shall support him most heartily.

On local issues Mayor Johnson is described by the Plain Dealer as having "discussed street railway questions in his old time form and completely swayed his immense audience." He "expressed his absolute faith in the belief that the people of Cleveland will uphold the street railway settlement entered into last April, at the referendum election in October, and promised that the Democratic delegation nominated for the State legislature from this county will be pledged to the enactment of a law that will permit the city to become a direct party in the lease that has been made between the Cleveland Railway Co. and the Municipal. He said that this law would permit the city itself, rather than the traction company, to become the trustee holding the property for the people." The greeting extended the Mayor and his address, says the Plain Dealer, "together with the wild ovation given the mention of William J. Bryan's name, were by all odds the feature of the meeting."

+ +

**The Independent Negro Movement.**

The so-called "Niagara Movement" (vol. ix, p. 517) in which Prof. W. E. B. DuBois of Georgia and Dr. Charles E. Bentley of Illinois are leaders, and which held its fourth annual meeting early this month in Oberlin, Ohio, has issued an address to the Negroes of the United States which—congratulates ten million Negro Americans on their unparalleled opportunity to lead the greatest moral battle of modern times—the fight for the abolition

of the color line. . . . Nowhere has the fearful cost of using crime and lies as a weapon to force races into subjection been so apparent as right here in the United States. . . . Once we were told: Be worthy and fit and the ways are open. To-day the avenues of advancement in the army, navy and civil service, and even in business and professional life, are continually closed to black applicants of proven fitness, simply on the bald excuse of race and color. This is the spirit and practice which the Niagara Movement is fighting, and will never cease to fight. First: We say to our own: Obey the law, defend no crime, conceal no criminal, seek no quarrel; but arm yourselves, and when the mob invades your home, shoot, and shoot to kill. Secondly: We say to voters: Register and vote whenever and wherever you have a right. Vote, not in the past, but in the present. Remember that the conduct of the Republican party toward Negroes has been a disgraceful failure to keep just promises. The dominant Roosevelt faction has sinned in this respect beyond forgiveness. We therefore trust that every black voter will uphold men like Joseph Benson Foraker, and will leave no stone unturned to defeat William H. Taft. Remember Brownsville, and establish next November the principle of Negro independence in voting, not only for punishing enemies, but for rebuking false friends. Let no bribe of money, office nor influence seduce the Negro American to betray the great principles of liberty, equality and opportunity.

\* \*

#### Distress of the Unemployed in Glasgow.

A remarkable scene was witnessed in Glasgow on the 10th, according to the press reports. While crowds of the unemployed (p. 566) waited in the streets, a delegation of twelve of their representatives was admitted to the city council, who received them standing. The spokesman for the delegation declared that never before had there been such distress in Glasgow. "Every human unit," he said, "is entitled to food. We make no outrageous request; we are only here to plead for the souls of men and women. They demand work." The chancellor replying with deep emotion, said the council had received the delegation in a spirit of brotherhood and that it would do all in its power to help those who needed work.

\* \*

#### England and the Roman Catholic Church.

The question of the present status of the Roman Catholic Church in England was raised on two points during the sessions of the Eucharistic congress which closed its first meeting in England on the 13th (p. 566). During the sessions protest was made by English Catholics to the declaration against Catholicism which by law the English sovereign is required to make upon his accession to the throne. Another point came up when it became publicly known that the leaders of the congress had arranged for a procession through the streets in the neighborhood of Westminster

Cathedral on Sunday, the 13th, in which the "host" should be borne on high for veneration. The extreme Protestants of England protested to the Government that such a ceremony would be in violation of the Catholic Emancipation act of 1829, which prohibited Catholic religious ceremonies from being held outside of the precincts of a church or private house. So great was the public agitation over the matter that the Government felt obliged to intervene, and request that the elements of an ecclesiastical ceremonial should be eliminated from the procession. The request was complied with, and without the eucharistic feature the procession passed through crowds greater than had assembled in London since the funeral of Queen Victoria, amid hoots and yells and jostlings, which it is generally believed would have developed into worse disorders had the original plans been carried out.

\* \*

#### Tolstoy's Birthday Celebrated in Russia.

So manifest was the intention of the Russian people to honor the eightieth birthday of Leo Tolstoy, that the Government rescinded its severest prohibitions upon celebrations, declaring that they had only intended to forbid political demonstrations and the glorification of Tolstoy's anti-religious and anarchistic ideas. The newspapers of the 10th appeared almost without exception as Tolstoy jubilee numbers. At Sebastopol the municipality conferred the freedom of the city on Count Tolstoy and named a school after him. At Dbinsk the municipal council conferred the name of Tolstoy on the square in the center of the city and sent a congratulatory telegram to him. Hundreds of visitors called at the home of Tolstoy at Yasnaya Poliana, and thousands of telegrams were received there from all parts of the world.

---

## NEWS NOTES

---

—The Playground Association of America held its second annual congress on the 8th at New York.

—The constitutionality of the Oklahoma deposit-insurance law (p. 542) was sustained on the 10th by the Supreme Court of that State without dissent.

—Mulai Hafid in announcing his assumption of the throne of Morocco to the Powers, states his adherence to the engagements on the part of Morocco to the Algeciras pact (p. 566).

—The board of directors of the National Federation of Women's Clubs (p. 349), in session at Colorado Springs last week, has selected Cincinnati as the place for the 1910 biennial national convention.

—Two more national banks in Oklahoma gave up their national charters and took out State charters on the 11th, making fifteen that have followed this course. Their object is to secure the benefits of the deposit-insurance law (p. 542) which Attorney Gen-

eral Bonaparte has decided that national banks cannot lawfully participate in.

—The American branch of the Theosophical Society (vol. x, p. 347) held its annual business convention in Chicago on the 13th. Sessions for papers and discussion were held on the days immediately following.

—Asiatic cholera is epidemic in St. Petersburg to a greater extent than since 1891. It spreads almost entirely among the very poor, who are living in filthy conditions. Twenty-three deaths had been reported up to the 12th.

—The Society for Ethical Culture of Chicago announces three lectures at Handel Hall, 45 East Randolph street, to be delivered by Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell University on September 20 and 27 and October 4 at 11 a. m.

