

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1898.

Number 15.

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.

The Spanish government complains that the Americans destroyed their ships with "incendiary projectiles." They certainly did not use rubber balls. What did the Spanish government expect?

Our ambassador to Italy is authority for the remarkable statement that "a considerable body of men in Spain regard the Spanish colonies as an incumbrance to the waging of the war," and think that "when the colonies have been lost, the country will be in a better condition than ever for the struggle." Spain should have consulted this optimistic body of men before the war began. By divesting herself of only one of the incumbrances—Cuba—and allowing the people of that island to govern themselves, she could have prevented the war. What is Spain fighting for, if not to hold fast to her colonial "incumbrances?"

Some mystery hangs about the neglect of the government to furnish a complete list of the casualties at the battle of Santiago. It is now two weeks since that battle was fought, yet the friends at home of most of the American soldiers who were engaged in it, are, at this writing, still ignorant of their fate. A few have been named among the killed, a few more among the wounded, and only a few, if any, among the missing. As to the rest—and many more were lost,—unless their friends have heard from them directly, they don't yet know whether they are alive or not. A delay of two weeks in publishing full lists of dead, wounded and missing after a battle,

fought even so far away as Santiago, indicates incapacity or indifference.

Is it possible that Spain treats failure in her military service as equivalent to treachery? It begins to look so. When the captain of a Spanish gunboat captured in Manila bay went to Manila on parole it was reported that he had been condemned to death as soon as he appeared within the Spanish lines, and that Dewey saved him by threatening immediate bombardment if the unfortunate Spaniard's life were taken. This seemed so incredible that it excited no feeling in America other than incredulity. But later the Spanish governor in the Ladrone islands, who, with his mere handful of men surrendered on honorable terms to an American man-of-war and was carried a prisoner to Cavite, expressed his desire to remain an American prisoner. His reasons were that there was danger of his being shot for having surrendered if he placed himself within the control of the Spanish authorities. And now Cervera is reported in an interview as saying that not only is his military career ended, but for having surrendered his foundering ship to Schley he must expect, upon returning home, to be killed or to die in disgrace. There are grounds, it would seem, then, for believing that Spain expects her soldiers to die uselessly, even when nothing in reason is left to do but surrender, and that with the malignancy of the savage she holds them to this obligation on pain of capital punishment. If that be true, it is no wonder that Spain loses her battles so disastrously. Desperation is no substitute for heroism.

The plutocratic elements are once more sure that the silver issue—by which term they designate all that the Chicago platform of 1896 stands for

—is fading out. It is to be expected that in the midst of war, issues of peace will be obscured; but let no one imagine that we are yet through with what is implied by the silver issue. The masses of this country know that they are being plundered with the sanction of the law; and several millions of them have concluded, rightly or wrongly, that the principal leverage for this plundering is currency contraction. Until that belief is overcome, the so-called silver question, though it may now and then be obscured by more sensational questions, will not fade out. And that belief cannot be overcome with epithets, nor with financial dogmatism, nor even through corrupt political campaigns. It can be overcome in one and in only one way—by making clear to popular apprehension what it really is, if not currency contraction, that enables the few to rob the many. The silver issue was "fading out" in 1894, it will be remembered, and again in 1895; but in 1896 it swept plutocracy out of the democratic party, and came near carrying a plebeian president into power—would have done so, indeed, but for the interposition of Mark Hanna's election methods and corruption money. An issue which fades out only to reappear so startlingly needs close watching, especially in the fading season.

The animus of Hawaiian annexation was exposed in the senate just prior to the passage of the annexation resolutions there, by the way in which amendments in the interest of popular rights were voted down. One of these amendments was intended to secure for Hawaii the principle of manhood suffrage, that bedrock principle of the American idea of government. It provided that all native born male Hawaiians, over 21 years of age, and all naturalized aliens, be allowed to

vote in the elections in Hawaii. This amendment was defeated. When the question of annexation comes before the people of the United States for their approval, it will be well for them to bear in mind that the annexationists have put themselves on record as opposed to manhood suffrage.

Another Hawaiian amendment, which was promptly defeated, provided for the submission of the annexation question to the voters of Hawaii, and required that the resolutions should not be operative until a majority of those voters had approved them. If it is true that Hawaii offers herself for annexation, how comes it that the American annexationists are afraid to submit the question to the people there? They have never voted upon it. The sober truth is that a few men, mostly of American birth or antecedents, have secured temporarily the reins of power in Hawaii, and fearing that they may be soon deposed if the strong arm of the American government does not intervene, have connived to secure that intervention by inviting the American government to grab and govern the islands against the will of their inhabitants.

In view, however, of the anti-slavery history of the republican party, the most disheartening vote of all in connection with the Hawaiian question was that of the republican senators against an amendment to repeal the contract labor laws now in force in the Hawaiian islands. That amendment, too, was promptly voted down. The labor laws thus sanctioned by the votes of 41 senators, mostly republicans, are in reality, as every senator who voted for them well knew, slavery laws. Under those laws, large numbers of working people are brought into Hawaii from Asia, and hired out for long terms of years to planters. If the poor victims of this slave trade refuse to work, they are not only deprived of the pitiful wages which the planter has agreed to pay them, but they are arrested and fined. The employer may advance

the fine and take it out of the slave's wages, or the slave may be compelled to work out the fine on the roads. If he remains obdurate, he is sent to jail. A significant feature of these "labor laws" is a fugitive law. The labor commissioner of California reports that he has seen rewards offered for the arrest of fugitive "contract laborers." And as an indication of the fact that this labor system is in reality a slavery system, the slaves are numbered. The same labor commissioner describes the published rewards for runaways as containing photographs of the fugitive in convict dress with his number printed across it. This system of slavery we have now annexed, and in the process of annexation a majority of the senate directly voted to retain the system. The amendment proposed for its abolition, in conformity with our anti-slavery policy, was voted down in the senate, as already stated, principally by republican senators.

It is becoming more and more evident that the imperialists care nothing for American policies or principles. The Monroe doctrine they are ready to heave overboard, and the principles of anti-slavery, of local self-government and of manhood government, along with it. Even the solemn pledge given at the outbreak of the war that we have no other purpose with reference to Cuba than to secure a stable government for the island by its own people, is about to be violated, if the imperialists have their way. We are being pushed headlong into a crusade against the rights and liberties of neighboring and even of distant peoples, peoples who are struggling for the right of self-government; and a war begun for the liberation of downtrodden neighbors, our imperialists are turning into a war of unrighteous conquest.

At such a time it is encouraging to hear a voice that recalls the spirit of Jefferson's democracy and Lincoln's republicanism. In celebration of the Fourth of July,—and that memorable day could not have been better

celebrated,—the Cincinnati single tax club adopted an inspiring address to brothers of ours who are fighting for their liberty and that of their children to-day, as our forefathers fought for theirs and ours more than a hundred years ago. Every word of the address rings true, and we give it in full:

Our insurgent neighbors, who are so nobly fighting for national independence in the Island of Cuba and in the Philippine Islands, are entitled to a full and most explicit assurance from the United States government that the ultimate object of our invasion of those countries is not conquest, nor the annexation of territory, and that we do not intend or desire to force upon the people of other lands a government not their own, but that we seek in good faith to lend a generous and friendly hand to oppressed brethren in their heroic struggle for the right to govern themselves. The policy of despoiling any people of their territory, or of their right to institute or maintain the government of their own free choice would be apostacy to the principle laid down in our Declaration of Independence, that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" it would be treason to that spirit of liberty and brotherhood which declares that "all men are born free and equal and possessed of unalienable rights." No man worthily represents a free government or the spirit of true Americans who contemplates "national expansion" by conquest. A smooth name does not alter the character of a crime; and, if there be any officer of our government so degenerate in political principle as to desire to establish such a policy, his first step toward this crime should be followed by immediate punishment. America's enthusiasm in this war is an enthusiasm for freedom and equal rights,—not an enthusiasm for plunder.

Believing, as true Americans must, in the principle of "no taxation without representation," we hold that our government has no right whatever to levy or collect taxes in foreign territory, nor to assume any functions of local control, not even the function of a "protectorate" or any other benevolent paternalism, unless under the free and express choice of the inhabitants of that territory.

The children of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln send loving greetings to Gomez and Garcia and President Aguinaldo, and to all their compatriots in both hemispheres who have

resolved with their noble leaders to stop at nothing less than national independence. Brothers, God speed you. May the freedom in whose birth throes you are now struggling prove a larger and truer freedom than any the world has yet seen. May your new republics be not only the guardians of civil and religious liberty, but also the guardians of industrial liberty. Make your lands and your markets free, as well as your worship and your politics, and thus escape the political corruption, the social miseries and the perpetual industrial wars which have befallen your older sister republics in America and England whose citizens have not yet learned that "they who would prove the blessings of Liberty must trust her wholly and follow her faithfully."

Most, if not all the Chicago newspapers have made it quite clear to their own editorial satisfaction, that the stereotypers were all wrong in the recent strike and the papers all right. But with the same unanimity with which they tried to deprive the public of news for four days, the papers have excluded the stereotypers' story from their columns. By doing that they have discredited their own story.

A decision recently made by the supreme court of Nebraska may well make men of democratic impulses doubtful whether to grieve or rejoice. The case in which the decision was made arose over an act of the legislature empowering the governor of the state to appoint fire commissioners and police commissioners in cities of the first class. The supreme court held the law to be unconstitutional on the ground that it deprived cities of their constitutional right to self-government. It would be gratifying to believe that the constitution of Nebraska in fact does protect cities in that way. There is nothing dearer to the democratic heart than the doctrine of local self-government; and it is encouraging to be judicially assured that the constitution of Nebraska forbids the legislature to divest Nebraska cities of it.

