

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy, and
a Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

Vol. XVII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JULY 10, 1914.

No. 849.

EDITORS, 1898-1913: LOUIS F. POST AND ALICE THACHER POST

SAMUEL DANZIGER, MANAGING EDITOR.
STOUGHTON COOLEY,
ANGELINE L. GRAVES, } ASSOCIATE EDITORS.
STANLEY BOWMAR, BUSINESS MANAGER.

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Virginia	LINCOLN STEFFENS, New York
HENRY F. RING, Texas	HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio	FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia	ROBERT BAKER, New York
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio	GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio	W. G. EGGLESTON, California
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois	C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon
LLEWELLYN JONES, Illinois	R. F. FETTERBERG, South Dakota
MRS. LORA INGRAM ROBINSON, Calif.	J. W. S. CALLIE, England
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island	JOHN PAUL, England
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota	ERNEST BRAY, Australia
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri	GEORGE FOWLER, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
Ellsworth Building, 837 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Canadian and Foreign, \$1.50

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago,
Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:	
Which Shall It Be?.....	649
The Right Trust Remedy.....	649
Roosevelt a National Asset.....	649
Roosevelt and the Wilson Administration.....	651
Strong Government.....	652
Boycotting of "Destructive" Mediums.....	652
Dodging a Proper Test.....	653
Taxation in Kentucky.....	653
Professor Bullock and Vancouver's Tax System.....	654
Raymond Robins' Candidacy.....	654
Inaccurate History.....	655
Intemperate Criticism.....	655
A Proper Action.....	655
Joseph Chamberlain.....	656
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:	
Connecticut Progressives at Work—Christopher M. Galup.....	656
News From Ontario—W. A. Douglass.....	656
NEWS NARRATIVE:	
President Wilson's Independence Day Oration.....	657
President Wilson and Woman Suffrage.....	658
Washington Doings.....	659
Roosevelt Discusses Public Questions.....	659
Commission on Industrial Relations.....	661
Social Questions Before the Rabbis' Conference.....	661
The Labor War.....	662
Bomb Explosion in New York.....	662
Reactionaries Defeated in Pueblo.....	662
Illinois Senatorial Situation.....	662
Chicago School Board Changes.....	662
Protest Against Segregation.....	662
Mexico and the United States.....	663
An Unconventional Diplomat.....	663
Austrian Mob Outbreak.....	664
English Affairs.....	664
News Notes.....	664
Press Opinions.....	665
RELATED THINGS:	
Obsolete—Richard Warner Borst.....	667
Privilege and Municipal Reform—Amos R. E. Pinchot.....	667
News of Our Town—Craig Ralston.....	668
The Cry of the Dreamer—John Boyle O'Reilly.....	668
BOOKS:	
Philosophy of Roosevelt.....	669
Efficiency in Government.....	669

EDITORIAL

Which Shall It Be?

Mr. Roosevelt, at Pittsburgh: We must supervise and direct the affairs of the people.

Mr. Wilson, at Philadelphia: We must establish conditions under which the people will be free to manage their own affairs.

S. C.



The Right Trust Remedy.

Former President Roosevelt correctly declares a failure the effort for twenty-four years to regulate the trusts. "The only alternative," he says, "is the Progressive plan." Where did he get that information? The Progressive plan is neither the only nor the most desirable alternative. A better plan is to quit fooling with commissions and investigations and repeal all tariff laws, excise and other labor taxing laws, all franchise grants and other grants of special privileges, and take all publicly earned values for public use. All big business combinations that will survive such a change will be those that are natural and useful. Those that will not survive will be the unnatural and predatory ones. A proposition to put this plan into the national Progressive platform received all but five votes of the twenty-five members of the Committee on Resolutions. But for some reason, still not satisfactorily explained, it never appeared in the platform.

S. D.



Roosevelt a National Asset.

Theodore Roosevelt has talked so much and so loud that some, seeing the smallness of his deeds in comparison with the magnitude of his promises, have been disposed to underrate his public worth. His deeds have been small, it is true; and many of those that are in themselves good are yet, owing to the manner of their doing, evil in their final effect. Nevertheless, ideas have a value, even when embalmed in sounding words; and though their author contents himself too often with ut-

terance without performance, they stand as a challenge to those who would perform, and fire the imagination of those who await performance. Mr. Roosevelt is a political gadfly, and there is nothing that the Democratic donkey now stands more in need of than vigorous goading. The Democratic party, standing on a hodge-podge platform of paternalism and democracy, has been pulled, by its addle-pated leaders, this way and that way, until it is almost at a standstill. The progress made during the last year has been due mainly to the momentary mastery of one commanding personality; but even that is now threatened.



The Democratic party, goaded by the President, has done some of the good things that it promised to do, and it deserves commendation; but at the very moment when it should press on toward the goal of economic freedom, it is threatened with political palsy. And it is at this opportune moment that Mr. Roosevelt alights upon the flank of the drowsy donkey. It is not that his program is better than that of the Democrats, for it is not, but that if the Democratic program does not bring results, the people will turn to the Progressive party. Absurd and ridiculous as Mr. Roosevelt's Pittsburgh speech is to real Democrats, it bears the semblance of reason in the mind of the average voter; and if the Democratic party is to have an opportunity to apply democracy it must be answered in the mind of the average voter. Mr. Roosevelt charges the Democrats with having promised to restore prosperity, reduce the cost of living, and control the trusts; and he declares that business is moribund, the cost of living is still high, and predicts failure from the trust-regulation laws. And he does it all in a manner well calculated to arouse enthusiasm in unwary voters.



Mr. Roosevelt would regulate the tariff by means of a non-partisan commission "divorced from favoritism and the fostering of special interests"—assisted, doubtless, by the aid and counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers. Another commission, with "thorough knowledge disinterestedly acquired," would "give proper encouragement to our merchants while also giving proper protection to our wageworkers, our farmers, and our business men." Still another commission "should exercise strict supervision and control over big business." Had not Mr. Roosevelt been under the doctor's care, with strict injunctions against "overdoing," he doubtless would have had commissions to regulate marriage and divorce, the in-

tensive culture of rutabagas, the fashions in ladies' hats, and the various activities of mankind. But not all will see the humor of universal government by commission. There are many earnest men and women who, seeing the failure of other plans, will turn to that of Mr. Roosevelt.



But just what is the function of a commission blessed with "thorough knowledge disinterestedly acquired?" and how would it give proper encouragement to all commercial activities? Suppose it considered the woodpulp industry, which has already been investigated? Consumers declared their prices too high. Investigation showed that some manufacturers made pulp at a much lower cost than others. The latter made a bare return on their capital; the former made abnormal profits. What would the commission do with such a problem? It could not fix one price for the efficient, and another price for the inefficient. If it fixed the price at a point to give a profit to the inefficient, the efficient would enjoy the abnormal profit made possible under the Aldrich tariff. If it cut the profit of the efficient to a reasonable figure, the inefficient would be driven out of business. Where then would be the economic justice that the commission form of government promises? It is one thing to be forced out of business by the competition of the open market; it is an entirely different thing to be shut out by the specific act of a commission. With the profits of business dependent upon the arbitrary fiat of the commission, greater pressure would be brought to bear upon its members than has yet fallen on public officials. Does past experience warrant a belief in the success of this plan?



Mr. Roosevelt proposes a commission to regulate monopoly. Mr. Wilson presents a commission to compel competition, within certain legal restrictions. Ultimately some one must offer a plan to remove all legal restraints of trade. Mr. Roosevelt proposes—if we reduce the proposition to concrete terms—that a public commission shall watch over the slaves to see that the masters are not too harsh. Mr. Wilson would give the slaves the privilege of selecting their own masters. But the day is not distant when the slaves will have restored to them the right to work for themselves. It is better to have some freedom than none at all. But man will not be satisfied until he is entirely free. The partial freedom offered by Mr. Wilson will be ineffectual, because the remaining restraints will ultimately overcome what has been released; and

the people, finding themselves without relief are likely to listen to the offer of another kind of commission regulation. People never stand still. They must go ahead, or go backward. The American people must either go on to complete freedom, or they will turn toward Socialism, democratic or plutocratic. Mr. Roosevelt's plan of state regulation of all forms of business is nothing more nor less than plutocratic socialism, and will afflict society with all the evils of paternalism.



The Democratic party can demonstrate its right to power only by boldly meeting Mr. Roosevelt's declaration, "unlimited competition has proved one of the greatest curses of modern civilization." It is not unlimited competition, but limited competition that has done the mischief. All business is shackled by legal privileges, and the enterprises so bound have been compelled to compete. Such competition must, from its very nature, lead to the evils of combinations on the one hand, and to the crushing of the weaker on the other. And the only positive and permanent relief possible must come from striking off the shackles. It is not necessary for the Democratic party, to announce at this time that it is opposed to all tariffs and other indirect taxes, and in favor of the complete exemption of all business from the burden of landlordism; but it must have this goal in mind, and it must move toward it fast enough to convince the people that it is going in that direction. s. c.



Roosevelt and the Wilson Administration.

Theodore Roosevelt's criticism of the administration's tariff policy, in his Pittsburgh speech of June 30; does not justify confidence in his judgment. It is true that this tariff policy is defective. Any tariff policy that falls short of absolute Free Trade is deserving of severe criticism and the Underwood tariff falls far short of even hailing distance of Free Trade. But Roosevelt does not criticize the Underwood law's defects but its merits. He does not advocate an improvement but the very opposite. He condemns the Underwood law for its failure to impose protective duties in behalf of certain interests. Evidently the Colonel is so little of a statesman, that he does not know that one competent to perform a useful service has no need of putting an artificial handicap on a potential competitor; while one who is himself incompetent should not be allowed to render others still more incompetent. Yet because the administration has taken the position that competent producers need no protection and incompetent ones don't

deserve any, Roosevelt criticizes it. His idea of a tariff commission to investigate and seek out the incompetents and protect them, makes him in principle, though not in degree as much a defender of Privilege as Penrose, Barnes, Root and others whom he delights in denouncing. He, too, is in favor of allowing parasitic business to continue living off of business that can stand on its own merits.



Even in attacking such vulnerable propositions as the pending anti-trust measures, Colonel Roosevelt failed to rise to his opportunity. He might well have referred to them as puerile efforts to remove an evil without touching its cause. He might have denounced them as examples of vicious legislation to the extent that they authorize governmental interference in matters that no government should interfere with, and authorize no interference where interference is needed. With the exception of the anti-injunction and labor exemption section of the Clayton bill, these bills as they stand can with little trouble be shown to be based on entirely wrong principles. Yet so little is Roosevelt able to see the real faults of these measures that in criticizing he represents them as having characteristics they do not possess. "We cannot make every man compete with every other man," he says in comment, "we cannot go back to 1850, still less to 1650." How bravely the Colonel attacks a man of straw! And the saddest part of it is that he sincerely imagines the straw to be flesh and blood.