—Orville Wright (p. 470) has been breaking all aeroplane records at Fort Myer during the past week. He has shown that his machine can fly in any direction at will, can remain more than an hour in flight and can fly at least forty miles an hour.

—Widespread forest fires in Minnesota, Ontario, Michigan and Wisconsin have raged during the past week, doing much damage, and threatening more. A two months' drought in the Northwest has left the forests as dry as tinder, and a spark sets flames flying (p. 566).

—The trial of Louis A. Gregori on the charge of attempting to kill Major Alfred Dreyfus on the occasion of the interment of Zola's remains at the Pantheon last June (p. 252), resulted on the 11th in an acquittal, although Gregori admitted that the shooting was premeditated.

—A reception-dinner of welcome to Louis F. Post upon his return from the International Free Trade Congress in London, was given at Kimball's restaurant, Chicago, on the 12th. Ex-Mayor Dunne presided, and Raymond Robins made the welcoming address. Over 200 guests were present.

—Henry Watterson denounces as a probable forgery the article purporting to be by the late Grover Cleveland (p. 533) which was published in the East by the New York Times and in the West by the Chicago Tribune. No attempt to establish its authenticity has been made by its original sponsors.

—The first congress of the International White Cross Association opened at Geneva, Switzerland, on the 8th. This congress is the result of an effort to group the work of the international societies engaged in fighting tuberculosis, cancer and other epidemic diseases; also social scourges, such as alcoholism and the drug habit, as well as food adulteration.

—Proceedings for contempt of court were begun last week at Washington against Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell and other labor leaders for printing a statement contrary to the terms of a labor injunction (p. 395) that organized workmen do not patronize the Buck Stove and Range Company. Alton B. Parker appeared as counsel for the defendants.

—On Labor Day in Providence, R. I., Mr. Edward Doherty, of Boston, represented the Tax Reform Association. The three other speakers included a Democrat, a Socialist and an Independence party

man. The oratory was at the shore resort Vanity Fair, which was patronized on that day by upwards of 40,000 people. In the evening Mr. Doherty addressed large crowds at two open air meetings in the city.

—The municipal street railways of Huddersfield, England, according to the Daily Consular Reports of the Department of Commerce and Labor of the United States for the 11th, show a gross surplus for the year of \$209,269 out of a total income of \$412,212. After paying interest on capital, and providing for redemption of debt and depreciation, there was a net surplus of \$31,700 which was turned into the city treasury for reduction of taxes.

—The total claims filed against the city of Springfield, Ill., for riot damages in the recent race fights (p. 566) come to \$121,856. Six suits have been filed against the county in the Circuit Court by the heirs of six of the riot victims, these totaling \$35,000. Claims have been filed against the State for \$83,109, which has been paid for transportation, feeding, and remuneration of troops, bringing the total to \$239,965. It is estimated there will be additional claims against the State in connection with the troops of not less than \$25,000, bringing the grand total bill of expenses for the riots to \$264,965.

—A joint association of railroads and their employees was formed at Chicago on the 14th. The following railroads and organized railroad employes being represented: Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, Chicago & Alton, Colorado & Southern, Chicago & Northwestern, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific, Illinois Central, Chicago & Eastern Illinois, Missouri Pacific; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, and Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

---

## PRESS OPINIONS

---

### The Cleveland Traction Question.

New York World (Dem.), Sept. 8.—In the brief period since the Cleveland Municipal Traction Co. began operating 3-cent cars Mayor Tom L. Johnson, who is its moving spirit, has had to face financial troubles and an awkward strike of employes. He is now assailed in a taxpayers' suit to annul the security grant of council to the Cleveland Railway Co. and to set aside the lease to the Municipal company because of alleged frauds. Finally, he is obliged to call a special election to submit to the voters the franchise under which the cars are run in order to quiet a question as to its legality. It is as well understood outside Cleveland as it is there that many of the troubles the Mayor has met and is meeting are due to the bitter opposition of the opponents of cheap street car fares, not all of whom live in Cleveland. Plenty of money can be raised to fight him in the special referendum election on the franchise and in the courts. The 3-cent fare experiment ought to be fairly tried in Cleveland, and a fair trial will take three or four years. Its success should not depend upon speculations as to Mr. Johnson's political future

or upon the financial schemes of his enemies. There is simply a question of fact in which every city in the United States is interested. That question is: "Can a 3-cent fare pay for good service?" On public grounds, it is most desirable that this question be settled by a fair trial that shall not be cut short, either by legal tangles or by political intrigue or by public sentiment.

+ +

#### William Marion Reedy on the Campaign.

The (St. Louis) Mirror, September 3.—National politics is pretty dull, except for the brilliance of Mr. Bryan's speeches. Beside them the utterances of Mr. Taft are verbose twaddle and more or less disingenuous argumentative gymnastics. Mr. Taft is cumbersome, and he is forced to more or less palatable straddles upon every issue. He has to blow hot and cold on everything from the tariff to labor. Bryan's speeches are pleasing in form and of a sound substance. He dodges nothing. He stands in the open. He talks for his party. Mr. Taft says one word for his party and ten for President Roosevelt. He is conservative in one-half of a sentence and radical in the other. And he is interminably long. The public are bored by Taft. They are stimulated by Bryan, and Bryan is most distinctly making the pace for his competitor. . . . Mr. Bryan seems to excite more interest than before among thoughtful people. The fear of him that was so manifest in 1896 has wholly passed. He is not a sensation. He is regarded seriously, and his message is gravely considered for its intrinsic value. There are Democrats, alleged, who are out with declarations for Taft. You can trail each one to his lair—in some present or prospective corporation job. But the Republicans who are going to vote for Bryan are not of the talkative kind. They don't tell their intentions. And there are more Bryan Republicans than there are Taft Democrats, because there are more men who know that Taft represents recession from Roosevelt's policies than there are men who believe that the sane and traveled and experienced and sobered Bryan is a menace to the country. Mr. Bryan is not leading in the present race, but he is much stronger than ever before with the silent vote. The people doubt Taft. In the West he runs as Roosevelt's heir. In the East he runs as one who will break away slowly but surely from Rooseveltism. Mr. Bryan represents Roosevelt's good intentions, plus Democratic logic and method.

