

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1898.

Number 35.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

At last Spain has yielded to the superior physical forces of the United States, and consented to sell her interest in the Philippine archipelago for \$20,000,000. It is on the whole a good price, for Spain had nothing to sell but the sovereign right to carry on an interminable war against the natives. And it is not improbable that we shall discover when too late that that is what we have bought.

Whether this bargain will hold, depends now upon the action of the United States senate. Senator Gray, who is one of the peace commissioners at Paris, has been reported as so outraged by the greedy demands of his associates, that he intends, upon resuming his place in the senate, to oppose the treaty. That report is of doubtful accuracy; but for Senator Gray's sake and the nation's sake, it is to be hoped that it is true. Nothing but the barely possible refusal of the senate to approve the Paris treaty, now stands in the way of our entering upon a corrupting career of empire.

All pretense of establishing a temporary protectorate over the native government of the Philippine islands has been thrust aside. We are to buy the islands, with the natives thrown in, and to force upon them a colonial government, in principle the same as that which Spain has so long maintained. In the face of our national polity and history, we are to go as a nation into real estate speculation across the seas. We are about to forcibly annex distant territory for the purpose of governing its people as England governs

Ireland—as England once governed us.

When President McKinley was considering the future of Cuba in his message to congress, he said: "I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of; that, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression." But he sees no such objection to the forcible annexation of the Philippines. Pray how do Cuba and the Philippines differ in this respect? What charm works the miracle of turning what would be criminal aggression in respect to a neighboring island, into patriotic and Christian expansion in respect to a distant archipelago?

In connection with the grabbing of the Philippines, the pretense has been made that we will adopt the "open door" policy. But we cannot do that without either establishing free trade for the Philippines or treating them as a foreign country. The "open door" policy would require Philippine ports to be open to every other nation upon the same tariff terms that they were open to ours. Now, upon what terms could they be open to our nation? If the archipelago were treated as part of our own territory, subject to our constitution, its ports would be free to us. There would then be no tariff against us. For our constitution requires free trade throughout the American nation. But in that case the "open door" would mean free trade. If there were no tariffs in the Philippines against us, there could be none against the rest of the world—if we adopted the "open door" policy. Consequently, to pursue the "open door" policy in the Philippines without establishing free trade there, we should have to keep the islands out of the reach of our constitution. It would be necessary to treat them as foreign,

and to have them set up a tariff against ourselves. This could be done only by means of a permanent irresponsible military government, similar to that which we now impose temporarily upon Puerto Rico and some parts of Cuba.

And if that were done, how would the acquisition of the Philippines benefit our trade? Would trade follow the flag even where the flag did not represent our fundamental law? even where the laws, though of our own making and though they admitted the flag, put fines upon our trade? If our exports to the Philippines are to be taxed as much as exports from other countries, of what advantage can our ownership of the islands be to our exporters?

He who tries to fathom the purpose of Philippine acquisition along these or kindred lines of thought, will make but little headway. The object in acquiring the Philippines has in truth only an incidental relation to the Philippines themselves. Those islands are to be merely a vantage ground for enabling this country to participate in the adjustment of the eastern question. Let them once come under the dominion of the American government, and we shall from that moment be in the very center of the quarrel between Russia, England, France and Germany. This is the culmination toward which the expansion policy of the administration is leading us; and signs that it is the preconceived object of that policy accumulate.

Senator Hoar, the veteran republican of Massachusetts, is as pronounced as ever against the revolutionary ambitions of President McKinley in connection with the Philippine purchase. He says he does not believe the treaty will be or ought to

be agreed to by the senate, and gives his reason in this fashion:

Spain has little sovereignty in the Philippines to sell just now, and I do not think the people of the United States are in the market to buy sovereignty just now, or that the constitution has conferred upon anybody the right to buy any such commodity. The constitution was framed upon the theory that sovereignty is not salable. The people of the United States have conferred upon nobody the power to make such purchases in their behalf. We have acquired territory, either vacant or so sparsely settled that there were no people capable of governing it and no germ of a national life. We have, also, in one recent case, acquired a territory where the original germ of national life had perished. But neither of these precedents applies to the Philippine archipelago, with its millions of inhabitants.

Some one having said, apropos of the imperial and colonial policy of the administration, that "God never intended one nation to govern another," some one else wants to know how the other some one happens be so familiar with God's intentions. This is a common inquiry when moral problems come up for solution. It is invariably propounded by advocates of the immoral side, and is usually regarded as a conclusive reply to appeals to the public conscience. But God's moral intentions are not so very difficult to understand. Nothing is easier. Even children understand them. Indeed, there is respectable Christian authority for the statement that God reveals his intentions unto babes. Whoever indulges a lively sense of justice, pushing selfishness behind him, knows the moral intentions of God. It is only men that put selfishness first, who find God's intentions in moral affairs complex and obscure.

That pet scheme of the national banking ring for killing the greenbacks and placing the control of the volume of the currency with the ring, the scheme which is embodied in the McCleary bill, has met a deadly foe in an unexpected quarter. Its new foe is no other than the comptroller of the currency, Charles G. Dawes. Mr.

Dawes, in his annual report, shows by the experience of his bureau that the McCleary bill, besides stimulating the flow of money to the great centers, would cause the greatest losses, when banks failed, to the depositors in small banks. This report, which saw the light prematurely, has temporarily demoralized the McCleary bill ring.

The cotton-mill operatives of Augusta, Ga., are enjoying a large slice of Mr. McKinley's peculiar species of prosperity. This species of prosperity, as we have already been advised by good McKinley authority, is especially notable for the fact that while it makes more work it provides less pay. And that is the peculiarity about it which the Augusta cotton operatives are now beginning to experience. Some 6,000 of them are striking against a reduced scale of wages which the mill owners are trying to enforce. Mills are open and work is to be had, but upon condition that operatives accept reduced pay.

When Mr. McKinley went upon the road as "an advance agent of prosperity," he neglected to enlarge upon this peculiarity of the prosperity he was about to introduce. But too much must not be expected of Mr. McKinley. It is impossible, even for so good and great a man as he, to increase the incomes of workers and also those of monopolists. Whenever one of these classes is benefited the other must correspondingly suffer. Now, Mr. McKinley has unquestionably increased the incomes of monopolists. Workers, therefore, must be content if they get more work; it were extravagant, in these circumstances, to expect more work and more pay too.

Commissary General Eagan gives but little aid and comfort, in his annual report, to those apologists for the mismanagement of the war, who attribute the suffering of the soldiers to general unpreparedness for war. He reports that rations sufficient for 16,000 men for 1,472 days were loaded upon the trans-

ports that carried Shafter's army from Tampa to Santiago. These rations consisted of bacon, beef, flour, hard-tack, beans, rice, potatoes, onions, tomatoes, coffee, sugar, salt and other provisions. Gen. Eagan also reports that additional supplies were soon afterward shipped to Santiago, consisting of such delicacies as canned fruit, canned soups, lime juice and jellies; and that when the transports left for Montauk there was an abundance of subsistence stores at and near to Santiago, with which the transports might have been provisioned. All this being true, the country appears to have been admirably prepared for war, so far as subsistence goes. No soldier should have suffered for want either of substantial food or of delicacies. Yet all the soldiers did suffer for both, not only on the way to Santiago, on the way back, and at Montauk, but also in front of Santiago. Col. Roosevelt has testified of the need of the soldiers for vegetables, and how he stretched his conscience to get only 500 pounds of beans for his men, being refused any vegetables unless he would certify that they were for officers. Why was not the whole army supplied with beans, rice, potatoes, onions and tomatoes, if, as Commissary Eagan now reports, such vegetables were available in sufficient quantity for 16,000 men for 1,472 days? Must we assume that Gen. Eagan's detailed report is false? There is no apparent reason for doing so. Then we are driven to the conclusion that although there was at all times an abundance of appropriate food within reach of the army, the officers who had it in charge withheld it from the soldiers.

In other words, the suffering of the soldiers was due not to lack of time for preparation for war, nor to lack of preparation, but to the indifference or incapacity or both of officers upon whom rested the responsibility for distributing the stores. And for these officers—Gen. Shafter and the sons and nephews of administration favorites—the responsibility is upon

President McKinley. It was he who put the worse than incompetent Shaftner at the head of the invading army, and appointed sons and nephews over the heads of experienced and competent men.

The importance of a real investigation into the mismanagement of the war is more evident than ever. That whitewashing committee which has been going around the country, making the scope of its inquiries as narrow as possible, throwing a veil over the favoritism that is so manifest to every observer, making favorable testimony prominent and discouraging the unfavorable, and withal having no legal standing—that committee will throw no light upon the truth. A rigid congressional investigation is needed. And such an investigation Senator Foraker, himself a republican, is determined to have if possible. So at least he is reported as saying. There should be an investigation, he says, rigid and impartial, by a congressional commission having power to administer oaths and to send for persons and papers; a commission that would also afford protection to witnesses who hesitate to tell what they know because they fear the wrath of the president and his secretary of war.

The Rev. Reverdy C. Ransom, a colored clergyman of Chicago, confirms our view that the negro question at the south is at bottom not a race but an industrial question, and part of the very labor question which agitates the rest of the country irrespective of race. Referring to our articles, Mr. Ransom says:

The belief which I have steadily maintained amid much discouragement, that there is a remnant who will forever oppose abridgement or usurpation of political equality as well as unfettered freedom of opportunity, has received fresh confirmation. You go to the very foundation of all this "race problem," when you say that the trouble is industrial rather than from any cause of race antipathy. It is, as you say, a question of the industrial servitude of one class to another. White

men the country over will one day discover a menace to their own industrial independence and prosperity, as well as their political liberty, through the degradation, by industrial and political serfdom, of the millions of black toilers of this land.

