

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1898.

Number 13.

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.

President McKinley's position with reference to the Cuban republic is painfully anomalous. According to the constitutional doctrine which he has borrowed from President Cleveland, it is the prerogative, not of congress, but of the executive, to recognize new governments. The responsibility, therefore, of recognizing Cuban belligerency, pursuant to his own theory, rests upon President McKinley. Accepting this responsibility he nevertheless refuses to make the recognition. Two representatives of the Cuban government—the vice president and the secretary for foreign affairs—are now in the United States awaiting an official audience which the president denies them. Thus the president, while uniting forces with the Cubans in the field, places the American government in the attitude of regarding them as Spain regards them—as banditti, as outlaws, whom the Spanish government may continue to shoot as fast as it catches them.

The Cuban republic has no belligerent rights. Under the law of nations its soldiers have no right to pull a trigger or strike a blow. They are subject to the municipal law of Spain, under which when they kill they commit legal murder. Nor have we conferred upon them the legal right to kill by amalgamating them in our armies. The Cuban troops are not under the command of our officers. Yet they are fighting for us, and with us. As commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, President McKinley has made them our allies, though as our civil

executive he refuses to recognize them as belligerents.

Is a greater anomaly in international affairs conceivable? If Gen. Garcia, our military ally, were captured by the Spanish, what protection could we give him? None. In the eye of the municipal law of Spain he is a murderer and outlaw. Legally, he is a murderer and outlaw also in the eye of the municipal law of the United States, so long as the United States refuses to recognize the war-making rights of the government whose commission he holds. Spain, then, would be free to shoot him or hang him if it caught him, and our lips would be closed, our arms paralyzed. We could not threaten the Spanish with retaliation. We have no retaliatory rights with reference to any civilized punishment the Spanish may choose to inflict upon unrecognized belligerents whom they capture. If they attempted to take Hobson's life, we could protect him by threats of executing Spanish prisoners; for Hobson is a belligerent in our own armies. So, if the belligerency of the Cuban republic were recognized by the United States, and the Spanish, having captured Garcia, undertook to treat him as an outlaw, we could protect him by threatening to retaliate upon Spanish prisoners; for then Garcia would be a belligerent in the army of our ally. But without our recognition of Cuban belligerency, if the Spanish were to capture Garcia, we should be powerless to protect him. Threats of retaliation on our part would be unlawful; and if he were shot or hanged, actual retaliation by the execution of Spanish prisoners in our hands would be legal murder. This is the position in which the president's refusal to recognize the Cuban republic in accordance with

his own claim of prerogative places the American people.

How do Americans who have justified this war on the only ground on which it can be justified, as an intervention in behalf of the Cuban republic in its struggle for freedom from Spanish despotism, how do they like the attitude in which the president is placing their country by accepting, in his capacity of commander-in-chief, the aid of the Cuban patriots as allies, while in his capacity of chief magistrate denying them belligerent recognition and therefore belligerent protection? Does he intend after all to make the war what Spain tauntingly told us at the outset it would be made—a war of conquest? If not, why deny to the Cuban republic that simple recognition of belligerency which would at once confirm our disinterested pretensions and protect Cuban soldiers from Spanish barbarity?

It is not likely that Spain would execute Garcia as a murderer and outlaw if she captured him. She might fear the retaliation of the United States, in spite of its lack of right under the laws of war to resort to retaliation. Or she might withhold her bloody hand out of respect to the opinions of mankind. And we, on the other hand, might in fact, though without right under the laws of war, visit upon some of her great men who fell into our hands the penalty which she, in the case supposed, inflicted upon Garcia. But, however all this might be, the fact remains, and that is the important consideration, that we have allied ourselves in war with soldiers whose right to make war we continue to deny.

The Spanish have recognized the anomalous situation in which Presi-

dent McKinley's refusal to recognize Cuban belligerency places us. Gen. Blanco's official organ at Havana, *La Lucha*, goes even so far as to claim that our own soldiers, by cooperating with military forces having no recognition as belligerents, lose their belligerent rights. Editorially, in its issue of June 22d, that paper declares that the American army of invasion will not be accorded belligerent rights, because it is acting in concert with "malcontents in rebellion against proper and established government—malcontents who have yet to be recognized as belligerents by any nation." The *La Lucha* editorial significantly adds: "If these rebels are not to be considered as a regular army, but only as a civil element warring against the established government of the state, the Americans cannot pretend or expect that the Spanish government will grant the forces they send to Cuba the right which they would accord to an army with an ally recognized as a belligerent power."

The above quotation clearly intimates that captured Americans may not be treated by the Spanish as prisoners of war. There is little likelihood, of course, that the intimation will be made good. Even the fatuous Spanish government will hardly go so far as to shoot or hang Americans captured in battle, though it may so dispose of our captured allies. But the theoretical strength of *La Lucha's* position is impregnable. We have made an alliance with a government whose belligerent rights we refuse to recognize. Though our military arm cooperates with its soldiers, the civil side of our government treats them as assassins.

The way out of this dilemma, since the president takes no action in his civil capacity to protect his military allies, is for congress to act. Of its right to do so there can be no reasonable question. Aside from all other authority, under its constitutional power "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and

naval forces," it may recognize the belligerent rights of the Cuban republic, simply as a basis for conforming and authorizing the otherwise unlawful acts of our army and navy in making a military alliance with that republic. Recognition of the belligerent rights of a military ally being the first condition of a lawful military alliance, legislative authority to regulate military alliances—and that is involved in authority to govern the land and naval forces of a nation—implies authority to recognize as belligerents the forces of a de facto government with which an alliance is desired.

Capt. Capron, who died fighting so bravely at the battle of La Quasina, had the misfortune just before sailing from Tampa to Cuba to write a letter to a most injudicious friend. It was after the transports had made their false start from Tampa and returned. Capron, still in his twenties, and full of energy and ambition, felt a keen sense of disappointment. He had gone out—vigorous, ambitious, doubtless patriotic, too—to fight under his country's flag; and here was a strong probability that the privilege might be denied him. While in this humor he wrote to his friend: "I am nearly wild for fear the Spanish government will try peace before we get started." From Capt. Capron, the athletic, hopeful, eager army officer, too young yet to realize the awfulness of welcoming war merely for war's sake, the unhappy feeling expressed in that letter may well be pardoned. It was but a passing passion of boyhood. But the man to whom he wrote the letter, a man old enough and mature enough to bear the title of "judge," yet who, after the young man's death, gave his letter to the public press as if its writer's passionate words were something to be proud of instead of an unfortunate expression to be excused, can plead nothing in mitigation, nothing whatever unless it be imbecility. In having worked his own way from private in the regular army to the commission that bore him to

his death, Capt. Capron made a record which his countrymen will remember with satisfaction, while they try to forget his boyish fear that peace might come before fighting, and they will not thank the injudicious friend who has obtruded that unfortunate letter upon their attention.

A distinguished senator, one who is not to be classed with the plutocrats who have made the word "senator" a stench in American nostrils, makes a thoughtless comment upon the death of young Hamilton Fish, at the battle of La Quasina. While feelingly referring to this brave young man's death as a hard blow to his family, Senator White, of California—for it is to him that we allude—says: "It will have a great effect on the country in obliterating the lines between the different classes," and then adds:

His service in the army shows that there is a common feeling between the rich and the poor, and the death of this millionaire, together with that of the poorest men in that troop, will do more toward promoting a better feeling among all classes of people than if Mr. Fish had ten times more money and ability than he possessed, and had lived a hundred years.

With abundant respect for the common sense and good feeling of Senator White, we beg leave to suggest that young Fish's death neither will nor ought to have any such effect. The lines between classes in this country cannot be obliterated by the death, however valorous, of rich men. Those lines are due to institutions, imbedded in the laws, which divert the earnings of the many to the pockets of the few. While such laws remain, working that result, class lines will be drawn. Does Senator White in sober thought believe that the rich will ignore class lines because a rich man now and then proves, what no one doubts, that despite his riches he is nevertheless a man? Does Senator White in sober thought believe that the poor will be blind to class lines because in the face of a common enemy a rich man drops into the same grave with poor men?

Does Senator White so much as hope in his heart that anyone—rich or poor—will be inspired by the dramatic spectacle of a millionaire's son falling in battle side by side with poor men, to cease working for the abrogation of the institutions and the repeal of the laws which make it possible for some to grow inordinately rich without working, while the many work inordinately without securing even the modest comforts of civilized life?

Emperor William is maneuvering his Asiatic fleet in a manner to excite just suspicions of his good will toward the United States. The presence of his whole fleet in Manila Bay is not necessary to protect Germans resident in Manila. One or two warships would be enough for that. Only one would be enough, merely as a representative of Germany, for Dewey could and would afford all necessary protection to Germans. He is fighting Spain, not Germany. The gathering there at this time in Manila Bay of the German emperor's Asiatic fleet, especially when it signalizes the event by saluting the Spanish fort, something which neither the French nor the English fleets did, and follows it by offensive behavior toward American warships, may well disturb American confidence. We are not called upon to resent this behavior by embroiling ourselves with Germany, as a bellicose congressman has proposed; but our state department is called upon to obtain more satisfactory assurances from the German government of its friendly intentions, than oral protestations from the emperor's ambassador at Washington to Secretary Day.

It was reported in Paris early in the week that Spain has a new scheme for circumventing American plans for the invasion of Puerto Rico. It is nothing less than granting independence to the little island. This would be the highest strategy. It would at once stop the invasion and protect Puerto Rico from falling into

the hands of the Elkinses and Hannas. But Spain has neither the good sense nor the sense of justice requisite for such grand tactics.

When Gen. Grosvenor, the president's spokesman in the lower house of congress, presided over the Ohio republican convention last month, he expressed his belief that no republican administration, and certainly not McKinley's administration, would ever take down the American flag from any flagstaff where conquest of arms had placed it. Grosvenor's sentiment is now being actively spread, though his formula is changed to one more dramatic. We are now told that wherever American blood flows, the land must be ours. There is a suggestion of transcendental patriotism in this idea, when first heard; but upon second thought, how groveling! Think of swapping American blood for real estate! The sentiment is fit to have originated in a Chicago abattoir.