But the disturbing fact remains that the constitution of Nebraska does

nothing of the sort. In order to invalidate the law described above, the supreme court was obliged to do a little constitution tinkering; and constitution tinkering by courts is worse than anti-home rule legislation. When the legislature violates the principle of home rule, the remedy is still in the people's hands. They can elect a more democratic legislature. But when courts tinker the constitution, there is no remedy. No people can draft a constitution which a constitution-tinkering court cannot tinker out of all semblance to its original shape. In the Nebraska case, the court failed to find a clause in the constitution which reserved the right of self-government to the cities of the state. It held, however, that inasmuch as this right had existed at the time when the constitution was adopted, and had not been expressly surrendered by that instrument, it existed still as an implied reservation, though not reserved in terms.

It is far from our purpose to sit in judgment upon court decisions. The Nebraska decision, for all we know, may be the best of law as law goes. Yet we have a vague notion that heretofore the power of state legislatures has been held to be circumscribed, not conferred, by the constitution. That has sometimes been noted as a distinguishing difference between state constitutions and the federal constitution. By the constitution of a state, legislative power is circumscribed or limited, the legislature being allowed to do whatever is not prohibited; whereas by the constitution of the United States, legislative power is conferred, the legislature being empowered to do nothing which is not authorized.

If that distinction is sound, the supreme court of Nebraska has reversed a sound principle in order to override a law to which it was otherwise unable to find any legal objection. As the court did this in the interest of home rule, it ought, perhaps, to be forgiven for its bad law for the sake

of its good politics. But it must not be forgotten that politics is for the legislature, and law for the courts. Besides, the decision has met with so much favor from the plutocratic press—which, as a regular thing, has a hatred for home rule akin to that of the devil for holy water,—as to make its straining after home rule principles appear not altogether wholesome.

The London Spectator finds it difficult "to define the moral objection to monopolies." It feels, though, that there must be a moral objection somewhere, if we could only find it, and with some hesitation expresses a suspicion that "monopoly is perfectly sinless unless it compels you or enables you to 'grind the face of the poor.'" But the Spectator is far off the main track. The moral objection to monopoly is neither more nor less than the moral objection to theft; and that does not depend upon whether or not it grinds the face of the poor. Monopoly is theft legalized. It differs from vulgar theft in this, that the thief is not the individual monopolist, but the community which stands responsible for the legal quality of the crime.

Those who recognize that there is such a thing as the social man, who see that society is so to speak in the form of a man, that it is indeed a greater man,—all such will understand us when we say that monopoly is to the social man what common larceny is to the individual unit. When the community creates a special privilege, whereby its beneficiary, in the guise of doing business, exacts tribute of his fellows, the community becomes a thief. By creating a monopoly, it commits larceny. In this view of the matter, there is no such difficulty as the London Spectator encounters in defining the moral objection to monopoly. That difficulty arises only when we shrink from the conclusions to which a true definition would lead. Pro-slavery men, for instances, were incapable of defining the moral objection to slavery, because

they shrank from condemning slavery. They, therefore, concluded that slavery was sinless provided the master were "good to his slaves," just as the Spectator concludes that monopoly is sinless except as it compels or enables its beneficiaries to "grind the face of the poor." But such exceptions are not contemplated by the eighth commandment.

It appears that the defeat of the federal constitution for the Australian colonies, was accomplished in the colony of New South Wales. Two-thirds of the popular vote in each colony was required for the adoption of the constitution, and though in the other principal colonies that vote was cast for it, the vote in New South Wales fell short. A majority there voted for adoption, but the requisite proportion of votes was lacking. The large minority of New South Wales voters who opposed federation doubtless understood what they were about. New South Wales is a free trade colony. It is almost absolutely so. Under this policy it has made rapid advances, and the people there have no notion of surrendering their freedom to the protectionists who rule the sister colony of Victoria. Though a majority did not suspect that federation would result in a general protection policy, as it has done in the United States, yet the large and effective minority evidently foresaw that under the federal constitution as proposed, the monopolists of Victoria, with a deluded people behind them, might in combination with the monopolists of New South Wales and the other colonies, close the ports of all Australia to the commerce of the world. Very sensibly, therefore, they preferred their freedom without nationality or expansion, to nationality and expansion with protection.

Most of Henry George's critics have been acute in discovering in his books much that is not there, and overlooking much that is there. The most charitable inference is that they have not read the books before reviewing

them. But the critic of the New York Independent is the first to confess that this was his case. He does confess it, however, almost in terms. Referring to George's last book—"The Science of Political Economy"—which he reviews at length without once touching upon any of its important points, this critic says: "We fail to find in it anything that is not to be found in Mr. George's earlier works, except some biographical details." No man could truthfully write that sentence if he had read the books. In the book under review, George discusses at length and with acuteness and profound judgment numerous subjects which are not to be found in any of his other works, except as the story of Robinson Crusoe is to be found in Webster's dictionary, or Webster's dictionary in the alphabet. Among these are the nature and causes of civilization, the distinction between political economy and "economics," the different schools of political economy, the history of political economy, the subject of value, the nature of money, the law of diminishing returns, the two modes of cooperation—by combination of effort and by separation of effort, and the subject of distribution. To imply that these subjects are to be found in George's earlier books is to confess ignorance of them; to assume that they are not to be found in his last book is to confess ignorance of that.

The truth is, that since George brought out so magnificently in "Progress and Poverty," one of those great elementary truths the proclamation of which makes an epoch in human history, his critics, like most inferior contemporaries of most great men, have been unable to measure him. If they see any allusion to that truth in earlier writers, they think George a plagiarist; if they see any allusion to it in his later works they think he repeats himself. And because George's last book makes still more solid the foundations of the truth he had proclaimed in all his other books, the chirping critics

"fail to find in it" anything that is not to be found in them.

OBLIGATIONS TO WORK.

The stereotypers' strike in Chicago brings up for consideration, with exceptional emphasis, a social question of vital and general concern. It is the question of the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by persons offering to serve the public to continue the service, if they can possibly do so, until after reasonable notice of their intention to withdraw.

For the better understanding of this question, as illustrated by the Chicago stereotypers' strike, a brief description of that strike is necessary. The stereotypers of the Chicago daily newspapers were under a contract with their employers as to wages and hours of labor, which they were at liberty to open up for revision at any time upon giving notice of their purpose. This notice was duly given and a new scale of wages demanded. No agreement was arrived at, however, and the publishers, believing that their stereotypers would strike unless increased wages and shorter hours were granted, anticipated that action by suddenly suspending publication. Every daily paper of importance in the city of Chicago joined in this suspension, so that for a period of four full days Chicago was without a local daily newspaper. And so perfect was the combination of publishers, that during the suspension every one of them refused in any way to make public the news in his possession. To aggravate the situation, this plan for exciting public hostility to the stereotypers was put in operation just at the close of the first day's battle before Santiago, and as the suspension continued throughout the four following days, the public of Chicago was deprived of extraordinarily important news, except as it percolated through chance channels. Was that conduct on the part of the publishers a breach of the obligation they had assumed, to serve the public with news?

It is always a good plan when dealing with a question like this, to get one's bearings by considering other cases, the same in principle, but simpler. Adopting that plan for present purposes, no better example could

be chosen than the business of the country doctor. When a doctor settles in a community as a doctor, he offers his services to the public, agreeing to minister to all who call; and so long as he holds that relation to the public he cannot turn away any person who applies to him, offering his accustomed fee. In a sense, he belongs to the community. And, though he may retire from practice at will, he may not do so without reasonable notice while remaining in the community. Much less may he withdraw from practice temporarily for purposes of coercion. In other words, a physician cannot strike. And in a community in which there were several physicians, a combination among them to strike against the community would be criminal conspiracy.

Not only is this good sense, but it is good law. Yet a moment's reflection will show that the reason for it is not the peculiarity of the physician's calling—his relation to bodily disease. That makes the fact plain that a physicians' strike would be a breach of obligation to the public; but it is not the determining factor. The reason that physicians may not strike is because, having offered their services to the public, thus causing the public to depend upon them, it is against public policy for them to withdraw their offer in such manner as to place the public at a serious disadvantage. The principle, therefore, so clearly applicable to the physician, is applicable also to every person of whatever calling who, having caused the public to depend upon his services, withdraws them at such a time or under such circumstances as to do a public injury.

That men who offer their services to the public often do withdraw them without exciting public censure is immaterial. The public does not happen to be dependent upon them. No objection is made even to the refusals of physicians to attend patients in a community where physicians are numerous. But in all occupations with reference to which the community is so situated as to be dependent upon the persons who offer to serve them in particular ways, the rule that applies to the country doctor holds good. In addition to the business of the country doctor, it is enough to cite

that of the country inn-keeper and the old-time miller.

The principle contended for above has been recognized by the law, not only with reference to the business of physicians, inn-keepers, millers and other special callings, but also with reference to vocations in general. Over and over again, and entirely regardless of the occupation, the courts have held that workingmen's strikes are criminal. For engaging in strikes, strikes that were quakeristic in their freedom from violence, many workingmen have served sentences in prison, not only in England but in this country, and not only in the last century, but in the latter half of the present one. These decisions against workingmen's strikes have proceeded upon the theory that when a man offers the community his services in any calling he assumes a public obligation. Various arguments have been offered in support of anti-strike decisions by the judges who have made them, but this has been the essential doctrine.

In legal and economic principle, these decisions were right. It was in the application of the principle that they were wrong. They were wrong because in the case of workingmen a vital fact is lacking. Workingmen do not offer their services to the public. The obligation, therefore, which exists between the public and business men does not exist between the public and workingmen. At the worst, a workingman's strike is a wrong to his employer only. It may be no wrong even to him; but be that as it may, it certainly is no wrong to the public. There is, in lawyer's phrase, no privity between the public and workingmen. Workingmen's relations are with their employers only. Consequently, a workingman's strike neither is nor ought to be considered as a breach of public obligation.

