

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1898.

Number 17.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The indignation which some very good people of reputed intelligence express over the way in which corporations are shifting war taxes from themselves to their customers is amusing. Telegraph companies are required by law to pay a stamp tax on their messages, but they simply refuse to take messages from any person who does not first affix the stamp. Express companies are required to place a stamp upon their shipping receipts. They can't imitate the telegraph companies and compel their customers to do this for them, so they calmly raise express rates high enough to cover the tax. This is as we said it would be. It is as congress and the administration expected it to be. Everybody who ever gave a thought to taxation knew it would be so. If the public learns from this experience that it is the customer who pays indirect taxes, no matter who is ordered to pay them, some very valuable information will have been very cheaply purchased.

We are gravely told that the devotion of the Spanish queen regent to her son appeals to every mother in the world. So does the devotion of any other mother to her son. But there are too many devoted mothers for the world to be especially interested in one of them merely because her son has a claim to a tottering throne. When such interest appears it is likely to be mawkish sentiment. It is as queen, not as mother, that the regent of Spain differs from the lowliest woman in her realm; and what the sensible world cares most to know about her is not as to her devotion to her son but as to her devotion to the

country that has placed itself under her magisterial care. Is she serving that devotedly? or is she sacrificing its people lest her son may lose a throne?

The Illinois supreme court has made a decision which, though on the surface in the interest of steam railroads as against suburban trolleys, is in the right direction. According to this decision, street car systems cannot condemn private property for the purpose of making short cuts across country. They must go along streets and roads. The privilege of condemnation is restricted to steam roads. Of right it never ought to have been granted at all. Eminent domain is a sovereign power, and sovereign power should be exercised exclusively by sovereign authority—the people themselves.

Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, is a republican of the Abraham Lincoln type. His is republicanism with the imperialistic notions of colonization, semi-slavery, and taxation without representation, left out. To use his own language, "we are not in the colonizing business." Colonies, he sensibly says, "are not a great benefit to the working people of the country, but simply open up a field for the capitalists and monopolists who obtain from the government grants for the building of public works, to be paid for by a system of taxation upon the masses. He adds significantly: "And it is the monopolists who desire this extension of our territory." That is a fact; monopoly and imperialism go hand in hand. Gov. Pingree represents in all this matter the highest type of American sentiment. Instead of annexing the Spanish colonies, he would "demand that Spain grant to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines perfect and absolute freedom."

Beyond that he would not have this country go, except to protect the new republics against disorder within and oppression from without, until the world comes to recognize their independence. Naturally, Gov. Pingree is not persona grata with with the Mark Hanna end of his party.

Studied efforts to belittle the Cuban cause and excite American hostility toward the Cuban patriots have been apparent ever since the American army was safely landed in eastern Cuba. Until that time, all the reports that reached this country told of the suffering, the bravery, the devotion, and the great usefulness to the American army of the insurgent troops. It was under their protection that the American army landed; and without their services then a bloodless landing could not have been effected. This was the tenor of the reports immediately following the landing. And they were doubtless true reports. But soon afterwards, when a foothold had been gained, and the insurgents were apparently no longer needed, as if by inspiration the imperialists began to abuse the Cuban patriots, denouncing them as unfit for self-government, and kept it up until Garcia withdrew his troops from further cooperation with the American army, and moved against the Spaniards on his own account, when, with a unanimity which again suggests inspiration, the imperialists changed their tone.

The slandering of the Cuban patriots was of the most baseless kind. They refused to make roads, it was said. Why shouldn't they refuse to make roads under the orders of officers to whom they owe no allegiance—as menial servants and not as soldiers. Our own soldiers also would have refused to make roads under like circumstances. They picked up the

impedimenta which our soldiers threw away, and appropriated them to themselves, was the burden of another complaint. But who was to warn them that our soldiers would want their impedimenta again? Did honor and honesty demand that the Cubans allow the impedimenta to rot upon the ground when they needed them? And then it was said that the Cuban soldiers gorged themselves with food. Well, are we quite sure that the best of our Yankee soldiers would not gorge themselves with food if they got the chance, after three years of fighting and starving? Whether any of the charges against the Cubans, were true or not, we have no means of knowing. But if they were true, what of it? What is the connection between such conduct and incapacity for self government?

Worst of all the accusations against the Cubans, however, was the pretense that they are brigands. This was dribbled out with here an incident and there another, intended to show that the Cubans murdered prisoners. What if they did? That was the kind of war to which the Spanish had accustomed them. If it was brigandage for the Cubans to murder Spanish prisoners, was it civilized for the Spanish to murder Cuban prisoners?

In the same connection a horrible tale was told of how the Cubans fired upon Spaniards escaping from Cervera's wrecks. Commenting upon this that eminent representative of plutocratic civilization, Harper's Weekly, voiced the general anti-Cuban sentiment. This conduct, said Harper's, of the Cubans, "puts them outside of the pale of civilization." Think of it! Weyler had murdered Cuban prisoners, but Harper's did not therefore expel the Spanish government from the pale of civilization. And even at the battle of Santiago, only one day before the Cubans fired upon escaping Spanish sailors, Spanish sharpshooters deliberately picked out wounded American soldiers and surgeons at the operating table as targets

for their marksmanship. This wasn't just right, you know, but it was not enough to put the Spanish outside of the pale of civilization. That penalty is reserved for Cubans, who fire upon escaping Spaniards—and whose island home, which is the important consideration, excites the cupidity of their detractors. How were these Cubans, educated by their enemy in a style of warfare which made Spanish prisoners fear death at the hands of the United States—how were they to know that it is uncivilized to fire at an escaping enemy? Even the American soldiers, only two days before, had fired upon the Spanish as they ran from San Juan hill. How could the untutored Cubans draw such fine distinctions in civilized warfare as that enemies escaping from a hill may be fired upon, while enemies escaping from war vessels must not be?

That the disposition to "lay pipes" for appropriating Cuba, by minimizing the strength and character of the Cuban patriots, has reached high up in the American government—even into the white house—is indicated by the circumstances of Garcia's withdrawal. Of the authenticity of Garcia's dignified letter to Shafter there may be room for doubt, though it bears many indications of genuineness. But Shafter's letter to Garcia in reply is authentic enough, and that in itself shows that Garcia had ample reason for withdrawing his cooperation. Gen. Shafter appears to have invited Garcia "to witness the surrender" of Santiago. But he invited reporters of newspapers to do that. Had he been accompanied in his camp by a civilian friend he might have invited him "to witness the surrender." Unquestionably Shafter did not confer with Garcia as to the surrender while negotiations were in progress, nor did he invite Garcia to participate in the ceremony of surrender in his official capacity. Shafter himself admits this by saying to Garcia: "It was out of the question for me to take any action in regard to your forces in connection with the surrender, which

was made solely to the American army." After having his forces treated in this way as a band of brigands, whom the American commander employs for their rations for scouting and bushwhacking, but ignores in all other respects, Garcia would have exhibited little respect for his cause, for his troops or for himself, had he remained within the American lines. The contemptuous treatment of the American imperialists had been repeated by the American commander, and could not be atoned for by the personal courtesy to Garcia himself of an invitation "to witness the surrender." But Gen. Shafter is not to be blamed for this. For all the public knows to the contrary, his treatment of the Cubans may have been as distasteful to him as it was to them. He was carrying out a policy which had been formulated at the white house.

That Shafter, in his officially contemptuous treatment of the Cubans was acting in obedience to a white house policy may be gathered from the president's instructions regarding the government of Santiago. The same contemptuous ignoring of the Cubans which had characterized the surrender also characterized these instructions. It is not likely that the presidential instructions were a reflection of Shafter's policy; it is much more probable that their scope and spirit had been conveyed to Shafter from his superiors before the surrender took place, and that in negotiating for and accepting the surrender he acted accordingly. In those instructions from the president, not only are the Cubans contemptuously ignored as friends and allies, from address to signature, but in one place they are pointedly alluded to as a local "party or faction." Shafter may have been untactful in carrying out the white house policy, as it is reported the administration complains, but tactful or not, that was the policy he faithfully carried out.

All this conduct is regarded by the Cubans, it is said, as

a tacit avowal on the part of the United States of its intention to annex the island instead of securing its independence; and so significant is it regarded by the Spanish that they are freely predicting an early union of the Cuban forces with their own to expel the American invaders. Of course their prediction is baseless. It is what the Spanish would like rather than what they expect, and is important only because it goes to show the impression which the conduct of this government toward the Cuban republic makes upon its enemies as well as its friends. But the Cubans are too level-headed to carry even just resentment so far. They know, too, that the administration is not the American people; and that however persistently the administration, backed by imperialistic and plutocratic sympathizers with the Havana autonomists, may try to repudiate with an appearance of honor, the pledge this country has given to Cuba, the people of the United States will see to it that that pledge is redeemed.

As late as the 20th, the war department had not received a complete report of the casualties at the battle of Santiago, fought three weeks before, and none was given out until the 26th. This is evidence of extreme incapacity or inexcusable neglect, and there is little difficulty in placing the responsibility where it belongs. It is inconceivable that the military officers at Santiago who hold their places legitimately should have been so grossly negligent. With a roll call every day, it is not probable that they omitted promptly to report the names of the killed, wounded and missing. But somewhere among the incompetent civilians whom the McKinley administration has been thrusting into places of military responsibility, these reports caught fast. It was all of a piece with the incompetency that characterized the shipment of arms and supplies to Santiago, for which shoulder-strapped white house favorites

were responsible. Nor was the delay of reports of casualties a minor matter. More than three score men of the American army had been reported as missing since the battle of Santiago, and as their names were not given, every family in the States which was represented by a father, son or brother at the front, from whom nothing had been heard since the battle, was kept in suspense lest he might be one of the missing. And this suspense continued for nearly a month. The neglect to publish the names of all the injured long before they were published was a piece of unpardonable cruelty, for which McKinley's partiality for senators' sons was doubtless accountable.