This proposition to "freeze to" every spot of earth that in the war we moisten with American blood, is the meanest possible justification of conquest. But if it were the highest, we should have no right to appeal to it. In entering upon the war we distinctly asserted that we had no intention of making it a war of conquest. "The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island"—Cuba—"except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people"—that was the express declaration of the joint resolution which congress passed and the president signed upon the eve of the war. And now, less than three months after that declaration, the president's mouthpiece in the lower house, and his friends throughout the country, are urging the people to seize upon Cuba and make it American territory. Nothing less can be

meant by the proposition that the American flag must not be taken down from any flagstaff where conquest of arms has placed it, for conquest of arms has placed it in Cuba. Nothing less can be meant by the suggestion that we retain all land that we moisten with American blood, for American blood has moistened the soil of Cuba.

Some advocates of conquest make a pettifogging distinction between Cuba and other Spanish colonies. Notable among these is that plutocratic democrat, John R. McLean, owner of the Cincinnati Enquirer. He, too, would have us add field to field. This question of conquest and imperialism is not yet a party question. Democratic partisans like McLean, as well as republican partisans like Grosvenor, are in the conspiracy. McLean is in it naturally. Where the carrion is, there also are the crows. But McLean, naturally again, pays the usual homage to virtue. He sees that the country is pledged against conquest as to Cuba, and, shrewder than Grosvenor, guesses that the American people will tolerate no violation of the pledge. But "no such reservation," he says, "exists as to any other island possession of Spain or the Spanish peninsula." Wherefore he would have the United States make complete conquest of Puerto Rico, of the Philippine islands, and of every other Spanish possession, Cuba excepted, which may come under our flag during the prosecution of the war. Of course this would be as clear a violation of the spirit of the pledge in the congressional resolutions which we have quoted, as the conquest of Cuba would be of its letter. But the interests which are trying to egg the country on to foreign conquest care nothing for that.

And what are those interests? They are the so-called "business interests"—the interests which in fact bear much the same relation to legitimate business that Jack Sheppard's occupation bore to travel on the king's high-

way. The object of this cry for conquest, this demand for imperialism, is to afford corporation promoters and land grabbers new and virgin fields of operation. But shall we for their enrichment moisten foreign soil with American blood? Shall their fortunes be fertilized by the bodies of American youth? For the extension of human liberty, no price is too high to pay, not even American blood; but American blood should be too precious to pour out for an extension of American monopoly.

There is a striking difference between the newspaper reports of general prosperity and the evidences on every hand of general depression. The papers say that good times have come again, yet merchants find it difficult to unload their goods; manufacturers, except in certain lines which are affected by the war demands of government, are desperately short of orders; capital rushes eagerly to invest in three per cent. bonds instead of business enterprises; and, although enlistments have made large drafts upon the army of the unemployed, it is well-nigh impossible for workingmen to get jobs. An advertisement for work brings few if any responses, except from book agencies and "fake" factories; while an advertisement for help overwhelms the advertiser with applications. Yet the papers, and the financial papers at that, multiply their assurances that we are on the flood tide of prosperity. There are only two ways of accounting for this. Either the reiterations of prosperity are made in bad faith, or those who make them proceed upon the theory that what ought to be, according to their philosophy, actually is. The latter is probably the explanation. It is supposed that we ought to be prosperous and therefore that we are, because our exports exceed our imports.

It is an old superstition that the prosperity of a country is due to its excess of exports. This superstition,

like most other superstitions, prevails in the face of the most patent facts. Were one asked to name the typically prosperous nation of the world, he would say Great Britain. This would not imply that everyone in Great Britain is rich; but that as a nation that country is notably prosperous. And if one were asked to name the typically unprosperous nation, he would be apt to say Egypt. Not that everyone is poor in Egypt. Quite the contrary. But Egypt is notably poor as a nation. Yet Great Britain, the rich nation, is an importing nation, and has been for half a century, whereas Egypt, the poor nation, has for long been an exporting nation. That is to say, in Great Britain imports steadily exceed exports, while in Egypt the reverse is the case—exports exceed imports. It is curious that with these two object lessons before their eyes all these years, American business men should be so deluded with the notion that an excess of imports means hard times, and an excess of exports good times.

Nor should these object lessons be at all necessary. The mere statement of the excessive export theory should condemn it. Briefly expressed it is that the country which sends out more property than it takes back is on the way to prosperity, whereas the one which takes in more property than it sends out is on the way to hard times. If an individual were advised to get rich according to the excessive export theory, he would laugh at the advice. How could an individual get rich by selling more property than he buys? Do you say he could do it by piling up the money he receives for what he sells? But if he did that, his trading would soon come to an end. Money is only a medium of trading. What men really trade is goods, and in order to do that they must buy as well as sell. Indeed, they must buy—or produce, and legitimate buying is but a form of production—so that they can sell. And un-

less they buy on the whole more in value than they sell, they will grow poor, not rich. It is the same with nations, even if we think of nations as traders.

The reason, perhaps, why it has come to be so strangely supposed that exporting enriches and importing impoverishes a country, is that it is assumed that exports will be offset with money; in other words, that exporting implies the accumulation of a debt in favor of the exporting country, which will ultimately be discharged with shipments of money. But this expectation is unfounded. As a matter of fact, exports could not in any great degree be paid for in money; and if they were, the money would have to go out again to pay for imports, which would change the nation from an exporting to an importing one. Is any debt accumulating in favor of Egypt in consequence of her excessive exports? Is any accumulating against Great Britain in consequence of her excessive imports? Certainly not. Egypt's excessive exports are due to the tribute which in one way and another she pays to absentees; and England's excessive imports are due to tribute which in one way and another she receives from other countries. This is the great fact which makes excessive exports an indication that a country, so far from being thereby enriched, is being drained of its wealth. It is a fact which suggests to thoughtful minds that our own continuous excess of exports means that we are being drained of our wealth by foreigners.

Propos of the collapse of the Leiter wheat corner, the Chicago Economist publishes a list of the elder Leiter's real estate holdings in the "windy city" alone. They are in number 28 pieces, most of them in the heart of the retail district. According to the report of the tax commission the value of this property is \$3,300,310 for the improvements,

and \$12,412,180 for the land alone, irrespective of the improvements.

It is significant of our disordered social conditions when one little man can own all this value—\$15,712,490 at the very lowest, for the tax commission will not be accused of over appraisal. Think a moment of what \$15,712,490 means in the distribution of the world's wealth! It is more than one man could earn, at good wages as wages go, in 25,000 years. Does anybody believe that the elder Leiter, "single-handed and alone," has earned—mind! you, we say "earned," mark the word, "earned!"—as much in his little lifetime as one able-bodied two-dollar-a-day man could earn in 25,000 years? No one dare say it, and yet pretend to be both sane and honest. Or, to put the matter another way: Leiter's fortune in Chicago real estate equals the value of more than 7,000 average Illinois farms with all their improvements. Leiter could not have earned so much. This fortune of his must represent in great degree the earnings of other men, which have been attracted to his strong box. What the magnet of attraction has been may be seen when it is considered that of this \$15,712,490, no less than \$12,412,180 is in the value of lots—nothing but a capitalization of the power which his ownership of those little pieces of earth enables him to draw annually from the enterprise and industry that center in Chicago.

— There is another point about these figures from the Economist as to Leiter's Chicago realty. The site value is less, it will be noticed, than 22 per cent. of the whole, while the land value is more than 78 per cent. It cannot be, however, that the lots are nearly vacant. They are in the heart of the retail district, and on the whole are doubtless well built upon. So here we find another illustration of the fact that in places where industry is intense, the value of improvements upon land is but a small proportion of the value of the land. This should

be a useful illustration for Henry George men. If taxes were levied upon land values alone, the veriest tyro in fiscal matters knows that farmers and small house owners would pay lower taxes than they pay now. Their land values are far less than other values in which they are interested. But taxes so laid would exempt only 22 per cent. of Leiter's Chicago realty, while taxing 78 per cent. of it to the full.

The supreme court of Tennessee has decided that the law for a Greater Memphis is unconstitutional. It seems that nineteen-twentieths of the people of Memphis and its suburbs had decided to place themselves under a general municipal government, to the end chiefly that a general sanitary system might be established to ward off yellow fever. The only opposition came from certain real estate owners who saw in the change the possibilities of heavier taxation upon that "unearned increment" with which every community rewards its landlords for holding its site in place—it must be for holding the site in place, for they earn the reward in no other way yet described; and though they were badly beaten in the vote they have succeeded in the courts, which, under our system of written constitutions, have become a power above the people. In commenting upon the matter, the Memphis Scimitar significantly says that this defeat of the people by the lot owners "has not been a pleasant spectacle, nor one to encourage citizens who have no unearned increment to add to family estates—who must work for what they get, and who are hurt in a vital part by every injury done to the community."

Last week, when commenting upon the negro question in this country, and while expressing our sympathy with the equality side of it, we described it, nevertheless, as a minor question, saying in that connection that the prejudice against negroes

merely because they are negroes is fast dying out and will soon pass away. We spoke particularly of the tendency of this question to disappear at the South. Hardly was the ink of last week's issue dry, when our view, as to the South, was signally confirmed. While republican officials at the North were resorting to subterfuges innumerable to withhold military commissions from negro officers of negro troops, the strait-laced democratic governor of Virginia was appointing negro officers to the command of negro volunteers from the Old Dominion. This governor held that as the negroes he appointed had creditably passed their examinations, their comrades were entitled to chose them as officers precisely the same as if everybody concerned had been white. Clearly the color line in the United States is fast breaking down, and bigger questions than it brought forward are coming to the front.

"All agree," says the Chicago Tribune, speaking of the outcry of working men against the war tax, "that the failure to put the tax all on the other fellow is the only really objectionable point about the new revenue law." The Tribune forgets landlords. They make no such complaint. Nor have they any cause to; as to them there was no failure in putting "the tax all on the other fellow."

Not only do American warships "move majestically" while Spanish warships "prowl," but the Americans bring "ingenuity" to their aid while the Spanish serve their cause with "intrigue."