But it is radically different with the employers' strike. There is privity between employers and the public. Employers offer to the public not only their services, but the services of enough workingmen to make the offer valuable. Standing as middle men between their employes and the public, they assume all the obligations of the business, including the obliga-

tion, as long as they remain in their respective callings, to serve the public with the utmost faithfulness, even if at times they have to pay such high wages as to make their business temporarily unprofitable. This risk is one of the chances they take when they contract with the public on the one hand to furnish work and with workingmen on the other to do the work. It is a chance which, in the complexity of chances they speculate in, is offset by the opportunities for exceptional profits that they and not their employes get the advantage of.

The application of these principles to the action of the newspaper publishers in depriving the Chicago public of news, and to the stereotypers' strike which that action anticipated, is clear. The stereotypers, had they struck, would have been guilty of no breach of obligation to the public. The publishers were guilty of such a breach. Nothing at all prevented the publishers from following their usual custom of bulletining the news as they got it; and nothing but the stereotypers' strike, as an alternative for an increase of about \$40 a day in the aggregate wages paid by all the daily papers together, could have stood in the way of regular publication. With the stereotypers, the public had nothing to do. Their action, whether they struck or not, was a private one between them and the publishers. But the publishers' strike was against the public. They had agreed with the public, as the stereotypers had not, to furnish news. Nothing could discharge them from that obligation so long as they remained in the news-purveying business. Certainly a temporary increase of \$40 a day in their aggregate wages expense would not do so. Could a doctor justify his refusal to attend a patient by pleading that his coachman wouldn't drive him unless his wages were increased a few cents a day, and that he was unable to find a coachman who would? Most assuredly not. Then how can the newspaper publishers of a great city justify their united refusal to publish the news, by pleading that they can't get stereotypers unless they increase the aggregate wages they are paying, by \$40 a day?

If ever a set of men rendered them-

selves justly liable to criminal prosecution for striking, the combined publishers of Chicago did so when they struck against their self-imposed obligation to supply the public regularly with news. For strikes imposing far less inconvenience upon the public, workmen, without being under any obligation at all to the public, have spent terms in the penitentiary; but no punishment by the law is feared by the striking publishers of Chicago, though they were under an obligation to the public and ignored it in the most exasperating fashion. They fear no punishment by the law, because they are enormously rich; and in Goldsmith's prophetic words, "rich men rule the law."

ELECTION REFORM.

It is possible to lay too much stress upon the importance of methods of voting. No election reform, however perfect, can at any time produce better civic results than the people at that time are ready for. If the people are besotted, even the best election methods can produce but a besotted government. It may be almost affirmed of a degraded people that the more perfect their election machinery is, the worse will their government be. Of nothing is the saying more strictly true than of human government, that a stream cannot rise above the level of its source.

But in this country the stream is not allowed to rise up to the level of its source. That is because our election methods are bad. Instead of facilitating, they obstruct the expression of public opinion. And in no respect are they worse than in connection with the nomination of candidates for office. In consequence of defective nominating methods the control of both political parties has fallen into the hands of political hucksters and traders; and the control of new parties will meet the same fate as soon as they gain strength enough to make them worth manipulating.

The essential vice of these methods is the delegate convention. Delegates are elected at popular primaries of their respective parties. They attend conventions and vote for candidates to be supported at the election. The plan seems fair enough,

and if it operated so as to elect untrammelled delegates, truly representative of their party, it would be fair. But as a result of caucuses, contests at primaries become faction fights, which end in the election of delegates who, so far from representing the party voters, are the pledged tools of successful caucus bosses. Then, when the convention meets, the bosses who "control delegations" pool their strength, and through the medium of further caucuses turn the convention to the right or the left, according to their own interests and utterly regardless of the interests or wishes of the party, which is swung into line at the election by appeals to party loyalty. Finally, most of the rank and file of the party, finding that primary voting is voting in the air, stay away from primaries, thus making the primary still less effective as a register of the will of the party, and the surrender of the party to bosses still more complete. The party ceases to be governed by its masses. Its masses come to be driven by a few politicians, who in turn are driven or bribed by monopolists. In this way democratic government degenerates into autocratic government of the worst sort.

Proportional representation would remedy this. Under a proper system of proportional representation the people would be able to secure legislative representatives who as a whole would be a microcosm of the people as a whole. If the republicans were in the majority among the people, they would be in the majority in the legislature. If a new party had any strength among the people, it would have the same legislative strength. If one party bore the relation toward another of two to one in the community, it would bear the relation of two to one in the halls of legislation. Under such a system the evils of delegate conventions would be minimized; and if proportional representation were supplemented with the initiative and referendum—under which no important law could become operative until sanctioned by the direct vote of the people, and every measure that by direct vote the people demanded must be enacted into law—delegate conventions would become innocuous if not obsolete.

But proportional representation is a system, and systems come into vogue painfully and slowly. We must wait patiently while we work for them. Meanwhile, it is possible to assault the delegate convention directly, and by requiring nominations to be made by popular vote at primary elections, to retire the boss from power. Jay D. Miller, a well-known Illinois lawyer, and the author of that valuable little pamphlet, "Finance and Transportation," is authority for the statement that this could be done by a simple amendment of the primary laws in all the states having such laws, and by a simple amendment of the election laws of other states. His plan is to make the primary election a nominating election. It would require every candidate to procure a written nomination of, say, five per cent. of his party, upon the strength of which his name should be printed in the proper place upon the ballots used at the party primary, the person receiving the highest number of votes for any office to be the candidate of the party for that office at the ensuing election.

This plan is not wholly new. It has been in successful operation with the republican party of Jackson county, Kansas, for 19 years. In an account given of that experiment by its author, John S. Hopkins, in the June, Arena, Mr. Hopkins explains that for the purpose of avoiding the ill effects of local favoritism or prejudice, each voting precinct is accorded a "representative vote," calculated upon the basis of its vote at some preceding general election for a high state official, and the primary candidates are credited with such share of this representative vote as their total vote in the precinct bears to the whole number cast. The person securing, not the largest vote, but the largest "representative vote," becomes the nominee of the party.

To quote from Mr. Hopkins by way of example:

Whiting precinct was entitled to 8 representative votes for sheriff; Neta-waka precinct to 7 representative votes, and Hoyt precinct to 9 representative votes. The number of votes that J. T. Hancher received in Whiting township was 49 of the total number (109) of votes cast at that precinct. Hancher therefore received 49:109 of 8 representative votes in that precinct; and in

the Netawaka precinct he received 18-99 of 7 representative votes; and in Hoyt precinct 1-56 of 9 representative votes; and so on. While George N. Haas, the successful applicant and nominee, received only 4 votes at Whiting precinct, therefore only 4-109 of 8 representative votes; 20-99 of 7 representative votes at Netawaka, and 14-56 of 9 representative votes at Hoyt; and so on. The other applicants received votes, and each counted his just share of the representative vote of each precinct in the proportion of the number of votes cast for him to the whole number cast therein.

The result of this method, as Mr. Hopkins explains it, is that "the weakest applicant, all round, fails; the strongest applicant, all round, wins the nomination."

The advantages of such a method over the present delegate convention method are evident. Not the least important among them is the natural tendency to draw out a full vote at the primaries. This appears to have been done in a remarkable degree by the Kansas experiment. At the primary election in 1895, of which Mr. Hopkins gives the returns, it appears that the number of republican votes cast was 1,931—only 20 less than the party cast at the succeeding general election; and for 19 years, according to Mr. Hopkins, "at each and every primary election, the republican voters of this county have been turning out in about the same proportion of the increase or decrease of the republican electors."

Another advantage that might be reasonably expected is freedom from "bolting," and therefore a direct measuring of strength at the general election between the regular political parties. That is an advantage, because bolting is only a necessity of bad nominating methods; it is not a political virtue in itself. This advantage, too, seems to have been demonstrated by the Kansas experiment in Jackson county. There has been no republican bolting there since the Hopkins experiment has been in operation.

A still greater advantage would be the certainty with which the nominations of every party would be made by the people of the party. And this would be attended with an advantage the benefits of which would exceed all expectations. Our elections would become what Mr. Hopkins

aptly terms "the great common school of politics." Any member of a party who believed that some new policy was in harmony with the principles of his party, could represent that policy as a candidate at the primaries, if he could obtain the indorsement of a small percentage of his copartisans, and thus call upon the party itself to give its commands in the matter. In doing so he would help to educate the community in the most effective manner, not only in regard to the particular policy he represented, but in regard also to the application of fundamental party principles. Primaries under such a nominating method would be the forum for the discussion and decision of all vital questions affecting political parties and through them the municipality, the state and the nation. They would lift the people themselves to a higher political plane. By improving electoral methods they would actually foster democracy. Though they could not make the stream rise above the level of its source, they would elevate the source.

The election reform which Mr. Miller proposes, and the operation of which in a Kansas county Mr. Hopkins has described, would rescue political parties from the caucuses and bosses; and while going a long way toward accomplishing the objects of proportional representation and the initiative and referendum, would make those still more fundamental reforms easier of adoption.

NEWS

The operations in front of Santiago are still the center of interest in connection with the war. At the close of the account of these operations last week, the fierce battle of the 1st and the intermittent skirmishes of the 2d had been fought, and the Americans were strengthening their entrenchments, which commanded the beleaguered Cuban city. Gen. Shafter, according to his own reports, was then master of the situation. He had already demanded an unconditional surrender, accompanying the demand with a notification that if not complied with by 10 o'clock on the morning of the 4th he would begin a bombardment, but had postponed his threatened bombardment twice, for

24 hours each time, first at the solicitation of the foreign consuls at Santiago, and then on account of the new aspect which had been put upon the situation by the destruction of Cervera's fleet. This brought the armistice down to the 6th. At that time the distance from the American trenches to the advance works of the Spanish was only 200 yards.

But the bombardment did not begin yet for several days, though the Spanish commandant had positively refused on the 5th to consider the question of surrender. Meanwhile, the Spanish tried on the 6th to sink the *Reina Mercedes* in the channel, for the purpose of blockading Sampson's entrance into Santiago bay; but the Massachusetts and the Texas discovered the movement and sunk the *Mercedes* in one of the coves of the bay where she offers no obstruction. Also, during the delay of the American advance, refugees from Santiago poured by thousands over into the American lines. This exodus from the city began on the 5th, when the Spanish commandant refused to consider the question of surrender, and on the 7th it was estimated that 15,000 had come over. They were chiefly foreigners and women and children, and all were in extreme distress for want of food. Among the refugees were the civil governor, the mayor, and the president of the upper court of justice, who had been forbidden by the commandant to leave, but had managed to slip away.