Gov. Tanner's testimony before the grand jury in the Virden labor riot cases goes far to show that his action in the matter was not so indefensible, even from a legal point of view, as it seemed at first. He makes it perfectly clear that what he did in preventing the unloading of negro miners from Alabama, was not directed against them as negroes; for he asserts that American citizens, white and black, have the right to seek employment wherever they can find it. He also makes it clear that his action was not against their coming in large bodies; for he says that American citizens, white and black, have the right not only to seek employment wherever they can find it, but to do so either singly or by thousands. But what he insists that no non-residents of Illinois, white or black, have the right to do, is to come into the state as those citizens of Alabama came to Virden, under the guard of a private military force—a force which under the statutes of Illinois is unlawful. Gov. Tanner denounces that, as an armed invasion of the state, which it was his duty as governor to repel. Upon this aspect of the case it may be that quite as much may be said in support of Gov. Tanner's action as against it, and probably more.

Conan Doyle, in an open letter to Michael Davitt apropos of the development of friendly relations between England and the United States, which Davitt as an Irish leader resents, argues that no liberty that has been granted England and Scotland has been denied Ireland. This is both true and false; true upon the surface, but false interiorly. While Irishmen as individuals are granted and denied the same liberties that are granted and denied to Englishmen and Scotchmen, the Irish people as a community are not granted that first of all lib-

erties, the liberty of self-government, in anything like the degree in which it is granted to the English and the Scotch people. Whereas the English and the Scotch rule themselves, the Irish are ruled by the English and the Scotch. Dr. Doyle should learn that the liberties of a people, to be truly liberties, must comprise something more than a set of privileges graciously granted as to inferiors by a superior.

Vermont is considering the advisability of making an experiment in personal property taxation. The old, old schemes for robbing men under the forms of law and in the name of personal property taxation have proved as abortive in the Green Mountain state as they always have everywhere else; and the Vermonters now propose to allow all newcomers to assess their own personal taxes for 30 years. According to this plan, any non-resident coming into the state to live may make a contract to pay a specified sum per annum for 30 years, in lieu of all other taxes on personal property. As the specified sum must not be less than \$500 in any case, the rather transparent object of this device is to enable rich tax dodgers of other states to do their dodging, for a consideration, under the sanction of Vermont law. It is not, therefore, a substitute for personal property taxation. Yet it suggests the best possible substitute. If personal property taxation were totally abolished, no one who ought to pay personal taxes would or could escape. For then the whole burden would fall upon real estate; and as the most valuable personal property—stocks and the like—consists in mere titles to real estate, such personal property would pay its share of taxes at the source. This method would be unfair, it is true, to owners of real estate improvements, which would then be overtaxed; but the soundness of that objection would be due, not to any wrongfulness involved in abolishing personal taxes, but to the wrongfulness of not also abolishing taxes on improvements. If

the whole burden of taxation were thrown upon land values alone, taxes on both improvements and personal property being abolished, no one would pay any tax to the community except in proportion to the pecuniary benefit which the community conferred upon him. He would get a "quid" for his "quo."

We are glad to note the fact that so old and important a religious publication as the *Journal and Messenger*,—a Baptist organ—adopts Enoch Ensley's sound principle of taxation, that "nothing should ever be taxed which would be of value to the state, and that would run away or that could and would come to you." The *Journal and Messenger* of November 10 says of this principle that it is "so evident that one would expect to find it acted upon in all legislation for taxation." It observes regretfully, however, that the reverse of this is true; and then argues that "the first principle of taxation should be to tax what cannot be moved and what could be readily found by the assessor." Our Baptist contemporary does not appear to perceive that what it argues for is in direct contravention of Ensley's principle which it approvingly quotes.

When Ensley objected to the taxation of things that "would run away, or that could and would come to you," he did not refer alone to things that can be readily found by the assessor, nor even to those that cannot be moved. He referred as well to things which, however palpable and stationary in character, might be kept away by taxation. Houses, for instance, would be taxed, if the proposition of the *Journal and Messenger* were carried out. Yet taxation of houses tends to keep houses out of a community. It not only prevents new ones from being built, but it also prevents old ones from being repaired and improved. Enoch Ensley proposed to carry out his principle by exempting everything from taxation except land, and taxing that in proportion to its

value. This is the only way in which the principle can be carried out. And it is a way which is not only practicable, but just.

A decision of extraordinary importance, as bearing upon public rights, is reported from the supreme court of Minnesota. In the case of Little Falls against the Little Falls Electric and Water company, that court holds that a 30-year franchise from a city council is invalid. We are not advised of all the circumstances affecting the decision, but it appears to have been based upon the broad general principle that a legislative body cannot bind the people by creating property rights in franchises for an unreasonable length of time. This is a sound principle of politics, and its recognition by one of our courts of last resort as a sound principle of law would be a healthy sign.

A novel legal question has been raised in New York in a suit by a Coney Island bathing master against the young woman who acquired notoriety last summer by slipping away from the bathing beach under circumstances, carefully designed by herself, which made it appear that she had been drowned. The object of the young woman was to make her family suppose her dead, while she effected an elopement. There was doubtless no thought in her mind of injuring anyone; but incidentally she did very seriously injure the bathing master. He incurred expense in dragging the bay for her body; he endured mental anguish in supposing that she had lost her life through some possible carelessness of his; he suffered in his professional reputation as a life-saver; and to crown all, he lost his job, worth \$300 a month. On account of these losses, he now sues the young woman for \$10,000. The question of his right to recover will doubtless turn upon whether his duty to her, as a bathing master responsible for the safety of his employer's patrons, imposed upon her a reciprocal duty to refrain from any

act which might reasonably be expected to needlessly injure him. Whatever the courts may decide as to this, minds untutored in the intricacies of the law will be inclined to look upon the bathing master's lawsuit with favor. Though the young woman's motive might have been good in itself, she invaded his rights when she made a pretense that exposed his livelihood to peril, and induced him, in the performance of his duty to her, to waste his money and his labor.

Persons who defend the existing order of wealth-distribution upon the ground that "brains" are entitled to the largest share of wealth, had better look to their statistics. A recent statistical compilation made in England indicates that in the distribution of wealth, "brains" are well behind in the race. This compilation of statistics deals with the fortunes left in the last ten years by 1,000 persons. Coal owners figure in it well up in the millions, while physicians and lawyers are at the bottom of the list, and artists, literary men, musicians and actors are wholly missing. We fear that the notion that wealth goes to "brains" contemplates less the quality of the "brains" than the particular uses to which they are applied. If applied, however successfully, to the service of mankind—in literature, art, medicine, law, and so on—"brains" seem to fare but little if any better than brawn; but if applied successfully to appropriating nature's gifts—coal fields, for instance—they yield handsomely. After all, it is not a question of "brains;" it is a question of grab. Brains figure only as they make the grab more effective.

It is not long since the railroad monopolists were celebrating a legislative victory in New York over ticket scalpers. They had lobbied through a law which made scalping criminal. But now the court of appeals—the highest court of New York—has declared that law to be unconstitutional. This is gratifying. Though we are not

especially interested in ticket scalpers, we are interested in the right of all people to be served fairly by railroads. That right is denied so long as railroads sell tickets at one price to some people and at a lower price for the same service to others. It is here that the scalper comes in. He buys up the under-priced tickets, and selling them at a slight advance, thereby gives to all comers equally the benefit which the railroads intend for special persons. The method is a bad one, but it is better than none. We hope, therefore, to see scalping flourish as long as railroads charge more for tickets sold to the general public than they charge to specially favored passengers. When the railroads sell to all at the cheapest rate for a given service, there will be no demand for scalpers, and the business will disappear. Meanwhile, the unused railroad ticket, like unused sugar, is merchandize into whosoever's hands it honestly comes; and anti-scalping laws are unwarranted invasions of the rights of scalpers as merchants and of the public as their customers.

A correspondent criticises H. L. Bliss's article of two weeks ago, for neglecting to reckon the price of board in the statistics of farm wages. The criticism is unfounded. Mr. Bliss's quotations as to farm wages were from the statistics of the department of agriculture, which give wages without board. What may have misled Mr. Bliss's critic is the fact that farm wages in Illinois are higher than the average. Mr. Bliss was dealing with the average for the whole country.

The dignified exploit of ex-Judge Blandin, of Cleveland, in publicly denouncing the bench before which he is accustomed to practice, charging the judges with tearing down and degrading the general administration of justice and dragging it in the mire, is probably without a parallel in the history of the American judiciary. Blandin's standing in the community, his position as the unquestioned leader of the Cleveland bar, the circum-

stances under which and the spirit in which, he made his accusation, all conspire to prove him a man of extraordinary moral courage. It is more than doubtful if in the same circumstances any leader of the bar in any other important community of the United States would have been brave enough to do what ex-Judge Blandin did. The reason is not far to seek. There is probably no other man who combines in himself as Blandin does the best qualities of a mature lawyer with the virtues of a good citizen and the sense of elemental justice of a genuine democrat.

So refreshing is this Blandin episode, that it will interest readers everywhere who are democratic in the primary as distinguished from the mere partisan meaning of that term. To appreciate it, the character of the Cleveland bench must be understood. The reputation of this bench has been such for years that certain Cleveland lawyers, better known for wire-pulling skill than for professional ability, have flourished at the expense of the good name of judges. Litigants who could afford to pay handsome fees sought out these lawyers in preference to better ones, because they cared less for having their cases well tried than for winning them. It was not this stigma upon the Cleveland bench, however, that called forth ex-Judge Blandin's cold, calm, scathing arraignment. His righteous wrath was aroused by the result of an investigation into which, as their leader, he had been forced by the bar.

One of the members of the Cleveland bar had circulated a story to the effect that one of the judges had divided fees with him. This story having come to the ear of the judge in question, he demanded action on the part of the bar. Action was accordingly taken, and ex-Judge Blandin was appointed by the bar to conserve the interests of both bench and bar. He accepted the responsibility reluctantly, and simply because, as he him-

self explained, he did not think it proper in him to shrink from any duty the bar might impose. When all the testimony had been produced before the investigating committee of the bar, Blandin was so stirred by the incidental developments that in summing up he declared that the particular question involved was of little consequence as compared with the evidence of unjudicial indifference which judges had shown at that hearing and preceding it, to degrading conduct of their associates of which they were cognizant. It was then that he spoke as no leader of an important bar ever spoke before.