#### EUROPEAN SOCIALISM.

Prior to the French elections of last May, the number of socialists in the French chamber of deputies was only 62. But the number chosen at those elections rose to 263. In the German reichstag which has just been dissolved, there were 48 socialists. That this number has been increased by the elections just held in Germany is reasonably certain; and that the popular

vote for the socialist party, which was in 1871, only 124,655; in 1881, 311,961; in 1890, 1,427,298, and in 1893, 1,876,758, has been carried beyond 2,000,000, is conceded.

Nor are these two the only European countries in which socialists have developed strength in politics. Italy has a socialist vote of some 90,000, with 19 deputies in parliament; Denmark has over 25,000 votes, with nine members of the rigsdag, and Belgium has 461,000 votes with 29 representatives.

This is by no means the extent of the socialistic movement in European politics. In every European country socialist agitation is in progress, and in most of them votes in large numbers are cast for socialist candidates. But there is no important parliamentary representation except as enumerated above; and only in France and Germany is the representation strong enough to visibly affect parliamentary action. In those two countries, however, the socialists have become a factor in government. They were chiefly instrumental two weeks ago in ousting the Meline ministry in France; and in Germany, with a larger popular vote than any other party, though with a comparatively small parliamentary representation, there is no foretelling what trouble they may yet make for the imperialists, in a parliament in which there are several other opposition parties.

Neither in France nor Germany is the socialist party an exception to the universal rule, so far as its platform of principles goes. In both countries the party stands for "collectivism," as the socialistic phrase has it, meaning government ownership of all the implements for producing wealth; but it is not to its platform of principles that it owes its strength in either country. In France the socialist party is the only one which is not under the control of reactionary priests or the army ring, a fact which tends to draw to it those voters who, whether believers in "collectivism" or not, are hostile to the church and the army. It is to this, far more than to any exceptional advance of socialistic sentiment, that the growth of political socialism in France is attributable. Similar reasons account for the tremendous socialist vote in Germany.

The only way in which a German democrat can forcibly express himself against what he objects to in German government, is by voting with the socialists. He cannot vote effectively with any other party. The centrists are strictly a Roman Catholic party, composed of both aristocratic and democratic elements and living merely upon the recollection of Bismarck's oppressive laws against the church. A vote for that party is not a vote against German paternalism, nor even against imperial oppression, except Bismarck's oppression of the church. The liberal party is not only timid, but is hopelessly broken up into small independent parties. There are a number of other parties, but none of them is attractive to a man who has any deep inclinations to vote against the obtrusive paternalism of the emperor and the conservatives, and some of them are distinctly repugnant. To express emphatic opposition, therefore, one must vote with the social democratic party.

And this the German democrats, like the French democrats, are doing in increasing numbers. They bother themselves little if at all about "collectivism." What they wish to do, as a recent prominent German politician says, is "to express their feeling of political discontent with things as they exist by voting for the most violent opposition." And not only do they find that to be the socialist party, but the socialist party invites support irrespective of its collectivist ideas. It is to a degree an opportunist party, so much so that in its parliamentary action it steadily opposes any increase of the powers of government under the existing system, even when the powers proposed would, if the government were democratic, be in harmony with collectivism. The socialist party of Germany is, as its name implies, a social democracy. Its programme is democratic collectivism, and in political action it gives more emphasis to the adjective than to the noun—is more democratic than collectivist. It is in fact the democratic, the only democratic, party of Germany.

The increase of the socialist vote in Germany, as in France, is therefore not remarkable. It does not indicate that the idea of socialism is any more

nearly triumphant in those countries than elsewhere. If the political conditions which prevail there prevailed in the United States or in England, it is altogether improbable that the socialist party in either would be the ciphers they are. But socialistic ideas would in neither be any further advanced.

There is of course a stronger tendency to socialism in the continental mind than we in this country are familiar with; but after fully allowing for that, it must still be plain, upon considering political conditions, that the political growth of French and German socialism marks a growth in France and Germany of democratic rather than socialistic sentiment.

#### EMASCULATED ECONOMICS.

In his last work, "The Science of Political Economy," Henry George directed attention to the fact, which most intelligent observers may now plainly see, that the universities have cast political economy overboard and substituted for it what they call "economics." They are teaching the science of individual wealth, as distinguished from the science of social wealth.

The advantage of this to those universities which, in our plutocratic regime, are dependent upon individual accumulations of wealth due to legalized plundering, is not far to seek. Though both political economy and "economics" deal with the natural laws under which civilized men get a living, their scope is different. Political economy—the economy of social wholes—deals with the way in which a living is got by mankind; whereas "economics"—the economy of individuals as distinguished from the economy of social wholes—deals only with the way in which a living is got by particular men, regardless of the rights of other men.

Particular civilized men may get a living either by exchanging services with others, or by extorting services from others. But considered as social wholes, civilized men can get a living only by exchanging services. They cannot get it by extortion. This is evident upon a moment's reflection. The living that one

man may extort must be at the expense of the living that other men earn. Wealth acquired by extortion adds nothing to aggregate wealth. The gain of one is the loss of others. Consequently, in the economy of social wholes, which is political economy, all the methods of individual economy must be excluded, save those that are consistent with getting a living by the exchange of services as distinguished from the extortion of services. Not so with reference to the laws of "economics." These relate only to the methods of individual economy. "Economics," therefore, is merely the science of getting rich and no questions asked. Its more significant name is "plutology."

This would be quite sufficient to account for the disposition of plutocratic colleges and professors to cast aside political economy and take up "economics" in its stead. But however that disposition may be accounted for, the fact remains that this change has been made. We now have "economics," and we have "sociology;" but we have no such union of the economic and the sociological as is implied by the term political economy. A virtual declaration of this fact appears in a criticism of George's "Science of Political Economy," which was published in the London Spectator of May 21. The essence of the criticism is that George does not distinguish between the "social organism" and the "body economic." Here, though there is a pretense in the term "body economic" of conceding a social quality to economics, yet the writer speaks in such a way of economics as the science, quoting from George, "of how civilized men get a living," as to show that his mind grasps the idea of civilized men not as social wholes, but as individuals. In thus distinguishing the social organism from the body economic, he divorces economics from sociology.

One of the absurd effects of this divorce, which is shown without a smile, by the Spectator itself, is the exclusion of the natural laws of distribution from economic science. When we "come to the distribution of wealth," it says, "we are in the midst of principles affecting the welfare of the social organism, which everywhere overreach those affecting the

body economic." This implies the transfer of distribution from "economics" to "sociology." Yet the distribution of wealth is as inseparable from the production of wealth as reaping is from sowing. If men could not reap they would not sow; but for distribution there would be no production. George truly says: "Distribution is in fact a continuation of production—the latter part of the same process of which production is the first part; for the desire which prompts to exertion in production is the desire for satisfaction, and distribution is the process by which what is brought into being by production is carried to the point where it yields satisfaction to desire—which point is the end and aim of production." This being understood, what should reasonable men think of the attempt of the universities to emasculate the science of political economy by treating production as "economics," and relegating the subject of distribution to the abstractions of university sociology?

That the Spectator is right, assuming that economics can be separated from sociology, in making the distribution of wealth a department of sociology instead of economics, is true. Since "economics" has to do only with individual economy, there is no place in it for the laws of distribution. It is the science of get; the balancing principle of give is foreign to it. And distribution implies giving as well as getting. But distribution must be excluded from "economics," in order to adapt that science to a plutocratic regime. The natural laws of distribution, practically considered—as political economy must, but mere abstract sociology need not, and our university sociology does not, consider them—would be a menace to the vested economic wrongs of our time, such as no millionaire patron of colleges would tolerate. The natural laws of distribution are loaded, and millionaires and their "economic" professors know it.

## NEWS

We were able last week to report the end of the first act in the drama of the invasion of Cuba—the landing on the 22d of June of an American

army upon Cuban soil. But we were not at that time in possession of the details. All during the night of the 21st a detachment of nearly 6,000 well-armed and well-disciplined Cubans, detailed by Gens. Garcia and Rabi, lay in ravines and thickets, keeping watch by every road and mountain path between Guantamano and Santiago, to guard the American troops against the possibility of a surprise on the following day. The landing was made, June 22, at Baiquiri, about two thirds the distance from Guantanamo to Santiago; except as to Gen. Kent's division, which landed on the 23d at Jaragua, about midway between Baiquiri and Santiago. The landing was unopposed, and but two men lost their lives. They were privates in the 10th cavalry, a negro regiment, who fell between a lighter and the pier at Baiquiri, and were crushed before they could be rescued. Besides these deaths the only American loss consisted of a few packages of supplies, and about 50 animals, that were drowned. The landing was accomplished by means of small boats. At this time the army was as healthy as when it left Tampa. Only 80 men were on the sick list, and no worse condition has been reported since.

The first act in the invasion was quickly followed by the second. Gen. Shafter advanced at once westwardly from Baiquiri to secure good positions near Sevilla, a fortified town on high ground just east of the Guama river, where the Spaniards were expected to make a stand. Meanwhile the Cubans were pushing on in the same general direction, but nearer to the coast, and by the night of the 23d their outposts were in the vicinity of Aguadores, at the mouth of the Guama river, southwest of Sevilla and about six miles from Santiago. In the afternoon they had skirmishes with Spanish outposts, routing them and killing two of their men and capturing 50 cavalry horses. Among their captures, also, were messages from Spanish headquarters ordering the Spanish forces to fall back upon Santiago as the Americans advanced, and not to risk a battle until the city should be attacked. These orders, as will appear further on, have been implicitly obeyed.

Early on the morning of the 24th, Shafter's advance in the direction of Sevilla had gone beyond Jaragua, and the head of his column was near the foot of the elevation upon which Se-

villa is located. It was proceeding along two roads about half a mile apart, for the purpose of attacking about 1,500 Spaniards who were reported as being at Sevilla. These roads, or trails, were really only narrow gullies, running through thick underbrush. "Roosevelt's rough riders," on foot, marched along the road to the left, while a detachment of the 1st and 10th regular cavalry under Gen. Young, took the one to the right. The heat was intense. The "rough riders" were moving cautiously in single file, when they heard firing from the road to the right where Gen. Young's detachment was known to be, and instantly, as if in response to a signal, they were themselves fired upon from the concealment of the bushes at the sides of the gully. Deploying at once as skirmishers they made a dash into the bushes, firing as they advanced, until they had driven the enemy up the hill and out into the open, to the Spanish block house back of Sevilla. While the "rough riders" were making this fight along the road to the left, Col. Young's men in the road to the right were beating out a similar ambush. They, too, succeeded in driving the Spaniards out of cover and up the hill. There was no more fighting. The Spaniards abandoned the block house at Sevilla and the Americans took possession. The firing had lasted about an hour.

At the battle of La Quasina, as the skirmish described above is called, the Americans killed, as officially reported, were 6 privates and 3 corporals of the regulars; and 4 privates, 1 corporal, 2 sergeants and 1 captain of the "rough riders." The wounded are reported to have exceeded 50. Upon the ground 30 bodies of Spanish soldiers were found, and Spanish pacificos who have since come into the American camp report the total Spanish loss as 77 killed and 89 wounded. Sergeant Hamilton Fish, of the "rough riders," the first to fall, was also the first in the war to lose his life in battle. He was at the head of the leading troop as it marched in single file along the narrow trail, and at the first volley a Mauser bullet struck him in the breast. He died in a few minutes. Mr. Fish was a wealthy young society man of New York city, a grandson of Hamilton Fish—once governor of New York, and, under President Grant, secretary of state of the United States,—and a great grandson of Col. Nicholas Fish, of

revolutionary fame. He was a lineal descendant also of Peter Stuyvesant, "hard-koppig Pete," the old Dutch Governor of New York in the days when it was called New Amsterdam. With the exception of Capt. Capron, all the "rough riders" were buried on the field. On the 25th upon the summit of the hill where they fell, their bodies, wrapped in blankets and covered with palm leaves, were laid together in one long trench, carpeted and hung with palm leaves. Capt. Capron's body was taken back to Jaragua, where it was buried on the same day.

One of the fruits of the victory at La Quasina was the displacement of the enemy from his strong position at Sevilla, which was promptly occupied by the American troops. On the following nights, the 25th and 26th, they pushed out beyond Sevilla, occupied the hills to the right and left, and crossed the Guama river, where they made a junction with 3,500 Cubans, including 2,000 who had come up from the mouth of the Guama. From the American front, on the elevated bank of the Guama, a mile west of the river, the Santiago intrenchments were in plain sight, and Santiago was less than three miles away. Morro Castle lay seven miles to the southwest. Still, no aggressive movement was expected immediately. Gen. Shafter was anxious to bring up his artillery and secure reinforcements before making an attack.

While the Spaniards have been retreating before the American advance, even to the extent of allowing the Americans, almost without embarrassment or loss, to secure a commanding position near to and overlooking Santiago, they have not left Santiago in a defenseless condition, but are reported as preparing for a desperate stand. On the 29th they blew up the steel railroad bridge across the inlet near Morro castle; and besides establishing many lines of entrenchments and mounting all the heavy guns they can get, they have on three sides inclosed the city and its entrenchments within fence after fence of barbed wire. Thus protected they await the American attack.

Though no open attack had then been made, the strength of the enemy was weakened on the 28th by the loss of his water supply. Cubans reported to Gen. Wheeler the location

of the Santiago water mains, and proposed that they be cut. This met Gen. Wheeler's approval and he sent engineers forward who destroyed every water pipe leading to the city. The work of destruction was done within a mile of the Spanish rifle pits.

Reinforcements began to reach Gen. Shafter on the 27th. They consisted of the 35d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th, which had sailed from Hampton Roads on the 23d in the Yale, and were landed four days later at Baiquiri. They were under command of Gen. Duffield. The government has recently purchased eight trans-Atlantic steamers for military purposes, and some of them have been assembled at Tampa, for the purpose, it is supposed, of still further reinforcing Shafter. But the censorship at Tampa is strict again and no reliable news comes from that point.

Preparatory to the final scene at Santiago, Admiral Sampson made a formal demand upon the Spanish for the surrender of the city and its defenses. The reply was a refusal to consider the matter. An interesting incident in connection with this demand is the fact that the Spanish tug, which brought the reply, was in command of Victor Concas, who commanded the Spanish caravel, Santa Maria, at the world's fair in Chicago in 1893. The demand was made and the reply received on the 23d.

It was supposed by the American authorities that they had cut the last cable connecting Cuba with Europe, but it now appears that they were mistaken. There is an overland telegraph wire from Havana to Santiago which connects with an old cable to Kingston, Jamaica, owned by an English company. This cable cannot be easily cut. Within a mile of the battery-protected shore it drops with the bottom to a depth of more than a mile, and as it is heavily covered with marine deposits, having lain there untouched for 20 years, and is grown over with seaweed, ordinary grappling irons, unless they should strike the cable where it hung over a depression in the bottom, would almost certainly fail to catch. Even if caught, the cable is so heavily weighted with marine deposits as to defy the power of almost any lifting apparatus on board an ordinary ship. Havana and Madrid, therefore, are still in communication.



Capt. Sigsbee, of the cruiser *St. Paul*, he who was in command of the *Maine* when it went down in Havana harbor, did some blockading on his own account at San Juan last week. The Hamburg-American steamship *Francia*, was about to enter the port of San Juan, when Capt. Sigsbee notified her that he held the port under blockade. She made one or two efforts to get within the protection of the Spanish guns, but upon Sigsbee's finally warning her that if she did not keep away he would put a shot into her, she withdrew. Among the passengers were two Spanish officers.

The president quickly followed Sigsbee's action with a proclamation declaring an effective blockade of San Juan. By the same proclamation he extended the Cuban blockade from Cape Frances, the southeastern extremity of the Province of Pinar del Rio, to Cape Cruz, the southwestern extremity of the Province of Santiago. The portions of Cuba now blockaded are, therefore, the southern coast from Cape Frances to Cape Cruz, and the northern coast from Cardenas to Bahia Honda, the latter having been included in the first blockade proclamation.

Sigsbee has made the *St. Paul* a fighter as well as a blockader. Being attacked off San Juan, Puerto Rico, by the torpedo boat destroyer *Terror*, he put three shots into his assailant, killing one officer and two men and driving the *Terror* back to the cover of the San Juan forts. He reported that the *Terror* was then towed into the harbor in a sinking condition.

While Sampson and Shafter have been preparing to take Santiago and Cervera's squadron, Camara's phantom fleet, which has flitted in and out of Cadiz, has materialized at Port Said, the northern terminus of the Suez Canal. It consists of the battleship *Pelayo*, the armored cruiser *Emperador Carlos Quintos*, the torpedo boat destroyers *Osado*, *Audaz* and *Proserpina*, and the transports *Patriota*, *Buenos Ayres*, the *Isla de Panay*, *Colon*, *Covadonga*, *Rapida* and *San Francisco*. The fleet arrived at Port Said on the 26th. *Sagasta* had said on the 24th that its destination was the Philippines, but from Port Said it was reported that the real destination was Hawaii and thence to San Francisco. Naval officers at Port Said, noted the bad condition of the vessels and laughed at the idea of their

attempting to reach the Philippines. Camara had not yet entered the Suez Canal on the 28th, and it was then doubtful if he would do so. The tolls were exceptionally heavy; payment was demanded in gold to an amount which he did not control; the Egyptian government was disinclined to allow him to coal; and with all the rest, under the neutrality treaty controlling the canal, not more than one armed vessel of the same nation is allowed to go through the canal at the same time.

The movement of the Cadiz fleet toward the Philippines, which was reported several days before it appeared at Port Said, was the signal for organizing an American fleet to cross the Atlantic and make a direct attack upon Spain. On the 27th the president authoritatively announced such an expedition. The plans were prepared by the world-renowned naval expert, Capt. Mahan, and Com. Watson was ordered to execute them, his squadron to consist of the *Newark*, the *Iowa*, the *Oregon*, the *Yankee*, the *Yosemite*, the *Dixie* and three colliers. The refrigerator ship *Supply*, loaded with fresh meat and vegetables, was ordered to join the *Watson* squadron at the appointed rendezvous. Upon learning of the American intention to send a squadron across the Atlantic, the British government ordered the battleship *Illustrious* to protect British interests on the Spanish coast.

In Spain the predicament of Cervera in the Santiago bottle, and of Camara at the Suez Canal, are not the only sources of trouble. *Sagasta* is at his wit's end; a demand for peace from the Catalan provinces, in which is Barcelona, has an ominous sound; the republicans are bitter; the queen regent is in despair; and the Carlists await their opportunity to spring a reactionary revolution. On the 25th the queen regent issued a decree suspending the cortes, and immediately afterward martial law was proclaimed. This action is regarded in some quarters as preliminary to suing for peace, martial law being regarded as the means whereby public indignation at thus surrendering "Spanish honor" may be held in check. But as yet no peace proposals have been advanced.

Spanish affairs in the Philippines do not improve. The deluded garrison has looked forward hopefully for

succor to the arrival of Camara's fleet, and for a time their hope was stirred by the German Asiatic squadron. On the 23d the entire German fleet, excepting three vessels, had assembled in Manila bay, and two of the missing vessels were expected. On arriving, the Germans fired salutes in honor of the Spanish, which neither the English nor the French commanders had done. The authorities at Washington appear to be satisfied, however, that no hostile intentions are harbored, the German ambassador having so assured Secretary Day; and at last accounts the hope which the German fleet inspired at Manila had vanished.

Aside from the appearance of the German fleet but little is to be noted regarding affairs in the Philippines. The wife and five children of the Spanish Captain General were still held by President Aguinaldo as prisoners. The German admiral had unofficially solicited their liberation, but President Aguinaldo refused on the ground that they were held as hostages to protect insurgent prisoners in Manila from Spanish cruelty. Aguinaldo has, at the request of the British consul, given up wounded Spanish prisoners to the care of Spanish surgeons at Manila. On the 23d Manila was completely isolated. Dewey writes in the highest terms of Aguinaldo's humanity, and describes his progress as wonderful.

The second American expedition was sighted on the 20th in mid ocean. It signaled that all on board were well. The third expedition sailed from San Francisco on the 27th with 4,000 troops on board of four transports; and Gen. Merritt himself sailed from San Francisco, on the 29th, on board the *Newport*.

To turn from war news to civil news, the second elections in Germany took place on the 24th. As stated last week, a large number of constituencies had failed to give a majority, at the first elections on the 16th, for any candidate. In accordance with German law second elections were necessary, therefore, in these constituencies. The candidates voted for at the second elections were the two having the highest vote in their constituency at the first elections. The strength of the socialists at the second elections diminished in the large cities and increased in the rural districts. Definite returns in full are not accessible, but

the best information indicates that the socialists will have 60 seats in the next reichstag as against 48 in the last. It is pretty certain that with the increased socialist representation and the other radical representation, the conservatives will not have a majority. As one of the results of the socialist gain it is reported by the Associated Press correspondent at Berlin that there is talk of repressive legislation against the socialists. He adds: "But the officials are deaf to all suggestions for removing the causes of socialism by means of social reforms." The German agrarians, agricultural protectionists, seem to have been snowed under. The party elected only one member, and the other parties have elected less than 100 members pledged to agrarianism. Dr. Barth, the freisinnige party leader, was defeated at the re-balloting by a socialist.

M. Sarrien, the moderate radical, was not more successful in forming a new French ministry than was M. Ribot, the moderate. Ribot did not go far enough to form one even upon paper. Sarrien did go that far, as we reported last week, but he got no farther; and M. Peytral, an avowed radical, was invited to try his hand. Peytral accepted the invitation, but failed also. On the 27th M. Henri Brisson, who was invited to try in turn, announced the following: President of the council and minister of the interior, M. Henri Brisson; minister of finance, M. Paul Peytral; minister of education, M. Leon Bourgeois; minister of justice, M. Ferdinand Sarrien; minister of war, M. Godfroy Cavaignac; minister of marine, M. Edouard Simon Lockroy; minister of foreign affairs, M. Theophile Delcasse; minister of the colonies, M. Georges Trouillet; minister of commerce, M. Emile Marcejouls; minister of agriculture, M. Albert Viger.

Japan also has a ministerial crisis on her hands. Marquis Ito, the premier, has resigned. His cabinet was formed only last January. It was strongly opposed by the military party, which advocates Japanese intervention in connection with the action of Russia at Port Arthur and Germany at Kiao-Chou. Though Ito's cabinet was non-partisan, he, upon resigning, advised the recognition hereafter of party lines.

A political shock of still another kind has been felt by the Australians.

For years a strong sentiment had been worked up among them in favor of an Australian federation similar to that of the American states. This agitation had progressed so far as to secure the preparation last spring by delegates from the different Australian colonies, of a constitution modeled partly upon that of the United States and partly upon the Canadian plan. Before this constitution could become operative, however, two-thirds of the voters of the colonies were required to sanction it. It has, therefore, been submitted to popular vote, but has been defeated. Though it received a majority of all the votes cast, this majority was less than the requisite two-thirds of all voters.

A new Italian cabinet, to succeed the Rudini ministry which resigned last month, has just been formed as follows: Gen. Pelloux, premier and minister of the interior; Admiral Canevaro, foreign affairs; Signor Carcano, finance; Senator Vacchelli, treasury; Gen. San Parzano, war; Admiral Palumbo, marine; Signor Baccelli, public instruction; Signor Fortis, agriculture; Signor Nunzionasi, posts and telegraph; Signor Finocchiaro, minister of justice.

One threatening labor strike has lent variety to war news in the United States. It was in connection with the sash and blind factories at Oshkosh, Wis. The demand was for a slight advance in wages, which are pitifully low. As usual, outside labor was brought in by the employers, and also as usual the strikers "picketed" the factories to urge the new laborers to quit. Among the "pickets" were women. On the 23d, a watchman at one of the factories pointed a revolver at some of the women "pickets," whereupon an assault was made upon him by strikers. He was rescued by the police, but a small riot had been started, which grew in violence until several persons were injured and one young man was killed. He was a striker. His funeral, appointed for Sunday last, was attended by over 2,000 people. Warrants were issued for some fifty strikers charged with riot, and on the 27th several arrests were made. In the course of the trouble state troops were sent to Oshkosh. These were mostly removed, however, on the 29th, the strike having been settled. The terms of settlement were, on one hand a slight increase of wages and no further employment of women, and on

the other non-recognition of the union.

While the labor riot was agitating Oshkosh on the 23d, the annual inter-collegiate boat race was under way at New London, Conn. It was between Yale, Harvard and Cornell. Cornell won by four lengths over Yale and fourteen over Harvard. Cornell's time was 23:48; Yale's, 24:02, and Harvard's 24:35. The Cornell crew was made up in accordance with Courtney's theory of small men of muscular build with a good reach. Yale depended upon large and heavy men. Harvard used the English system. This is not Cornell's first rowing victory over Yale and Harvard. She distinguished herself in the seventies, and last year also she left her rivals behind.

### IN CONGRESS.

Week ending June 29, 1898.

#### Senate.

On the 23d a resolution was adopted directing the select committee on the construction of the Nicaragua canal to inquire into the claims of the Republic of Nicaragua under the concession of that republic to the Nicaragua Canal company; and on the 25th the report of the conferees of the two houses on the bankruptcy bill was agreed to—43 to 13. On the 27th a message was received from the president asking authority to reward Lieut. Hobson, and other naval officers and men for gallantry. A resolution was accordingly adopted on the 29th, tendering the thanks of congress to men as well as officers. The general deficiency bill, appropriating \$227,000,000, was passed on the 29th. No other business of general interest was done. The Hawaiian annexation debate still continues.

#### House.

The conference report on the bankruptcy bill was adopted on the 28th—134 to 53. The measure now goes to the president for his signature.

### NEWS NOTES.

—The Iowa building at the Omaha exposition was dedicated on the 23d. Over 30,000 people attended.

Adolph Moll, of St. Louis, a wealthy grocer and well-known follower of Henry George, is dead.

—Charles E. Tripler, of New York, has given exhibitions of his liquid air inventions to scientific men. Liquid air

is common air reduced to a liquid by means of heavy pressure.

—On the 27th Milwaukee celebrated the completion of the fiftieth year of Wisconsin's statehood.

—Congressman Bland was renominated by acclamation by the democrats of the Eighth Missouri district on the 23d.

—Walter Wellman's arctic expedition sailed on the 26th from Tromsøe, island of Tromsøe, Norway, in search of Prof. Andree and to discover the north pole.

—Edward F. Underhill, the veteran court stenographer of New York, is dead. He was 68 years old. During his more active life he was one of the best-known and best-liked men in his state.

—Count de Cassini, Russia's first ambassador to the United States, was presented to the president in the blue parlor of the white house on the 23d. The usual amicable speeches were made.

—Mrs. William B. Lowe, of Georgia, was elected on the 27th, at Denver, as president of the General Federation of Women's clubs. The vote was 429 for her, against 234 for Alice Ives Breed, of Boston, Mass.

—The second section of a train carrying Col. Torrey's regiment of rough riders, of Cheyenne, Wyo., ran into the first section at Tupelo, Miss., killing five troopers, fatally wounding one, and injuring 14 others including the colonel.

—Admiral Sampson reported on the 24th that upon careful investigation he withdraws the charge of mutilation of American soldiers by the Spanish, being satisfied that the apparent mutilation was probably due to the effect of short-range firing.

—The law passed by congress in February, 1897, authorizing the postmaster-general to indemnify the owners of registered mail for losses, to the amount of ten dollars, or for actual value of the mail lost if less in value than ten dollars, will go into effect July 1.

—The three parties—populist, republican-silver and democratic—made fusion nominations in South Dakota on the 23d. On the 29th the prohibitionists of Iowa, the republicans of Arkansas and the democrats of Tennessee, Georgia and Pennsylvania, made their nominations.

Michael Schwab died on the 29th at the Alexian Brothers' hospital, Chicago, after an illness of eight months due to consumption and spinal troubles. Mr. Schwab was one of the "anarchists" of Chicago who was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1887 and pardoned by Gov. Altgeld in 1893.

—The Holland submarine boat has a rival. It is the Raddatz, which was tested at Milwaukee on the 28th. Three men went down in her and remained under water an hour and fifteen min-

utes, 35 minutes longer than the longest record of the Holland. She is submerged and raised with ease and remains even at a great depth on an even keel.

—Andres Moreno de la Torre, secretary of foreign affairs of the Cuban republic, has arrived in this country to confer officially with the president and secretary of state. It is doubted, however, that the president will see him officially. Vice President Capote, of the Cuban republic, has been here several weeks without securing an official interview.

—Gen. Wheeler's appointment to a place in the volunteer army has raised a question as to his right to remain a member of the lower house of congress. While relinquishing all claims to the emoluments of his congressional office, he insists that it is not vacated by his acceptance of a commission in the volunteer service; but the governor of his state takes a different view of the matter, and has ordered an election for the 1st of August.

—At the joint attack on the part of the Texas and the Cubans at Matamoras, west of Santiago, on the 22d, which was reported on page 8 last week, though the Texas destroyed an important battery, she was herself struck in the bow by a shell, which penetrated the side below the main deck, and, exploding, killed a first-class apprentice and wounded three seamen, four apprentices and one landsman. Only one of the wounded men was dangerously hurt. F. R. Blakeley, of Newport, the first-class apprentice who was killed, stood about two feet from the place of explosion, and was literally torn to pieces.

## MISCELLANY

### MIRACLES.

Since I have listened to the song  
The melted snow-bank sings,  
I've roamed the earth a credulous man,  
Believing many things.  
The snow which made the mountains  
white,  
Made green the babbling lea;  
And since that day have miracles  
Been commonplace to me.

Sprung from the slime of sluggish streams,  
Inert, and dark, and chilly,  
Have I not seen the miracle  
And glory of the lily?  
Have I not seen, when June's glad smile  
Upon the earth reposes,  
The cosmic impulse in the clod  
Reveal itself in roses?

Have I not seen the frozen hill,  
Where snowy chaos tosses,  
Smile back upon the smiling sun  
With violets and mosses?  
Have I not seen the dead old world  
Rise to a newer birth,  
When fragrance from the lilac blooms  
Rejuvenates the earth?

Have I not seen the rolling earth,  
A clod of frozen death,  
Burst from its grave-clothes of the snow,  
Touched by an April breath?  
Have I not seen the bare-boughed tree,  
That from the winter shrinks,  
Imparadised in apple blooms  
And loud with bobolinks?

Now, who can riddle me this thing,  
Or tell me how or where  
The tulip stains its crimson cup  
From the transparent air?  
So, from the wonder-bearing day  
I take the gifts it brings,  
And roam the earth a credulous man,  
Believing many things.  
—Sam. Walter Foss, in "Dreams in Home-spun."

### REFORMS THAT ARE A WASTE OF TIME.

The next thing after being dissatisfied with things as they are, is to find out why they are as they are, and how it is that in everyday life, men, to procure a living of even the most meager sort, have to make it to the absolute disadvantage of their neighbors, whom they are told to love as themselves.

Here is a cursory review of a few of the difficulties that are obstructing the way of the Lord:

First, until our present system is altered, charities, hospitals, schools, reformatories, etc., only intensify the difficulties. How? By drawing more population to the locality where they are established, thereby increasing the rent of bare land and consequently decreasing wages. Remember, you never pay rent for a house; it is the land upon which it is built. For the house you only pay interest on capital expended in building it; in other words, enough to replace it or keep it in repair.

Second.—Our cooperative societies, which under a proper system would be a blessing, under the present only succeed in making a few more successful lower, middle class people, and result in making the condition of those outside worse than ever by reducing prices, thereby bringing population to the locality and consequently raising the value of land, which means more rent and lower wages.

Third.—Trades unions have also failed in ameliorating the general condition of labor, and in the nature of things must always do so. They are destructive in their action, not reconstructive. Their aims in the main are right, but their methods, invalid. All they have accomplished so far is to educate and show by practical demonstration what they cannot do.

Fourth.—Deprivation, economy and temperance, or even total abstinence under the present system, if put in practice generally, would end in disaster to civilization by causing a return to sav-

age conditions of life. What do they mean? They mean that if I, as an individual, stop drinking and smoking, or deprive myself of any product of labor, that I desire, that I gain so much, provided the great majority of people continue spendthrifts, prodigals and drunkards—or in other words, continue to be too ignorant to know how, or too tender hearted to be able to carry out all the petty meannesses embodied in the term economy—meannesses that take the milk of human kindness out of life, and eventually leave the persons who practice them utterly selfish, and an abominable product of Pharisaism, or that modern product termed a self-made man. Of these self-made people Huxley once said: "I have always taken this phrase about 'self-making' to be a metaphor, and a very foolish one, inasmuch as the men said to be self-made are usually those whom nature especially favored with costly gifts and exceptional opportunities." If instead of one alone, or a minority of us becoming economical, or total abstainers, the deprivation and total abstinence clap-trap drummed into the masses by well-intentioned, misinformed temperance lecturers, or a few equally well intentioned politicians, altogether ignorant of the simplest laws that govern society as a whole, and the big majority of equally ignorant but intentionally selfish political humbugs—if these should be taken seriously and a majority of the masses were to put into practice these doctrines, by, for instance, refraining from smoking and drinking, what would be the consequences? At once all the people now employed in the production of tobacco and drink would be thrown into the reservoir of unemployed labor and thus add to the pressure for employment in other lines of productive industry. Down the wages would come, just the difference of the prices of the smokes and drinks; and if the masses still continued the same course and deprived themselves of clothes, articles of food, etc., in the lapse of a few years every factory and farm in the land would be idle and civilization wiped out. Don't say that because I show this would inevitably happen under our present system if deprivation were put into practice, that I am advocating intemperance. By no means. I believe in doing away with the causes that produce intemperance, not alone in smoking and drinking, but in everything else.—W. L. Sinton.

#### SIXTY YEARS AGO AND NOW.

In 1837, when Victoria was crowned, the entire (British) white colonial pop-

ulation was only 1,250,000. To-day it is over 10,000,000. At that time India was not yet a direct dependency of the crown, but was still under the rule of the East India company. Hong-Kong had not been added as a military outpost, nor was nearly so large a part of the Malay Peninsula under British control. In all Australasia, in 1837, there were only about 100,000 British colonists—scattered in Tasmania, New Zealand and South Australia—and most of these were supposed to be felons and convicts. The interior of Australia was entirely unexplored. The resources were unknown, its future undreamed. To-day Australasia is made up of seven rich provinces, and has a population of 4,000,000, as loyal, intelligent and progressive British subjects as exist on the globe. In South Africa, 60 years ago, the English domain was confined to the southern point of the continent; to-day it extends, with only one important break, from the Cape to the sources of the Nile. When Victoria ascended the throne the British in North America were nearly all gathered in Ontario and Quebec, and the Hudson Bay company occupied all the central and western provinces of what is now known as the Canadian Dominion. British Columbia was an unknown waste, only to be reached by a terrible sea voyage around Cape Horn. Yet to-day the imperial government is in force over all this vast territory. London is now only ten days from Vancouver and every year is seeing the development of new resources in a territory once believed to be useless save as a fur-producing country.—Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, in McClure's for July.

#### TENEMENT HOUSE CONDITIONS IN THE POORER PARTS OF NEW YORK CITY.

In tenements, the average family has one light room, the other either dark or lighted by an airshaft. Some of the houses are in moderately good sanitary condition, but many are extremely bad. I believe, upon the whole, that the old style of tenement house is better than the new. The rooms were larger, with more light and air, less of the ground was built over, unless there was a rear tenement. Now we find three or four tiny rooms, dark with "modern conveniences." Part of the kitchen is occupied by a couple of stationary washtubs and a sink. When a stove, a table and a couple of chairs are added, the room is almost completely filled. The front room is large enough to accommodate a table, a lounge, three or four chairs. Thus there is no room for more than two people at one time. The bedroom

will hold a three-quarters bed and occasionally a chair may be squeezed in. For such a place as this ten to twelve dollars per month will be charged.

To-day I saw a family (an ordinary case) where the front room of such an apartment as described was used for a shoe mending shop. The man and two assistants mended old "shoes for the trade." They, with their tools and a lounge, completely filled the room. There was a kitchen and two bedrooms, the latter so small that in order to examine my patient I either had to sit on the bed or stand up. The family consists of six persons and three lodgers. The rent is \$10.50 per month. The apartment is what is called the basement of the new style of flat-house, but is really a part of the cellar plastered off.

This week in a similar apartment, where men, women and children were finishing trousers, we found three families—one lived in the bedroom, one in the kitchen and the other in the front room. A fourth family came to join the family in the front room on the last day of my visit to the child sick with diphtheria.—Dr. A. S. Daniel, in Municipal Affairs for June.

#### THE FRUITS OF OBSTINACY.

According to the New York World the present year is to see the last of the horse car in that city, and even the cable is soon to give place to the underground electric trolley. The underground trolley has been in successful operation in Washington, D. C., for some time, and has made the street railway system of that city the admiration of all visitors. This is the system that is being adopted in New York.

While all the other cities in the country outside of Washington, except New York, were boasting of the improved service they were getting by substituting the overhead trolley for the horse car, New York remained obdurate against the overhead trolley. That city is now reaping its reward in being given the best form of electric traction. The New York World regards this as a great object lesson. It says:

People everywhere said that New York was slow and stupidly conservative because we refused to adopt the "modern improvement" of the overhead trolley. To every effort to introduce that nuisance the press of this city opposed itself resolutely, and so successfully that there is now but one overhead trolley line on Manhattan island, and that a short one. Now, it was this obstinate refusal of New York to permit overhead trolleys that compelled the adoption of the underground trolley. It is not too much to say that this is the very best system of surface traction that has ever been used in a great city. \* \* \* By resolutely refusing to accept an objectionable "improvement" we have secured as

nearly perfect a system as the ingenuity of inventors has been able to devise.

There is an important lesson in this for all American municipalities. The feverish demand for improvements frequently leads cities to accept objectionable improvements, when by moving a little more slowly they might get the very best, to the great benefit of the public in the long run.

There is a special lesson in this for Chicago. When other cities are already beginning to get the much more desirable underground electric trolley-car system, this city ought not to be granting 50-year franchises for the use of the objectionable overhead trolley. The overhead trolley has been in use scarcely more than a decade, and within a dozen years more is likely to be as much out of date as the horse car is now.—Chicago Record.

#### CUBAN HOSPITALS.

On account of the tactics employed by the Cuban forces, and the divisions made in them, together with the fact that small bands often operate alone, there is not a sufficient number of doctors properly to attend to the wounded. One doctor, and in some cases two, are assigned to an entire division. These doctors appoint assistants from the men in the ranks, who, after a little instruction, are given a few bandages, cotton, carbolic acid, quinine, etc., and assigned to the various regiments in the division. These men are expected to give the first aid to the wounded, and administer such medicines as they may have when they are required; but even then it often happens that they are not present when the men are wounded, and it is necessary to take them many miles on horseback, or in hammocks hung on a long pole, before their wounds are dressed. Owing to this delay, small wounds often prove very serious. After their wounds are attended to they are taken, as soon as practicable, to one of the many small hospitals in the woods, where they are given every attention possible under the circumstances.

These hospitals are nothing more than deserted country houses, with beds made by driving four forked sticks into the ground, two at the head and two at the foot. A heavy stick is then laid in each pair of forks, and thin sticks, laid lengthwise of the bed, rest on these. The frame is then covered with banana leaves, and, if it is possible to procure it, a sheet completes the bed. These hospitals are in charge of a practicante, but under the general supervision of the doctor, who visits them as often as pos-

sible; and in some cases, as after a heavy engagement, a doctor or several doctors are assigned to them, and remain as long as their services are required. As soon as a new patient arrives he is placed on a new bed, as the same bed is never used twice, and is given an attendant to do his cooking and attend to his wants. These hospitals are well supplied with bandages and medicine, and the prefect is required to keep them supplied with vegetables, sugar, milk, etc. The general in whose division they are furnishes meat, and the country people bring chickens, eggs, and little dainties they may have. As the wounds are mostly from Mauser balls, few amputations are necessary, and the patients recover rapidly; but when the wounds are from Remingtons with the ordinary lead ball, or the lead ball with a thin brass jacket (explosive ball), they often prove fatal, and if the patient recovers, the improvement is slow.—Emory W. Penn, in the Century.

#### A REAL LOVE OF THE CHURCH.

We can no more love the church in the abstract than we can love a woman or a child in the abstract. In these days of transformation and transition childhood is much in evidence, and it is not uncommon to hear the protestation: "I do so love children." This new and widespread interest in children and their development is full of promise, but the real love of childhood is no fine sentiment for pretty days. People who profess to love children generally mean that they like to see them sweet and clean, and don't mind playing with them a brief spell. But the real test of love is when one without impatience or dogmatism waits on the child's growing capacities for knowledge and morals, when he sacrifices himself to give the child the companionship that costs time and self-restraint, when he waits on him through weary nights of sickness, and perhaps for years carries an untold burden of anxiety and care that will never be appreciated. Only the man or woman who would pour out his heart's wealth and body's strength for those dependent on him, without ever expectation of recompense, can be really said to love children.

So is it with the love of the church. Anybody can love, or think he loves, a church whose imaginary members are done up in white divinity, cradled in the abstract, and trotted out for contemplation in hours of toilless reverie. But the congregation made up of Tom, Dick and Harry, and their cousins on both sides of the house—that is a very different affair! Every member of the

congregation started very recently from Egypt, and still hungers hard except by spells for the fleshpots. He is loaded with the conceits and despairs of the egotism of self-love. He bristles with untouchable points of tenderness. The church on earth is made up of men and women who are only promises and potencies of the angelic life, and the church is most emphatically God-made by virtue of the fact that the Divine voice has called just such undeveloped and unfinished elements out of the highways and hedges with the indubitable assurance that if they shun their evils as sins against God, eventually all their crankiness and selfishness will be thrown irretrievably into the back-ground. In the meantime the truest love is that which overlooks the disparities and angularities of those whom the Lord has gathered round his Word and sacraments, and which encourages the spiritual germs and dawning capacities for use in each one, with steadfast eye on the full measure of a man which is the unquestioned heritage of all who will turn in and find a home in the four-square city of revealed doctrine.—New Church Messenger.

#### EVIL WITH GOOD.

Nothing is more difficult of application or more perplexing to the judgment than the injunction, "Overcome evil with good." The two are endlessly commingled; the good draws after itself so much evil; the evil shows here and there such desirable results in good, that we are put to our wits' end in the separation and the exclusion. A boy cannot rescue a dog from the cruelty of his playmates without getting into a quarrel; the man cannot administer a deserved rebuke without having occasion to remember with shame his unseemly haste. If we waited to do any good act until our motives and feelings were all irreproachable, we should hardly make a beginning. Even more is this commingled character of action manifest when a nation is involved. Every variety of impulse and opinion gains expression. We fling a shovelful taken from the very bottom of the floor into the air, and dirt, chaff and grain fly in all directions. This is apparent in the war in which we are all involved.

War is so dreadful a thing, so lets loose all that is passionate and brutal in men, so commingles evil with good and overwhelms good with evil, that one feels it alone divine to say, I will have none of it; I wash my hands of strife.

Is this the true position? If it is the world is oddly made. Its discipline always has been, and will long be, one form or another of warfare. Warfare

puts away warfare, and only by better strife do we conquer peace. Life in all its forms is a contention, and a harmony established between contending forces. The eagle reposes on the bosom of the wind; the spirit gets the power to ride the storm out of the storm. We cannot be indifferent to wrong; we cannot fail to express censure, that censure which will pull down upon us strife. If we are not to spare our own lives in this contention, why should we spare the lives of those involved adversely in it? The principle must have its way through life and over life. The conditions of our action are ordered by us in only a very secondary degree. We must "fight it out on this line," the line given us, no matter how long and bitter the strife.

We have occasion to be thankful in the present war that the deepest, most prevailing impulse has been a humane one—one in favor of liberty, one against deliberate and protracted tyranny. Jingoism and revenge have entered in, but only as unavoidable incidents. War is not for the good of man; it is for the world, the wicked world. Dare we, in the wicked world, let wrong go unrebuked, leave the weak unaided, have nothing to say or do in the issue of events? For my part, I see no other way than marching along the road that lies before us, before the world as one whole—now over green sward and through flowers, now knee-deep in mire. We shall be fearfully besplashed with sin before we are through with the war; but would it have been better to sit down in the mud on the farther side? Hardly. God orders the world collectively, and we are common soldiers left to do the fighting, as best we can, that falls to us. A protest against the method is not in order.—Prof. John Bascom, in *The Kingdom*.

#### MORE ABOUT THE PHILIPPINE INSURGENTS.

An extract from an article on "Manila and the Philippines," by Isaac M. Elliott, United States consul at Manila from 1893 to 1896, published in *Scribner's* for July, 1896.

The insurrection in the Philippines, of which we have heard so much, is really a righteous uprising of the producing class against misgovernment. They are the Malays and half-castes, who have been robbed of their rightful share of the returns of their industry, and have taken up arms against the government. The savages, or Negritos, have nothing to do with this insurrection. All that the United States has to apprehend is that, having been oppressed for so many years, the insurgents may, if let loose, indiscriminately

slaughter, loot and destroy all foreigners. Under a liberal government, however, and if the Mestizos, whose part in affairs I shall describe later, are used as intermediaries, they will become a docile, orderly element.

There is great discrepancy in the accounts of the number of the islands, by reason of the hundreds of them that are simply rocks in the sea without inhabitants. There are probably 1,200 separate islands in the archipelago, of which 400 are inhabited. Most of these contain only wild bands of the Negritos, the original natives, who have never been conquered or civilized. Actual Spanish dominion is united to the western coast of the largest island, Luzon, of which Manila is the capital; to the eastern coast of Mindoro island, immediately south of Luzon; to Panay, a large island over which the Spanish have complete control, and whose port is Iloilo, of which Admiral Dewey has already taken possession; and to the southeast of it, Negros and Cebu islands, where the Spanish have partial control at certain seaports. The largest island in the whole group next to Luzon is Mindanao, where the Spaniards have never gained a foothold, except in two or three fortified coast towns. The absolute ruler is the sultan of Buhaten, who controls an immense sultanate of Malaysians who were converted to Mohammedanism. It thus appears that Spanish dominion is practically confined to narrow sea-coast strips, and that the great bulk of the territory of the Philippines is unsubdued and undeveloped and inhabited by the original savage Negritos, who roam the islands unmolested and give no trouble whatever, unless interfered with in their fastnesses.

The inhabitants of the Philippine islands who are to be considered in commercial questions are the Malaysians, the Chinese, the Europeans, the English and the Americans. When one speaks of the "natives," he generally refers to the Malaysians and the half-castes, who are the descendants of Malaysians and various foreign races who have intermarried with them. These are called Mestizos, and are often well educated. The wealthy Mestizos, or half-castes, send their children to Europe to be educated, and they are very apt pupils, too. I know a number of young men who are graduates of the best colleges in Europe.

The commercial and industrial life is founded on the great natural adaptability of the soil for producing tobacco, hemp and sugar. Plantation life is the industrial unit on which the whole commercial system turns. These planta-

tions are large or small, according to the wealth of the proprietor, who is generally a Malay. All the work of the plantation is done by other Malaysians, and on some of the large plantations as many as 500 or 600 of these live in little bamboo houses, just as the negroes lived on the old cotton plantations in the south.

#### WEALTH AND EDUCATION AS AMERICAN SOCIAL FORCES.

An extract from an article on "American Social Forces," published in the *London Spectator*.

Superficial observation would lead to the belief that the "almighty dollar" is by far the greatest of social forces in America, and that to it every other force must bow. Nobody can deny that in America, as all over the civilized world, concentrated wealth is now a gigantic and dangerous power. The equipment of whole regiments of volunteers by rich people is certainly a significant fact, as is the power of the trust in politics. On the surface, too, "society" in an American city appears to be dominated by rich people in their own interests. We have all heard of the "Four Hundred" in New York, and of the lavish expenditure which marks their entertainments. But enormous wealth is only a supreme power in so far as people choose to bow to its influence and to acknowledge it as the controlling element in their lives. Now we doubt, in spite of external manifestations, if there is more worship of the golden calf in America than there is elsewhere. The marriages of American heiresses to European nobles seem to hint at a devotion to Mammon in Europe which is the more keen because of the bare acres and empty coffers on this side of the Atlantic; while on the American side a certain worship of rank seems to be clearly suggested. The mass of American people, like the mass of every other people, are comparatively poor, and with little love, as a rule, for the rich class, but with a keen appreciation of some of the fruits of wealth. The desire for material enjoyment and for material conveniences is a democratic tendency, and it is, therefore, marked among American people. Thus it is that the making of money is a great social force in America, but it must be carefully differentiated from that vulgar worship of wealth which is thought to mark the millionaire. Men cannot afford to sit still and "get left," as they put it; consequently the energy displayed in business and the time devoted to it are out of all proportion to the mere desire for accumulation. Nor can the very rich man in America command such avenues of celebrity as he

can in Europe. Everyone knows him, remembers when he started as a poor boy; there is no glamour of antiquity about his family. He may have built for himself a splendid villa, but nobody goes to see him, he commands none of the attachments which a man of his position would secure in Europe. On the whole, therefore, we do not think that mere wealth, great as is its power, holds that supreme position in America which is too commonly supposed. A force it is, a very great force, but not the greatest. Is it not a remarkable fact that neither political party dare nominate a rich man for the presidency? The truth is, the average quiet, undemonstrative American citizen, who in the last resort really rules, is distrustful of great wealth; and events are likely before long to happen which will make evident that distrust.