Though the Spanish commandant had declined to surrender on the 5th he afterwards concluded to confer upon the subject with Gen. Blanco at Havana and his home government at Madrid. Being totally without telegraph operators, however,—the operators of the only open line, the English, having deserted,—he was obliged to apply to Gen. Shafter for assistance in that particular. Gen. Shafter responded by sending employes of the English cable company back within the Spanish lines, under the protection of the British consul, and upon the assurance of the Spanish commandant that they should be used only for the purpose of communicating regarding a surrender. He also granted an armistice until the 9th to afford an opportunity for the contemplated communication with Blanco and Madrid.

Gen. Shafter, therefore, delayed a

direct advance upon Santiago, but he continued to strengthen his line and to extend it to the north and west around the city. On the 9th the Spanish commandant, doubtless acting under orders, offered to surrender upon condition that his army be permitted to leave the city under arms and with colors flying. Shafter refused the offer, but agreed to further delay his long-threatened bombardment until the 10th, and meantime to communicate the Spanish offer to the president. The president was notified accordingly, but he replied at once requiring the surrender to be unconditional.

After again conferring with his superiors at Havana and Madrid, the Spanish commandant refused, on the 10th, to surrender unconditionally; and at 4 o'clock in the afternoon of that day the American bombardment began. It continued until dark, both the land artillery and the fleet participating.

The operations of the fleet on the 10th were under the command of Com. Schley. He brought the Brooklyn, the Indiana and the Texas within 500 yards of the shore at a point about four miles and a half south of Santiago, and, with the help of army signalling, threw shells over the high cliffs and into the city. On the following day the New York, the Brooklyn, the Newark and the Indiana were the bombarding ships. One of their shots struck a church where powder was stored and blew it up. But early in the afternoon Shafter ordered all firing to cease, to enable him to make a third and last demand for surrender before storming the city. The Spanish commandant asked time to receive instructions from Madrid, which was granted, and on the 12th the demand for unconditional surrender was again refused.

When Gen. Shafter made his third demand for the surrender of the city he had the city completely surrounded. His right wing had been extended almost to the road from Santiago to Caimanes, a town to the northwest of Santiago, along which road the Spanish would have to move if they retreated; and Garcia with his Cubans had taken Caimanes. This made a complete line, extending from the west shore of the bay opposite Santiago, in northerly, easterly and southerly directions, to the coast. No

opportunity for the escape of the Spanish was left, except by a dash through the American line; and though that line was thin, it was being rapidly strengthened with reinforcements. On the 13th Gen. Shafter's available force numbered 21,873 men.

Though the Spanish commandant refused on the 12th to surrender unconditionally, the bombardment was not resumed on that day. Shafter was still in communication with Washington with reference to the Spanish demand for a modification of the terms of surrender. On the 13th he was positively and finally instructed by the president that no modification would be made. He then brought about a personal interview, under a flag of truce between the lines, with Gen. Toral, the Spanish commandant, who has acted in the place of Gen. Linares since the latter was wounded in the battle of the 1st and 2d, at which interview Gen. Shafter explained the situation to Gen. Toral, telling him that he was without hope of escape, that his surrender only would be considered, and that under the circumstances he had no right to waste human lives by continuing to fight. Gen. Toral claimed that without further authority from his government, all he was authorized to do was to surrender the harbor, forts and munitions of war, and the eastern portion of Cuba, upon being allowed to withdraw. Permission to withdraw was refused, but the United States offered to send his forces to Spain, allowing the officers to wear their side arms. Upon Gen. Toral's urgent request for time to receive from his home government an answer to this offer Gen. Shafter gave him until 12 o'clock noon, of the 14th, but notified him that at the expiration of that time, unless the American terms were accepted, he would attack with every gun in the fleet and the army. This is the situation as we go to press.

Shortly after the cessation of the bombardment on the 11th, Gen. Nelson A. Miles, the general in command of the United States armies, arrived off Santiago bay on board the Yale. He had left Washington on the 7th and embarked on the Yale at Charleston on the 8th. His purpose in appearing at the front is not known, but he insists that it involves no displacement of Gen. Shafter or interference with his plans.

The destruction of Cervera's fleet

by Com. Schley, which was reported last week, was followed by an official survey of the wrecks. It was thought at first that three of the Spanish ships might be saved, but the board of survey reported on the 11th that it would be impossible to save any but the Infanta Maria Teresa, formerly Admiral Cervera's flagship. An important fact was incidentally disclosed by the survey. The interior explosions had bulged the injured parts of the hulks outward, a fact which strengthens the conclusion that the Maine, whose injured parts bulged inward, was sunk by an exterior explosion.

While the survey of the Spanish wrecks was in progress, their former commander, Admiral Cervera, was on his way, on board the St. Louis, along with 746 other Spanish prisoners, to their quarters in the United States. They arrived at Portsmouth, N. H., on the 10th, whence they go to Annapolis, Md., where they are to be detained. Before leaving the West Indies, Cervera cabled his official report to Gen. Blanco. This was on the 4th. He reported that in obedience to Blanco's orders he had gone out of Santiago harbor on the 3d, and after an unequal combat with forces more than triple his own, had lost his squadron. The number of men he had lost he did not know, but was sure it would exceed 600 killed and as many wounded, Villanil, the commander of the torpedo flotilla, being among the killed. Admiral Cervera also reported the gratitude of himself and his fellow prisoners for the "noble generosity" with which they were treated by their captors.

Another immediate result of Cervera's misfortune, was the release of Lieut. Hobson and his associates, of the Merrimac fame. They were exchanged on the 6th, and on the same night Hobson returned to his ship, the New York. He said that he had known all along that the Merrimac was not sunk where it would close the channel. He was unable to get her in place as he intended, because the Spaniards had shot her rudder away, and at the last moment she would not obey the helm. Submarine mines were exploded all about his party, he said, and he did not know whether the Merrimac was blown up by her own explosive or by Spanish torpedoes. He and his men were in the water for an hour before they were picked up by a Spanish boat. They

were sent at once to Morro Castle, and confined in the inner side of that fortress; but after the first bombardment, the British consul protested, and the Spanish then removed them to the hospital.

A yellow fever scare has been started, but on the 11th, the latest date of authentic reports, there were only 14 cases in the field hospital. Other reports tell of additional cases. The sick have been isolated, and on the 12th Siboney was burned by order of the military health authorities.

Though public interest is centered upon the investment of Santiago, offensive operations are in progress in other parts of Cuba, also. On the 6th a fight occurred off Mariel, on the north coast, a few miles west of Havana. The American boats engaged were the Hawk, the Prairie and the Castine. They silenced two Spanish batteries, put two gunboats to flight, and drove a large transport, burning, upon the beach. The transport was supposed to be the Alfonso XII.

A less successful affair occurred off Manzanilla, on the south coast of Cuba, some 80 miles west of Santiago. It happened on the 3d, the day of Cervera's defeat, but was not reported from Santiago until the 8th. Expecting to be confronted by only one small fort and two gunboats, the Scorpion and the Osceola entered Manzanilla bay. To the surprise of their commanders the shore was strongly guarded by Spanish artillery and infantry. They gave battle, however, for 25 minutes, but were frequently hit, and they finally retreated.

In Havana itself, the poor are dying of hunger in the streets, so a member of the British consulate reports. He accompanied the British consul-general on the British cruiser, Talbot, which left Havana on the 5th and touched at Port Royal, Jamaica, on the 8th. Well-to-do residents of Havana, he further said, are subsisting tolerably. No explanation of the departure of the officers of the British consulate at Havana was given, except that they were on leave. Since then a refugee from Havana confirms the reports of starvation, and adds that upon receiving positive news of Cervera's defeat, Blanco attempted suicide.

Another Cuban cable was cut on the 11th. It was the line which con-

nected Havana with Santiago, by way of Cienfuegos, Trinidad, Tunas and Manzanilla. The work of cutting was done by Capt. Young, of the Hist, at a point 15 miles southeast of Santa Cruz.

Further developments in the Philippines were reported on the 9th, reaching this country by way of Hong Kong on the 13th. The insurgents had complained on the 6th that a German warship in Subig bay, forbade their making an attack upon Spaniards on Grande island, the only part of Subig bay which Aguinaldo had not taken. Promptly upon receiving this complaint, Dewey sent the Raleigh and the Concord to Subig bay, and these vessels opened fire on the Spaniards. The German war ship immediately steamed away, and the Spaniards, 1,300 in number, surrendered. Subig bay is on the west coast of the island of Luzon about 30 miles north of the entrance to Manila bay. The commander of the German war ship explained, upon his return to Manila bay, that he had interfered only in the cause of humanity. He proffered to Dewey the refugees he had taken on board, but Dewey declined to receive them.

Furious fighting takes place at intervals between the Philippine insurgents and the Spanish, the insurgents acting independently of the Americans and being generally victorious. On the 1st Aguinaldo proclaimed the Philippine republic, with himself as president.

The second Manila expedition from the United States, which left San Francisco on the 15th of June, arrived at Honolulu, in the Hawaiian islands, on the 23d and sailed thence on the 25th. It is now about due at Manila. Meantime the troops already landed at Cavite are persistently drilling, and a fourth expedition is nearly ready to leave San Francisco, while the third is far on its way.

The Spanish expedition to the Philippines—Camara's fleet,—which had gone through the Suez canal at our last report, has come back again. It reentered the canal at the southern terminus on the 8th, to return to Spain. The torpedo boats had already turned back, and were reported at Messina, Sicily, on the 9th, where their officers learned of Cervera's disaster. On the 11th the whole fleet, with the exception of the Pelayo and

the San Agustín, which were temporarily detained at Port Said, were steaming through the Mediterranean for home.