Following the lead of his friend, George W. Perkins, Roosevelt delivers himself of the following:

Unlimited competition has proved one of the greatest curses of modern civilization. It was unlimited competition which created the great trusts, exactly as it created the sweatshop, and is chiefly responsible for child labor. The new freedom is merely the exceedingly old freedom, which permits each man to cut his neighbor's throat.

Thus Roosevelt finds two objections to his conception of the New Freedom. One is it will take us back to conditions of 1650, when our great trusts were impossible. Another is it will keep us under conditions of 1914 which have created the great trusts.



But let his statement concerning competition be analyzed. Has "unlimited competition created the great trusts"? How could there be unlimited competition with a protective tariff in operation, with

public highways in possession of private corporations, openly or secretly giving preferential rates, rebates and other favors to fortunate ones, with natural resources held by comparatively few able to give or withhold permission to use them, with patent laws making a privilege of the right to manufacture or use the most effective instruments or processes of production, and with other legislation conferring artificial advantages on some and disadvantages on others? Is this the statesman to lead us out of the wilderness, who can not see the difference between unlimited competition and a scramble among unprivileged unfortunates for the little that Privilege has not monopolized, or for the favor of Privilege's beneficiaries? But wait! Roosevelt does not actually say that unlimited competition has created trusts. He only says it has created them "exactly as it created the sweat shops and is chiefly responsible for child labor." The words "exactly as" leave room for quibbling. Sweat shops and child labor actually result from denial of opportunity to Labor by Monopoly. It is only restriction of competition that enters into creation of these evils. Strictly construed, the Colonel's statement exonerates unlimited competition. He surely knows how many are the limitations of competition which exist and so must know that unlimited competition does not exist and has not existed within his memory. Those blessed weasel words, "exactly as," leave opportunity to save the Colonel's reputation for far-seeing statesmanship.



But there is truth as well as error in much that Roosevelt has to say. It is true that "we cannot destroy real monopoly by attacking its legal forms. We must find out and take away the economic basis of monopoly." But why we must do that if competition is a bad thing the Colonel does not say. Yet in spite of his inconsistency, Roosevelt has offered a true statesmanlike suggestion. In this suggestion lies the refutation of all the charges brought against unlimited competition. Upon this truth he might have based a criticism of the administration that could not be easily brushed aside. But he clearly failed to realize its importance. Furthermore, his advocacy of a protective tariff indicates but an imperfect comprehension of the meaning of his suggestion. It is unfortunate that the leader of a party containing such excellent material as the Progressive party has not a better understanding of fundamental principles. Colonel Roosevelt may well be credited with an eager desire to bring about social justice. But the influence of his old party associations is still keeping him from clearly seeing the right way to ac-

complish that object. Should he fail to learn, then new leadership will be the Progressive party's only salvation.

S. D.



Strong Government.

Our Apostle of Force said in his Pittsburgh speech that the Democrats had failed, and always would fail, because they were afraid of a strong government. Speculation on the relative merits of plutocratic and democratic governments is unnecessary in the light of history. Nor is it necessary to go to distant shores, or to ancient times. Porfirio Diaz gave Mexico a strong government. There was never a question as to its stability. Order succeeded chaos, railroads were built, mines were opened, and there were the surface manifestations of modern civilization. Complaints of tyranny were met with the assertion that this was the only kind of government the people of Mexico could appreciate. And President Diaz was hailed as the builder of his country. Here was the ideal strong government.



But nature, though long defied, will ultimately assert herself. A time came when human nature could endure no more; and when the people of Mexico began to assert themselves the whole structure tumbled about the strong man's ears. The wonderful creation was found to be nothing more than a shell, empty and devoid of substance. The lands had been taken from the people, and the mines, railroads, and huge estates rested upon the backs of a nation of peons, taxed to the last point of endurance to support the government that had betrayed them. The strong government had grown tyrannical, because it is only by means of tyranny that such a government can express itself, and it had become corrupt, because oppression always begets corruption. President Diaz displayed to the world a nation orderly and prosperous; but when at last his own power crumbled, the world saw a nation steeped in social misery and political debauchery. The really strong government is the will of a strong people; and a people are strong, not from having things done for them by strong men, but from doing things for themselves.

S. C.



Boycotting of "Destructive" Mediums.

Copies of a letter from Henry B. Joy, president of the Packard Motor Car Company of Detroit, addressed to Marshall Cushing of New York City, under date of June 2, have been widely circulated among business men. The letter, while disclaiming

any desire "to purchase or dictate the editorial or business policy of any publication," yet questions the advisability of advertising in publications "seeking in every way to destroy business possibilities by creating conditions under which business could not thrive or exist except in a most modified degree." It further points out that it is a manufacturer's privilege to withhold advertising from such a publication. Printed in red ink over the letter is the exhortation, "advertise in constructive mediums." This letter was naturally construed as an attempt to discourage publication of articles rightly or wrongly looked upon as "destructive to business." The New York Herald construed it as designed to boycott papers supporting President Wilson's program or whose policy is "not in accord with the advertiser's economic or political views." In a letter dated June 17, addressed to the Herald, and also published in circular form, Mr. Joy denies the correctness of this construction, and explains he only referred to "destructive mediums." By this he means "any publication that misrepresents one class in order to win the plaudits of another class, or seeks to array class against class, or unwarrantably and without any basis in fact attacks the character of an upright citizen or public official."

Mr. Joy's refutation does not refute. Any attack on an existing wrong is necessarily destructive of that wrong. Upon such wrongs many predatory businesses are founded. Upholders of these wrongs, especially if they derive financial benefit therefrom, are in the habit of denouncing attacks upon them as "arraying of class against class." Protected interests have again and again so referred to free trade agitators, as also have railroad interests designated those who oppose the pending application for rate increase. Workers for various kinds of labor legislation have been denounced in the same way. Henry George, in his New York mayoralty campaign, was so referred to. The same was said of John P. Altgeld, William J. Bryan, Tom L. Johnson, Joseph Fels, Robert LaFollette, and many others who attacked predatory privilege. It was even said about Grover Cleveland for his mild remark about the "communism of pelf." Lloyd George is so denounced in England today. Mr. Joy could scarcely have had the socialistic or other radical press in mind, since these do not figure widely in such advertising circles as he can reach. While denying that he referred to the Wilson administration's policy, he neglects to say what he did have in mind. This is to be regretted, for

it would be interesting to learn what question it is that he does not want discussed.



Dodging a Proper Test.

"A 15 mills tax on a mortgage drawing six per cent interest is the same as a tax of 25 per cent upon the income derived from the mortgage," declares the Secretary of the Ohio State Board of Commerce, Mr. O. K. Shimansky, in arguing for a tax amendment. A similar argument is frequently used in favor of exemption of stocks, bonds and other intangible property. There is no denying the truth of it. But why restrict that argument to intangible property? How about a fifteen mills tax on household goods which yield no income at all? How about a tax on the personal property of a merchant or manufacturer whose business happens to be losing money? Mr. Shimansky favors a tax amendment which will make possible the exemption of intangible personal property, but which he further declares will make impossible relief of wealth producers from unjust taxation. He advocates lop-sided reform.



The justice or injustice of a tax can not be measured by the percentage of income it absorbs. A 25 per cent tax on an income is outrageously unjust if the person drawing it has honestly earned it. So is a ten per cent tax, for that matter, or a one per cent tax, or an infinitesimal fraction of a one per cent tax. But a twenty-five per cent tax on an unearned income is not unjust when the real earner of the income happens to be the public. Nor, for that matter, would a 100 per cent tax be unjust. Mr. Shimansky and his State Board of Commerce are subjecting the merits of their proposed reform to the wrong kind of test.

S. D.



Taxation in Kentucky.

Kentucky is numbered among the states in which there is dissatisfaction with the working of the general property tax. The Kentucky Tax League has issued a statement naming some of the bad results of that system. These are the same as are to be noted in other places. It does not produce sufficient revenue, encourages deception, works unequally in different parts of the State, and drives away people and capital. The league is advocating adoption of an amendment providing for classification of property for taxation. Since there does not seem to be any tricky restrictions

or conditions tacked on to this amendment, such as the Ohio State Board of Commerce is endeavoring to get through in that State, Kentucky voters will do well to adopt it.



But it would be well if the Kentucky Tax League would be somewhat more clear than it appears to be in presenting arguments in behalf of the change. Thus voters are given to understand that investment of capital will be encouraged through exemption from taxation. Says the League in its statement:

When your cow comes up to the barn to be milked do you take a club and drive her away? That is what Kentucky is virtually doing when it answers capital knocking at the door by saying "you cannot come in with your money unless you are willing to give up the better part of your earnings or hide what you have from the assessor."

That argument is sound and offers hope that under the new amendment capital will not be taxed if invested in factories, buildings, farm implements, live stock, merchandise, or other ways of employing labor and producing wealth. At any rate the new amendment, if adopted, will make such encouragement possible to industry and enterprise. But the Tax League also promises "it will eventually reduce the taxes on town lots and farming lands." If it means town lots and farming lands that have been fully improved, then it is in line with the policy of attracting capital and stimulating industry. But if it means vacant or partly used property then the change will be of no benefit to the State. Untaxed or lightly taxed vacant land can be more profitably withheld from use than used. Such a policy will not encourage productive investments. On the contrary new industries will be kept away by the high prices which untaxed speculators can and will ask for sites, and by the taxes on industry which exemption of vacant lands will necessitate. The Tax League should make these matters more clear, that voters may properly understand the best use to make of the reform when they get it.

S. D.



Prof. Bullock and Vancouver's Tax System.

Professor Charles J. Bullock of the Harvard Economics Department writes in the Boston Transcript of June 27, concerning Vancouver and its system of taxation. The Professor questions whether partial application of the Singletax principle in that city is the cause of its phenomenal growth. However, that is of no immediate importance. The fact is that Vancouver has grown

considerably under the Singletax. No skepticism as to whether Singletax caused the growth can alter the fact that it refutes all such prophecies of evil as were spread by opponents in recent campaigns in Oregon and Missouri. Professor Bullock is apparently unaware of the fact that Singletaxers not only looked for this growth but also realized that the usual results of such a growth must follow if a much greater percentage of the rental value of land were not taken for public purposes than has actually been taken in Vancouver. Writing in *The Public*, as far back as the issue of March 31, 1911, Henry George, Jr., called attention to this matter.



Some of Professor Bullock's comments are not such as one would look for from an economic expert. Thus he holds that to encourage building must cause congestion in cities, as though increase in housing accommodation can cause anything of the kind. Equally surprising is his apparent approval of the oft repeated fallacy about the alleged unfairness of taxing the owner of a vacant lot to furnish fire protection. A vacant lot does not need fire protection, neither does it need police protection nor in fact any other service that government provides. But what would happen to the value of the vacant lot, if fire protection were withdrawn from all buildings in the town in which it lies? It would certainly depreciate. What would happen to the value of such a lot should fire protection be furnished in a town where it was lacking before? It would as surely increase. The same applies to all governmental services, whether needed for preservation of the vacant lot or not. Vacant lot owners are benefited as much financially as are owners of improved property by all improvements in government. Professor Bullock, in discussing the matter, seems to have allowed some principles of the science which he teaches, to temporarily slip his mind. S. D.



