

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1898.

Number 36.

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.

As the Chicago Chronicle puts it, Speaker Reed is now in session.

President McKinley's message to Congress, particularly in its review of the war with Spain, is an exceptionally impressive state paper. This is attributable to its admirable composition. Of ministerial English, it is a model. While rhetorically expansive and rotund, it is nevertheless exceedingly simple. The art of making readers see things from the writer's point of view was never more perfectly practiced.

In other respects also the message is a superior production. But to this there are exceptions. When in the preamble the president allows himself to go into ecstasies over the prosperity of the people, it is evident that he has been influenced by the joy of his monopoly cronies more than by the misery of the millions who perceive no practical distinction between the prosperity to which they have attained and the hard times through which they have passed.

And one must be somewhat of a stoic to suppress a smile at some passages in the message, so suggestive are they of unsophistication. One of these is the complacent reference to the small allotments of war bonds, as if they indicated a wide distribution of the war debt among the people. Is it not notorious that a large proportion of these small allotments went to big investors under cover of the bids of employes? Mr. Gage caught Armour in the trick, but he didn't catch everybody who played it. Still

further evidence of unsophistication appears in the president's grave assumption that the Spanish fleet at Manila was "formidable!"

The message almost escaped one blemish. We refer to the display of Mr. McKinley's characteristic cant. But room was made for that in one short paragraph. The president thanks God for His services in the war, in the same spirit in which the war heroes are thanked. Readers are made to feel that in Mr. McKinley's estimation the loving Father of all men was a most useful American partisan in the conflict, who, since he cannot be promoted ought at least to receive honorable mention. It is a bit of pietistic idolatry more appropriate to a tribe of pagans than to a nation of Christians.

But few important recommendations are made in the message. Such as are made are almost without exception either in the interest of the plutocratic elements of the country or otherwise contrary to the spirit of democracy. Chief among these is the proposition to set aside a trust fund in gold for the redemption of greenbacks, and to reissue redeemed greenbacks only in exchange for gold. The object of that policy is to reduce the volume of government money by the amount of the greenbacks in existence, and thus to open the way to the national banks to control the supply to that extent of the circulating medium. Retirement of the greenbacks is what this recommendation by the president means.

Another objectionable recommendation relates to extradition. In extradition treaties it is common to provide that neither of the contracting nations shall be bound to sur-

render its own citizens to the other upon charges of crime; and our courts hold that under such treaties the president has no power to surrender an American citizen. Mr. McKinley now asks that this power be conferred. His request is for authority to do in his discretion what the treaty making power established by the constitution refuses to allow him to do. It is not for the president alone, but for the president and the senate together, to decide who shall be surrendered for criminal trial abroad, and upon what terms the surrender shall be made; and there is reason to doubt the constitutional power of congress to confer upon the president the power he solicits. But whether constitutional or not, such an extension of his discretionary power would be another step in the direction of making of the president an absolute monarch. That is in itself an all-sufficient reason for denying the request.

Worst of all the president's recommendations is that for a fourfold increase of the standing army. This is something which European experience and our own traditions warn us against. Large standing armies afford opportunists at critical moments for suppressing popular movements and putting dangerous men on horseback. One is needed by us for no other purpose. What we lacked in the Spanish war, for example, was not an army, but supplies for the army. And we should not have been lacking in that respect if the president had appointed West Point graduates instead of civilians with a "pull," to places of military authority. If we have a large standing army it will itch for a chance to practice, and in default of foreign foes will practice upon the people at home. Standing armies, like loaded pistols, are most dangerous to those who carry them.

While the president in his message gives details of battle casualties, he makes no allusion to the mismanagement of the war, to the suffering of soldiers with sickness and their death from disease, nor to the inquiry which he is prosecuting through Gen. Dodge's committee. His attitude regarding the question of newly acquired territory is treated in an article on another page entitled, "Our New Possessions."

It is not long since British approval of anything American, instantly condemned it in republican eyes. British approval of a message of Cleveland's, for instance, would have been regarded as shocking evidence of treason in the white house. But something must have happened, for republican papers and statesmen are clapping their hands enthusiastically at the British approval of McKinley's message.

Admiral Sampson's report, made public the latter part of last week, goes far to confirm a suspicion as to Gen. Shafter's campaign in Cuba which other sources of information had aroused and strengthened. It was from the first inconceivable to the non-military mind that a competent general in Shafter's situation should in good faith have marched into the interior, out of the reach of naval support, and invited such casualties, apparently useless, as those which Shafter suffered the 1st and 2d of July. The obvious point of attack would have seemed to be upon the fortifications at the harbor entrance, with the navy clearing the way as the army advanced along the southern coast.

Shafter has given four reasons for not adopting that course. He has said that the line of march would have been through poisonous undergrowth; that the army could not have availed itself of the streams for water; that the Spanish position at the mouth of the harbor was so strong that it could have been carried only with great loss to the assailants; and that the Spanish would have had an

open line of retreat from Santiago to the north and west.

Most of these explanations do not explain. As all the streams referred to emptied into the waters of the southern coast it is not easy to see how they offered better facilities for water supply in the interior than nearer the sea, unless the tides affected them, in which case water from the transports might have been safely depended upon. The plea that the Spanish would have an open line of retreat is also flimsy. Their open line of retreat would have led them into a devastated country from which hunger would have soon driven them back. Of the dangers of a march through poisonous undergrowth, the non-military mind is of course incompetent to form an opinion. But Gen. Shafter appears to have been alone in scenting that danger; and it may be inferred, not unreasonably, that the danger might have been encountered by the soldiers with as much fortitude as a galling Spanish fire from entrenchments against which heavy guns could not be brought to bear. As to the comparative impregnability of the Spanish defenses at the mouth of the harbor, Admiral Sampson does not agree with Gen. Shafter. Quoting from his own official dispatch of July 14, the admiral says: "I have been ready at any time during the last three weeks to silence works, to clear entrance of mines, and to enter harbor whenever the army will do the part which the proper conduct of war assigns to it." The "proper conduct" of the army which Admiral Sampson contemplated, was a land attack, by way of the coast, upon fortifications at the harbor entrance. This could have been made under the protection and with the aid of the great guns of the fleet, which would have cleared the way for an almost bloodless advance of the army. The successful accomplishment of such an attack would have put Shafter in control of the mine fields in the harbor and made it prudent for Sampson to move up the channel. After that, the army and navy, in further coopera-

tion, could have placed Cervera's fleet and the city of Santiago at once at their mercy.

But in the execution of that programme the navy must have shared honors with the army; and for that reason, apparently—at any rate, no other plausible reason appears—Shafter, whether of his own notion or under orders from Washington is not yet clear, plunged far into the interior. Beyond the possibility of naval assistance, without guides, without scouts, without artillery, he there made upon the strongest and least exposed of the Spanish intrenchments a disordered infantry attack which occasioned enormous loss; and which, but for the reckless bravery of his troops, would have culminated in complete disaster. It was an attack, too, which, even when victorious, could have accomplished nothing but for the unexpected folly of Cervera's fleet. Had Cervera staid where he was, Shafter would still have been obliged, after his bloody victory in the interior, to capture the entrance fortifications and secure control of the field of mines for Sampson, before a substantial victory could have been gained.

It may be presumptuous to criticise Gen. Shafter in this way, but as the criticism, one that in substance we made long ago, is now buttressed by Admiral Sampson's official report, we may venture to repeat it.

Besides criticising the Shafter campaign we have had the temerity also to criticise the condition of affairs at the camp at Montauk, where many a soldier died from neglect and maltreatment and many another was barely rescued by friends before it was too late. These criticisms were based upon the best information; but if the testimony of Dr. Forwood be true, we owe an apology for them to some one.

The burden of the complaints as to Montauk Point was that, although this camp was within 60 miles of the American metropolis, where any of

the world's products could be had for the asking, wholesome food and food suitable for the sick, as well as medicines and hospital accommodations and medical attention, were lacking. But Dr. Forwood tells the "willing whitewashing" committee a different story. He says that from the beginning to the end, at the general hospital at Montauk, there were from 50 to 500 vacant beds! That there were medical supplies in abundance—"wasteful abundance"!! That the water was pure and plentiful!! That army rations at the hospital were supplemented with everything that could be found in the Waldorf-Astoria hotel, including roast turkey, pheasants, squab, lambs, sheep, pigs, game of all kinds, pate de fois gras, mineral waters, the finest champagnes and liquors!!!! What delicate-stomached wretches those private soldiers at Montauk must have been, to complain of fare like that. And what ascetic friends they had, to drag them away to city hospitals on pretense of wishing to save their lives. If Dr. Forwood's testimony were only corroborated by that of a few private soldiers who lived at Montauk on Waldorf-Astoria fare—except as the beneficiaries of Helen Gould's charity—we should feel like apologizing to the war department.

There is something amusing in the laborious effort of the Hawaiian annexation committee to exclude the Chinese and Japanese citizens of Hawaii from American citizenship without excluding other non-white races. To accomplish this bit of legal jugglery the commission has actually proposed to enact that negroes are white men. "All white men," they say, "including . . . . persons of African descent," shall be American citizens. As Chinese and Japanese are not white men, nor yet Africans, they are excluded as neatly as you please; but this is at the expense of legislation that wrenches language to declare that the term "white men" includes black men without including yellow men. It may be well to re-

mark that it has long been a universally recognized law that upon a change of government all the citizens of the old become of right citizens of the new.