The series of disasters to the Spanish cause, culminating in Cervera's defeat and the recall of Camara, produced the long-expected ministerial crisis at Madrid. The head of the ministry, Senor Sagasta, went to the palace on the 11th and tendered to the queen regent his own resignation and that of the rest of cabinet. No successors have yet been appointed. The conservatives are not disposed to accept the responsibilities of office in this emergency; Campos, who appears willing to assume the burden, would probably be without the support of a majority in the cortes; and a liberal cabinet, in harmony with the political complexion of the cortes, would be an absurdity without an acceptable liberal leader at the head of it. There is an impression, therefore, that Sagasta may be obliged to form the new cabinet himself. Pending the adjustment of this difficulty the old cabinet continues to meet in council. Latest reports are to the effect that Sagasta has succeeded in harmonizing the old cabinet.

The ministerial crisis at Madrid, following upon the disasters to Spanish arms, has set on foot persistent rumors of an early peace. These rumors have about them at least the color of probability. In addition to the situation which would induce Spain to sue for peace if she were rational, it appears that close upon the heels of a conference at Madrid between the Spanish minister for foreign affairs and the French ambassador to Spain, the French ambassador at Washington visited the white house to make a formal presentation to President McKinley, the nature of which has not been authoritatively divulged. From the coincidence of these two conferences, it is inferred that Spain has solicited the good offices of France to secure a termination of the war.

Among the peace rumors it was reported also that overtures had been made by Spain to Great Britain to act as intermediary. As this story runs, proposed terms were submitted by the Spanish ministry to the British ambassador at Madrid. They involved the independence of Cuba, upon the assumption by Cuba of the colonial debt of \$500,000,000 or more.

Spain was to retain possession of Havana until details are adjusted, and to pay a cash war indemnity, to be determined by arbitration. The United States meantime, was to control the Philippine islands and Puerto Rico. It was also to select a harbor in any of the Philippines except Luzon, for a permanent naval station. The British ambassador refused to submit these propositions to the United States, on the ground that they would probably be rejected; but he cabled them to the foreign office in London where they were informally communicated to the American minister. The truth of the foregoing story is quite doubtful. Indeed, there is no certainty that any overtures whatever have yet been made by Spain in any direction, looking to peace.

Next to the war with Spain, the most important news of the week, to the people of the United States, is the progress of the movement for the acquisition of Hawaii. As reported last week, the house joint resolutions for the annexation of that republic, as territorial property of the United States government, was adopted on the 6th by the senate. On the 7th, at 7 o'clock in the evening, President McKinley signed the resolutions, and immediately orders were issued from the navy department putting the Philadelphia, at San Francisco, in commission to carry the American flag to Honolulu and formally to annex the islands. On the following day, the 8th, it was decided at a cabinet meeting to dispatch a regiment of troops also to Honolulu; and the 1st New York volunteers, Col. Thos H. Barber, which was on that day passing through Chicago en route to the Philippines, was selected for the purpose and ordered accordingly. The regiment arrived at San Francisco on the 13th. By order of the war department on the 11th the Hawaiian islands were attached to the military department of California.

The American members of the commission provided for by the Hawaiian annexation resolutions, were appointed by the president on the 8th. They are Senator Cullom and Representative Hitt, of Illinois, and Senator Morgan, of Alabama. The appointees met at the national capitol on the 11th, and organized by electing Senator Cullom chairman. The formation of the commission is to recommend to congress legislation

concerning the newly-acquired islands. The three commissioners named have expressed themselves as favoring a full territorial government, with a delegate in congress and a local legislature.

The most important state convention yet held in 1898, the one of most interest, at any rate, to the country at large, was the democratic convention of Illinois, which met at Springfield, Ill., on the 12th. It was presided over by William Prentiss, of Chicago, an adherent of ex-Gov. Altgeld, and Altgeld himself made the speech of the occasion. Two prominent democrats who left the party in 1896, one of them being Ben T. Cable, were placed upon the state committee, upon assurances publicly made in the convention by their friends that they now accepted the Chicago platform of 1896. A sharp fight was made against Altgeld by Mayor Harrison, of Chicago, for control of the state committee. The result is doubtful. According to one report each secured 14 members, the other three being in doubt. Among the nominations was that of Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, of Chicago, for trustee of the state university.

IN CONGRESS.

Week ending July 13, 1898.

On the 7th the house passed a joint resolution that congress adjourn sine die on the 8th at 2 o'clock in the afternoon; and the senate having adopted the resolution early on the following day, the two houses stood adjourned on the 8th at the hour named.

The session just closed was the first regular session of the 55th congress, though it is spoken of as the second session from the fact that a special session was called by the president soon after his inauguration. The next regular session will convene on the first Monday in December next. At the session which adjourned on the 5th, business was done of extraordinary importance and far reaching effect. Cuban independence was recognized; war was declared against Spain; appropriations were made aggregating nearly \$900,000,000; a large interest bearing debt was created; the regular army was reorganized and a volunteer army provided for; a general bankruptcy law was created; and the Hawaiian islands were acquired as national territory.

NEWS NOTES.

—The National Educational association met at Washington on the 8th.

—The National League of Republican Clubs met at Omaha, Neb., on the 13th.

—Lieut. Peary arrived at Sydney, Cape Briton, on the 8th, on his way to the pole.

—Omar D. Conger, formerly a United States senator from Michigan, died at Ocean City, Md., on the 11th.

—An explosion in the new water works tunnel at Cleveland, Ohio, killed 11 workmen. Their bodies have not been recovered.

—The tenth triennial national council of Congregational churches of the United States, met at Portland, Ore., on the 7th.

—The Retail Furniture Dealers Association of the United States held their fourth annual convention at Chicago on the 12th.

—The annual convention of the Young People's Christian Union, a Universalist organization, met at Chicago on the 13th.

—Parker Pillsbury died at Concord, N. H., on the 7th at the age of almost 89 years. He was one of the early abolitionists, an associate of Garrison and Phillips.

—In a rainfall at St. Louis on the 8th there fell 5.08 inches of water in 24 hours. The greatest previous rainfall there was 4.64 inches on the 15-16 June, 1888.

—It was reported on the 8th that a Spanish privateer of five guns was prowling along the coast of British Columbia to intercept American vessels from the Klondike.

—Col. Wood, of the rough riders, was promoted on the 8th to be a brigadier general. Lieut. Col. Roosevelt was at the same time promoted to the colonelcy of the regiment.

—By a vote of 13 to 6, two not voting, the Chicago board of education on the 13th chose for superintendent of schools President E. Benjamin Andrews, of Brown university, Rhode Island.

—The Chicago newspapers are again printing regular issues of the usual size. Whether they are doing so with non-union stereotypers, or have come to terms with their old men, is not reported.

—Col. William J. Bryan's regiment of Nebraska volunteers was notified on the 11th to be in readiness to move to Jacksonville. It is understood that it will be attached to the command of Gen. Fitzhugh Lee.

—The Hattie I. Phillips was the first arrival this year from the Klondike. She reached San Francisco on the 10th, bringing in a party of 20 miners. They report a good season, and tell extraordinary stories of the prices of com-

modities at Dawson. The half dollar, they say, is the smallest coin used there.

—The provincial elections for the province of British Columbia, Dominion of Canada, return only 15 government members as against 17 opposition, with 6 doubtful. Mr. Turner, the premier, was defeated.

—An Anglo-American league was formed in London on the 13th, under the presidency of the duke of Sutherland. James Bryce, author of the "American Commonwealth," is also a promoter of the league.

—Carranza and Du Bosc, the Spanish spies, lately connected with the Spanish embassy here, boarded the Dominion steamer Ottoman, at Montreal, on the 12th, with the apparent intention of leaving the continent.

—On the 12th the secretary of war ordered the removal of submarine mines from the harbors of the United States. This was in accordance with a decision of the cabinet, which regards the American coast now as entirely safe.

—The Canadian cabinet on the 13th selected the British colonies to which the preferential tariff granted at the last session of the dominion parliament is to apply. They are New South Wales, British India, Straits Settlement and Ceylon.

—The Cuban edition of the New York Journal, the first American newspaper published in Cuba, was issued at Siboney on the 10th. It gave the latest general news, and was distributed among the men in the trenches and on the ships.

—A general United States post office has been established under the management of Eben Brewer, at Baiquiri, Cuba, which is known as Military Station No. 1. It is a sub-station of the New York city post office, and Louis Kempner is superintendent.

—The Italian government announces its intention to resort to force to compel the republic of Colombia to pay the award of \$250,000 which President Cleveland made in favor of Ernesto Cerruti, an Italian citizen, in the arbitration submitted to him.

—The Clyde line steamer Delaware, which left New York for Charleston, S. C., on the 8th, loaded with passengers and a general cargo, was destroyed by fire early on the 9th near Barnegat Inlet. No sailor left until the passengers had been placed in the boats, and not a life was lost.

—Another powder mill was exploded on the 12th, killing several men. It was the establishment of the Laffin & Rand Powder company, at Pompton Lakes, N. J. A New Jersey regiment of volunteers was on guard, and one of them was fatally injured. The explosion occurred in the smokeless powder department.

—A fire was discovered on the 6th in cotton in the hold of the Cunard

line steamer Catalonia; but owing to the coolness of the officers and the courage and discipline of the crew, the fire was extinguished and the vessel arrived safely at Queenstown on the 9th. The passengers were principally a school party of tourists from Boston.

—The complete official report of casualties at the two days' battle before Santiago, July 1 and 2, was made by Gen. Shafter on the 9th. It was as follows: Killed: 22 officers, 208 enlisted men; wounded: 81 officers, 1,203 enlisted men; missing: 79 enlisted men. No full publication has yet been made of the names of the killed, wounded and missing.