+ +

#### Not Parties But Principles.

The (Alexandria, Va.) Horizon (Negro), August. —We Negroes are voting, or we should be voting, not to secure jobs for the few but to secure justice for all; we are voting to break down and wipe out and utterly abolish the most asinine and brutal and cruel of human distinctions: the color line—the monstrous heathenism that judges a human being not by the size of his soul but by the hue of his hide. Would God, we could vote on the thing directly! Would God we could choose between two parties—one of which stood for caste, and the other for freedom. But we cannot. We must choose between two parties, both of which represent largely things

which we and all decent citizens ought to hate and despise. What then? We must still vote. We must choose between two evils, but choose the larger good that is intermixed. That is what the power of the ballot means. It takes years for the voter in a republic to get a chance to vote for his greatest desire. It took England a generation to get a chance to vote on the corn laws—it took America forty years to get a chance to vote on slavery; it may take us a hundred years to get a chance to vote squarely on the color-line; but the chance will come and we will hasten the chance by voting intelligently and not blindly and ignorantly at every preliminary step. Moreover, in voting for justice to Negroes we are not voting injustice to whites. On the contrary, the salvation of white America lies in justice to black America. . . . No party can claim gratitude for past services—gratitude belongs to the principles for which a party stands. When it deserts those principles it forfeits all claim to gratitude. A party is not a person to be loved or revered or hated. It is a machine for registering the will of the majority. When it refuses to register that will, it is not only the privilege, it is the bounden duty of the majority to call another machine. To vote "solid" against your convictions is to be an ass. Standing then in the presence of the Republican and Democratic parties we have to ask ourselves: not, which party stands for our principles—neither does; but, the triumph of which of these two parties will in the long run bring the triumph of our principles? The answer must be: The triumph of the Democratic party.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### THE KING OF SEERS.\*

Hail to the prophets! Hail to the sages!  
 Hail to the seers and the saviors of men!  
 Hail to the martyrs who blaze new paths  
 And bring new truth to bless mankind!  
 Garland their brows with laurel crowns;  
 Bring words of praise for the works they wrought.  
 Champions of Liberty!  
 Leaders in the struggle for freedom!  
 With joy we speak your names today;  
 With joy and gladness, each day, and all days, we  
 bear witness to your unselfish love;  
 We bear witness to the truth you brought to heal the  
 wounds of the world.

And how shall these wounds be healed?  
 How bind the limbs, and stop the pains;  
 How soothe the smarts and aches and burns  
 That crush and curse the common life;  
 That doom the poor and rich alike  
 To spend their days and years in Hell?

One only balm can heal the nation's wounds;  
 One only path leads straight from out this hell of  
 modern life;

\*This tribute to Henry George was read at the Simons-Tolstoy-George birthday celebration, given at Minnehaha Falls, Sept. 6, 1908, under the auspices of the Men's Club of the First Unitarian Church of Minneapolis.

One only way has ever yet been found,  
So Peace and Joy and Brotherhood may reign su-  
preme on earth.

Let Love and Justice rule the world.  
Let Justice sway the common weal,  
And Love direct our private lives;  
Let Equal Freedom grasp the flag,  
And lead the hosts of men;  
No laws of man save such alone  
As square with laws of God.

Let what is mine be wholly mine,  
And what is thine be wholly thine.  
Let Love alone decide the share  
That charity shall give;  
And never think to strengthen Love  
By force of man-made law.  
But what is ours belongs to all,  
And none may claim as his alone.

The bounteous earth was made for man—  
For all to use on equal terms;  
For all to have, to hold, enjoy,  
And reap the fruit of honest toil;  
But not to fence and hold away  
From e'en the least of fellow men.

One right alone there is by which  
Men take and hold the land of earth—  
The right of use.  
This right alone gives title deed;  
This right alone is all they need,  
Who work for what they have.

So taught the prophets, teachers, seers,  
From oldest age to present time;  
And all the martyrs, sages, saints,  
Who've spent their lives to bless the race,  
Have thundered forth this mighty truth,  
And called mankind to hear and heed.

"But how? O how?" the masses called;  
"How then can this be done?  
We quick can tell what things are mine,  
And just as quickly what are thine;  
But how to know what things are ours,  
And how to make them meet the need  
Of common life and common weal?"

Then one arose from out the ranks—  
A simple, humble, workingman,  
With seeing eye and clever brain,  
Whose thought for many years had dwelt  
On this the riddle of the Sphinx.

With Love and Justice for his guide,  
He trod the thorny path alone,  
And blazed the trees on either side.  
And now all men may see the way;  
And all may know the path of right;  
And what is ours stands forth so plain  
That none may fall who try to see.

And here today where God's green earth,  
Where cooling shade and summer sun  
Suggest again the mighty truth  
That he made clear to all the world,  
We crown the brow of Henry George,  
And now proclaim him King of Seers.

C. J. BUELL.

## "THE SERVANT IN THE HOUSE."

From the Boston Evening Transcript of May 2, 1908.

It came to the Savoy Theater last month without blare of trumpets or extravagant claims—one of the most remarkable plays that has been seen on the American stage for many a long day, this "The Servant in the House," by Mr. Charles Rann Kennedy. It is not that the play is evidently the work of a ripe scholar and a deep thinker, though this is much; it is plain that the play is made by one who is imbued with the spirit of the classical tradition of the stage, and who, adapting modern conditions to classical needs, has, as severely as the Greeks did, preserved the unities of time, place, and action, as laid down by Aristotle and strictly adhered to until they were overridden by the genius of Shakespeare.

In "The Servant in the House" we see the modern stage at its best. Here it appears not simply as a pander to the desire for amusement, but as the purveyor of entertainment that appeals to the intellect and as a teacher of moral dogma whose lessons thus presented are certain to take a firmer hold than if its tenets were pronounced from any pulpit.

It is evident that this play is a vital expression of its author's unrest under social conditions—one might almost say social hypocrisies—as they exist today. There is something healthily iconoclastic about his protest against the present as voiced through the mouths and actions of his characters. In a most daring way he has ventured to put upon the stage a character in the Bishop of Benares who, as near as may be, approximates the figure and attributes of Jesus Christ, and the audience is permitted to see that if He were to return to earth today, and were obliged, living as a man, to combat our social conditions and inequalities, He would have to declare himself, as "The Servant in the House" does, a socialist.