"Freedom of the port" is a device for enabling the rich to escape custom house snares which they lay for the poor. In plain English it is a license to smuggle, which is issued by the administration to wealthy friends thereof. When working men complained that under McKinleyism poor men were taxed for clothes which they might send for from abroad, while rich men who could afford to go to Europe were allowed to bring in all the clothes they wanted without paying a penny of duty, the complaint was silenced with a provision in the Dingley law forbidding the importation by travelers of more than \$100 worth of personal effects. This clause, it appears, was for the benefit of workingmen—to hoodwink them; for now it comes out that the administration assumes to exempt rich friends from having their baggage examined upon arriving from a foreign country. This exemption is called "the freedom of the port."

Not long ago, it seems, the "freedom of the port" of New York was extended to W. D. Sloane and his party, upon their return from a Vanderbilt wedding abroad. They offered to pay \$600 duties upon their baggage, but that was not satisfactory to the agents of the board of trade,

who, acting under special authority to search baggage, and arbitrarily disregarding the privileges of "freedom of the port" which the Sloane-Vanderbilt party had received, examined their baggage mercilessly. As a result, it appeared that the baggage, instead of being covered by \$600 duties, was lawfully subject to \$2,500. It will be seen, therefore, that the "freedom of the port," if frequently extended, would be well worth an occasional campaign contribution.

Landlords are pretty much the same everywhere. Living as they do upon the labor of other people, they can never quite bring themselves to feel that they ought to pay anything for the pecuniary benefits the public confers upon them. Their disposition thus to shirk just obligations is most frequently manifested in connection with street improvements. The number of instances in which landlords have tried to shift the expenses of street improvements from themselves, who are enriched by the improvements, to the masses of the community, whom the improvements do not enrich a penny's worth, since all their advantages are offset by the higher rent they pay to landlords, would fill a doomsday book. And the success of landlords in this is astonishing.

London landlords are no exception. For years the people of London have been agitating for a wide street from the Strand to Holborn. Justly enough, the London county council proposed that the expense be born by the landlords whom the great improvement would enrich. But characteristically, the landlords opposed that proposition with all their might. They wanted the thoroughfare. They knew it would enable them to charge higher ground rents. They were not at all ignorant of the fact that it would pour gold into their pockets from the pockets of other people, without their having done a thing to earn it. But all the same, they wanted other people to pay the expense. And,

as usual, the landlords have won. The great thoroughfare is to be built; it will increase ground rents throughout the neighborhood; the landlords are to pocket the increased ground rents; and the people who bear the burden of the taxes—the poorer people bear most of it—are to foot the bills. Then, at the end, the London landlords will be still further confirmed in their notion that they are the upper classes and that the London landless, who bear the burdens of making them rich, are men of inferior clay. Perhaps they are right. Men of better clay wouldn't tolerate the arrogance of these parasites.

There is no difference between the hunger of London landlords for "unearned increment" and that of Irish landlords. After 20 years of passionate opposition an Irish local government bill has passed the British house of commons without an angry word, as smooth as the flight of a gull. That miracle of legislative miracles was accomplished by the shrewd device of tax exemptions for the benefit of Irish landlords and sub-landlords. Landlords are to pay no local rates, and the county councils cannot tax them. For all local improvements tenants and laborers must foot the bill, while landlords pocket the benefits. Without this concession the landlord interest in parliament would have defeated the bill; with it the people of Ireland are no better off than before. They will continue to work for the landlord.

The London Spectator thinks it odd that Gladstone did not perceive that Irishmen are free. So do we. And we think it would be rather difficult for anyone who disputes it, to answer the Spectator when it asks: "In what are Irishmen not as free, in any true sense of freedom, as Tories are, indeed, as free as the English, as free as the Scotch, as free as Americans. Yet it does not follow that Irishmen are really free. Only some Englishmen, only some Scotchmen,

only some Americans are free. The great masses everywhere, no matter how free their form of government, are subject to monopolies which serve the ends, in this politically freer era, which autocratic government served in an earlier era. The real explanation of Irish discontent is not that Irishmen are less free than the masses of English, Scotch and Americans, but that oppressive economic institutions to which these have grown accustomed make the Irish sore. They themselves suppose they are restive under English political institutions, which bear upon them with peculiar severity. But what they are really restive under, as the "no rent" agitation went to show, is the economic institution of landlordism, which bears upon them in the same way and with the same severity as upon their brethren across the channel and their cousins over the Atlantic. The reason they feel this as English tyranny, instead of recognizing it as an evil under which the landless everywhere are suffering, is because their landlords are mostly Englishmen or absentee descendants of English land grabbers.

Were it not for being accused of punning, we should be tempted to say of that really useful magazine, *Self-Culture*, that it sometimes needs a little. So does its critic who reviews Henry George's theory in the July number. Thoughtful readers of George's works will be interested to learn, upon the authority of this critic, that George has utterly failed to show definitely how land as raw material, and made or improved land, "can be separately treated so as to do justice to the individual's right to enjoy the results of his own labor." If the author of *Progress and Poverty* made anything clearer than anything else, it was this. He showed that economic rent is the measure of the value of land as raw material, and that by taking economic rent for common use, while exempting land improvements along with all other product values, "the individual's right to enjoy the re-

sults of his own labor" would be secure.

In another place in his *Self-Culture* article, George's critic quotes a Cornell professor. George had said that social progress increases land values by increasing the demand for land; to which the professor replies, "as to agricultural lands," that improvements bring in better grades, thus throwing poorer grades out of use and decreasing rents. If this means anything, it means that improvements in transportation, etc., have brought into use distant lands of higher fertility and put out of use the nearby lands, thus reducing the rents of the latter. But what about the rents of the former which before the improvements were at zero? Henry George never said that social progress might not reduce the rents of particular lands. What he maintained was that it tends to increase rent as a whole. Moreover, Henry George was dealing with land, all land, not agricultural land alone. To segregate agricultural land from other land, therefore, in order to reply to him at this point, is either stupid or dishonest. Even if agricultural rent as a whole were to diminish under the influence of improvement—in fact it has not diminished—yet that would be no refutation of George's position, if at the same time the rent or value of other than agricultural lands, urban lands and mines, for example, had increased.

To the mind of *Self-Culture's* critic, the strongest argument in favor of the single tax, upon his own confession, is that in regard to "the unearned increment." Here he shows how much superior his own mind is in economics to the second hand mind with which universities equip their economic students. But the second hand mind obtrudes, nevertheless. For he declares that even the unearned increment "is not without its counterbalance." Behold now the counterbalance. We state it in his own language: "If we admit the injustice of permitting the individual

to retain that which is clearly the product of the community by reason of its growth, we must also admit the justice of repaying property owners for loss occasioned by the decline of the community." This argument is a stale chestnut of college economics. It amounts to this, that if the community takes the "increment" of land from landlords whose lands increase in value, it must recompense for "decrement" the landlords whose lands decline in value. Even an undergraduate ought to see through that piece of sophistry. It is very transparent. We have only to consider that the community loses the so-called "increment" which landlords gain, but does not gain the so-called "decrement" which landlords lose. Wherefore, should the community make good those losses from which it derives no benefit, as a condition of appropriating the gains that belong to it? If the "increment" belongs to the community, the community can by taking it fall under no possible obligation to indemnify anybody for losses incurred in trying unsuccessfully to get some of it. To this academic view of the question we might add the practical one, namely, that under Henry George's single tax theory, landlords whose lands decreased in value would pay a lower tax accordingly. The academic point therefore is of no practical importance.

We are under the necessity of apologizing to our readers for having stated last week that a clique in Mark Hanna's Cleveland bailiwick had obtained a charter for the First National bank of the Philippines. This was a mistake. What we had in mind was the first national bank of Hawaii. For eight years Perry Heath, of Cleveland, has annually renewed an application for the First national bank of Hawaii, in anticipation of the annexation of those islands. The annexation having been made, Mr. Heath is now the fortunate forestaller of a bank charter under the authority of the United States, for Honolulu; and upon de-

positing United States bonds at Washington, for which he will continue to receive interest the same as if they were in his own strong box, the government will lend him as much currency as he requires, without interest. It is "a soft snap."

It appears from later reports that we were only a week too early in speaking of the first national bank of the Philippines. One week later and no apology would have been necessary. An application for permission to organize the First national bank of Manila is now on file, and the "soft snap" there will doubtless be forthcoming if we annex the Philippines. In these occurrences, the real inwardness of the imperialistic policy may be observed.

Some of the "business" papers are crowing over the commercial statistics which show that within a year the United States has marketed \$1,210,274,015 worth of domestic products, while receiving back only \$616,052,844. This shows that we have sent out of the country \$594,221,171 worth of produce more than we have received back. But isn't that a losing rather than a gainful state of affairs? Suppose nothing should ever come back in payment of the balance, how would the United States have been benefited? Wouldn't this country be just \$594,221,171 poorer?

If that is good trading, why not throw our goods into the sea? By doing so, we could always prevent an excess of imports. All we should have to do, whenever our imports rose a million or so above our exports, would be to dump two million or so into the briny deep. The balance would thus once more be shifted to the "favorable" side. By following this method strictly, we could maintain a "favorable" balance perpetually.

We are told, however, that the balance will come back to us in gold, and thus make money plentiful. Those who say so know better, unless they are fools. Not as much gold as

that has come to this country, in excess of what has gone out, for more than ten years; nor could anything like that amount be expected to come in for the next five years, in excess of what goes out, even if gold imports were phenomenal. This balance of nearly six hundred millions, which foreign countries owe us as the result of the past year's trading, will never be paid off in gold; nor so much as a moderate fraction of it. If paid off at all, most of it must be paid off in goods. And if it were paid off in goods, how could our "business" papers then crow over an excess of exports? To pay that balance in goods at some time in the future would be at that time to throw the balance the other way. But that would never do. If there be any virtue at all in the theory that an export balance is a favorable balance, then the export balance must be kept up; which means, since we are not to get our pay in gold, that we are to lose the larger part of the balance altogether.