—The largest real estate sale ever made in Chicago was closed on the 9th. The lot of land at the southeast corner of State and Madison streets, was sold by Levi Z. Leiter to Marshall Field, for \$2,100,000. The sale was of the site alone—the area of which is 11,866½ feet—and by comparison with an appraisement made in 1896, indicates an increase in "unearned increment" since that time of \$319,150.

—United States Senator Richard Rollin Kenney, of Delaware, was put upon trial at Wilmington on the 11th, before the United States court, charged by indictment with aiding and abetting a national bank teller in embezzling from the bank. It is alleged that he drew checks upon the bank, in which he had no funds, and that the teller paid them, the money being used to further stock speculations in which they were jointly interested.

MISCELLANY

TO-DAY.

How like a mendicant To-day doth stand,
Pleading for alms by some frequented way!
Lordlier To-morrow heeds no outstretched hand,

And hastens not one whit, nor "yea" nor "nay"

Vouchsafes to give; and fairer Yesterday,
Tricked out in all the bravery of old Time,
Mocks at him, saying: "This, and this, was thine,"

With elfin laughter, sweet and far away.
Poor Day, so thwarted, baffled and betrayed,

Thy pittance feeds our future's swelling state!

Of this same stuff our yesterdays were made,

And on thy trembling movements hangs our fate.

Disowned king, how humbly thou dost sue,
When all life's kingdom is thy right and due!

—Ella F. Mosby.

JAMES BRYCE ON THE AMERICAN FUTURE.

From an interview with Henry George, Jr., published in the New York Journal.

I have confidence in the good sense of the American people, for the people not only feel in their veins the pulse of

youthful strength, but remember the magnitude of the evils they have vanquished, and see that they have already achieved many things which the old world has longed for in vain. And by so much as the people of the United States are more hopeful, by that much are they more healthy. They do not, like their forefathers, expect to attain their ideals either easily or soon; but they say that they will continue to strive toward them, and they say it with a note of confidence in the voice which rings in the ear of the European visitor and fills him with something of their own hopefulness. America has still a long vista of years stretching before her in which she will enjoy conditions more auspicious than England can count upon. And that America marks the highest level, not only of national well being, but of intelligence and happiness, which the race has yet attained, will be the judgment of those who look not at the favored few, for whose benefit the world seems hitherto to have framed its institutions, but at the whole body of the people.

USING AND ABUSING.

When we so use the world that it fails to minister to our spiritual nature we are abusing the world; when we so use the world that it ministers to our spiritual nature we are rightly using the world.

There are two very common abuses in our time, much the same in spirit, though in the outward manifestation very different; one is care, and the other luxury. There is a familiar proverb, It is not worth while to kill yourself to keep yourself—homely but useful. There are not a few men, and there are many women, who are killing themselves to keep themselves. Women will read this article who are wearing out their lives to keep house on a scale too great for their abilities, and endeavoring to justify themselves on the ground that they are doing it for the sake of their children and their husbands; who are destroying themselves to maintain spotlessness and order, or to maintain appearances equal to their neighbors; women who are housekeepers, and not homekeepers; women who are breaking themselves down and their children down and their husbands down by the sacrifice of their souls to material things. Men will read this article who are doing the same; men who can buy pictures but cannot enjoy them; libraries, and care not to read; all luxuries, and have brought on dyspepsia by their work, so that they cannot eat what is on their table. Our great cities are full of men who have de-

stroyed their lives in the mad endeavor to get things.

Care is the first abuse of things; luxury is the second. What is luxury? The luxury of yesterday is the comfort of to-day. Comfort for one person is luxury to another. Anything is legitimate comfort which ministers to the higher life; anything is illegitimate luxury which enervates and degrades the higher life.—The Outlook.

WHAT SHALL THE AMERICAN FLAG STAND FOR?

Mr. President, it is not merely the Hawaiian group which is involved in this disputation. Some suppose that the issue is thus limited. By no means. True, that object, and that alone, can be directly and at once accomplished; but there are other issues tied to this. I have heard it said here and elsewhere, and I have read it in this and that newspaper, that Hawaiian annexation must be considered alone; that its effect upon other questions is not proper for debate. On the other hand, almost each hour of the day the advocates of this annexation make use of expressions resembling this: "When once the American flag is raised anywhere, there it must forever float."

Mr. President, the American flag we revere and honor because it is not only the flag of our country, but because we believe that the government which it represents is based and acts upon principles of honor, upon maxims and policies which will stand the scrutiny of ages and remain untarnished and unquestioned when the strongest of us shall be summoned hence, when tyranny shall be driven from the earth.

Whether that flag should float or should be taken down depends upon whether it was raised in justice and maintained in righteousness. If miscreant schemer shall place it where it should not be placed; if the hand of the invader and spoliator shall seize it, and under it conduct a campaign of disorder and rapine, of oppression and robbery, it will not be for the honor of this republic or the glory of that flag that it shall continue to wave over such an accomplishment. Nay, that man is a patriot who will take it from the hand which held it for disgrace, who will return it to its true home, where it may float as the representative of progress and freedom; who will visit prompt and adequate penalty upon him who has insulted the emblem of a virtuous and Christian people. . . .

This is not the place, it seems to me, wherein to allude to the necessity of

maintaining the flag wherever it may be hoisted. This capital ought to be near the abode of justice. I trust we are not in barbarous days. If an officer of the United States plays the part of a usurper, does his illicit conduct bind this country? The United States ought to be the last of nations to sanction crimes committed under assumed powers untruly alleged to have been lawfully bestowed.

When senators state that they will never favor the withdrawal of our power from any locality where, in the midst of war or as the result of criminality or assumption, we may have taken possession and lifted our ensign, they make a broad assertion; and when that statement is uttered in this chamber, when it is made in this presence, it suggests a situation that extends far beyond Hawaii and to which we had well give heed. The doctrine contended for by some is almost piratical. — Hon. Stephen M White, of California, in the Senate, June 21.

SOCIETY AND THE BABY.

There was a Baby born; a brand new, fresh Baby, who didn't mean any harm, and came quite unintentionally.

Said Society to the Baby: You don't own that land—get off!

Said the Baby to Society: How absurd you are! I must have some land to sit on or I can't stay. You don't expect me to live in the water, do you?

Said Society to the Baby: It is immaterial to me where you live, or whether you live at all; but you can't stay on the face of the earth without paying for it. To sit or stand or walk or have your little grave in—you can't have any land without paying for it!

All right! said the Baby, briskly. It seems absurd to me, but I'm young yet. I'll pay with all my heart when I'm bigger. Just feed me well now, and when I'm grown I'll be a credit to you. The more you do for me now the more I'll do for you then—see? And I can pay back compound interest, for the work of a smart person is worth vastly more than his keep.

And the Baby opened his mouth in cheerful confidence.

But Society put dirt into it.

Child, said Society, you can't have food without paying for it!

But I must have food or I can't live! said the Baby. And the better the food the better for you when I'm bigger.

It is immaterial to me whether you

live or die, or how you live or die, said Society. You have got to pay for everything you get; and because you can't, your parents must!

Parents! echoed the Baby. What are they?

You young heathen, cried Society. Your parents have brought you into this world in accordance with inevitable laws of nature; this is an immense benefit to you, because the world is so pleasant, and, therefore, you should regard them with veneration, gratitude and love, no matter what kind of people they are, or what they do to you afterward.

To bring you into the world was a duty and a privilege to them, an honor and a benefit to you; therefore, you owe them obedience and devotion, but they owe me for your board and keep.

You don't seem to me to make that quite clear, said the Baby. It doesn't seem to hang together. You say it was by inevitable natural law that I came at all?

Yes, said Society.

They why should I owe them for doing what they ought to do, and couldn't help doing? And if it was what they ought to do and couldn't help doing, why should they pay you for it? asked the Baby.

You owe them for their affection, care and support, said Society.

But I have their affection, care and support, or I couldn't live, said Baby. I've a right to it.

I tell you it makes no difference to me whether you live or not, said Society.

Oh, come now! I know better than that, if I am young, said Baby. Who are you, anyway?

I am Society.

And what are you made of?

People, said Society, with some reluctance.

Aha, I thought so. And the better the people are the better you are—is that not so?

Yes, said Society, with even more reluctance.

And the people are all Babies first, aren't they? And the better the Babies are the better the people are, and the better you are! cried the Baby, who was beginning to take notice, and feeling his feet. Talk to me about parents! My business is with you, you old fossil! My parents are temporary guardians, but you and I are permanently connected. Why, you short-sighted ostrich! What hurts me hurts you, and what helps me helps you, and without me there wouldn't be any you! And there you sit and

plaster your wounds, and nurse your diseases, and fight your vices, and pretend you own the earth! You are a hollow, crack-brained, discrepant old riment! Be off with you, dodo! I'm Society, myself!

But Society, though on its last legs, was bigger than the Baby, and put more dirt in its mouth, and the Baby died.

But there are more Babies.—Charlotte Perkins Stetson, in *The New Californian*.

AN ARGUMENT FOR THE TAXATION OF FRANCHISES AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

In the memorial of the St. Louis Single Tax league figures are revived to which I invite the attention of the house. Referring to the eleventh census, that for 1890, it is found that the value of the gross product per capita for the employes engaged in the mechanical and manufacturing industries was \$2,204, and the average annual wage per employe was \$445. This latter statement I verify by citing the reports of the department of labor, volume 3, March, 1896.

I now call the attention of the house to the fact that from the census of 1890, referring to the distribution of wealth, the owners of privileges which controlled the natural rights in the public utilities and general privileges of the earth have an income per capita each of \$445 per day. Here we have the problem of distribution. The first, who creates the wealth by his labor, takes \$445 a year upon which to support his family and maintain existence. The second, who assumes the right to barter away the natural rights of the citizen in the fruits of the earth, takes \$445 per day. We have more than 22,000,000 people toiling for a living, but none of these are privileged to extract from the general wealth or to live upon the labor of their fellows. Upon the assumption of 74,000,000 people—which is the school census—as the inhabitants of the United States, upon the established figures, adopting Dr. Spahr and the latter declarations of Judge Shearman, author of *Taxation of Personal Property*, it has been clearly demonstrated that the great wealth of the country is controlled completely by 6,000,000 people.