Judge Blandin said:

That the general administration of justice should be torn down and degraded and dragged in the mire is of the utmost and last importance to every man, woman and child in the county, and I may say to unborn generations, because when once you have degraded the courts of this country, the last sheet anchor to which we can hang for the preservation of our rights and liberties, you have assailed the roots and foundation of all that is important and sacred to men who have liberty and property to be preserved. In vain will you write constitutions and laws and rules of procedure unless high character, integrity, freedom and prudence can clothe the judge who sits upon the bench. Contracts may be written in vain as well, and anarchy will ensue.

I was told not long ago by a respectable attorney that a book entitled "Law, as She Is Practiced in Cleveland," if it told the truth, would be one of the most startling books that could be written. And I believe that you can never tone up the bar properly until you begin at the top and tone up the bench. You cannot work from below upwards, but you must work from above downwards. And the character of the bar will never rise higher than the general character of the bench. It will never rise unless men upon the bench have a due and proper appreciation of the dignity and importance of their position, and unless they are accustomed to the use of respectful language, and unless they are entitled to enjoy the confidence and respect of each other. If, on the contrary, they are abusive of each other in their language; if they have no confidence in each other; and if facts exist warrant-

ing such lack of confidence in each other, so long as that condition exists you may struggle and strive in vain to tone up the bar of Cuyahoga county. It can't be done. . . .

I say this because I feel it all, and I feel it sincerely and deeply, and I know that the public shares in this feeling, and I do know that the facts which have been detailed in this investigation are such as ought to make the community consider how we can reform the judiciary of the county, how we can restore confidence between the members of the bench, how we can get rid of those slanderous things that are said (slanderous if they are not true). from day to day in the newspapers, how we can tone up the bar to a fitness to practice law before judges who are fit to sit in judgment and to administer the law.

That Judge Blandin's speech was to him no light bit of rhetoric, but a serious matter, is evident from the words with which he preceded it:

I know what risk and jeopardy and hazard I take in making these statements. I have been cautioned and warned by other members of the county bar, and I say it for them, when they don't dare to say it for themselves. They are afraid to say what they know. They are afraid to speak the truth with respect to even so important a matter as the purity of the judiciary, and the high character of our judiciary, for fear, forsooth, that the interests of their clients from time to time might be jeopardized in trials before these men. I will not be deterred from it in the discharge of a duty which is put upon me. I say I didn't select it or choose it, but being here, I am not going to mince matters. I am going to speak what I think in respect to them. And I do say that the circumstances and facts that are detailed here beyond any question and beyond any controversy in this hearing are such as may well fill the public mind with apprehension and alarm.

And that there was reason for the caution which Judge Blandin ignored was made manifest soon after he had spoken. One of the worst of the judges to whom Blandin had referred, and the most notoriously impudent, endeavored to secure the joint action of his fellow judges in proceedings to arraign Blandin for contempt of court. But at that the bar and the people laughed. By the strength of his po-

sition and by his courage, Judge Blandin had secured their unanimous support. If his example were imitated in the same spirit by leading lawyers elsewhere throughout the United States, a long stride would be made in the direction of purifying the local judiciary.

Workingmen who have been looking forward to the possibilities of employment and consequent easing up of the labor market, which the annexation of Hawaii would offer, will be interested in a letter from J. B. Atherton, president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' association, which has just been published. Mr. Atherton says that the only opportunity for those seeking work in Hawaii is "for a limited number of farmers to do plantation work at \$18 or \$20 a month"—a limited number! The more we learn about expansion the clearer we shall see that it is not for the benefit of workingmen, but for the benefit of workingmen's parasites, that it is advocated.

Great Britain is being commiserated upon the falling off of her exports during the present year; and from the same protection sources Mr. Dingley receives high commendation, because his tariff bill is credited with having caused the decrease. But Great Britain may notwithstanding be better off than ever. Though her exports have decreased, her imports may have increased. The wealth of a nation is determined, not by the amount of wealth it gets rid of in exporting, but by the amount it acquires by importing.

By the way in which plutocratic magazines and newspapers exploit W. H. Mallock, the English essayist, one might suppose Mallock to be something more than a verbal prestidigitateur. Mallock himself, so very clever are some of his tricks, appears at times to make the same mistake. Some one has wittily described his method in this wise: He argues with clearness and force to prove that twice

one is two, following with a similarly clear and forcible argument to show that twice two is four. He may even go the length of elaborately demonstrating that twice four is eight. But he then supposes you to have become thoroughly impressed with the opinion that his conclusions are irrefutable; whereupon, assuming an air of superior intelligence, he assures you that if you have really followed him thus far you will perceive that twice eight is forty-three and a quarter.

It would appear to be by some such process that Mr. Mallock has by his recent book, "Aristocracy and Evolution," satisfied confiding readers that material progress has been effected by exceptional men, and that the human mass has contributed little or nothing. As he himself puts it, "ability" has contributed nearly everything, and "labor" hardly anything. It is upon this theory that Mr. Mallock justifies the principle of human slavery. His differentiation of "ability" from "labor," is one of his choicest bits of legerdemain. It is really nothing more than a differentiation of "leadership" from "following." But if those terms, or any of their familiar equivalents were used, Mr. Mallock could not so easily begof his readers. To say that material progress is effected almost wholly by leaders, and hardly at all by followers, would be absurd. It would be incon- tinently scouted by anyone with sense enough to see that "leadership" and "following" are terms which merely describe two elements of the same force, neither of which could be effective without the other.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND THE LAW

Harold Frederic's death under the ministrations of a Christian Science healer in London, and the consequent criminal proceedings against the healer, have attracted widespread attention to the relations of Christian Science to the law.

The subject appears to have been

before our own courts on more than one occasion.

In Nebraska four years ago the highest court of the state sustained an indictment against a healer for practicing medicine contrary to the laws of the state. But the reasoning of the court in that case has not commended itself favorably to the legal profession. One need only read it to know why.

A decision to the same general effect was made a year ago in Pennsylvania. Judge Pennypacker refused the application of a Christian Science society for a church charter, doing so under a statute forbidding the practice of medicine without a diploma from a chartered medical school. He based his judgment upon the ground that the Christian Science society was attempting not merely to propagate a religious belief, but also to establish a method of curing bodily disease.

But the most important and best considered decision directly upon the subject was rendered during the present year by the supreme court of Rhode Island. This was in the criminal case of the state against Mylod. Mylod was the leader or teacher of a Christian Science society in Providence. He was prosecuted for practicing medicine without a certificate from the state board of health, and the highest court decided that the prosecution could not be sustained. The practice of medicine was held to be quite different from the mere teaching of the doctrine that disease can be reduced to a minimum through the power of prayer.

The reasoning of the judge in this Rhode Island case is very satisfactory. Holding that the phrase "practice of medicine," in the statutes, is to be understood in the ordinary or popular sense, and explaining that in the popular sense it refers to "the discovery of the cause and nature of disease and the administration of remedies or the prescribing of treatment therefor," he argued that "prayer for those suffering from disease, or words of encouragement, or the teaching that disease will disappear and physical perfection be attained as a result of prayer, or that humanity will be brought into harmony with God by right thinking and a fixed determination to look on the bright side of life,

does not constitute the practice of medicine."

In another branch of his argument, the Rhode Island judge exposed the absurdity of the theory of the prosecution. Supposing that Christian Science were to be considered as a school of medicine, he showed that the board of health would be compelled to recognize it and issue certificates. For the board of health is not vested with arbitrary power to decide between different medical systems. Its power consists merely in the right to determine whether applicants possess the qualifications to practice in accordance with the recognized theories of the particular system to which they adhere. Therefore, if Christian Science be a medical system, the board of health must grant certificates to competent professors of the Christian Science method of treatment. Yet, continued the judge, it would defeat the very object of the statute "to hold that a person who does not know or pretend to know anything about disease, or about the method of ascertaining the presence or the nature of disease, or about the nature, preparation or use of drugs or remedies, and who never administers them, may obtain a certificate to practice medicine."

For these reasons the Rhode Island court held that a Christian Science healer cannot be prosecuted for practicing medicine without a certificate as a medical practitioner.

But the question raised in the Harold Frederic case may be somewhat different. The apparent point in that case is not whether Christian Science healers violate a statute regulating the practice of medicine, but whether when they assume to cure disease and fail, the patient dying for lack of medical care, they are responsible under the general criminal law for manslaughter.

Harold Frederic, the well-known novelist and European correspondent, was prostrated with serious illness. Expert medical men testify that a simple surgical operation might have saved his life. But no surgical or other conventional treatment was administered. He was cared for by a Christian Science healer whose ministrations were ineffectual, and he died. It was in accordance with his own de-

sire that Frederic received this treatment, and that physicians and surgeons were kept away from him. He did not believe in them, and he did believe in Christian Science. Upon these facts the indictment for manslaughter of the healer who attended him is made to rest.

Commenting upon the Frederic case, law periodicals are at variance.

The Albany Law Journal, which is notable for the narrowness of its provincialism, hopes that the prompt and vigorous action against this healer "may lead to the treatment of this class of fanatics as they deserve." But vaguely recognizing the incongruity in a free country, of forcing adults to submit to medical treatment whether they have confidence in it or not, the Law Journal cites the absurd suicide legislation of New York, and argues that if to commit suicide may be declared a crime, then trusting to Christian Science in critical illness, or in cases of mangled bones and tissues, may be preventable by law as a species of slow suicide!

