

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1898.

Number 16.

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.

Now that we have taken Santiago, what of it? If Spain makes terms of peace, it will not be because she has lost Santiago, but because she has lost her navy. It is true, of course, that Cervera forced Santiago upon us as a necessary point of attack, by rushing his squadron into that harbor. We were compelled to attack Santiago because it sheltered Cervera. Otherwise Santiago would have been of no importance to us. It was not, and is not, a key to the situation in Cuba. The key to the situation there is now, as it was at the beginning, the city of Havana. To take that is to take Cuba. To take that is to drive Spain out of the West Indies. To take that is to end the war. Why then was not Havana instead of Santiago attacked before Cervera's squadron got into West Indian waters? Gen. Lee, when he left Havana, said the city could be taken, in its then comparatively defenseless condition, within five days. That was a full month before Cervera's fleet arrived. But the attempt was not made, and now, with Santiago in our hands, we are as far removed from the capture of Havana as ever. We are even farther removed, for Havana has been thoroughly fortified meanwhile, and Santiago affords no better base for attack than Florida did.

Whether Gen. Miles ever becomes lieutenant general is a small matter in comparison with the respect of the American people which he has earned by his generous conduct towards Gen. Shafter in connection with the surrender of Santiago. To a smaller man, the temptation to take command

and reap the military honors incident to the surrender would have been great and probably irresistible. Miles was Shafter's superior; he came upon the ground before Toral was ready to submit; he brought orders fresh from Washington, and he was in every other respect in excellent position to assume command. But if he was for a moment tempted to do so, he restrained himself. By doing that, he at once won popular respect and proved himself worthy of it.

The contrast between Gen. Miles's behavior toward Shafter, and Admiral Sampson's toward Schley is striking. Sampson's opportunity was pretty much the same as Miles's. It was rather better. Sampson, it will be remembered, is only a captain; but pursuant to the policy of favoritism which has disgraced the management of the war at Washington, he was, without reason and upon the flimsiest of pretexts, early raised in temporary rank above all his superiors, including Schley. But the fortunes of war did not favor him as the fortunes of politics had done. While he was watching Cervera in the region of the Virgin islands, Schley was bottling up that suave Spaniard in Santiago bay. Then Sampson came to Santiago and virtually reduced Com. Schley to a captaincy by taking command of the fleet. But the critical moment, when Cervera was slipping out of the harbor, found Sampson far off to the east on his way to a conference with Shafter, and gave to Schley the coveted opportunity to secure the prize of Cervera's fleet. Sampson had not been derelict. Though absent from the mouth of the bay, he was attending strictly to his duty. No possible blame could have attached to him; and though his temporary subordinate Schley won the honor of destroying the enemy's fleet, everybody

would have looked upon Sampson as justly entitled, as the commanding officer, to share the honor, had he been generous about reporting it, as Miles was with Shafter. Everybody would have felt moreover that he was to be more than forgiven for being a favorite of the political powers. But Sampson wanted to appropriate the credit which justly belonged to Schley. So he telegraphed to Washington a report which for two or three days left the public to suppose that the victory Schley's alertness and commanding skill had won, was all Sampson's own. It was he, according to his report—he and his fleet—that gave the American people the destruction of the Spanish fleet for a Fourth of July present. Schley, who had really directed the work, was unnamed; and by Sampson he remains unnamed to this day. The contrast between this behavior and that of Miles, calls for candid consideration.

Senator Teller has told a Chicago reporter that in his opinion "there is no more reason why a republic is not qualified to maintain colonies than a monarchy." But that point no one has disputed. Of the qualifications of the United States to maintain a colonial system there is no doubt. The real question is, in the first place, the moral right of a republic to assume the relation of a monarchy to peoples beyond its borders; and, in the second, the reactionary effect of such a policy upon the republic itself. The Roman republic was qualified to maintain colonies, and it did maintain them; but the Roman republic degenerated and became an empire. Are the American people ambitious to have their republic follow in the footsteps of the dead and buried republic of Rome?

Mr. Teller further says, in the same interview, that during all our history we have maintained colonies; and he points to our "territorial organization as a colonial one." Here he loses sight of the essential difference between a colony and what we call a territory. Our territorial system is republican, not colonial. What are our territories, what have they ever been, but what the name implies—territory, mere territory? They are denied statehood only while their populations are sparse. As soon as our territories have become populous enough to claim statehood, they have been taken into the union. Meantime such sparse population as they have had has been secured a full measure of self-government. Our territorial system has been republican. Something very different is a colony. That term, too, is significant. As it implies, a colony is more than mere territory; it is a community to which self-government is denied, within territory which it is never intended to admit to statehood. The difference between one of our territories and a colony is analogous to the difference between a young American citizen who upon coming of age acquires all the rights of citizenship, and an old-time slave who could never grow out of his status. What the imperialists propose to do is not to acquire mere territory, but to acquire dominion over communities which, already populous enough for statehood, are nevertheless to be held forever in subjection to federal laws in the enactment of which they are to have no voice.

It is only fair to Senator Teller to say, however, that he is not in sympathy with the colonial system. He declares himself, in the same interview, as being in favor of establishing local self-government both in Cuba and in the Philippines.

The underlying purpose of the colonization idea, the animating motive of this new imperialism that confronts us, was incautiously ex-

pressed by a New York promoter whom an omnipresent Chicago reporter caught "on the fly" for an interview. S. Fredericks is the name of the gentleman from New York, and as a promoter he knows well enough what he is talking about. His theme is the Philippine islands; his ambition, to interest capital in Philippine investments. Eloquently he describes the marvelous richness of those islands in "natural resources," and right acutely does he calculate the rich profits they would yield "under such stable governmental conditions as would be insured by American control." It is the "natural resources" that our imperialistic friends are after. With a colonial system under which, as the imperialistic press enthusiastically assures us, congress would exercise absolute control, what rich pickings would not Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines offer to American investors in "natural resources?" We should soon make of those hapless islands what England made of Ireland.

Nor would "natural resources" be the only pickings. Already it appears that a far-seeing little clique in Mark Hanna's bailiwick of Cleveland, O., has procured a charter for the "First national bank of the Philippines;" and if the United States were to appropriate those islands it would not be long before we should find congress making corporation charters and creating monopoly franchises at a startling rate. A seat in congress would then be worth more, "on the side," than a seat in the Illinois legislature or the Chicago board of aldermen during a Yerkes session.

The text of the speech made on the 4th of July at Leipsic by our ambassador to Germany, Andrew D. White, has just reached this country. It was well calculated to allay the prejudice which certain interests were working up in Germany against the United States, in connection with the war with Spain; and not the least composing part of it was that in which

Mr. White said: "Whether others know it or not, the men governing Germany know . . . that our motive in entering the war was not to grasp new territory." But suppose the imperialists should succeed, what then could Mr. White say? Could he explain that while that was not our motive in entering the war, the events of the war had made it necessary? Such an explanation is not to be thought of; Mr. White is no pettifogger. But what could he say? Could he do less than apologize for his 4th of July speech, admitting that those Germans were right who had believed that whatever our professions might be, our purpose in going to war was to grasp new territory?

The Chicago Times-Herald, which often displays profound wisdom in discussing subjects about which it has thought little and knows less, speaks owlishly of an astonishing demand which is to come up out of Asia as the result of our imperial policy. It is to be a demand for "things which labor alone cannot produce." Now the Times-Herald does not mean raw material; yet raw material is the only thing outside of man himself which human labor, and that alone, does not produce. We suppose that things produced by machinery were in the mind of the Times-Herald writer. It is a common notion that when labor uses machinery the products are not produced by labor alone; that machinery is a partner. This is one of the root fallacies of socialism. It is a fallacy of the most misleading type. For labor not only uses all machinery; it also produces all machinery. There is nothing for exportation either to Asia or elsewhere, except the rawest of raw material, actual territory—and that is non-exportable,—which is not produced by labor, and by labor alone.

Out of all the clamor for colonization and empire, Gov. Altgeld's voice rang true at the Illinois democratic convention. In a masterly speech in which on one hand he advocated the expansion of the American ideal

of republican government, he on the other hand warned his party against "those wild schemes of conquest and plunder which contemplate the establishment of a colonial empire." For the democratic motto he advocated: "The natural development and supremacy of this continent, but opposition to spoliation and conquest."

Gov. Altgeld also prescribed on this occasion a test of party loyalty which the democratic party has long needed, pestered as it is with parasites who, capturing democratic conventions, promote their nefarious schemes by appeals to the sense of party loyalty. It is a fundamental democratic principle, said Altgeld, that "no party can compel a man to support a criminal for office." He therefore urged his followers, in every case in which a man regarded by the public as a boodler forces himself upon the democratic ticket, to make an independent democratic nomination, so that the democrats may have an opportunity to say at the polls whether they want such a man to represent them or not. Thus Gov. Altgeld makes a genuine distinction between loyalty to party, and submission to knavery. Party loyalty is sound doctrine. It is right that the members of a party should support their regularly nominated party candidate. The man who brags of scratching his ballot without just cause, brags of treachery. When the candidates of a party are fairly nominated, are honest men, and are honestly representative of the party principles, it is a political duty of all the members of their party to support them. But if the candidate does not stand for the principles of his party—if he is really in sympathy with the opposing party,—or if he has secured his nomination by means of fraud, or if he is a boodler, it is as much the political duty of the members of the party to defeat him if possible, as otherwise it would be to support him. Better that the candidates of opposition parties tem-

porarily succeed, than that one's own party should be discredited and demoralized by treachery or internal rottenness.

