

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1898.

Number 8.

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.

There appears to be little doubt at the hour of going to press that Admiral Cervera's fleet is in the harbor of Santiago, on the southern coast and near the eastern extremity of Cuba. This harbor is approached by a narrow channel, through which but one ship can pass at a time, whether going in or out. It is, therefore, not likely that the American fleet will venture in over the destructive mines with which the channel is certainly defended; and it is certain that the Spanish fleet cannot emerge, even though the mouth of the harbor be guarded by only a small detachment from either Schley's or Sampson's squadron. Admiral Cervera, then, unless he surrenders, is likely to pass the remainder of the war period in Santiago harbor.

It may well be asked why the Spanish fleet crossed the Atlantic and came into the enemy's sphere of operations, if it could find nothing more effective to do there than to dodge the enemy's ships for a week and then bottle itself up in a harbor from which it cannot emerge, and in which it can render no service. Time may answer the question. An explanation now can only be inferred. The probabilities indicate that Cervera crossed the Atlantic for the purpose of establishing a rendezvous for the Spanish fleet at San Juan. Clearly San Juan was the point for which he was making when he stopped at Martinique and first disclosed his presence in American waters. Had he succeeded in quietly entering San Juan harbor, he might have held Sampson off until the Cadiz squadron

could slip in and join him, or, if necessary, assail Sampson in the rear. In either case the Spanish would have had a good rallying point. But instead of finding San Juan open, Cervera found it under bombardment, and was obliged to accept a battle which he wished to avoid, or to dodge. He dodged. And if he is in fact in Santiago, the Cadiz fleet is now as harmless as his own, and the end of the war is near. With one formidable part of her fleet held in check by a small part of ours, with another part at the bottom of Manila Bay, and with the third part much inferior to the force that we could safely withdraw from our Cuban squadrons, Spain can hardly hope much longer to keep on playing her game of war in the hope that something may turn up to bring other European nations to her aid. There was an inclination to sniff at Sampson's bombardment of San Juan, but it may prove to have been the decisive event of the war.

Capt. Clark, of the Oregon, is said to have sent to the Board of Strategy, when fears were entertained for his safety, the following message: "Don't tangle me up with instructions. I am not afraid of the whole Spanish fleet." In the latter sentence there is a good deal of the spirit of Yankee bluff; but it is no worse than Spanish bravado, and the first sentence redeems it with Yankee sense. The greatest danger we have to confront in this war, so far as the war itself is concerned, is not the Spanish fleet; it is the tangling up of military and naval officers with instructions from Washington.

A number of antique preachers at the Presbyterian general assembly, at Winona Lake, Ind., last week, during a discussion of the question of Sun-

day observance, bunched themselves with the pious gentlemen of old Judea who on a memorable occasion criticized the gathering of corn on the Sabbath. There happened, however, to be no one present at Winona Lake to administer the Judean rebuke. Some of these nineteenth century by-law worshipers objected to riding on railroads on Sunday. "You can't ride on Sunday morning, and atone by preaching in the evening!" exclaimed one of the pietists. Many others shouted, "Yes!" to the inquiry: "Do you condemn the metropolitan clergy for riding on street cars on Sunday?" And one remnant of New England puritanism, who hailed, however, from Baltimore, said that he had given up eating ice cream on Sundays, because he liked it! It would be interesting to know what the Nazarene would have said, had He been present in the flesh when these pagans were thus expressing themselves.

It is significant that so many clergymen—of the Christian, in contradistinction to the pietistic type—have accepted the teachings of Henry George. Chief among these, perhaps, is Father McGlynn, the Roman Catholic priest whose controversy with the mediæval archbishop of New York, from which Dr. McGlynn emerged the victor after an appeal to the pope, attracted universal attention a few years ago. The controversy was over the right of a Catholic priest to hold and publicly advocate George's doctrines; and by overruling the archbishop and reinstating Dr. McGlynn in the priestly office from which the archbishop had removed him, the pope decided in favor of that right. Many other Catholic priests are in accord with Dr. McGlynn on this subject, though he is the most famous. To the list of clergymen who believe

in Henry George's single tax the Episcopal church also contributes. Bishop Huntington, of the diocese of Central New York, is one. His son, Father Huntington, is another. Still another is Dean Williams, of Trinity cathedral, Cleveland, Ohio, whose graphic paper on the right to the use of the earth, read before the Boston single tax society last winter, and published in pamphlet form by the National Single Taxer, of Minneapolis, identifies him most distinctly with the George movement. Dean Williams is a man of extraordinary eloquence and force. In the Church of the Disciples, Rev. Harris R. Cooley, also of Cleveland, is a notable follower of George; and among the Presbyterians Rev. S. S. Craig, the Canadian, may be said to lead the list. The Methodists also contribute a strong Canadian in Rev. Salem Bland. Among the Swedenborgians, clergymen of pronounced single tax views are numerous, while the Congregationalists and the Jews are well represented. Rabbi Sale, of St. Louis, is a leading single taxer. To give the names of even a small proportion of the ministers of all denominations who have found inspiration in George's writings and volunteered to propagate the truths he taught, would require an alphabetical index for convenient reference. One name, however, that of a man who to the general religious and educational public of America is perhaps best known of all, must not be omitted. We refer to Prof. George D. Herron, D. D., of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa. Prof. Herron's tendencies at first were regarded as socialistic; but of his complete acceptance of Henry George's doctrines there is now from his writings no room for doubt. Among the later acquisitions to the single tax movement is Rev. Alexander Kent, of the People's church, Washington, D. C., whose sermon on the subject, which appears in the May number of "Why?" published at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is an exceptionally discriminating and forceful presentation of the substance of George's teachings.

A recent discussion of the theory of an Austrian professor of embryology who holds that the sex of children is determined wholly by the mother, has brought out some arguments which go to show the shallowness of much that is said for pre-natal influences, including the influences of heredity, upon the minds and morals of children. One well-known physician, arguing that while the mother has a potent influence hers is not the only one, is quoted as saying: "A clever father having five children and a dull wife will be lucky if more than one rises above mediocrity intellectually; but, per contra, if a clever woman is married to a dull husband and has five children, probably four will be bright. Even here, however, we see the male has still some influence, for history shows us that the finest intellects come from the union of a bright father and mother." This observation is especially valuable because it admirably illustrates the tendency of heredity theorists to ignore an influence which is certainly not less potent than pre-natal conditions, namely, the influence of environment. The ordinary man of common sense, if he stopped to think when told that a clever father having five children and a dull wife would be lucky if more than one of the children rose above mediocrity intellectually, would suspect the reason to be that during the impressionable years of the children their mental development had been influenced chiefly by the mother, through her maternal relationship, which during that period is as a rule closer and more impressive than the relationship of the father. If then this ordinary man of common sense were told that on the other hand, if a clever woman is married to a dull husband and has five children probably four will be bright, he would regard his suspicion as fairly well verified. And if after that he were told that history shows that the finest intellects come from a bright father and mother, he would conclude that the child's future intellectually is

determined not at all by heredity, but wholly by his bringing up. In so concluding, he might be in error. Heredity doubtless plays a part in the physical qualities of men, and it may play a part also in their mental qualities. But he would not be so grossly in error as is the speculative scientist or faddist who turns to heredity for an explanation of all mental and moral peculiarities, while leaving environment wholly out of consideration.

When the supreme court of Washington was about to pass upon the constitutionality of a law of that state prohibiting the specific enforcement of contracts for payments in gold coin, it introduced a method of reaching sound conclusions which might well be imitated by appellate courts generally, whenever questions affecting the public at large are before them. It invited the leading lawyers of the state, though not interested in the case, to submit briefs supplementary to those of the regularly retained counsel. The only objection to this innovation is that it does not go far enough. It ought to be the privilege of every lawyer to submit a brief on questions of law in any case, without being either retained by one of the parties directly in interest or personally invited by the court. Since decisions become precedents affecting interests far beyond those immediately involved, there should be an orderly method by which all persons who are to be affected by the decision as a precedent may be heard. In the Washington case, the innovation does not appear to have worked very well. The court decided that the law in controversy was unconstitutional because it undertook to regulate a subject over which congress has exclusive control. When it is considered that the law did not assume to determine what is legal tender, nor to interfere with contracts already made, but only to provide that future contracts made payable in gold coin may be satisfied with "any kind of lawful money or currency of

the United States," it is not easy to see how the exclusive province of federal legislation was invaded. But this miscarriage does not prove that the idea of inviting arguments from the bar in general upon important questions of law about to be decided by a court of last resort is not a good one.

The Philadelphia Single Tax society has voted down a series of resolutions in condemnation of the war. These resolutions denounced war as in itself a great evil, which brings in its train many other evils, and asserted that no war can be justified except when clearly the only means of defense. They justified the Cuban revolt, and the efforts of Americans to help the Cuban cause, and condemned the government of the United States for its interference; a wrong, said the resolutions, which "cannot be atoned for by committing other wrongs," such as the declaration of war to make Cuba independent. In so declaring, the resolutions proceeded, the government "exceeds its functions and violates its traditions; it commits robbery not alone by the seizure at sea of the property of inoffensive Spaniards, but also by the misuse of public funds which cannot rightfully be used in a war unnecessary for the defense of the owners of those funds." Among the other grounds of condemnation, the war was charged with shedding innocent blood, generating international hatred, and reviving militarism and thereby retarding the advance of freedom and public virtue; and the government was accused of giving the lie to its professions of desire for justice by ignoring Spain's offer to arbitrate the dispute over the destruction of the Maine. These resolutions having been voted down by the single tax society, 17 prominent members have signed and published them as their individual protest.