Following the agreement for the cession of the Philippine archipelago by Spain to the United States, come two significant reports from the Philippines. The natives, according to one of these reports, are cruelly murdering Catholic priests; according to the other they are threatening resistance to the authority of the United States as Spain's assignee. Of these reports, the first is gauzy. It has evidently been manufactured with the object of exciting hostility on the part of American Catholics toward the Filipinos in order to strengthen the demand among Americans for the subjugation of the Filipinos. But the second report is doubtless well founded. It is not probable that the natives of the Philippines, after fighting Spain "to a standstill," and almost achieving their independence, will submit to be turned over to any power on earth, without being so much as consulted. We would not do it ourselves under similar circumstances. Why should we expect them to?

It is claimed by the Filipinos that before the purchase of the Philippines by the United States they themselves had wrested from Spain the Island of Luzon, part of the Visayas islands, and the Island of Mindanao; and that although the Americans had helped them indirectly by attacking Manila, yet they would even without that help have ultimately won. They also claim that Spain cannot sell the whole archipelago, for she has never been able to make it her own. And, asserting that they are unanimous in demanding nothing less than independence, these Filipinos announce their determination, Yankee fashion, to fight for it. Suppose they execute their determination, how shall we assert our sovereignty over them? Shall we subdue them? Why, that would be forcible annexation, which President McKinley himself has most soi-

emly denounced as unthinkable, because by our code of morality, as he says, it would be criminal aggression. How, then, could we morally justify an attempt to complete our Spanish purchase of the Philippines by the use of force against the Filipinos? We could not do it at all. If the Filipinos resist our aggression, every American with the blood of the revolutionary fathers in his veins, with the principles of the declaration of independence in his heart, with Lincoln's immortal oration at Gettysburg in his memory, with President McKinley's reference to our code of morality upon his conscience—every such American must pray for their triumph.

In the December number of the *Nineteenth Century Magazine* an article in justification of lavish expenditure of wealth appears. It is from the pen of Bradley Martin, Jr., he of the Bradley Martin ball. Mr. Martin's argument runs along the old lines. It is like this: By spending money lavishly in luxuries, the rich set at work producers of luxuries, who, being thereby enabled to buy luxuries and necessities for themselves, set at work producers of other luxuries and of necessities, who in turn set at work other producers of luxuries and necessities, and so on in an ever widening circle until the whole industrial community feels the benefit of the first impulse.

As an argument, irrespective of the assumed premises, Mr. Martin's plea for idle luxury is not gainsaid. It is, indeed, true that industrial communities prosper through spending and not by hoarding. If everybody were strictly economical in his expenditures, a very large proportion of the world's industries would be closed down. But in his premises Mr. Martin is weak. He assumes that it makes no difference whether the rich earn their wealth or not, so long as they keep the wheels of industry turning by spending it. That assumption begs the whole social question. How the rich spend their wealth, or

whether they spend it at all, is a matter of small importance in comparison with how they get it.

While developing his argument, Mr. Martin asks categorically: "Can a rich man rightfully be prevented from spending his income as he chooses?" To this question Mr. Martin demands a negative answer, and we have no hesitation in answering it in the negative. With the exception of expenditures which interfere with the rights—not the comforts, but the rights—of others, every man, be he rich or poor, has the right to spend his income as he chooses. It is not within the rightful province of human law to interfere. His exercise of this right raises only a personal question between himself and his Maker.

But if Mr. Martin had taken the trouble to ask whether rich men can rightfully be prevented from acquiring their incomes as they choose, he would have drawn out a very different answer. When any man—be he in this case also rich or poor—acquires his income at the expense of others, it is within the rightful province of the law to interfere. This is universally conceded when the income so acquired is by means of individual acts; but it is denied when the means are institutional. Yet the moral principle is the same. It can make no difference, either morally or economically, whether the incomes of some are acquired at the expense of others by means of forgery, fraud, or more vulgar forms of larceny, or by means of such legalized institutions as monopolized street franchises or the all-embracing institution of landlordism. The essential thing is not a stigmatizing legal name for the means, but the fact that what some gain others are thereby forced against their will to lose.

This is something which it is within the rightful province of human law to prevent. And if it were prevented, Mr. Martin would neither spend his money in giving notoriously luxurious

balls, nor ask whether he had not a right to spend his money as he chose. He would be unable to earn enough to afford the balls, and nobody would be interested in his question. The fundamental objection to lavish expenditures like those of the Bradley Martins, is not a question of spending. It is a question of earning; and neither Bradley Martin nor all his American ancestors ever earned or seriously pretended to earn, over and above their "keep," the price of the Bradley-Martin ball.

Mr. Martin indulges in another suggestive question in his Nineteenth Century article. He wants to know whether a millionaire member of a community is to be desired. That question also depends upon whether or not the millionaire is a millionaire or only a million-grabber. It could certainly be of no benefit to a community to have in its population a millionaire whose income depended upon successful pocketpicking, unless his field of operations lay outside that community. Moral considerations apart, we can conceive the desirability of a millionaire of this type, provided he bring his annual plunder from beyond the community limits. But in no aspect of the matter can we conceive him to be desirable if he acquire it within the community itself. In that case, all that he got, the rest of the community would lose. The principle would be the same, whether he got his plunder by illegal pocketpicking or under forms of law.

But Mr. Martin does not look at the matter in that way. He thinks that out of a given sum one rich man would save more than say 10,000 poor men. Here is his illustrative example: A person with an annual income of \$5,000,000 could not well spend more than \$500,000, and would, therefore, save \$4,500,000; whereas 10,000 people with an income of \$5,000,000 would have but \$500 apiece, out of which they could not well save over their living expenses more than \$50 apiece, or in the aggregate only \$500,-

000. Thus if the entire annual income of the community of 10,001 persons,—an income of \$5,000,000,—went to one man who didn't earn any of it, the general wealth would increase at the rate of \$4,500,000. But if it went instead to 10,000 persons who earned it all, the general wealth would increase only at the rate of \$500,000. Mr. Martin does not undertake to explain what would become of these 10,001 people if, in order to enhance the wealth of the community, they turned over their total incomes to one man; but we suspect that it would be a community of only 1 in short order, and that instead of saving millions this 1 would be forced to grub a frugal living with his own hands. Incomes, whether big or little, have to be earned right along by somebody, no matter who gets them.

Regardless, however, of his foolish illustration, Mr. Martin has hold of an idea which, though as foolish as his illustration, deceives millions of people, rich and poor. It is the foundation principle of the iniquitous doctrine of protection. He wants it understood, and appears himself to understand, that if the earners of wealth can be forced by law to surrender part of their earnings to a privileged few, thus creating a rich leisure class, the rich leisure class will by extraordinary saving multiply the aggregate annual accumulations of wealth, and by extraordinary spending provide work for the earning class. But, in the expressive slang of the day, "what's the matter with" the earning class providing work for themselves, and keeping all they earn? If they did not save as much, they would at least live better; and on the whole they would produce more, for the leisure class would then have to lend a hand. And could they not provide work for themselves? They could at any rate provide it for one another. When trade was no longer obstructed by public and private taxation in the interest of a privileged few, and the natural and industrial advantages of specially fruitful locations upon the earth were no long-

er withheld from general use in the same interest, there would be neither lack of work nor escape from work.

Government by injunction has another defender in W. B. Phillips, of Pittsburgh, editor of the *American Manufacturer and Iron World*. Dr. Phillips entitles his defense, "Government by Injunction: A Plea for Personal Rights." He delivered it before the Johnstown board of trade during the past month. With most of what he said we should most heartily agree. We doubt not, however, that he himself would as heartily disagree with it if he were writing on the subject of free trade instead of free labor. If we are wrong, it would give us great pleasure to read in the *American Manufacturer and Iron World* an editorial in which the principles of Dr. Phillips "plea for personal rights" were faithfully applied to the doctrine of protection.

But what Dr. Phillips ignores, what every other defender of government by injunction ignores, is the fact that government by injunction as now administered abolishes jury trial, in local courts, upon charges of local crime. This, and not their interference with labor unions, is the vice of labor injunctions. A federal judge, appealed to by citizens of another state than the one in which he sits, and assuming jurisdiction for that or some other technical reason, forbids all persons, some being named and others not, from doing a certain specified criminal act. This is the first step. The second is to arrest, try and punish persons charged with committing that act. Such trial is before the judge who issued the injunction, and he, without the intervention of a jury, acquits or convicts, and then arbitrarily fixes the penalty. Thus men may be punished by federal judges, for purely local crimes, and without the constitutionally guaranteed right of trial by jury.

So plainly is this in derogation of the Anglo-Saxon safeguards of liberty, that until recently the courts of

this country and of England almost uniformly refused injunctions against crime. They held that the granting of such injunctions would be a round-about way of abolishing grand juries and jury trial in criminal cases. The English courts still so hold. They have overruled the one modern case which, upon the authority of a decision in feudal times, allowed an injunction against crime. But in this country, in recent labor cases, and thus far only in labor cases, federal judges have dug up and followed that overruled English precedent, and by issuing injunctions against striking workmen, forbidding them to commit crimes, have not only set about administering non-federal criminal law, but in doing so have in such cases abolished jury trials. That usurpation is what is meant by "government by injunction."