On the other hand, Law Notes, a broad-gauge legal magazine, published at Northport, N. Y., treats the question sanely. While defending the police legislation which aims to prevent imposition by charlatans upon the ignorant and credulous, it recognizes the right of the mature and intelligent to decide for themselves regarding their treatment for illness, and observes that it cannot be safely asserted that Christian Scientists are charlatans. On the latter point Law Notes says:

If human testimony is worthy of any credit real cures have been accomplished by them, and at the very least substantial peace of mind has been brought through their agency to sufferers pronounced beyond the powers of ordinary physicians. The positive worth of the results achieved by Christian Science is not to be set aside dogmatically or contemptuously. But even if the doctrine is pronounced a groundless superstition, its believers have a constitutional right to hold and follow what seems to them a system of truth. The law cannot afford to approach the subject in a narrow or intolerant spirit. No one has a right to judge another's beliefs.

The real difficulty in determining the relation of the healing phase of

Christian Science to the law, does not rise out of cases like that of Harold Frederic, in which a sane man, in the exercise of his undeniable right of belief, deliberately refuses the assistance of doctors and puts his trust in Christian Science. It is no function of the public to force doctors upon such a man. Not only is it his right to decide for himself, but if he were denied that right the healing profession might be stagnated. Had police regulations successfully interfered with freedom of choice in this respect in the past, the new schools of medicine that have from time to time challenged and ultimately modified the old, would have been suppressed; and like the law-protected Chinese, we might still measure the usefulness of a physician by the amount of blood he draws and the virtues of drugs by their nastiness. But while there is no difficulty in the cases of adults, yet out of the cases of children a very real difficulty in this matter does arise.

Because mature persons have the right, in their treatment of their own ills, to ignore public sentiment as it at any time exists, it by no means follows that they have the right to do so in the treatment of the ills of their children. During that period of tutelage in which a child cannot choose for itself in such matters, and the right of choice falls primarily upon parents, society owes to the child the duty of protecting its right to life not only against what may appear to the community to be the malice of parents, but also against what may appear to the community to be their foolishness. The "foolish" parents may in fact be wise and the "wise" community foolish, and time may demonstrate this; but pending the demonstration, prevailing opinion must determine between parent and child in questions involving the child's personal rights.

To us it seems that the true principle of the law in its relation to Christian Science is suggested by a recent English decision affecting a sect known as the Peculiar People. Under the doctrines of this sect, physicians are not to be called in cases of sickness, but an elder is to pray over the patient and anoint him with oil. The infant daughter of two members

of the sect having fallen ill with whooping cough, it was subjected to this treatment and given no other. The child died, and the parents were indicted for manslaughter. In sustaining the indictment the English judge made a brief, but in our opinion, irrefutable argument. Pointing to the duty of parents to provide medical aid for their sick children, he dwelt upon the fact that children of tender years cannot choose for themselves in the matter of accepting or rejecting novel methods of treatment; and, inferring that it therefore becomes a duty of parents to their children to have recourse to established methods, he concluded that their refusal to do so is the same in law as if they were to neglect their sick children altogether.

Here is a distinct denial of the right of parents to subject their sick children to methods of treatment which have not yet secured general recognition. And although the point was not directly involved, there is an implied acceptance of the proposition that persons capable of exercising a free choice may utterly ignore established methods of treatment, without involving any one in legal complications. If the reason for legal interference in the case of children is their incapacity to choose, then persons having capacity to choose must have the right to choose without legal interference. And that, it seems to us, is the true principle.

The question is not peculiar to Christian Science treatment, but relates to all novel methods for the cure of disease. Not long ago the dispute was between homeopaths and allopaths. That dispute is over. The homeopaths have secured their position in public sentiment as a regular school of medicine. Even their detractors no longer deny their right to all the legal prerogatives of healers, including the treatment of children. But in the beginning, communities were justified in refusing to permit parents to treat their children, in cases of severe illness, with sugar pellets. They were not justified, however, in interfering for the supposed protection of mature men and women. It is at this point that in all analogous cases the line should be drawn—between

the child too young to choose, and the adult whose natural privilege it is to choose.

NEWS

The treaty of peace between the United States and Spain has in substance been agreed upon. Spain complies unconditionally with the demands made by the United States.

When last we wrote upon this subject, we gave the result of the joint meeting of the peace commissions on the 21st. The Americans had at that meeting demanded the entire Philippine archipelago for \$20,000,000, and fixed November 28 as the date on which they would expect a definite response. It was believed, from hints thrown out by Spanish commissioners, that the response would be made on the 23d, to which date the joint meeting was adjourned, but on that day the Spaniards requested a further adjournment. Their request was granted, and the 28th was fixed for the next meeting. During the interval the Spanish commissioners submitted informally by letter to the American commissioners three alternative propositions for a compromise. They offered to cede not only Puerto Rico but the other Spanish West India islands, the whole of the Ladrões, and the whole of the Philippines for \$100,000,000; or to cede the Philippines and grant certain privileges in the Carolines and the Ladrões for \$50,000,000; or to cede the Philippines, the Spanish West Indies and Guam, submitting to arbitration the question of the debts and obligations of a colonial character which the United States ought to assume. It is understood that these propositions were considered by a cabinet meeting at Washington; and upon the authority of Secretary Hay it is reported that the president cabled the American commissioners to follow his former instructions, which were to insist unconditionally upon the terms already proposed by them. This the American commissioners did; and on the 28th, at a brief joint meeting the Spanish commissioners announced their acceptance of those terms.

The body of the text of the Spanish memorandum of acceptance, as cabled to this country on the 28th, is as follows:

✦ We do not acknowledge your interpretation of the protocol; we do not

The Public

surrender to you as a right any of our pretensions; but the Spanish government, considering the United States has claimed the Philippines by an ultimatum, that America extends equal trade privileges to Spain, that the United States guarantees protection to Spanish life and property in the islands, that motives of humanity require that the Spanish people be not put through the horrors of another war, and that there is need of reviving Spanish trade, submits to the cruel law of conquerors and accepts all the terms in the American demand without change.

Senor Montero Rios, the head of the Spanish commission, in commenting upon the meeting after it had adjourned to the 30th for consideration of the formal treaty, said: "We have been abandoned by all Europe. It is a disgusting end."

The commissioners met again in joint session on the 30th for the purpose of formulating the treaty upon the basis of the terms agreed upon the day before. This meeting was a long one, and considerable progress was made. The Associated Press reports that articles were agreed upon as to the following points: Relinquishment of sovereignty over Cuba; cession of Porto Rico and other Spanish possessions in the West Indies; cession of the Philippines; and mutual release of military prisoners, including the Philippine rebels held by Spain and the Spaniards held by Aguinaldo. Adjournment was taken to Dec. 1. When the treaty shall have been signed by the joint commissioners, it must be adopted by the Spanish cortes and the United States senate before becoming operative.

Next in importance to the treaty agreement, in the business of closing up the war, is the occupation by the United States of western Cuba. This began on the 25th, with the arrival at Marianao beach, near Havana, of a detachment of the 2d regiment of engineers, comprising 233 soldiers and 10 officers. In preparing camp they were aided by a force of Cuban troops from Gen. Menocal's division. This first appearance of American troops near Havana was quickly followed by the withdrawal of Capt. Gen. Blanco from his office. His last official act was performed on the 28th, and on the 30th he sailed for Spain. Gen. Castellanos takes Blanco's place pending the evacuation.

In eastern Cuba, Gen. Wood is perfecting civil government under mili-

tary authority. He is reported as still exhibiting an inclination to favor Cuban self government. For mayor of Santiago city in place of the American military officer who has held that post, Gen. Wood appointed on the 25th Senor Bacardi, an old resident and Cuban sympathizer. Mayor Bacardi, with the full approval of Gen. Wood, and in accordance with his policy, immediately replaced the entire clerical force of the mayor's office with Cubans who had served in the war. The civil establishment of Santiago province is now reported as virtually complete.

France is again disturbed by the Dreyfus question. This is once more the most absorbing topic in European affairs, and it is even hinted that the emperor of Germany is preparing to make a declaration on the subject. The French chamber of deputies was this week in another turmoil over it, the particular point at issue having direct relation to Col. Picquart.

It will be remembered that Col. Picquart lost favor with the military ring by revealing facts which indicated the innocence of Dreyfus. In connection with this he was prosecuted in the ordinary criminal courts upon a charge of revealing documents concerning the national defense. His trial was to have begun September 21, but at that time the public prosecutor moved an adjournment on the ground that a military prosecution had been ordered by the war department upon charges of forgery and using forged documents in connection with the Dreyfus case. Picquart opposed this motion as an attempt to thrust him into the clutches of the military ring; but it was granted, and Picquart was taken out of the hands of the civil authorities and placed in military custody. He has ever since been in a military prison. It was believed at the time that Gen. Zur Linden, then minister of war, had taken this step for the purpose of getting a dangerous witness in the Dreyfus case out of the way.

Col. Picquart was not heard of again until he was brought before the court of cassation in the Dreyfus case as a witness. Thereupon Gen. Zur Linden, as military governor of Paris, signed a decree for his trial by court-martial. This decree was made public November 23. It ordered the court-martial to begin on December 12, the charges to be forgery and di-

vulging secret documents concerning the safety of the state. Col. Picquart was at the time under examination in the Dreyfus case before the court of cassation, and a deputation of senators of the left requested the premier, M. Dupuy, to postpone the Picquart court-martial until after the decision of the court of cassation in the Dreyfus case. M. Dupuy submitted this request to the cabinet, and as a result of its deliberations refused the request. That was on the 27th. On the 28th the matter came up in the chamber of deputies. The ministry submitted to the interpellation, and in a crowded chamber and amid great excitement the subject was immediately discussed.

The position taken by the ministry was that it could not order a postponement of the Picquart court-martial until a decision of the civil court in the Dreyfus case, without striking a blow at the principle of the separation of the military from the judicial powers. Upon this principle the ministry was sustained by a vote of 437 to 73.