What may have been the motive of the Philadelphia single tax society in thus defeating the resolutions

outlined above, can be known of course only to the members respectively who voted against them; but several reasons might be inferred, any of which would have justified the action. It will be sufficient here to name only one. The resolutions rest upon the anarchistic principle—which is not at all the single tax principle—that the community or nation is a loose aggregation, having no individuality of its own, and owing no obligations as a whole to other nations. In other words, that there is no such thing as international law which we as a community ought to respect. It is only upon this basis that it can be maintained that our citizens should have been permitted to make unlicensed war upon Spain in behalf of Cuba. If the principle of responsible government be admitted, the right of individuals to make war upon their own account must be denied. The protest, made as it is in the spirit of peace, is entitled to all respect; but the single tax man militant—and most single tax men are militant when questions of liberty, political as well as economic, are at stake—will, we take it, be glad that the Philadelphia single tax society did not give it their sanction. To paraphrase a famous utterance, conditions as well as theories confront the single tax movement.

One of the signs of a disposition among what Gladstone called "the classes" in contradistinction to what he called "the masses," to govern the masses without their consent, appears in a growing tendency to revert to the old plan, abandoned because it was undemocratic, of making state constitutions against the interests and the will of the people as a whole. The latest instance of this species of usurpation is furnished by "the classes" of Louisiana. A constitutional convention of that state, which has just completed its official labors, has not only virtually disfranchised the negroes, who comprise half the population of the state, but has proclaimed the instrument in operation without submis-

sion to the voters. In disfranchising the negro population, these constitution makers have violated their obligation to propose an instrument for the good of all the people, and not of a class merely; but in declaring it the constitution of the state without confirmation by popular suffrage, they have gone much further in the direction of usurpation. A constitution is the charter by which the people themselves establish their state. To assume, then, to make such an instrument valid without the consent of the people, is the baldest kind of usurpation. If one constitutional convention can do this, and in doing it can disfranchise one class in the community, another can do the same thing, disfranchising another class. Let the white people of Louisiana beware how they tolerate usurpation, even though they think it excusable for the purpose of taking the suffrage from the blacks. An act like that of their recent constitutional convention is a menace to their own liberties. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance. People who acquiesce in acts of usurpation like these, fail to pay that price and must expect in consequence to find themselves divested of the goods. The despoilers of liberty never sleep.

At the instance of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a bill is now pending in the United States senate for largely increasing the power of that commission over interstate commerce by railway. The bill was introduced by Senator Cullom, and is known as Senate Bill 3,354. Should this bill become a law, interstate railroads would fall completely under the control of the Interstate Commission. It is a bad bill. But not for the reasons given by the railroads in their opposition to it. They make a great deal about giving "a political body the practical control of property which in the aggregate represents nearly one-fifth of the total assets of the United States," as if a fifth of the wealth of the country were any more sacred than a twenty-fifth or a millionth! The sanctity of property rights is to

be determined by their character, not by their value. The railroads also object to the bill that it would make the commission sole arbiter of matters "now safely regulated by that great corrective, competition." If railroads were regulated now by competition, this objection would be good; but they are not. Healthy competition is unknown in the railroad business, for the simple reason that the basis of that business as now conducted is monopoly, which is the antithesis of competition. The real reason why the Cullom bill is a bad one is that it establishes over railroading a power akin to that which some of our municipal regulations give to policemen over vice. As the police often wink at vice when they are bribed, and sternly repress it when they are not, so would the Interstate Commerce Commission come, under the operation of the Cullom law, to govern railroads according to the bribes which in some form or other were offered. The bill embodies all the evils of socialism, with none of its benefits. If the government intends to manage railroads at all, let it own the railroads it manages. Ownership and management cannot be safely separated. If the government undertakes to manage railroads while they remain private property, as the Cullom bill contemplates, it will find itself, through its Commission, in a corrupt partnership with the very worst elements of railway monopoly. The true method of dealing with this question is to eliminate the monopoly features of railroading by putting them wholly under public control, and then to leave the business to the regulation of competition.

Three years ago Joseph Edwards, of Wallasey, near Liverpool, England, issued the first number of his "Labour Annual," and the publication has been continued regularly since, the fourth number, that for 1898, being now available. It may be had of Mr. Edwards himself; of the Clarion Co., 72 Fleet street, E. C., London; or of the "Labour Press," Miller street,

Manchester; or, as the title page somewhat severely says, "of Decent Booksellers Everywhere." The price of the "Labour Annual" is one shilling net, which to the American purchaser would be 25 cents, plus postage—probably 35 cents in all. It is a useful reference book for persons interested in any kind of subject related to the labor question. Along with much other information, the number for 1898 contains the names and post office addresses of the leading labor reformers of the world, and of the leading reform papers; a chronology of those events in the world's history which indicate social and political progress; a list of public reports and reference books bearing upon labor questions; a description of English labor legislation for the preceding year; a list of recent books on social reform, and the official reports of the principal reform and labor organizations of England. Many contributions to labor literature are also embraced in this number, including the last newspaper article by Henry George—that which appeared on Labor day, 1897, entitled "The Great Battle of Labor." From this article we quote Mr. George's fable for illustrating the merits of violent labor strikes. The fable is well worth preserving as an answer to those self-satisfied men who think that workingmen are wholly blameable for disturbances and violence in connection with labor disputes. To all who understand the importance to labor of the land, of mother earth, which is indeed the mother, as labor is the father, of all genuine wealth, the fable points its own moral with startling clearness. It is as follows:

Before the Cadi of an eastern city there came from the desert two torn and bruised travelers.

"There were five of us," they said, "on our way hither with merchandise. A day's journey hence we halted and made our camp, when following us there came a crowd of ill-conditioned fellows, who demanded entrance to our camp, and who, on our refusing it, used to us violent and threatening words, and, when we answered not their threats, set upon us with force. Three of us were slain, and we two barely escaped with our lives to ask for justice."

"Justice you shall have," answered the Cadi. "If what you say be true, they who assaulted you when you had not assaulted them shall die. If what you say be not true, your own lives shall pay the penalty of falsehood."

When the assailants of the merchants arrived they were brought at once before the Cadi.

"Is the merchants' story true?" he asked.

"It is, but—"

"I will hear no more!" cried the Cadi. "You admit having reviled men who had not reproached you, and having assaulted men who had not assaulted you. In this you have deserved death."

But as they were being carried off to execution the prisoners still tried to explain.

"Hear them, Cadi," said an old man, "lest you commit injustice."

"But they have admitted the merchants' words are true."

"Yes, but their words may not be all the truth."

So the Cadi heard them, and they said that when they came up to the merchants' halting place they found that the merchants had pitched their camp around the only well in that part of the desert, and refused to let them enter and drink. They first remonstrated, then threatened, and then, rather than die of thirst, rushed upon the merchants' camp, and in the melee three of the merchants were slain.

"Is this also true?" asked the Cadi of the merchants.

The merchants were forced to admit that it was.

"Then," said the Cadi, "you told me truth that, being only part of the truth, was really a falsehood. You were the aggressors by taking for yourselves alone the only well from which these men could drink. Now the death I have decreed is for you."

#### AN ENGLISH ALLIANCE.

Our war with Spain has not only bridged the "bloody chasm" between the North and the South; it has filled it up, so that the chasm no longer exists. The American Union, for the first time, is truly reconstructed. Nor is that all. The Spanish war has wiped out the animosities engendered by the war of the revolution and that of 1812, which were perpetuated by "patriotic" school books and Anglophobic newspapers and stump orators; so that, besides a perfect union of the American states, we may reasonably look forward to a perpetual communion of the English-speaking peoples.

It is with no idea of apologizing for the war that we note these beneficent results, nor at all in the spirit of com-

mending evil for the good that may come out of it. It would give us much greater satisfaction to be able to attribute this rehabilitation of the Union, and this communion of all the English, to something else than a war, breeding animosities in other directions. But the fact remains that after a generation of bitterness, more or less suppressed, between the North and the South, and more than a century of hatred toward England, we suddenly find, as a result of our war for the liberation of Cuba, that a spirit of amity is hovering over the English-speaking countries.

This spirit of amity is to be cordially welcomed. God grant that the time may at last have come when a war between the United States and any other English nation will be forever impossible. The communal character and the lofty aspirations of Canada, of the Australasian colonies, and of England herself, are so like our own that no temporary irritation should be allowed again to estrange us from them or them from us.

We are really one people, notwithstanding the hypercritics who remind us of the various races which contribute to the American population. Nationality springs less from race origin than from identity of language, of laws, of institutions, of history, and above all of political ideals. And the language, the laws, the institutions, the history and the political ideals of Americans—whatever their race origin—are English. Even what historically is distinctly American has come to be English in essence. Our revolutionary war, for example, in which we fought England, produced a revolution in government the benefits of which we have shared with the people of England, of Canada, and of Australasia. Their liberty is due to the contest we waged. So true is this that Englishmen often rank the revolt of the American colonies with the rebellion of Cromwell and the revolution of William and Mary, as a stage in the progress of English freedom. Race cuts a small figure in nationality in comparison with other considerations. Gov. Altgeld was right, though thoughtless people laughed at him as if he had perpetrated an Irish bull, when he, a German by birth, referred to the founders of this government as

“our forefathers.” In the political sense they were his forefathers as truly as if he had boasted a long line of American ancestry. And by the same token, the fathers of English freedom also were his forefathers. English history, English institutions, and that love of liberty which is distinctively the English ideal, make one people of all English-speaking peoples, however conglomerate their race origin.

It does not follow, however, that we should welcome a formal alliance with England. Entangling alliances with no nation is a rule that still holds good. If a combination of nations hostile to England were made, having the destruction of England for its object, it would be short sighted in this country to stand by and see that object accomplished. Were England crushed by hostile powers, the democratic movement in the world would be set back by centuries; and our own national independence would be imperilled. As we value the advances in political freedom that have been made, regarding them as necessary prerequisites to the acquisition of economic freedom, we must be jealous to preserve them, not only within our own borders, but to the greatest possible extent within the borders of every other nation that has secured them. In an emergency, then, involving her existence, England should have the support of the United States. But to unite with England in an emergency, for the preservation of English liberty, is a very different thing from uniting with her in a general alliance, not only for the preservation of English liberty, but also for the promotion of tory aggressions. We want no such alliance.