An astonishing crusade against money lenders is said to be under way in the British house of commons. The money lending committee, it is understood, have resolved to recommend a law providing that whenever a money lending transaction comes before a court all the circumstances shall be reviewed, the account shall be reopened, and the judge shall have the power to fix any rate of interest he deems proper, and to compel the return of all interest in excess of that amount which the borrower may have paid. This sort of legislation is not confined to England, nor to a time there when great money lending scandals have come to light. It is as old as the days when Christians borrowed of Jews only to defraud them, and we are familiar with it on the American side of the Atlantic. But why should such restrictive laws be passed in any country. Why may not men contract as freely with reference to the terms of a loan as to the terms of a sale? Lenders resort to no coercion to com-

pel men to borrow. No one is forced to borrow if he doesn't wish to; he who borrows of a money lender is as free to contract as is he who buys of a grocer. Why, then, should borrowing contracts be subject to censorship while grocery contracts are inviolable? No one has ever explained this, and probably no one ever will.

When a college professor takes up the task of flaying Godkin, that pope infallible of the gospel of selfishness, one can contemplate the proceeding with a good deal of complacency, even though he do not altogether approve the professor's cutlery. For that reason the paper on "Mr. Godkin and the New Political Economy," which Prof. Green, of Bethany College, contributes to the July Arena, is quite enjoyable. But Prof. Green's cutlery is objectionable, after all. Dropping the metaphor, his political economy is no better than Godkin's. If Godkin's political economy is harsh, the professor's is mushy. To refer to only one point. Godkin holds to the doctrine of "laissez faire," while the professor insists that this doctrine has been utterly discredited by the march of events. What the professor means is that the march of events has proved that the doctrine of "laissez faire" is harsh to the weak and destructive to society. In truth, however, the march of events has proved nothing of the kind. It has proved, indeed, that Godkin's conception of "laissez faire" is harsh and destructive; but the march of events was not needed to prove that. For by "laissez faire" Godkin means "competition, with conditions as they are." No march of events is necessary to prove that "laissez faire" in that sense would crush the poor and, making the rich few fewer and richer, would ultimately destroy society. But Godkin's understanding of "laissez faire" is as narrow and selfish as his philosophy. It is not a true interpretation of the doctrine. What that doctrine really means is not "competition, with conditions as they are," but "competition under free and equal condi-

tions." Such competition we have never yet been allowed by law to have. Consequently, the march of events has proved nothing as to "laissez faire," in its true meaning as distinguished from the Godkin meaning, and of course has not discredited it. So far as the march of events throws any light upon economic problems, it shows that the one thing needful for the relief of the impoverished and the salvation of society, is that competition which we have never yet had, but which is implied by the "laissez faire" doctrine when truly interpreted—namely, competition in freedom, competition in which opportunities are equal.

There is some reason to fear that the horrible details of the Guldensuppe murder in New York may have unduly affected the final decision of the courts in the case of his murderer, upon a point of great importance to persons who may be hereafter accused of crime in that state. Martin Thorn was charged with Guldensuppe's murder. In the course of his trial the jury, under the direction of the court, visited the scene of the murder. Thorn's attorney expressly waived the prisoner's right to accompany the jury. This waiver was made, doubtless, for the purpose of manufacturing "a point" on which to get a new trial. For it is a settled and wholesome principle that the prisoner in a criminal trial can waive none of the safeguards the law throws around him. One of the reasons for this principle is that if a prisoner could waive them, he might often do so improvidently, lest by refusing he should prejudice his defense with the jury. On the point of Thorn's waiver, his case went to the highest court of the state. Two of the judges in that court held that it was Thorn's right to go with the jury when it visited the scene of the crime, and that he could not waive it. They, therefore, voted to give him a new trial. But the majority of the judges were of opinion that a view of the scene of the crime by the jury is not the taking of evi-

dence, and hence may be had in the prisoner's absence without ignoring his constitutional right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. They therefore held that Thorn was legally convicted notwithstanding his absence when the jury examined the scene of the crime. Their opinion prevailed, of course, and a precedent was thereby established for judicial proceedings in criminal cases in the absence of the prisoner, which would have made the lawyers of a generation ago shudder. It is to be hoped that the repulsiveness of the crime and the evident purpose of the prisoner's counsel to play a trick upon the court, did not contribute to the making of this somewhat dangerous precedent.

BRYCE'S SIX EQUALITIES.

The author of "The American Commonwealth," James Bryce, of London, has expanded an address of his to the Municipal society of Glasgow, and published it in the July number of the Century under the title "Equality." It is intensely interesting, as all Mr. Bryce's writings are; and it is animated by a democratic spirit. But as a contribution to the philosophy of the subject discussed, there is in Mr. Bryce's essay little of value except his classification of the different kinds of equality.

He enumerates six senses in which the term "equality" is currently used. Two refer to man as a product of nature; four refer to him as a social being.

The two senses in which equality is predicated of man as a product of nature are described by Mr. Bryce as, first, the spiritual; and, second, the physical, intellectual and moral. He concedes equality as to the first. "Between each man," he says, "simply as a man, and every other man, there is an equality of soul, an equal worth of personality," an equality which is denoted by the phrase: "All men are equal in the sight of God." But as to the second, Mr. Bryce denies the claim of equality. On this point he says that between men there is "an inequality of gifts, each man differing from his fellows in physical strength

and in physical needs, in intellectual strength and intellectual tastes, in force of will, in industry, in perseverance, in rectitude, in capacity for emotion, whether good or bad." As regards what he calls natural man, therefore, our English philosopher finds that spiritual equality is opposed by physical, intellectual and moral inequality.

The four remaining senses of equality are described respectively as civil, political, social and economic. Civil equality means equal rights within the sphere of private law; political equality signifies the right to an equal share in government; social equality has reference to voluntary social intercourse; and economic equality is equal possession of property.

Of Mr. Bryce's six equalities, only the last, economic equality, calls for much attention. Yet it will be worth while in passing, to make an observation or two regarding the others.

That spiritual equality is in these days agreed to on all hands, is true. The agreement is little better, however, even now, than nominal. Though everybody concedes that God is no respecter of persons, most of us are disposed to allow for at least one exception; and some of our laws and institutions perpetuate the tradition that God is a respecter of persons. Our systems of land tenure, for instance, which give to the millionaire's child an abundance of God's earth, and deny so much as standing room to multitudes of the children of the poor, have at bottom no other support.

As to civil equality, in which Mr. Bryce considers much of the progress of the world during the past four centuries to consist, nothing need be said of his discussion, even in passing, except that he seems to have dropped into a common and sometimes vicious error, that of confounding the natural with the primitive. Civil equality "is so far from being natural," he says, "that it is found only in advanced civilizations." Primitive, not natural, is clearly the true idea. For civilization does not advance away from the natural; its advances are a development of the natural. So, while we may say that civil equality is not a primitive condition, we cannot say that it is not natural.

Mr. Bryce is satisfactorily democratic in his elaboration of the idea of political equality. He is entirely beyond criticism, also, in what he has to say of social equality; though social equality, depending as it does and ought to upon mutual congeniality and voluntary selection, is an unimportant phase of the equality question. Correlative rights and duties are not involved in it.

But it is evident that in considering physical, intellectual and moral qualities, which he holds to be unequal, Mr. Bryce has laid altogether too much stress upon his idea that these qualities are wholly natural gifts. No one will dispute, of course, that there are natural inequalities in these respects. But in great degree, what are regarded as inequalities are not inequalities but differences. One man may have enormous physical strength for concentrated effort and but little endurance, while another has great endurance and comparatively but little strength in concentrated effort; shall we call their physical gifts unequal? Or, one man may have a great faculty for generalization and none for minute investigation, while another who investigates with thoroughness lacks the generalizing faculty; shall we say that their intellectual gifts are unequal? or only that they differ? And besides differences mistakenly considered as personal inequalities, real inequalities attributed to nature are often in fact due to differences in social environment during infancy and youth, those differences in environment having been caused by defective civil and political equality. Such personal inequalities are chargeable not to nature, but to society.

If, however, we accept, without modification or question, Mr. Bryce's views as to physical, intellectual and moral equality, and proceed to a consideration of the last and practically most important of his six equalities, the economic, we shall find that his ideas respecting the two are in direct conflict.

Mr. Bryce defines economic equality as "the possession by every man of an equal quantity or value of property, none being either richer or poorer than his neighbor." But if it be true, as Mr. Bryce contends, that in

physical and intellectual strength, in force of will, and in industry, men are unequal, then it cannot be true that the possession by every man of an equal quantity or value of property would constitute economic equality. On the contrary, equality of possessions in such circumstances would constitute economic inequality. Economic equality demands that the possession of products be in proportion to productive powers and thrift. Would Mr. Bryce claim that men were economically equal if the idler possessed as much as the worker, the intelligent worker as much as the stupid one, the thrifless as much as the thrifty, the non-producer as much as the producer? Yet he must make that flimsy claim, or abandon one or the other of his two propositions. Without that, they do not hold together. Either, men are not unequal in productive power and thrift, or else equal possessions do not constitute economic equality.

It might be urged, of course, that there is such a concept as absolute equality of possessions, and that Mr. Bryce has merely intended to classify that concept as economic equality. But we are not quarreling with words and phrases. The answer to that plea would be that there is also such a concept as equality of possessions in proportion to production and thrift, and that Mr. Bryce, if he has intended to provide for the former concept by classifying it as economic equality, has made no provision at all for the latter, which is infinitely the more important of the two.