Raymond Robins' Candidacy.

The announcement that Raymond Robins will be a candidate for the Illinois Progressive party nomination for United States Senator is good news. It offers that party as good an opportunity as the candidacy of John Z. White offers to the Democratic party. It should serve as a warning to Democratic politicians against the nomination of Roger Sullivan or any other opponent of democracy. What is more important, it assures democratic voters, that, whatever may be the re-

sult of the Democratic party primary, there will be a candidate on the Progressive ticket worthy of their support.

S. D.



Inaccurate History.

John Howard Todd, A. B., who is writing the history of Illinois for the Chicago Herald, is not as accurate as a reliable historian should be. On May 11 in speaking of the railroad strike of 1894 he erroneously stated that Eugene V. Debs was tried and convicted on an indictment. Although his attention was called to the error it has not yet been corrected. Now, in the issue of July 3, he has made an even more serious error. Speaking of President Cleveland's action in sending federal troops into Illinois he says: "It was the time of the Pullman strike when train crews refused to handle trains carrying Pullman cars and rioters were tearing up tracks, overturning and burning cars and paralyzing traffic generally." Professor Todd here gives the impression that prior to the ordering of federal troops to Chicago rioting prevailed and railroad property was being destroyed. The fact is that there were no riots nor any serious destruction of railroad property until the order had been issued to send in federal troops. There was certainly nothing serious enough to justify use of troops of any kind. Professor Todd must have failed to study Governor Altgeld's message to the legislature on this matter, since it is inconceivable that, had he done so he would so disregard his duty, as a historian to deliberately make the statement he did. If similar errors exist in his statements regarding other events in the history of Illinois then his history can not well be accepted as fairly accurate.

S. D.



Intemperate Criticism.

The assassination of the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary suggests again the need of a healthy public opinion to secure rational action. Whatever may be the excuse for reform by assassination in countries afflicted with autocratic governments, there is none at all under popular governments. The Russian government has invited the assassin; but the English government anticipates him with freedom. The one government has seen many bloody deeds; the other has been singularly free from personal violence. Yet, we of this country, enjoying the freedom of England, suffer the violence of Russia. Of the thirteen Presidents who have presided at Washington during the last fifty years, three of them have been

assassinated; and attempts have been made on the lives of numerous lesser officials. But there is this difference, however: In Russia the assassin is a man of intellect and character, nerved by a love of liberty. In this country the assassin is a weak-minded man, laboring under some hallucination; but whether the assassin be a patriot striving to free his oppressed countrymen from tyranny, or a crank striking to redress an imaginary wrong, the reality is the same to the individual.



That intemperate criticism of public officials in this country is responsible for overturning the judgment of weak-minded individuals is evident. The relation of our government and people is quite similar to that of the English government and people; but our methods of criticism are very different. Not that the Englishman is at all backward in finding fault with his government, far from it; but he is more temperate of statement. He does not "see red," and his press is not "yellow." The gross exaggeration and intemperate abuse of some of our press cannot but be evil in its influence. The intelligent recognize the exaggeration, but the weak-minded take it in all seriousness; and some are aroused to the point of violent action. It is not a matter, however, for legislation, but rather, the cultivation of a sane public opinion. Laws will not control the weak-minded, but public opinion can restrain the utterance of the intemperate criticism that dethrones the weak mind. Hence, in the last analysis, the responsibility rests with the people themselves; and by patient persistence, by a greater readiness to recognize an opponent's worth, and above all, by placing law above persons, we shall eventually arrive at a public state of mind in which we can discuss rationally our common interests.

S. C.



A Proper Action.

Friends of Joseph Fels have no criticism to offer of the action of the Central Conference of American Rabbis at Detroit in tabling resolutions of sympathy over his death. Nor should the advocates of other resolutions relating to public questions feel that any wrong was done. A resolution should express the sincere feeling of the body that adopts it, or not be adopted at all. Joseph Fels stood for a modern application of the doctrines of social justice proclaimed in the Old Testament. He stood for stopping the taking of wealth from those who have earned it by those who have not. He stood for the abolition of poverty and all the

vice, crime and misery resulting therefrom. The adoption of the resolution would have been construed as implying that the conference felt sympathetically toward such a position. Clearly those who do not feel so were right in objecting. Those who do not stand for social and economic justice should not be forced to appear as though they do. Those who tolerate Oppression should not be asked to give a perfunctory, apparent endorsement to Freedom. If Rabbi Stephen Wise was right in saying, "You are afraid of what the rich may say," then the conference took the only course it should have taken in tabling all resolutions. Insincere praise would be no honor—rather the reverse.

S. D.



Joseph Chamberlain.

The passing of Joseph Chamberlain arrests attention because of his connection with the reactionary movement in restraint of trade. And the fact that such a brilliant leader was unable to revive the protective tariff is good evidence that the British have made a distinct advance on the road toward direct taxation. While Americans, having a protective tariff, have resisted fifty years of campaigning to convince them that the tariff is a tax and that the foreigner does not pay it Mr. Chamberlain with all the power of the Unionist party and Tory landlords behind him was unable to persuade the English workingmen, lacking protection, that a tariff is not a tax, and that the foreigner pays it. In that significant fact lies great hope for economic progress. England was compelled to raise more revenue, and it was a question as to whether it should be raised by direct or by indirect taxation; in other words, whether it should fall upon the bent back of labor, or be drawn from the coffers of idle landlords. Mr. Chamberlain failed; Mr. Lloyd George has succeeded.



Just how much Mr. Chamberlain's course was due to conviction, and how much to overweening ambition may never be known. The fact that he should say in defending his tariff proposals that all direct taxes are either shifted to the consumer or drive the property taxed out of the country showed an utter lack of understanding of the incidence of taxation. The English landlord has not been able to shift to the tenant the land tax of the Lloyd George Budget; and there is very little likelihood of their taking their land out of the country. On the other hand, Mr. Chamberlain's surpassing qualifications for leadership might well

arouse in him aspirations that could not be satisfied while serving under Mr. Gladstone. It was unlikely that he should supplant his chief within the Liberal party; while it was possible, by means of clever political machinations, to ride into power at the head of a new party. Mr. Gladstone began his political career as a Conservative, and changed to the Liberals. Mr. Chamberlain started as a Liberal, and became Conservative. Their paths crossed, but were not long parallel; and the success of the one, and the failure of the other may be taken as an indication of the trend of the times. As Thomas Carlyle and Rudyard Kipling have failed with their Tory preaching to make an impression on the world commensurate with their literary ability, so Joseph Chamberlain, by his espousal of Toryism, has been unable to stay the march toward democracy.

S. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CONNECTICUT'S PROGRESSIVES AT WORK.

Lake Compounce, Conn., June 27, 1914.

Breakers ahead for the Bourbons! More than a hundred militant Democrats assembled here this afternoon, to demand progressive measures and forward looking candidates from their party in this State. Harmony, independence and determination were the dominant notes of the convention. The terms direct primary, initiative and referendum, recall, preferential ballot, home rule in taxation, etc., echoed and re-echoed through it all. The event was without parallel in the political annals of Connecticut, and some of the old-time singletaxers here had to fairly rub their eyes open, to make sure that they were in the Nutmeg State. George M. Wallace of New Haven, chairman of the meeting and a democrat of the most fundamental sort, was finally authorized to appoint a committee of ten to organize the movement and lay plans for the coming campaign. The appointments will be announced later in the week. Another conference will be held within the next six weeks, in accordance with a unanimous vote of those present.

CHRISTOPHER M. GALLUP.



NEWS FROM ONTARIO.

Toronto, July 1.

We have just concluded a big fight. We have been defeated, but not vanquished. The enemy has won and the downtrodden are rejoicing that their oppressors are still in the saddle.

Eighteen months ago the people of this city by a direct vote of four to one declared in favor of local option in taxation. The city council prepared a bill to give effect to that vote; but when it reached the parliament, it never passed the committee stage, the eight representatives of the city utterly ignored the bill, and yesterday, at the elec-

tion, the public returned the same men at the head of the poll. Such is the difference between direct legislation and indirect legislation.

Not many weeks ago Sir James Whitney, the Premier of the Province, prorogued the parliament. The Reform party, or the Liberal party as it is generally called, had laid as the basis of its platform the abolition of saloons, local option in taxation and woman suffrage. To all these Sir James and his shadows had declared their emphatic opposition. There was therefore a very clearly cut issue between the two parties.

The Tax Reformers in Toronto nominated Mr. Arthur B. Farmer, M. A., the secretary of the Tax Reform League, for one of the seats, and shortly afterwards he was endorsed by the Liberals. This seemed to give him something of a fighting chance, although he was opposed to the Hon. Mr. Crawford, who for some time had been Speaker of the House, and who had won the previous election by a vote of 5,469 to 1,519.

At once vigorous methods were adopted to appeal to the public. Two tents were secured and various speakers kept busy night after night. It was cause for great rejoicing at last to have the chance in an election to proclaim the grand truths that God made the land for the people, and that a race of land speculators have no more right to exist than a race of potato bugs. Besides the tent meetings, some of the boys invaded the street corners, where they took the same kind of a platform as the apostles of old, with the heavens for their canopy, and there they discoursed to the people on the essential difference between the value that comes with the growth of population, and the value due to the efforts of industry.

Last night the votes were counted, for Crawford 5,934, for Farmer 3,805. It is true that Mr. Crawford will sit in the next parliament, but not by a vote of three to one, as formerly.

The ridings are arranged in such a way that they give no possibility of any approach to fair representation. The constituencies were cut up purposely to deprive the Reformers of all representation. The total Tory vote in the whole city was less than 50,000, while the Reform vote was upwards of 26,000. With any kind of fair voting, therefore, out of the ten members the Reformers should have had three seats. As it is they have none.

In each constituency two men had to be elected, but not necessarily the two who had the highest number of votes. Mr. Farmer, whose platform was primarily for Tax Reform, was pitted against Mr. Crawford, and Mr. McTaggart, who fought principally for the closing of the bar, was pitted against Mr. McPherson. As Mr. Farmer had about 500 more votes than Mr. McTaggart, it seems to indicate that Tax Reform was more popular than Temperance Reform.

Our good friend and champion for Tax Reform, Arthur Roebuck, ran in another constituency and made a valiant fight, losing his election by only about 400 votes.

In the city of Ottawa, our good friends, the Southams, the owners of the Ottawa Citizen, an old Tory paper, came out in opposition to their own

party, with the result that the two members returned from that city stand for Tax Reform.