When the wife of the Austrian emperor was murdered in Switzerland, several of the European powers took measures looking to a conference for devising means of suppressing what was vaguely described as "anarchy." This conference met on the 24th at Rome. All the European nations are reported as having been represented. It was opened by the Italian minister of foreign affairs, Vice Admiral Canevaro, who delivered an address on behalf of the king, and was subsequently elected president of the conference. Five propositions have been laid before the conference, for the consideration of which in detail five committees have been appointed. The propositions are as follows:

- 1.—To define a "criminal anarchist."
- 2.—To decide that anarchist outrages must be considered as crimes against common law and felonies and not as political offenses.
- 3.—To concert special measures against the press which incites the anarchist outrages or which carries on the anarchist propaganda in its columns.
- 4.—To establish a system of special and summary extradition or expulsion of anarchists or persons suspected on reasonable grounds of being engaged in anarchical plots.
- 5.—To organize a police service commissioned to keep up closer international relations.

Better methods of suppressing anarchy than any that the Rome conference is likely to devise, were under consideration on the 24th at Toronto. More than 100 advocates of social reform, coming from all parts of the province of Ontario, assembled in conference at the capital city for the purpose of promoting direct legislation by the people. Rev. Elliot S. Rowe was chairman of the conference. The methods decided upon were the "initiative," whereby a reasonable percentage of the people may compel the legislature to submit to popular vote any law for which they petition; the "referendum," whereby a reasonable percentage of the people may compel the legislature to submit to popular vote any law it may pass; and "proportional representation," whereby legislative bodies may be so constituted as to reflect proportionally the principal conflicting opinions of the community. After accepting these as their methods of direct legislation the Toronto conference resolved itself into the Canadian Direct Legislation League, and elected J. L. Hughes as president and Geo. Wrigley as corresponding secretary.

Our news note of last week to the effect that a revolt was then in progress in Salvador which might involve the new federation known as the United States of Central America, though based, as explained, upon indefinite and not quite trustworthy information, proves to have been true. The revolt has disrupted the federation. This federation, begun in June, 1897, and which originally included all the five Central American states, was finally organized November 1, 1898, by Nicaragua, Salvador and Honduras alone. Guatemala and Costa Rica held aloof. The plan was opposed by Gen. Tomas Regalado, formerly of the Salvador artillery service, who carried his opposition to the point of raising a rebellion against the Salvador government. President Gutierrez, of Salvador, sought and obtained the aid of Honduras; but after a conference between the three presidents of the newly federated republics, the president of Nicaragua refused to employ his troops against the rebels. The Honduras troops were not enough, and when President Gutierrez returned to Salvador after this conference, he found his government overthrown and the rebellious Regalado in full possession. In consequence of this successful revolt in Sal-

vador, the federal organizers, on the 30th, formally declared the federation dissolved.

A storm among the most terrible and disastrous of recent times, this week burst upon the Atlantic coast. It began in the evening of the 26th and was still raging 24 hours later. In Boston harbor one big ocean steamship and 28 schooners were wrecked, with the loss of a large but as yet unknown number of lives. The losses outside of this harbor can only be guessed at, but of property they will run into millions, and of lives into hundreds. Heavy damage was suffered also upon land. In Boston, Hartford, New York and as far south as Philadelphia, the wind was terrific and the snow piled up in high drifts. Railroad traffic was tied up, and great losses to both property and life are reported. No storm in the east has approached this one in severity, since the New York blizzard of 1888; and upon the sea if not also upon the land, this one was worse than that.

Among the many disasters which this storm caused at sea was the loss of the Portland, with all on board. The Portland, a large side wheel passenger steamer, started upon her regular trip from Boston to Portland, with 121 people on board, passengers and crew, at 7 o'clock on the evening of the 26th, while the storm was gathering. She soon encountered a gale blowing at the rate of 70 miles an hour, making waves like great rolling and tumbling mountains, and it is surmised that she became disabled and drifted helplessly. But what actually happened is not known and never will be. All who went out upon her were lost, while she, smashed and torn, lies upon the Cape Cod beach at North Truro, near Highland light. The bodies of thirty or more of her passengers and crew have been washed ashore, but none have yet been identified except by their life preservers, on which the name of the Portland is painted. From the hour near which all the watches found on recovered bodies had stopped, it is inferred that the Portland foundered or was abandoned at about nine o'clock on the morning of the 27th.

Thanksgiving day football, on the 24th, furnished an abundance of college sporting news. At Philadelphia, Pennsylvania University defeated

Cornell by 12 to 6. At San Francisco, Leland Stanford Jr., University counted 22 to 0 against the University of California. Wisconsin university won the game at Chicago against the Northwestern, by 47 to 0. Iowa university met the Nebraska students, at Council Bluffs, and won by 6 to 5. The team of the Illinois university went to Minneapolis and won against the Minnesota university by a score of 11 to 10. Kansas rolled up 12 to 0 at Kansas City against the Missouri university. And Oberlin defeated Purdue, at Lafayette, Ind., by 10 to 0.

NEWS NOTES.

—A new battleship, the Wisconsin, was launched on the 26th at San Francisco.

—Charles W. Couldock, a veteran actor of 60 years' experience, died at New York on the 27th at the age of 83.

—Lyman Abbott, has resigned the pastorate of Plymouth Church, in which he succeeded Henry Ward Beecher.

—The single tax league of Texas has presented to the University of that state a copy of the memorial edition of the works of Henry George.

—Final returns from South Dakota show that the initiative and referendum amendment was carried at the late election by a majority of 6,000.

—A successor to Dr. Briggs, the Union Theological seminary has offered a professorship to the Rev. Thos. C. Hall, brother of Bolton Hall. Mr. Hall has accepted.

—On the 23d the Baldwin hotel, San Francisco, was entirely destroyed by fire. Though there were 800 guests in the house at the time, besides employes, but two persons lost their lives.

—Of 94 members of the Oxford University debating society, 41 voted on the 24th, after a debate, in favor of socialism as the best remedy for the social and industrial evils of the present day.

—The generally accepted report that South Dakota voted for woman suffrage at the late elections, proves to have been a mistake. Final returns show that the suffrage amendment was defeated by 4,008 votes.

—The emperor of Germany has returned from his Holy Land tour. His yacht, with the imperial party on board, arrived at Pola, Austria, on the 23d. After a reception there he and his party left on the same day for home.

—Willis J. Abbott, under whose inspiration the editorial page of the New York Journal redeemed the "yellowness" of that paper in other depart-

ments, has withdrawn from his position as managing editor. The Journal has become an organ of imperialism.

—The court of appeals of New York decides that the anti-scalping law of that state is unconstitutional. It holds that the buying and selling of railroad tickets is a legitimate business, which may be honestly conducted, and therefore that the legislature has no power to destroy it.

—A claim of \$3,000 for arming and equipping troops, which was allowed to the state of Virginia by the war department, has, without the consent of Virginia, been balanced off by the treasury department against a claim the general government holds against her upon defaulted state bonds. The importance of this item lies in the fact that the general government could not enforce its claim directly by any legal process.

—The National Municipal League, or federation of Civic Clubs, held its seventh annual conference at Indianapolis on the 30th. Among the representative delegates in attendance were Horace Deming and Prof. John R. Commons, of New York; Prof. George D. Herron and William Graham, of Iowa; William Dudley Foulke, of Indiana; Hon. Samuel M. Jones and Rev. B. O. Vincent, of Ohio; Hon. Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, and Prof. E. W. Bemis, of Kansas. The league had under consideration a model city charter, prepared and submitted by the committee of seven appointed for that purpose at the conference at Louisville in May, 1897.

MISCELLANY

SUNRISE IN MEXICO.

For the Public.

Oh, I look east, and there smiles at me—

Ere the rosy dawn is red—

A silver ship in a golden sea,

With a pearl-pink sail outspread.

And heavily draped and crimson tinged,

Purple shadowed and golden fringed,

The curtaining clouds draw wide.

And I look west, and the valleys laugh,

And the hillside dimples show;

And far beyond, where the mountains gleam,

The sunbeams redden the snow

And the blue sky peeps thro' the rose-cloud spray,

And the silver ship sails away, away—

Away on the endless tide!

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BALLOT.

The indifference of educated women to their political disabilities may be traced in a large measure to their comfortable environments, and their fear of assuming new responsibilities. The indifference of the working classes is due to their imperative necessities, which fully occupy their hands and

thoughts. Thus as a class we are sacrificed to plenty on the one side, and poverty on the other, the few only being roused to action by the vindication of a principle. The many do not see that the wrongs of society are the result of laws made by man that can be repealed. We are not the victims of an inexorable Providence that has placed us in a position where we are compelled to stay. "Dead fish go down with the current; live ones only swim up the stream."—Elizabeth Cady Stanton, before the New York State Suffrage Asso., Nov. 8.

WANTS A MONOPOLY.

Ex-Queen Liliuokalani has returned to the United States for the purpose, it is said, of making formal application for the restoration of the Hawaiian crown lands, valued at \$6,000,000. The application will be based on the ground that the lands are private property, and therefore are not subject to confiscation. What the ex-queen really wants this government to do is to give her and her heirs authority to enrich themselves and live in luxury at the expense of others. Perhaps 40, or at most 160 acres, carefully cultivated, would afford the royal family a comfortable living. But this is not satisfactory. They want millions of acres to the end that they may extort tribute from the thousands who, forced by their necessities, must work the land as tenants or laborers. So far as the common people of Hawaii are concerned it will probably make no difference whether Liliuokalani is granted or refused what she intends to ask, since if she is not accorded a monopoly of the land others will be and they must therefore continue tribute payment. What is objectionable, whether the monopolist be of royal or non-royal blood, is the system of land tenure which permits and encourages monopoly. — Dubuque (Ia.) Daily Telegraph.

BRAINS NOT ESSENTIAL TO MONEY-MAKING.