Both of Mr. Bryce's propositions—that human powers are unequal, and that equality of possessions is economic equality—are in truth defective. We have already indicated weaknesses in the argument for inequality of human powers. We are inclined also to think that these inequalities, so far as they depend upon natural gifts, are less and fewer than Mr. Bryce supposes. Be that as it may, however, men's contributions to production do differ, not only in character, but in value; and whether this difference is one of original powers or of inclination, of capability or of industry, is of little moment. It is enough for present purposes that it exists. Since it exists, a worse definition of economic

equality than that which Mr. Bryce gives—equality of possessions—could hardly be formulated. Economic equality and equality of possessions cannot be the same thing, while contributions to production and savings of product are unequal. Yet, if we had economic equality, doubtless there would be a nearer approach than now to equality of possessions. But that would not be because economic equality and equality of possessions are identical. It would be because inequalities in productive and saving power and inclination are really less than they appear to be. With the possessions of each measured by his earnings and savings, both the original powers of production, and inclination to produce and save, would be seen to be not far from a common level; and equality of possessions would then naturally tend to coincide with economic equality. Mr. Bryce's propositions are therefore defective on the one hand in making too much of the inequality of personal powers, and on the other in confusing economic equality with the equality of possessions toward which economic equality would tend.

In comparing economic with civil and political equality, Mr. Bryce shows that he fails to grasp what Hamlin Garland calls "the clue to the snarl." For the question of equality is a snarl until you grasp the clue; then, like Columbus's problem of the egg, it becomes very simple, indeed. Mr. Bryce notes, as a capital difference, that whereas in civil and political inequality "one man's gain is another's loss," with economic inequality it is otherwise. This is a vital point. If Mr. Bryce were right in his contention that in economic inequalities one man's gain is not another's loss, nothing could be urged against economic inequality. But he is mistaken. In economic inequalities one man's gain is of necessity another's loss. Possessions not being in proportion to earnings and savings, what one gets in excess of his industry and thrift others must lose out of the proceeds of their industry and thrift. And because one man's gain is thus another's loss—just as the gain of one is the loss of another in both civil and political inequality—economic inequality is wrong; and for that reason

it produces the ill effects which Mr. Bryce enumerates, but accounts for as accidents of experience rather than inevitable consequences of violated moral law.

Mr. Bryce makes one exception to his observation that in economic inequalities one man's gain is no other man's loss. This exception is the possession of land. Here he stumbles upon "the clue to the snarl," but fails to grasp it. He thinks of land only as one class of property among many. Were he to consider it as the one great class of property which at the last controls all other kinds, and—by disturbing the natural equilibrium of possession, that true economic equality, of each in proportion to his earnings and savings—enables some to gain what others lose, he would grasp "the clue to the snarl" and unravel the tangle as he faithfully followed the clue.

After that Mr. Bryce would cease to be concerned about the dangers involved in taking property away from the rich and giving it to the poor. For he would no longer need to contemplate the possibility of such a proceeding. He would see that nothing need be done to produce true economic equality, but to abolish the unjust and blighting economic power of landlordism. This would indeed be to take away from individuals one kind of property, but a kind which is inimical to all just property rights. Could Mr. Bryce say that doing this would "weaken the motives for thrift and foresight which operate on the mind of the rich" to acquire property justly, or "the natural incentive to exertion which the need of providing" for themselves creates in the mind of the poor? Would he not be compelled to say, on the contrary, that it would give a new impulse to production and strengthen the guarantees of all just property rights—of all property rights, that is to say, under which one man's gain is not another's loss?

To abolish the wicked economic power of landlordism, while it would take no just property from the rich and give it to the poor, would prevent the further taking of just property from the poor and giving it to the rich. Is that change desirable or not? If not, why not?

NEWS

Peace is now in sight. Rumors of it have abounded, almost from the beginning of the war; but on the 26th it was for the first time proposed definitely and officially. On that day the French ambassador at Washington, acting officially in behalf of Spain, and under the direction of the Spanish minister of foreign affairs, formally presented to President McKinley, at the white house, a message from the Spanish government making peace proposals. The message looked, in the language of the official bulletin issued from the white house, "to the termination of the war and the settlement of terms of peace."

It was doubtless in anticipation of these peace overtures that the personal liberties guaranteed by the constitution of Spain were suspended on the 14th, as reported last week, and that publications and public meetings in that country have been suppressed. The Spanish government fears both a republican and a Carlist uprising, the former to establish a republican form of government and the latter to replace the Carlist line upon the throne. What the extent of the danger of a republican uprising may be is not very clear, but the menaces of the Carlists have become more and more threatening. Don Carlos, the royal claimant, issued a manifesto on the 16th which we reported last week, calling upon the Spanish army and people to rebel; and since then preparations on the part of the Carlists have been active for a rebellion in the event of the surrender of any Spanish territory. These preparations have been met by the Spanish government, the Basque country and other districts in which the Carlists are strong having been placed upon a war footing.

A full day before the peace overtures from Spain reached the president, Gen. Miles had effected a landing upon the island of Puerto Rico. On the 19th he was still at Guantanamo, Cuba, held back by delay in organizing his naval force; but on the 21st it was reported from Washington that he was well on his way. He had left, in fact, in the evening of the 21st. His expedition was heard from on the 22d, off Mole St. Nicholas, Hayti, in a complaint from the commander that the construction corps had not arrived, and that snagboats

and lighters were missing. The vessels of Gen. Miles's expedition were sighted, on the 23d, off the north coast of San Domingo, and on the 25th at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, the Spanish flag had been lowered and the American flag raised, at Guanica, on the south coast of Puerto Rico, about 20 miles from the western end of the island, and about 75 miles southwest from San Juan.

The landing at Guanica was easily effected, under the cover of five warships. Early in the morning of the 25th Lieut. Commander Wainwright steamed into the harbor with the Gloucester, formerly J. Pierpont Morgan's yacht, to reconnoiter. The Spaniards were taken completely by surprise. Their first intimation of danger came in the form of a shot from the Gloucester, to which they made no reply. Thirty men, under Lieut. Huse, were then put ashore without opposition. They hauled down the Spanish flag from the blockhouse near the village and raised the American flag in its place. Hardly had this been done when they were fired upon. They replied to the fire, and the Gloucester shelled the town and a body of Spanish cavalry which was seen to be rapidly approaching. A street fight ensued, but it was of short duration. Before ten o'clock the Americans were in undisputed possession. Meanwhile the landing of American troops in large bodies had regularly begun, and a force was pushed forward to capture the railroad leading to Ponce, a garrisoned coast town some 15 or 20 miles to the east. The Spanish report their loss as one officer killed and three soldiers wounded. The Americans suffered no loss.

The movement upon Guanica was determined upon while the expedition was yet at sea. The original objective of the expedition was San Juan cape, but on the 24th Gen. Miles announced that he had decided to turn south, go through the Mona passage, and, surprising the Spanish, make his first landing at Guanica. His success in this was complete. The harbor is deep and well protected, and from Ponce there is a good military road directly across the island to San Juan.

While Gen. Miles leads the invasion of Puerto Rico, the surrender of eastern Cuba proceeds. Rumors were afloat that the various Spanish garrisons outside of Santiago, which Toral

had surrendered, would not give up without a fight; but these rumors seem to have had their origin in the fact that the outlying garrisons did not believe that they had been surrendered. When they were assured upon this point they came in without resistance. On the 25th the largest garrison, that at Guantanamo, consisting of 7,000 troops, laid down their arms. The garrisons at San Luis and Palma, numbering 3,350 had already done so. The only other garrisons included in Toral's surrender which had not yet come in were 1,000 troops at Sagua, the northwestern part of the surrendered territory, and 2,000 at Baracoa, on the northern coast near the eastern extremity of Cuba. Gen. Shafter estimated the number of prisoners as likely to exceed the estimate made at the time of the surrender, which was from 22,000 to 23,000.

In the government of the city of Santiago, a change has been made. Gen. Wood, lately colonel of Roosevelt's rough riders, has been substituted for Gen. McKibben as military governor. Gen. McKibben is ill. This change was made on the 20th. Wood promptly instituted strict sanitary regulations for Santiago, set about cleaning the streets, and buried the bodies of dead animals which had been poisoning the air for days.

Sanitary measures taken by the American authorities in and about Santiago have had the effect of lessening fears of yellow fever. Though a number of American soldiers had died and 2,425 were sick, on the 25th, only about 10 per cent. of all the fever patients had yellow fever. The number of new cases of fever on the 25th was 495, and the number of fever patients who returned to duty on that day was 412. Matters looked worse, however, on the 27th. There were then 500 cases of yellow fever, which indicates that the former estimate of ten per cent. was erroneous. Still, the yellow fever is of a mild type, and the deaths are few. Owing to this pestilence at the front, the Florida health authorities refuse to allow Col. John Jacob Astor to land at Tampa, though he bears dispatches from Gen. Shafter to the war department.

Since the American landing upon Cuban soil, reports of dissatisfaction with the Cuban troops have been frequent, and upon the surrender of the city of Santiago to Gen. Shafter, he ignored them. This gave confirma-

tion to rumors that Garcia, the Cuban general, had resigned, and these rumors were further confirmed by a letter from Garcia to Shafter which may very likely become historic. The authenticity of the letter was denied, but there is good reason for believing in its genuineness. Gen. Garcia has not repudiated it, and Gen. Shafter evidently believed that Garcia had authorized it or he would not have answered it. The theory that it is not authentic seems to have no better foundation than the idea that the literary author of the letter was a newspaper man on Garcia's staff, and not Garcia himself.