What we do want, and what we should lose no opportunity in securing, is a treaty with England that will secure all the English-speaking peoples against the possibility in future of war among themselves. No dispute can come up between this country and England which might not be appropriately submitted to arbitration. Questions involving denials of the right to liberty are not at all likely to arise. All English countries are too much at one on that subject to give opportunity for deadly dispute. If it were otherwise, a general treaty

of arbitration should not be made. Questions between free and autocratic nations, which involve the right to liberty, cannot be submitted to arbitration. Regarding these questions there is but one appeal, and that is to arms. But other questions—the only kind of question likely to arise between this country and England or any of her colonies—may be properly arbitrated; and advantage should be taken of the new era of good feeling between England and the United States to enter into a standing treaty for the determination of all disputes between those countries in that manner.

Beyond this, no treaty looking to an alliance ought to be made. We doubt if any closer alliance would be tolerated by the American people or deemed advisable by the English. In neither country is the best sentiment inclined toward an aggressive combination.

#### MILITARY SNOBBERY.

The war calls attention to a condition in the American army which should make every American with democratic blood in his veins blush with shame for the hypocrisy of his country. We refer to the status of the private soldier. This is well described by a correspondent of an eastern paper—the New York Post—who writes from Tampa. He says:

Socially the regular private soldier is nowhere at all. If he enters the big hotel where the headquarters of the army are, and which is constantly full of officers, he enters it only as a messenger for an officer, and must enter it hat in hand, and go by an inconspicuous way around to the desk and present his message, and when he has had his answer, he must go out in the same way. The private soldier or non-commissioned officer cannot eat at the same public table with officers, nor drink at the same bar. This social distinction is not founded, it should be said, on the assertion of any difference of class, but on the necessity of discipline.

It is untrue that this social difference is founded not upon caste, but upon the necessity of discipline. It is founded distinctly and knowingly upon caste. Discipline requires no social distinctions.

Between the lieutenant, for instance, and his superior officers there is social equality, in so far as there is congeniality; yet the lieutenant

ant is as amenable to discipline as the socially ostracised private. Since social subjection, then, is not necessary to make officers of inferior rank obedient to the commands of superiors, neither should it be necessary to make privates obedient to officers.

That it is not necessary is demonstrated by the fact that privates and officers in militia regiments are unaffected in their social relations by the difference in their military rank. The distinctions there are military, not social. If a militiaman when off duty were not allowed, merely because he was a private, to enter a hotel in his own right, because some of his officers were lounging there; if he were obliged to behave like a lackey when he came into a hotel under such circumstances; if he were not allowed to eat at the same public table or drink at the same bar with his officers, merely because he was a private, —if in any such way he were made to suffer social indignities, the officers who thus took advantage of their military authority to play the snob, would quickly find their level, both militarily and socially, and it would be below that of the man they had offended. No militia officer who had proved himself so contemptible could remain in his regiment or retain the social fellowship of gentlemen. Nevertheless, the discipline of the militia is not so bad.

It may be said, of course, that the militia is composed of play soldiers. Let it be so. Yet no one would presume to explain that this is because militia officers recognize the social rights of militia privates. And volunteers are not play soldiers, though among the volunteers it is not regarded as necessary to discipline to make officers' lackies out of the privates.

One of the most notable examples of the utter lack of any necessity for subjecting private soldiers to social indignities in the interest of discipline is afforded by the French army. Since the French revolution the French soldier has been the equal, as to social rights, of his highest officers. Military distinctions in France neither give nor take away social rights. Such rights as a Frenchman has out of the army, he retains as a private in the army. He is no officer's

lackey. Distinctions in the French army begin and end with military functions. Yet the French army is not lacking in discipline. Just as our lieutenants, though they may eat at the same public tables with captains and colonels and even gold laced generals, though they may drink at the same bars, though they may enter the lobbies of the same hotels when off duty, and do so as men and not as mice, are nevertheless amenable to discipline, so is it with the French private.

No, it is not for reasons of discipline that the position of private soldier in our regular army is so degraded socially that the best military material of the country holds aloof from service in it. That is not the reason. The reason is that as the French army has inherited its social rights from the days of the French revolution, ours has inherited its snobbery from the days when the English army was manned by English peasants and workingmen, and officered by aristocrats who bought their commissions and regarded peasants and workingmen much as old-time slaveholders regarded what they called "niggers." The social degradation of the private in the American army is not at all for military reasons. It is for social reasons—for the same reason that colored boys are objected to as cadets and officers. We educate our army officers at West Point. They are taught there to be not only officers but aristocrats. Association with a servant affords grounds for suspicions of unofficer-like conduct, and marriage into the family of a private or noncommissioned officer is a crime. This snobish education has perpetuated itself until the time has come when self-respecting men hesitate to enlist even in the volunteer service. They dread the social indignities which they may experience at the hands of snobs with shoulderstraps, though they care nothing for the dangers of battle. Instead of promoting the good of the service, our system of degrading privates and noncommissioned officers tells against it.

If a military career were open to privates in our regular army, and they had no reason to suppose that they would not be treated as gentle-

men so long as their personal conduct was gentlemanly, the army in time of peace would fill up with Americans who would submit to discipline intelligently and willingly, not as dumb, driven brutes; and in time of war, enlistments would take the place of the selfish wire pulling for commissions which scandalizes American patriotism.

Military discipline is one thing, social snobbery is quite another. The two do not belong together, and in a democratic country the latter should not be permitted to flourish under military authority. To abolish it might bear heavily upon officers whose only titles to social distinction are their commissions, and upon privates who secure favors by turning themselves into cringing valets; but it would give us better soldiers, better discipline, and altogether a better army.

#### GLADSTONE.

In the world's history there are two great types of leader. There is the leader who cuts new paths, who tells the world what it ought to do and spends his energies in urging the world to do it. In his own day he is despised. But later, when the worthiness of his purposes and the greatness of his work begin to be appreciated, he is said to have lived ahead of his time; and at last, what to him was a dream becomes to those who follow him a grand reality, and his name is indelibly inscribed upon the pages of history. The leader of the other type cuts no new paths. He is never looked upon as having lived a day ahead of his time. The world does not wait until the grass is green upon his grave or the grave is forgotten, to do him honor. He enjoys honors while he lives, but when he dies his fame grows fainter as time rolls on. What he does for the world is at best to guide it in the beaten paths.

It is of the latter type of leader that Gladstone was an example. Had he lived in a country where slavery flourished, and at a time when the world had not yet been awakened by leaders of the other type to the infamy of that institution, he would have left it where he found it. It would have seemed to him, and so far as the conscious influence of his

life went it would have seemed to the world, like a beneficent institution, established and patronized by God himself. Gladstone was not one of the leaders who convict the world of its institutional sins and lead it on to repentance and conversion.

Yet it must not be understood that Gladstone's life was a useless one, or that his species of usefulness had no effect upon the world's forward movement. Though he cut no new paths, acting only as a guide in the beaten paths, his face was turned forward, not backward. Belonging to the same general type of leader as Disraeli, since neither lived ahead of his time, he differed from Disraeli in this, that while Disraeli led away from new paths, Gladstone led toward them. In no sense a leader of the first type which we have described above, never even tempted to get out of speaking distance ahead of the popular sentiment of his day, he was nevertheless always on the alert to bring up the main body to the support of an advancing sentiment when the main body was ready for it.

Gladstone's work was that of a great politician. As such he will live in history. But if the lesson of history may be trusted, those who expect his name to fill a large place in it, would, if they could live a few generations hence, be immeasurably surprised. Men have lived in Gladstone's day who while they lived were hardly known except to be despised, men with whom Gladstone would not have deigned to consult upon any public question, whose names, when the history of the time comes to be written by posterity, will be better known than Gladstone's. This will be not because they were abler men or better men. It will be because the part which Gladstone played in the world's onward movement was, in comparison with theirs, a secondary part.

#### BELLAMY.

Edward Bellamy, whose death is noted this week, was an important contributor to the social agitation which has been in progress during the past two decades, and upon the continuation of which depend the possibilities of economic freedom and social justice. His story, "Looking Backward," has been most influential

in fixing attention upon the inequalities that are generated and perpetuated by existing economic conditions and institutions.

But Mr. Bellamy's well-meant method of reform has been but superficially accepted. That is because it is itself superficial. It appeals merely to people who, when anything goes wrong, exclaim: "Let us make a law against it!" Though these people are numerous enough, they lack the directness of aim necessary to the accomplishment of beneficent results. Only when shrewd men with axes to grind make use of the impulses of such people do their numbers count in producing results; and then the results are anything but what they would desire.

It is to this ill-considered impulse to remedy evils by restrictive laws, under the manipulation of self-seeking and far seeing men, that we are indebted for our protective system. "Work is scarce and wages are low; make a law!" that is the cry. And the self-seeking protectionist exclaims: "Of course, make a law! and what more sensible law, what law more directly calculated to remedy the evil, than one which keeps foreign goods out of our market and gives all American work to American labor?" Therefore, a protective tariff, with its intensification of the evils which American workingmen suffer, but with great plunder for the shrewd men who know how to avail themselves of impulsive demands for restrictive laws.

Mr. Bellamy's response, however, to the people who, feeling some kind of wrong, but unable to locate the wrong except in its surface manifestations, cry out for a law, was not of the selfish-shrewd order. He became the honest exponent of their cry by proposing a law, or a system of laws, for the reformation of the awful social conditions which he so graphically described.

This system comprised a new plan of society. Ignoring the laws of nature which operate in social life, he evolved a social scheme from his own inner consciousness. Mr. Bellamy might be likened to a man who with great power should describe the ugliness and barrenness of a worn-out peach orchard, and then by way of

remedy, instead of proposing to set out new peach trees and by guarding them against their enemies allow them to grow according to the order of nature, should propose to whittle peach trees out of pine sticks and decorate their artificial leaves with green paint. The fundamental objection to his constructive teaching is that he tried to invent a social system, instead of trying to discover and apply the natural laws of social growth.

But he did one man's work, in making thousands see the injustice of things as they are. If his method of reform was artificial and superficial, there are many nevertheless to whom he brought a realization of existing injustice, who will be neither artificial nor superficial in their search for a remedy. He is not to be ranked with Gladstone as a political leader; nor yet with George as a pioneer, though he was of the pioneer rather than the political type of leader. But his name will be remembered as that of one of the men of this dying century who honestly endeavored to hand down to those who might come after him a better world than he received from those who had gone before.