But it is socialism in its better, finer sense that is meant. Not that grim body that is held up by demagogues to frighten the childlike voter; the unshaven, ignorant fanatic, waving red flags and crying "Down with everything!" This socialism is the socialism of Christianity; socialism that looks life squarely in the face; which decries the division of the human brotherhood into classes, and which stands upon the truth—quite unassailable—that the man who does the work of the scavenger in the world—"some one has to do it," as the play says—and does it well, is a better man, a better Christian, a better citizen than the black-robed bishop who prostitutes his high office and his gifts of scholarship to his own selfish ends.

And so in this play we get the fine allegory of the drains that cause illness and which keep people away from the church, and when the scavenger investigates, lo! he finds the defect begins in the rector's study, and he follows it up until he

finds its source under the very church itself. And there is a fine example there of what a priest should be and should do when he faces the facts, ugly though they may be. It is for him not to waste his time in prayer—though that is good, too—but to pull off his coat and to share in the risks; face the danger and the filth and the muck and do his part in cleaning up the sore and wretched places.

All this is most beautifully exemplified in the play. Bob, the vicar's brother; a drain man; a man who has fallen low largely because his too-righteous brother, with his too-loving wife, have not seen it was their first duty to stretch out their hands to save him. Bob has come into the study after discovering the source of the trouble to the drain. He is covered with muck and filth; and yet, because this has come to him through doing a brave work honestly, there was nothing really repulsive in it.

Bob—That's what I come 'ere to talk abaht—my job. P'r'aps you'll think as it ain't a tasty subjic, before a lot o' nice, clean, respectable people as never 'ad anythin' worse on their fingers than a bit of lawn dirt, playin' crokey; but someone 'as to see to the drains, someone 'as to clear up the muck of the world! I'm the one. An' I'm 'ere to tell you about it.

Aunt (involuntarily)—Oh!

Bob—You don't like that, ma'am? 'Urts your feelin's, eh?

Aunt—Yes; but not in the way you mean.

Mary—But, you know, you really are a little unpleasant.

Bob—I'm not 'ere to be pleasant, young leddy, I'm 'ere to edicate you.

Vic—Yes; I think I see.

Aunt (breathlessly)—Go on; go on!

Bob—Well, I come to this 'ouse this mornin', I don't mind ownin' it, in a rotten bad frame of mind. I 'ad a little job on, and a job a bit above my 'ead, an' it got me dahn an' worried me; yus, it did—worried me. That young leddy 'll tell you wot I was like when she furst saw me. I looked that bad she thought I come to steal summat. Well, p'r'aps I did, arter all—summat as I ad no right to, summat as don't properly belong to a streaky swine like me. That was when she first saw me; but I was wuss before that, I tell you straight!

Mary (self-consciously)—What changed you?

Bob—A bloke I met, miss, as knowed me better than I knowed myself. 'E changed me.

Aunt—Manson!

Vic—Manson!

Bob—Don't know 'is name. 'E was a fair knockaht. Got togs on 'im like an Earl's Court exhibition. 'E changed me; 'e taugt me my own mind; 'e brought me back to my own job—drains.

Aunt—Yes.

Bob—Funny thing, ma'am, people's born different; some 's born without noses in their 'eads worth speakin' of. I wasn't—I can smell out a stink anywhere.

Aunt (fascinated)—I am sure you can. This is most interesting!

Bob (warming)—Moment I stuck my 'ead in this 'ouse I knowed as summat was wrong in my line, and ses to myself: "Wot oh! 'e ain't such an awmighty liar, arter all—that 's drains!" An' drains it was, strike me dead, arsking your pawdon!

Mary—Now didn't I always say—

Bob—Yus, miss; you 're one o' the nosey uns, I can see. Well, soon as ole Togs got done with 'is talk, I got my smeller dahn, folloed up the scent, and afore I knowed where I was I was in it up to my eyes. Out there in the room with the blood-red 'eap a' books. Blimey, you never did see! Muck, ma'am! Just look at my 'ands! Aint that pretty? 'Owever, I got there, right enough, I don't fink. Fancy I put that little bit strite afore I done.

Aunt—Oh, this is too beautiful of you.

Bob (burning with enthusiasm and manifestly affected by her appreciation)—Wait a bit; I got more yet. Talk baht bee-utiful! That bit was on'y an ashan. Look 'ere, ma'am. I got the lovellest little job on as ever yer soiled yer 'ands in.

Mary—Oh, do tell us.

Aunt—Yes, do.

Vic—Yes, yes!

(A splendid rapture infects them all.)

Bob—I followed up that drain—was n't goin' to stick till kingdom come inside your little mouse 'ole out there. No, I said, where 's this leadin' to? What 's the elanglory use o' flushin' out this blarsted bit of a sink, with devil-knows-wot stinkin' cesspool at the end of it. That 's wot I said, ma'am.

Aunt—Very rightly. I see! I see!

Bob—So up I go through the sludge, puffin' and blowin' like a bally ole cart 'orse. Strooth, it seemed miles. Talk abaht bee-utiful, ma'am; it 'ud a done your 'eart good, ma'am, it 'ould, really. Rats! 'undreds of 'em, ma'am; I 'm bitten clean through in places. 'Owever, I pushed my way through, some'ow, oldin' my nose an' fightin' for my breath, till at last I got to the end—an' then I soon saw wot was the matter. It 's under the church—that 's where it is! I know it's the church, 'cos I 'eard "The Church's One Foundation" on the organ, rumblin' up over my 'ead.

All—Yes, yes!

Aunt—Why don't you go on?

Bob—You'd never guess wot I saw there, not if you was to try from now till glory alelooyer. The biggest back-hander I ever did 'av, swelp me. (They hang on his words expectantly.) It ain't no dream at all!

All (breathlessly)—Why, what is it, then?

Bob—It 's a grive!

All—A grave!

Bob—Yus, one o' them whoppin' great beer vaults as you shove big bugses' corpses inter. What d' yer think o' that now?

Mary—Oh!

Aunt—Horrible!

Vic—I seem to remember some traditions . . .