This correspondence between Garcia and Shafter cannot be condensed to advantage. The full text of the letters is necessary in order to give the atmosphere of the situation. We therefore publish them in full. Garcia's letter to Shafter was as follows:

Sir: On May 12 the government of the republic of Cuba ordered me, as commander of the Cuban army in the east, to cooperate with the American army, following plans and obeying the orders of its commanders. I have done my best, sir, to fulfill the wishes of my government, and I have been until now one of your most faithful subordinates, honoring myself in carrying out your orders and instructions as far as my powers have allowed me to do it. The city of Santiago finally surrendered to the American army, and the news of that important victory was given to me by persons entirely foreign to your staff. I have not been honored, sir, with a single word from yourself informing me about the negotiations for peace or the terms of the capitulation by the Spaniards. The important ceremonies of the surrender of the Spanish army and the possession of the city by yourself took place later on, and I only knew of both events by the public reports. I was not honored, sir, with a kind word from you inviting myself or any officer of my staff to represent the Cuban army on that memorable occasion.

Finally, I know that you have left in power at Santiago the same Spanish authorities that for three years I have fought as enemies of the independence of Cuba. I beg to state that those authorities have never been elected at Santiago by residents of the city, but were appointed by royal decree of the queen of Spain. I would agree, sir, that that army under your command should have taken possession of the city and garrisoned the forts. I would give my warm cooperation to any measure you may have deemed best under American military law to hold the city for your army and

preserve public order until the time comes to fulfill the solemn pledge of the people of the United States to establish in Cuba a free and independent government; but when the question arises of appointing authorities in Santiago de Cuba, and under the peculiar circumstances created by the 30 years of our struggle against the Spanish rule, I cannot see but with the deepest regret that such authorities are not elected by the Cuban people and the inhabitants of the city but the same ones selected by the queen of Spain and her ministers to defend against the Cubans.

The Spanish sovereignty, a rumor too absurd to be believed, generally ascribes the reason of your measure and of orders forbidding my army to enter Santiago to fear of massacres and revenges against the Spaniards. Allow me, sir, to protest against even the shadow of such an idea. We are not savages ignoring the rules of civilized warfare. We are a poor, ragged army, as ragged and poor as was the army of your forefathers in their noble war for independence, but we respect too deeply our cause to disgrace it with barbarism and cowardice. In view of all these reasons I sincerely regret to be unable to fulfill any longer the orders of my government and therefore I have tendered to-day to the commander in chief of the Cuban army, Maj. Gen. Maximo Gomez, my resignation as commander of this section of our army. Awaiting his resolution I withdraw with my forces to Jiguari.

To the foregoing letter from Gen. Garcia, the following answer was sent by Gen. Shafter:

"My Dear Gen. Garcia: I must say that I was very much surprised at the receipt of your letter this morning and regret extremely that you should regard yourself as in any way slighted or aggrieved. You will remember the fact that I invited you to accompany me into the town of Santiago to witness the surrender, which you declined. This war, as you know, is between the United States and Spain, and it was out of the question for me to take any action in regard to your forces in connection with the surrender, which was made solely to the American army. The policy of my government in continuing in power temporarily the persons occupying the offices is one which I am of course unable to discuss.

"To show you the views held by my government I inclose copy of instructions received by me yesterday from the president, which appear to cover everything that can possibly arise in the government of this territory while held by the United States. Full credit has been given you and your valiant men in my report to my government, and I wish to acknowledge to you the

great and valuable assistance you rendered during the campaign. I regret much to know of your determination to withdraw yourself from this vicinity. I remain yours sincerely."

Whether Garcia wrote the letter quoted above or not, he has certainly withdrawn from the American lines; and that this has not been done under Gen. Shafter's directions is evident from the latter's letter. If Gen. Garcia is operating at all, therefore, it must be independently. And on the 24th a telegram from Havana by way of Madrid indicated that he is operating. According to this telegram he had attacked Gibara, at the mouth of the river Gibara, on the north coast of Cuba, almost due north from Holguin, and not more than 30 miles away, and captured it. The fighting was severe. This Havana dispatch was confirmed, also on the 24th, from Santiago; but nothing further has been reported. Gibara is the natural port of Holguin, which is garrisoned by 10,000 Spaniards, and if Garcia has really captured it, he holds a strong position with reference to Holguin, apparently the point against which the American forces are preparing to move.

The first step in the movement of the American forces against Holguin was made on the 21st at Port Nipe, on the northern coast, and almost due north from Santiago. The attack was made by the Topeka, of the northern blockading squadron, and the Annapolis, the Wasp, and the tug Leyden from the south. Sampson had dispatched them with orders to take Nipe. The harbor of Nipe is 20 miles long and from three to ten miles wide, but the entrance is crooked and narrow. Its direction is south for two miles, then west for two miles, and then south for two miles more. At the mouth, on high bluffs there was a fort to the right and another to the left; and the channel between the first and second turns was sowed with mines, while the course from the second turn to the harbor was guarded by Spanish riflemen. The forts were soon silenced and easily and safely passed; and in the channel only one mine exploded, and that did no damage. The real battle was with a Spanish cruiser, two gunboats and an armed launch in the harbor, supported by a fort. As in all previous naval engagements of the war, the American marksmanship was phenomenal, while the Spanish fired wild. The

Spanish cruiser was sunk and the town surrendered. No injury was sustained by the American vessels, and no one on board was hurt.

With the Americans thus in possession of Port Nipe to the northeast of Holguin, and of Santiago to the southeast, while the Cubans hold Gibara, the Spanish are virtually ousted from the whole of Santiago province.

Other movements in Cuba relate to the capture off Cienfuegos on the 19th of the British steamer Newfoundland, from Nova Scotia, while she was trying to run the blockade; and to the reestablishment of postal communication with all Cuban territory captured by the United States.

From the Philippines no further reports appear of strained relations between Dewey and the German admiral. Aguinaldo has organized the republican cabinet. It consists of Gen. Aguinaldo as president of the council, Baldimiro Aguinaldo, his nephew, as secretary of war, Leander Ibaria as secretary of the interior, and Mariano Trias as secretary of state. The cabinet was sworn in on the 17th at Bacoor, in the presence of 5,000 natives, the ceremony being followed by a fireworks celebration.

Additional reinforcements sailed from San Francisco for the Philippines on the 23d. They were from South Dakota and Utah.

That the government regards the war as fast coming to an end, and the American coast as now entirely safe, was evidenced on the 25th by the explosion, under orders from Washington, of the defensive mines in New York harbor. The event was observed by thousands of spectators.

Watson's fleet, which was to have crossed the Atlantic to attack Spain at home, but has delayed its departure from time to time ever since the 27th of June, is at last officially called off. "The project has been suspended until stern measures become necessary to secure peace," is the manner in which the "call off" is announced.

The most important event of the week, apart from the war, was the publication on the 22d of Alderman Harlan's report to the Chicago board of aldermen on the subject of local

street car franchises. In this report actual investments are compared with dividends and the market value of stock, and a conclusion is reached that for the past eight years the principal street car lines of Chicago could have paid six per cent. dividends on actual investments, and yet have turned over to the city from 18 to 20 per cent. of gross earnings, or have reduced fares to four cents or less. The report is of more than local interest and value. The committee, consisting of Aldermen Harlan—a son of Justice Harlan, of the United States supreme court,—Jackson, Maltby and Maypole, was appointed by Mayor Harrison last October. The mayor was ex-officio a member and chairman of the committee, and the report was the work in large degree, under Harlan's direction, of George E. Hooper, the committee's secretary.

NEWS NOTES.

—Italy and Argentina have joined in a general arbitration treaty.

—Klondike miners are still returning with gold dust and tales.

—Ferdinand W. Peck was on the 22d appointed by President McKinley to be commissioner general to the Paris exposition.

—The king of Corea, wishing to abdicate, asks the British consulate at Seoul to give him refuge. The British consul declines.

—The official reports of Admiral Sampson and his officers, on the destruction of Cervera's fleet, were made public on the 27th.

—Ex-Queen Liliuokalani has returned to Hawaii. She is reported as dying. Her disease is cancer of the neck near the jugular vein.

—Italy has sent two more cruisers into Colombian waters to press for settlement of the Cerutti claim which President Cleveland, as arbitrator, awarded.

—Admiral McNair, superintendent of the United States naval academy at Annapolis, entertained the Spanish Admiral Cervera and his staff at a formal dinner on the 27th.

—The Chinese ambassador at Berlin, Hsuo, has excited much diplomatic curiosity by a sudden and unexplained departure. He is on his way to China by way of the United States.

—New Yorkers do not understand why the commerce of their state is falling off, while that of other states gains, and Gov. Black has appointed a commissioner to hunt for an explanation.

—The civic federation of Chicago has called a national conference to be held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on the

19th and 20th, and consider the disposition to be made of conquered Spanish territory.

—The jury in the case of U. S. Senator Kenney, of Delaware, who was on trial for abetting embezzlement by a bank teller, failed to agree on the 25th, and were discharged. They had been out since the 22d.

—The Pennsylvania railroad between Philadelphia and Atlantic City uses petroleum on the tracks to lay the dust. The method used is to spray the roadbed about once a year. Other railroads are experimenting with the process.

—Sylvester Scovel, the newspaper correspondent who struck Gen. Shafter, as reported last week, was by order of the general expelled from Shafter's military department. Scovel's paper, the New York World, announces that he is no longer connected with it.

—An anti-foreign mob has destroyed the China inland mission house at Chang-Shu, in the province of Quang-si. The missionaries escaped. The rebellion in the same province is reported from imperial sources as having been almost suppressed; but other reports indicate that it is making headway. The leader has proclaimed a new dynasty, which he calls "Vast Progress."

—Spalding, the convicted banker, of Chicago, was married on the 23d. He had been brought from the penitentiary to Chicago as a witness, and while in attendance as such, was taken by the Chicago jailer, with the consent of the sheriff and the warden of the penitentiary, before a justice of the peace, who performed the marriage ceremony. The bride was his former stenographer.