---

## NEWS

---

The center of interest in connection with the war is still in the West Indies. But at the hour of writing there is no absolutely trustworthy news. The cable companies have been forbidden to accept or deliver telegrams regarding the movements of the fleets, except to authorized officials of the government or with the permission of the censor. But rumors have been abundant and of such variety as to meet any demand. They culminated on the 24th in reports of the utter destruction of the Spanish fleet, but at great cost to the Americans, including the sinking of the New York and the Iowa, with Admiral Sampson, "Fighting Bob" Evans, and all hands. This rumor, like most of the others, was accompanied with the explanation that it was "unconfirmed." There was no truth in it.

Commodore Schley's squadron, which was at Key West when last week's issue went to press, left there on the 19th, since which time it has

been heard from only through unconfirmed rumors.

The whereabouts of Admiral Cervera's Spanish fleet—the so-called Cape Verde squadron—also, has been problematical since its departure from Curacao, reported on page 9 last week. According to rumors on the 19th, it had got into the harbor of Santiago de Cuba, and also into Cienfuegos, Cuba, some 400 miles or more farther west. Both rumors could not, of course, have been true; and it was by no means certain that either was. The censor at Madrid allowed the former to pass him, for on that day reports came from Madrid announcing that the Spanish fleet had arrived at Santiago de Cuba. On the 20th the Spanish minister of marine announced the receipt of a dispatch from Admiral Cervera at Santiago de Cuba dated May 19th and saying: "This morning I have without incident entered this port accompanied by the squadron." In an interview the minister of marine said he was "greatly rejoiced at the safe arrival of the Spanish fleet at Santiago de Cuba," and declared it to be "an immense triumph for the Spanish navy," and the cortes voted congratulations to Cervera for "cleverly dodging the American squadron."

The American government confirmed these reports on the 20th in a news bulletin announcing that the war department was in possession of information believed to be authentic that Cervera was at Santiago de Cuba.

Nevertheless the reports were doubted. For this there were several reasons. In the first place the Madrid authorities claimed that the reports were true, something which they would not be apt to do except to deceive the Americans by leading them to suppose that the Spanish fleet was where it was not. In the second place the Washington authorities admitted it. This it was supposed they would do only for the purpose of appearing to be deceived. And in the third place, it was difficult to understand why Cervera should bottle himself up in a harbor with a channel so narrow that one gunboat could command it, and between which and Havana there is no communication, the eastern part of the island being cut off from the western by insurgents. These considerations seem to have impressed the Madrid authorities, for hardly had they announced the arrival of Cervera at Santiago de Cuba, than, on the same

day—the 20th—they allowed news to pass the censor to the effect that Cervera, after coaling at Santiago de Cuba, would sail for Havana; and at midnight of the same day they allowed the further announcement to be made that his squadron had left Santiago de Cuba. The latter announcement was echoed from Kingston, Jamaica, on the 22d. Rumors from that source had it that on entering Santiago de Cuba, Cervera discovered that upon the return of the American fleet, which would now know the whereabouts of his fleet, he would be entrapped; so he quickly coaled and went out of the harbor. But according to the best information obtainable on the 24th—though this was unconfirmed—the Spanish fleet had actually taken refuge in Santiago harbor, and was still there. On the 25th Sagasta put out a statement in which he said that Cervera's squadron would remain at Santiago, "cleaning the hulls of the ships and leisurely coaling," and that an early engagement in Cuban waters is improbable. He added: "Everything is being carried out in obedience to a well-conceived plan. If the Americans intend to invade Cuba we shall then fight on land and sea. We can await events calmly." Madrid dispatches of the 25th give detailed accounts of the arrival and reception of the Spanish squadron at Santiago on the 19th.

Among the rumors which located the Spanish fleet in Santiago harbor, was one to the effect that upon entering the harbor, Cervera had driven away two American warships. It has since been officially reported that the American cruiser, St. Louis, and another vessel were before the entrance to Santiago harbor about that time. They were trying to cut the cables. On the 24th the St. Louis telegraphed from the island of St. Thomas that it had cut not only the cables from San Juan, Puerto Rico, but also those from Santiago de Cuba, thus severing both Cuba and Puerto Rico from cable communication with Spain. The work at Santiago was done under fire from the castle at the entrance to the harbor. It has been ascertained since, however, that the Santiago cable which the St. Louis had cut, was not the French line running to Hayti, as was supposed, but only one of the two English cables running to Jamaica, and that cable communication between Spain and Santiago de Cuba is still open.

In connection apparently with this cable cutting expedition, Blanco cabled his government that "in order to deceive the garrison of Guantanamo—the name of a bay a few miles east of Santiago, where part of the cable cutting was finally done—the American warships hoisted Spanish flags. Upon the basis of that dispatch this alleged conduct of the Americans was notified to the European powers by the Spanish government as "cowardly and iniquitous."

The announcement of the departure of Com. Schley from Key West on the 19th was quickly followed by a rumor that Sampson's fleet also had come and gone. It was said to have arrived at Key West on the 19th and, after coaling, to have departed on the 20th. Then it was that rumors of battle began to come in until public attention and anxiety were strained almost beyond endurance. Santiago de Cuba had been bombarded on the 19th, said one of these rumors, the only basis for which appears to have been the firing upon the St. Louis and her little attendant while they were dragging for the Santiago cables. This rumor was both confirmed and denied on the same day, and in the bustle of more exciting rumors was soon forgotten. On the 21st it was rumored at Cape Haytien, that a fight had taken place off Mole St. Nicholas, on the west coast of Hayti; but this was authoritatively denied on the 22d. Rumors were thick in Port au Prince, Hayti, on the 22d, that the Spanish had been disastrously defeated in a naval battle near Port de Paix; but these rumors still lack confirmation. Persistent reports came from London on the 24th, of an engagement in the Windward Passage, between Cuba and Hayti, in which both American squadrons closed in on the Spanish fleet and annihilated it; but at midnight on the same day it was announced officially at the navy department in Washington that no report had been received from Sampson or Schley of any engagement with the Spanish.

According to the best information obtainable as this issue of *The Public* goes to press, the Spanish fleet is held by an American squadron in the harbor of Santiago de Cuba. But even this is uncertain. It is not positively known, to the public at least, where either the American or the Spanish fleets are. The American authorities



believe, however, that the Spanish fleet is now bottled up.

The same doubt, though not the same anxiety, applies to the whereabouts of the Cadiz squadron of Spanish warships as to Cervera's squadron. As stated on page 9 last week, the Cadiz squadron has, according to rumors, been now setting out for the Philippines, and again preparing to strike our North Atlantic coast, while at other times it was actually in American waters. On the 19th it was reported from Madrid as still at Cadiz. Then on the 20th the Philippine expedition theory was given color by a report from Barcelona, Spain, that from 8,000 to 10,000 Spanish troops had been drawn from Catalonia, Andalusia, Aragon and Valencia, and were at Barcelona embarking for the Philippines. But on the 22d a rumor was in circulation at Gibraltar that the squadron was about to sail for Cuban waters; and a dispatch from Madrid on the 24th said that the programme regarding the Philippine Islands had been changed, and it was believed that Cervera would draw off the Americans from the neighborhood of Havana while the Cadiz squadron relieved that city. On the 24th seven vessels supposed to be this squadron were seen off the coast of Nova Scotia. A dispatch of the next day from Madrid, however, said that the squadron had returned to Cadiz, and after a trial of speed, etc., would depart under sealed orders. From Cadiz itself no news is allowed to come.

By way of Port au Prince, Hayti, it was reported on the 20th, that Gen. Gomez, with 15,000 insurgents was closing in on Havana, while Gen. Garcia with 5,000 was menacing Santiago de Cuba and cutting off all sources of supply.

On the 21st the first copy was received in the United States of a proclamation relative to the war, made April 28th, by President Masso, of the Cuban Republic. It is in full as follows:

People of Cuba: The revolution started by Jose Marti on February 24, 1895, is near its triumph. With the magnanimous aid of the United States, our arms, unconquered by the Spaniards during three years, will be soon victorious.

The congress of the United States has decreed that Cuba is free, and that it is for the Cubans. President McKinley has signed that just and noble docu-

ment. War between Spain and America, declared on April 25, is going on. The few seaports of the tyrants are blockaded by the American fleet. Arms, ammunition and provisions come for us from the country of Washington and Lincoln. Side by side, Americans and Cubans, we will end the Spanish rule in Cuba.

Cubans, you have fought during three years for your freedom, and now your duty is to be the vanguard of the allied army. Autonomist Spaniards, who doubted our triumphs, the time has come for you to join us. The republic of Cuba will receive you cordially, because our only aim is to establish here a stable and just government for all the inhabitants of the island.

Let all good men come to us and found the Cuban nation. We have had the courage of facing death. We will have the glory of pardoning our enemies. Country and liberty! Your president, BARTOLOME MASSO.

A second proclamation from President Masso, supplementary to the one quoted above, is addressed to the guerilla forces serving Spain, and reads as follows:

To the Guerrilla Forces Serving Spain: The sovereignty of Spain has ended in Cuba. The government of the United States demands the evacuation of Cuba by the regular Spanish troops.

This measure will include, as a security for peace, guerrillas born in Cuba, but serving Spain. The republic of Cuba will lament that men born here should die in Spain, hated and despised as traitors by the ones who employed them. This is the moment for you to join our ranks. You are still in time.

Gen. Gomez, the Cuban commander in chief, has issued an address to the insurgents, published May 10 and just received in this country, in which he reminds his followers that they have now a recognized country to fight for; and warns them that as they are no longer insurgents but Cuban soldiers, they must respect the rules of civilized warfare. He also impresses upon them that the war on their part is to be carried on not for revenge but for liberty and independence.

On the 21st it was reported from Macon, Ga., on what was regarded as good authority, that on the 18th the U. S. transport Florida, had left Tampa with several hundred volunteer troops on board belonging to the regiment of Cuban volunteers organized in Florida some weeks ago. This report, however, must be classed with the other unconfirmed rumors of the time.