Bob—You 'd a-said so, if you 'd seen wot I seen! Talk abaht corfins, an' shrouds, an' bones, an' dead men gone to rot, they was n't in it, wot I saw dahn there! Madame Twosoos is a flea-bite to it! Lord! And the rats an' the stink, an' the bloomin' gravy thick up to your eyes—I never thought there could be such a lot o' muck an' dead things all in one

place before. It was a fair treat, it was, I tek my oath! (Rapturously.) Why, it may cost a man 'is life to deal with that little job.

Vic—My God! The thing 's impossible!

Bob—Impossible! Means a bit of work, that 's all!

Vic—Why, no one would ever dare. . . .

Bob—Dare! Why, what d' you think I come 'ere for?

Vic—You?

Bob—Yus, makin' myself unpleasant. . . .

Vic—Do you mean—do I understand?—

Bob—I mean as I 'v found my place, or I don't know a good thing when I see it.

Aunt—What! To go into that dreadful vault, and—

Bob—Why not? Ain't it my job?

Aunt—But you said—perhaps—death.

Bob—It 's worth it—it 's a lovely bit of wark!

Vic—No, ten thousand times no! The sacrifice is too much.

Bob—You call that sacrifice? It 's fun; not arf.

Vic—I had rather see the church itself—

Bob—What, you call yourself a clergyman?

Vic—I call myself nothing. I am nothing—less than nothing in all this living world.

Bob—By God, but I call myself summat—I 'm the drain man, that 's wot I am.

Vic (feverishly)—You shall not go!

Bob—Why, wot is there to fear? Ain't it worth while to move away that load o' muck?

Vic—The stench—the horror—the darkness.

Bob—What 's it matter, if the comrides up above 'av' light an' joy an' a breath of 'olesome air to sing by?

Vic—Hour by hour—dying alone—

Bob—The comrides up in the spann an' arches, joinin' 'ands.

Vic—Fainter and fainter, below there, and at last—an endless silence.

Bob—'Igh in the dome the ammerins of the comrides as 'av' climbed aloft!

Aunt—William, there is yet one other way!

Vic—Yes, yes! I see! I see! (To Bob) Then—you mean to go?

Bob—By 'Even, yus!

Vic—Then, by God and all the powers of grace, you shall not go alone! Off with these lies and make-believes! Off with these prisoner's shackles! They cramp, they stifle me! Freedom! Freedom! This is no priest's work—it calls for a man! (He tears off his parson's coat and collar, casting them furiously aside. He rolls up his sleeves.) Now, if you're ready, comrade; you and I together!

Aunt—God's might go with you, William! Accept him, Christ!

+

**James O'Donnell Bennett, in the Chicago Record-Herald of August 18, 1908.**

A serene and commanding Presence enters a household of vexed and troubled hearts; a Presence helpful, wise, forbearant, gently ironic, winning, making plain the way to groping souls. Then vanish the silent, subtle, respectable lies of expediency and no longer rule there the laws of self-interest and self-pride; brother is reconciled

unto brother and the child knows the father. The desolate one crying, "God has left me stranded!" is taken in and, gazing dully upon the readjusted order, mutters: "After all, he is my brother." The secret of sore lives is laid bare and dark places that breathed pestilence are made clean. So—and solely so—is it brought to pass because men reach out their hands one to another and, meaning it with all the conviction of their souls and all the might of their beings, say, "This is my brother." Life is no longer shabby and mean, no more do compromises and grudges govern conduct. Life is exultant and free and fine, and men breathe deep, and a light is in their eyes. Only he who withholds his hand dwells in darkness and is bitter and hard. Labor is right and good, and no man and no deed of labor is contemptible, and the song of labor is not a dirge any more but a chant of victory, steady, profound, glad.

In majestic allegory—the greatest English allegory since the inspired thinker of Bedford gave "Pilgrim's Progress" to the world from his prison—and in intimate, homely appeal, too, so speaks "The Servant in the House."

This sublime work was revealed at Powers' Theater last evening for the first time on the local boards. Its fame has, of course, preceded it. In its printed form it has been much read, and it has been much discussed. There was a feeling that an examination so particular and attentive might discount the histrionic representation of it. It was not so. If ever a play responded to the touch of the player this one does, and those who laid down the book impressed will leave the theater overwhelmed. It was more than acting that Mr. Kennedy's drama received; it was interpretation—reverent, exalted, searching. The players acted not like players but like devotees, and carried their calling back to the spirit of the days when it was priestly. With wet eyes and quivering lips and pain-laden voices they acted, not like people playing for hire, but like mentors voicing the lesson of brotherhood and the teachings of Jesus—saying, and saying again, and bearing it in upon the hearts of the silent people, the gospel of the Servant:

"My religion is very simple; I love God and all my brothers."

Before the majesty and the feeling of such a drama as this the shop phrases of a reviewer's smug approbation, seem very meaningless; one would as soon think of praising the Book of Common Prayer. It is a work for the world to see and ponder upon and take unto itself in silence and humility, and then be thankful that it puts blood and will into a man's heart. It is, therefore, with a sense of diffidence that we attempt a record of last night's representation; in truth, it is difficult to write with composure of a play of which the appeal is at once so lofty and so

intimate when the spell of it still is heavy upon the mind. That spell held the audience strangely. Throughout the evening there was little applause—little, that is, if what demonstration that was made is measured by the intensity of the emotions aroused. The demeanor of the people is described with absolute truth when it is said that for a great part of the time they were listening in silence and in tears, their eyes dimmed by the pathos and the reality of the struggle, their hearts aching with the tension of it.

\* \* \*

## AN OPEN LETTER FROM DANIEL KIEFER TO JAMES W. VAN CLEAVE.

Mr. James W. Van Cleave, Pres. The National Association of Manufacturers.  
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Sir:—Charles Kingsley, in his novel "Alton Locke," portrayed a certain class very much like the anti-Bryanites of the National Association of Manufacturers. He describes the Chartist agitation, and the foolish, unreasoned fear it aroused. The demand for reforms, all of which have by this time either been incorporated into English law, or received the endorsement of England's greatest thinkers and statesmen, was so misrepresented by the aristocratic interests that the business men of the time were deluded into believing that the Chartists stood for riot and plunder. Kingsley tells how a number of London tradesmen hastened to be sworn in as special constables, to protect the city from the imaginary danger; and how they marched about shouting, "God, save the Queen!" On hearing these shouts, he makes his hero state the blunt truth: "What you mean is, 'God save our shops.'"