I cannot but feel that the Labor party has been humbled. Out of the whole Province they have won only one seat. Mr. Studholm of Hamilton, the lone representative in Parliament for some years, offered himself for re-election, and though the Tories had an overwhelming majority of members in the House they did not have the chivalry to let the labor men keep that seat without a contest. I am glad, however, that the public stood by him and returned him with a majority of about a thousand. For many years he has been a faithful friend to the Tax Reformers.

At the last municipal election in Toronto the Labor party put James Simpson at the head of the poll for the position of Controller. Today the Labor party has not a single representative to parliament in this city.

My impression is that we are on the eve of a commercial depression. That may lead the people to think. The Prodigal had to come down to the hog trough in order to "come to himself." Often the same thing is true of nations, as of men.

W. A. DOUGLASS.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, July 7, 1914.

The President's Independence Day Oration.

In a Fourth of July address at Philadelphia President Wilson advocated application of the principles of the Declaration of Independence to modern conditions. Among other things he said:

Liberty does not consist in mere general declarations as to the rights of man. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action. Therefore, standing here, where the declaration was adopted, reading its businesslike sentences, we ought to ask ourselves what is there in it for us. There is nothing in it for us unless we can translate it into terms of our own condition and of our own lives. We must reduce it to what the lawyers call a bill of particulars. It contains a bill of particulars—the bill of particulars of 1776—and if we are to revitalize it we are to fill it with a bill of particulars of 1914. . . . Patriotism consists of some practical things—practical in that they belong to every day life; in that they belong to no extraordinary distinction, but to those things which are associated with our every day, commonplace duty. . . . I have had some experiences in the last fourteen months which have not been refreshing. It was universally admitted that the banking system of this country needed reorganization. We set the best minds we could find to the task of discovering the best methods of reorganization. We met with hardly anything but criticism from the bankers of this country, or at least from the majority of

those who said anything. And yet, just as soon as that act was passed, on the next day, there was an universal chorus of applause from the bankers of the United States. Now, if it was wrong the day before it was passed, why was it right the day after it was passed? Where had been the candor of criticism by the concert of counsel which makes a great nation successful? It is not patriotic to concert measures against one another; it is patriotic to concert measures for one another.

One of the most serious questions for sober-minded men to address themselves to in these United States is what are we going to do with the influence and power of this great nation? Are we going to play the old role of using that power for our own aggrandizement and material benefit? You know what that means. That means we shall use it to make the people of other nations suffer in the way in which we said it was intolerable to suffer when we uttered the Declaration of Independence.

The department of state of the United States is constantly called upon to back up commercial enterprises and the industrial enterprises of the United States in foreign countries; and it at one time went so far in that direction that all its diplomacy was designated as "dollar diplomacy." It was for supporting every man who wanted to earn anything anywhere if he was an American.

But there is a limit to that which has been laid upon us more than any other nation in the world. We set up this nation and we propose to set it up on the rights of man. We did not name any differences between one race and another; we did not set up any barriers against any particular race or people, but opened our gates to the world and said all men who wish to be free come to us and they will be welcome.

We said this independence is not merely for us—a selfish thing for our own private use—but for everybody to whom we can find the means of extending it.

Now, we cannot, with that oath taken in our youth; we cannot, with that great idea set before us when we were a young people, and practically only a scant 3,000,000 people, take upon ourselves, now that we are 100,000,000, any other conception of duty than what we entertained at that time. So if American enterprise in foreign countries, particularly in those foreign countries which are not strong enough to resist us, takes the shape of imposing upon and exploiting the mass of the people in that country, it ought to be put to a stop, not encouraged.

I am willing to get anything for an American that money can buy, except the rights of other men. I will not help any man buy a power he should not exercise over his fellow being. . . . You hear a great deal stated about the property loss in Mexico and I deplore it with all my heart. Upon the conclusion of the present disturbed condition in Mexico, undoubtedly those who have lost properties ought to be compensated. Man's individual rights have met with many deplorable circumstances, but back of it all is the struggle of the people, and while we think of the one in the foreground, let us not forget the other in the background.

Every patriotic American is a man who is not

niggardly and selfish in the things he needs that make for human liberty and the rights of man, but wants to share it with the whole world. And he is never so proud of the great flag as when it means for other people as well as for himself the symbol of liberty and freedom.

I would be ashamed of this flag if it ever did anything outside of America that we would not permit it to do inside of America. We stand for the mass of the men, women, and children who make up the vitality of every nation. . . .

It is patriotic sometimes to regard the honor of this country in preference to its material interests. Would you rather be despised by all nations of the world as incapable of keeping your treaty obligations, or would you rather have free tolls for American ships? The treaty may have been a mistake, but its meaning was unmistakable.

When I have made a promise to a man I try to keep it. The most honorable and distinguished nation in the world is the nation that can keep its promises to its own hurt. I want to say, parenthetically, that I don't think anybody was hurt. I am not enthusiastic for subsidies to a monopoly and nobody can get me enthusiastic on that subject. But assuming that was a matter of enthusiasm, I am much more enthusiastic for keeping the integrity of the United States absolutely unquestioned and unswayed.

Popularity is not always successful patriotism. The most patriotic man is sometimes the man who goes in the direction in which he thinks he is right, whether or not he thinks anybody agrees with him, because it is patriotic to sacrifice yourself if you think you are right. Do not blame anybody else if they do not agree with you. That is not the point. Do not die with bitterness in your heart because you do not convince anybody. But die happy because you believe you tried to serve your country without selling your soul. . . . And my dream is this, that, as the years go on and the world knows more and more of America it will turn to America for those moral inspirations that lie at the base of human freedom, that it will never fear America unless it finds itself engaged in some enterprise inconsistent with the rights of humanity; that America will come to that day when all shall know she puts human rights above all other rights and that her flag is the flag not only of America but the flag of humanity.



President Wilson and Woman Suffrage.

A delegation of 446 women called on President Wilson on June 30 to present the resolutions favoring woman suffrage adopted by the Federation of Women's Clubs, and to urge his support of the pending Bristow-Mondell woman suffrage amendment. In reply the President again referred to the failure of the Baltimore convention to embody endorsement of suffrage in the platform. His personal opinion, he said, is that it is a matter that belongs to the states for settlement, not the nation. Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr then asked, "Is it not a fact that we have very good precedents for altering the electorate by the Con-

stitution of the United States?" To which the President answered, "I do not think that has anything to do with my convictions as to the best way it can be done." Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley of the District of Columbia Federation referred to the fact that the pending amendment would have to be referred to the states. To which the President answered by pointing out that three-fourths of the states could then force the measure on an objecting one-fourth. On this point Mrs. Dorr wished to know if the agreement when the Constitution was made did not imply submission on the part of the one-fourth? Answering that he could not say what was agreed upon and declaring the cross-examination improper, the President closed the meeting. [See current volume, page 586.]

On July 3 Dr. Anna H. Shaw, president of the National American Woman's Suffrage Association, wrote to President Wilson disavowing in behalf of the association all responsibility for this attempt to enlist his aid, and saying further that her association had accepted as final his statement made at the previous meeting with him. [See current volume, page 464.]

Washington Doings.

To definitely ascertain the condition of business throughout the country Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo on June 29 sent the following list of questions to all national banks:

1. Does your bank expect to have any unusual demand for money or credit within the next six months? If so, for what purpose or purposes?
2. To what extent, in your judgment, will funds be needed in your immediate section in addition to what local banks may be able to supply conveniently and normally, from their own sources or through the usual accommodations from correspondents?
3. During what months between now and January 1, 1915, will additional funds, if any, be most needed?
4. If, in your opinion, it is desirable to deposit public funds, as was done last year, in the national banks in certain principal cities of the different states, please indicate when and to what extent you think it may be desirable to place such funds in the national banks in the principal cities in your state, upon the assumption that the banks in such principal cities will use such funds, as far as practicable, for the accommodation of their country bank correspondents.
5. If such deposits should be made this season please state when you think the deposits placed in your community could be returned conveniently to the treasury, indicating the proportion of the deposits to be returned each month, so that the last repayments may be made not later than March 1, 1915.
6. What security—commercial paper, United

States or other bonds—can, with the greatest advantage to general business, and with safety to the government, be given by the banks in your section to secure such government deposits?

While it is expected that the federal reserve banks will begin business in time to assist in moving the crops this fall, the treasury department nevertheless will be prepared to help business to the full extent of its powers through the proper use of government funds if it becomes apparent at any time that such help is needed in any section of the country.

The Democratic Senate caucus on July 1 decided against adjournment until the pending anti-trust measures have been disposed of.

The Senate on July 6 confirmed the nomination of Charles S. Hamlin of Massachusetts, W. P. G. Harding of Alabama and A. C. Miller of San Francisco to the federal reserve board. The nominations of Thos. D. Jones of Illinois and of Paul Warburg of New York are still held up. Mr. Jones was subjected to a long cross-examination by the Committee on Banking and Currency regarding his relations with the International Harvester Co., and the New Jersey Zinc Co. He declared that he fully approved of all acts of the Harvester Co., since he became a director. Mr. Warburg was reported on July 6 to have requested the President to withdraw his name. [See current volume, page 586.]

Senators Overman and Chilton testified on July 2, before the committee investigating the use of Senate stationery for promotion of a gold mining company. Senator Overman declared that unknown to him his stenographer had written letters commending the project on the stationery. The stenographer corroborated him, and a messenger told of giving some of the stationery to a promoter who had employed the Senator's son-in-law as attorney. Senator Chilton denied all knowledge concerning the matter. Both Senators said that they own stock in the company. [See current volume, page 609.]

Roosevelt Discusses Public Questions.

Speaking at Pittsburgh on June 30 at a meeting of the Washington party—as the Progressive party is called in Pennsylvania—ex-President Roosevelt condemned the policies of the Wilson administration, and severely denounced Senator Penrose. He spoke in part as follows:

The present national administration is pursuing a course that prevents the existence of prosperity and that does not offer a single serious or intelligible plan for passing prosperity round, should prosperity in spite of the administration's efforts at some future

time return to our people. This is true both as regards the trust question and the tariff question. As regards both the only wise course to follow is that set forth in the National Progressive platform. The nation should deal with both by continuing executive action through administrative commissions of ample power. One commission should shape our tariff policies so as, with thorough knowledge disinterestedly acquired, to give proper encouragement to our merchants, while also giving proper protection to our wageworkers, our farmers and our business men. The other commission should exercise strict supervision and control over big business. We should treat it with entire justice, drawing the line not on size, but on misconduct. As regards the tariff, I wish especially to call your attention to the promises made by President Wilson, and his supporters two years ago. They asserted that their method of tariff reduction would reduce the cost of living and would thus solve the trust question, because, as they said, the trusts were the creatures of the tariff. We then answered that their promises were empty words.