The state convention before which Gov. Altgeld spoke, acting probably under Altgeld's influence—if not directly, then indirectly, through the Jeffersonian democratic spirit which he has revived in the state of Illinois—made a pronounced declaration against the private ownership of monopolies. It was nothing less than a demand for "municipal ownership and control of all public franchises and all other natural monopolies, which of right belong to the people." This demand is more radical and far reaching than was probably intended by some of the men who agreed to it. To street car systems, there can be no doubt of its deliberate application. It binds the democratic party of Illinois to put an end to the swindling and corrupting system of street car franchises, and to substitute for it the system which has been introduced so satisfactorily in England and Australasia, that of municipal ownership. But it goes farther. In principle, at any rate, it calls for the establishment of publicly owned railroads, telegraphs and telephones. Nor would that mark the limit of its application. What are we to understand by "natural monopolies which of right belong to the people?" This certainly includes more than street car lines, railways and telegraphs. It includes every "monopoly which of right belongs to the people;" and most important among these—most important because it is the mother of all other monopolies and would make monopoly flourish in all its vigor though every other form of monopoly were abolished—is monopoly of land. The Illinois democratic platform of 1898 therefore lays down the principle, to which it pledges the party, that private monopoly of land shall cease. By what particular method this monopoly is to be supplanted the platform does not state. Nor was it nec-

essary to do so. But the principle for which Henry George contended is there distinctly asserted.

In nominating James G. Maguire for governor, the populists of California have shown good judgment. He is a candidate for the democratic nomination, and this action of the populists probably guarantees a union of the truly democratic forces at the California election. Upon no better candidate could the two parties concentrate. They could not concentrate upon another so good. James G. Maguire is a prominent lawyer of San Francisco. A blacksmith by trade, he worked his own way to the bar, where he made a record that put him upon the superior court bench when he was not yet thirty years of age. After serving with distinction as a judge till the end of his term, he contested his district as a democrat for a seat in congress. It was supposed that his prominence as a follower of Henry George, whose personal friend and pronounced disciple he had been for years, would lose him the election. On the contrary it won him a triumph in a district which straight-out democrats had been unable to carry. Once elected to congress, Maguire was returned again and again. The people of his district had found in him a consistent, unpurchaseable, and able adversary of the railroad monopolies which are a curse to California. It was a novel sensation, and they enjoyed it. Because of his record in congress, Maguire is now the most popular man in the golden state. His gubernatorial campaign, if the democratic convention does not fall a prey to railroad corruption funds and defeat his nomination, will be a battle royal of sterling democracy against monopoly pirates of the purest breed.

The secretary of the treasury has been reported as saying that the over-subscription to the national loan is a good sign of prosperity. Does Mr. Gage really believe that? Is it possible that he ever said it? How can he or anyone else infer that we are in prosperous times because people

rush for a chance to invest in three per cent. bonds? Three per cent. is not a prosperity rate of interest. This over-subscription must be due either to disinterested and self-sacrificing patriotism, or to a condition of times so bad that three per cent. seems like a boon to investors. And who believes that it is self-sacrificing patriotism? Not the investors, certainly. They would withdraw their bids instantly if English bonds were offered at five per cent., and no single one of them doubts it.

Assistant Secretary Vanderbilt, of the treasury, unconsciously gives the patriotism theory of bond-buying a blow, when he enthusiastically exclaims that "for every volunteer soldier we have in the field, two citizens have come forward with offers of financial aid, and the army of subscribers to this loan would be twice the size of the volunteer army in the field." It is a discreet sort of patriotism that enlists in the army of investors with a three per cent. interest rate, in preference to the army in the field, with a ten per cent. casualty rate.

The war department has begun in Cuba an experiment of extraordinary interest and magnitude. It involves nothing less than the integrity of Gresham's famous currency law. According to Gresham's law, inferior currency will always drive superior currency out of a country. The two cannot circulate together; and contrary to the rule which holds as to everything else, the weaker survives. This Gresham law was often invoked, it will be remembered, during the presidential campaign of 1896. We were assured at that time, in behalf of the presidential aspirations of the present commander in chief, under whose authority the financial experiment in Cuba is to be tried, that silver dollars being worth less, dollar for dollar, than gold dollars, would, if freely coined, drive gold dollars out of circulation and degrade our whole financial system to a silver basis. In support of that proposition Gresham's law was

learnedly, not to say loftily, quoted. We were assured that with free coinage of silver and gold at 16 to 1, the silver would depreciate, and that under Gresham's law, depreciated silver dollars would drive sound gold dollars out of circulation. The present McKinley administration, before it was an administration but was trying to be one, made that argument, over and over again. But it seems, after all, that the McKinley administration hasn't much confidence in Gresham's law. In the experiment mentioned above, to be made in Cuba by the war department, it is proposed to demonstrate the unsoundness of that law by driving out of Cuba a depreciated currency with a sound currency.

This is no joke. Nearly a million dollars in American gold and silver, mostly gold, has been sent to Cuba for the purpose of paying off the soldiers there. The idea is to be credited to Paymaster General Stanton, one of whose subordinates at Washington, Major Fishback, explained it to a reporter on the 18th, as follows:

The purpose is to introduce the American money in Cuba. General Stanton was of the impression that it would be an excellent idea to drive out the Spanish depreciated currency at the same time that the Spanish soldiers are driven out. With a stable currency on the island the plan to establish a stable government would be greatly facilitated. The time to begin, he contended, was at the beginning. The force of his argument was appreciated by the administration and he was given his way. The scheme is to put out of circulation altogether in Santiago Province the Spanish money, both coin and paper. By the introduction of nearly a million dollars in American coin into Santiago Province in one payment General Stanton believes that our money can at once be made the standard of value.

This experiment will be watched with interest. If the McKinley administration, which is indebted to Gresham's law for its election, can demonstrate by this financial experiment in Cuba, that Gresham's law is a mere electioneering sham, the McKinley administration will not have been

ellected wholly in vain. For ourselves, we still cherish a lingering respect for Gresham's law—a superstitious respect, if you please,—but we shall observe the effect of the administration's assault upon it with the utmost interest. If good American coin can be made to drive depreciated Spanish currency out of Cuba, a new chapter will have been contributed to the history and philosophy of finance.

Of the inner meaning of the New York "force bill" there cannot be two opinions; if it is not a bull to say so, its inner meaning lies upon the surface. This "force bill" is an election law, contrived by Tom Platt, whom the republicans of New York justly denounce as a political partner of Croker, the Tammany boss, and it places the absolute control of New York city elections under a state board appointed by Mr. Platt's gubernatorial protegee. To appreciate the animus of the new law, it is only necessary to note that the state board which is to control New York city elections has no jurisdiction outside of that city except over a very limited territory, which has been included so as to give color of legitimacy to the bill. The pretended excuse for the bill is the alleged necessity of curbing election frauds by Tammany hall. But the idea of the Platt machine as a moral censor of the Tammany machine is ludicrous. The real object of the law is to enable Platt to compel Croker to make election bargains and carry them out, under threats of being made the victim of worse election frauds than Tammany has either the power or the inclination to perpetrate.

It is gratifying to see that prince of statistical humbuggery—Carroll D. Wright—brought to task by a man who understands the statistical trade. Wright poses as a labor statistician who finds by addition, division, silence, etc., that the condition of the workingman is improving. His rea-

soning is so absurd that one needs to know nothing of statistics to expose him. But the exposure is so much more circumstantial when made by statistical experts. For one exposure some years ago we are indebted to Frederick C. Waite, of the department of agriculture. It was in connection with the misleading Aldrich committee's report on prices and wages. Another exposure has been made more recently by H. L. Bliss, of Chicago, in the American Journal of Sociology. His last article appears in the July number. It is impossible to summarize Mr. Bliss's exposure briefly, he having already condensed it almost to the limits of condensation, but it will be sufficient to say that Bliss, like Waite, confirms the inference which Wright's pretentious magazine articles have given rise to, that his sociological conclusions are worthless.

A former judge at Buffalo is trying to bring influence to bear upon the next legislature of New York to abolish the old-time practice still prevailing among the judges of that state, of "charging the jury," in a verdict-making speech. He proposes the substitution of the Illinois practice of confining the instructions of judges in cases on trial before them to statements of the law, made in writing. If this reform goes through, it will be a great relief to the bar of New York. So much abuse has the practice of delivering "charges" suffered in that state, that most cases are understood to depend more upon the judge than the jury. A bright judge can secure almost any kind of verdict he wants. Nor can appellate courts afford relief against the worst abuses of the system. Of one New York judge it used to be said that stenographic notes were not enough to carry his "charges" properly before the higher court. A camera and a phonograph were needed besides. He has been known to state the law of a case to a jury with such verbal accuracy that no flaw appeared in the record, and yet with intonations of the voice and shrugs of the shoulder

and smirks of the face, so significant as to falsify his words. For the sake of a better administration of the law everywhere, and for the further removal of temptation from judges to become advocates, to say nothing of the rights of New York litigants, it is to be hoped that the Buffalo ex-judge may be successful in his efforts to abolish a practice which, in the name of justice, lends itself to such outrages upon justice.

We told briefly last week of the largest real estate sale in the city of Chicago. A lot of land not much more than a quarter of an acre in extent—11,866½ square feet, to be exact—located at the corner of State and Madison streets, was sold by Levi Z. Leiter to Marshall Field, for \$2,100,000. This was for the lot alone, the value of the improvements not entering into the price. Subsequently it appeared that just before closing this sale, Mr. Leiter had leased the lot for 99 years to Schlessinger & Mayer, at an annual ground rent of \$112,000. The rental shows that Field bought the property at a low price. If ground rent be taken as five per cent. of selling value, the selling value of this lot would be \$2,240,000—\$140,000 in excess of what Field paid. But five per cent. is more than gilt edge investments are worth; and as capital is rushing to buy bonds at three per cent., it would not be unfair to estimate ground rent as three per cent. of true value, which would make the true value of the property in question about \$3,733,333.

Now, it is an important question, since Field, Leiter, and Schlessinger & Mayer are dealing with this great value as if it were theirs, to decide to whom it in justice belongs. Nearly four million dollars is not such a trifle that its honest ownership may be ignored. Neither is the ground rental upon which it is calculated, namely \$112,000 a year. Does that rental belong to Leiter. Of course not; he has sold to Field. Does it then belong to Field? That depends upon

whether Leiter owned it when he sold. That Leiter had legal title to it is true; but if we stop to inquire what it is that he had legal title to, we shall instantly see how basely absurd it is to regard his legal title as just. This \$112,000 a year, what does it depend upon? Upon nothing that Field has ever done. Upon nothing that Leiter has ever done. Upon nothing that Schlessinger & Mayer have ever done. Upon nothing even that the city of Chicago or all the people of Chicago or of the world have ever done. It depends solely upon what the people of the city of Chicago will do in the future. It is, in other words, a premium upon the labor of the people of Chicago next year, the year after, the year after that, and so on for a century. Who could possibly have the moral right either to sell or to buy that premium? Assuredly not Mr. Leiter, nor Mr. Field, nor Schlessinger & Mayer. Their just contribution to the amount will be slight at the best. Could the city of Chicago, then, or the state of Illinois, justly sell the future earnings of five generations of Chicago people? It would be as sensible to say that they could sell the people themselves. There is in fact no justification for a condition in which two or three men are permitted by law to traffic and deal, for their own profit, in those future earnings of people whose natural rights are equal to theirs. Legalized plundering like this, tends to bring the law into contempt with the plundered.

OUR FOREIGN POLIOY.

Whether for right or wrong or good or ill, the annexation of Hawaii marks the beginning of a new era in American national life. Of the popularity of this first step in the direction of acquiring and colonizing territory in distant parts of the globe and extending our political power beyond our natural boundaries, there can be no denial. Were it unpopular it could never have been consummated in the face, as it was, of all our traditions. The people were not taken unawares by congress; their own manifest wishes were

obeyed. The cry against further national isolation touches a responsive chord in the public mind, and national ambition sweeps us on into the whirlpool of international politics. Dread it as we may, nothing can now prevent the United States from taking its place, as the expression goes, among the great nations of the earth. Conditions favor it, Europe expects it, and our own people are eager for it.

The undeniable aspiration of the American people for national aggrandizement, for an equal place among the Powers, and an equal voice with them in dictating the destinies of the world, is too strong to be suppressed. We cannot meet the demand for territorial expansion, for instance, with mere negation. If we try to do so the inevitable result will be imperialism. Simply to oppose territorial expansion is to resist a resistless current of sentiment in favor of extending the greatness and glory of this nation; it is also to strengthen the imperialists by weakening opposition to them. But while the American aspiration for aggrandizement cannot be suppressed, it can be guided. Not with a policy of negation and obstruction, then, but with an affirmative policy, with a policy which, while resisting imperialism, shall recognize the patriotic aspiration that imperialism feeds upon, and afford it satisfactory and legitimate opportunities for expression, must we be prepared to deal with the growing ambition for national aggrandizement. Such a policy is ready at hand in the spirit of the Monroe doctrine.

Historically, the Monroe doctrine begins, and except for the Mexican episode of 1865, it ends, with the period of the South America revolts against Spain. The Holy Alliance of European sovereigns, formed for the purpose of forcibly reaffirming the divine right of kings, was then giving aid and comfort to Spain, and President Monroe, with the encouragement if not at the suggestion of Great Britain, warned them off. In his message of 1823 he declared that this country would consider any attempt on the part of the Holy Alliance of European monarchs "to extend their system to any portion of

this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety," and that any effort on their part to oppress our sister republics in the western hemisphere, or to control their destiny, would be regarded by us "as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." In the same message and in the same connection President Monroe said: "The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." These are the limitations of the Monroe doctrine, historically. But in American thought, that doctrine has always meant more than appears upon the surface of its history. In spirit it antedates the Holy Alliance, and it survives long after that reactionary compact has become a mere historical curiosity. The spirit of the Monroe doctrine is the spirit of '76. It is the spirit of republicanism.

The Monroe doctrine then, as it is understood and believed in by the American people, means not only that monarchy must not be further extended in this hemisphere, but that ultimately the principle of monarchy that has already acquired lodgment here must depart and republicanism take its place. In that meaning the doctrine is almost completely realized. Republican government prevails in form, and in growing degree in substance also, virtually upon the whole continent to the south of us; and it prevails in substance as well as form to the north of us, for it were absurd to think of Canada as a monarchy or the dependency of a monarchy, when in all the essentials that go to distinguish republics from monarchies, Canada is as republican as we are. On some of the adjacent islands the old colonial system of continental Europe does still exist; but it no longer flourishes even there. And with Spain expelled from this hemisphere—the very mildest condition of peace that Americans would patiently accept,—and the people of Cuba and Puerto Rico encouraged to set up republics, it might be reasonably affirmed that the spirit of the Monroe doctrine had conquered the western world.

Yet this doctrine would not then have been exhausted, if the sphere of American influence is to be extended beyond the American continents. If we are about to step into the arena of the world's politics as one of the great Powers, and there begin a career which the annexation of Hawaii and our relations to the Philippines seems to have opened up to us, and upon which our people give every indication of eagerness to enter, then we ought to carry the spirit of the Monroe doctrine with us. That doctrine must animate the American policy to the uttermost limits of the American sphere of influence, wherever those limits may extend.

If we are to widen our sphere of influence beyond the boundaries which President Monroe recognized in 1823, we nevertheless cannot afford to abandon the essence of the Monroe doctrine, as we should do were we to emulate the European powers in their policy of conquest, subjugation, land grabbing and colonization. All this would be hostile to the spirit of the Monroe doctrine. It should be our policy, and to the utmost of our influence in international politics we should make it the policy of the other Powers, to recognize, protect and foster the principle of self-government wherever within our sphere of influence that principle becomes manifest. In so doing we should bring to our nation a greatness and shed upon its flag a glory infinitely superior to the greatness and glory which any people had ever before achieved. The United States would be known and honored now and for all time not as one of the despoilers, but par excellence as the leader among nations. Her guns would be feared only by tyrants, while her flag would be loved wherever upon sea or land its colors were seen. What nobler national aggrandizement could honorable ambition desire?

In the policy of expansion which the United States is about to adopt—which indeed it has already adopted, and which the people are determined that in some form, about which their ideas are as yet vague, it shall promote, perfect and make triumphant—we have to choose either the greatness and glory that would follow a truly grand leader-

ship by this nation of all the others, under the inspiration of Jefferson and Monroe, or the bitter fruits of an ignoble struggle for conquest and plunder under the inspiration of the tribes of Hannas and Elkinse. Shall we expand as republicans, or as imperialists? as democrats or as monopolists? as missionaries of the gospel of liberty, justice and peace, or as the advance guard of a millionaire army of plunderers? Shall we be animated by the spirit of the Monroe doctrine, or by lust for conquest and dominion? These are questions which are gathering fast and pressing hard for an answer. And to refuse to answer them at all, is in effect to answer them as the imperialists desire. The current has set in for expansion. Resistance to it now would be futile even if it were desirable. What lies before us to do is to choose between republican expansion, and imperialistic expansion.

TRIUMPH OF THE COUNTINGROOM.

Time was, in the history of daily journalism, when the editorial department of newspapers was controlled by the editor. Though the editor were a salaried man, working for a corporation, he was master of the paper in all but countingroom details, as a captain is master of his ship. Those were the times of Greeley, of the Tribune, and Raymond, of the Times. Bennett, of the Herald, is not to be considered in this connection, for he was owner as well as editor of his paper. But Greeley and Raymond were hired editors. Yet their word was law to their respective papers. While they did not govern the countingroom in financial details, the countingroom did not govern them in anything. Neither did their subordinates take their cue from the countingroom. All that concerned the paper, as a purveyor of news and an organ of opinion, centered in the editor. He was the paper.

Yet, even in those early days, the conflict between the editorial room and the countingroom had begun. With men like Greeley and Raymond the business manager dared not trifle; but as against smaller men, the editors of other papers, this functionary was already trying to encroach

upon the editorial domain. Still, the function of the editor as master of the paper was too clearly defined and recognized for hired publishers to make much headway against hired editors in the conflict between their departments. The fight continued, however, until the editor was ousted from his chair, and the publisher, as the direct representative of the paper's financial backers, had taken his place; or, more accurately, until the publisher's chair was elevated above that of the editor.

Upon papers in which the owner is also editor this revolution is not particularly noticeable; the owner gives his orders to subordinate editors, as editor. But upon papers in which both editor and publisher are hired men, the triumph of the countingroom over the editorial room has long been an acknowledged, though a guardedly acknowledged, fact. The acknowledgement has been guarded, because on the side of the editor it does not comport with the traditional dignity of his position and the importance of his relations to the public to acknowledge with freedom that he has a boss; while on the side of the publisher, he realizes the importance of having the public suppose that the paper is governed by its editor. Subordinates in each department take their cue from their superiors. Nevertheless, on all hands it is well known that newspapers are controlled no longer by the editor, but by the publisher. He it is who determines what policy pays and what policy does not, what articles may offend the inside friends of the paper and what articles will please them; and so, regardless of the outside friends of the paper, whose sentiments the editor is traditionally supposed to cater to, the publisher gives orders to the editor.

A notable example of the power which the countingroom has acquired over the editorial room was incautiously offered the public by the publishers of the Chicago daily papers when they stopped publication for four days rather than submit to an increase of stereotypers' wages to the aggregate amount for the whole city of \$40 a day. No one who is at all familiar with the editorial mind needs to be told that this stoppage was or-

dered not by editors, but by publishers, and not with the hearty acquiescence of the editors, but against their judgment. If the editors did not openly protest, it was because they had fallen so completely into the condition of what socialists call "wage slaves" that they dared not even dispute with all the powerful countingroom.

Raymond had more than one conflict with striking employes, but he never stopped the Times. And if the publisher of the Tribune had proposed to Greeley to suspend publication rather than add a few cents more to his pay roll, Greeley would have denounced him as a profanely epithetical ass. It is inconceivable that any man with the editorial instinct half alive in his brain should be willing to suspend the publication of a paper of which he is editor for any reason whatever when news is to be had, much less for a petty saving when news is extraordinary. The Chicago suspension could have originated nowhere but in the countingroom. It was almost in the nature of a celebration of the triumph of the countingroom over the editorial department.

This triumph would be unaccountable but for the circumstances which have latterly grown up around all vocations. It is not the result of degeneracy among editors, concurrently with higher intellectual development in the countingroom. Quite the contrary. It is but another manifestation of the monopolistic tendency of the time, which shows itself in all departments of industry, not even excepting that of the lawyer. Rich men own newspapers now, not as a business in which to earn a livelihood, or a profession in which to excel, but as a weapon. They hire editors as they hire coachmen. While they want the newspaper to support itself, that is a secondary consideration, their main purpose in owning and controlling it being to enable them to manipulate other interests out of which they can not only make good the paper's losses, but secure a profit besides which no legitimate newspaper could win for them.

Chicago again furnishes the most striking example. With only two inconsequential exceptions, the news-

papers of Chicago are owned by rich men, who are not newspaper men, and whose object is not to serve the public with a newspaper but to serve collateral interests of their own by befooling the public. And without exception every newspaper in Chicago is as obedient to the commands of a little coterie of rich men, who know nothing of journalism and care nothing for it except as the poor fellows they hire may help their financial schemes along, as is a weathercock to the fluctuations of the breeze. So complex are financial ramifications in Chicago, and so intimately do they blend with public corruption, that no great piece of public corruption can be run to its hole without disturbing financial interests which connect with and control the governing proprietors of every newspaper in the city. "Thus far and no farther mayst thou go!" is the admonition under which every editor of a Chicago daily paper does his work. The editors are controlled by the countingroom, and the countingroom receives orders from the millionaire owners, who in turn are governed not by perceptions of journalistic duty, but by an acute understanding of their own collateral interests. Even if they were disposed to act disinterestedly they could not, because they are entangled in the financial network.

NEWS

Since our report of last week, Santiago has surrendered. At the time of that report, which closed with the 13th, Gen. Shafter had given the Spanish commander until noon of the 14th to accept the American terms of surrender or submit to a bombardment. This was the last of a series of truces, extending altogether from the 4th, which were granted for the purpose of securing the surrender of the city without further fighting. In compliance with Gen. Shafter's demand, the Spanish commandant decided on the morning of the 14th to surrender, and he asked the appointment of American commissioners to meet Spanish commissioners for the arrangement of details. American commissioners were accordingly appointed. They were Gens. Lawton and Wheeler and Capt. Miley, the Spanish commissioners being the

British consul and two Spanish officers.

The work of the joint commission was soon accomplished. Not long after midnight on the 16th, the surrender had been definitely settled. It comprised all that part of Cuba lying to the east of an imaginary line running north from Aserradero, about 25 miles west of Santiago on the southerly coast, to Las Palmas, which lies in the interior, and thence northeast to Sagua on the northerly coast. Included in the surrender were all the Spanish troops and materials of war in the surrendered territory. The Spanish forces were to march out of Santiago with the honors of war, depositing their arms at a point agreed upon, where they were to be subject to the disposition of the United States government, it being understood that the commissioners representing the United States would recommend that the arms be returned to the Spanish troops to be carried by them back to Spain. Officers were to retain their side arms, and officers and men their personal property. The Spanish records were to be retained by the Spanish commandant. Cuban soldiers in the Spanish service were to remain in Cuba upon parole if they wished; but all other Spanish troops were to be transported at the earliest possible moment by the United States to Spain. The formal surrender was to take place on the 17th.

The formal surrender took place according to the agreement. At noon on the 17th, the American flag was hoisted over the house of the civil government in Santiago. Meantime the Spanish flags had been lowered, and the Spanish troops continued to deposit their arms, which they had been doing since daylight, in an armory guarded by an American force. Gen. Toral also formally surrendered the territory and all the stores under his command. Among the surrendered munitions were 10,000 rifles and 10,000,000 rounds of ammunition.

Preliminary to the formal surrender the honors of war were paid, at a point between the lines, to the Spanish commandant, who thereupon escorted Gen. Shafter and his staff into Santiago. A reception at the palace, tendered by the archbishop of Santiago and the Spanish commandant to the American general and his companions, was accepted. Among the

other amenities attending the ceremonies of surrender was the return by Shafter to Toral of the latter's surrendered sword. Gen. Garcia is reported to have declined Gen. Shafter's invitation to accept the Spanish hospitality.

The military expedition which thus terminated in the capture of an entire army corps of Spanish soldiers with all their munitions, together with more than a third of the territory of the Province of Santiago, and won military honors of the highest order in the fierce fighting of July 1 and 2, an expedition which was made especially notable by the brilliant victory that Commodore Schley won over Cervera in totally destroying the latter's fleet with the loss to the American navy of but a single life—this expedition was organized at Tampa, Florida, early in June. It made a false start from Tampa, on the 6th of that month, but on the 13th and 14th got finally under way. It consisted of 35 transports, four tenders and 14 warships as convoys. All the troops—773 officers and 14,564 enlisted men—were regulars, except the 2d Massachusetts and the 71st New York. On the 20th of June the expedition arrived off Santiago. The debarkation began on the 22d of June under the protection of Gen. Garcia's Cuban troops, and was completed on the 23d. This was at Baiquiri, about 12 miles to the east of Santiago. An advance in the direction of Santiago was immediately made, and on the 24th, near Sevilla, a skirmish was fought with a loss to the Americans of 17 killed and more than 50 wounded. The Spanish, with even greater loss, were driven back. Meanwhile the expedition was receiving reinforcements. By the last of the month the American line had advanced to within three miles of Santiago, and on the 1st of July a general and bloody engagement was fought, which extended well over into the 2d. At the close of this battle, the American line had advanced to within half a mile of the city. On the 3d Cervera's fleet, which had participated in the battle of the preceding two days, attempted to slip out of the harbor, and was totally destroyed by the American fleet, which, in the temporary absence of Admiral Sampson, was under the command of Commodore Schley. On the same day, Gen. Shafter demanded the unconditional surrender of the city. Then began the series of truces which culminated on the 17th

in the formal surrender of the city. At the time of surrender Gen. Shafter's line had drawn close up to the city, it was strongly entrenched, and, including Gen. Garcia's force, it extended from the coast east of the bay entrance, around the city to the bay on the west, completely hemming the Spaniards in. Menaced thus by Shafter's superior and well placed force, and made helpless by lack of food, the Spanish commandant had no choice but to surrender. Yet Shafter has reported since the surrender took place, that the city was so well defended that a successful assault would have cost him at least 5,000 men—25 per cent. of his force.

The occupation of Santiago by the Americans on the 17th was followed on the 18th by a proclamation of President McKinley, relating to the government of the surrendered territory. This document proclaims security in person, property and all private rights and relations to the law-abiding inhabitants, assuring them that the Americans came not to make war upon them, nor upon any party or faction among them, but to give them protection. It recognizes the authority of the civil officials in office at the time of surrender, provided only that they accept the supremacy of the United States; but threatens their replacement if, in the judgment of the American commander-in-chief, the inhabitants render such a proceeding indispensable to the maintenance of law and order. And it opens to the commerce of the neutral nations, including the United States, all Cuban ports in American possession, upon payment of the prescribed rates of duty.

For temporary military governor of Santiago, the president has appointed Gen. Chambers McKibben, a Pennsylvanian, who went to Cuba as lieutenant colonel of the 21st infantry, and was promoted to brigadier general of volunteers for distinguished services at the battle of Santiago. He took command of the city immediately after the American flag had been raised. Gen. McKibben's appointment to the temporary military governorship of Santiago was in opposition to the wishes of the Cuban government, which solicited the appointment of Gen. Castillo, of their own service.

Coincident with the presidential proclamation described above, cus-

toms duties applicable to the eastern part of Cuba were decided upon by the president. Prior to the American occupation there was one rate of import duty for Spain and a higher rate for other countries; but beginning with the 19th, the rates theretofore prevailing as to Spanish products were applied to all neutral nations, including the United States. Export duties remain in full force.

The American casualties before Santiago, as officially reported, were 230 killed, 1,284 wounded, and 79 missing. It is understood, however, that the total loss will come nearer to 2,000. A full list of names has not yet been made public. Of the wounded, only a small percentage have died. Gunshot wounds have never in the history of war proved less fatal, nor healed so rapidly. This is due to the advances in surgery. Each soldier was provided with anti-septic dressing and instructions for use. The dressing was used skilfully by the injured themselves or their companions; and as soon as the surgeons reached a wounded man they at once bathed the wound with bi-chloride of mercury and dressed it with anti-septic gauze. In consequence, not a single case of blood poisoning has been reported.

While the army still lay in siege before Santiago, yellow fever broke out at Siboney, as stated last week, and for a time caused considerable alarm. The alarm has subsided, however, the attack of the pestilence having been mild and the deaths few. Among the victims was Gen. Duffield, who suffered from a slight attack, but is reported as out of danger. Several war correspondents, also, were taken down with the fever; and Eben Brewer, who established the first military postal station in Cuba, died of it.

Active operations have been in progress elsewhere in Cuba, though their lustre has been dimmed by the events at Santiago. Probably the most important collateral movement was the successful landing of a large expedition to the insurgents under Gomez. The expedition was carried over from Key West by the Florida and the Fanita, under convoy of the auxiliary gunboat Peoria. It left Key West June 25th and landed at Palo Alto, on the southern coast of Cuba, on the 3d; but the landing was not reported in the United States until

the 14th. The expedition consisted of 35 Cubans under Gen. Nunez, 50 troopers of the 5th U. S. Cavalry, 25 rough riders under Winthrop Chanler, and an enormous cargo of subsistence and arms. An attempt to land was first made near Las Tunas, to the east of Trinidad, but there the expedition was repulsed with considerable loss, Chanler being badly wounded and Nunez killed. The next attempt, at Palo Alto, fifty miles east of Las Tunas, was successful and without loss. On the 4th, Gen. Gomez, who was known to be in the neighborhood with 2,000 men, appeared in person at Palo Alto, and transmitted in writing to President McKinley, a plan of campaign.

Another movement outside of the Santiago region, was a bombardment of Manzanillo, on the gulf in the north of the Province of Santiago, which took place on the 18th. Seven American warships were engaged; and several Spanish gunboats, which went out to defend the town were stranded in the throat of the harbor.