The best review of the late elections that we have seen is that of S. S. Field, of Baltimore. He writes from the point of view of a party democrat, but nevertheless with knowledge and sense. Mr. Field is not surprised at the election of a republican congress. That, he says, was to have been expected, since the war with Spain was carried to a successful conclusion under a republican administration; for "in any movement which succeeds, people do not stop to inquire into the merits of the various persons engaged in it—all their praise accrues to the leader." And he credits with patriotic disinterestedness the democrats in congress who, when they "forced the war upon McKinley, knew that it would probably result in the election of a republican congress this fall, and they stood for right rather than party expediency." But Mr. Field finds, nevertheless, that the Chicago platform democrats have much reason to congratulate themselves upon the election. He believes them to be in a stronger position than ever before.

To begin with, says Mr. Field, the gold democratic party no longer exists. In the east its leaders have returned to the regular party, hoping to

control it; in the south and west, where there is no such hope, the leaders have gone over to the republicans. Only three Chicago platform senators are lost, while one is gained, but the gold democrats lost six and have but two left. Yet 20 democratic senators were opposed to free coinage at 16 to 1 only four years ago. And though the republicans have gained a majority of 9 in the senate, 13 republicans retire two years hence who represent states that will be carried by the democrats if the democrats are at all successful. Thus the control of the senate under a democratic administration is more than possible. Similar encouragement is derived from the make-up of the lower house. On state issues democrats were largely defeated; on Chicago platform issues they were notably successful; while the overwhelming republican majority is cut down to almost nothing. Three-fourths of the democratic gains in the house, says Mr. Field, are Chicago platform men, while five of the eight losses in the senate were gold democrats. Mr. Field is encouraged by this condition because it suggests a united democracy in 1900, along the lines of the Chicago platform for an aggressive instead of a defensive fight. He is responsible also for a further very significant comparison. It is of the elections of 1894 and those of 1898. In 1894, under the leadership of the gold democratic elements, the democrats lost 8 seats in the senate and 113 in the house; but in 1898, under the leadership of Chicago platform men, though they lost 8 in the senate, 5 of these were gold democrats, and they gained 41 in the house, three-fourths of whom stand on the Chicago platform.

The Illinois Humane society ought to change either its name or its president. The "Illinois Brutalizing society" would be a more appropriate name if it supports President Shortall in his advocacy of a whipping post. Mr. Shortall proposes this method of punishment for certain classes of offenses. They are distinctively the offenses of poverty, the offenses of people who are forced to grow up in a de-

graded environment which fosters brutal instincts. The whipping post, therefore, would be what it always was, a peculiar punishment for the poor. The rich would escape it, not because they refrain from crime, but because they have no mind for the kinds of crime which Mr. Shortall specifies. If we are to have a whipping post at all, let us have it for all crimes, distinguishing degrees only by the number of lashes. There would be some equality in that. But no community can establish the whipping post without going backward. Only men with brutal instincts suggest it, and only communities of brutal tendencies can adopt it. In use it would develop those instincts and injure the community more than the criminal.

In view of the destruction by fire of several great fire-proof buildings in New York this week, insurance companies are reconsidering their rates for that class of risk. It might not be unreasonable if they were to decide to put fire-proof buildings in the class called extra-hazardous.

Prof. James, of the Chicago university, in a recent explanation of the false standards of morality that prevail in colleges, puts his finger upon the fundamental cause. He alluded to the familiar tricks of college athletics and the well-known habits of cheating at examinations, vices which he denounced as not only common among the students of schools and universities, but as being tolerated by teachers and faculties. All this, he says, is the natural outgrowth of despotic school government. He would substitute a school democracy. Prof. James's view is sustained wherever his principle has been tried. Those colleges and schools in which the students are self-governing have proved most effectual in making wholesome young men and young women. And the experiment has been more widely tried, perhaps, than is generally supposed. Even for very young children there is a school in Chicago in which despotic government has been abol-

ished and the democratic method successfully substituted. Without naming other experiments in this line, George's "Junior Republic," in which children of the city slums govern themselves in the summer far better than grown people govern them in winter, is a wonderful demonstration of responsible self-government. In childhood, as in maturity, democracy is the natural remedy for the evils which despotism has bred.

### OUR "NEW POSSESSIONS."

#### I.

When congress, the sole war-making authority of the United States, directed the president, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, to resort to arms against Spain, it placed upon him a specific limitation, and in behalf of this nation made to the world in unmistakable terms a declaration of its non-aggressive and unselfish purpose.

Conquest was not contemplated. On the contrary, it was distinctly disclaimed.

The act by which this was done was the passage of the joint resolutions of April 20, 1898, recognizing the independence of the people of Cuba.

Those resolutions, which were the president's only lawful authority for prosecuting the war, demanded the withdrawal by Spain of her land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directed and empowered the president—

to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into actual service of the United States the militia of the several states to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Note the last words: "to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect."

That was the full extent of the power the war resolutions conferred upon the president—that he should use the army and navy merely to establish Cuban independence. They gave him no further authority.

Then, having conferred this power, and in order that there might be no misunderstanding, Congress turned to the civilized world and in the final

resolution of the series, explicitly declared that—

the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government of the island to its people.

Though Congress flatly overruled the president, in thus recognizing the independence of Cuba—for in his message, to which these resolutions were the response, he had condemned such recognition—it adopted his own views when it disclaimed all intentions of conquest. In his message he had upon this point said:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of; that, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression.

Both by his own official declaration, therefore, and by the declaration of Congress, as well as by the limitation which Congress had expressly placed upon him in directing him to make war, the president was bound to refrain from turning the war into a war of conquest.

#### II.

He was not bound, of course, to refrain from making military and naval captures.

When Spain defied our demand that she retire from Cuba and Cuban waters, war was upon us; and it was then quite within the president's province to capture Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, or any other Spanish dependency, and even Spain herself.

No matter what the original motive and ultimate purpose of a war may be, one of its incidents while it lasts is the right to weaken the enemy by capturing not only his forts and ships and troops, but the territory from which he draws his supplies. These are among the means of forcing him to sue for peace.

But when he does sue for peace, then any attempt permanently to hold territory that has been captured from him, or to wrest from him territory that has not been captured, gives to the war the essential character of a war of conquest.

While President McKinley was not bound to refrain from making temporary captures of Spanish territory in the prosecution of the war, he was

bound by the authority he had received from Congress, and the pledge which Congress had made to the world, to refrain from turning those captures into permanent conquests as conditions of peace.

### III.

The disclaimer by Congress of all purpose of making conquest, and the declaration by the president of the criminal immorality of such a purpose, referred, it is true, to Cuba only. But that was because Cuba was at that time the sole subject of controversy. The principle invoked is applicable to all foreign territory.

It is not to be supposed that either Congress or the president was pettifogging: that Congress made a mental reservation as to Porto Rico and the Philippines when disclaiming "any disposition to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control" over Cuba; or that the president meant that forcible annexation would by our code of morality be criminal oppression as to Cuba alone. They must be taken to have meant all that their words implied, and as matter of principle and not of word-juggling. What the outside world understood, what we of this country understood, what Congress and the president must be presumed to have intended all to understand, was that in going to war with Spain for the independence of Cuba the United States would be guided by the principle proclaimed in the declaration of independence and echoed in Lincoln's speech at Gettysburgh—the principle of government by the consent of the governed; of government of the people, for the people and by the people. This nation was pledged in honor to wage no war of conquest, and to hold under its dominion as the result of the war, no subject colonies.

### IV.

But that pledge with which we began the war has been ignored by the president.

He has used the army and navy not alone to establish Cuban independence and to drive the Spanish out of Cuban waters. But, regardless of the national pledge and of the limitations placed upon his authority by Congress, he has also used, and in his

last message he threatens to further use, the army and navy to forcibly annex territory and to subdue and subjugate its inhabitants.

If the senate confirms the treaty of peace which the president is making through his commissioners at Paris, the pledge of honor of this nation will have been repudiated, and contrary not only to that pledge, but to our political traditions and ideals, we shall then have entered upon a career of conquest and colonial dominion from which only the courage and sense of Congress can rescue us.

### V.

In his message just read to Congress, the president refrains from discussing the government of what he calls "the new possessions which will come to us as the result of the war with Spain." How does that language comport with the solemn national disclaimer of all intention of conquest with which we challenged Spain to war?

It is true that the words do not refer to Cuba. On the assumption that his message is not disingenuous, the president intends, so far as Cuba is concerned, to honor our national pledge. Of ingenuousness, however, there can be no certainty, for though in one part of his message he writes of giving Cuba a free and independent government, in another he associates Cuba and Porto Rico and the Philippines under the general description of "the newly acquired islands." But be his intentions what they may as to Cuba, there is no question about them as to the Philippines and Porto Rico.

In the face of the limitation which Congress placed upon his authority, in defiance of the pledge against conquest which Congress made in the name of the nation, and regardless even of his own declaration as to the criminal immorality of forcible annexation, President McKinley has undertaken to conquer and forcibly annex those islands. It is a matter about which he does not propose to consult Congress. For in his message he expressly postpones all discussion of the subject until "after the treaty of peace shall be ratified," and the senate alone has to do with ratifying treaties. So the only voice that Congress will have in the matter will be

in determining the kind of government to establish over the president's conquests. Meantime he will continue to administer military government.

### VI.

And what kind of government can Congress establish?

Constitutionally, and in accordance with precedent, it can establish only a territorial government, one like that which was set up over the Northwest Territory and out of which sovereign states were carved. The kind that we now give to Arizona.

But this kind of government contemplates ultimate statehood.