The Progressive party stands for protection as regards business man, farmer and wageworker alike. It is against all favoritism to special interests. It believes that the tariff is a matter not of politics, but of sound public policy, and that it should be handled in a business way. The schedules should be determined by a knowledge of facts, not by trading votes and log-rolling. It should be the result of the careful deliberation of a body of trained men, chosen not for their political beliefs, but for their expert knowledge of business conditions.

We Progressives advocate the immediate creation of a nonpartisan commission, with power to propose revision of the tariff rates, schedule by schedule, treating each case on an intelligent consideration of its merits, divorced from favoritism and the fostering of special interests.

The Progressive tariff program would not be attained by the reckless haste, the improper influences, the sectional party policies which characterize our present methods of tariff legislation by the general law; and remember, that exactly the same methods were pursued in making the present tariff law as in making the Payne-Aldrich law, which it superseded. . . . Let us turn now to the Progressive anti-trust program. . . . Our program is based on the fundamental proposition that the state should regard private monopolistic power as contrary to public welfare, but that it should never attack a particular business organization merely because of its size. In many lines of industry the unit of social and economic efficiency in our time is a large unit. . . . We wish to put a stop to the misdeeds of business men who do wrong. We wish also to put a stop to the harrasing and persecution of honest business men who do right.

In the main monopoly springs from two causes—either the ability and the will to engage in unfair or oppressive trade practices or the control of some factor necessary to the successful conduct of the industry involved. . . . The evil to which public attention should be directed is not efficiency, but the control of the market gained by unfair trade practices or by taking undue advantage of the exclusive control of a factor essential to successful produc-

tion. . . . We cannot control our great national businesses without power, national power. But the Democrats dare not use power themselves nor let any one else have it. Their trust program, as it stands today, is made futile by this fear. Their official administration bills propose a weak federal trade commission, with no power except to investigate and report. . . . They hold that two farmers selling milk across a state line cannot co-operate, and that two men doing any business across a state line cannot form a partnership or a corporation. They insist that there must be no big business power, concentrated power, or large enterprises anywhere, and that our business must go back to the period of not merely 1850, but 1650; to the cobbler's bench, the grist mill and the blacksmith's forge. This is economic absurdity. We live in the twentieth century, not the seventeenth. . . . Unlimited competition has proved one of the greatest curses of modern civilization. It was unlimited competition which created the great trusts, exactly as it created the sweatshop and is chiefly responsible for child labor. The New Freedom is merely the exceedingly old freedom which permits each man to cut his neighbor's throat.

The Progressives are of the Twentieth century. They face the facts of today. They are not afraid of power, either in business or in government. . . . By long and disappointing experience we have had several cardinal facts hammered into us.

1. We cannot and do not want to destroy all corporations; we must have large units to do our work.

2. We cannot make every man compete with every other man; we cannot go back to 1850, still less to 1650.

3. We cannot destroy monopoly by attacking all forms of concentration, whether monopolistic or not.

4. We cannot destroy real monopoly by attacking its legal form. We must find out and take away the real economic basis of monopoly, which is a very different thing.

5. We can get no effective results through the courts, with their slow and restricted procedure.

6. We must encourage honest business and allow that business concentration which will give the power necessary to serve us. This policy of the encouragement of decent business is as important to the welfare of our people as is our other policy of effective warfare against corrupt and unfair business.

7. There must be co-operation among business men, among wageworkers and among farmers.

The Progressive party is the only party which recognizes these facts. . . . Any attempt such as the Clayton bill makes to destroy all combinations will also destroy this business machinery, which is not monopolistic, which is necessary to modern life, and which only needs to be regulated for the public good.

The only alternative is the Progressive plan, which is sane, effective and fair. We propose to provide a strong commission, getting prompt action by direct administrative process; with power in that commission to attack directly all unfair and oppressive forms of competition; power in that commission to take a case of monopoly, find out what is

the real business cornerstone of its monopoly, and then bring the full strength of the government directly against it. We propose to do away with all unfair practices by big business or little business.

We propose heartily to encourage honest business and to give full scope to efficiency, provided the efficiency is used for the benefit and not to the detriment of the people as a whole.



Concerning Senator Penrose, Colonel Roosevelt held him responsible, together with Barnes, Root and other Republican leaders, for the election of Wilson. "They stole from the rank and file of the Republican party," he said, "the right to govern themselves; to nominate their own candidates and promulgate their own platform. They took this action with the deliberate purpose of electing a Democratic President." In reply to this denunciation, Senator Penrose, in an interview, quoted a letter of congratulation he had received from Roosevelt on the occasion of the great majority rolled up in Pennsylvania in 1904. The Senator stated further that during Roosevelt's whole administration their relations were cordial.



In a statement given to the press on July 2, Colonel Roosevelt denounced the treaty with Colombia. He declared the payment of \$25,000,000 to be "a naked payment of belated blackmail." He characterized the transaction as "discreditable," and further said that "it will forfeit the right to the respect of the people of the United States." "There is small wonder," he said, "that many hundreds of Americans in Mexico have been endeavoring to become British, German or French subjects in order to get some protection from some government." [See current volume, page 609.]



This statement by Colonel Roosevelt followed one made on the preceding day by James T. Du Bois of Hallstead, Pennsylvania, who had been minister to Colombia during Taft's administration. In this statement Mr. Du Bois endorsed the pending treaty. "The public men of Colombia," he said, "compare favorably with those of other countries and are neither blackmailers nor bandits." Concerning the Panama revolution, Mr. Du Bois said:

A handful of men, who were to be the direct beneficiaries of the revolution, conceived it and not the hundredth part of the inhabitants of the isthmus knew of the revolt until an American officer, in the uniform of the United States army, raised the flag of the new republic.

Mr. Du Bois declared that negotiations under the Taft administration failed because of excessive

care to avoid impugning the motives of ex-President Roosevelt. He further said:

While negotiating for a treaty I made the Colombian authorities understand that under no circumstances would the United States apologize to any nation for a political act—that was our unwritten law that never had been and never would be broken. I suggested that a chivalrous expression of regret that our friendship had in any way been marred might later be embodied in the treaty as a balm for the wounded feelings of a once friendly nation which had been humiliated before the world, whose credit had been destroyed in foreign countries, whose borrowing ability had been annihilated, and whose persistent appeals for arbitration had been ignored.



That Colonel Roosevelt will be able to resume public speaking in six weeks was the assurance given on July 1 by his physician, Dr. H. Holbrook Curtis, a throat specialist. [See current volume, page 635.]



Commission on Industrial Relations.

The Federal Industrial Commission heard on June 27 at Philadelphia the testimony of James H. Maurer, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor and a Socialist member of the legislature. Mr. Maurer declared that union men were justified in arming themselves under such conditions as prevail in Colorado, Michigan and West Virginia. When asked about the McNamaras he disclaimed sympathy with them but said that they "were victims of your own system of individualism. If their pleas were true, and I believe they were, they tried to protect their class by employing the methods of this idiotic age." As an immediate relief measure Mr. Maurer suggested the minimum wage. [See current volume, page 636.]



The action of the Senate Appropriation Committee on July 6, in cutting down the appropriation for the Industrial Relations Commission from \$200,000 to \$50,000 will, if not corrected, cripple the work of the commission. The explanation offered for the action is that the commission offended in letting facts become known regarding the prevalence of unemployment.



Social Questions Before the Rabbis' Conference.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis at Detroit on July 6, tabled a resolution of sympathy for Joseph Fels, also one declaring against prohibition, and others declaring for the minimum wage, industrial insurance, old age pensions, prohibition of child labor, right of labor to organize and similar measures. Rabbis Alfred G. Moses of Mobile and Max Heller of New Orleans advocated the Fels resolution. "Here is a man whose name

throws luster on the Jewish race," said Rabbi Moses. "Are we to disclaim him because we feel that he was not entirely in sympathy with certain forms and ceremonies? It is to our best interests to claim him as our own." The conference was rebuked at a later session by Rabbi Stephen Wise of New York, especially for its attitude toward the palliative measures. Dr. Wise said: "What you want us to do is to cater to the wealthy employers of labor who so largely support the synagogue. You are afraid of what the rich may say if we take a stand for social and economic justice. You quote the scripture that 'Justice, justice, shalt thou pursue,' but you are afraid to practice what you preach."



The Labor War.

The sentence of Bouck White to six months at Blackwell's Island was affirmed on June 22 by Judge Malone, in the General Sessions Court. Mayor Mitchell was reported to have announced that he would not interfere by granting a pardon. [See current volume, page 492.]



In one branch of the Westinghouse Company at Pittsburgh, the switch and signal department, the demands of the strikers were granted after a conference on June 23, with the exception of the eight-hour day which both sides agreed to submit to arbitration. The men decided to return to work in this department. In other departments the strike still remains unsettled.



An incident of the internecine fight in the miners' union at Butte was a murderous assault on Mayor Duncan on July 3. The Mayor was compelled to kill his assailant in self defense.



Investigation proceeds in Chicago of blackmailing tactics by some business agents of the unions. The investigation has not yet resulted in any indictments, or in any libel charge against the newspapers which have published names of certain agents and plainly charged them with blackmail.



Bomb Explosion in New York.

The explosion of a bomb in a tenement house at 1626 Lexington Avenue, New York City, on July 4 killed Arthur Caron, Carl Hanson, Charles Berg and Marie Chavez, all said to be members of the I. W. W. No satisfactory evidence has yet been produced as to who is responsible for either the bomb or the explosion. A theory reported by the press that the bomb had been made by the victims and was intended to be carried by them twenty miles to Tarrytown to be used against the Rocke-

ellers remains so far a theory unsupported by evidence.



Reactionaries Defeated in Pueblo.

The proposition submitted by the public service corporations and other reactionary elements of Pueblo, Colorado, to abandon the commission form of government and revert to the old mayor and council system, was defeated at the election on June 30. The vote was 5219 to 1689. Had the proposition carried the act of last November providing local singletax would have been automatically repealed, as would all other policies which can under the law be undertaken only by commission-governed cities. [See current volume, page 591.]



Illinois Senatorial Situation.

Raymond Robins of Chicago announced on July 3 that he will be a candidate for the Progressive party nomination for United States Senator from Illinois. An unauthorized statement regarding John Z. White has appeared in papers throughout the State, saying that he has withdrawn from the Democratic race in favor of Congressman Stringer. Mr. White has denied the report and declares his position is still the same as when first announced.



Chicago School Board Changes.

Mayor Harrison named six members of the Board on the 29th to fill the places of members retiring July 17. Three of the appointees, Harry A. Lipsky, Jacob W. Loeb and Mrs. John MacMahon, succeed themselves. Joseph A. Holpuch, John W. Eckhart and Mrs. William E. Gallagher are new members. A strong effort was made by members of the women's clubs to secure the appointment of Mrs. George Bass, former president of the Chicago Woman's Club, and chairman on public affairs, in place of the seventh retiring member, Charles O. Sethness. But the Mayor on the 2d appointed Mrs. Charles O. Sethness to succeed her husband. Mr. Sethness opposed Mrs. Young's policies; Mrs. Sethness is in favor of them. [See current volume, page 468.]