The Oregon, for which so much anxiety has been felt, arrived safely at Jupiter, Florida, on the 24th. The Marietta and the Nichtheroy, now the Buffalo, were with her. She left again on the 25th.

The Spanish consul at Kingston, Jamaica, demanded of the Jamaican authorities on the 24th, the right to search the British steamer Adula and her packages and passengers, upon her arrival from Cienfuegos, Cuba, whence she comes with refugees. The object of the proposed search is to discover dispatches from the American fleet to the American navy department. The consul cites in support of his demand, the British neutrality laws, which hold official dispatches to be contraband. The demand is so far refused by the Jamaican authorities, for lack of proof of probable cause for believing that the vessel carries contraband dispatches.

The Harvard, which had been at Martinique since the bombardment of San Juan, left there on the 19th. On the same day the Spanish torpedo boat Terror had completed her repairs at Martinique and was ready to leave at any moment, but was still there on the 20th, when a Spanish hospital ship, Alicante, was reported to be with her. But the Alicante has turned out to be a collier instead of a hospital ship. On the 24th she was loading the Terror with coal at the mouth of Fort de France harbor, Martinique, and on the 25th the Terror left the harbor.

A dispatch from Admiral Dewey was received on the 24th. It had left Manila by boat on the 21st and been cabled from Hong Kong, thus showing that the Manila cable is not yet again in operation. Dewey's dispatch was as follows:

"Hong-Kong, May 24, 1898, Cavite, May 20.—Secretary of Navy, Washington: Situation unchanged. Strict blockade is continued. Great scarcity prevails at Manila. Foreign subjects fear an outbreak of the Spanish soldiers. Arrangements have been made for them to be transferred to Cavite by the foreign men-of-war if necessary. Aguinaldo, the rebel commander in chief, was brought down by McCulloch. Organizing forces near Cavite, and may render assistance that would be valuable.

On the same day on which Dewey sent this dispatch others were sent from which it is learned also that the Spanish troops at Manila are in a

state verging on insubordination, owing to the lack of food and non-payment of their wages, and that the insurgents hem in the Spaniards on the land side of the city and may be expected soon to make an attack. The Spanish governor general tries to keep up the courage of his army by frequently proclaiming that Spanish warships are coming to their relief. The German consul tried to land provisions, so it was said, from a German ship, but Dewey refused to permit it, whereupon the consul undertook to force a landing under the protection of two German cruisers. Dewey threatened to fire upon the cruisers if the landing were attempted and it was then abandoned. This story, however, is denied from Berlin.

The Charleston, which left Mare Island, California, on the 18th, with ammunition for Admiral Dewey, as reported on page 11 last week, returned on the 19th for repairs. She had suffered from the recent earthquake shock, when she was in dry dock, and although she had been repaired before sailing, her short trip showed that the repairs were not complete. On the 22d she finally passed through Golden Gate, San Francisco, on her voyage to Manila.

The First Regiment, California volunteers, embarked for Manila at San Francisco on the 23d; and on the 24th, four companies of the Fourteenth U. S. infantry, together with the Second Oregon volunteers and a detachment of heavy artillery, joined them. The total number of troops embarked was 2,600. Brig. Gen. Anderson was in command. The vessels for the expedition consist of the City of Peking, the City of Sydney, and the Australia. They sailed on the 25th, carrying supplies to last a year, besides ammunition and naval stores for Dewey. Gen. Merritt is now on his way to the Pacific coast to take command at the Philippines.

At a meeting of the United States cabinet on the 24th, it was decided that no new form of government should be made in the Philippines for the present, but that Gen. Merritt should accept things as he finds them, and enforce the Spanish laws as they exist so far as that may be done without oppression. No republic is to be organized, nor any innovation whatever made until the destiny of the

islands shall have been determined upon.

President McKinley issued a proclamation on the 25th making a second call for volunteers, the number called for being 75,000. This call, when answered, will provide a force of 216,500 volunteers, in addition to 62,000 regulars, making an army of 278,500 men.

The new Spanish ministry, whose names were given on page 12 last week, appeared in the cortes on the 20th—all except the minister for foreign affairs, Leon y Castillo, who has not yet accepted. Sagasta, the premier, addressed both houses, making a bellicose speech in which he said Spain would continue the war to the utmost until an honorable peace is obtainable. Leon's non-acceptance was explained as being due to important negotiations which, as ambassador to France, he was engaged in at Paris. From this explanation two inferences were drawn. He was suspected of negotiating with representatives of the Cuban insurgents at Paris for the submission of the insurgent army, which would remove the American pretext for the war; and also of proposing to the French government the sale or gift to France of the Philippine Islands, so as to prevent them falling into the hands of the United States. On the 25th the Cuban financial agent at Paris publicly stated that a proposition had been made to him from Spanish sources looking to the independence of Cuba on condition of its uniting with Spain to make war upon the United States, and that he had declined to entertain the proposition, first, because he is a financial and not a political agent of Cuba, and second because Cuba owes a debt of gratitude to the United States for making war in behalf of Cuban liberty.

On the 20th Mr. Balfour moved an address to the queen in the house of commons relative to the interment of Gladstone's body at Westminster Abbey. Sir William Vernon Harcourt seconded the address on behalf of the liberals, and John Dillon on behalf of the Irish parliamentary party. The chamber was crowded. In the house of lords the Marquis of Salisbury led the speaking in Gladstone's memory. The names of the pallbearers were announced in the 24th. They are the Prince of Wales, the Duke of York,

the Marquis of Salisbury, the Earl of Kimberly, the Earl of Rosebery, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. A. J. Balfour, and Sir William Vernon Harcourt. On the 26th at one o'clock in the morning the body was laid in state in Westminster hall.

A report was current in London on the 20th that the British government had given France an ultimatum to the effect that she must relinquish her African hinterland claims, and withdraw all representatives and expeditions within a month. Some days before, Lord Salisbury had said in a communication to the bankers that the West African question was the most serious the cabinet had before it, and that a satisfactory solution seemed well-nigh improbable. The Duke of Cambridge, formerly commander in chief of the British army, had also been credited with the remark at a banquet of volunteers that France had been given a month to clear out of the Boussa region, the territory which takes its name from the town of Boussa lying at the head of navigation on the river Niger. The duke denied having said this, but volunteer officers who were present insisted that his words had been distinctly noted. It has for some time been understood that the British ministry were disposed to force France to evacuate the Boussa, even at the risk of war.

To understand the West African controversy between France and Great Britain, find on any map the northern terminus of the eastern boundary line of Dahoméy, in Upper Guinea, at about latitude 9 north, and longitude 2.18 east. From this point draw a line eastwardly to the Niger; then northwestwardly along the Niger upward to the town of Say, and finally southerly from Say to the point of beginning. The triangle thus enclosed will indicate the territory in dispute. France claims it as its particular "sphere of influence," while England claims a protectorate over it. A sphere of influence has been aptly described as neither a sovereignty nor a protectorate over the territory to which it relates, but as marking out, "as between one European state and another, the limits within which each state may establish a measure of sovereignty if it can, and outside which it undertakes to respect any sovereignty the others may succeed in establishing." The English claim the

territory in question on the ground that the line, the northern terminus of which we have in the description above made the point of beginning, and which from the coast to that point is the western boundary of the English "hinterland," should in accordance with well settled principles, be extended to Say. They also claim to have made several treaties with native chiefs within the disputed territory before the French appeared in the region at all, and to have notified the French government of their protectorate without evoking any protest. France admits the general principles and the treaties, and does not deny the notification, but claims the territory on the ground of "effectual occupation" in advance of the English, and of subsequent treaties with stronger chiefs.

Whether an ultimatum was in fact given by the English appears now to be of little importance. France has yielded the best part of her claim. On the 22d, the Paris Figaro announced that the question had been settled by an agreement under which England is to have Boussa. The line of demarcation, according to the Figaro, is to start from Ilo on the Niger, instead of Say, and run southwest to the Dahomey boundary, thus leaving Nikki inside the French sphere. A line drawn from Say, which is more than 100 miles north and west of Ilo, would have given Nikki to the English.

Late Asiatic papers received on the 20th at Tacoma, Washington, say that there are many indications of rebellion in the Yangtze-Kiang Valley, China, owing to unsettled industrial conditions. The real ruler of this valley is said to be Cheng Chih-tung, viceroy of Honan and Hoo-Peh, who is disgusted with the weakness of the Peking government and is encouraging preparations for a revolt. Many missionaries in that section are thought to be in danger.

Advices from Samoa received at Vancouver, B. C., on the 20th, say that a native war is believed to be inevitable, the rebels having hoisted their flag in defiance of Malietoa's government. Samoa is that group of islands in the South Pacific ocean, formerly known as the Navigators' Islands, which are under a species of joint protection of Great Britain, Germany and the United States. These three powers while reserving

certain privileges for one another, recognize the independence of Samoa and the rights of the natives to elect their own ruler and choose their own form of government. The agreement between these powers was made at the Berlin conference in 1889, under the protection of which the former king of Samoa, Maliteoa Laupepa, whose authority is now again threatened, was restored to the kingship November 9, 1889.

Edward Bellamy died at Chicopee Falls, Mass., on the 22d, of consumption. He was the author of "Looking Backward," one of the few American books of vast circulation; and of a sequel to it, "Equality." As the author of the former book Mr. Bellamy may be said to have been the founder of the Nationalist movement. He was 49 years old.

#### IN CONGRESS.

Week Ending May 25, 1898.

##### Senate.

The debate on the war revenue measure continues.

##### House.

The house bill for the arbitration of labor disputes between railroads and their employes, as amended by the senate, was finally passed on the 19th by a vote of 219 to 4. No other action of public interest has been taken, but trouble over the question of the annexation of Hawaii is brewing. Unless Speaker Reed allows the matter to come up on the committee's report, it is probable that a caucus will override him. If that were once done it is believed that his autocratic power would be at an end.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The Columbia left the harbor of New York on the 22d.