And not only does it contemplate statehood, but pending statehood its citizens would be citizens of the United States, entitled in every state to all the rights and privileges of such.

Moreover, the territory would be United States territory. No tariff peculiar to it could be set up. As between it and the rest of the United States, absolute free trade would have to prevail; as between it and the rest of the world except the United States, our high protection tariff and obstructive navigation laws would have to be enforced.

To such a government for the president's conquests there would be varied objections, some of which would come from powerful sources.

Not least powerful among the latter objections would be the European demand for an "open door" in the Philippines—for a tariff, that is to say, which would be the same for all other nations as for the United States; and that demand could not be complied with without making the United States a free trade country throughout.

It is safe to say, therefore, that a regular territorial government will be avoided for the Philippines, if not also for Porto Rico.

The alternative is a colonial government, under which the inhabitants would be governed by the United States without being citizens, and the territory would belong to the United States without being of the United States.

That is the kind of government with which England provided the

American colonies before the American revolution. It is the kind with which Rome provided her conquered provinces, and in doing so planted the seeds of her own destruction. It would be the worst possible form of that "forcible annexation" which President McKinley denounced as unthinkable because "by our code of morality" it "would be criminal aggression."

#### VII.

Should the senate enable the president, by ratifying his treaty, to discuss with Congress the government and future of "the new possessions" which he, in excess of his authority and in defiance of the national pledge, has forcibly annexed, there is one safe and honorable course, and only one, that Congress can pursue. It can freely give to the people of those "new possessions" their liberty.

Should this require a temporary protectorate, until governments were formed by the people and recognized as independent by other nations, that courtesy should be extended. But we cannot with honor or safety to ourselves or with justice to the people of the conquered islands, treat these presidential conquests as national booty.

### NEWS

The 55th Congress convened in its second session on the 5th, and on that day listened to the reading of President McKinley's second annual message. Exceptional importance was attached to this message, because it was expected to deal with questions growing out of the war; but this expectation was disappointed. The message treats of the war only in a historical way, leaving the problems growing out of the war to be discussed as they arise.

After referring to the general prosperity of the country, the message sets forth the leading events of the war, from the conditions causing it, to which Mr. McKinley's first message referred, down to the organization of the peace commission at Paris. It concludes upon that subject with the following statement as to Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines:

I do not discuss at this time the government or the future of the new pos-

sessions which will come to us as the result of the war with Spain. Such discussion will be appropriate after the treaty of peace shall be ratified. In the meantime and until the congress has legislated otherwise, it will be my duty to continue the military governments which have existed since our occupation and government of the people, security in life and property and encouragement under a just and beneficent rule.

As soon as we are in possession of Cuba and have pacified the island it will be necessary to give aid and direction to the people to form a government for themselves. This should be undertaken at the earliest moment consistent with safety and assured success. It is important that our relations with these people shall be of the most friendly character and our commercial relations close and reciprocal. It should be our duty to assist in every proper way to build up the waste places of the island, encourage the industry of the people and assist them to form a government which shall be free and independent, thus realizing the best aspirations of the Cuban people.

Spanish rule must be replaced by a just, benevolent and humane government, created by the people of Cuba, capable of performing all international obligations and which shall encourage thrift, industry and prosperity and promote peace and good will among all of the inhabitants, whatever may have been their relations in the past. Neither revenge nor passion should have a place in the new government. Until there is complete tranquillity in the island and a stable government inaugurated military occupation will be continued.

The only other notable reference in the message to the new possessions is in connection with recommendations as to a maritime policy. This reference is as follows:

The annexation of Hawaii and the changed relations of the United States to Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, resulting from the war, compel the prompt adoption of a maritime policy by the United States. There should be established regular and frequent steamship communication, encouraged by the United States under the American flag, with the newly acquired islands.

Other subjects dealt with in the message are numerous. Most of them have to do with our foreign relations, inclusive of the later history of Hawaiian annexation. An increase of the regular army to 100,000 men, with permission to recruit "from the inhabitants of the islands with the government of which we are charged," is recommended; and the president's intention to muster out the entire vol-

unteer force upon the allowance of the proposed increase of the regular army is stated. Plans for increasing the navy are also approved.

Among the department reports accompanying the president's message, the most important under the circumstances is that of the secretary of war. This includes the reports of the generals who participated in the war, and gives in detail the history of the operations of the war department, accompanied by copies of official dispatches. The report suggests among other things that the regular army be increased to 100,000 men, with the requisite number of officers; that a portion of the rank and file be drawn from the natives of the islands we are to occupy; that a native constabulary force be established in the cities of Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines; and that a government railroad be built lengthwise across the island of Cuba, with branches, for the double purpose of giving work to the natives and of pacifying and developing the island.

The report of the comptroller of the currency is of special importance because it takes positive ground against the bank note system which is proposed by the so-called McCleary bill now pending in Congress. Referring to this system, the comptroller says that no bank-note system is fair which, in the distribution of the assets of insolvent banks, creates a preference in favor of note holders as against depositors. And he concludes that if costly currency reform is needed, it would be better for the government, as the representative of all the people, to meet the cost direct than to evade it by granting extensive currency privileges to banks.

At the date of our last report on the peace conference at Paris the joint meetings had been adjourned to the 1st; but on that day no joint meeting was held. It was postponed at the request of the American commissioners, who required time to consider a proposition of detail which the Spanish had urgently made. The latter had proposed that for a term of five years, the United States grant to Spanish ships carrying Spanish products to Porto Rico—and also to Cuba so long as the United States remains dominant there—the same privileges as might be enjoyed by American vessels engaged in the same trade. It was to enable the Americans to con-



sider this proposition that the joint meeting was delayed until the 2d. As the reports now have it, this proposition will be put aside for future consideration through regular diplomatic channels.

The commissioners reconvened in joint meeting on the 2d, but nothing was accomplished, and an adjournment was taken until the 3d. On that day the sitting was still further postponed, because both commissions wished to consult. But on the 5th a long joint session was held, at which much was accomplished, so it is reported, though none of the results have been made public. Their general character may be gathered, however, from two reported remarks of important officials. One was made after the first meeting, by the secretary of the Spanish commissioners, in answer to an inquiry. He said: "I am almost mad. I cannot talk. We are making progress." The other remark was made at the joint meeting, by the chairman of the American commissioners—ex-Secretary Day,—who said: "A peace treaty can contain anything which the victors put into it."

Another joint meeting of the commissions was held on the 6th, but nothing of its proceedings is known except by inference from an interview with one of the Spanish commissioners, Senor Abarzuza, who said: "Things look black to-day. Your American friends use the reverse to conciliatory tactics and will make no fair concessions. They are insisting on bringing things into the treaty that we don't want, and will not agree to include others that we do want. It is true we have agreed to the first eight articles of the treaty, but if we can't agree about the rest these will fall to the ground. The debt question has no connection with the present difficulty." The first eight articles referred to by Senor Abarzuza, are summarized by the Associated Press as follows:

First—Customary preface of treaties in the nature of an expression of amity and of hope for perpetual peace.

Second—Relinquishment by Spain of her sovereignty over Cuba.

Third—Withdrawal of the Spanish troops.

Fourth—Relinquishment by Spain of her sovereignty over Porto Rico.

Fifth—Spain's cession of the Philippines.

Sixth—Withdrawal of the Spanish troops there.

Seventh—Payment by the United States of \$20,000,000 for the Philippines.

Eighth—Provision for the "open door" commercial policy in the Philippines.

No joint session was held on the 7th, the day on which our report for this week closes.

Since the agreement at Paris on the part of Spain to surrender the Philippines, the native Philippine government has given indications of dissatisfaction. Nothing official appears to have been done, but prominent Filipinos at Manila declare that their people are not to be transferred like merchandise; and that the independent party will be satisfied with nothing short of absolute independence. The native press also gives indications of the probability of general and bitter opposition to American sovereignty. The *Independencia*, of Manila, proclaims the readiness of the Filipinos to fight in defense of their rights; and the *Republica Filipina*, also of Manila, while affirming the friendship of the Filipinos for the Americans and promising that the native government will not fire the first shot, gives warning that the Filipinos "will never consent to the ignominy of being treated as chattels," but "will shed their blood in torrents again before bowing to foreign dominion however light." Gen. Riewodidos and Dr. Lesdajluna, representatives of the Filipino junta, left Hong Kong for Washington on the 7th, to present the Filipino case to the American government and people.

Proceedings relative to the annexation of Hawaii to the United States have been resumed in Congress. On the 6th the president transmitted to Congress the report of the Hawaiian commission, together with the bills proposed by the commission for the government of that territory. The principal bill outlines the general form of government. It provides for the erection of the Hawaiian islands into a territory of the United States to be styled the Territory of Hawaii, of which the chief officer is to be a governor. Two legislative houses are named—a senate and a house of representatives—the members of which are to be elected biennially on and after the first Monday of November, 1899. Senators must be male citizens 30 years of age, who have resided in the territory three years, and are worth in their own right \$2,000 or have

during the preceding year received an income of \$1,000. Representatives must be male citizens, 25 years old, who have lived three years in the territory and have an annual income of \$250. Voters for representative must be male citizens 21 years old, who have resided one year in the territory and paid all taxes, and who are "able to understandingly speak, read and write the English and Hawaiian language;" and voters for senator, besides having the same qualifications must also own \$1,000 worth of real estate in their own right or have received a money income during the previous year of \$300. Citizenship is defined by the bill as follows:

All white persons, including Portuguese and persons of African descent, and all other persons descending from the Hawaiian race on either paternal or maternal side, who were citizens of the republic of Hawaii immediately prior to the transfer of the sovereignty thereof to the United States, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States.