Protest Against Segregation.

A mass meeting of colored people was held in Louisville on July 5 to protest against a segregation ordinance recently passed in the city. The principal address was by Dr. J. E. Springarn of New York, chairman of the Board of Directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Dr. Springarn, in arguing against the logic of the claims that the ordinance does not discriminate because it forbids the mov-

ing of white families into black neighborhoods, said:

Imagine the justice of a law which denied the right of poor men to borrow from rich men, and then, to make the matter wholly equitable, denied the right of rich men to borrow from poor ones! We white men hold all the coigns of vantage, and this legislation is merely an effort to prevent others from ever disputing our rights to hold them. The result of such an arrangement can be only one—to develop a permanently inferior civilization in our midst, which must serve forever as a corrupting force in the movement of the larger civilization of which it must continue to remain a part.



Mexico and the United States.

Ambassador Da Gama of Brazil, in formally commenting on the understanding arrived at between the United States and the Huerta regime, declared the purpose of President Wilson had been accomplished, of aiding "the contending parties in Mexico to reach an agreement among themselves, thus obtaining a Mexican solution of the Mexican question." And he expressed the opinion that in doing so there had been "created a more favorable atmosphere in international politics in America." [See current volume, page 634.]



The three mediators and the American delegates left Niagara Falls on the 2d, and the Huerta delegates left on the 3rd. The next step in carrying out the terms of the protocol is to set up a provisional government by agreement between the Huertistas and Constitutionalists. General Carranza, who asked for more time in which to discuss the matter with his supporters, is still asking for more definite statements as to what will be the scope of the new conference.



Charges and counter-charges have been made regarding American interests that are alleged to be supporting the Constitutionalists. General Carranza says, in denial of the charge: "I have received no pecuniary assistance from foreign governments or citizens, and from the beginning of the present revolution it has been solely sustained by national funds and will be until the end."



Friction between General Carranza and General Villa led to the appointment of a joint commission to adjust the situation created by General Carranza's refusal to supply the coal and ammunition needed by General Villa to continue his campaign to Mexico City. The agreement so far as announced states that General Carranza is to be recognized as the supreme head of the revolution, with General Villa second in command, with

full charge of the campaign at San Louis Potosi and the south.



The special election held on the 5th resulted in the choice of General Huerta for president and Aureliano Blanquet for vice-president. Only three per cent of the vote was cast, and that was mainly confined to Mexico City. As Huerta and Blanquet were already in power the election makes no change either locally or internationally.



An Unconventional Diplomat.

The unrestrained indignation of George Fred Williams, American Minister to Greece and Montenegro, due to the deplorable conditions in Albania, has again drawn attention to that unhappy country. Mr. Williams was so wrought up over what he found in Albania, that he disregarded all diplomatic forms, and issued a statement to the world. And to save his government from embarrassment, and to be free to devote himself to ameliorating the conditions of the oppressed people, he resigned his post. [See current volume, page 639.]



Regarding conditions at Durazzo consequent upon the incompetency of William of Weid, who was appointed by the Great Powers to rule Albania, Mr. Williams says:

I found a state of anarchy and that the sovereignty of Albania remains where it belongs—in the people of the country. I found a prince calling himself a king with no powers, no territory and no subjects, except his wife and children.

It was at this point that I determined to take upon myself the responsibility for this statement, which the United States Government cannot and will not indorse. I doubt not that my government will be as much shocked by it as will be all diplomatic authorities.

I am impelled to this statement by two considerations: first, that the people of an inoffensive nation are being murdered in cold blood; and second, that the so-called Government of Albania is merely a state of anarchy. The Government has shown skill and success in one respect only. It has been able to prevail upon the various religious and racial forces of Albania to set upon each other with murderous purpose. Hundreds of Albanian lives have thus been sacrificed at the hands of Albanians.

Any Christian Prince assigned to govern Albania, who had a breath of Christ's spirit would have first announced a purpose to bring all races and religions into accord and cause old animosities to be buried.

Instead of this the Prince of Wied, has started a religious war throughout Albania.

I could not await the acceptance of my resignation by my government to denounce these cruel and inhuman policies practiced upon a people which has committed no offense and is the victim of an international conspiracy against its liberty.

I will not conceal the fact that I have taken mea-

tures which promise to unite the people of Albania under Cantonal forms in opposition to such inhuman scheme and I take full responsibility for my acts, the details of which I trust will later appear. I hope to be instrumental in saving one whole section of the country from destruction. I have arrived at the definite conclusion that the people of Albania are capable of self government.



Austrian Mob Outbreak.

The assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand on the 28th, by the Servian student Prinzip, led to anti-Servian demonstrations and riots in various parts of the empire. Two hundred persons were killed at Mostar, the capital of Herzegovina, on the 1st, during fierce riots between Croats and Serbs. Disturbances occurred also at Sarajevo, the scene of the assassination, and at Vienna. Martial law has been declared in several cities and towns, and public feeling is intense. [See current volume, page 638.]



English Affairs.

During the debate on Home Rule in the House of Lords, both on the Home Rule bill itself, and on the Amending bill as well, there is perceptible a growing anxiety on the part of the Unionists and Tories to reach a peaceful settlement. Not only do the leaders shrink from the horrors of civil war, but they are conscious of having made a tactical mistake that leaves them in a false position politically. The coddling of Ulster has merely resulted in tying their own hands in other matters, and in furnishing glaring precedents for the future use of the Nationalists, Liberals and Laborites. Ulstermen who boasted that their gun-running exploits had given them the upper hand over the Nationalists are bitterly complaining of the laxness of the government in permitting gun-running by their opponents. But the leaders of the Unionists, conscious of their defeat, show by their handling of the bills before the Lords that it is now a question of the best terms possible. Instead, therefore, of throwing out the Amending bill, as the extremists counseled, the bill was passed on second reading on the 6th by a vote of 273 to 10. This brings the bill to the amendment stage; and immediately upon its passage amendments were presented to exclude the whole of Ulster from the operation of the Home Rule bill. [See current volume, page 638.]



The debate and vote on the Amending bill was significant of the change that has been taking place in the Unionist ranks. Notwithstanding such speeches as that of Lord Roberts, in which he repeated his warnings that the army would not support such a measure, and the declaration of Lord Milner that "the coercion of Ulster is a hor-

rible idea," and "the British empire will not for long survive such a shock," only ten votes could be mustered to reject the bill. The Marquis of Crewe, the government leader in the House of Lords, said the cabinet would give careful consideration to the amendments offered by the Unionists; but he warned them that if the surrender of the government's policy was the alternative of accepting the amendments as offered, they would be rejected.

NEWS NOTES

—The Blue Sky Law of Iowa was on July 6 declared unconstitutional by the federal circuit court.

—The prohibitory law adopted by West Virginia in 1912 went into effect on June 30. It closes 1,200 saloons.

—The reported casualties on July 4, show a great decrease over previous years. The entire number throughout the country reported killed from accident is 14 and of injuries is 382.

—Laurie J. Quinby, of Omaha, one of the most prominent of Nebraska's fundamental Democrats, and well known as a Singletax advocate, will be a candidate at the Democratic primary on August 18 for State Senator.

—The Prohibition party of Massachusetts in state convention at Worcester on June 30 declared for gradual adoption of the Singletax, for public ownership of public utilities, and for the initiative, referendum and recall.

—The Massachusetts House of Representatives on June 24 defeated the proposed constitutional amendment for the initiative and referendum. The vote was 141 in favor to 85 against, but required a two-thirds vote to pass. Democrats, with one exception, and Progressives voted solidly in favor.

—The Dutch government issued invitations on the 2nd to the nations participating in the second Hague peace conference to appoint delegates to a committee to formulate a definite program for the third conference. The committee is to assemble at The Hague, June 1, 1915. [See vol. xvi., p. 615, 827.]

—Immigration into the United States for the year ending June 30, exceeded by 200,000 the immigration of the previous year. The total, according to Commissioner of Immigration Caminetti, was 1,300,000. 270,000 were Italians, 140,000 were Russians, and 130,000 were Poles. There were 10,000 Japanese.

—What is termed in press dispatches as a "fairly orderly" election for members of the national assembly took place in Panama on the 5th. The contest was between two factions of the Liberal party, in which the opposition, under the leadership of ex-President Carlos Mendoza, gained a decisive victory over the faction in power.

—St. Louis adopted a new charter on June 30 by a vote of 46,839 to 44,158. A similar proposition was defeated three years ago by about 30,000. The charter centralizes power in the mayor and substitutes a single chambered council of 28 members for the present bicameral body. It provides for the initiative, referendum and recall. It furthermore requires

cost of street improvements to be assessed against abutting property.

—Municipal journals are published by the following cities: Atlantic City, Boston, Burlington, Cedar Rapids (Ia.), Centralia, Chehalis, Chicago, Decatur (Ill.), Guthrie (Okla.), Hoquiam, Jackson (Miss.), Colorado Springs, Memphis, Missoula, New York City, North Yakima, Ogden, Oklahoma City, Omaha, San Francisco, Sioux City, Spokane (health leaf), Tacoma, Walla Walla.

PRESS OPINIONS

Needs Deliverance from His Friends.

Wilson Gardner in Cincinnati Post, June 27.—Of course, anybody who knows Col. Roosevelt knew he would stand by his friend, George W. Perkins. Standing by his bad friends is T. R.'s long suit. He has been doing that for years. All the worst political consequences he has ever suffered have come from standing by his unwisely selected friends—or friends who have selected him. There, for instance, was the Hon. Leslie M. Shaw, whom T. R. selected as Secretary of the Treasury, resurrecting him from a political graveyard in Iowa. Shaw went out of office writing a book to discredit the man who put him into his Cabinet. But, of course, T. R. never did anything but stand by his friend Shaw. He stood by Mellen, who was trying to work him on the New Haven, as he subsequently admitted under oath in the recent investigation. He stood by Harriman, who, like other kings of high finance, tried to work a political pull for his selfish financial ends. He stood by Root, who later managed the rigged convention in Chicago. He stood by Taft and made him President. He stood by Paul Morton, whom he selected to assist in wiping out railroad rebates, though Morton was discovered to have been the greatest of all rebate takers. He stood by Gary and the Morgan crowd after they had loaded the responsibility on Roosevelt for the merger of the Tennessee Coal & Iron with the rest of the steel trust properties. He stood by Lodge—his friend "Cabot"—who had lived four years under the political sheltering wing of the Taft administration, but who was willing to have T. R. come up and campaign for him after his return from Africa. Of course he would stand by George Perkins. He would stand by him if it were demonstrated by all the theorems in the books of logic that Perkins alone was responsible for the oppressive labor system as it exists in the steel trust and all other trusts in existence. Perkins has been his friend, and T. R. stands by his friends—particularly his rotten friends.