The National Association of Manufacturers furnishes us with duplicates of these London "society savers" of the past century. Like them, they have let themselves be scared like a crowd of children by a bogey, labeled "Bryanism," displayed before their frightened eyes by representatives of special privilege. Like them, they are trying, by raising patriotic shouts, to conceal the fact that their childish fear is only dread of personal loss. Like them, they are letting themselves be used as cat's-paws for the privileged interests.

When they endorse the political pamphlets you are issuing as president of the Association, they show either that their fright is so strong that they are incapable of realizing the number of absurdities contained therein, or that their ignorance of matters outside of their immediate business interests is so dense that they must take for granted anything of an economic or political nature that designing schemers see fit to tell them.

You ask, "Where are the persons asking for a

modification of the court practices regarding injunctions?" Possibly you do not consider anyone outside of the National Association of Manufacturers as anybody, or you would not ask that question. The question of restricting injunctions was before the people in 1896 and 1900, and both times more than six million voters approved the demand. Only a very small percentage of these voters were either "political laborers" or "truckling politicians." Indeed, most of the trade unionists and truckling politicians voted the other way—to their shame be it said.

But I find it necessary to inform you of a truth that must be news to you, as you do not seem to have grasped it in any of your writings. The right or wrong of a demand has nothing at all to do with the question of who favors it or how many. If it be just, it ought to be granted regardless of the number or the identity of those demanding it.

You declare the demand for a jury trial in cases of indirect contempt to be a reflection upon the judge. Well, what of it? Are there not men on the bench like Peter Grosscup, who was recently shown to have deliberately misquoted the record of Judge Landis's court in the interest of the Standard Oil Company? I would certainly have some misgivings if I were interested in a case against that corporation before Judge Grosscup, no matter how much justice I might have on my side. Honestly, now, wouldn't you feel doubtful yourself? Grosscup is only a type. He was "caught with the goods on." Other judges, as bad or worse, have been more cautious and have covered their tracks.

But the need of a jury trial in indirect contempt cases is shown even in your own objections. You say it would delay and defeat the court in the enforcement of decrees. How could there be much if any more delay in trying a case in the presence of a jury than without one? Only in one way. The jury would want to hear the evidence and arguments of both sides, and carefully consider them, before rendering a decision. If the judge honestly wanted to do the same thing, it would take about as long for him to decide. But suppose he did not want to take time for this? Suppose his mind was made up in advance? Then you are quite right. A jury trial would delay and defeat the court. Don't you think it ought to do so? Now, what kind of a judge would be most likely to object to a jury trial of one of his contempt cases? One who knew his decree to be a proper one, or one of the Grosscup kind?

Your peculiar objections have been voiced by Candidate Taft as well. What stronger indication can there be that, down in his heart, he feels that no reasonable and impartial jury would have upheld him in his own injunction cases? Yet, in spite of this implied admission of your own candidate, you challenge Mr. Bryan to "cite a

single instance of prejudice against workers in the whole record of injunctions by the Federal courts which gives the slightest color for this accusation."

Do you not know that when the practice of substituting court injunctions for legislative enactments was still in its infancy, a man named Woods, occupying a Federal judgeship, issued an injunction against Debs and other officers of the American Railway Union, forbidding them from doing some things which they had no intention of doing, and others which they had a perfect legal right to do if they saw fit? Do you not know that Debs was afterward charged with violating this injunction, his alleged offense consisting of acts already forbidden by law? Do you not know that after a mock trial before Woods, without a jury, Debs was found guilty and sent to jail for six months? Do you not furthermore know that a criminal indictment was found against Debs for the same acts he was said to have committed in violation of the injunction? And do you not know that, in spite of all the efforts of Debs' attorneys to secure a trial of his case on this indictment, which would have come before a jury, the District Attorney insisted on having the case nolle? Why? Before the jury the prosecution would have been compelled to produce the evidence, and this evidence would have shown that when Woods sent Debs to jail for contempt, he did so knowingly without proper cause. The jury would have been compelled to acquit; and this acquittal would have been a public announcement of the unjust and partisan character of Judge Woods' action. Are there not some circumstances in this case which give a slight color to an accusation of prejudice?

Judge Taft's action in the Phelan case was very similar to Woods's, but there was no grand jury indictment here to embarrass him later.

You admit the right of unions to organize, but say you oppose violence, intimidation and murder. That is a part of your attempted defense of the Federal court injunctions. It was sufficiently answered in a little squib that appeared about eleven years ago in the *Johnstown, Pa., Democrat*, somewhat to this effect:

Suppose some judge sitting in equity should enjoin every person from committing any crime whatsoever. What would that mean? That every person charged with crime would be denied the right of trial by jury.

Violence, intimidation and murder are already forbidden by law, but, while most persons charged with committing any of these acts would be given the benefit of a trial by jury, the Federal injunctions that have been issued single out certain persons connected with labor unions for the purpose of depriving them of this right.

You have nothing to say, apparently, in defense of the injunctions that have forbidden peace-

able persuasion or such proper acts as the advancing of railroad fare by a union to some non-union worker. I do not wonder at this. The job is no doubt beyond your power. You could say nothing in defense that would not serve equally well as an argument in favor of establishing a Russian despotism.

Most amusing is your declaration that you were a Democrat until 1896, when, as you say, "The Democratic party ceased to be democratic." It shows that you do not know democracy when you see it. You say the party "ceased to be democratic" at the very time it only began to be so. But your statement certainly means, if it means anything at all, that previous to 1896 the party was as democratic as yourself. Yet, you say in regard to the free trade in trust products plank of the Denver platform, "As nearly every sort of a business which is conducted on a large scale throughout the country would come under the Bryanite definition of a trust, what does Mr. Bryan propose to do with the factories which his policy would close?" You thus show that you hold that American industries need a protective tariff. If you did not, you would not ask the question you do. Yet you were "always a Democrat until 1896." And you furthermore let it be understood that you would be a Democrat today if the party stood in the same position it did previous to that year. That means, among other things, you favor such a platform as the party had in 1892, a platform that declared protection to be a fraud and a robbery of the American people, and furthermore denounced it as unconstitutional. This was the foremost plank of that platform, the one on which the campaign was fought and won.