There is a force in American life whose persistence and whose unquestioned sway does honor to the American people. We refer to the force of education. Mr. Bryce once said with truth that the most respected and influential men in America were the college presidents. Not one Englishman in a thousand knows who is at the head of Oxford or Cambridge; but the great mass of American people not only know who is at the head of Harvard or Columbia, but they honor him as they honor no other man save the president of the republic. When President Eliot, of Harvard, went over to the democratic party, it was treated as a national event, and no hall in Boston was large enough to contain the crowds who went to hear him make a campaign speech. The candidature of President Low for the mayoralty of Greater New York could scarcely have happened elsewhere in the world. When the president of Brown university declared for Mr. Bryan and the silver cause, columns were devoted to the event in the newspapers from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The influence of not a few of the leading Harvard professors is being exerted at the present moment on New England against the Spanish-American war, and it is a factor recognized at once, and everywhere. As with the university, so with the common school; it is a great and powerful institution, far greater than in England. In these elements of her life, indeed, America more closely resembles Scotland and the Scandinavian countries than any other part of Europe.

#### AN ARIZONA WINTER NIGHT.

The night is not, as in California, a purple sky studded with stars, but stars studded with purple sky. The milky

way, which [in California] is a smoky wreath, is there a shining scarf flung from horizon to horizon. The stars crowd upon one another; they fall into tangles—into mobs, from which the great ones blaze in untwinkling glory. The desert ceases to be a world, and becomes a stage, across which goes this solemn procession of worlds, not one night, but every night of the cold, calm winter. There are no mists to dim it, no mountains to circumscribe the largeness of the heavens; and the foal may lie in his horse blanket from sunset to dawn, and have his dull soul made radiant. The desert becomes the comrade of the stars; and the lonely herder has set before him earth's best offering.—I. H. Ballard, in *The Century*.

#### DECLARATION OF CHILDREN'S INDEPENDENCE.

When you see a furious man beating his horse you do not inquire whether the horse was naughty or not; you say: "That is brutal," and threaten to report him for cruelty to animals. Your children, however, are beaten at home by angry parents, and it is not reported. No; you and I tell the children, "whose angels are always beholding the face of their Father which is in heaven," that they are wicked and that God will punish them; then, lest God should make some mistake, we punish them ourselves.

"The divine right" of parents to rule is as ridiculous as the "divine right" of kings and much more injurious; the Declaration of our Independence says that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Have your children consented that you should be their policeman, judge, and jailer every time you get into a bad temper? Truly, "neglect and contempt of human rights" are responsible for as much of the miseries of childhood as of society.

"But it is necessary to punish children," you say. Necessary, but not right!—that is equivalent to saying either that there is no God, or that his law will not work. You are not God yourself, and to punish is to assume more than divine wisdom, for there are no punishments in God's order of nature, only inevitable consequences. Remember that scarcely omniscience could measure out punishment suited exactly to the offense. Harmony, consequence, law: that is the message of the infinite; and when you secrete the candy-box lest the child should over-indulge, you deprive him of his birth-right of opportunity for self-restraint. I daily see a child who will play with candy all day long and never touch a

bit, except under her mother's advice. She says: "It would not be good for me." She has learned that faith that is justified by its works.

The nature of things is a school in which one learns to rule his own spirit, to control himself. Then are we to counteract the discipline of the schoolmasters of God?

Of course, it takes more time and trouble to teach children than it does to whack them; but have you anything better worth the time and trouble—except to go to afternoon teas?

Love, patience, experience; these, and not slippers, are the divine means of teaching; for bruising can teach a child nothing but that you are a bruiser, which he would soon enough learn without your pains. But your bruising does lead a child to think that if you are not there to punish wrongdoing, it will go unpunished, and that whatsoever the child soweth, that shall he not also reap, but something else—the only real infidelity.

But, my lazy, dear friend, the world is so made that it really pays to do right. "Godliness is profitable for all things;" such is the goodness and the severity of God; and you will be surprised to find how even the young barbarian whom you have brought forth and developed will respond to kindness. He is not really worse than the boys at the Elmira reformatory or than Dr. Arnold's Rugby boys; if the appeal to reason and righteousness succeeds with them, it might with your little child; and if you must treat him as a mere animal, it is because you have brought him up as a mere brute and not as a reasonable soul. Experience is a severe teacher, but there is no other for him or for us; the most we can do is to repeat, explain and illustrate her lessons. To constantly stand in her way is the only "sparing of the rod" that can really spoil the child.

My baby sat next me at table as soon as it was able to sit up, and was consumed with a desire to reach the silver kettle of hot water. I carefully explained by signs that it would burn. Nevertheless, baby sensibly concluded to try for itself. All right. It did burn. Papa was wiser than baby thought, and could safely be trusted again; also baby could be trusted near the kettle. If the child had trusted without trying, it would have been a little fool; and if I had forced it to, I would have been a big one.

If the child has eaten enough, make him understand that; and if he will then eat more, let him have indigestion, and let him understand the cause and the consequent discomfort. "But most

of the discomfort and care will fall upon me," you say; true, thank God for that. We can somewhat bear one another's burdens. Besides, thereby you may get some of the education yourself.

Your little boy sees you take out a knife, curious, shining, and cut a stick in two. He feels the faculty in himself also to work such miracles as that, if he only had the knife. But you tell him not to touch it; being wiser than you, he does touch it; if no evil happens you are convicted of error; if he cuts his fingers does not that hurt? Then why do you box his ears? It only makes him think you are stupid or revengeful (he is only a child). Better far to let him try, explain to him its dangers, protect him in the trial, and, as soon as he has learned them, let him have a knife.

Thereby you have fulfilled the highest mission of man. What is the good of you and of me except to show the right and warn against the wrong? To the extent that we do those things, we are the prophets of the Lord.

A child whose education has been by experience will not, like nearly all young girls, run out in the wet with thin shoes, merely because mamma is not there to say no; nor will she clandestinely marry a good-looking "count."

Let your children know the truth, and they will trust to it and you. Appeal always to the divinity in little men, and not to the little beast. If something necessarily disagreeable must be done (there are few such things), explain the reasons, if there be any; let the little one know just how much pain it may have to undergo, and accustom it to "do what is wise." If it sometimes refuses to do it, the mischief is less than to run the risk of "breaking its will;" I had as soon break a child's back as its will. Where deadly peril threatens, do for your child what you ought to do for your neighbor; you have no right to do more or less. If you see a man ignorantly run in front of the cars, you pull him back; if he but goes out in the rain, you only warn him. So you may do with your child.

You may advise with your superior intelligence; you must not substitute your mind for his. You may guide by your greater knowledge; but you cannot alter his nature with a club. Above all things, do not condemn him. "Judge not, that ye be not judged," for your judgment will probably be wrong.—Bolton Hall, in *The Outlook*.

While it may be necessary to hold the Philippines during the war, their in-

ternal administration should be left to the insurgents until order is fully restored by means of a really democratic government, to be brought about as speedily as consistent with security of person and property. There would be no real difficulty in doing all this but for American land-grabbers and monopolists, who see a prospective rich harvest for their extortions, both there and in Cuba.—San Francisco Star.

#### AND THE WAR ALSO WAGES IN CHICAGO.

In the Harrison street police court Mr. Gabriel Ruggles (colored), defendant, prosecuted by Mr. Alfred Riggs (semi-colored), testified thus:

"Judge, dish yuh ain' no scrap—dis is patriotism. Yessah. Long time ago dish yuh man out-point all of us wid Miss Lucretia Wilson, but dat don' make us fightin' mad. No, suh. He tol' de lady dat he is sup-e-yah to cullud people mos'tly, he bein' a Spanyold. Yessah. He say in dem days dat he's a Spanyold. Yessah. He win de lady dat way an' we let it go, faw dat's his business. But times is changed. He come back an' showed up down dat way agin. We didn't say nothin' 'bout Miss Lucretia Wilson, cause dat's his business. But we git togeddah an' decide dat once a Spanyold always a Spanyold, an' we ac' 'cawdingly. Yessah. We wasn't scrapperun' but helpin' de good wohk of de gov'ment along. Freedom of Cuba an' remembah de Maine. I got nothin' mo' to say. I throw myse'f on yo' honnah's patriotism."

Mr. Ruggles was put under peace bonds, and Mr. Riggs concluded to return to the west, where he was not a Spaniard.—Chicago Record.

The Parsees are no more "fire worshipers" than the Christians are cross worshipers. Fire is to them the symbol of God and His purity. The rule of life impressed upon the minds of Parsee children at the first dawn of intelligence is: "The good thought, the good word, the good deed;" and their subsequent life-prayer is a desire to follow at all times this rule.—The New Christianity.

John F. Bass, writing in *Harper's Weekly*, says:

I understand that excessive finish in drilling is not aimed at in our army, as it is supposed to make mere machines out of the men. According to this standard, the "painfully perfect" company is not looked upon with favor.

On the historic morning when Admiral Dewey sailed into the harbor of Manila to face a hostile fleet and a line of hostile forts, the signal which he hoisted to his fleet did not read: "Remember

the Maine," but, "Keep cool and obey orders."—*The Outlook*.

"I can't quite understand this. Manila is in the east, but it says here the ships that's goin' out there is sailin' west."

"Well, don't go to criticisin' the administration. Maybe that's some piece of strategy."—Puck.

"I tell you, a war is just what we need to make good times for the farmers."

"I guess you're right there! I never see crops look better'n they have since that Maine explosion."—Puck.

The one quality which stands out pre-eminently in the sort of courage displayed by Lieut. Hobson and his men on the Merrimac is its perfect sanity.—N. Y. Press.

According to John Fox, Jr., writing in *Harper's Weekly*, 25 per cent. of the Kentucky volunteers were rejected because of their extraordinary height.

The life of one entire generation is not too great a sacrifice to the prosperity of countless generations to come.—Hernandez, the Cuban Patriot.

The first thing for sound politicians to learn is, That Truth, to draw kindly in all sorts of harness, Must be kept in the abstract, for come to apply it You're sure to hurt some folks' interests by it.  
—Bigelow Papers.

### 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 822,  
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

#### SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PRISTER, 314 American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069), Cleveland, Ohio.

Omaha and Council Bluffs, Mrs. C. D. JAMES, 2208 Douglas Street, Omaha, Neb.