This leaves us approximately the fact that 66,000,000 of our people live from day to day by the labor of their hands or of their heads. I include in this latter calculation the people dependent upon those who do so work. Now, the question confronts the fair and just man as follows: Assuming

to each the full result of their genius, their toil, and their investments, suppose we decline to add to those the free gift of the natural fruits of the earth out of which the especial few are permitted to tax the many for their enjoyment. Supposing we take these natural fruits, these natural products planted by the maker, and so distribute them that all of mankind may be beneficiaries proportionately. Would not that at once add a proportionate wealth to all of these 66,000,000, rescuing them from the burden and hardship of a grinding existence, while as to the amassed fortunes of the especial 6,000,000 it leaves them the enjoyment of such a proportionate fortune as it is clear gives to them more than they could expend within the divine statute of limitation to their lives? This only prohibits them from the attempt at handing down to their special heirs as free gifts those real gifts which God gave to all of us in common as the heirs of Heaven and the joint heirs of Christ. Is not this doctrine humane? Is not the birth of that the highest justice of which we ever speak, to wit, equal and exact justice to man?—Hon. J. Hamilton Lewis, of Washington, in the House, June 9.

THE RESULT OF THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT IN EDUCATION.

An extract from an address on "The Scientific Spirit of Education," delivered at the semi-centennial celebration of Iowa college, at Grinnell, Ia., June 20, 1898, by Prof. Jesse Macy, and published in *The Kingdom*.

The new education proposed to establish righteous relations among men. And now at the end of a hundred years there is more widespread sense of injustice than ever before. Never was there such an amount of rational, intelligent discontent as now. There is an increased knowledge of the process of injustice. There is an increased moral sense of the rights of the injured. Great as is the revolution accomplished in the enthronement of science, a greater remains yet to be accomplished. For thousands of years it has been known that men could be scientific, or truth-loving, while dealing with states of mind or subjective phenomena, but this sectarian truth could not regenerate society. Now it is discovered for the first time that millions of people can be truth-loving and truth-telling while dealing with material phenomena.

We may reasonably conclude that this sectarian material science will not of itself renovate the political world. To some minds the term scien-

tific spirit expresses a cold-blooded, heartless, unsympathetic state of mind. So far as sectarian material science is concerned it might easily fall into the hands of its old enemy, dogmatic tyranny. It is only during the temporary stage while science is in the process of rapid advancement that it is destructive to dogmatic teaching. The body of ascertained science yields itself to tyranny as readily as to righteousness. Already those who a little while ago would stone the prophets of science are beginning to garnish their tombs. The tyrant will seek to make science sectarian. He will build a wall between science and politics. He will teach, and he will honestly believe that all that civilization holds dear would be destroyed if men should seriously apply the scientific method to politics. The perpetrators of industrial and political injustice are naturally sensitive about a proposition to remove from industry and politics all lying, all prejudice, all disposition to believe according to one's own interests and to substitute a disposition to believe only according to truth. Of one thing we may be sure. The triumph of science will not leave the political world as it was before. Science has multiplied many fold the brute force of man. If this force is not utilized for the liberation of the victims of injustice it will be utilized in strengthening their chains.

The triumph of science is a day of judgment for church and state. The Christian who stands in the place of the martyrs and saints who have looked for a righteous state has now an opportunity denied to all former generations. There are now millions of people trained to a habit of conscientious mental integrity while dealing with a large body of external phenomena. In view of this new vantage ground, the intelligent Christian who does not prevalently seek to carry this same spirit into all industrial and social life will become a self-condemned hypocrite. With the advent of science the intelligent Christian loses the power to maintain a position of moral integrity in merely subjective mental states of mind. Science has furnished the means for putting subjective Christianity to an objective test. After this day of judgment we have no farther use for the old-fashioned type of merely sectarian, subjective Christianity. It becomes nonexistent. In fact, there never was any Christianity which did not seek objective expression. And the man of material science who has learned to have all regard for the

truth in a wide range of experience will become a more brutal creature than he would otherwise be if he does not prevalently seek to carry the truth into all human relations.

THE PHILIPPINES PROBLEM.

Extracts from a special dispatch from Washington to the New York Evening Post, under date of July 2.

Little has yet been heard here of the settlement of the anticipated Philippine problem, by turning the government over to the natives and guaranteeing their independence, and yet many persons think that the proper course for the United States to take. This is generally the plan advocated by democratic congressmen of a philosophic turn of mind. Freedom and self-government for the greatest number of the peoples of the world, they declare, are the true ideals of democracy, and certainly the rankest imperialist should not dismiss this plan from consideration without giving the arguments in its behalf a careful hearing.

Among the intelligent advocates of this idea is Representative John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, who is one of the most highly educated men in congress.

"What would you do with the Philippine islands?" I asked Mr. Williams.

"Why not leave to the natives of the islands the poor boon of self-government and independence? The country is theirs; they had our full sympathy in their contest against Spanish tyranny. Why should we at the last moment deprive them of the most sacred right of mankind, the right to govern themselves? Aguinaldo and his followers have demonstrated that they are very far from being savages, as reputed. They have shown a capacity for organization, concentration, disciplined movements, and self-control which, while it may not come up to the full standard of the English-speaking races, shows them at least superior to the Spaniards who have hitherto held control of the islands."

"Might they not misgovern themselves?"

"So might we, so might the people of France, of old Spain, of Honduras, of Venezuela, or of San Domingo. In fact, so do many of these peoples all the time. God has not made His agents upon earth to encircle it with armies and navies for the purpose of preventing peoples from misgoverning themselves. From the Spaniard's point of view our whole theory is a misgovernment—a government independent of the church, a 'constitution without

God in it.' From our standpoint the Spaniard's objection is the objection of a mediæval and feudal fool, and yet I doubt not his objection to our 'godlessness' seems as rational to him as the theory is dear to me of a 'separation of the church and state.'"

"Might not these islands lapse into a state of anarchy?"

"How do we know they will? No man can learn to walk unless you let him try to walk; no people can learn to use and not abuse self-government unless you let them try self-government. But suppose they should 'lapse into anarchy' or into what we might deem anarchy? When did God or nature give us a globe-trotting commission as 'anarchy forestallers?' Shall we not be busy enough if we ward off the possibility of anarchy coming in our own national vineyard? Why could we not at the end of this war recognize a government established by Aguinaldo and his companions in arms as the rightful government of the Philippine islands, or, at any rate, of the main island upon which the city of Manila is situated? And why would it not be perfectly easy to enter into a treaty with that government, to which not only we might be parties, but England and Japan and Germany and Russia, mutually covenanting for the independence of the islands, and receiving in return therefor, not for ourselves alone, but for the whole civilized world, the boon of free ports and of approximately, if not completely, free and untaxed entry of goods?"

THE NEW CAPITAL OF CHINA.

The place selected for the new capital is not the one of which Europeans have thought, viz., Nankin, which is the center of Chinese as opposed to Tartar feeling, but Singan, in the province of Shensi, the ancient capital, which was also selected during the Japanese war. Singan is a great fortified city, with old palaces in it, capable of easy defense, and is exposed to influences rather Mongolian than Chinese. It is 700 miles from Peking, 900 miles from the more southern coasts, is protected on the south and east by a chain of hills, and on the north and west by the Hoangho, and is backed by the wildest portion of the great Mongolian steppe, which can be traversed only by Tartar caravans, and by them with exceeding difficulty. Singan is hundreds of miles from the Russian frontier. It affords, therefore, the safest of retreats for the court, which once seated there will be to a great extent exempted from pressure, whether coming from the coast or

from Russia; while as regards the general government of China, Singan is at least as central as Peking. The new capital will allow the court to retreat in an emergency either into Tibet or Mongolia, whither it could hardly be followed, and its situation may make it possible to raise an army of hardier men than those now called soldiers, men who will actually fight, and whom if they are well armed, fairly drilled, and supported by the desert cavalry, it may be a task of some difficulty to subdue. The Chinese emperors had such a force at their disposal once, and rotten as everything in China has become, it is by no means certain that if the court were only relieved of the incessant pressure put upon Peking by its accessibility to any sea-borne or rail-borne force, they could not gather a force for their defense which would have some reality. With 50,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry and a force of light and mobile artillery at the disposal of Singan, it would be a serious enterprise for any power to push invasion up to the gates of the new sacred city, the mere cost of such a movement being too great for any power except England and America, and great even for them unless the object were of the first importance.

The abandonment of Peking will then be injurious to European influence on China? That depends. It may be taken as certain that this will be the object of the court in making so great a change, and in certain respects that object will in all probability be realized. The menacing importance of Port Arthur, of Wei-hai-wei, of Kiao-chow and of the Japanese ports will be decidedly diminished. Neither St. Petersburg, London, Berlin nor Tokio will be able to squeeze the central power with as much ease as at present, for to reach Singan they must move armies over nearly 1,000 miles through a hostile country, which, even if it refused to fight, might render the collection of supplies intolerably costly. It is possible even, if the emperors build fortifications and use the spade wisely, that reaching Singan may be made impracticable, and that the court, feeling safe, may venture once more obstinately to refuse all European demands, just as well as unjust. If the dynasty suddenly produced a man competent to govern, or if a new and better set of mandarins grew up round the throne, this would be the result, and the fall of China might be postponed for a century; but events may also go in a very different way. The safety in which the descendants of Timour lived at Delhi

did not save India from being conquered. The emperor at Singan will have no more power over his great viceroys, unless, indeed, he can create a mobile army, than he has at Peking; and we should suspect that it is at this point that the joint in his armor will be found. The European powers, finding representations made at Singan utterly useless, will whenever a difficulty occurs negotiate, as they did in India, with individual viceroys; will treat them as they did in India, as if they were independent princes; and will disregard the fact that their concessions are legally of no value.—The London Spectator.

THE GREAT FAIR AT OMAHA.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by Henry Wysham Lanier, published in the Review of Reviews for July.

It has been less than a century since the great Louisiana territory, stretching from the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean, came into our possession, and there were many thousands of people then who thought the "Great American desert" but a poor equivalent for the millions paid to France for it. The name of Omaha commemorates the aboriginal owners of this particular locality (whose Chief Blackbird is so renowned in Indian history), and 50 years ago the savages hunted buffalo where now rise the great white buildings devoted to the arts, sciences and industries that have attained such ample growth within the recollection of many men still living. Not till 1845 was the first white settlement made, and the Mormons who then came under the leadership of Brigham Young left two years later for Utah. In 1854 a number of pioneers located here, and their rude cabins were the first permanent residences of the whites in Nebraska. Soon designated as the territorial capital, the young city entered at once upon the career of steady growth of which the exposition is at once the official sign and the culmination.

It is not difficult to understand the absolute self-confidence, the instinct of doing a thing entirely without regard to the "impossibilities" which marks all this region, when one realizes that there are dozens of men working for the success of this exposition who have watched Omaha grow around them from a collection of log cabins in 1854 to a city of 16,000 people in 1870, to 30,000 in 1880, and to 140,000 in 1890; who have seen the "Great American desert" transformed into a vast farming region with hundreds of towns and cities; who have assisted in promulgating through their exposition

the fact that to-day the "west" in the old sense no longer exists; for Omaha, which has seemed to dwellers on the Atlantic even further away than San Francisco, is almost exactly half way between Eastport, Me., and Cape Flattery—in the very center of our country. It seems destined from its location to become the metropolis of the great plains lying between the Mississippi and the Rockies—and what this means the citizens have endeavored to set before the world in the exhibition that opened on June 1 with impressive functions which President McKinley and many other dignitaries, besides 100,000 visitors, helped to render memorable.

The grounds occupy about 200 acres of land, forming a great L, one side of which stretches along the "Bluff tract." From this portion the visitor has a noble view up and down the valley of the Missouri and out across the superb sweep of plain as far as the Iowa bluffs. Here are the state buildings, the concessions, and the like. Stretching back from this river strip and connected with it by a viaduct is what is known as Kountze park, admirably adapted to the more pretentious architectural structures flanking the main court, and forming altogether a most attractive setting for the monuments of human ingenuity which dot its surface. The whole is a scant two miles from the heart of Omaha, the scores of tramways and railroads whirling visitors thither in ten or fifteen minutes.

Indeed, the promoters of the enterprise have been influenced throughout by the belief that concentration was essential to the success of their plan. Not only is it close to the city, but the buildings themselves are more accessible than were those at Chicago. The magnificent but utterly exhausting distances have been abandoned, so that it is really possible for a stranger to grasp much more of the vital idea of the exposition, to get with a reasonable expenditure of effort what it is designed to give—a comprehensive summing up of the progress and resources of the trans-Mississippi states.

The general plan of the main exhibition building is novel and very effective. The Grand canal stretches in the center for nearly half a mile, spanned by several picturesque bridges, with an island in the center, and forming, with the broad esplanades, a central court around which are grouped the buildings devoted to the United States government, agriculture, mines, machinery, art, liberal arts, manufactures, and the auditorium, as well as the administration arch and the arch of the

states. All these edifices are connected by continuous promenades of vine-shaded columns, much after the fashion of the Pompeians, and offering a really charming walk from one attraction to another. The design, grouping and color scheme are all thoroughly original. The buildings are all tinted to the hue of old ivory, the staff work being carefully colored to the exact shade, and the sculptures and carvings, the porticos, columns, bas-reliefs and pedestaled lions all harmonize in one great scheme of color and design.

The entrance to this court is through the Arch of the States, whose 24 courses of stone come one from each of the trans-Mississippi states and territories, Nebraska stone also providing a foundation. These states also display their coats-of-arms in color on a broad frieze of arches in double arcade, and above the whole on the surmounting parapet is the great shield and golden eagle of the United States. The arch will make a fitting memorial of the exposition when the latter's course is run, and will form the future entrance to Kountze park.

Immediately opposite this entrance is the Administration Arch, and to the left, at the extreme western end of the court, rises the Government building. The center of its three sections is capped by a colossal gilt dome bearing a reproduction of the Bartholdi statue of Liberty, whose electric torch is held 178 feet above the ground. This structure's 500 feet of length incloses a floor space of 50,000 square feet, over which is spread a collection of exhibits never before equaled by the central government. Not only are the functions and the administrative powers in war and peace amply demonstrated, but the work of every department is skillfully presented. What is being done by the laborers in the state, treasury, war, navy, post office, interior, judicial and agricultural branches; the achievements of the fish commission, the Smithsonian, the patent office, the geological survey, the Indian bureau and the bureau of education are all spread out for the public to view. A series of special commemorative postage stamps, bearing typical designs ranging from a representation of Pere Marquette on the Mississippi to a modern harvesting scene in the farming regions of the great northwest, will especially interest philatelists.

Broad steps lined with sculptures lead down from this Ionic pile to the Mirrors, as this portion of the lake is called. A noble fountain and many other artistic features, as well as the

surrounding park, the pleasure boats, the waterfowl, and the aquatic festivities, will undoubtedly combine to make this one of the most frequented portions of the grounds.

"CONVERTED LINERS" OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Converted merchant vessels and yachts are making a strong showing in this war. No other four vessels in the navy seem to have been in so many places and done so many things as the four Atlantic liners, the St. Louis, the St. Paul, the Harvard and the Yale. They are always popping up in some new place on some useful mission. And the converted yacht Gloucester appears to have done the impossible in the great naval battle of Santiago.

But this is not the first time that merchant ships have done good service in a fleet operating against Spain. The Great Round World of July 7th gives an interesting account of "Our Fight with the Spaniards in 1587"—and by "our" they mean English, for we were of the English in those days.

In April of that year Sir Francis Drake sailed for Cadiz, and "with very small losse not worth the mentioning," destroyed "100 saile of barks," and, as he put it, "singed the beard of the King of Spain." The quaint old chronicler, Richard Hakluyt, describes the ships of Drake's fleet which were taken from the royal navy, and then says: "There were also added unto this Fleete certaine tall ships of the Citie of London of whose especial good service the Generall made particular mention in his private Letters directed to her Maiestre."

We ought to cultivate the unpremeditated and surprise ourselves with planless enjoyment. The things done on impulse are often divine. I remember a little boy who stopped in his play and thought:

"I want to go visiting to my old uncle's. The sun shines, and the grass smells good. I want to hear the hens cackling in his barnyard, and to eat one of the delicious dinners my old aunt gives us when we go there."

He left his playthings on the lawn and went to his mother. She had some fresh, crisp clothes airing on a chair, and said to him:

"I was just going to call you."

"I want to go to my uncle's to spend the day," said the little boy.

"We are going there," she answered. "You must be dressed."

It was as perfect as a fairy story. That is the way things must happen in paradise, and would happen in the world if we had not made for ourselves

cast iron systems.—Chicago Evening Post.

Military signaling is of exclusively modern development. The importance of accurate and speedy communication between a commander and the different portions of his army has been recognized from the most ancient times, and it was soon perceived, in the words of the great Napoleon, that "the secret of war is in the secret of communication." Aides, scouts, couriers, these performed the functions of communication, until an American, Albert James Myer, of the medical department, United States army, evolved a system of intercommunication, which he afterwards elaborated into the code of military signaling now in use, with modifications, in all the armies of the world.—L. E. Van Norman, in *The Outlook*.

Civil reform does not mean either moral or spiritual reform. Civil life is man's associate life for self-preservation, its motives being desire for prosperity and fear of adversity. The aim of Providence through the human prudence of civil life is not directly to make men spiritual, but to furnish a place where they can be made spiritual—to remove by civil reform some obstruction to men's freedom and activity. Civil reform is exclusively the reform of conditions. To object that it is not identical with either moral reformation or spiritual regeneration, is to find fault with it for not being something else than it properly is.—Rev. S. C. Eby, in *New Church Messenger*.

Senor Pi y Margall, a prominent Spanish politician, said in a recent article in his newspaper:

The country has been deceived, for heretofore the United States has been represented to be merely a nation of merchants, unfit for war, incapable of standing a long struggle, lacking a navy, and imbued only with greed for gold. It was concealed from us that this nation had fought two wars with Great Britain, one with Mexico, and also the civil war in 1861, which gave liberty to the slaves. The power and strength of that nation have been hidden from our people, as well as our own weakness.

—Public Opinion.

In the present undertaking we are merely doing a piece of that very sort of international police work that would have to fall to somebody's lot, even if the schemes of all the peace lovers of our time and of past generations were put into practice. It is anything but easy or pleasant to render the world these services that require the exercise of force; but it is far more noble and wholesome to face such duties, and to perform them,

than to shirk them under the false and cowardly excuse that we love peace. Let us hope that we understand ourselves, and that indeed it is precisely because we love peace, and because it is our providential duty to maintain peace, that we have entered upon the task of establishing permanent peace in Cuba.—Dr. Albert Shaw, at the Iowa College Semi-Centennial Celebration.

To a company of enthusiastic Wordsworthians who were deploring their master's confession that he got drunk at Cambridge, Mr. Shorthouse, the accomplished author of "John Inglesant," soothingly remarked that in all probability "Wordsworth's standard of intoxication was miserably low."—"Collections and Recollections," by George Russell.

Farmer—"That was a good number of the Tooter you got out last week." Country Editor—"I am glad to hear that you were pleased with it." Farmer—"Them stories you had in about them fellers bein' cured of long-standin' diseases were the entertainingest bits of news I've read for a long while."—Auckland (New Zealand) Weekly News.

No consecrated absurdity would have stood its ground in this world, if the man had not silenced the objection of the child.—Michelet.

We can't take our money with us when we die; but some of us give it to a church and get a letter of credit.—Puck.

THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico; elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,
Schiffel Building, Chicago, Ill.**

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 316
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.