—Gen. Fitzhugh Lee arrived at Tampa on the 25th and was to report for duty to Gen. Shafter on the 26th.

—The general assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States met at Winona Lake, Ind., on the 18th.

—Lieut. Sobral, formerly naval attaché of the Spanish legation at Washington, is in American custody under accusation of being a spy.

—A railroad collision near Chickamauga, Tenn., on the 21st killed one member of the First Missouri volunteers and wounded eight others.

—The mill of the Economical Smokeless Powder company, at Hessville, Ind., was blown up on the 21st, killing one man, seriously injuring three others

and destroying \$10,000 worth of property.

—A railroad collision on the Vandalia, near Collinsville, Ill., on the 21st, caused the death of four persons. Twenty others were wounded, five of them seriously.

—Polo, the ex-minister from Spain to the United States, went on board the Dominion, with his suite, at Montreal on the 20th and sailed for Europe on the 21st.

—On the 19th reports were received that the Spanish loss at Cienfuegos when the cables were cut, as reported on page 10 last week, was 300 killed, besides several hundred wounded.

—A riot, in which 3,000 persons engaged and lasting two hours, occurred at Bhowanipoor, 99 miles west of Dyanaghpoor, India, on the 22d. The rioters were dispersed by the police.

—Ex-President Harrison, of the United States, has been engaged by the Venezuelan government as counsel for Venezuela before the arbitrators in the boundary dispute with Great Britain.

—Jerry Simpson was renominated for congress by acclamation by the populists of the Seventh Kansas district on the 19th. This will be his fifth congressional campaign. He has been beaten once, and elected three times.

—William Astor Chanler, who was raising a company of Cubans, has given over that work to his brother and accepted an appointment as assistant adjutant general, with the rank of captain, on the staff of Gen. Joseph Wheeler.

—While off Cape San Antonio, at the western extremity of Cuba, on the 23d, a part of the American blockading squadron felt the force of a terrific but mysterious explosion. Its cause is unexplained, though it is supposed to have been an earthquake.

—The American cruiser Newark was put in commission at Norfolk, Va., on the 21st. It is a protected twin-screw steel cruiser, having a main battery of 12 six-inch breech-loading rifles, and a secondary battery of four six-pound rapid-fire guns, four Hotchkiss revolving cannon and four Gatlings.

—The number of killed by the cyclone which began by destroying Cunningham, near Wichita, Kan., and passing northeastwardly did great damage in eastern Iowa and western Illinois and Wisconsin, proved much greater than was at first supposed. But for war it would have been the news sensation of the week.

—Fifty thousand people welcomed the Sixth Massachusetts regiment on its way through Baltimore. This is the same regiment which, in 1861, in passing through the same city, was fired upon by a Baltimore mob. One of the legends on a flower design presented to the regiment on the 21st read: "Baltimore welcomes the Sixth

Massachusetts;" and another, "Flowers, not bullets." One hundred Confederate veterans acted as a guard of honor.

## MISCELLANY

IN MEMORIAM—MAY 30, 1892.

Not as white saints without a blot  
We celebrate the deeds they wrought;  
For they were made of average clay,  
As mortal men are made to-day.  
For always, in dark hours of need,  
A man is furnished for the deed;  
And always when the storm clouds  
lower

Strong men are ready for the hour;  
And thus from earth's most common  
breed

Spring heroes fit for every need.

These men were common men, 'tis true,  
Just common men like me and you.  
The plain man is the basic clod  
From which we grow the demigod;  
And in the average man is curled  
The hero stuff that rules the world.  
And so we deck, on hill and glen,  
The hero graves of common men.

Plain common men of every day,  
Who left their homes to march away  
To perish on the battle plain,  
As common men will do again—  
To lift a ghastly, glazing eye  
Up through the belching battlesmoke,  
Whose continental thunder broke  
Like rhythm beats of destiny—  
To lift a ghastly, glazing eye  
Up to a lurid, stranger sky,  
Until it sees a painted rag,  
The same old common, spangled flag—  
And then to die and testify  
To all the ages far and nigh,  
How commonplace it is to die.

It is not merely now and then  
We find such hearts in common men,  
Such hero souls enwrapped away  
In swathing folds of common clay,  
For, standing face to face with fate,  
All common men are always great.  
For men are cowards in the gloom  
Of their own little, selfish fears—  
Not when the thunder steps of doom  
Stride through the trembling years,  
And in an open fight with fate  
All common men are always great.  
—Sam Walter Foss.

### THE CHARITY OF WAR.

Extracts from an editorial in the New-Church Messenger.

The important point for us at this moment to understand is that if we go to war at all we should do it in a spirit of charity. We may be very glad of the support and cooperation of thousands who know nothing of the spiritual laws of life, but "Down with Spain" and "Remember the Maine," are very

inadequate mottoes, to say the least, for those who would see the will of God done on earth as it is done in Heaven. We may demolish Spanish authority on this continent without infringing in the slightest degree the laws of charity. For it is a mistake to suppose that charity toward the neighbor means a soft compliance with his likes or an avoidance of friction with his dislikes. The truest charity is compatible with the sternest opposition to the ideas and ways of the neighbor. The policeman, the prosecuting attorney, the judge, in the degree that they do their duty in sincerity and truth, are as surely forms of charity as the teacher, the philanthropist, or the minister of the Gospel.

These considerations come home with peculiar force at this time when our country has gone to war with Spain. We need to realize that we are not animated by any cheap and unworthy hatred of Spanish men and women. With the personal qualities of Spanish individuals we have nothing to do. America in such a case can deal only with ideas and forces that affect nations and the world. This country is committed to the doctrine that all men are entitled to freedom and political equality; that is to say, the natural resources of every country are there for the people of the country who will demonstrate that they can use them. They must at least have enough freedom and equality to allow them to be men in reality; and such success as they have they must be permitted to get in honest ways and not as pensioners or paupers, and such failures as they make must be made in freedom and not as slaves. Spain represents the idea which is the precise opposite of the American idea. Spanish policy is the same in essence to-day as it was in 1565, when Menendez left St. Augustine and massacred with the utmost cold-blooded treachery the French colony at Fort Caroline. To-day Spanish policy tolerates every infamous method of plundering the weak, and of insulting and punishing those who wish for freedom and progress. This entire century has witnessed the perpetual looting of Cuba by Spanish officials, and a systematic plan of excluding the native inhabitants from their civil and political rights. Several respectable revolutions have arisen before the present one, and after the cessation of each the Spaniards have repudiated their promises of redress. In this last revolution, the insurgents have demonstrated that they can preserve a better state of order and government than the Spaniards can maintain in Havana and the surrounding country with an army of 100,000

men. Spain has insisted that the United States shall violate the sentiments of a nation of 70,000,000 by a strict and expensive observance of neutrality laws, in face of conditions that are a disgrace to civilization. The attitude of America is simply the logical and honest expression of our national convictions, and is the tardy assumption of the responsibility of our being what we are. The war means that this country is not to be a forced party to maintaining a system of rule that was outrageous enough in the sixteenth century, and is simply intolerable on the eve of the twentieth.

We may rest assured that this war is entirely in accord with the principles of genuine charity, for it is in defense of the truths on which our homes and country are established. It is vastly better than a merely selfish and literal defense of our acres and crops, for it looks to the extension to others of the liberties and benefactions that we enjoy.

### "LOOKING FOR SOCIOLOGY."

A young woman with a notebook of forbidding size and a gold-trimmed fountain pen called at a settlement not long ago, and said she wanted a resident to take her into some "lower class homes, don't you know." She looked very wise and very intellectual, and, it must be admitted, very pretty, as she explained: "I am looking for sociology. I wanted to make a study of human nature, and thought some of you delightful settlement people could take me where there was some."

Few cases so naive as this come to hand, to be sure, but it is in this spirit that many a bright young man or woman enters upon settlement residence or visitation. We are continually forgetting that "human nature" is no more to be found among what the "superior" are pleased to call the "lower classes" than among the superior themselves. The settlement resident had some difficulty in refraining from telling the young woman of the incident above related that she herself was one of the finest specimens of "human nature" that had of late come under his observation.

We are always looking somewhere else for our sociology. The pot of golden knowledge is always at the foot of the receding rainbow. When shall we learn that "sociology" is going on in our own street, our own house, our own family, our own self? The relation of family to family is exemplified with intensest interest in our own neighborhood; social psychology, social customs, social consciousness, are to be

studied at first-hand in our own church, in our own club, at the last card party, wedding, dance or funeral that we attended. The labor question with its aspect of caste hatred, economic injustice, industrial misunderstanding and conflict of interest is nowhere crying louder for study and solution than in the relation between your own parlor and your own kitchen, dear searchers after "sociology and human nature." Nobody needs study and reformation any more than you do, fair reader who keeps the "servants" in "their place." You yourself, lofty mistress of your menage, are one of the most insoluble problems of the social complexity!

Let us put aside the buncombe, now, and in all honesty look each other in the face. Let us admit, lofty and lowly together, scribe and Pharisee and publican, leper and harlot, bond and free, Jew and Gentile, self-righteous and dust-humbled, all and each of us, that we are the problem of the ages; that we are "human nature" ourselves; that neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem shall we find what we seek. What we must study and reform is ourselves, and our problem is always to be found beneath our own hats, standing in our own shoes.—Chicago Commons.

#### INTERNATIONAL IGNORANCE AND PREJUDICE.

I take Cannes as a type—Cannes, founded by an Englishman, Lord Brougham, and which owes to foreigners the greater part of its prosperity.

The first thing which strikes me is that all these people who mingle do not penetrate each other. Each one leads in his own home the life of his own country, remains the slave of his own petty habits. An English company—the same one which owns the Hotel Metropole in London—has built very near Cannes an enormous hotel which is filled with English people. Why do they go there instead of to other hotels equally as well, or better situated? Because the wall-papers, the furniture, the stuffs, and even the fenders, all come from London; because they give bacon for breakfast in the morning and toast and muffins at afternoon tea; because, in short, they provide themselves with the illusion of being on the shores of the Mediterranean without having left England. What do the Frenchmen who are passing through London seek at the Hotel Savoy, unless it is French cooking and French servants? To tell the truth, I do not believe that this anxiety over things in themselves tolerably insignificant possesses the importance

which certain persons attribute to it; for there is a class of travelers who think that one cannot know a country unless he adopts its manner of living, even in the most minute details. These are the old-fashioned travelers. They will not feel as though they have seen Rome unless during their brief stay they have taken their meals in a little osteria on the banks of the Tiber, the dirtiest one possible, and the point which interests them most in the life of the Arabs is that among them boiled mutton is eaten with the fingers.