In order, among other things, to protect Hawaii from the importation of coolie labor and foreign products, the bill provides that the constitution and laws of the United States, locally applicable, shall have the same force in the territory as elsewhere in the United States. But all the existing laws of Hawaii not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States or the proposed act, are to remain in force until repealed or amended by the territorial legislature or Congress.

Two other Hawaiian bills accompany the principal one. By one of these the redemption of Hawaiian silver and treasury notes is provided for; and by the other the Hawaiian postal savings bank is abolished.

Though the United States has monopolized most of the political news of the week, some important events have occurred elsewhere. In Germany the reichstag was opened on the 6th by the emperor at Berlin. The emperor announced the introduction of a series of social and labor bills, the character of which is not cabled, and outlined steps for the increase of the army to a peace footing for rank and file of 502,508. A coalition under the leadership of the agrarians, who are the protectionists of Germany, became immediately noticeable. It has already within 29 of a majority, and its purpose in general is to control leg-

isolation in the interest of protection, and in particular to make a tariff war upon Russia and the United States.

In France, on the 2d, a republican introduced in the chamber of deputies a measure for the election of senators by universal suffrage, for which he demanded urgency. The premier opposed granting urgency, saying that the chamber should be cautious about deciding upon a proposition which would change the whole electoral system. Upon this question the premier was defeated. The chamber granted urgency for the measure by a vote of 243 to 228.

The Picquart case in France has not materially altered since our report of last week, though strenuous attempts have been made to prevent Picquart's trial by court-martial on the 12th. In the senate, on the 1st, one of these attempts took the form of a proposal to empower the court of cassation to stay any prosecution calculated to hamper a revision case. Though couched in general terms, this proposal referred plainly to the Picquart prosecution and the Dreyfus revision. Urgency for the proposal was moved, but upon a tie vote of 133 to 113 was lost. The proposal cannot be adopted, therefore, in time to interfere with the court martial proceedings of the 12th. But Picquart himself is now reported as having taken direct steps to secure a postponement.

Passing from political to what may be distinguished as civic news, our attention turns back to the United States. A probably momentous struggle over street car franchises has begun in Chicago. At the last session of the legislature authority was conferred upon municipalities to grant franchises for 50 years. The repeal of this measure, known as "the Allen law," was a vital issue in the late legislative elections, and it is expected that the incoming legislature will repeal the law. To secure a long extension of franchises, therefore, while "the Allen law" is still in force, the Chicago street railroad companies made application on the 4th to the city council by the presentation of the ordinance they desire. This ordinance would extend all unexpired franchises 50 years, with the right to charge 5 cents fare for at least 20 years. In consideration of this the

companies would pay from  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on such annual gross receipts as were not less than \$7,500 per mile of road, to 3 per cent. on such as were \$20,000 or more per mile. An amendment was proposed by a councilman which would compel the companies to adopt the eight-hour day for their employes, and to pay at least 25 cents an hour as wages. The ordinance was referred, and has not yet been reported back. A vote on the question of referring indicated that the ordinance will pass by a small majority. But the mayor, who is pledged to veto it, believes it cannot be passed over his veto.

The sessions at Indianapolis of the National Municipal League, of which we made a note last week, continued until the 2d. Among the papers read was one by Horace E. Deming, of New York, on "The Municipal Problem in the United States." Mr. Deming supported the following fundamental propositions:

1. The municipal corporation should be invested with the governmental powers requisite to determine all questions of local public policy. There should be no excuse, and, if possible, no opportunity to apply to the legislature for additional powers; and, on the other hand, the legislature should have no excuse, and, if possible, no opportunity to intermeddle with the local government by granting or taking away any power to enable the city to decide for itself any question of local public policy.

2. The citizens of the municipality under general laws should be free to make and amend their own form of municipal government, provided it be based upon democratic republican principles, and to determine their own methods of administration of the local governmental powers, according to their own ideas as to what will best satisfy their local needs.

3. In so far as the municipal corporation is made the agent of the state to enforce and administer general laws within the corporate limits, it should be under the supervision of and responsible to central state administrative departments, and not subject to the sport of special legislation.

A municipality thus constituted is not an imperium in imperio, but a free self-governing community, subject to state administrative supervision as to all matters of general state policy to be enforced throughout the state. Legislative interference is eliminated. Home rule is not only possible but compulsory.

To accomplish these results in their completeness and to guarantee their performance a constitutional amendment is much to be desired. In every state the friends of efficient, econom-

ical, progressive municipal government should organize and continue a vigorous and unwearying campaign until a constitutional amendment embodying these fundamental principles shall have been adopted.

The highest public good requires that the constitution should guarantee to each city, subject alone to the restriction that a democratic republican form of government be preserved, complete freedom to control the methods of the exercise of municipal suffrage in purely municipal elections.

Other papers were read before the Municipal league conference by Albert Shaw, of New York; Charles Richardson, of Philadelphia; D. F. Wilcox of Cleveland; W. M. Graham, of Dubuque; George Burnham, of Philadelphia; John R. Commons, of Syracuse; Edward Bemis, of Kansas, and Mayor Jones, of Toledo. Mayor Jones opposed the granting of street franchises under any circumstances whatever. In the course of his argument he said:

I am unable to see why it is not just as reasonable to undertake to make a plan for providing individuals or corporations with franchises to build and take care of the city streets and bridges, letting them collect their pay by the old-fashioned method of the toll-gate, as to grant franchises to people to furnish us with light. Plenty of individuals and corporations can be found who will agree to furnish this or any other social service cheaper than the city can do it through municipal ownership. They will agree to police our cities; they will agree to take care of our fires; they will agree to carry on our schools, to take care of our poor as they used to do in the days gone by, and proclaim that they can save money for the taxpayer.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Hazing at Princeton has been abolished by unanimous vote of the students in mass meeting.

—The anti-anarchist conference at Rome is still in session, but its proceedings are conducted with rigorous secrecy.

—The tin plate trust has been formed as a New Jersey corporation. Its name is "The Consolidated Tin Plate Company."

—On the 2d the fiftieth anniversary of the accession of Francis Joseph to the Austrian throne was celebrated with a jubilee at Vienna.

—The diet of the duchy of Brunswick, as well as that of Saxony, has imposed heavy progressive special taxes on department stores.

—Yale college won the debate at New Haven on the 6th, in which Prince-

ton had the affirmative of the proposition that the United States annex Cuba.

—Gov. Tanner has been indicted by the grand jury of Macoupin county, Illinois, for refusing to aid the sheriff with troops during the Virden labor troubles.

—Through the intercession of Oscar S. Straus, American minister at Constantinople, the sultan of Turkey now concedes travelling permits to foreigners in the interior of Asia Minor.

—Gen. Kitchener—now distinguished as “Gen. Lord Kitchener of Khartoum, sirdar of the Egyptian forces”—left London on the 7th on his return to his command in the Soudan.

—The Christian Science healer whom the English coroner’s jury charged with manslaughter in connection with the death of Harold Frederic, has been discharged by the committing magistrates.

—At a city convention held last week the single taxers of Philadelphia organized a municipal party on the basis of the single tax, proportional representation, direct legislation, and entire municipal control of city highways. The candidates are Herman V. Hetzel for mayor, J. Henry McIntyre for city solicitor, and John Mulholland and Thomas F. Brennan for magistrates.

—Immediately after the fall elections we reported the election to the legislature of Massachusetts of two candidates of the socialist-labor party. This was in accordance with the telegraphic news of the week. We are now advised, however, that the two candidates were representatives not of the socialist-labor party but of the social democratic party—the party originally organized by Eugene V. Debs.

—Prof. Lombroso’s daughter, Paola, has been sentenced in the criminal court of Turin to 22 days’ imprisonment and a fine of 62 lire. Her crime was publishing an article in a socialistic paper, in which she described the misery she herself had seen among the poor people and declared that the social system which made such evil conditions should be overthrown. Like her father, the anthropologist, and other professors of the university of Turin, she is a socialist.

—At the convention of Hebrew congregations in Richmond on the 7th, an adverse report on the movement to recover political power in Palestine, which is known as Zionism, was adopted. This report recognizes Zion as a precious memory of the past, but, declaring that the Jews are not a nation but a religious community, affirms their unalterable opposition to political Zionism. Zion “is a holy memory,” says the report as adopted, “but it is not a hope of the future; America is our Zion.”

—In a letter received by the Anti-Imperialistic league on the 7th, from John Sherman, Mr. Sherman declares his hope that the senate will reject the Spanish treaty and “leave the people of the islands free from the shackles of Spain and the distant domination of the United States.” He also expresses his sympathy “with Aguinaldo in his ambition to found a republic in the China sea,” and hopes “he may become the Washington of a new nation, absolutely free from European and American influence.”

IN CONGRESS.

For week ending Dec. 7th, 1898.

Senate.

Vice President Hobart called the senate to order on the 5th at noon. The session was thereupon opened with prayer by Chaplain Milburn. A committee was appointed to wait upon the president with a similar committee from the house, and notify him of the session; and soon after 1 o’clock the president’s executive clerk appeared in response to this notification and delivered the president’s message. At 1:28 the reading of the message began, and continued for two hours and eighteen minutes. After that the session adjourned for the day.

