

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1898.

Number 26.

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.

Sir William Crookes, in an address before the British association, has warned the world that in 1931 the consumption of wealth will be in excess of the production. Strangely enough, the press regards this as a calamitous prophecy. Yet the same press has habitually ascribed poverty to over-production. How, then, can it regard as calamitous a prophecy that in 1931 the excessive production of wealth will be overtaken by a condition in which consumption will exceed production? For ourselves, we do not clearly see how consumption can ever exceed production. Things that are not produced cannot be consumed. That, at least, is our opinion. But suppose consumption should by 1931 only equal production, why cry about it? If it be true that poverty is caused by over-production, there would then be no poverty. Let us rather look forward to 1931 as a red letter year, when none will any longer starve from an excess of food, nor suffer exposure from a superabundance of houses and clothing.

A captain of German cavalry has murdered a sergeant, and it is understood that if he is punished at all it will be only with a slight reprimand. It is reported that the emperor has even expressed his approval of the murder. This is in the interest of military discipline. It seems that the sergeant had been assailed by the captain with villainous names for some supposed neglect regarding the cooking of food; whereupon the sergeant, who had a valid excuse, told the captain that he did not think he deserved such names, and, as a rebuke to this "impu-

dence" the captain hit the sergeant heavily upon the side of the head, knocking him against a wagon. The sergeant called to two of his comrades, saying: "You saw that I was struck." That was his mortal offense. The captain, in a rage, stabbed the sergeant with a saber, first in the leg and then behind the ear, from the effects of which the sergeant died. Americans would demand extreme punishment for such a murder. They are therefore inclined to think themselves more civilized than the Germans. But they, too, tolerate unjust treatment of private soldiers by officers, upon the plea of military discipline. The custom of making private soldiers the menials of officers, as a necessity of military discipline, is the same in principle. If private soldiers in the German army were the equals before the law of their officers, no such outrage as that of the German captain upon his sergeant could have been perpetrated with impunity; so if private soldiers in the American army were the equals before the law of their officers, they could not with impunity be turned into bottle washers and general drudges for military superiors.

But the most suggestive thing in connection with the murder of the German sergeant by his captain, is the difference between the way in which it is viewed—by the Emperor William for instance—and the way in which the murder of the Austrian empress was viewed by that apostle of divine right. Her assassination struck horror to William's soul; but the sergeant's assassination he justifies as a bit of military discipline. The difference is in the person, not in the crime.

Scribner's Magazine would hardly be classified, even by President McKinley's most partisan supporters, as

a "yellow journal," nor Richard Harding Davis as a manufacturer of "yellow journal" literature; yet in the October number of that magazine Mr. Davis, giving an account of his experience and observations at the battle of Santiago, justifies every important charge that has been made as to the mismanagement of the Cuban campaign. His article offers no argument. It is simply an array of facts, from which readers may draw their own conclusions. But these facts hold Gen. Shafter up to public gaze as an incompetent, and pillory the president as the original cause of the unnecessary suffering and loss of life at Santiago.

The facts Mr. Davis gives show that Santiago was not captured by Shafter's army, but was abandoned by the Spanish fleet. But for Cervera's unaccountable withdrawal, the American army, so Mr. Davis explains, would have suffered humiliating defeat or melted away. Even had it succeeded in getting possession of Santiago—a conquest of no importance in itself—Cervera could, as Mr. Davis says he threatened to do, have made its position there untenable. The mismanagement in this connection consisted in moving against Santiago instead of continuing Gen. Miles's plan of attacking the harbor defenses and, by removing the explosives, opening the way to our fleet to attack and destroy Cervera's, a plan which harmonized with the only honest and sane purpose of making any campaign at Santiago at all. This and all the other mismanagement of which Mr. Davis tells most convincingly, he ascribes to political favoritism. If that be its cause, the president's responsibility is established. He is commander-in-chief. He appointed the secretary of war. He also appointed the sons and nephews of po-

litical favorites to military positions over the heads of tried soldiers. Shafter himself could never have been in position to prove his gross incompetency at the expense of the health and lives of American troops but for the president's manifest partiality, or what amounts to the same thing, his assent to Alger's partiality. Let those who doubt the justice of our conclusions in this matter, read Davis's article in the October Scribner's; and then, by way of a "settler," let them read in the same magazine, the account by the British military observer, of the fighting at El Caney during the Santiago battle. These publications are formidable indictments.