An engagement occurred also off Cape Francis on the south coast of Pinar del Rio on the 12th. It was reported in the United States on the 19th. The armed yacht Eagle destroyed the Spanish auxiliary cruiser Santo Domingo. The Santo Domingo had run the blockade with a large cargo of food and war munitions from Mexico, which she was just about to lighter ashore when the Eagle attacked her. Ship and cargo were totally destroyed.

While the final flag of truce was flying over the entrenchments before Santiago, a reinforcing expedition was about to depart from Tampa, but on the 14th it was stopped. Since then, news from Tampa has been sparse and unreliable. Preparations for another movement have evidently been in progress, and the dispatches are under censorship. It is not certainly known what the movement is, but it is supposed to be an expedition to Puerto Rico.

Definite reports of a Puerto Rican expedition began to arrive from Washington prior to the 18th, and on that day it was announced that Gen. Miles had already started from Santiago and would be in Puerto Rico before the end of the week. He was said to have under his immediate command 10,000 troops, and it was

understood that Gen. Brooke would follow him with 15,000 more. But on the 19th Miles had not yet got away from Guantanamo, near Santiago. He attributed the delay to the unreadiness of the naval force; and at his request peremptory orders were sent to Admiral Sampson to sail at once. There is evident lack of harmony between the army and the navy regarding the expedition.

While the Puerto Rican expedition was pending, the cruiser New Orleans captured a French liner, *Olinde-Rodriguez*, as it attempted to run the Puerto Rico blockade.

Though the rumors of peace proposals from Spain, which we noted last week, have not wholly died out, nothing definite has been reported. A step has been taken, however, by the hold-over Sagasta ministry, which may be preliminary to propositions looking to peace. By royal decree, posted in Madrid on the 14th, the individual rights guaranteed by the Spanish constitution were suspended. Under this decree, the captain general of Madrid prohibited all meetings and publications not specially permitted. As a result, several of the Madrid papers of the 14th appeared with blank columns representing portions of news which had been suppressed by the censor, and no important news has since come from the Spanish capital. This decree against meetings and publications may have been promulgated in order to enable the government to restrain uprisings which proposals of peace might excite. Such an interpretation seems to be warranted by a circumstantial report on the 20th, that the Spanish ministry, after an all-night session, has decided to ask the United States for peace.

But the decree suppressing meetings and publications may have been only for the purpose of enabling the government to control uprisings which might occur without regard to peace proposals. Only a few days before, an influential deputation from the Basque provinces appeared at Madrid to protest against the recent war tax imposed by the cortes. The menacing significance of this protest will be appreciated if the relations of the Basque provinces of Spain are understood. These provinces are three—Biscay, Guipuzcoa, and Alava. They adjoin one another, and form a tri-

angle with the base extending westward along the Bay of Biscay from the Pyrenees mountains. Until 1876, they retained a separate constitution, which guaranteed them political, military and fiscal rights called "fueros," which were not enjoyed by the rest of Spain. These rights were based upon the old laws of the Visigoths, and were established before the Spanish monarchy. At first, mere privileges granted to particular cities, they grew into constitutional rights of provinces, and were in time collected and sanctioned as such. The "fueros" established equality among natives of pure blood; lodged supreme power in a general assembly; forbade any royal governing except as to the post office; limited royal taxation; exempted the inhabitants from Spanish military service, and in many other ways secured the liberties of the Basques. In 1876-77 the "fueros" were abolished and the administration of the Basque provinces assimilated to that of Spain. By an agreement with the Spanish crown, however, the Basques retained the right to collect all taxes within their borders, the amount being fixed by the agreement. This agreement, as these provinces claim, is violated by the new war tax, and the deputation mentioned above appeared at Madrid for the purpose not only of protesting, but of admonishing the crown that the Basques are determined to insist upon the agreement. That is not a mild threat. The Basque provinces have always been the chief support of the Carlist cause, the Carlist claimants to the throne having promised to restore the Basque "fueros." The spirit of independence is still alive among the Basques, and it is feared that if they are denied their military and fiscal exemptions, they may revolt and call upon Don Carlos to head their rebellion.

For some such opportunity Don Carlos is evidently waiting. On the 16th his party issued a manifesto calling upon the Spanish army and people to rebel against the government. In anticipation of the surrender of Santiago and the abandonment of Cuba, this manifesto grows furious over what it calls the "most terrible and unpardonable ignominy of the nineteenth century"—the placing of nearly 200,000 Spanish troops at the feet of 20,000 American invaders and 15,000 insurgents.

Trouble for Spain is brewing also

in the Canaries. The people are said to be ripe for revolt. They point to the loss of Cervera's squadron as evidence of treachery on the part of Sagasta's government. Their suspicions are not allayed by the fact that the troops at the capital of the islands are defenseless because the heavy ammunition with which they have been supplied is two sizes too large for their guns.

Withal, the whole Spanish community of the coast towns is alarmed at the expected approach of Watson's fleet. This expedition under Watson was announced by the president on the 27th of June, but at the present writing the indications of its departure are no more marked than nearly a month ago. An opinion prevails, based upon the freedom with which the expedition has been talked about at Washington and the fact that its departure has been so long delayed, that Watson's fleet was a "bluff" to scare back Camara's fleet from the Suez canal. If that was the purpose, Watson's victory has been already won; for Camara has brought his ships back to Spain.

In the Philippines the behavior of the German admiral, whose fleet is concentrated in Manila bay, ostensibly to protect German residents but in reality, judging from its actions, for an ulterior and secret purpose, has attracted Admiral Dewey's marked attention. We told last week of the incident of the *Irene*, the German warship which appeared to be meddling in Subig bay, just north of the Bay of Manila. It seems also that the German admiral has in other ways annoyed the Americans and given aid and comfort to the Spanish. On the 11th, Admiral Dewey requested a statement of the German attitude, at the same time protesting against the behavior of German officers. An explanation was returned by the German admiral, the particulars of which have not been published. On the 13th the German admiral protested. His protest was directed against the boarding, by American officers, of German vessels, upon their coming into the port a second time. To this Dewey replied that as the commander of a blockading squadron it was his duty to board every vessel coming into the harbor, whether the first, second or any other time, to assure himself that it was not an enemy's ship flying a neutral flag. Admiral Dewey supplemented this reply with an in-

timation that if Germany was at peace with the United States, German naval officers in Manila bay would have to change their methods; and that if Germany was at war with the United States he desired to know it that he might act accordingly.

There is a report, apparently well founded, that the German admiral asked Capt. Chichester, of the British warship *Immortalite*, now in Manila bay, what he would do if the Germans interfered with Dewey, and that Capt. Chichester replied, significantly: "There is but one man who knows what I would do, and his name is Dewey."

The third military expedition to the Philippines touched at Honolulu on the 1st, and the fourth left San Francisco on the 15th. The second arrived at Manila on the 16th and 17th.

The principal political event of the week is the nomination by the populists of California, on the 13th, of Congressman James G. Maguire for governor. As Maguire is a candidate for the democratic nomination, his selection by the populists probably insures his success at the democratic convention and then at the polls. It is a guarantee, if the democrats nominate him, of an anti-monopoly campaign with all the anti-monopoly forces of California united. The platform upon which the populists have nominated Maguire declares for the initiative and referendum, denounces the funding of railroad indebtedness and the issue of war bonds, opposes the gold standard and its corollaries, favors a vigorous prosecution of the war for liberty, advocates postal savings banks, demands the election of United States senators by the people, and proposes the construction, ownership and operation of the Nicaragua canal by the government of the United States.

Returns from the Klondike region continue. Forty men arrived at Victoria, B. C., on the 15th, carrying with them nearly \$1,000,000, partly in drafts and partly in dust. They had left Dawson on the 28th of June. On the 17th the steamer *St. Paul* arrived at San Francisco from *St. Michael*, with 176 passengers and \$6,000,000 in drafts and gold dust. Also on the 17th the *City of Seattle*

brought 17 Klondike miners to Seattle with \$600,000 among them. Three days later the *Roanoke* brought 210 passengers to Seattle with \$2,000,000 in gold dust. Among the passengers was Joaquin Miller.

A threatening rebellion is in progress in China, in the two southern provinces of Quang-si and Quang-tung, the latter being the province in which Canton is situated. The imperial troops were defeated early in the month in a battle with the rebels near Woo-chow, on the Canton river, with a loss of 1,500 killed. There were fears on the 13th that the rebels would follow their victory with an advance upon Canton, where the native inhabitants are known to sympathize with them. The causes of the rebellion are either not understood or are badly reported, but it seems to have broken out over the distribution of Chinese territory by the imperial government among the European powers. The resentment of the rebels is shown impartially to the imperial government and to Europeans. Imperial officials and foreign missionaries are indiscriminately killed. The French are reported as likely to interfere for the protection of French commercial interests, and this causes uneasiness on the part of the British. They believe that if French troops cross the Tonquin border into Quang-si and Quang-tung they will never go back again, but that France will retain the territory she enters. The rebel leader is supposed to be Sun Yat Sen, the Chinese doctor whom the Chinese embassy kidnaped in London two years ago. Rumors of the 20th from Hong-Kong are to the effect that the imperial troops have rallied and are dispersing the rebels.

Farther north, at Ning Po, near Shanghai, the French have been having trouble with the Chinese over an attempt on their part to remove an old Chinese cemetery. There were riots there on the 17th. The mob attacked the French police station and were fired upon by the French police and a body of French marines. Twenty natives were killed. Further rioting occurred on the 20th, but on the same day it was reported that the French had pacified the natives by relinquishing their designs upon the cemetery in consideration of further territorial concessions.

NEWS NOTES.

—The filibustering prosecutions instituted at Baltimore against Gen. Roloff and other Cuban officials, were dismissed on the 18th.

—Col. William J. Bryan, with his regiment, the Third Nebraska, left Omaha for Florida on the 18th, and arrived at Jacksonville, Florida, on the 20th.

—The North Dakota republicans and the Vermont democrats made nominations on the 20th. The Vermont democrats indorsed the national platform of 1896.

—The prince of Wales struck his knee against the edge of a stair at the county seat of Baron Rothschild, Waddeston Manor, Ailesbury, on the 18th and fractured his knee cap.

—President E. Benjamin Andrews, of Brown university, has accepted the appointment of superintendent of the Chicago public schools. He resigned the presidency of Brown on the 18th.

—It has been decided to establish a postage rate of one penny (two cents) per half ounce for letters in the United Kingdom, Canada, Newfoundland, Cape Colony and Natal. The date for the change has not yet been fixed.

—The bid of the Spanish Transatlantic company for carrying the Spanish prisoners back to Spain has been accepted. This company's proposal is \$20 for privates and noncommissioned officers and \$55 for commissioned officers, subsistence to be on the army ration basis. The ships will fly Spanish colors.

—Work was almost suspended at the packing houses in Omaha on the 15th in consequence of a strike, which was settled on the 17th. The strike was against the custom of calling men to work and keeping them at the packing houses, but paying them only for the time they were actually at work. They are now to be paid for all the time they are required to put in.

—Following its announcement, which we reported in these notes last week, the Italian government sent a squadron into Colombian waters preparatory to making a demand upon the republic of Colombia for the immediate payment of the \$250,000 awarded by President Cleveland, as arbitrator, to Ernest Cerruti, an Italian citizen. No further demonstration has been made.

—Sylvester Scovel, a war correspondent who hails from Cleveland, O., was put under military arrest on the 18th at Santiago for slapping Gen. Shafter in the face. He had made a request of Gen. Shafter, which the latter denied, to be present at the unfurling of the American flag on the occasion of the surrender. What led to the assault is not yet very clear, but it is explained that an altercation took place, in which Shafter applied an offensive

epithet to Scovel, and the latter replied with the blow.

—Admiral Cervera and his subordinates were taken from Portsmouth, N. H., to Annapolis, Md., on the 14th on board the cruiser St. Louis. They arrived at Annapolis on the 16th, where paroles were signed and the paroled prisoners were taken ashore. Capt. Eulate, of the Vizcaya, who refused the parole, was placed aboard the Santee. The paroled officers talk freely of the dispatch of their fleet to America. They say that the vessels badly lacked both arms and fuel, and were sent over to satisfy public opinion in Spain. Cervera himself says that the guns which the vessels ought to have had, "were in the pockets of the contractors." Some of the officers describe the orders which sent them out of Santiago harbor to useless destruction as cruel.

MISCELLANY

AT THE KING'S GATE.

A beggar sat at the king's gate,
And sang of summer in the rain—
A song which sounds reverberate
Of wood and hill and plain,
That rising bore a tender weight
Of sweetness, strong and passionate;
A song with sigh of mountain pass,
Ripple and rustle of deep grass,
The whispering of wind-smote sheaves,
Low lapping of long lily leaves,
Red morns and purple-mooned eves.

The king was weary of his part,
The king was tired of his crown;
He looked across the rainy land,
Across the barren stretch of sand
Out to the rainy sea;
He heard the wind beat loud and free
The gilded casement, sullenly
Falling away with mist and rain.
"But oh! it is a weary thing
To wear a crown and be a king,
Unending war with care and pain;
O for one golden hour and sweet,
To serve the king with willing feet!"
But he would sleep, and from his heart
The jeweled silken girdle loose,
And give it room to turn and choose
An easier measure for its beat.

Into the gilded chamber crept
A breath of summer blown with rain
And wild wet leaves against the pane.
The royal sleeper smiled and slept.
"I thought that all things sweet were
dead!"

They heard him say, who came to wed
The crown again to the king's head.
—Juliet C. Marsh.

HE MIXED HIS ENEMIES UP.

To the splendid generalship of Gen. Joe Wheeler as much as to any other cause is due the repeated successes of the American forces around Santiago. To see this white-haired veteran of the war of the rebellion astride his horse, leading the regiments under his command, made up almost entirely of

northern men, is a sight to stir the heart of every American who remembers that there was once a Mason and Dixon line in the United States.

The camp here is ringing with praise of Wheeler, and at the same time a good story of his words during a desperate charge last week is going the rounds. As he was leading the Seventy-first New York, the Roosevelt rough riders, and a strong force of regulars up a high hill at San Juan, storming a large body of Spanish who were strongly intrenched, the attacking line began to waver under a fierce fire from Gatling guns and strong field pieces.

Wheeler saw his men waver and began shouting at the top of his voice, while the guns were roaring and the small arms rattling:

"Steady, boys. Come on, now. The Yankees are giving way. Look, there they go! The Yankees are leaving their guns!" and, suddenly catching himself, he cried out even more vigorously: "I mean the Spaniards are running. Go for 'em, boys!"

Despite the hail of Mauser and Springfield bullets, the rain of the shrapnel and Gatling fire, the soldiers laughed at their old general's absent-minded memory of other days. But they did "go for 'em." Instantly the wavering line took on new confidence, the gaps closed and in twenty minutes San Juan was ours.—Dispatch from Siboney to Chicago Tribune, under date of July 13.

TOURISTS' TICKETS IN SWITZERLAND.

Passenger fares in Switzerland are already being revised with a view to the largest possible public service, rather than the largest possible profits to the railroads. By one of the new arrangements, which is of especial interest to American tourists, passes good for 15 days on all the railroads and steamboats of Switzerland are now sold for extremely small sums. Even if one wishes to travel pretentiously, his first-class ticket will cost him but \$12, and if he is content with moderate comfort or cares for economy, he can secure his second or third-class ticket for \$8.40 and six dollars, respectively. The lowness of these rates is in part made possible by the smallness of the Swiss territory—which is less than twice the size of Massachusetts—and in part by the fact that where passenger service is maintained it costs little more to carry 250 passengers than to carry 50, and passenger travel can be greatly increased by low rates. The custom of taking vaca-

tions is constantly on the increase. The German government has found profitable its system of selling round-trip tickets by different routes to those who wished to see a great deal of their country during the holidays. Switzerland, by its still more liberal arrangement, bids fair to make itself more than ever the goal of tourists from other countries as well as to enable its own citizens to see all parts of their own land for a most moderate sum. To citizens who travel the whole year round—such as commercial travelers—the new rates established are still lower, \$84 securing a pass good for 12 months on second-class coaches, and \$60 paying for third-class transportation.—The Outlook.

THE HORRIBLE SIDE OF A NAVAL BATTLE.

The frightful carnage in that mad dash for liberty out of Santiago harbor is still the only thought, the only talk of the prisoners by day, their only dream or nightmare by night. Lieut. Carlos Eoado Suances tells his experience on the Pluton, the torpedo boat destroyer. These are his words:

"We were shot to pieces before we got within half the torpedo-striking distance of the American ships. We found ourselves riddled and could not strike a blow in return. That young commander of the Gloucester (meaning Lieut. Wainwright, of the Maïue) is as brave as any man alive, but he did not destroy us. It was the shells of the Brooklyn and Texas that blew us up.

"Admiral Cervera signaled the other ships behind him as he started out of the harbor: 'My dear boys, your admiral prays for a speedy victory.' But in five minutes we were in the infernal regions. The nearest American ship, the Iowa, was 2,500 yards away. Life anywhere on board the Pluton was not worth an ochave (a quarter of a cent).

"My chum and classmate was struck by a shell in the breast while standing three feet from me. He was decapitated as quickly as if by the guillotine. The head and body separated and fell off the deck into the sea. The same shell struck the edge of the conning tower and exploded. The concussion threw me on my hands and knees. At the same instant a heavier shell struck the Pluton's side and it careened violently. The next moment another shell struck the deck exactly where I had been a moment before, exploding and wounding me slightly.

"We had prepared our torpedo tubes, but before the Texas, now the nearest enemy, was within 1,500 yards of us—

too far to use a torpedo—our fishing gear was crippled, half of our crew were killed and escaping steam below showed that our engines were mortally hurt. The biggest shells were fired so as to ricochet along the water. We could see them coming at us by the enormous splashes they made, and they came straight. Finally a shell from the Brooklyn, I think, tore the insides out of our ship. We were utterly helpless in that storm of death.”—Dispatch to Chicago Tribune from Portsmouth, N. H., under date of July 17.

REPORTS OF FAMINE IN RUSSIA.

The news of the widespread famine in Russia is getting worse, and the picture of the suffering of millions of disinherited peasants is distressing and heartrending in the extreme. The Russian government has at last been compelled to break its silence, and has issued an official proclamation endeavoring to quiet the general alarm raised in Russian society and in the press. The government asserts that the private accounts of general starvation, “hunger-typhus,” and other effects of lack of nourishment, are all exaggerated, and that the facts published in many papers are only “the ordinary appearances of poverty and want to be met with in the existing conditions of life among the agricultural as well as other classes of the population.” This apology and admission are characteristic in themselves. What are the facts?

This official account admits that 19 provinces, with a population of 40,000,000, are affected by the bad crops of last year. Numerous private, but more authoritative than official, reports from various localities, state that a large number of peasants have been compelled to sell their horses and cows at an average price of four rubles (about eight shillings) per head; that in numerous cottages the hedges and the barns have been burnt through the winter as fuel; and the very thatch from the roofs has been consumed in food for the cattle; that “meals” are taken once a day, the bread consisting more of the bark of trees, leaves, and chaff, than of flour; that diseases have broken out everywhere, as the result of cold and hunger. In many provinces the peasants, to save themselves from utter starvation, offer their day’s labor with that of their horse for the sum of 20 kopecks—about four pence, English. The appalling facts the government calls “ordinary appearances of poverty and want,” and attributes them “to existing conditions of life,” for which the govern-

ment apparently considers itself not in the least responsible.

We quite agree that the abject poverty and want of the millions of the Russian people, amounting practically to incessant semi-starvation, are “ordinary appearances” in Russia, but the misery is not the outcome of natural conditions beyond human control. The soil of the provinces now affected by the famine is incomparably richer and more productive than that of Finland and the Baltic region, but the population, thoroughly Russian, is more ignorant, entirely under the control of the state church, bearing on its weary shoulders all the terrible weight of a double system which may be truly designated as that of czarism and papacy combined, affiliated, or rather assimilated and absorbed into one another. We say, therefore, without hesitation, that the Russian government is responsible, and to be blamed for all calamities which befall Russia, be it famine, epidemic, self-demolishing fanaticism, or what not. For it keeps systematically and intentionally the whole nation in a state of childish ignorance.—Extract from *The Anglo-Russian*, of London, as published in *Public Opinion*.

A MOUNTAIN INN IN SPAIN.

An extract from one of Poultney Bigelow’s articles entitled “A Yankee in Spain,” now running in *Harper’s Weekly*.

At length the narrow streets of San Juan took us into their wallowy embrace. The little donkeys that passed us sank up to their knees, while we had ceased to care how far we went, so long as each step brought us nearer to *Senor Matias*.

What a blessed moment that was when we finally dropped down on a bench in his inn yard and commenced to remove our boots! I say inn yard for want of a word in our language that fits. The house, from our point of view, did not commence until the upper story. That is to say, we came in upon a broad space partly occupied by a mule cart and partly by kitchen utensils. From this apartment radiated doors communicating partly into a stable for donkeys, partly into a storage-room for forage, partly into sleeping quarters for the servants and the poorer guests, and partly into a yard devoted to manure and chickens. There appeared to be no door to this house—at least not on the ground floor. The population of the village drifted in and out without restraint, and I must again note the excellent manners they exhibited towards strangers like ourselves, who at such a time must have been well worth star-

ing at. There is no sign to mark this house as an inn, nor is there anything to indicate that the establishment supplies likewise a large variety of general articles in the way of wine, groceries, bread and the things usually kept at small country stores. Five drovers were having their supper at a table near the mule cart as we came in, and a kindly old lady was cooking savory things for them at the big gypsy fire in the corner. She had no light to see by save an iron bowl filled with lard, from the corner of which emerged a slender thread which served as a wick. It was the light that shone in the tent of Hannibal two centuries before Christ was born, and it is the light which will shine for centuries to come in this part of the world unless from without comes a heavy jog to this backward people, a reminder that they must use improved tools or else become unfit to compete with their fellow-men in other parts of the world.

As I sat with the five muleteers, watching the kindly old lady cooking for a large household by the light of a lamp so feeble that it could hardly have sufficed to show the way in a mine shaft, I could not help wondering how long this state of things could last in a land that was a geographic portion of Europe, whose king claimed the title of “Most Catholic.” I seemed to be an anachronism with my kodak, my bike, my stylographic pen, my portable typewriter—all recent triumphs of Yankee invention. I felt that I was in a way like Mark Twain’s Yankee at the court of King Arthur, and that the people about might readily regard as witchcraft the mechanical devices so far beyond their power to appreciate or even to understand.

Now and then purchasers came in, who waited patiently until *Matias* turned up from the stable, or his wife from where she was preparing our beds, or the kindly old lady from the fireplace, or some other member of the large household. No one was in a hurry, or, if he were, he did not show it.

When we had unstrapped the luggage from our bikes and put on bedroom slippers (a great luxury at such a time) we went upstairs, the part of the house evidently reserved for distinguished strangers. Here was a broad hall opening out at the front into a dining-room which faced the village street. At the back the hall opened upon a garden full of palms and southern trees. The bedrooms were merely alcoves opening upon this hall, black spaces large enough to hold a bed and a chair. We were so glad to

get this much that we questioned nothing, but made ready for dinner.

We little thought that a prehistoric lamp and a gypsy fire could have made such a dinner as the one we enjoyed that night in this far-away little Spanish village. The event made such an impression on us that the two songsters of the party treated the community to one of their choicest selections from "Carmen," which, by the way, sounds to a Spaniard about as much like his music as cockney does like plantation talk to a darky. However, the people showed no resentment, and the host even paid us some hollow compliments on the sweetness of our English song. George tried to explain to him that it was not English, but Spanish, which only confirmed Matias in his original view. He paid us a high compliment that night, no less than waiting on us himself, with a vast sombrero on his head, a cigarette between his teeth, and a species of smock which he wore when dressed for parade. George thinks we earned this by reason of having sung "Carmen." That may be. I am inclined to think that we won his heart by taking an interest in his wine cellar, by sampling some specimens of his Alicante vintage, both red and white, and finally by selecting with knowledge the wine which he too regarded as best.

By the way, let me remark that throughout Spain I cannot remember seeing a single drunken man, not even among the soldiers. And Spain is the country where wine is cheaper than milk—at times not dearer than pure water. Here is stuff for the teetotaler. Perhaps if America were to remove the tax on wine, we might assist the cause of temperance. Whisky might at the same time be rated as a poison, and prohibited altogether, save upon medical advice. For myself, I believe in total abstinence from alcoholic drink. And the best way to fight alcohol is to make light wine abundant and cheap. The world over we find that the cheaper the wine the more temperate the people; for drunkards, commend me to England and the United States, where wine is heavily taxed.

Do you want to know what sort of dinner we got in this savage section of mountainous Spain? Go there and sing to Matias, and he will provide the same for you.

First course: cheese, salt fish, cold ham. These by way of a cocktail.

Second course: Matias brought up from the gypsy fire a casserole, hot from the ashes, filled with a delicious medley, which I recall having enjoyed at Senor Castelar's eventful dinner. I

cannot remember the native name, but there was much onion or garlic, potato, and pieces of meat, and many odds and ends not readily analyzed. Matias told me all about the make of this dish; and Ned vowed that he would give a grand dinner when he got home, just like this one. We had some inkling of what was to be the extent of our meal, for before each of us was a stack of plates, each plate portending a separate course. Thus, after the table was once laid Matias had only to take away, never to bring on plates. Of course we kept the same knife and fork throughout.

The third course was a tortilla, or Spanish omelet, through which were scattered raw beans, which looked rather pretty, but which we judiciously dropped into our pockets when Matias was not looking.

As fourth course came an excellently dressed lettuce salad, which confirmed me in my respect for Matias. Then came a variety of fruit—nuts, raisins, oranges—all grown in the neighborhood; and finally a little cup of black coffee that could not have been produced better at that famous little French place in New Orleans. We had drunk with this Lucullian banquet a wine of Alicante that would have been rated at three dollars a bottle, yet our bill for this luxury came in at the rate of one dollar a day for everything. At night we slept soundly on soft mattresses with clean sheets, and in the morning washed in tin bowls at the chairs out in the general hall. Do you wonder that we love Spain?

A SOUTH AFRICAN SNAP-SHOT AT KIPLING.

A small man, dressed to match his old pipe—and rather fond of cutting jokes at his own expense on both scores—with prominent spectacles and prominent chin, dark mustache, keen dark eyes, keen expression, quick movements, and astonishingly quick rejoinders in talking; the distinctive note of him was keenness altogether, but sympathetic keenness. Somehow one began with an idea that he would be a rather cocksure and self-confident person. He is, of course, quite young; far younger than he looks—it was those long early years of hard unrecognized newspaper work in India that "knocked the youth out of him;" he is ridiculously young to be so famous and to have earned his fame by so much entirely solid work, political, or rather national, as well as literary. Nevertheless, as one enthusiast expressed it, "he puts the least side on of any celebrity I ever met."

He takes his work hard. He is tremendously in earnest about it; anxious to give of his best; often dissatisfied with his best. He is quite comically dissatisfied with success; quite tragically haunted by the fear that this or that piece of work, felt intensely by himself in writing, and applauded even by high and mighty critics, is in reality cheap and shoddy in execution, and it will be cast in damages before the higher court of posterity. When Rudyard Kipling had written the "Recessional," which two hemispheres felt to be one of the very truest and soundest pieces of work done by any writing man in our day and generation, he was so depressed by its shortcomings of his private conception that he threw the rough copy in the waste-paper basket. Thence Mrs. Kipling rescued it. But for Mrs. Kipling we should have had no "Recessional." For his best patriotic poems he has declined to accept any pay.—Cape Times, as quoted in Public Opinion.

THE SEAFARING INSTINCT OF RESCUE.

Even the babies in Gloucester are not without this instinct, although they do not count among their playthings medals from the Humane society. It happened, this last summer, that a couple of children were playing in a spar yard. They had ventured out upon the rolling logs floating on the tide. The older boy slipped. He was six. Down he went, head first, of course. The other one, a child of three, ran over to where he saw his playmate disappear between the logs, lay down at full length, and grabbed him by the hair when he came up. But the logs were coming together, so the baby put one of his chubby legs between the closing of the crush, and began to shriek. Without that spontaneous coolness and ability to rescue, which he probably inherited from generations of seamen, there would have been another procession of mourning hacks in the old town.—Herbert D. Ward, in The Century.

THE DIFFICULTY OF TAXING PERSONAL PROPERTY.

For very many years an opinion has been prevalent that the great bulk of the personal property of the States, especially of the class denominated "securities," including stocks, bonds, notes, mortgages and such like, has escaped taxation. With a very few exceptions the great fortunes in this country are invested in such securities. There is, of course, in the aggregate a somewhat wide distribution of the stocks and bonds of some of our

corporations, but it seems probable that these smaller holdings are in a fairer degree represented in the tax returns. The delinquency appears to be largely located in our great cities. Recent investigations by students of political science and recent tables prepared by state tax officials have disclosed an appalling condition of things. The evil seems to have been progressive until in some of our great centers of population and wealth these forms of personal property seem to have been almost eliminated from the tax list.

In 1870 in the state of New York the personal property assessed amounted to 22 per cent. of the total property assessed. In 1896 the proportion of personal property assessed had fallen to 12.4 per cent. Comptroller Roberts, of that state, declares that, as a rule, this class of property escapes taxation. The taxable value of real estate in the state of New York increased between 1870 and 1895 155 per cent., while the value of taxable personal property, as shown by the assessment, within the same time increased less than six per cent. Mr. Roberts expresses the opinion that the increase in the value of personal property has, in fact, been much more rapid than that of real estate, and that the value of personal property owned in the state is at least equal to if not more than the value of the real estate. He states that from \$2,500,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000 of personal property, taxable by law in New York, escapes taxation every year.