You would have us believe that you favored this principle, that you only opposed the Democratic party because it does not occupy the same position it did in 1892, and yet you forget yourself further along to such an extent that you declare protective duties to be necessary and justifiable.

It is well you are responsible only to such an organization as the National Association of Manufacturers. No other would tolerate such a blunder in a public statement of its president. Certainly no labor organization would fail to have members with sufficient political and economic knowledge to see that it was not made ridiculous by such contradictory statements in the same pamphlet.

It is possible that you share with the other members of your organization the silly fear of the bogey labeled "Bryanism," with which beneficiaries of vested wrongs are trying to scare the country. This may account for the state of mind that causes you to declare yourself on both sides of the same question. But it certainly does not improve the quality of your reasoning and arguments.

Yours truly,  
DANIEL KIEFER.

Cincinnati, Sept. 7, 1908.

## BOOKS

### CROSBY THE "HUMANIST."

Ernest Howard Crosby. By Leonard D. Abbott. Published by the Ariel Press, Westwood, Mass. 1907. Price, paper, 25 cents. Cloth, 50 cents.

That the author knew and loved Crosby, his character-sketch leaves no doubt. The study intimate, sweet-spirited and full of a great admiration. But the picture is not in focus; six out of thirty pages about Crosby's non-Socialism, only three on his faith in non-resistance, and one-half page concerning his belief in Single-Tax! The fact that Mr. Abbott is a Socialist and an occasional believer in the "spirit of violent revolt" explains it does not excuse the distortion.

If, however, the reader finds fault, it is more

because his esteem for Crosby makes him too severe a critic, than because this sincere tribute to a noble man is not precious for the love it holds.

ANGELINE LOESCH.

## PAMPHLETS

### "The Political Joke Book."

"The Stumpville Comedy," by Wm. B. Fleming (cartoons by Charles Lederer), is something new in the way of campaign literature. With humorous dialogue and funny pictures it outlines the issues of the campaign from the Democratic point of view so as to make easy reading and serious thinking. The book is sold by the author, 62 E. 36th St., Chicago, at 10 cents a copy.

+ +

Don't prepare for death—prepare for life.—The Silent Partner, of Cleveland.

You cannot afford to miss our Advertising. ¶ It changes every week.

### THE POLITICAL JOKE BOOK

Take-off of Trust Platforms and Candidates. The issues summed up and illustrated with Pictures, Stories and Jokes. Fun and Frolic, Facts and Figures, Jest and Logic combined. A novelty in literature. Should be read by every Democrat and put in the hands of every Republican.

Price per Copy, 10 cents, postpaid. In lots of 100, 5 cents.

AGENTS WANTED.

W. B. FLEMING, Publisher, 62 E. 36th St., Chicago

### ECONOMIC AND REFORM BOOKS

A Specialty. New Bargain Catalog, Just Ready, FREE.

H. H. TIMBY, Conneaut, Ohio

### REAL ESTATE FOR SALE AND EXCHANGE

EDWARD POLAK

350 Third Avenue - - NEW YORK CITY

## Proof Portraits of Tolstoy

On heavy paper, from the plate of the illustration in the Public of August 28. For sale by our Book Department.

This portrait, which is not to be procured elsewhere, is said to be beloved by the common people of Russia, as it depicts their friend as a peasant.

The portrait is sold by us at ten cents, postpaid.

Address BOOK DEPARTMENT of THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago.

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

Telephone Harrison 1637

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

Office: 45 Auditorium Building

HOTEL WARNER—EVENINGS

CHICAGO

## 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

## PERIODICALS

The principal article of the Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor (Washington) for May is by W. D. P. Bliss. It deals with the subject of the unemployed in foreign countries.

+

The Quarterly Journal of Economics (Harvard) for August gives place to a comprehensive and judicial statement from the pen of Prof. E. W. Bemis, of the history and present status of the traction question in Cleveland.

+

The American Federationist (Washington) comes out for September as a Labor Day edition. Beginning at page 674 it publishes in full the petition of the Van Cleave Buck Stove Co. for the punishment

of Samuel Gompers, Frank Morrison and John Mitchell for publishing a boycott of the Buck Stove concern as an enemy of organized labor. Many of its pages are devoted also to advice regarding political action.

+

Dr. Alice Hamilton writes briefly in Charities and Commons for September on industrial diseases with reference especially to working women. In the same issue Agnes Nestor pictures the daily grind of a factory glovemaker.

+

In the Arena (Trenton and Boston) for July Charlotte Teller breezily tells the story of the Socialist convention, and William Malley writes with acute apprehension of the notable plays of the season. Among the other subjects are the future of the Negro, the advance of despotism in the United States, the fight against Baileyism in Texas, and an

## In Our Book Dept

### Progress and Poverty.

By HENRY GEORGE.  
Anniversary Edition. Dark blue cloth, \$1.10, postpaid. Paper, 50c, postpaid.

### Our Land and Land Policy.

By HENRY GEORGE.  
The volume includes some of Mr. George's contributions to periodicals and addresses, as: "Thou Shalt Not Steal" and "Thy Kingdom Come." Dark green cloth, \$2.50, postpaid.

### The Land Question.

By HENRY GEORGE.  
Light green cloth, \$1.00, postpaid. Paper, 50c, postpaid.

### Social Problems.

By HENRY GEORGE.  
Light green cloth, \$1.10, postpaid. Paper, 55c, postpaid.

### Protection or Free Trade.

By HENRY GEORGE.  
Light green cloth, \$1.00, postpaid. Paper, 50c, postpaid.

### A Perplexed Philosopher.

By HENRY GEORGE.  
Light green cloth, \$1.00, postpaid. Paper, 50c, postpaid.

### The Life of Henry George.

By HENRY GEORGE, Jr.  
Anniversary Edition. With eight illustrations. Dark blue cloth, \$1.10, postpaid.

### Natural Taxation.

By THOMAS G. SHEARMAN.  
Paper, 50c, postpaid.