For placing the responsibility for the disgraceful part of the war upon the president, we have been accused of partisanship. Since we lay no claim to infallibility, but only to such virtue as there may be in definitely expressing honest opinions, we freely admit the possibility of our being partisan, though we endeavor to be fair. But let it not be forgotten that there are two kinds of partisanship. It is partisan to attack a political adversary regardless of his merits, but it is also partisan to defend a political friend regardless of his faults. And of the two species, the latter is by far the most dangerous. By partisan assertions of faults in political adversaries where none exist, they alone can be injured at the worst, and even that is not likely to occur; whereas, by concealing or excusing the faults of political friends, the whole country may be made to suffer from incompetency or dishonesty. The true balance, however, is in avoiding both species of partisanship. That is difficult to do, but it is what all should aim at. And we are not conscious of deviating to either side when, in explanation of the mismanagement of the war, we point at the president and say, "Thou art the man!"

Why should the president be credited with the glory which attaches to the success of the war, but exonerated

from responsibility for favoritism which has caused the unnecessary loss of thousands of men? Why, especially why, when the source of that favoritism was the president himself? The New York Evening Post, one of the most ardent and effective of the advocates for Mr. McKinley's election two years ago, publishes and vouches for the truth of a letter from Washington which closes with these words: "If the president had been choosing a caterer for a camping party of a half-dozen friends, there are not a corporal's guard of these staff officers, whom he has chosen to transport and feed and clothe and shelter the soldiers of the United States, to whom he would think for a moment of turning over the comparatively simple job."

The staff officers above referred to are named by the same correspondent. Many of the names are not suggestive of the origin of the presidential "pull" that secured their appointment, but not a few are as significant as a barometer in August. Among the latter are such names as Alger, Blaine, Allison, Foraker, New, Sewell, Botkin, Elkins, McMillan, Goff, Flower, Scott, Longstreet, Brice, Milliken, Fairbanks, Coudert, Hobart. Most of these are the sons or nephews of republican friends of the administration, though some are sons or nephews of democratic hangers-on. But all are from civil life, and the names of all supply prima facie evidence of presidential favoritism. They are among the men to whose incapacity we are indebted for an army sick and death list which is to the casualties of battle in the shocking ratio of about 5 to 1. In all good faith let us ask candid republicans whether they think it unprejudiced fairness in this connection to defend the president, and partisanship to insist upon his responsibility?

To go a little further, what has the president done to fix the blame for the army mismanagement which is now conceded by all impartial men? As commander-in-chief he might have

set on foot a military inquiry accompanied with legal power to secure testimony; but he has in fact appointed a commission unknown to either the military or the civil law, and which therefore is utterly incapable of obtaining any testimony, oral or documentary, except such as may be volunteered. The first appointments upon this committee were in the main satisfactory to all who wish for a genuine investigation; but most of the original appointees declined the farcical task of serving upon an impotent commission, and the body as now constituted, made up entirely of men unknown to the nation, is described by the Washington correspondent of one of the least partisan of daily newspapers, the Chicago Record, as appearing to be unanimously "very friendly to the administration!" One of the members of this commission, Col. Sexton, known at the time of his appointment to be a friend of Alger, who stands next to the president in point of responsibility for the mismanagement of the war, has gone so far as publicly to announce at least part of his verdict, and a very important part, in advance even of such an impotent inquiry as he is charged to make. He told the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record, on the 23d of September, at Washington, that he had explicit confidence in Secretary Alger, that he was sure the secretary's statements were correct, and that he regarded much of the present discontent as being chargeable to the enterprising journals of the day. After all this, what is the president's request to the commission to trace the abuses to their source, even into the White House—what is that solemn admonition but part one of the shifting scenes in the farce.