In an article published in the Forum in 1897 in advocacy of a progressive inheritance tax he takes 107 estates, which he says were selected at random in the comptroller's office, and contrasts the amount of appraised personal property found after death with the amount returned for taxation the year before death. He says that of this number of estates 34, ranging in value from \$54,000 to over \$3,000,000, were assessed the year before the decedent's death absolutely nothing. These 107 estates disclosed personalty at death to the aggregate amount of \$215,132,366, and this enormous aggregate had the year before the respective deaths of the owners been assessed at the amount of \$3,819,412, or 1.77 per cent. of the actual value of the property.

In 1874 the board of state assessors of New York reported to the legislature as follows:

From our examinations we are satisfied that less than 15 per cent. of the personal property of the state liable to taxation

finds a place on the rolls of the assessor. * * * The amount of personal property assessed in some of the counties is less than the banking capital, and the same is true of 30 towns and cities, among which are some of the most prosperous in the state.

In 1892 the tax board said:

Laws for the assessment of personal property have failed to do their work, and the failure becomes more complete and more unjust with every successive year.

The tax commission of Massachusetts, which reported to the governor a few months ago, shows that the total valuation of real estate in that state for taxation was, in 1896, \$2,040,200,644, and the total valuation of personal property assessed in the same year was \$582,319,634—about one-fourth.

As to the tax upon securities, or intangible property, as it is called, the commission says:

In each of the cities a few persons of unusual conscientiousness make returns. Such persons are accordingly taxed fully, and, as a rule, much more heavily than their less conscientious neighbors. * * * From the testimony which assessors have given before us there is a grave suspicion that sometimes sworn statements are falsely made and that perjury is added for the sake of evading or reducing taxation.

Concluding the discussion upon this subject, the majority of the commissioners say:

That the great bulk of intangible property taxable by law is not reached is admitted on all hands. It is proved beyond doubt by the sensitive records of the stock and bond market. Securities of all kinds, taxable in Massachusetts but not taxable in New York and in other states, are publicly bought and sold every day at the same prices in the different markets. If taxed according to law in Massachusetts, at a rate of from one to one and one-half per cent. of their selling value, they could not possibly command the price in Massachusetts which they command in other states; nor could they be sold side by side with shares in Massachusetts corporations or with mortgage loans at such prices as to yield about the same interest on the same investment. As a matter of fact, securities of the same solidity and yielding the same income are sold side by side with no material difference in quotations, whether they are taxable or not taxable. Taxable securities are bought and sold every day, not on the basis of being taxed in fact, but only on the basis of some incalculable and disregarded possibility of their being reached by taxation.

A gentleman of prominence, residing in one of the smaller towns of New England, recently told me that there had resided in his town for many years a gentleman who was reputed to be wealthy, whom he supposed to be worth, perhaps, a million dollars, and who was assessed for \$100,000. He died, and when his personal property was scheduled by his executor it was found to amount to about \$6,000,000—if I recall the figures accurately—and when this property went upon the assessment roll of the town the tax rate was reduced one-half. In other words, this gentleman, living in neighborly relations to his fellow citizens and dis-

charging, apparently, with kindness all of the obligations of citizenship, had been every year of his residence in the town defrauding his neighbors by compelling them to contribute to the public expense a share that he should, in honesty and in good conscience, have discharged. He was filching from every hand that was extended to him in neighborly confidence. His aims were of other men's goods.

A newspaper report of addresses by the advocates of the single land tax to some Massachusetts tax assessors contains some extreme but interesting statements. A prominent New York lawyer is reported to have spoken with an amazing frankness as to his personal and professional participation in tax evasion thus:

They maintain a system which is worth a great deal of money to me, and in these hard times every little counts; and when I think how much they save me in taxes I feel grateful to them. I feel grateful to the western farmers because they pay my taxes. It is not necessary for me to tell lies in New York to get rid of this taxation—it needs nothing but a little clever management. I manage it for many of my clients. One of them is a clergyman's widow, who would no more tell a lie than anything in the world, but I have so managed her property as gradually to reduce it, until this year I got her off the list entirely.

The appeal tax court of Maryland, responding to an inquiry from the tax commission of that state in 1881, said:

We utterly fail in reaching private securities of any description. Here and there only have they been returned by some conscientious holders.

The report of the revenue commission of Illinois of 1886 declares that practically the same state of things exists in your state. Indeed, so glaring and outrageous is this withholding of personal property from the tax list and the inequalities between the counties of your state resulting from this practice that I notice the labor commission of Illinois recommends the abandonment of the attempt to collect taxes upon personal property. The statements attributed by the bureau of labor in their report to eminent citizens of Chicago as to tax conditions here are appalling.

Prof. Bemis, in a recent letter in the Independent, speaking of affairs here in Illinois and of some revelations made by your Taxpayers' Defense league, makes a comparison between the commercial agency ratings and the tax list, and gives this instance: A certain banker, rated by Bradstreet's among the millionaires, is assessed at \$1,200, or less than one per cent. of his personal property, while a poor woman, Mrs. McGuire, is assessed on her real estate at 23 per cent. of its value. The question nat-

urally arises: "How long will there be any respect for government or law if these things are allowed to continue?" In conclusion he says:

A great awakening all over the country is needed, and that speedily, in order that the people may appreciate the enormity and injustice of existing methods of state and local taxation, and may be impelled to effect changes that shall make of the state an instrument of righteousness rather than what it is now in this matter of taxation—a conniver at fraud and creator of inequality.

... Mr. Lincoln's startling declaration that this country could not continue to exist half slave and half free may be paraphrased to-day by saying that this country cannot continue to exist half taxed and half free.—Hon. Benjamin Harrison, Ex-President of the United States.

GENERAL GOMEZ TO GENERAL BLANCO.

Your audacity in again offering terms of peace, astonishes me, knowing as you do that Cubans and Spaniards can never again live peaceably in Cuba.

You represent on this continent an old and blood-stained monarchy. We fight for an American principle. You say we belong to the same race, and you invite me to keep back the foreign invader; but in that you are again mistaken.

There are no differences in blood and races. I believe there is only one race, that of humanity; and for me there are but good and wicked nations. Spain has been up to the present a wicked nation.

The United States is endeavoring to fulfill for Cuba a duty of humanity and civilization.—Extracts from Letter.

A little Harlem girl drew a picture of Uncle Sam chasing a Spaniard, and, calling her mother's attention to it, said: "The poor Spaniard oughtn't to have but two legs, but I drew him with six so he could get away, I feel so sorry for him."—The Tammany Times.

Judge Reagan thinks that to hold captured territory is "a debt we owe to humanity"—the same idea of freedom he learned in childhood, that it was "in the interest of humanity" to hold the negro in bondage.—Amarillo (Texas) Weekly News.

"Do you think there will be any men at the seashore this summer?"

"Of course; the kind I met there last summer were the kind who wouldn't ever find out that we are having a war."—Detroit Free Press.

"Some of them new guns will carry 15 miles."

"At wan shot?"—Cincinnati Enquirer.

UNCLE IKE ON IMPERIALISM.

Yes, I like your idee, parson, that the war should be humane; That it is a war for freedom, not a greedy strife for gain; But your salary's in danger if you preach much more of that, For it don't suit Banker Thompson, judgin' from a little chat

Which I overheard last Sunday, when he said to Deacon Duff That he wasn't goin' to pay for much more of such plous stuff; And that preachers should be careful and should ponder what they say, And not injure business int'rests if they want to get their pay.

And he said: "Them lovely islands, most as large as all Japan, Are a very land of promise to the keen-eyed business man; For the soil is so productive, though so little used as yet, If their power was developed they could stand a monstrous debt.

"And the country here is mortgaged just about all it will stand, So to use our idle money we must somehow get more land; And the chance to get franchises there is better now than here, For the people here are cranky and such things are gettin' dear.

"Then, we need a standin' army such as all great nations boast, So whenever labor troubles show themselves, like Banquo's ghost, We may readily subdue them and put down the hostile crew, And protect our vested int'rests, just as all great nations do.

"But our people are such Quakers and so much opposed to war, If we have a larger army, we must show some reason for Our departure from old doctrines and our nation's ancient creed, And the holdin' of them islands is the very thing we need."

Parson, them remarks of Thompson makes old Uncle Ike more set In his views that war for conquest is a scheme of "plutes" to get Our old Uncle Sam committed to the European plan; Then good-by to all republics and the liberties of man.—George McA. Miller, in The Democratic Magazine.

There are, apparently, a limited number of people in the country who are for the war all the time, and glad we undertook it, and ready to face all the inconvenience, danger, responsibility and expense that may result from it. There are also a limited number of people who are opposed to the war all the time, and convinced that it is a lamentable enterprise. But the mind of the average citizen seems to work back and forth between these extremes. Now he is glad; again he is sorry; now he is reconciled; again he is filled with forebodings, and inclined to anathematize all jingoes, and fire-eaters, and shouters for the annexa-

tion of the Spanish islands, and to hark back to the Farewell Address and our old policy of staying at home. Which way the average American's mind will finally lean is the most important political question of the hour. He would like to know himself, for uncertainty tires him. He is sure all the time that he will support his government, but he doesn't know in what course he will support it. His government is embarrassed, too; for, looking far ahead, it cannot plan its course except in so far as it can forecast his probable wishes. So the average citizen and the government both watch events, take one step at a time, and wait on Providence.—Life.

Jimmy—Didn't you hear the Sunday school teacher say your conscience is what tells you when you do wrong?

Tommy—It's a good thing it don't tell your mother.—Puck.

"It is all wrong," said the Cornfed Philosopher, "to say that a woman can make a fool of a man. She merely develops him."—Indianapolis Journal.

Many of us have the idea that we are not practicing true economy unless we are depriving ourselves of some real necessity of life.—West Union Gazette.

READERS who find this paper interesting or useful, are requested to bring it to the attention of their acquaintances, and also to forward the names and addresses of such persons as they think might become subscribers after seeing sample copies.

THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

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