Value of Forest Conservation.

Milwaukee Journal, June 30.—Forestry is a practical science. It is a profitable undertaking. For instance, a public forest near Zurich, Switzerland, . . . has for years yielded a net annual profit of \$12 per acre. State forests in Germany give net profits as high as \$11 per acre every year.

Wisconsin has been paying an average of less than \$3.50 an acre for the lands which have been

acquired for forestry purposes. Upon this land, now that it is protected against fire, pine trees in countless numbers are growing naturally, but to insure the utmost use pine seedlings are being planted. It will, of course, take years for the seedlings of today to become trees of marketable size, but there will be a steadily increasing income from this source. State forestry is an investment whose profits, to judge from the experience of other countries, are certain to exceed greatly the cost of the land and any loss on account of taxes, and in addition, it will furnish raw material for the State's wood-using industries, which already import more than half of the lumber that they require.



Democracy and Art.

Dr. Frank Crane in New York Globe, June 8.—We are in the mewling and creeping infancy of art. Almost all of our art products are ludicrous, because we have no conception of the value of beauty to life. As a people we do not want beautiful things. What we want is to get more things to eat, to wear, and to display. So our cities are ugly, our houses are depressing, our furniture is vulgar, and our clothes are wholly without taste. This age is probably the ugliest in history. The reason of this is that art is under the baneful patronage of wealth. The so-called art treasures of New York, Chicago or Boston are in museums, or in the houses of the rich. These cities are themselves hideous, without artistic unity. There can be no real art until the people want it, until the whole community feels the hunger for the beautiful. A democracy that wants to be rich can never be artistic. A democracy that has such a system of wealth distribution that its common profits go to a few successful persons, to whom beauty means luxury, will remain forever ugly. We shall have real art only when the homes of the poor are built with as much taste as those of the rich; when the business street of a town is planned with a view to picturesqueness and charm even as a millionaire's suburban residence; when we want to work under conditions of beauty, as well as to house our families in charming environment; when we will not tolerate a South Clark street in Chicago nor an East Side human rabbit warren in New York; when each city shall have a unified plan and allow the erection of no building that is not harmonious; when we realize that beautiful things cannot be owned, but are in the nature of the case public; when we realize that ugly office buildings, streets and houses make ugly souls; when we resolve that every inch of the city shall be beautiful; when cheap houses, furniture and pictures are made as beautiful in their way as the expensive, and money ceases to mean beauty; when art becomes democratic for all, when the people learn good taste, when the multitudes shall demand beauty, and when public opinion shall ridicule and banish ugliness everywhere; when we shall cease stuffing museums with art objects, and shall apply the money to making our whole environment beautiful; and when art is no more to be the fad of the few, and the people really care. So long as art is a time-server of plutocracy it must remain sterile and vulgar. The new Renaissance will come when art is set free from

subserviency, and begins to build the city, decorate the streets, adorn the public buildings, and beautify the homes of the people.



"Law and Order" Versus Justice.

Everyman (Los Angeles), April-May.—Unless a powerful wave of public opinion reaches San Antonio and subdues the ferocity of its property-mad citizens, at least Cline and Rangel, and perhaps half a dozen others, will be hanged on Texas gibbets. . . . They are being tried for "conspiracy to murder" on a pretext so flimsy that even a San Diego mob of business-men-vigilantes would blush to stand for it. . . . This is their "crime": Last September they set out to cross the line and join their brothers in Mexico fighting to regain their homes from American exploiters. Having violated no federal or Texas statute they could not "legally" be estopped, but secretly they were dogged by the sheriff's men (?), who suddenly opened fire on them from ambush, killing one of them, Silvestre Lomas, by a bullet in the back of the head—and all this without notice, with no demand for surrender in "the name of the law" and without "authority" of legal process. The Rangel and Cline party showed fight, turned on the "officers of the law!"—crime of all crimes!! Could they have done otherwise without insult to the women who bore them? And they captured two of the "officers of the law"—Eugene Buck, sheriff of Dimmit county, and his deputy, Candelario Ortiz. The others fled. Being men, instead of "officers of the law," they didn't handcuff their prisoners, or tie them, but placed them under guard and proceeded toward the Mexican border. Ortiz loitered behind, until seeing a possible chance to escape he tried to seize the gun of his guard, Jose Guerra. A tussle ensued in which Ortiz was slain. Crime No. 2, an "officer of the law" killed. The march toward Mexico was continued until the following day when more "officers of the law" appeared to demand the surrender of Sheriff Buck. As he was neither useful nor ornamental to the rebel sympathizers they gladly released him upon the signing of a written agreement by Jesse J. Campbell, spokesman of the "law and order" party, that in return for the sheriff the party would be allowed to proceed to Mexico without further molestation of the "law." What the law cares for honor, decency, or its written promise was shown that night when a large party of "law and order" men crept upon the sleeping travelers and wakened them with a volley of lead. One of the "law and order" bullets mortally wounded Juan Rincon, Jr., and two other "law and order" bullets seriously wounded Jose Cisneros and Leonard Vasquez. The rest of the party were taken prisoners. Rincon lay on the sand gasping in death throes and begging water. "Law and Order" mocked him and marched off with its prisoners. Into the town of Carrizo Springs they were taken with chains on their hands and feet and bound to one another by heavy chains round their necks. Here "law and order" tried to lynch them, but the "officers of the law" managed to save them for a slower torture. Four have been "tried" and sentenced to long terms in prison, and the program of "the law" is that at

least Rangel and Cline, the leaders, shall be "tried" and hanged. Thus, we see, dear children, what a noble thing is law and order and how the law and the courts and their hired thugs should always be revered and meekly obeyed.



Sounds Like Singletax.

Appeal to Reason, June 20.—Under the system of private ownership of land in America more than half the people rent either the farm or the city property they use. Ownership therefore does not conduce to use, strange as that may sound. The reason is found in the fact that less than a fourth of the land of America is used, while less than half the people have a chance to use what is used, except on the basis of paying tribute to others for the privilege. In a majority of cases the farmer is holding out from use as much land as he is actually using. The ownership of land therefore does not give incentive for the use of it. Suppose, on the other hand, that the Socialist idea of land-holding prevailed. The land that was held by the whole people would all be used for the benefit of the whole people. The land that was privately held would all be used, for the reason that it would not pay a man to pay taxes on land he did not use and could never realize on either as an investment or in renting. That land which was abandoned because of its not paying to hold it idle would at once be available for use by others, either in private or public capacity. The result would be that then any man could have access to the land without having first to pay for it, and without having to rent it and pay tribute to another, before he was enabled to do so. Now that the frontier is closed, the only possible way of making land available for all is through the Socialist plan.



Modern Civilization.

Mildred Bain in The Conservator (Philadelphia), May.—The state is a cold-blooded murderer. It helps to create the criminal. It looks on indifferent while tenements and poverty and prostitution and industrial slavery turn out their millions of moral and physical deficients. But when one of these maimed creatures breaks a law its indifference vanishes like magic. It arrests him and throws him into jail. It has absolutely no mercy. It even believes him guilty before he is tried. It puts on a black cap and whines: "May God have mercy on your soul." God's shoulders are broad. Let him take the responsibility. . . . The state pretends it wants more children born. It pensions its mothers. It entreats its citizens not to allow the birth rate to fall. All the while it allows children to be stunted and dwarfed and killed in factories. It is righteously indignant with the unfortunate girl who brings a baby into the world without its legal say so. It undertakes to tell nature which kind of babies are all right and which kind are all wrong. It even goes so far as to hold the mother for murder when, terrified of its wrath, she has been forced to make way with her child. . . . Yes, "may God have mercy on our souls." For we don't know what it is to have mercy on each other's.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

OBSOLETE.

For The Public.

I know a cliff remote and high,
Whence terraces rise to the sky;
Whereon, all stark and turreted,
A hoary castle lifts its head.

The sky is low and leaden gray;
The castle casements look away,
Staring upon the bleak landscape;
The castle portal swings agape.

Ah, futile now the stone and moat!—
The north wind mocks with husky throat:
"Safe guarded from the outer world,
They found the Worm within them curled!"

RICHARD WARNER BORST.



PRIVILEGE AND MUNICIPAL REFORM.

Speech of Amos R. E. Pinchot at the Banquet of
National Singletax Conference at Washington
on January 17, 1914.

Mr. Toastmaster, when you began that story about the turtle I got very nervous; indeed, but you ended up all right. Now I will admit that I have been a turtle for a good long time. Recently I have begun to emerge from the cave and awake from my hibernating sleep and now I stand before you tonight practically purged of all I did.

I didn't expect to be here tonight and I plead to be demoted from the honorable list of speakers this evening and put down among the United States Senators and Members of Congress who, on account of their terrible reputation, are only allowed to speak five minutes. As a religion, I am not interested in the Singletax movement. It may be that God made the land for the people, but I am interested in the Singletax because I have grown to realize that the land privilege is one of the great privileges, if not the basic privilege, upon which the exploitation of the American people, both political and economic, depends. Now I have worked out with the help of friends a kind of vision of American democracy. I am interested in the Singletax because it pertains to this dream I have. I tried to find by analyzing as best I could what was the matter with us in the United States and what was the one common cause, if there is a common cause, both of political corruption and of economic exploitation. I think I have found that the one principle behind our trouble is the principle of private monopoly. If you look around you at all places where you have corrupt govern-

ment and inefficient government, where your legislatures are bought or wrong men are put in public office, you will find that this is done almost universally in order that one small group of monopolists can keep a monopoly or price fixing power. If you look around you in the economic world and find where groups of men are able to exploit the people, you will find that this almost always has been done by their gaining monopolistic or price fixing power. Now I believe the mission of American civilization is what the mission of all civilizations has been and that is to destroy the principle of private monopoly in our lives. I am not going to speak to you long. I am not going to analyze this, but I think we are all going to analyze it for ourselves. I think we are all going to be satisfied. We are going to make everybody in public life acknowledge that the battle in America is the battle of the people at large against a monopolistic group. With this vision of American life, with this theory of practical politics, the fight against privilege can go on in all states and in all cities but not under a single flag. Singletaxers can fight land monopoly. The man who believes in government ownership of railroads can work for that, the conservationist can fight the forces that are stealing from the people our great natural resources. Each group can feel bound in brotherhood, irrespective of party—bound together to love the principle which Lincoln named the one principle of civilization, the principle to prevent one man eating the bread of other men made.