The principal business on the 6th was the introduction by Senator Vest of Missouri of the following joint resolution:

That under the constitution of the United States no power is given to the federal government to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently as colonies. The colonial system of European nations cannot be established under our present constitution, but all territory acquired by the government, except such small amount as may be necessary for coaling stations, correction of boundaries, and similar governmental purposes, must be acquired and governed with the purpose of ultimately organizing such territory into states suitable for admission into the union.

No business was done in open session on the 7th, though Senator Hawley introduced a bill for the reorganization of the regular army. But in executive session the appointment of John Hay as secretary of state was confirmed, and Senator Hoar (rep.) opposed the confirmation of Senator Cullom, as one of the Hawaiian commissioners, on the ground that no senator or representative can be constitutionally appointed to any United States office which was created or the emoluments of which were increased during the term for which he was elected. The question was referred to the judiciary committee.

House.

At precisely 12 o’clock noon, on the 5th, Speaker Reed ascended the rostrum, and, calling the house to order with a blow of his gavel, directed the chaplain to offer prayer. After prayer the roll call showed the presence of 267 members. Three new members

were sworn in to fill vacancies. A committee was then appointed to join a similar committee from the senate and advise the president of the assembling of congress. Following a short recess the committee reported, and immediately afterward the president’s executive clerk appeared with the president’s message. This was read to the house, and at the conclusion of the reading the house adjourned for the day. Prior to the reading of the message, however, Congressman Sulzer, of New York, ranking democratic member of the committee on military affairs, introduced a resolution authorizing and directing that committee “to investigate the war department and the conduct of the Spanish-American war.”

The session on the 6th was brief. But a deficiency appropriation bill for extraordinary expenses of the army and navy from January 1 to July 1, 1899, was reported; and the report of the Hawaiian commission, together with bills to carry out its recommendations, transmitted by the president, were received and referred to the committee on territories.

On the 7th the anti-ticket scalping bill was passed by a vote of 119 to 101, after a debate of four hours.

MISCELLANY

SUNSET IN MEXICO.

For The Public.

Where the skies of Mexico meet the mountain walls,  
There the golden lances blaze when the Day-king falls;  
Flame behind the violet hills marks the monarch’s flight,  
While the legions of the Sun check the march of Night.  
Still the royal banners stream ruby red and gold,  
Orange clad, the royal guards strive the heights to hold,  
While the vanguards of the Night, robed in purple flim,  
Silver broided, diamond starred, press the falling Realm,  
’Til the lost flag’s ruby glow sinks behind the steep,  
And the conquering hosts of Night up the ramparts sweep!

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

WE LEARNED TO GOVERN OURSELVES.

For The Public.

The argument that we should govern Cuba and the Philippines, because the inhabitants are incapable of self-government, is, in reality, no argument whatever. It is argued that the natives of these islands would probably develop a state of anarchy, and that it is our duty to prevent any such possibility by governing them ourselves.

If we will but cast our eyes backward to the time when the Saxons set-

tioned England we shall find a state of anarchy and turmoil which lasted for about 200 years—petty tribe warring with petty tribe, while the whole country was filled with rapine and bloodshed. But out of these warring elements came the Anglo-Saxon, who has made such valuable contributions to the world's advancement. It would have been a sad day for the world had there been a power large and strong enough to have said to the men of that day: "Here, you are not fit to govern yourselves, but I am powerful and civilized, and I will govern you." Where now would be our boasted Anglo-Saxon civilization?

Perhaps the Cubans and the Filipinos have valuable contributions of truth to make to the world, if left to work out their own destiny. Certainly more good will come to them from working out their own problems, though they work them out imperfectly, than can come to them through a foreign power. If there is any truth in the principle upon which this government was founded, that governments receive their just powers from the consent of the governed, what business have we in Cuba and the Philippines?

"But," says the church, "we must take these islands and open them to the Gospel." Will not the Gospel have much more power if it goes to these people in the spirit of love and sacrifice, as did Augustine and his followers of our Saxon ancestors, instead of as part of a conquering nation? Let us insure these people against interference from other nations, and then let them work out their own destiny.

LOA ERMINA SCOTT.

#### OUR DUTIES TO THE HEATHEN.

From Greenland's icy mountains an' Manila's coral strand, the pore benighted heathen call away to beat the band. They're achin' ter be civilized. in every heathen land, an' we've gotter have an army fer the job. The heathen are a-callin' to our noble Christian race. America with all the rest has got to set a pace, and for our surplus products we must have a market place—and we've gotter have an army fer the job. The heathen in the peaceful paths of freedom must be led. At present he's too volatyle and light as to his head. The only way to keep him down's ter fill him up with lead—and we've gotter have an army fer the job. Then it's "rise up, Willyum Riley now and come along weth me." We're goin' to bring 'em blessin's and to set their pore souls free. They're only yeller niggers, an' they'll soon be up a tree—but we've gotter have an army fer the job!

The pore benighted heathen now no Christian peace enjoys. We'll edjercate 'em like they do at Virden, Illinois, or down in Caroliny where we hang 'em, men and boys, just ter elevate the standard of the race. The Malays of the Phillerpeens hain't got no sense at all. They wantter rule their place themselves—I shudder at their gall! We've gotter kill 'em off in droves, to make the rest sing small, and ter elevate the standard of the race. They're so besotted in their pride that ef the truth were known, they'd likely ask our government to leave 'em all alone. The heathen in their blindness now bow down to stock and stone; but we'll elevate the standard of their race. They've gotter learn their lessons in a mighty bitter school. They've gotter crawl an' grovel under white men's noble rule. We've gotter tread 'em in th' mud, ter keep our tempers cool and ter elevate the standard of the race.

The onward march of destiny no nigger crowd can stay. The Anglo-Saxon race must git its three square meals a day. We'll take their lands and make 'em work and then we'll shout "Hooray!" an' thus we'll spread th' Gospel far an' wide. We'll raise 100,000 men ter fight 'em in their swamps, to lie at night in jungles with their fever-ridden damps, and tho' we'll lose 10,000 there, from wounds or cholera cramps, we'll spread th' blessed Gospel far an' wide. Altho' I haven't been to church for nigh on 20 year, it makes me feel reel pious just to think of the idear ( I saw one firm will send out there 10,000 quarts of beer) of how we'll spread the Gospel far an' wide. I'd write you more, but I have got a little "date" at three. We're goin' to hang a nigger politician to a tree. So I will close this letter on the march of destiny and the way to spread the Gospel far an' wide.—"Col. Yellowstone Yell," of South Carolina, in Springfield Republican.

#### LET US LEARN OF THE FILIPINOS.

"Cleanliness is next to godliness."

The native house of the common type is a small structure built entirely of bamboo and thatched with palm leaves ingeniously folded over bits of sticks and tied to the rafters by rattan, says a Manila correspondent of the London Times. The eaves are broad, and the window openings, which are innocent of glass or of the shell casements in use in the better class of houses, are provided with palm leaf shutters hung at the top and propped open, shading the interior from the sun and shedding the rain. At night all are closed up tightly. There are usually two rooms in

the house, and the furniture consists chiefly of sleeping mats, pillows and a few wicker stools, perhaps. The simplest and most primitive utensils are in use in the kitchen. The stove is an earthen affair like a brazier, with projecting knuckles to hold the cooking vessel. Frequently this simple dwelling, which is, indeed, as a rule, as clean and tidy as constant scrubbing can make it—is extended, according to the taste or ingenuity of the owner, into quite an elaborate arrangement of platforms, little storerooms and shelters. The whole structure is built around tall posts, which, as is the case with all the houses here, even with the elaborate and expensive bungalows, are firmly fixed in the ground and extend to the wall-plate supporting the rafters.

The living and sleeping rooms are, as I have before remarked, raised five or six feet above the ground, a custom which prevails in all the architecture here. Sometimes the space under the house is inclosed by mats, but it is oftener left open and is used as a storehouse for the large earthen water jars and the great flat wash tubs hollowed out of a large block of wood.

One thing always strikes even the casual observer, and that is the cleanliness of the people. They are always bathing and washing, and it is the rarest thing to see soiled garments. Even the beggars are clean. It is, in consequence of these commendable habits that so few annoying pests of insect life are met with. Although I have, during my two months' stay in the country, slept in all sorts of places, from the meanest hut of the peasant to the governor general's palace, I have never had my rest disturbed by anything more annoying than mosquitoes, which are mild and unenterprising enough as compared with the breed which infests most places in America and many resorts in Europe.

The writers on the Philippines have almost unanimously declared the country to be the home of all sorts of insects and reptiles which make life burdensome. But one soon finds that the innocent little lizards which run over the walls are engaged in catching flies and mosquitoes, that the great beetles are harmless as grasshoppers and that there is here, indeed, a remarkable immunity from the petty annoyances which one expects to find in a sojourn in the tropics.—Chicago Daily News.

#### WHO DOES THE HUNTING?

For The Public.

In one of his eloquent and roseate speeches in an Iowa town, on returning from the Omaha exposition, President

McKinley said that "the job hunts the man now, and not the man the job."

In order to acquit the chief magistrate of the nation of willful falsehood we must presume that he was deplorably ignorant as to the industrial conditions prevailing in this country. And surely the President of the United States ought not to be ignorant on so important a matter as that. The statement herein quoted implies that as a rule there is plenty of employment for all willing workers, and if the demand for workers exceeds the supply, or is even equal to it, wages must necessarily be good. Is such the case? Hardly. Every sensible man in the country knows better, unless he is blinded by the glare of some artificial surroundings, as is liable to be the case with a naturally egotistical President.

Let me mention one instance, or incident, which occurred in Los Angeles a few days ago, from which a valuable lesson may be drawn. And the metropolis of Southern California is certainly as prosperous as the average of cities containing 100,000 population or more.

The inventor of a new kind of health food in that city decided to run a delivery wagon. He accordingly inserted in a local paper a brief announcement that he wished to employ a man to run such a team. On going to his office the next morning he found a crowd of men on the sidewalk and a string of them reaching up the stairway to the office door. He counted them and found there were just one hundred and fifty. Their ages ran from about 18 to 60. Some of the applicants were well dressed, educated men, others were evidently very poor and in straitened circumstances, but all were eager for the job. The advertiser suggested to several of the most intelligent applicants that their services were worth more than the small sum of one dollar a day, which was all he could afford to pay, as the business was experimental. But every one insisted that he would gladly work for even such a small wage, as it was the best he could do and he needed to work for somebody at any amount of pay he could get. As there was a job for only one man of course one hundred and forty-nine of those who applied had to go away without any encouragement, and renew their hunt for employment, with the chances of finding it overwhelmingly against them.

There is no reason to suppose that Los Angeles is an exception to the general rule of over-supply in the labor market. What intelligent man really believes that jobs are around hunting

for men to work? Such a supposition is too absurd for serious consideration. And that the President of the United States should publicly make a statement so destitute of truth, and so palpably at variance with existing industrial conditions all over the land, is shameful.

The time when jobs will hunt men can never come till all men are permitted to freely use those natural elements from which every human being must procure the needful things of life. With land monopoly upheld by law, the man and not the job, will continue to be the hunter.

RALPH HOYT.  
San Francisco, Cal., December 1st, 1898.

#### JUDGE MAGUIRE ON THE CAMPAIGN IN CALIFORNIA.

The contest in which we are engaged is much broader than the money question or the railroad question or any of the specific purposes for which we stood. They are but the phases of the contest against privilege and in favor of equal rights.

This fight once intelligently begun on principles as it has been must go on to ultimate success. Every fight for freedom has ultimately triumphed and so will this. This is a struggle for industrial freedom, for equality, not of wealth, but of opportunity, for the overthrow of the unnatural power which some men now have to control and limit the opportunities of others, and by the mere assertion of privilege to command the services of others without giving an equivalent in return.

The establishment of political equality required a struggle of centuries. The abolition of chattel slavery was the ultimate result of a long and often hopeless struggle conducted by men who had no direct interest in the result and who could hope for no assistance from the helpless creatures for whose natural rights they strove and sacrificed, but never for an hour was ultimate success doubted by those who believed in liberty and had faith in the justice of God. So, in this struggle for industrial freedom, while we have political equality established and those who suffer most from the injustice which we would overthrow are armed with the means of immediately and finally establishing their own rights, we find a very large proportion of them using their suffrage to defeat their own emancipation.

This is due to many causes against which we must patiently contend. The first is that men in society must and do adjust their interests to the existing industrial system whether it be

good or bad, and they naturally fear a disturbance of that adjustment until they can be certain that the changes proposed will in fact as well as in appearance be better for them. They therefore vote against change lest they might make their conditions worse while trying to improve them. The trite arguments "Let well enough alone" and "Half a loaf is better than no bread," either consciously or unconsciously move the minds of the poor, to whom the fear of want, caused by the conditions against which we fight, is a life-long nightmare.

Again, the present monopoly system, by which all industry is controlled, degrades a large proportion of the laboring classes to a point at which they feel no interest in the country or its institutions and are led to sell their votes and services to the very monopolists by whom they know they are being oppressed. Again, the shrewd and designing representatives of privileged interests avail themselves of all racial and religious prejudices, by skillfully fomenting which the laboring classes may be divided into bitterly hostile political forces, and even by deception, as in the last election, may all be rallied to the support of the monopoly interest. Again, insidious bribes to localities and to classes, which great monopolies can offer, substantially strengthen their support.

We did not underestimate these forces in the last campaign. We allowed for them and expected to win in spite of them. But we underestimated another force, namely the popular sentiment in favor of congratulating a national administration, under which a successful war had been fought, by supporting the party representing the administration. The people unwisely but very naturally allowed this sentiment too largely to control their votes to the defeat of their own substantial interests and rights. Another cause with which our movement must reckon for the next four years is the reaction from depression to industrial activity which is now going on, and which will in my opinion continue for the next four years. Whether or not that temporary improvement in industrial conditions will be strong enough to counteract the increase of knowledge among the working classes concerning their own interests and rights remains to be seen.

After 1902 I look for the decennial period of industrial depression which never failed to come to our country on time during the last hundred years. These periods of industrial depression are the periods of social and political evolution for which the forces of prog-

ress should always be prepared by thorough organization. In my opinion the absolute and unreversible triumph of our principles may be looked for not later than 1904 if it does not come to us earlier.

These suggestions are not in the nature of prophecy, but are based upon the reasonable expectation that the alternation of periods of prosperity and depression which have followed each other during the last century with the regularity of changes in the moon's phases will continue for some time in the future.

As to the issues which will be paramount in the next three elections, I can but surmise. In my opinion the money question will be the paramount issue of the campaign of 1900 and may cut an important figure in the state campaign of 1902. The land question in some form will, I think, be one of the prominent issues, if not the paramount issue, in the campaign of 1904. Whether it will take the form of a struggle for the adoption of the single-tax or otherwise I do not attempt to predict, but it will be a movement intended to attach the people of our country to the soil of our country as the holders and owners of independent homes; to turn back the tide of rural population now congesting the labor markets of our cities, restore the individual independence of our citizens which for the last 30 years has been steadily undermined, and elevate American labor to a plane of industrial freedom and freedom of opportunity never before enjoyed in the history of the world. That in my opinion is the destiny and the early destiny of our nation. The alternative is the fall of our republic, not through revolution nor by invasion, but through the destruction of liberty by monopoly.

During the depression from which we are just emerging I saw a newspaper published in one of the middle western states which contained 12 pages of foreclosure notices embracing about 30 notices to the page. Every one of those notices meant the reduction of an American family from the independent position of occupying ownership to the homeless and helpless struggle for existence in the labor market. This tendency must be arrested, and it will be in my opinion. The single-tax is our proposition to that end. If a better remedy for land monopoly is suggested which will be at the same time practical, just and constitutional, I for one will readily accept it in place of the single tax; for the single tax is to me but a means to the accomplish-

ment of the end, namely, the universal attachment of our people to the soil of our country as the occupying owners of independent homes.

The single tax was not a political issue in the late campaign in California because no party had declared for it. I do not know whether or not it will be a political issue in this state in the near future, but it is an issue in modern civilization, and must some day, and I trust at an early day, be the paramount issue in state and national politics unless, as I have suggested, some better and equally effective remedy for the evil of land monopoly shall be presented.—Hon. James G. Maguire, in San Francisco Examiner.

#### QUEEN WILHELMINA'S CORONATION.

The coronation of 18-year-old Queen Wilhelmina of Holland has called out many pleasant comments and good wishes for the young sovereign. This is natural; for, according to all accounts, Wilhelmina is a good and intelligent girl, as well as a charming one. Even newspapers strongly opposed to suffrage for American women are warm in their congratulations of the winsome Dutch maiden.

This shows how completely the opposition to political rights for women is a matter of habit and prejudice. Every argument used against allowing a woman to vote applies with double force against allowing her to be a queen. Is it said that contact with public affairs must be destructive to womanliness? Then Wilhelmina should be pitied instead of congratulated. Is it said that political rights involve too much publicity? What amount of publicity is incurred by the average American voter, in comparison with "that fierce light that beats upon a throne?" Is it said that political duties would take so much time as to compel a woman to neglect her family? Wilhelmina during her whole life will have to give more time to political duties than 99 voters out of 100. Yet the very persons who object to equal suffrage for fear some woman might occasionally be elected to office, are ready to congratulate Wilhelmina on her being placed for life in the highest office in her country.

Nearly 40 years ago Henry Ward Beecher called attention to this inconsistency. He said:

For ages, woman has been advanced to honor, influence, office, and the highest public trusts, if she will accept them in aristocratic forms. She may be an abbess, a countess, a queen. It is only woman without a title that must have no privileges. With a crown on her brow, she may enter parliaments and govern empires.

With only her own simple virtues, she may not lift up her hand to cast a vote. Now, as a Christian democrat, I assert for her every right and every privilege that aristocracy accords her. That which is good enough for a queen is not too good for my wife. That which is noble in a duchess is honorable in my daughter.

Good and bright as young Queen Wilhelmina doubtless is, yet there are thousands of American girls just as good and bright as she. Why should they be debarred as unfit from all share in political rights and responsibilities? Thoughtful men are more and more coming to say, with a late distinguished senator: "If women are fit to rule in monarchies, it is difficult to see why they are not qualified to vote in a republic."—Alice Stone Blackwell, in New Christianity.

#### NATIONAL EXPANSION UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.

Extracts from an address on the above subject, delivered by Edwin Burritt Smith, of the Chicago bar, before the Sunset club of Chicago, October 27.

"In vain we call old notions fudge,  
And bend our conscience to our dealing;  
The ten commandments will not budge,  
And stealing will continue stealing."  
—Lowell.

The new policy of national expansion, into which we are drifting, calls for a reexamination of the essential conditions of free government. What will our new possessions do with us, not what shall we do with them? is, as Bishop Potter suggests, the real question. Our institutions rest upon the proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This consent means more than mere acquiescence. It contemplates the active participation by the governed in a government which is their own and which they alone control. Our governments, local, state and national, exercise only such authority as is conferred upon them by the people. None of them claims or exercises original or arbitrary power. All, as the agents of the governed, execute none but delegated authority.

The president and the congress of the United States must govern all new acquisitions of territory under and by virtue of the constitution, or by self-assumed and arbitrary power. The constitution created a nation of states, "an indissoluble union of indestructible states." It called into being a United States of America, not a United States of America and Asia. Every person born or naturalized within its borders was to be a citizen of the nation and of the state of his residence. All the people of the nation were to constitute a brotherhood of citizens having equal rights before the

law, which might not be denied or abridged because of race or color. There were to be no subjects, but only citizens. Congress might organize territorial governments for the administration of the sparsely settled national domain outside the states; but the territorial form of government was to be but temporary and merely preparatory to statehood. Such was our noble scheme of popular government; such was our splendid vision; and until now there has been no desire among us to have it otherwise.

Those who hold that fatalism in the form of "duty determines destiny," and that destiny itself is an affair of the heart rather than of the head, lightly reply to all this that they have proposed no such annexation as will make these islands subject to the constitution and general laws of the United States. They assume, without shadow of authority, that congress may deal with such acquisitions free from all constitutional restraints. This seems to be the view at Washington. It is even reported that the president will recommend to congress the appointment of a commission to recommend a plan of insular taxation, both local and general. No commission is needed to point out the constitutional requirements that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The cool assumption that congress may itself acquire and hold new territory conditioned that it shall not be subject to the constitution and general laws of the United States, is the most dangerous development of the expansion craze through which we are passing. It means in plain language that there are those among us who, for the moment at least, are prepared to discredit and even abandon representative government. Thus far it has been our greatest glory that ours is a government of laws, not a government of men. Presidents and congresses have exercised only delegated powers. They have ruled as the servants and with the consent and cooperation of the people. It is now proposed that in addition to their duties as public servants, they shall take on other duties of an entirely different character; that they shall exercise a self-assumed, arbitrary and uncontrolled authority over distant and subject peoples. If this extraordinary programme can be carried out, we shall see the president and congress daily exercising from Washington both delegated and self-assumed powers. At one moment they will act as the duly authorized servants of a free people, and the next as despotic rulers of sub-

ject races. Their authority over us will remain at least in name expressly delegated. Their authority over their remote subjects will remain self-assumed and unrestrained.

It is a law of physics that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time. Abraham Lincoln but declared the application of this law to the realm of politics when he declared that "this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." Under his great leadership his prediction that the union would cease to be divided was gloriously fulfilled. The question for our generation is whether we shall voluntarily again divide it; whether we shall permit to be set up at the seat of government despotic power to compete with representative authority for final supremacy.

Those among us who have so suddenly awakened to what they are pleased to call our national "isolation," exhibit a growing impatience with the counsels of the fathers. They even lightly refer to them as puritanical and timid old souls, whose advice was well enough for a boy. They have just discovered that the nation has become a giant, who "is no longer content with the nursery rhymes which were sung around his cradle."\*

They are especially certain that the Farewell Address is outgrown, and is no longer of value to a nation that has suddenly become a "world power," and that even the Monroe doctrine has become somewhat shopworn, or at least of but one-sided application. Yet the counsels of the fathers were not born of weakness or fear. The policy of non-interference by us in the affairs of Europe was early announced in the face of the pressing demands of France that we redeem the supposed obligations growing out of her assistance in our revolt against England. That of non-intervention by European powers on this continent was suddenly proclaimed in 1823 by a nation of less than 12,000,000 souls, in opposition to the "holy alliance" which had been organized by the emperors of Russia and Austria and the king of Prussia to conserve and maintain absolutism in Europe and over all lands claimed by European powers. The policies thus announced were believed by their authors to be of permanent application. It is, of course, possible that Washington was mistaken, but his counsels if wise are for all time. His solemn admonitions were not for temporary purposes. They ring in our ears to-day with the added

\*President Northrup, University of Minnesota, at Chicago peace jubilee banquet.

weight of a century of successful application.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. \* \* \* 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. \* \* \* Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity and interest. The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.

These are not the words of transient wisdom or temporary expediency. Only what Washington and Hamilton expected has happened in America. We have merely reached the position which they clearly foresaw, "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, aided by our justice, shall counsel." Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Shall we dash to the ground their splendid vision of national life that shall lead the world to higher things by a spectacle of peace, liberty and prosperity? Shall we adopt a policy that will mark a complete departure from our well-considered course for a century, and convert a nation whose chief glory it has been to achieve a position to command permanent peace—the opportunity for the steady pursuit of an entire people of their chosen occupations—over a vast area, into a high priest of militarism? Taxation without representation is still tyranny. Government by force is still despotism.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

While woman suffrage was defeated in Washington at the recent election, South Dakota approved it. There are now five states in which women may vote, all of them west of the Missouri. The states have 17 electoral votes, and woman has therefore become an important factor in national politics. Her vote in the five states may determine the election of a president. Instead of a waning equal suffrage is a growing cause. The long agitation of the Anthonys and Stantons for endowment of their sex with the full rights of citizenship is finally bearing fruit. States which have not yet gone so far as to extend unlimited have extended limited suffrage to women. And in operation

equal suffrage is refuting the theories of those who antagonized it. Where it exists and is exercised it is not producing any of the evils its opponents predicted. The women are just as womanly as elsewhere, they are as attentive to their household duties as before, their homes are as free from discord, and the only change the ballot has made in them is to broaden their understanding of questions in which they previously took little or no interest. In practice woman suffrage is quite different from the anticipation.—Dubuque Daily Telegraph.

#### BOSTON'S CARE OF HER STREET MUSIC.

The Boston music commission to-day (December 1) mobilized all the street musicians in the North End park and for four hours listened to their efforts. The examination was with the object of selecting and licensing only those who play classical music.

There were hurdy-gurdies, hand organs and cornets among the instruments examined. Several musicians were instructed to have their instruments tuned up. The principal tunes played were "The Banks of the Wash-bash" and "St. Patrick's Day." About 50 licenses were issued, and fully as many more musicians were turned away because their music was not up to the Boston standard.—Boston Correspondence in Chicago Chronicle.

"I never cheated an honest man"—so says a notorious "green goods" dealer who recently finished a term in the penitentiary. We see no reason to doubt the truth of this statement. The man who offers counterfeit money for sale does not expect a rush of honest customers. Whether he be a dealer in bogus currency or a mere pretender, arranging to exchange blank paper for lawful currency, his customers know that he is a rascal and they believe that he is going to sell them counterfeit money. Their object is to enrich themselves by committing a felony.—Washington Post.

"Whose street is this anyway?" demanded the indignant citizen.

"Ours," promptly answered the representative of a street-railway corporation.

"Yours?" exclaimed the indignant citizen. "I suppose you'd like to have me believe that you bought it."

"We did buy it."

"From the city?"

"Certainly not; from the aldermen."—The Evening Post, Chicago.

The senate does not represent the people or the common interest. It is

composed of representatives of special interests, and what legislation is had is a compromise. In other words, the senate is becoming oligarchical instead of democratic. And it will grow worse instead of better until some way is found to bring senators to a closer accounting to the people. As long as they are "owned," to use the expressive language of one of them, popular legislation cannot be expected.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

It was the first Napoleon who, speaking from an extended observation and some personal experience, said: "Empires generally die from indigestion through swallowing too much territory." History has repeatedly confirmed the truth of that sagacious utterance. Great Britain is beginning to exhibit signs of alimentary distress through overindulgence of the land appetite. Hardly a week now passes that the bloated physical proportions of the empire do not encounter a hostile stroke in some part of the world.—Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

What is this, the sound and rumor—what is this that all men hear,  
Like the wind in hollow valleys when the storm is drawing near,  
Like the rolling on of ocean in the eventide of fear?

'Tis the people marching on!  
—William Morris.

Had Christ not preached equality among men, had he not sought to establish a Christian communism, he would never have been crucified. For the same reasons his apostles suffered martyrdom. They were never molested for their style of worship. Invariably they were charged as disturbers, anarchists and haters of mankind. Wherever you find a period of martyrdom it has been not a religious persecution, but an economic persecution instituted by political agents. Every Old Testament prophet was a political agitator. The multitude is leaving the church to-day not because it is becoming less religious, but because it is becoming more religious. There was never a time when the great heart of mankind called more clearly for a definite, tangible faith. There was never so much unorganized material for martyrdom. Men and women are waiting for the call that shall summon them to give their lives for their brethren, not concerned in the mere selfish saving of their souls.—Prof. George D. Herron, before the People's University Club of Chicago.

In Berlin the emperor is always spoken of as Mr. Lehmann. Instead of saying "the kaiser has done this" one frequently hears the remark "Mr. Leh-

mann has been doing something extraordinary again." This preserves the subjects of his eccentric majesty from being indicted for lese majesty.—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.....(Beligion)  
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-Thea**, 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 622,  
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PRISTER, 140  
Wason Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St.  
West.