We are wont to regard the acquisition of large fortunes as due to exceptional thrift and enterprise, or to farsightedness, and the existence of poverty to indolence and improvidence, as well as to want of sagacity and foresight. But this is not true. While there is a great difference in business sagacity and qualifications for business, no man can earn a great fortune by honest toil, nor can any man acquire a large fortune, by which we mean become a millionaire, and give the public an equivalent in return for it. Some men have a keener sense of spoils and profits

than others, are shrewder in trade and more alert for opportunities and less scrupulous in improving them than others. The possession of these qualities is rather to be deprecated than boasted of. Who would not rather be poor like a Sumner or a Stevens, a Whittier or a Hawthorne, or even a Burns, than rich like a Gould, a Mills, or a Sage? Again, the love of money is stronger in some than in others. It often amounts to a passion, and dominates all considerations of fair play, honesty and even honor. Men thus constituted bend all their powers to business, and accordingly succeed, not by weight of talent or exceptional ability, except it be for business, but rather by reason of enterprise and unscrupulousness as to methods.—American Magazine of Civics.

THE NEW ZEALAND OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

New Zealand has recently made a remarkable experiment by a law allowing £18 a year (about \$90) to every person in the colony whose income is less than 13s. (\$3.25) a week, and whose age is over sixty-five. This is practically an application of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's idea of old-age pensions, and is especially interesting by reason of the time and place of its probable operation.

New Zealand is pre-eminently the leader in advanced democratic legislation, and whatever distrust may be felt in regard to some of its experiments is fairly well balanced by the approval of changes which have proved solidly beneficial, and by the deep interest which its fearless attempts to actualize theories of social amelioration have excited.

This thought of old-age pensions is deep in the minds of millions of workmen, especially in Europe, and it is associated with the idea of justice due from the community to those whose labor has benefited it, as well as the duty of the State, the executive organ of the community, to see that justice is done. New Zealand is apparently about to do what vast masses of democratic voters in England and on the Continent of Europe would like to see done in their respective countries; and, if New Zealand is successful in the attempt, the hopes of the older peoples will be perceptibly nearer realization.

We have not yet seen any particulars as to the methods of taxation to provide for these pensions. Much will depend upon the view of the Government as to special contributions by workmen. The London Spectator recommends that the necessary taxation

should take the form of a system of universal compulsory insurance, supervised and rather heavily aided by the State. "There is no doubt in anyone's mind," says that journal, "that pensions to the aged poor or the aged population, whenever adopted, must involve increased taxation, but there is absolutely no reason why that taxation should not take the just and expedient form of a minute payment from the age of majority to that of sixty-five." In New Zealand, however, this could hardly be done if the process savored of treating workmen as a class; the strongly felt, not to say fierce, democratic equality of the people would not allow it. The taxes for pensions will in all probability be levied in the ordinary way.—The Outlook.

A DEFENSE OF THE ROYAL HOUSE OF ITALY.

In The Public of November 26 appeared an extract from an article by "Ouida" entitled "An Impeachment of Modern Italy," which had been published in the November Review of Reviews. In the same number of the same magazine appeared a reply to "Ouida's" impeachment, by Giovanni Dalla Vecchia, from which we take the following paragraphs:

It is extremely vulgar to speak disrespectfully of the house of Savoy and of King Humbert. It is simply cruel to represent the king of Italy—one of the most valiant and kind-hearted rulers who ever sat on a throne—as a greedy man and to pass nasty remarks about his civil list. Anyone might know what use King Humbert makes of the money he receives from the country. He has \$1,750,000 yearly, and with this he has to keep going ten royal residences. Three would be enough for him, but all the capitals of the ancient states of Italy wish to have their own court. With this money he keeps thousands of people either in his service or out of the workhouse. When King Victor Emmanuel died he left a debt of about 36,000,000 lire. Crispi intended to ask parliament to pay this debt, but King Humbert refused the offer, saying: "The debts of the father shall be paid by the son," and he paid them. According to the Italian statute the heir to the throne is entitled to an appanage when he comes of age and another when he marries. King Humbert has not yet allowed his minister to ask parliament to vote this grant, and the court of the Prince of Naples is still kept by King Humbert himself. When the city of Turin voted 150,000 lire for a monument to King Humbert's brother, with his thanks the king sent a check for 160,000 lire to help finish a hospital which is now the greatest and the most modern hospital of Europe. King Humbert

every year distributes about 1,000,000 lire in charity. . . .

I do not deny the existence of a widespread dissatisfaction, but I deny that the present regime is in the main responsible for it; I deny that another regime would improve matters. To think, as some do, that the republic would have the magical power to enlighten the benighted, to make dishonest men honest, to turn the water of the rivers into milk and the stones of the streets into bread, is a sheer nightmare. No one denies the Italian people the right to change their constitution; but the change must be willed by the nation and not by a few agitators. However, the conscience of all well-meaning persons attests that the evil is not in the machine, but in the way it has been worked this last thirty years.

THE CHINESE EMPEROR'S DEPOSITION.

The full story of the deposition of the Emperor of China and the return of the Empress Dowager to power has at last reached Europe. It appears that the Emperor had decided to remove the Empress Dowager to a separate palace, where she would be shut off from communication with officials and unable to interfere with the line of action which was outlined in the rapid succession of edicts providing for the reorganization of the Empire. Warning had reached the Emperor that the Empress and Li Hung Chang were conspiring to rob him of power; in order to protect himself and carry out his measures, upon consultation with Yuan, the Emperor had decided to bring a large force of troops to the capital. Unfortunately, Yuan told a friend in confidence, and this friend promptly carried the Emperor's plan to the Empress Dowager. The Emperor received an urgent message to visit the Empress Dowager; he did so, and from that day has not been seen by any outsiders except a French physician.

As soon as the Empress had secured the custody of the Emperor's person she ordered the arrest of all the leaders of the reform party, and, after a sham trial, six prominent officials were decapitated. Her methods are illustrated by the neat little scheme by which she disposed of the life of Chang Yin Yuan, one of the prominent reformers. The life of Chang was spared, and he was exiled to Kashgari, as the result of an appeal by the British and Japanese Ministers. He was accompanied by two servants, a cook, a guard of ten soldiers, also by an extra man, or runner. This man carried with him a warrant for the execution of Chang, and he was to kill

all his servants so that no news of the death should reach Peking. He was ordered to execute his warrant at a considerable distance from Peking, but, becoming impatient at the end of four days' travel, he strangled Chang, and the servants, with a single exception, were also killed. The facts are known only to a few persons besides the Empress, and the former are under a reign of terror which makes it impossible for them to talk about it.

In fact, all Peking is under a reign of terror, and no official who has at any time favored reform or been friendly to foreigners is sure of his life. Edicts have been issued by the Empress suppressing newspapers and magazines, restoring the old system of examination for civil service, and bringing in all the old abuses. In a word, the reform movement which the Emperor projected has been checked at every point and the old order restored in every particular.—The Outlook.

THE PAST HAS NO RIGHT TO CONTROL THE PRESENT.

Every age and generation must be as free to act for itself in all cases as the ages and generations which preceded it. The vanity and presumption of governing beyond the grave is the most ridiculous and insolent of all tyrannies. Man has no property in man; neither has any generation a property in the generations which are to follow. The parliament or the people of 1688, or any other period, has no more right to dispose of the people of the present day, or to bind or control them in any shape whatever, than the parliament or the people of the present day have to dispose of, bind, or control those who are to live a hundred or a thousand years hence. Every generation is and must be competent to all the purposes which its occasion requires. It is the living and not the dead that are to be accommodated. When a man ceases to be, his power and his wants cease with him; and, having no longer any participation in the concerns of this world, he has no longer any authority in directing who shall be its governors, or how its government shall be organized or how administered. Those who have quitted the world, and those who have not yet arrived in it, are as remote from each other as the utmost stretch of mortal imagination can conceive. What possible obligation then can exist between them? What rule or principle can be laid down, that two nonentities, the one out of existence and the other not in, and who never can meet in this world, that the one should control the other to the end of time?—Thomas Paine.

A WELL TRIED REMEDY.

The deciphering of an Egyptian papyrus in the Museum of Turin, shows how the old proverb that there is nothing new under the sun, applies to strikes as to many other things.

This papyrus, which is a sort of journal or day book of the superintendent of the Thebes necropolis, furnishes curious details of a workman's riot or trade dispute, which occurred in the ancient city in the reign of Ramses III.

The workmen's quarter sent a deputation to the keeper of the books and to several priests of the necropolis during the strike. The speaker of the deputation is reported as having said:

"Behold, we are face to face with famine. We have neither nourishment, nor oil, nor vestments; we have no fish; we have no vegetables. We have already sent a petition to our sovereign lord, the Pharaoh, praying him to give us these things, and now we address the governor, in order that he might give us the wherewithal to live."

This event took place on the first day of the month Tibi (equal to our December 27), and from the facts gathered from the interesting document it would appear that the men had struck work about two months previously. Some weeks after this they were in full revolt. Three times they emerged from their quarters, notwithstanding the walls that surrounded them and the gates that shut them in. "We will not return," cried they to the police sent in pursuit of them. "Go tell your chief what we tell you. It is famine which speaks by our mouths."

"To argue with them was useless; there was great agitation," writes the superintendent in his daybook. "I gave them the strongest answer I could imagine, but their words were true and came from their hearts."

They were quieted by the distribution of half rations, but ten days later they were up again. Kohus, the leader of the band, pressed his companions to provide for themselves. "Let us fall," said he, "upon the stores of provisions and let the governor's men go and tell him what we have done." This was the advice of their agitator. It would appear that his counsel was acted upon as soon as it was given. They forcibly entered the inclosure, but not the fortress, where the provisions were kept. The keeper of the stores, Amen Nextu, gave them something and continued to induce them to return to their quarters. Eleven days later their movements began again. The commander of Thebes, passing by, found them seated on the ground holding a meeting behind the temple of Seti, at the northern end of

the necropolis. Immediately they began to shout out: "Famine! Famine!"