—The first news of the annexation of Hawaii reached Honolulu on the 13th by the British steamer Coptic. A salute of 100 guns was fired, and the accounts tell of enthusiastic rejoicing among the inhabitants. A cup suitably engraved was presented to the captain of the Coptic in memory of the event. On the 27th, Admiral Miller sailed for Honolulu from San Francisco, on the Philadelphia.

—Among the Spanish officers wounded in the destruction of Cervera's fleet was Capt. Concas, who brought the Columbus caravels from Spain to the World's Fair at Chicago in 1893. A fragment of a shell tore a large piece of flesh and muscle from his hip and another made a hole in the fleshy part of his right arm. With these wounds he tried to swim ashore when his vessel struck bottom, and would have drowned but for the aid of one of his sailors. His wounds were dressed on an American yacht. Though painful, the wounds are not serious, and Capt. Concas is rapidly getting well.

MISCELLANY

WHY DID WE MARRY?

Why did we marry—you and I?

Ah, me! why did we? In our youth I vowed I loved; and your reply, Heart-sung, yet silent, seemed the truth.

Beside our love's now swelling tone,
How faint was that first throb, dear heart!

It was a babe that since has grown
Big as the world, of which we're part.

Ay, bigger yet, like Paradise;
For when you told me to your breast,
Or I drink deep from your dear eyes,
The world's forgot, with all the rest.

Give more, dear nobler half! I thirst
For all the love you once kept hid.
What if we did not love at first?

Thank God, sweet wife, we thought we did.

—Julian Ralph, in McClure's Magazine for June, 1894.

THE CONSOLATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC RELIGION.

Written for The Public.

The Tigress had been eating her cubs. Having a little indigestion, she was inclined to repent, but philosophy came to her aid.

"Rapine," she reflected, "is the law of existence; see how the fleas are biting me." She licked her chops. "The survival of the fittest," thought she, "is the way of progress for the race." She looked at the last cub. "Great rewards and fearful punishments" (she sighed, as she scrunched its head) "are necessary to make us do our best." She settled herself to sleep. "There will be no change," she added drowsily, "till consciousness awakes in cubs."

Society is a Tigress.

BOLTON HALL.

20 East 65th St., New York.

A KANSAS JUDGE.

When George R. Peck first became an attorney for the Santa Fe he went to a small town in western Kansas to argue a case that had been brought against the road for damages to several head of cattle that had been killed. The case was tried before a judge who was decidedly German. The witnesses were examined, the case was gone through with, and the attorney for the prosecution arose and made a strong plea for conviction. He waxed eloquent, and the judge paid close attention.

"Are you troo?" asked the judge when the lawyer stopped.

"Yes, your honor."

"You vins de case," said the judge.

"But I want a chance to argue my side of the case," said Peck.

"No, he vins," stoutly asserted the judge. But Peck commenced to talk and gradually his talk led up to the case, and before the judge knew it Peck was arguing the defense. The judge listened closely, and when Peck had finished he said:

"You vins de case."

"But you have already decided in my favor," said the other lawyer.

"Dat's all right. I reverse my first decision. Dis man vins," and the judge stuck to his last decision and Peck won his railroad case.—Topeka State Journal.

THE AMERICAN REGULAR CAV- ALRY.

All of our men are physically as large as life guardsmen, and what they lose in contrast by lack of gold and pipe-clay, and through the inferiority of their equipment and uniform, is made up to them in the way they ride a horse. A German or English trooper sits his horse like a clothes-pin stuck on a line—the line may rise or sag, or swing in the wind, but the clothes-pin maintains its equilibrium at any cost, and is straight, unbending, and a thing to itself. The American trooper, with his deep saddle and long stirrup, swings with the horse, as a ship rides at anchor on the waves; he makes a line of grace and strength and suppleness from the rake of his sombrero to the toe of his hooded stirrup. When his horse walks, he sits it erect and motionless; when it trots, he rises with it, but never leaves the saddle; and when it gallops he swings in unison with it, like a cowboy, or a coxswain in a racing-shell.—Richard Harding Davis, in Scribner's.

"LIFE" ON AN INDEMNITY.

"Life" is, perhaps, a little slow about realizing the inevitability of all the sequences of our war, and it confesses that it cannot see any sure moral grounds for exacting or proposing to exact an indemnity in money from Spain. It can easily understand the sentiment in this country that Spanish rule in Cuba was atrocious enough to be worth ending by force; it can understand that the iniquity of Spanish rule in the Philippines seriously complicates the proposition to give those islands back to Spain. But why, when we have taken Spain's colonies away from her, we should feel that we have a moral right to demand that she should pay us for our trouble, it does not understand at all. Of course, there

must be terms of peace. Of course, we shall keep all the ships we have captured, and perhaps demand possession of any others that may still be afloat; but to ask for money, too, really seems not only grasping but somewhat perplexing. No one of sound mind believes that war was forced upon us. We forced war on Spain. Our reasons seemed to us to be good, but they were our reasons. We cannot blame Spain for not accepting them. We will fight the war through and do all we intended, and probably a good deal more. We will free Cuba, doubtless take and hold Puerto Rico, and make some kind of dicker about the future control of the various Spanish islands of the Pacific. But an indemnity we will hardly get out of Spain whether we demand it or not, except in the form of outlying real estate. . . . Distinctions of mine and thine get sorely mixed in war time, but the rudiments of conduct must survive even war.—Editorial in New York Life.

HEROES OF THE DEEP.

An extract from an article with the above title, by Herbert D. Ward, published in the Century for July.

The beautiful harbor of Gloucester stretches from Norman's Woe to Eastern Point, and the fish that enter are daily measured by the hundred thousand weight. . . . The great fishing fleet holds nearly seven thousand souls under its hurried decks, and every one of these has faced, as a matter of course, dangers that would give the average reader many a nightmare, if he could experience but a touch of their reality. What novelist would think of sketching the story of a dried codfish? What novelist could do better?

It is always with a vague regret that we read the sagas, and are thrilled by the vikings's exploits. It seems as if the deeds of daring had gone by forever, and as if the heroes of the deep were a myth of the past. Absorbed in the Norse romance, we forget that the vikings were only pirates, and that they dared for slaughter and for booty. If the Gloucester of to-day had only existed then, what heroic saga would it not have inspired! For to risk life for glory, or riches, or rescue, or love is in the heart of every man to do; but to risk life for a bare existence, for other people's profit and for an anonymous end partakes of that commonplace sublimity which does not form the favorite plot of poets, although once in awhile it is the subject of a daily paragraph.

For the vikings are not dead. From Portland to New Orleans our harbors

are full of them. They lounge upon our wharves, and we do not recognize them. They loiter on our streets, and we know them not.

SENATOR HOAR ON IMPERIALISM.

In one of the strongest speeches of all of the strong speeches made by him, Senator Hoar has pointed out that, in order to realize imperialism, we must revolutionize our form of government, and permit ambition, avarice, glory, power and wealth to take the place in the minds of our people, as controlling motives, of justice, freedom, kindness, love of country, love of home, public spirit, education, humanity and charity. It is not, he insists, a mere change of government policy; it is a change of national existence and national ideals, the first step, but a long one, toward the destruction of the American republic. He announces that this policy is one which he proposes to resist to the death, and that, in his opinion, through the advocacy of it, "the people of the United States are confronted at this moment with the most serious danger that they have encountered in all their history, unless we except the danger that slavery would be extended over the whole country, or the danger that the rebellion would succeed."

Here is a solemn warning and pledge given by the senior senator of Massachusetts in the congress of the United States, in a speech of almost unparalleled weight and force. In making this declaration, there can be little doubt that Senator Hoar believed he was echoing the cool, sober views of a majority of the citizens of Massachusetts. Clearly, if he is right—and there is no reason to think that he is wrong, for the advocates of imperialism are daily proclaiming that their views are those which are to control national action—it behooves the people of this state to do all that lies in their power to uphold their senior senator, and endeavor to make Massachusetts influence in opposition to a pernicious change as strong and effective as possible.—From Editorial in Boston Herald of July 16.

GOVERNOR ALTGELD ON OUR NA- TIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

This war is creating new conditions. It is starting new currents which we cannot stop, and upon which we must launch our boat if we would not be left behind. The man who launches his boat upon the river will be carried to the sea; the man who refuses to do so will remain behind. This mighty nation is stirred, and is going to move along the line of its natural development toward the goal of the

greatest usefulness and the greatest power. Providence designed this nation to be the supreme mistress of the western hemisphere, and we must steer our vessel toward this haven. While the democracy shaped the policy of this country we had close commercial relations with all people, and the time is near at hand when this will again be the case. We must dig and absolutely own the Nicaragua canal. It is essential to our progress, to our safety and to our convenience. For our own safety and advantage we must, in the course of time, as they become ripe for such a step, acquire the West Indian islands, to round out our south-eastern boundary and perfect our republic. We must have harbors all over the earth for the accommodation of our fleets, of our navy and of our shipping.

These things are in the line of our natural development and progress. They do not involve the establishment of a corrupt colonial system. They will be in line with the policy pursued by all of the great democrats who gave this republic the American continent. On the other hand, we must prevent those wild schemes of conquest and plunder which contemplate the establishment of a colonial empire on another continent and under conditions which must result in injustice and in gigantic scandals, schemes which, instead of adding honor to our flag, would pollute it in the estimation of mankind; schemes which would involve us in endless difficulties and wars, and which in the end could not give us any advantage over and above that which we would get by simply securing intimate commercial relations with these countries. Our motto must be "the natural development and supremacy of this continent," but opposition to spoliation and conquest." "A mighty Anglo-Saxon republic, not a mongrel conglomeration."—Speech at Democratic State Convention, July 2.