### Bisocialism: The Reign of the Man at the Margin.

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE.  
Price, 60c, postpaid.

### The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth.

By LEWIS H. BERENS.  
Green canvas, \$2.00, postpaid.

### Labor and Neighbor.

By ERNEST CROSBY.  
Stiff drab paper cover, 25c, postpaid.

### Garrison, The Non-Resistant.

By ERNEST CROSBY.  
With portrait of Garrison. Blue cloth, 50c, postpaid. In new stiff drab paper cover, without portrait, 25c, postpaid.

### Ethics of Democracy.

By LOUIS F. POST.  
With portrait of author. Blue cloth, \$1.25, postpaid.

### Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce.

By LOUIS F. POST.  
Blue cloth, \$1.00, postpaid.

### The Single Tax.

By LOUIS F. POST.  
With colored charts. Stiff red paper cover, 25c, postpaid.

### The Prophet of San Francisco.

By LOUIS F. POST.  
Rough gray paper cover, 10c, postpaid.

### Success in Life.

By LOUIS F. POST.  
Gray paper cover 5c, postpaid.

### The Story of My Dictatorship: A Dream of the Future.

Gray paper, 12c, postpaid.

### The Hungry Forties: Life under the Bread Tax.

Orange paper cover, 20c, postpaid.

### Live Questions.

By JOHN P. ALTGELD.  
Cloth, \$2.50; by mail, \$2.80.

### The Cost of Something for Nothing.

By JOHN P. ALTGELD.  
With portrait. Green, maroon or red cloth, \$1.00, postpaid.

### Gillette's Social Redemption.

By MELVIN L. SEVERY.  
Sea green cloth, \$1.75, postpaid.

### Fellowship Songs.

Compiled by RALPH ALBERTSON.  
With music. Stiff cover with cloth back, 25c, postpaid.

Address:

THE PUBLIC, Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago

excellent paper by Mr. Flower, the editor, on Prof. S. S. Curry and his work in developing fundamentally the art of expression.

\* \* \*

A three-year-old youngster came home from Sunday-school, and upon being asked whom he saw, said, promptly:

"I saw eve'body I knew 'cep'n' God."—Unknown.

\* \* \*

The people were writhing beneath the claws and teeth of the System.

"Help!" they shrieked.

"Be of good cheer!" shouted a commanding voice. "Courage! I am coming!"

It was Tom Lawson.

With one mighty leap he landed in the center of the arena.

To pull the horrid monster off the prostrate People was but the work of a moment.

"Now," he said, "to disable the hideous thing, so it can do no more mischief."

Whipping a bundle of newspapers out of his pocket, he crumpled them into the shape of a ball.

With all his might he thrust this ball into the hideous creature's mouth.

Then, giving the gagged and helpless System a

## READ OUR CAMPAIGN OFFER

**T**HE great Campaign of 1908 is under way, 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 August 7, with the issue of **JULY 3** (with Bryan portrait supplement) thrown in, to and including the issue of **NOVEMBER 13** (with full election news and editorial comment)—fifteen issues in all—for **TWENTY CENTS**, cash in advance. ¶ **CLUBS OF TEN** will be served for the same period for **\$1.50**, cash in advance.

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

## 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

parting kick, he led the People forth in safety, leaving the writhing beast vainly trying to claw the bundle of newspapers out of its mouth.

He had saved the People!—Chicago Tribune.

+ + +

Judge: "Young man, you're making a good deal of unnecessary noise, I think."

Young Attorney: "Your honor, I've lost my overcoat and am trying to find it."

Judge: "Whole suits have been lost here, sir, with much less noise"—Lippincott's Magazine.

## 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 or 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.

When writing to Advertisers please mention THE PUBLIC.

## 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.

## Fellowship Songs.

A collection of Hymns and Songs voicing personal aspiration, civic and religious purpose, social conscience and democratic faith; compiled by Ralph Albertson from such writers as Lowell, Whittier, Kingsley, Tennyson, Mackay, Carpenter, Markham, Massey, Crosby, Mrs. Gilman and W. C. Gannett.

Ernest Crosby's last written words for THE PUBLIC were about these Fellowship Songs. The review appeared in THE PUBLIC of January 5, 1907, which went to press on the morning of the 3rd, the morning on which he died. Of the Songs he wrote, among other things:

Ralph Albertson's "Fellowship Songs" is an admirable collection of the best liberal hymns and poems, set to the best music. . . . Every progressive group of thinkers—liberal church, woman's club or what not—would do well to lay in a supply of "Fellowship Songs" and practice its melodies.

Handsome stiff cover with cloth back, 25 cts., postpaid.

THE PUBLIC, BOOK DEPT  
 Ellsworth Bldg. 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

## THE CLEVELAND STREET RAILWAY REFERENDUM

The "tainted news" agencies have made it appear that Cleveland is so dissatisfied with the operation of its street railways by the Municipal Traction Company that the council has decided that further continuance of the present arrangement be left to the voters of the city and decided by popular election October 22.

The fact is that the election has been forced by Mayor Johnson. The referendum act applying to street railway franchises (passed by the last Ohio legislature through Mayor Johnson's influence) requires a vote of the people upon all franchises, and the city council delayed calling a referendum until certain law suits attacking the franchise had been decided.

Mayor Johnson, in order to demonstrate the popularity of the street railways under the management of the Municipal Traction Company, and to give to Cleveland Railway stock the value of a vote of approval to the franchise by the people of Cleveland, has forced a referendum election through the Johnson supporters in the city council to take place at the earliest possible date, October 22, less than two weeks before the general election.

The result of the referendum is a foregone conclusion. The franchise of the Cleveland Railway Company will be ratified and the operation of the lines at 3c fare overwhelmingly approved.

All of which will add immensely to the value of the stock and re-prove the fact that the people of Cleveland stand solidly behind Mayor Johnson.

But watch and see how little the "tainted news" organs will have to say about the victory.

### THE OFFER:

First, we will sell Cleveland Railway Company Stock at par (\$100.00) and 6 per cent interest.

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, 650 Electric Bldg.  
Make all checks payable to the Municipal Traction Co.

# The Municipal Traction Company

A. B. DU PONT, President.