The commander then gave an order for 50 measures of wheat in the name of Pharaoh, "who has sworn an oath," said he, "that you will have food again." Most likely Pharaoh never heard of the event, and never received the petition addressed to him a couple of months previously. Kohus, above referred to, was evidently the leader of the strikers, much as we have labor leaders now, and the man of the hour while the agitation lasted.—Biblia.

WHY WOMEN SHOULD VOTE.

For the Public.

Among thinking men the question of female suffrage is attracting increased attention. I favor woman suffrage,

First, because there are more good women than there are good men, and for that reason the moral effect of an election would be greater.

Second, because women have more love of humanity, more sentiment, more sympathy for distress, and are more unselfish. True, they have not had so much training in business as men, but that is one of the reasons why I favor giving them the elective franchise. We have heard so much about the business interests, which they claim will be injured by the success of those who believe in certain necessary reforms, that I think it high time those who are not so much interested in that business bogymen should vote.

What are these business interests which are to be so seriously affected? Are they not monopolies and trusts? Is it not an admitted fact among all honest men that nearly every branch of business is controlled by a monopoly or trust? If not I would like to have some reader of *The Public* point out to its readers any important business that is not controlled by a trust.

If it is the business interests of the country which are to be the controlling factor in our elections, then we commit ourselves to the policy of conserving the interests of trusts and monopolies. If such business interests will be disturbed by the much-needed monetary reform, then it is high time such a disturbance took place.

A woman brought about the greatest moral reform that ever rocked the foundations of the republic, when she wrote "Uncle Tom's Cabin." True, it was sentimental; true, it disturbed the business interests of those who were living in luxury on the sweat and blood of those who toiled, just as the so-called business interests are now doing.

Chattel slavery is not as inhuman as economic slavery. True, chattel slavery was the breeder of lust and licentiousness. True, it separated husbands and wives in some instances, when slaves were sold; but, is not the economic slavery of our day responsible for nine-tenths of the prostitution of to-day? Are not many of the wives and daughters of to-day sold body and soul for the necessities of life?

If women voted does any thinking man believe that the low saloon element would control our primaries and elections? Sentiment, humanity and sympathy for the oppressed should have more recognition in the politics of our country. Sentimental considerations have produced the greatest revolutions in the world's history, and have done more for the uplifting of the human race than all the business interests combined.

We need a little more sentiment, a little more humanity, yes, a little more of the religion of Jesus Christ in our politics. Women will give it to us if we give them a chance. Women are certainly as well educated as men; they are more sympathetic; they are more moral, and less selfish. Do we not need just those elements in our politics?

A woman emancipated the black slaves of the south. Women must emancipate the white slaves of the whole country, or the greed and selfishness of men will reduce the toilers of this country to a still more oppressive slavery to the monopolies and trusts.

W. J. STRONG.

"MONSTROUS INCAPACITY."

A portion of a letter addressed by Robert B. Roosevelt, secretary of the committee of the Society for the Protection of Soldiers, to the war investigating commission, meeting in New York, Nov. 26. The letter was read to the commission, and placed on file.

To the Presidential Commission of Inquiry—Gentlemen: I have noticed in the morning press that one of your members criticises the witnesses who have testified at the request of the committee formed in this city to protect the soldiers, for the reason that while establishing the fact that much groundless and excusable suffering was inflicted on the army, they do not fix the responsibility nor show who is to blame. If the views of your commission are correctly reported, there seems to be a misunderstanding between us. We supposed that all the witnesses were to do was to prove the facts, and that the commission would fix the responsibility, indeed, was appointed for the

express purpose of fixing the responsibility.

The heroic boys may forget their sufferings; may even refuse to testify to them, but their mothers will not and their fathers will not. Nor will it do to take refuge behind the errors of the civil war. There was then no intentional cruelty, such as seems to have so often prevailed in this war. The sick men were not starved. Sick men were treated with all possible attention and kindness. Water was not sold to fever-racked sufferers at ten cents a glass; food was not sold at 25 cents for a sandwich, and dainties for the dying men were not eaten by the officers. But suppose matters had been a thousand times worse in the civil war, would that be any reason now that our men should be sent with arms out of date, that there should be no ambulances, no pack trains or transportation to carry food to the front; not half sufficient medicines, nor doctors; no proper hospitals, and that men with freshly treated wounds should be left to lie in the mud on a blanket if they had one—without if they had none—nor even why midwinter underclothing should be sent to Cuba and midsummer gauze undershirts to Montana?

The witnesses have established monstrous incapacity. That they have not full confidence in the power of your commission, no matter how good its will, to meet all the requirements the public demands of it, is only echoing your own doubt, but in spite of that they seem to have done their share, and it would seem that it only remains for you to do your best even if that best is not quite satisfactory to yourselves. If done in good faith it will teach the soldiers that at least there is a power which was honestly endeavoring to do them justice.

You can direct your inquiries in the first place to the food supply. Find out who gets the difference between the liberal rations allowed by the government and the meager hard tack, bacon and green coffee served to the soldiers. The witnesses are the books and the rolls in the public departments, to which you have full access.

We have furnished you the facts, shown you brutality, cruelty, neglect, indifference; how men whom the government was under every obligation to protect, and especially because they had a right to rely on such protection, were starved, even in the land of plenty; were uncared for when sick, left without attention; when wounded were abused, maltreated — in some cases practically murdered. We have shown you an indifference and belittling of

human sufferings which continue even now. If this nation is to become a warlike one, if we are to have an army which shall be efficient and to be relied upon, these crimes and blunders must be corrected, and your commission must correct them. It is not for you to make the feeble excuse that our committee, a mere voluntary association with no legal existence even, shall shoulder this responsibility.

"ORIGINAL WORK."

Mr. Frederic Harrison, in his article in the *Nineteenth Century* on Freeman's "Historical Method" has some sharp but just things to say about the ravages of what is called "original work" in history. What is meant is terrific labor in accumulating a mass of minute details never before brought to light, but which prove to be either untrustworthy or without significance when the grave-clothes are torn off them. It is this system of "minute realism" in history which gives us so many monographs and studies dull as ditch-water, and leads so many investigators to wreak themselves in mighty volumes upon a "period." Under the triumphant name of "new material" and "unpublished manuscripts," the learned world is deluged with material which, whether new or old, is a weariness to the flesh, and with manuscripts which Heaven seemed specially to have designed never to be published. As Mr. Harrison says, it is this sort of research which is killing the art of historical narration, and rendering history, instead of a synthetic whole, instead of a life-like picture, a mass of dreary fac-similes of queen's washing-lists and inventories of the number of swine kept on a baronial manor in the twelfth century. It is fun for the investigator, but it is death to the reader. The world, observes Mr. Harrison, is "not as fond of 'periods' as a school-teacher and a college tutor."

Mr. Harrison thinks that this blight of minute knowledge which has fallen upon historical composition is due to the system of examinations. Their very life-blood is in subtle points and out-of-the-way scraps of knowledge which form the basis for "marks." But the same tendencies are observable in this country, where examinations have not been developed with such rigor, nor made the sure means of a livelihood, as in England. Many of our historical monographs are as murderously petty and prolonged as anything Oxford can show. And the same methods are carried into other departments. Since literature, for example, came to be "scientifically" studied in our colleges, the fearful and wonderful results of-

ferred us in the name of "original work" have been enough to make a census report fascinating reading by comparison. Our original literary workers dive into a great poem or a masterpiece of prose and come up in triumph laden with statistics. They have counted the number of false rhymes in the "Faery Queen," they can tell you exactly how many times the word "nature" occurs in Burke. Who shall, after that, forbid them the degree of Litt. Doc.? Really "original" literary work seems now, in fact, to be largely an affair of counting. It is arithmetic applied to literature. Criticism is the art of turning out statistics. Thus we read of a devoted woman, painfully toiling after the higher education and the degree of M. A., who wrestled night after night with a thesis on Browning. But what was it all about? Why, the dear lady was counting and classifying the colors, and the animals, and the precious stones, and the flowers, and the figures of speech to be found in Browning's complete works! Of course, she was doing it on the advice of her professor. True monsters of learning, each of them!

It seems probable that all this is partly, at least, the result of the rush of so many to the schools. Out of them all, but here and there one has a mind of true insight, of native taste, of grasp on principles; and what easier disposition to make of the rest than to set them counting? Almost anybody can count so many hours a day. Give a student pigeon-holes enough, and he can in time analyze and classify all literature—and not know the first thing about it when he is done. Certain it is that the scientific organization of the departments of literature in many of our colleges and universities has led thousands to drench and drown their minds in these floods of trifling details, in which every spark of real literary taste is surely extinguished. The system distinctly tends to give us, in the professors' chairs, pottering statisticians instead of inspiring lecturers, and, on the students' benches, a generation that loses itself in verbal forms and weak endings, and remains dull and blank to literature itself.

Perhaps the phenomenon should be treated as one of the inevitable vices of specialization. The time of the wide-ranging intellect seems gone by, in science and economics as well as history and literature. In their room we get 10,000 men, each cultivating his little garden plot, all the while making it smaller and smaller, and bending over it with eyes ever more bleared and short-sighted. David A. Wells was almost an extinct type of economist,

even before he died. Few survive with his vast power of coordination and assimilation. Instead of his wide outlook upon diverse phenomena, the typical worker in economics to-day is the man who will prove, after several years of exhausting labor, that Thorold Rogers was all wrong about the price of wheat in Bristol in the year 1521. In science, too, the men of eagle eye, like Darwin and Dana, are gone, and we know now only the intense specialists who are content to wear out their lives in "settling hoti's business." Darwin's son, endowed with a generous portion of his father's spirit, as he is, confesses in his latest book the deadly effect of specialization and of the multiplied apparatus of modern laboratories upon native scientific genius.

All this is not saying that minute research is not necessary and may not, in the hands of masters, lead to most important results. As Mr. Harrison says of Freeman, "new material" and "unpublished manuscripts" were a powerful weapon when it was he that grasped it; but "it is a very dangerous tool in the hands of the lads and lasses who swagger about with it in public." It is little better than a modern superstition to suppose that history can be written by laboriously copying out and stringing together bits of paper dug up in Simancas; or that a man is fitted to discourse on sociology and propose plans for remodelling society simply by having averaged the annual outlay for beer of 237 selected families on Avenue A, or that a critic is qualified to lecture on Shakespeare by having thumbed his works solely to discover exactly how many times the scenes end with a rhymed couplet, and how many times with blank verse. Before we boast of "original work," we should decide whether it was worth doing, originally or subsequently, and whether it leads to something for the worker, besides helplessly floundering in a morass of his own creating.—Editorial in New York Evening Post.

THE COST OF EMPIRE.

The mere money cost of this colonial enterprise, even so far as we have gone, will be enormous. The annual cost of our small army on a peace footing is about \$24,500,000. The cost of the administrative force and the miscellaneous and incidental expenses of the war department is about \$7,000,000, making a total of a little more than \$31,000,000. The cost of the navy, counting the appropriation for its increase, is about \$30,000,000. No military authority believes that we ought to main-

tain an army of less than 100,000 men. The pay, traveling expenses, transportation, and general expenses of the army, as it stood before the war, were about \$16,000,000. On this basis the same expenses would amount to quite \$65,000,000, for not only would the pay of the troops be multiplied by four, but the cost of their transportation would be increased in a much greater ratio. The cost of subsistence for the army would be increased from \$1,750,000 to at least \$7,000,000. The item of quartermaster's supplies would grow from \$2,300,000 to quite \$10,000,000 for several years to come, and after that to at least \$5,000,000. There would be an increase of expenditure for horses alone of about \$500,000, and of at least \$1,500,000 for medical and ordnance departments and other incidentals. This estimate, which is moderate, shows an annual increase of \$64,000,000 for army expenses alone if the army be increased to 100,000, while the additional cost of new fortifications, new post buildings, quarters and barracks, would easily bring this up to \$65,000,000. But it is very well understood, even by those who are talking of increasing the army to 100,000 men, that such a force would not begin to be adequate to the demands of the new colonies for their defense and for service at home, and that an army of at least 250,000 men will be necessary for these purposes, including the maintenance of peace at home; and the statesman who is counting the cost of annexation and expansion, if there be such a statesman in the country, would be imprudent to estimate for an annual increase of the army budget of less than \$100,000,000.

As to the navy, we shall, in the first place, be obliged to count on an expenditure of at least \$100,000,000 for the purpose of bringing it into the rank of of first-class "fighting fleets," and instead of appropriating from \$9,000,000 to \$13,000,000 annually for the purpose of increasing it, congress will be obliged to appropriate from \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000 if we are to catch up with European governments. Even then they will be obliged to halt for us if we are to speedily arrive at their state of preparation. The annual cost of the British navy is about \$115,000,000, and that of the French navy about \$57,000,000. We shall be lucky if we get off with an expenditure for the navy of less than \$60,000,000 a year in excess of the expenditures of 1897.

After this war we shall have to reckon on large additions to our civil list, which will be made necessary by our new colonies. They must be governed, and governed thoroughly and ex-

pensively, if they are to be governed well. The cost of a colonial service must be largely a matter of conjecture. It depends on the intelligence of congress; and we are painfully aware that the legislative branch of the government is not inclined to expend the public money merely where it is needed. Congressmen are always desirous that it shall go where it will do the most good—to them; that is, where their constituents may get a share, whether government receives a return for its expenditure or not. We are assuming, however, that in time circumstances, which are likely to be delicate on distant frontiers, will compel the establishment of a good colonial service, and in that event we fancy that its cost will be a good deal larger than the present cost of our foreign service, which is in the neighborhood of \$1,700,000. The cost of our diplomatic service must also increase with new international complications, and this increase together with the cost of the colonial service will certainly amount to \$3,000,000.

Thus we have at once an annual increase of expenditures for colonial defense and government of the very considerable amount of \$163,000,000. The calculations on which this estimate is based are necessarily crude, but the result may be depended upon to be well within the sum which the possession of distant colonies will add to the cost of government. Moreover, this great sum must be raised by direct taxation; for the extension of the free-trade principle to these colonies—the principle which obtains between the states—will deprive the government of a main source of its customs revenue. We cannot levy a customs duty on the products of our own country. But in ordinary years raw sugar pays us more than \$50,000,000 in revenue, while tobacco pays us from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000. Are the sugars of Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines and Hawaii to come in free, and the tobacco and cigars of the West Indies and the Philippines to be untaxed at the threshold of the country? Certainly, if the countries in which these products are produced are to become part of the United States. Here then we have at least \$60,000,000 to be added to the amount which the colonies will actually cost, making in all something like \$223,000,000 that must be raised every year by direct taxation, in addition to the present ordinary expenses of the government, which are supposed to be enormously extravagant. We repeat that this great sum must be raised by direct taxation, because we assume that in due time our politicians will come to un-

derstand that expansion and protection cannot go together. But this is a subject for future consideration. We rest content at present with showing that the cost of empire is as splendid as empire itself. We might go further, and point out that the returns from such colonies as those which are now stimulating the imaginations of our politicians would make a most insignificant showing on the other side of the ledger. Of this we may be sure, that the further we go into this predatory scheme, the more surely will we realize that empire in our time and for us will be a useless extravagance, on account of whose burdens our descendants will deride us, for they will consider annexation and expansion as the political and economic follies of the end of the century the opening of which glowed with the hope of democracy.—Editorial in Harper's Weekly of Nov. 26.

The greatest problem now confronting American cities is that of the disposition and control of municipal monopolies. The next in importance is that of honesty in the conduct of municipal affairs. The solving of the first will largely settle the second, for the chief source of public dishonesty is found in the system of bribery, shamelessly and professionally practiced by the conscienceless Shylocks, who monopolize the necessities of city life. . . No individual, or corporation of associated individuals, should be granted privileges that of right are the common property of the entire body of citizenship. Upon its very face such action is both a moral and economic wrong, and the day is nearing when a clarified public opinion will stamp it as wholesale robbery.—Rev. James Hoffman Batten, as reported by Peoria Herald.

Already they are estimating that 22,000 pension claims growing out of the Spanish war will be filed in this country, 20,000 of which will be due to disabilities and deaths contracted in the camps. It will be a long time before we shall get through paying for the luxury of Algerism.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

Cuba—Gi'mme that knife and let me carve out my own destiny, as you said you would! If you don't I'll take to the woods again!

United States—But I had no idee you were sech a little feller! Children shouldn't be allowed to handle edged tools, you know.—Citizen and Country, of Toronto.

Pennsylvania swallows Stone and stones Swallow.—The Bulletin, Philadelphia.

ONE TYPE OF PATRIOT.

When he reads of San Juan he imagines himself glorying in the storm of shot and shell.

But on election day he guesses it looks rather stormy, and he doesn't bother about going to the polls.—The Inter Ocean, Chicago.

To-day the men who dig coal are in abject want within ten miles of the Ohio home of the president; even while he is preaching the prosperity he has brought us, from his palace car. Let me quote you an extract from the last report of the mine inspector of Ohio: "From the statistics gathered from 1,228 mines in the state I find the whole number of working days for Ohio miners in 1897 was about 150 out of the 312 working days in the year. The total average earning per man of Ohio miners in 1897 was \$192.05, while in 1896, under the deplorable Grover Cleveland, it was \$221.55. In other words, counting his whole year's work, a coal miner receives a trifle less than 53 cents per day under the McKinley prosperity, while in 1896 he received a trifle over 60 cents per day under Grover Cleveland's starvation panic wages.—Cleveland Recorder.

In order to further discredit the McKinley administration and bring reproach upon the management of the war, Colonel Bryan has conceived the subtle villainy of contracting fever in camp at Savannah.—The News, Detroit.

One of the oldest maritime fictions has received its deathblow by the raising of the American flag over Guam, in the Ladrone islands. According to sailors, thousands of vessels cleared for Guam from ports all over the world each year, but none ever arrived there. Clearing for Guam was done by ships which wished to conceal their real destination. According to maritime law, when once a vessel has cleared for a port it must proceed there by the most direct route or give a satisfactory explanation.

Finance and Transportation

BY JAY D. MILLER.

Paper; 96 pages; Single Copies, 10c., 30 Copies, \$1.00.

Gov. H. S. Pingree, Lansing, Mich. "This publication presents in their true light, questions that immediately concern the American people."
 Mayor S. M. Jones, Toledo, O. "It is one of the most comprehensive statements of our social and economic problems that has come to my hands."
 Prof. Geo. D. Herron, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. "Its facts are presented in a very unprejudiced and helpful spirit, and can not be set aside. I use it among my students and recommend it every where."
 Louis F. Post, Chicago. "It is an intellectual mine which all parties to the controversy may profitably explore."

JAY D. MILLER'S SONS, Oak Park, Ill.

planation. Guam was a closed port under the Spanish rule and ships could always give that as a reason for not going there after having cleared for the place.—Chicago Chronicle.

God Winning Us.

BY REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:
 GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US.....(Incarnation)
 GOD WINNING US.....(Atonement)
 GOD OPENING OUR EYES.....(Faith)
 GOD GROWING IN US.....(Regeneration)
 GOD ACTING THROUGH US.....(Religion)
 GOD CARING FOR US.....(Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, GERMANTOWN, PA

The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office, \$0.02
 Quantities delivered at office, per 100, 1.00
 Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, .03
 Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100, 2.00
 In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100, 1.25

- The following pamphlets are now ready:
1. A Business Tendency (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
 2. That Favorable Balance of Trade (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
 3. Nero-Then, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
 4. Department Stores (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

The Public

Is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.
 Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.
 Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 522, Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address: THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:
 Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PRISTER, 140 Wason Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St. West.