I have always noticed that travelers of this sort know no more about the countries which they have visited than do the former sort. This is because in both cases they waste their time and fetter their minds by taking into consideration only the frame, instead of looking at the picture. What connection can possibly exist between the fact that Americans drink iced water and eat fried oysters and their method of government and education? Would they be any the less good republicans if they ate macaroni, and would the Russians change their character if they ceased to like caviar?

Now I greatly regret that I am obliged to note the fact that the information possessed by many cosmopolitans concerning the people whom they have visited does not exceed that range of ideas. Daily habits constitute a slavery from which it is difficult to free one's self. Forain, the Parisian caricaturist, who had come to Chicago during the world's fair, one day complained in my presence that the hotel where he was staying was lighted with electricity. "When I come home at night," he said with comical vexation, "what would I not give to have the porter hand me my candlestick—my old candlestick with a candle in it!"

Well, many travelers are like that. They cannot get used to the absence of their "old candlestick," and this mere trifle suffices to put them in a bad humor and prevents their understanding what surrounds them. Thus in every way the daily habits constitute an obstacle to true internationalism. Whether yours keep you at home or those of the people whom you visit interest you, amuse you, and rivet your thoughts, in either case the effect produced is the same, either you learn nothing of what goes on outside, or you draw from what you see false conclusions, for the appearances of the daily life of the citizens are infinitely deceptive as a basis upon which to judge the collective life of the nation.

I seek the proof of this and am not long in finding it. I question a French

writer, well known beyond sea, where many of his romances have been translated and read; moreover, he is very well educated, knows many languages, and has often spoken of the English and the Americans in a manner which proves that he knows what is taking place among them. I asked him if he believes in the future of the United States and what he thinks of their incessant progress.

"Good heavens," he replied. "The Americans are enjoying only a temporary power, which is entirely industrial and commercial; but that power rests on nothing. The family does not exist among them. They live in hotels! People who live in hotels do not form families, and where there are no families there is no nation!" So there you have the American people judged by an eminent man, according to data which possess no value, for, in the first place, the Americans do not live in hotels, and, in the second place, it has not been proved that one cannot live in a hotel without entirely losing the family spirit. It makes no difference that this prejudice is very widely spread throughout Europe, and not in France alone. The idea that family bonds do not exist at all in the United States is an idea which is to be met with in the conversation of a German, as well as that of a Spaniard.

Let us now pass on to an Englishman who loves France and who often comes hither. He is convinced that she is profoundly demoralized by the bad books which are published here, and that the literature here is the faithful reflection of manners and customs. Nothing could be more inexact. It is deplorable and even shameful for my country that such books should be published in such great numbers, but the persons who read them are not in the majority, and if a man is impartial, he must admit that these books are purchased in large quantities by foreigners.

Here, again, is a Frenchman whom I question concerning Italy. He does not believe that anything good can be found in Italy. All Italians are knaves, are jealous and cruel. They have a habit of stabbing and a taste for plotting. They are not to be trusted; moreover, they are vain to excess, liars, and so forth. He can never finish the enumeration of their faults, and imagines that in this manner he possesses an exact view of the Italian nation, to whom he attributes as a whole all the defects which he has observed in individuals.

And I must confess that I have met far too many Americans who judged

the peoples of Europe in exactly this manner. I always wonder how a person can judge a nation from an individual—from less than that, sometimes, from an incident; and I recall an amusing adventure that happened to a French lady who was traveling in Switzerland with her maid. She was desirous that the latter should derive some profit from her travels, and therefore, on setting out, she had given her a small blankbook and urged her to write down therein daily the names of the places through which they should pass and a memorandum of what was interesting there. On their return she wished to learn her maid's impressions of travel and asked for the blankbook. In it she found this solitary reflection, dated from Zurich: "To-day, for the second time, we have had an umbrella stolen. The Swiss steal umbrellas by preference because there is a great deal of rain in their country in winter." How many educated persons exercise no more conscientiousness or care in forming their judgments on a nation.—Baron Pierre de Coubertin, in the Review of Reviews.

#### THE CHARACTER MADE BY POVERTY.

It is the children that constitute the East side's greatest charm, and no doubt it is especially due to them that a veracious man who often walks northward or eastward from Mulberry Bend late in the afternoon is able to testify that he invariably reaches Bleecker street with modified and softened sentiments towards his fellows, and increased tolerance for creation and its perplexing incidents. It cannot be said that the East side children are clean. Some of them are clean sometimes. It is stamped upon an observer's memory that on a Saturday early in April he passed a little girl in Hester street who had one of the cleanest heads of sunshiny hair he ever saw. Some East side children are cleaner than others, but as a rule they are pretty dirty. The streets are clean for streets, and the children are clean for children who play in the streets.

To be very clean indeed is a luxury of high price. People are apt to look upon it as a mere virtue, but that is a modern notion born of hot and cold running water and a bathroom on every floor. Saints in old times usually went very dirty from religious conviction. East siders don't do that, but they put up with a moderate amount of dirt because it is one of the unavoidable conditions of their existence. Their children are usually dirty, but only moderately dirty, as any normal child will

be after playing in the street or anywhere out of doors. Dirt or no dirt, in good weather the children of the East side are very interesting to watch. Some of them look sick, and a sick child is a pathetic sight wherever seen, but except in midsummer the great majority of them seem to be in good health and well nourished and lively. They play together very much as children do everywhere, and if they are more amusing than a lot of Fifth avenue children it is doubtless because they are under less supervision and are more natural. The most natural behavior we are used to see obtains in a cage of monkeys. The East side children are nearly as untrammelled as the monkeys, but they are a great deal kinder to one another. Little girls tending babies and carrying them from doorstep to doorstep are a common sight.

The little mothers are famous, but it seems to be in the nature of little girls to love babies and be good to them. What is more remarkable, and yet not uncommon on the East side, is kind and responsible little boys who look after still smaller children, and drag them around in ramshackle carts or amuse them and keep them out of harm's way. Of course one sees something of the other side of human nature too. There are crying children, and mothers whose patience is worn out, and bullying older boys, but the East side would not soften the heart of the sympathetic passer-by, and make him happier for passing through it, if the evidences of human kindness were not more plenty than the signs of the other side of human nature. It is what you see in people's faces that affects your spirits, not what they wear on their backs, or even on their heads. Fine birds in fine feathers are a gladdening sight. Really fine people with proper souls, whose faces show really superior qualities, and whose clothes and cleanliness and gentility are becoming to them, adorn creation in their way, and are folks that observers looking on at life are thankful for. You do not see people of that sort on the East side; but, on the other hand, you are not shocked there by the contrast between the individual and his circumstances. There are no "chappies" there; there is nothing to be seen there quite so astonishing and amusing and queer and pathetic as such chappies as one may sometimes see sipping green mint and smoking cigarettes in the purlieus of the Waldorf hotel. The East side is thoroughly disciplined. Faces there show rarely dejection, except what comes from illness, but endurance, patience, the practical education that comes of daily labor. In

front of an uptown club is a cab loaded with traveling bags. Inside are two young fellows just starting for some railroad station. A servant stands bare-headed at the cab door. One of the young men inside is dissatisfied with something. His arrogant face, as he makes complaint, is the face of a youth who has never earned his salt; who has been overfed, overstimulated, over-amused; who has always had all material luxuries within his reach, has accepted all as his due, is grateful for nothing, is appreciative of nothing, and whose conception of his obligations in life is pretty well fulfilled if he does what he considers his part in keeping club servants thoroughly well up to his notion of their duties. Faces of the type of his face are not prevalent on the East side. Persons whose business in life is to be carried, and to kick at their carriers when they stumble, do not abound down there. There are coarse people there, but they wear cheap clothes and work hard. There is no such disconcerting contrast between their outside and what one reads in their faces as afflicts the observer in more opulent parts of the town. If their looks are often enough commonplace and sometimes disagreeable, their environment and their clothes modify instead of aggravating them. Beggars may be picturesque, but beggars on horseback are grotesque.—E. S. Martin, in Harper's Magazine.

#### THE INSURGENT GOVERNMENT IN CUBA.

Extracts from an article by Horatio L. Rubens, published in the North American Review for May.

The Cuban rebellion of 1868 proved the power of endurance and resistance of the Cuban people. The present uprising proves that the Cubans are good organizers, thoroughly practical and amenable to discipline. The ten years' war was projected by the more educated part of the community; the present insurrection is the result of a popular upheaval.

The great secret of the success of the present Cuban movement lies in its organization. It is claimed that the Cuban people are incapable of self-government, but the facts prove the falsity of this statement.

It must be borne in mind that on the termination of the ten years' war, and the failure of Spain to keep faith with the Cubans and give them that home rule for which alone they laid down their arms, a large number of Cubans left the Island to live in the United States, Central America and the West Indies. Most of these were veteran

fighters; all were opposed to Spanish rule.

Time passed; Spanish rule had become more intolerable than ever. The Cubans on the island looked to the veteran leaders abroad for counsel and aid. The spirit of revolt was there, but organization was needed.

Jose Marti assumed the great task. He organized the Cubans abroad into clubs, and these clubs were associated to constitute the Cuban revolutionary party. Every member of the party became not only a worker, but a regular contributor to the revolutionary fund. The veterans were pledged to lead in the coming conflict. It was agreed that Gen. Maximo Gomez, then in Santo Domingo, should have supreme command. On the island were established secret committees which completed the organization there, in accordance with Marti's plans.