I have been put on the program tonight—I don't know, Mr. Reedy, whether you were responsible for it or not—to speak about privilege and municipal reform. I suppose that subject was given me because in New York any real municipal reform along fundamental lines has had so insignificant a past and such a magnificent future. Now, I do not think I have time to go at length into our recent campaign. I did what I could with Ben Marsh, Mr. Leubuscher and other men in this room, to get my party, the Progressive Party, to adopt the Singletax principle in the progressive municipal platform. We sat up many nights discussing this question and we came to the conclusion, at least I did, and I think others did, too, that the best way to do that was to call for home rule in the question of taxation and finally we succeeded in actually working into this platform a provision for home rule in taxation. We talked it over with the mayor and he made statements which satisfied us and I think it is up to us to keep at Mitchel to make him remember that we are still there in New York just as we were before election day.

The problem of municipal reform in New York is a perfectly simple problem. Anybody can understand it and I believe before another municipal campaign comes around, every one will be obliged to understand it, whether he wants it or not. The

city of New York is not governed by Tammany Hall. That is a fundamental proposition. Tammany Hall is merely the executive arm of the real governing body and the New York City government today consists of three branches, the Edison Company, the Transportation System and the Gas monopoly. They have one thousand million dollars invested in the city of New York. It is absolutely necessary for them to control the government of New York and so long as this is necessary they will continue to hold that control. It may be broken, but with men of the character of Ryan, Belmont and Bradley, it will continue. Let Mr. Bradley and Mr. Belmont really desire and need something and associate to get it, they are exceedingly apt to get it. The only way we can succeed is to rid the city of New York of financial speculation in public utilities. We can drive Tammany out but it will always come back. So long as the successful interest returns upon that one thousand million dollars depends upon the control of New York, it seems almost right that they should have it and they will have it until we finally take away and publicly own these public utilities. This has a great deal to do with the Singletax, because I believe the most effective method of getting back into the hands of the people the things belong to them is along the lines of taxation.

Edmund Burke said "the battle between privilege and the people was always upon the field of taxation." It is still on the field of taxation and I understand that is the reason for this dinner tonight.



NEWS OF OUR TOWN.

(By Our Special Country Correspondent.)
For The Public.

Hail Columbiaville, June 26.—John Morgan, the Wall Run money lender, is complaining bitterly. He has a house worth \$5,000 he rented to Neighbor Jones. Needing some cash, he borrowed \$5,000 each from four widows and gave the house as security to each. When he raised Jones' rent from \$25 to \$125 a month to meet the interest, Jones kicked, which made John justly indignant, who says such men as Jones are ruining the securities market and threatening the investments of widows and orphans.



Vic Berger dropped into our office the other day. He favors turning the rascals out and creating a new government with jobs enough so there would be chances for 5,559 times as many. Vic says this would end all our troubles, and we don't know but what it would.



Town Chairman Wood Wilson is having a hard

time with the town board, which insists on fixing things so some of the boatmen can send their barges through the government south canal free. However, the board hasn't yet thought of having the government haul all the farmers' wagons to town free.



Vince Astor, our popular young society leader, is in an interesting argument. He owns an acre of land worth about ten cents, and the other morning he gets up and sees that five horses worth \$100 each had wandered onto it from Jim Smith's place. Vince, he says right away that the land is now worth \$500 an acre, since the law is that any value produced by other people's exertion that strays on the land belongs to the land owner. Smith wanted to argue it, but Vince told him he was one of them confiscators, so he shut up.



Some of our wealthy philanthropists who are busy reforming the morals of the lower classes had Bill Binks pinched for running a poker game. Binks told them that title to most property is decided by accident, such as time of birth, ancestry, etc.; also that the law expressly declares wealth may be legally taken away from its producers. Bill says that his poker game depends both on chance and taking wealth away from the producer, and so it must be a law abiding institution and a desirable adjunct to our civilization. His depraved ideas cost him \$25 in police court.

CRAIG RALSTON.



THE CRY OF THE DREAMER.

By John Boyle O'Reilly.

I am tired of the planning and tolling,
In the crowding hives of men;
Heart-weary of building and spoiling,
And spoiling and building again.
And I long for the dear old river
Where I dreamed my youth away—
For a dreamer lives forever
And a toiler dies in a day.

I am sick of the showy seeming
Of a life that is half a lie,
Of the faces lined with scheming
In the throng that hurries by.
No, no; from the streets' rude bustle,
From the trophies from mart and stage,
I would fly to the woods' low rustle
And the meadows' kindly page.

Let us dream as of yore by the river,
And be loved for the dream away—
For a dreamer lives forever,
While a thinker dies in a day.



If you are not master of yourself you are not yet free.—Leavenworth (Penitentiary) New Era.

BOOKS

PHILOSOPHY OF ROOSEVELT.

Progressive Principles. By Theodore Roosevelt. Selections from Addresses made during the Campaign of 1912. Edited by Elmer H. Youngman. Progressive National Service, 30 E. 42d St., N. Y. Price, \$1.00 net.

In these speeches and extracts many subjects of importance are discussed, including the initiative, the referendum, the recall, Presidential primaries, woman suffrage, trusts, the tariff, a living wage for men, a minimum wage for women and others. A sufficiently detailed consideration of these questions or of any one of them should not be expected within the limits of a campaign speech. It is enough if there is a statement of the principles by which the problems have been or may be solved, and of the solutions reached. The problems divide themselves into two classes; those which deal with the machinery of government and the increased control over it, which Col. Roosevelt urges the people to take; and those which deal with the use to be made of the machinery (including some proposed new machinery), in removing the evils incident to modern industry. To take a specific instance from the latter class, Col. Roosevelt proposes a tariff commission of non-partisan experts "to study scientifically all phases of tariff making and of tariff effects—to cover all the different and widely varying branches of American industry—to have ample powers to enable it to secure exact and reliable information."

"Wherever, nowadays, an industry is to be protected, it should be on the theory that such protection will serve to keep up the wages and the standard of living of the wage-worker in that industry, with full regard for the interest of the consumer. To accomplish this the tariff to be levied should, as nearly as is scientifically possible, approximate the differential between the cost of production at home and abroad."

The proposed industrial commission for the regulation of business in lines in which competitive conditions cannot be restored will have a similar task to the extent that it will have to determine, among other things, costs of production.

This suggests a line of investigation which the inquiring citizen will do well to follow. He will, perhaps, look at the tariff law and get an idea how many articles there are the costs of production of which will have to be ascertained. He may also look into one of the actual attempts to ascertain costs of production; say the Report of the Commissioner of Corporations (Roosevelt administration) on the costs of production of the Steel Corporation. He may conclude that the Commissioner after an earnest effort to find out what he

could, accomplished but a small portion of the task and left much to be done by future explorers. He may regret that there is not some simpler solution of the tariff question and may even be led to consider some that have been offered—say, for instance, the abolition of the tariff. But if this proposition attracts him he will do well to keep an open mind. Can we be sure that a reduction or even the abolition of the tariff on a given article will reduce the price to the consumer? We may suppose that it will if conditions are competitive. But this raises the question of monopoly, and Col. Roosevelt tells us that "we must not forget that monopoly is based on the control of natural resources and natural advantages." He bases on this a plea for conservation, but that is manifestly but a partial solution of that problem.

These speeches and extracts are suggestive, and they have not lost any of their importance. The Progressive movement of 1912 represented in the main a justifiable discontent with present conditions and whatever may be the fate of the Progressive party the movement, in one shape or another, will remain a force to be reckoned with until there is a radical improvement in conditions.

WM. E. MCKENNA.



EFFICIENCY IN GOVERNMENT.

Principles of Prussian Administration. By Herman Gerlach James, J. D., Ph. D. Published by The Macmillan Co., New York. Price, \$1.50 net.

While this book may possibly be of much value to the student specializing in sociology, yet the average lay reader who has enjoyed the brilliant style of such modern philosophical writers as Prof. Wm. James will no doubt find the present work decidedly heavy. Nevertheless in this day of political dissatisfaction in America, when nearly every community is either voting on a new constitution or a revised charter, or is striving for that opportunity, it would be well if a knowledge of the principles of Prussian administrative methods were more clearly understood. Nowhere in the world has administrative efficiency been so highly developed, a situation which partially accounts for the contentment of a people essentially as democratic and certainly as cultured as are we, though possessed of but a fraction of the political independence existing in either this country or England. The owners of this, our land, might well profit by this example, and after close study of this book of Prof. James, they might decide, in interlocked directory assembled, that they could best stem the rising tide of popular discontent, by seeing to it that their bosses and office-holders henceforth afford the people the sort of satisfactory local governments with which the people of Prussia are blessed.

JOSEPH DANZIGER.

Observing an unfamiliar shrub by a country roadside a student of botany stopped to make an examination.

"Are you acquainted with this flower, young man?" he asked of a passing yokel.

"Yep," the boy laconically answered.

"To what family do you think it belongs?"

Indicating a near-by house with a pudgy thumb, the boy answered: "Higginses."—Puck.

Tommy was throwing stones, and his mother caught him at it.

"Don't let me catch you throwing stones any more," she cautioned him.

"Well, what will I do when the other fellows throw them at me?" demanded Tommy.

"Just come and tell me."

"Tell you!" he exclaimed. "Why, you couldn't hit the broad side of a barn!"—Everybody's Magazine.

**Exempt from
State and Local Taxation
in the State of New York**

**Exempt from the
Federal
Income Tax**

7%

on your investment

Booklet on Request

The Tax Lien Co. of New York
William and Cedar Sts., New York City

**File
Your
Public**

BY filing each copy as it arrives you can greatly enhance the value of your Public. A special filing binder, with the name stamped in gold, costs only 70c postpaid.

Los Angeles, Calif. Home Rule in Taxation League, 516 American Bank Building. Visitors in Los Angeles are invited to make the League their headquarters.

R. B. BRINSMADE, E. M., Consulting Engineer
Expert Investigation of Mexican Mines, Lands or Enterprises.
"ABC" Code—1a Pensador Mex. No. 1, Puebla, Pue., Mexico

"TOM L. JOHNSON"

Tributes by

Herbert S. Bigelow (*Johnson, The Man*)
Louis F. Post (*Johnson in the George Campaigns*)
Newton D. Baker (*Johnson in Cleveland*)
John DeWitt Warner (*Johnson in Congress*)
Henry George, Jr. (*Johnson, The Disciple*)
Edmund Vance Cook (*Johnson in Defeat*)

These eloquent tributes, made at the banquet given to Mr. Johnson in New York City, May 1910, are obtainable in book form. Beautifully printed and done up in strong, overlapping brown paper covers.

The book makes a handsome, helpful present for men and women capable of appreciating the Johnson heritage—

... "that firm-fixed spirit which was he,
That heritage he left for you and me:
Before no Vested Wrong to bow the knee
Before no Righteous Fight to shirk or flee,
Before all else to make men free, free,
free."

The copies we have are being sold at 25c postpaid, less than half the cost of production. Three copies, 60c, twenty copies, \$3.50. To anyone who contemplates buying twenty or more copies, for presentation purposes, a sample copy will be sent for examination. Don't let this opportunity slip by.

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago