

out delay. It is intended for the relief of persons that have occasion to send or receive money through the mail in small sums, and who are now embarrassed for want of some convenient and safe means of transmission. This bill would meet that requirement while furnishing the most convenient small change ever yet devised. It provides that post-check notes shall be substituted, to a certain extent, for the paper currency now in use. These notes would be of various denominations, from five cents to five dollars, and in size $2\frac{1}{4}$ by 4 inches, and a space would be left on each for writing in the name of a payee and his post office town. So long as this space remained blank the note would pass from hand to hand as money; but by filling in the space and affixing a postage stamp of one cent for notes under one dollar and of two cents for those above that amount, the holder of a note could make it payable to a particular person at a particular post office. These notes, therefore, would be exactly like paper money, except that they could be transmitted through the mail with the same safety as a money order or check. The effect of the bill consequently would be to replace all the paper currency of five dollars and under with post checks which, while passing from hand to hand as money, would at any moment be available for transmission as checks drawn to order.

IS IT THE DEAD CAPITAL OF A DYING REPUBLIC?

One needs to spend but a few weeks in Washington to feel the influence that the party in power has over visitors that come to the city even for a short time. All hesitate to make an adverse criticism concerning the war now pending in the Philippines, however strongly they may condemn it in their own minds.

It is no longer possible for citizens of the United States to remain in doubt upon the radical departure of the present incumbent of the white house from the principles and policies which have guided all presidents

in the past. Although this cannot commend itself to the intelligence and conscience of a large number of people, yet they are silenced, or almost stifled, if they attempt to express a conviction based upon the great principles enunciated in the declaration of independence.

How thoroughly the lash of the party in power whips all its members into line is well illustrated by a conversation with a congressman held in the parlor of the Riggs house. He was a man under 40, educated, one would think, as a true American patriot. The conversation was in part as follows:

"Then you approve of converting our republic into an empire?" To which he answered:

"Most assuredly I do."

"Do you believe in a revolutionary movement which will destroy the principles of the declaration of independence?"

"Oh, fie!" he replied. "What is the declaration of independence? Merely a piece of schoolboy oratory."

From whence is the influence which can so revolutionize the minds of our young men, especially those we trust to make our laws?

Three women's conventions were held in Washington during the month of February. All were silent upon this burning question of the hour. Officers of the Suffrage association made it difficult for its members to give any public expression concerning the Philippine horror, although many of them pronounced it the greatest crime of modern times. The Daughters of the American Revolution held their annual convention during the week which includes Washington's birthday. Long reports were made of the preservation of valuable relics of the revolutionary war, many of these antiquities being mere stocks and stones; but nothing was said about preserving our immortal declaration of independence and the constitution inherited from our forefathers. Also the Woman's National Single Tax League, which was organized in Washington in February, refused to pass a resolution denouncing the Philippine policy of the administration, because some of its members were in government employ.

These organizations lost an opportunity to make their influence felt when they did not permit the Philippine iniquity to be publicly discussed at this particular time. But we have a consolation in the fact that men possess the Australian ballot and by their votes can give forcible expression to their opinions with impunity.

LOUISA SOUTHWORTH.
Cleveland, O.

THE GREATEST WANT OF THE AGE.

This boasted nineteenth century of progress, of social activity and of so-called philanthropy has had many critics and detractors. Plenty of men have detected the hollowness of its civilization, and the questionable nature of its philanthropy. They have seen that material progress does not mean human happiness, that intellectual culture is not the same thing as moral culture, and that the moral progress of the human race is almost brought to a standstill by the huge spectre of international distrust. What the age wants is not somebody to tell it that there is "something rotten in the state of Denmark," but somebody to act as if he believed that there was.

In short, what we want is some indication on the part of those who know the truth, that they really believe it, and are prepared to make some sacrifices for it.

Let us for a moment "survey mankind from China to Peru." Do we not find that the best energies of the men of all nations are devoted to the manufacture of machines for slaughtering their fellow men, who have the same right to live as themselves? Do we not find that nations, even when not at "war" in the physical sense, are still in the habit of erecting tariff barriers on the boundaries, thus preventing that natural interchange of labor which God intended, and insuring the maximum of human exertion with the minimum result? Do we not find that the throne of the world is occupied by capitalization with its callous disregard for all the nobler aspects of human nature, that for its sake governments are prepared to make war, the law courts are prepared to decide that black is white, the newspapers are prepared to blacken the character of inoffensive tribes, the church is prepared to pour its mercenary bless-

ings upon its selfish designs, and national sentiment is, alas! only too ready to spill its blood in the diabolical cause without regard to the rights or wrongs of the quarrel? These are some of the prominent features of the present age, and they are so familiar to us that one has almost to apologize for mentioning them.