It might be asked why, if the movement was a popular one, there was not from the first a general uprising. It must be remembered that the Cubans were not allowed under Spanish rule to bear arms. Every rifle had to be secretly bought or smuggled into the country. In the western districts those which had been provided were seized by the Spanish government. To rush into the field unarmed would have been madness. A nucleus had to be formed, and it was much safer to do this in the mountainous east. The 24th of February, 1895, the day set by Marti for the uprising, saw the formation of this nucleus in the province of Santiago. In April the celebrated Maceo brothers landed, as did Gen. Gomez and Marti shortly after. Professional and business men, engineers and men of leisure flocked from the cities to the insurgent standards, leaving their families behind them. The country people applied for admission to the ranks in great numbers, until the leaders decided to take no man unless he could be armed with a rifle. . . .

There has been, especially of late, much criticism of those Cubans who reside abroad, it being claimed that they are too cowardly to fight. There never was need for them in the field, but for the money which they laboriously earned, and which they have given so freely, there was much need. The constant sacrifice of the Cubans abroad to supply the patriots in the field with arms and ammunition, is as remarkable as it is touching. These men, who have been called cowards, have proved themselves to be endowed with the highest moral courage and capacity for self-sacrifice, and they are an indispensable part of the revolutionary movement.

The so-called Cuban Junta, which is really the American delegation of the Cuban Revolutionary Party, and also the representatives abroad of the Cuban Republic, is responsible to the civil government for the fulfillment of its various and onerous duties.

On September 13, 1895, delegates from the several provinces met at Jimaguayu, adopted a constitution which was to last for two years, and elected the officers provided for. Salvador Cisneros, who renounced the Spanish title of Marquis of Santa Lucia, was elected president and Bartolome Maso, vice president. These, together with a government council, consisting of a secretary of war, a secretary of foreign affairs, a secretary of the treasury, and a secretary of the interior, were vested with legislative functions. Subsecretaries, governors of provinces, and their lieutenants, were then appointed. The entire island was divided into small districts, called prefectures, and responsible persons were appointed as prefects. These prefects, besides being charged with the safety of those residing within their jurisdiction, have judicial functions and are responsible for the local property and interests of the Republic.

Tanneries, smithies for the repair of arms, shops for manufacturing saddlery, shoes and clothing, the raising of crops, the herding and propagation of cattle in secure places, and the care of spare or overworked horses are all in charge of the prefects. A department of communications, with its chiefs and subordinates, facilitates correspondence on the island. Responsible tax-collectors receive the imposts decreed by the government. In the year ending 1897 over \$400,000 was collected by the Republic by way of taxes. The organized Cubans abroad constituted a source of steady revenue, besides which there were large extraordinary donations by individual patriots. One lady contributed more than \$120,000. On the occasion of Gen. Antonio Maceo's death an extraordinary contribution was made by the Paris colony of more than \$100,000. Little more than \$100,000, face value, of the bonds issued by the Republic, have been sold, at an average of forty cents on the dollar. The sale or grant of concessions or privileges has been absolutely refused. In short, the utmost care has been exercised to avoid the creation of liabilities.

The army is subordinate to the civil government. No military commissions, except the lowest grades, can be given except on recommendation by the commander-in-chief and the approval of the government. The army was

wholly volunteer without pay, until the government passed a law providing for the payment of salaries, after the establishment of peace, for the term of actual service. The pay ranges from \$30 per month for privates up to \$500 per month for major-generals. The object of this legislation was to provide for the speedy disbandment of the army when the war ends, by enabling its members to return immediately to their peaceful pursuits, and placing a considerable sum in circulation. It is also the intention of the government to supply with tools and implements those who are in need, so that they may at once resume their former trades and occupations. To accomplish this purpose a loan will be easily floated, as the credit of the island has been kept unpledged. The civil government was at first confined to the east, but broadened with the spread of the military occupation.

In October, 1897, at the expiration of the term fixed by the constitution, a new constituent assembly was elected in the manner prescribed by law. This assembly amended the old constitution, and elected a new set of government officials. Bartolome Maso is now president and Mendez Capote vice president. The council of government consists of the president, vice president and secretary of war, Jose B. Aleman; a secretary of foreign relations, Andres Moreno de la Torre; a secretary of the treasury, Ernesto Fonts Stirling; and a secretary of the interior, Manuel Ramon Silva. The secretary of the council is Jose Clemente Vivanco. The constitution provides that upon the establishment of peace there shall be an immediate general election of a new government at which everyone shall have free voice and vote.

There was no attempt on the part of the military element to influence the elections. The seat of the government was formerly at Cubitas, in Puerto Principe province; it is now at Agramonte, in the same province.

In the eastern districts, where the country is in almost undisputed possession of the Cubans, newspapers are published, and even schools have been established. The constituent assembly of 1895, and again that of 1897, elected Maximo Gomez commander-in-chief. There are six army corps. The First, Second and Third army corps are commanded by Gen. Calixto Garcia, but the First is under the immediate command of Pedro Perez; Jesus Rabi is in charge of the Second, and Gen. Xavier Vega of the Third. The Fourth army corps is commanded by Gen. Francisco Carrillo; the Fifth, in two divisions, by Gens. Pedro

Betancourt and Alejandro Rodriguez, and finally, the Sixth is under Gen. Pedro Diaz. The Fifth and Sixth are, however, subject to the superior command of Gen. Jose Maria Rodriguez.

There are now about 40,000 well-armed Cubans in the field. There are, besides, the impedimenta and others who have sought safety within the Cuban lines, amounting to about 100,000 additional men, all waiting for rifles.

A people capable of such organization, civil and military, and of fighting a European power to a standstill on a little island like Cuba, without a navy and at first utterly unarmed, have surely given sufficient promise of capability of self-government. Nor is there danger of future internecine strife. The turbulent Indian blood which has proven unfortunate to some Spanish-American countries is entirely absent in Cuba. The racial question is not apt to prove troublesome. Only 30 per cent. of the population is of the negro race, including in this calculation the mixed races, even to the one-sixteenth of African blood.

Education has helped to develop the Cubans, and the fact that most of them have been educated in France and the United States goes far to prove that they understand the principles of republican institutions.

The Cubans have looked to the United States as the great model and protector of American republics, and, firm in the belief of the sympathy and justice of the American people, they have appealed for recognition as an independent nation. Once free, there are many Cubans who may doubtless desire to follow the example of Texas; but even as an independent republic, Cuba will always be bound to the United States by the strongest commercial ties, and the conditions of intercourse on Cuba's side must of necessity be the more liberal, since the speedy attainment of her independence shall have been the result of the friendly alliance and intervention of this country.

#### THE HUNGER IN ITALY.

Sympathy with the starving was undoubtedly the cause of what was intended to be a peaceful demonstration in Milan and ended in revolt. There are very serious reasons for revolt. The outbreaks in all parts of Italy are caused by grievances of long standing. Each year 100,000 people go mad from hunger in Italy. This is according to official statistics and does not include the thousands in a half demented state called la melancolia, from lack of nourishment. There are hundreds of thousands who never have enough to eat,

or live on moldy corn year in and year out, till soul and body can barely stay together. The general suffering in Italy is so great that nothing like it exists in any other country. The Hispano-American conflict may have aggravated the conditions, for the increase of a centesimo, the fifth of a cent, on a pound of corn meal is felt by the poor. There are 4,965 cantons where the use of meat is unknown, except in moneyed families, and there are 1,700 where food made of flour or grain is rarely eaten except on holidays, or in cases of sickness. What do they eat? Roots and acorns are largely used in some parts of Italy.—Mrs. Fidelia Papa, in the New York Sun.

#### HOW MEN FIGHT FOR LIBERTY.

Casper Whitney writes to Harper's Weekly from Tampa, Fla., that Capt. Dorst, in talking of the first of his two recent trips to Cuba, seemed most impressed by the contempt the insurgents showed for the Spanish troops.

There were about 200 insurgents at the rendezvous, fully half of them not armed, and every last one of them literally in rags. They appeared little like soldiers or men able to withstand the fatigues of a campaign, so hungry-looking and worn were they. Yet the known presence of Spanish cavalry in the immediate vicinity seemed no occasion for alarm. They worked with unconcern at stowing away the ammunition, and when attack came, as it did before their work was completed, they retired to the bush, and by a straggling fire drove the Spaniards beyond danger. That these half-starved, half-armed patriots can successfully and repeatedly repulse the Spaniards with the greater loss to the latter bespeaks a determination and courage of an order that comes only to those fighting for liberty.

Mr. A. G. Hall, of Nashville, has been at pains to trace back the expression "are, and of right ought to be," which occurs in the Declaration of Independence and in the Mechlenburg Declaration, and was used the other day in the resolutions of congress about Cuba. He finds that on March 16, 1766, the English parliament repealed the stamp act and passed a "declaration act" in which is set forth "that parliament had, and of right ought to have, power to bind the colonies in all cases whatsoever."—Harper's Weekly.

The possibility that the future offers of every man residing in a cottage of his own, can best be appreciated by people who have visited Australia. In Victoria and South Australia, more than two-fifths of the entire population dwell in the capital cities. No such

concentration of population as this is known anywhere else in the world. Only one-seventh of the population of England and Wales is concentrated in the metropolis of London. But the large agglomerations in Australia are by no means "plague-spots," or "wens on the face of the earth," the explanation being that their population is not congested, but scattered over a large area.—A. F. Weber, in North American Review.

A man is startled sometimes when he thinks of his former ignorance; but he generally feels that his present knowledge is ample.—Puck.

The Almighty never created the black man in order that sugar or cotton might be sold a cent a pound cheaper.—Channing.

"And he is kind-hearted, is he?"  
"Kind-hearted! why, I don't believe he ever said an unkind word, even to an alarm clock."

What stamps a man as great is not freedom from faults, but abundance of powers.—Prof. George H. Palmer.

From panic, pride and terror,  
Revenge that knows no rein,  
Light haste and lawless error,  
Protect us yet again.  
Cloak thou our undeserving,  
Make firm the shuddering breath,  
In silence and unswerving  
To taste thy lesser death.  
—Hymn before Action, by Rudyard Kipling.

#### THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by  
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 522,  
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

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

#### SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

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

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