ADVANCED DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE.

Ex-Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, who is one of the most brainy men among the modern radical democracy, delivered a speech at the late democratic state convention of his state, which has importance from the character and influence of its author. He lays down a course of action for the future, which he holds to be "in line with the policy pursued by all the great democrats who gave this republic to the American continent." It comprehends the acquisition of the

West Indian islands, "in the course of time, as they become ripe for such a step," but is against "wild schemes of conquest and plunder, which contemplate the establishment of a colonial empire on another continent, and under conditions which must result in injustice and gigantic scandals." Our national motto must be, he says, "the natural development and supremacy of this continent, but opposition to spoliation and conquest." Here is the doctrine outlined previously by Mr. Bryan, indorsed and formulated by a more powerful mind. It may afford the key for the future to the democratic party. Governor Altgeld is unquestionably a thoughtful man in statesmanship, however there may be dissent from some of the ideas he has advanced. He is much nearer being great in point of intellect than many who have opposed him have been in the habit of conceding.—From Editorial in Boston Herald of July 16.

GOV. ALTGELD ON BOLTING.

The interests of the half million democrats of this state are greater than those of any individual, and while it is necessary that the majority shall govern, that democrats shall support their ticket, when it is put up according to democratic methods, it is also a fundamental principle of democracy that the voters shall have a voice in selecting candidates, and wherever they are deprived of a fair opportunity to express that choice, there the nomination is not a democratic nomination. And it is another fundamental principle of democracy that no party can compel a man to support a criminal for office. I do not for one moment dispute the fact that if the democrats of any legislative district want to elect a boodler to the legislature it is their privilege to do it, but they must not be compelled by any trickery to submit to having a representative who is not their choice. The law has provided, in every case, that where the voters of a party are not satisfied with the nomination that has been made, they can put up another candidate by petition, and I want every democrat in this state to hear me, when I say that in every case in which a man who is regarded by the public as a boodler forces himself upon the ticket, through machinery or trickery, there the democrats must be given an opportunity to say at the polls whether they want him or whether they do not want him. And in every such district it is the duty of men who want to perpetuate free institutions, who want to save the foundations of liberty, who want

government to be something more than a mere machine to rob the people, it is the duty, I say, of all such men to see to it that this boodleism is brought to an end. Two years ago in forming our lines we threw off the parasites and the deadheads, and the more we threw off of this element the more vigorous and powerful we became. We have a little poison in our blood yet.—Speech at Democratic State Convention, July 12.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON ON THE RELIGIOUS CARE OF YOUNG MEN.

This is a matter which greatly interests the younger clergy. They are always willing, the bishop tells us, "to discuss with the greatest earnestness and zeal how to get hold of young men"—meaning usually young men of the working class. They have the clearest possible conception of what such a young man ought to be, and the bishop has been greatly struck with the high standard which underlies this conception. But his attitude towards this conception is wholly one of acceptance.

"I have reduced," he says—and we can well believe him—"conference after conference to nothing by saying: 'Well, I suppose that when you were at school at the age of 17 the attitude that you had towards your school chapel and all the religious privileges that were there offered to you was what you have expected as natural from the working lads of East London.' I am afraid that this remark has been followed by a gasp and a gulp on the part of the speaker, and that he has sat down without having anything else to say."

That is precisely the sort of warning that the younger and more enthusiastic clergy need. They "too much tend to deal with boys in the abstract, with the ideal boy, without considering sufficiently the real boy." And one great corrective to this omission would be "a little recollection of our own boyhood"—and, we may add, of our own contemporaries in, and long after, boyhood.

Where religion is concerned classes are very much alike. Descriptions of working-class irreligion often bear a striking resemblance to what we know of irreligion among professional men. The difference is that this latter phenomenon is not described. The function of the professional and the upper classes generally in the community is to subscribe to missions for spreading religion in the slums, and the clergy are fain to regard this in the light of

compensation for some indifference to religion in the persons of the subscribers. If they would bear in mind that those whom a mission is meant to improve are not likely to be very much in advance of the class by which the mission is possibly supported, there would be less disappointment with the result.—London Spectator.

THE REAL CAUSES OF THE FALL OF POLAND.

An extract from an editorial in The Kingdom on "The Writings and Ideas of Henryk Sienkiewicz," by Prof. George D. Herron.

The political evil lay in the almost total incapacity of the Polish people for collective action. The great nobles viewed the Commonwealth only from the personal standpoint. Each of the magnatés was seeking his own individual power and glory, rather than the common good. Each man shaped his conduct in battle, his policy at the Diet, his relation to other magnates from a personal motive, always with the possibility of the throne in view. The result was that each of the great lords was a kinglet, a sovereign in a state of his own. Jealousy of the possible growth of each other in power and glory brought treason in every great foreign war, and failure in every great internal policy. The national consciousness never rose above self-interest or family consciousness.

But behind the political cause lay a much deeper economic and social cause. The Polish nobles were in greater part the worst and most remorseless oppressors of the peasants and the common people in Europe; they not only were, but probably still are, as one discovers on a visit to Russian or Austrian Poland, where the life of a peasant, on the great estates, is dwarfed, stunted, stupefied, brutalized by brutal oppression, almost beyond thought or words. It was this economic oppression that wrested from Poland the great Cossack territories that are now Russian. The original Cossack life of the Russian steppes had in it many elements of the very highest type of social organization. The communes, or primitive villages, in which all things were produced in common and distributed equally, were full of a really beautiful, happy and promising life. The Polish lords took possession of these original communes. They made serfs of the people, and private property of their lands and villages. They oppressed them even worse than the Tartars and Turks, using them merely as the meanest beasts of burden. To many of the

Polish knights, the life of the peasant was as inconsiderable as the life of a fly. It was against this entire overthrow of an original social and economic system, and the awful oppression that followed, that all Cossackdom arose in the dreadful wars that slew men by the hundred thousand, that turned eastern Europe into a wilderness, and the people into bloody madness. The story of this original Russian village life has been scientifically told and analyzed by Prince Kropotkin and by other Russian scientists and economists.

It was the same oppression in Poland itself that led to Russian conquest and Polish denationalization. Prof. Ashley has called attention to this in his economic studies. The evil of Poland lay within and not without. The Polish peoples turned to the Russian conquerors as liberators from the oppression of their own lords. Poland never could have been conquered from without. Even to-day, Poland is full of a virile and heroic potentiality that would make its capital the political and art center of Europe, if economic and social regeneration could prepare the way for it. But the future of the nation is in the hand of the Spirit that broods over all peoples, and we cannot foresee; we can only trust; but we may trust that no nation was ever born to finally die,—at least, history does not make it seem so.

THE NEW RUSSIAN OCCUPATION OF THE FAR EAST.

Extracts from an article on "Eastern Siberia," by Stephen Bonsal, published in Harper's Magazine for July. Vladivostock is the new Russian port on the Japan Sea, and the terminus of the great Trans-Siberian Railway. Khabarovka is situated at the point where the railway leaves the Amur River, turning abruptly south to Vladivostock, while the river turns as abruptly north to its outlet into the Okhotsk Sea.

In the long, low-lined sheds (at Vladivostock) which stretch along the hillside there were at the moment at least 8,000 emigrants, recently arrived, who were making their purchases and taking a short rest preparatory to starting out for their frontier homes in the wilderness which they were to win for civilization and for Russia. In the first shed we discovered some 1,500 Cossacks, men, women and children; down the middle of the shed ran a broad corridor, opening upon which were numerous alcoves. Each family was allotted two of these, men on the right and women on the left; they were a fine-looking set of people, and evidently would prove excellent pioneers. . . .

One of the Cossacks, evidently a petty officer, having given us a military salute, made us very much at home in his alcove, and between the tea and the cigarettes told us the conditions upon which they had consented to leave their country and become the guardians of the marshes and the fords upon the Chinese frontier. He repeated several times that they had only come at the special request of the czar, and seemed not a little proud that all the frontiers of Russia had to be guarded by his people, even this new frontier in a far-away corner of the empire. He said that the Cossacks are carried free of all expense from their native villages at home to Odessa, and from there transported in vessels of the volunteer fleet to Vladivostock, and from here to the frontier station designated for their residence. They receive, during this transit period, 16 copecks a day for provisions, and for each child eight copecks extra. The head of each family receives 60 acres of land, and an increase for each child. When their new home is reached they are given a small working stock of horses, cows, rifles and provisions, and 20 rubles in cash. This is the end of government assistance, except under the stress of extraordinary circumstances. For two years, while they are expected to be clearing their land and putting it under cultivation, they are not liable to military service, except in cases of emergency. . . .

I found that your Siberian Russian regards our people, particularly our people of the Pacific slope, with very much the same consideration which we have for the unfortunate and never sufficiently to be pitied denizens of Great Britain and Europe. It will be of interest to the people of the Pacific slope to know that 20 years from now all the bread they eat and all their salmon will come from Siberia, and that if Siberia should not care to send her produce to California and to Oregon the people of those states will have to starve. . . .

Khabarovka, this great Siberian city of the future, the St. Louis of this country, which is to become the great port of transshipment for goods going to and produce coming from all the lands that are reached by the waterways of the Amur, the Ussuri and the Sungaru, is not prepossessing upon first view. It is a long, straggling collection of little hamlets, connected by a few muddy roads; the distances are magnificent, and suggest that the builders of the city have built for the next and not for the present century, and are endued with a very sanguine appreciation of the probable impor-

tance of the place in the generations to come.