Yet, why should familiarity with evil slacken and dissolve our resolution until we become part of the evil itself? That is the great danger—the indifferentism that comes from familiarity. Men talk of wars in progress and wars about to be declared with as much indifference as if they were talking about the weather or the theater. The idea of slaughter entirely escapes their notice. Yet the same people would be shocked with the details of a single murder. For murder on a wholesale scale they have no compunction. All the same the murders that are being committed by the orders of fallible or corrupt governments with the approval, more or less, of the misguided peoples they rule, are identical in moral texture with the isolated cases which excite the indignation of ordinary citizens.

The guilt may be more difficult to localize, but it is there. Every one of these murders is committed in violation of the principle none the less true because it is not recognized—that the highest interests of the peoples of all nations are identical. It is a principle written clearly on the face of nature. England to-day, for instance, cannot injure the Boers without injuring herself. The war that will annihilate the two republics will also cost England the lives of 40,000 or 50,000 of her subjects, and (what is of more importance to the capitalist mind, for blood is cheap in these days of foolish patriotism), £60,000,000.

In the same way a nation cannot enrich itself by trade without enriching the nation with whom it trades. Cobden taught the English people the sound doctrine of the interdependence of nations, and with remarkable success, too, for his time. By his efforts he brought about greater freedom of trade between England and France, to the mutual benefit—till political ambition stepped in and usurped the place of common sense—of both countries.

There is, in short, no natural quarrel between the German and the Frenchman, between the Englishman and the Irishman, between the Russian and the Pole; the interests of all alike, being to live and let live. But there is a natural quarrel between me and the man who—be he foreigner or fellow countryman—takes away my right to live, or prevents me from buying and selling with my fellow man in any part of the world.

War has its uses in this world, but it must be a war not for the furtherance of personal or political ambition, nor for vengeance, nor for swelling the gains of capital, but for the defense of some clearly defined human right which is endangered. We have too many wars of the former class, and not enough of the latter. We want to declare war against monopoly and privilege and against all those artificial ordinances which place equal beings upon an unequal footing in the race for life. We want men who will carry the banner of political and economic truth and disentangle its teachings from the illusions of a spurious and hypocritical patriotism. We must bestir ourselves if we are what we say we are. Falsehood and Fraud can find millions of soldiers to fight for them, and why not Truth.

T. SCANLON.

Liverpool, Eng.

NEWS

At the close of our last report of the progress of the British war in South Africa, Lord Roberts had begun to advance with his center from Kroonstad northward toward Pretoria, and had reached the Rhenoster river, about half way between Kroonstad and the Vaal, the Boers, apparently outflanked, retreating in good order before him. This was on the 23d. For two or three days thereafter Lord Roberts was delayed at the Rhenoster, the stream not being fordable. A pontoon bridge was thrown across, however, and on the 26th his advance proceeded. The advancing line was 30 miles long, with Gen. French's cavalry on the left and Gen. Hamilton's mounted infantry on the right. Before this long line the Boers continued their retreat, apparently unable to cope with the vastly superior force that confronted them, either by concentrating, since that would expose

their flanks, or by extending their line, since that would fatally weaken it. On the 26th they had withdrawn to the north side of the Vaal. A crossing had already been effected by the British left at Grobler's drift, which is not far from Parys, a Free State town a few miles west of the railroad. At that time little news of the situation had been received, the censorship having been tightened; but it is now known that Roberts's force of 50,000 men crossed the Vaal on the 27th without opposition and was moving over the desert upon Johannesburg, 50 miles to the north, a suburb of which it occupied on the 29th. There was no serious fighting. The Boers continued their retreat, carrying their guns and supplies with them, and every effort on the part of Lord Roberts to surround and capture them failed. This is the situation from authentic sources of information as we go to press (May 31); but from unauthentic sources it is positively reported that both Johannesburg and Pretoria have been surrendered by the Boers, without the slightest resistance, and that President Kruger has fled from Pretoria to Waterfalboven, a small station on the Delagoa bay railway some 120 miles east from Pretoria.

On the 28th Lord Roberts formally declared the Orange Free State a British colony by right of conquest, under the name of the Orange River colony.

The British war office has decided to send 11,000 more troops to South Africa in June. The number already sent there is in round numbers 300,000, including colonials. No reports of British losses have been recently cabled, but the estimates of correspondents vary from 15,000 to 70,000.

An indication of British sentiment on the subject of the war in the Transvaal is supplied by the by-election at South Manchester, held since our last issue, for the purpose of filling the seat in the house of commons of the Marquis of Lorne, who goes to the house of lords as Duke of Argyll in place of his father, the late duke. South Manchester was formerly a liberal constituency, but it was carried in 1896 by the Marquis of Lorne by a majority of 78 in a poll of 8,836. At the recent election the seat was contested by a radical, and the issue was distinctly jingo. The radical opposed subjugation of the Boer republics and