There was a charm and freshness in the life of this rude settlement at the junction of the great Siberian rivers which I know not how to express. But I know that a day in Khabarovka was as exhilarating to my mind as a plunge in ice cold water proves to one accustomed to the tepid enervating baths of the lazy east. Here our race and our people, our civilization and our religion, though transplanted, to be sure, have come to strike deep root, to grow, to broaden and expand, and though exotic, they give every prospect of a permanent, vigorous growth. Here the Europeans do not come and go, hurried travelers through strange lands, or traders who work and toil and plan and scheme, and then some day sail away, never to return again. In the English and French, the Spanish and the Portuguese, and in the Dutch possessions, though in a less degree, the white men follow each other, flight after flight, like ducks who seek the low-lying paddy lands where the wild celery grows, and fly away when they have eaten their fill.

But here there are no transients; these settlers will never go back to Russia, but they will draw Russia to them in closer union with every decade. These pioneers are great, sturdy fellows, capable of bringing the rude land, which has been so long a waste, into subjection, and then to make it produce; from their loins will spring a race of men born to eastern conditions, who will control and people this continent as far south as it is habitable for men of our race; and certainly that vast country from the Amur to the Yellow river, and perhaps as far south as the Yang-tze, is as suitable for the conditions of life of the Russians as are the middle states for us; and their women, too, are women fit for the duties, the responsibilities, and the emergencies of frontier life—great, deep-chested women, strong and quick of limb, wearing spurs, and using them, too, as they straddle their ponies man like, and gallop down the unpaved streets to do a little "shopping," with great masses of flaxen hair falling down over their shoulders; and when at home, what a number of babies there are clinging to their short skirts!

There are no windows, no glass, and no shutters as yet in the town, with the exception of a few residences of officials. In the humble dwellings of log and plank and mud which are springing up in hundreds with mushroom rapidity, these luxuries are unknown,

so the intimate life of the home is open to those who walk the streets, as I did, studying the present situation, and drawing from it a horoscope of the future. The women went about their household duties bright and fresh and hopeful, and wearing the neat white apron and the many-colored velvet petticoats, and with gay kerchiefs twisted around their heads and hair; and I remember so vividly one of these homely scenes, which I will endeavor to describe, however imperfectly, because I believe that it reveals the essence of the leaven with which Russia is working miracles in East Asia to-day. It was evening, under the smiling image of the Ikon, the protecting saint, which, smiling down upon the humble bed and board of the colonists, faces towards the door, as ever in a Russian home, so that whoever enters may know that he has come among those who believe, and who work and rest under the protection of his covenant. The house before me was very small, belonging evidently to the very poor among the colonists; it was unfinished, as there were still many weeks before the season of the great cold, and through the windows and incomplete walls I could not help seeing, as I passed, the intimate life of the pioneer family. Two little children sat upon logs upturned to serve as chairs, before a rough-hewn table; the mother, with grave and gentle face, was cutting them slices of their daily bread, so difficult to earn, so sweet to give, and, as I passed on, the father of the household came in from his work, covered with dust, and placed his great hand upon the little heads; then he kissed their buttery mouths, and the good wife sang happily a song of the Volga.

THE TRUE PURPOSE OF SCIENCE.

Extract from a recent article by Count Leo Tolstoy, on "The Superstitions of Science," translated by Charles Johnston, Esq., and published in *The Arena* for July.

In the case of science, which finds its subject, not in the study of how people should live, but in the study of what is, and is therefore preeminently occupied with the investigation of dead bodies, and leaves the structure of human society as it is, no achievements and no victories over nature can improve the condition of the people.

And medicine? You forget the beneficent successes of medicine. And the inoculation of bacteria? And the present operations? exclaim, as usual, the defenders of science, as a last resource, bringing forward the successes of medicine as a demonstration of the fruitfulness of all science.

We can guard against diseases and accomplish cures by inoculation, we can perform painless operations, we can take out internal organs and cleanse them, we can straighten hunchbacks, generally say the defenders of science, holding for some reason or other that to cure one child of diphtheria from among all the children, fifty per cent. of whom in all Russia, and eighty per cent in institutions, normally die, must convince people of the beneficence of science in general.

The structure of our life is such that not only children, but the majority of the people, owing to bad food, inordinately hard and injurious work, unhealthy dwellings, and insufficient clothing, do not live half the term of years they ought to live; the condition of life is such that children's diseases, syphilis, phthisis and alcoholism lay hold of an ever-increasing number of people; that the greater part of their labor is perverted to preparations for war; that every ten or twenty years millions of people are destroyed by war; and all this takes place because science, instead of spreading among us true religious, moral and social ideas, as a result of which all these evils would disappear of their own accord, occupies itself on the one hand with justification of the existing order, and on the other with playthings, and, to demonstrate to us the fruitfulness of science, points to the fact that it cures a thousandth part of the ills which overtake us simply because science does not do its duty. If even a small fraction of the effort, attention and labor which men of science spend on trifles which occupy them were directed to establishing right religious, moral, social, or even hygienic ideas, there would not be a hundredth part of the diphtheria, hysteria, spinal curvature, and the like, on the cure of which science so prides itself, accomplishing these cures in hospitals, whose accommodations cannot be extended to all.

This is just as if people who had plowed badly a field sown badly, with bad seed, were to go about the field, and to cure the broken ears in the crop, which grew beside diseased ears, at the same time trampling down all the rest, and were to bring forward their art in curing the diseased ears as a proof of their knowledge of agriculture.

Our science, in order to become science, and to become truly beneficent, and not injurious to mankind, must first of all renounce its empirical method, according to which it considers itself bound to study only what is, and must return to the only wise and fruitful understanding of science,

according to which its object is the study of how people ought to live. In this is the aim and purpose of science; and the study of what is can only be the subject of science so far as that study contributes to a knowledge of how people ought to live.

We are, unfortunately, in the eastern question, and I see no way in which we can return to our former policy of isolation. The Philippines are at our mercy. We may eat our own professions and swallow our own principles and hold them as subject territory to be skinned for the benefit of American speculators, the plan outlined by Grosvenor at the republican state convention; or we may leave them defenseless, to be gobbled up by France, Russia, Germany, etc., to be skinned by their speculators while we look on unconcerned; or we may be true to our own principles and say to them after we have settled our account with Spain: "Set up your own government," and to the other powers: "Hands off!" It may be that Luzon will set up one government and Mindanao another—that's none of our business if the people of those islands so elect. It may be that there will be an occasional revolution as in Venezuela—that's none of our business. Give them a chance and let them alone, and in time they will solve, as Mexico has, the problem of larger liberty under stable self-government—a lesson no people ever learned by being held as subject territory.—Dr. L. B. Tuckerman, in Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Actions that we term stupid are simply wild traits in animals that have become highly specialized, and have been unable to adapt themselves to their new environment. The donkey, the sheep, and the goose are exceedingly intelligent and wary animals in their natural homes. It is the same with what we call vices, such as shying and buck-jumping in horses. Many a wild horse must have saved his life through the habit of swerving suddenly aside on discovering a lurking foe. Buck-jumping, which is a habit with all young colts when at play, and therefore instinctive and extremely ancient, must have been protective against the successful spring and hold of a leopard or panther. Some horses are frantic with terror at the rustling of reeds by a river bank, and a donkey carries his fear further, and refuses to enter running water. The probable explanation is that carnivora, especially crocodiles, lay in ambush at the ancient drinking places.—London Spectator.

THE OLD STORY IN A TAMPA DRESS.

It seemed a fact almost too good to be true that the great complaint of the New York men was the superabundance of beans served out to them, and that the first complaint of the sons of Massachusetts was that they had not received beans enough.

"Beans for breakfast, beans for lunch, beans for dinner—what t'ell!" growled the New Yorkers.

"And as for beans," shrieked a Massachusetts warrior, "they don't give you enough to fill a tablespoon."—Richard Harding Davis, in Scribner's.

In the name of humanity, why not be merciful to Arizona and grant her the priceless boon of controlling her own interests? * * * No martial music, no heroic sacrifices are required. We have sent our best and bravest that Cuba may be free. In dispensing your merciful charities on foreign lands, do not overlook the struggles and difficulties of Arizona. Give her that crowning goal of her ambition, statehood. Release her from political vassalage; place her among the select sisterhood of states. She courts the responsibilities and courts freedom with as earnest a desire as the dark sons of the queen of the Antilles.—Arizona Gazette.

A student recently asked the president of Oberlin college if he could not take a shorter course than that prescribed by the institution. "Oh, yes," was the reply, "but that depends upon what you want to make of yourself. When God wants to make an oak he takes a hundred years, but when he wants to make a squash he takes six months."—Argonaut.

The worst of laws may have some redeeming features. The war tax bill has a valuable feature requiring all sales of land to be recorded at the actual price paid; otherwise the revenue would be defrauded. It has been customary to record them at a trifling sum, so as to blind the assessor.—San Francisco Star.

It is a common idea that slavery is bad for the slaves; that colonial government is bad for the colonies. It is true—but there is a larger truth. It is worse for the slaveholders and for the home government.—L. A. Russell, in Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The officers of the Bourgogne did not do their duty by dying; their duty

was to have had their crew in such a state of discipline that the sacrifice of their own lives and those of their passengers would have been unnecessary.—The Outlook.

Insurance Agent—"We can't insure you. Old Man—"Why not?" Insurance Agent—"You are 94 years old." Old Man—"What of that? Statistics will tell you that fewer men die at 94 than any other age."—Baltimore Jewish Comment.

Gracie—Mamma, what does Santa Claus do after Christmas?

Mamma—Why, he begins to collect toys for the following Christmas.

Gracie—Oh, I know! He reads the papers and watches out for bargain sales.

Our people want the war pushed speedily to a triumphal close, followed by the extension of the principles of self-government to the rescued—not conquered—islands.—San Francisco Star.

In fact, land is not sold, but the advantages of occupying it. Land, merely as land, is worth nothing. This fact may serve to correct some false reasoning.—St. Louis Retriever.

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 filling.

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,
Schiffel Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

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