Partisanship! The truth is that most active republicans of these days of Mark Hanna, are thick and thin partisans. Not only is a republican leader of high degree immaculate to them, though he be covered with slime from his own mudpuddle, but everybody else must regard him as im-

maculate on pain of being denounced for partisanship; whereas an opposing leader of high degree, however unimpeachable his character, is to them an object of contempt whom it is a Christian duty to caricature and malign. In proof of this we have only to refer to the leading republican newspapers of the country. It has been our effort to commend republican leaders, for good words and good conduct; if we have seldom done so it has not been for lack of will but for lack of opportunity. With the exception of Pingree, of Michigan, and La Follette, of Wisconsin, our attention has yet to be called to any modern republican leader of national reputation to whom the fleshpots of his party have not invariably proved more seductive than any other consideration in public life. On the other hand, if we frequently speak in praise of some democratic leaders it is because they have shown themselves to be really public spirited men—democratic democrats instead of machine democrats. Last week ex-Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois, when opening the democratic campaign at Chicago, upon referring to a piece of scandalously corrupt legislation in the republican legislature, said:

The question is asked, "Did not some democrats support that legislation?" Yes, they did; but outside of Chicago nearly every one of them has been repudiated by his constituents, and the democratic party, as a party, has taken a firm stand against this legislation, while the republican state administration stands by these acts. \* \* \* Let me say, however, that if there is a man on the democratic ticket that you believe to be a "boodler," then vote against that man. The democratic party is struggling to get away from those influences and to get on to higher ground, and it will not thank you for supporting a "boodler," even if he has wormed himself on to our ticket.

Let any republican of national reputation make such a declaration regarding republican candidates, or say or do anything else equally bold to the voters of his party, and we will gladly recognize both his courage and his public spirit.

One good service which our war with Spain has rendered must not be overlooked. It has made it much more difficult ever to stir up another war in this generation or in any which is influenced by this. For the past 10 years our country had been in a fever heat for war with somebody, anybody, no matter whom, provided it were war. In fact this feeling had existed ever since the close of the rebellion. There had always since then been an itching for a fight, and the itch had been stimulated by that conflict, in which there was glory. It entailed great losses, but had it not also given great prizes? The president had died in a halo, and his name was enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen. An obscure tanner had come to the front as one of the great generals of modern times, from which vantage ground he had stepped into the presidency. Even the defeated chieftain came out of the struggle an historic hero. These were the great achievements. Others not so great, but brilliant nevertheless, were numbered by the score. After that our histories were full of suggestion of the possibilities that war gives for renown, and the military spirit was kept alive. Children were animated by it, and Sunday schools, professed nurseries in the garden of the Prince of Peace, were actually turned into armories and their little attendants into warriors. Swords and guns mingled with bibles and hymn books when no enemy threatened, and the inculcation of the command "thou shalt not kill" was supplemented with instruction in the most scientific way of killing. Everything contributed to foster the warlike spirit which the rebellion had breathed into the nostrils of the American people, and if we had not gone to war with Spain when we did, we should soon have gone to war with another nation. Young America carried a chip on his shoulder. But the Spanish war will leave us no such legacy. It gave us a taste of the horrors of war, but none of its glory. The bell-cose Roosevelt is the only person

likely to build up a career upon his military reputation, and even his chances are what insurance men would call a bad risk. Some others have achieved a little temporary notoriety, but nothing else. Soon their names will be less familiar than that of the favorite prize fighter or variety stage singer. Withal, the great mass of soldiers have learned that war is nothing but a beastly thing. This is the impression which is now likely to be carried down in popular feeling, instead of that which the civil war left us; and the public man who next tries to excite a war fever will, in the expressive phrase of the street, "get the wooden ear."

It is so seldom we have an opportunity to approve an utterance of the president's mentor, Mark Hanna, that we gladly embrace every opportunity. One has just offered itself. In an interview given to a reporter of the Cleveland Recorder Mr. Hanna is quoted as saying not only that there are not nearly so many chances now for a poor young man to amass a fortune as there were 20 years ago, but that such chances as remain are very slight. This confession must be somewhat startling to the goody-goody people who are still parroting the pretty talk that "went" some 20 years ago, about the splendid opportunities there are for poor young men of industry and pluck. Mr. Hanna sees no such opportunities. All he sees is a possibility for young men of "ability" to get to the top in the course of time if they enter the employment of a good concern and stick. Mr. Hanna does not note the fact that there cannot be room at the top for every young man of "ability" who enters a good concern, nor does he call attention to the other important fact that a large percentage of the good concerns fail before many even of the ablest of their employes have a chance to get to the top. But the astute reporter who interviewed Mr. Hanna directed his attention so forcibly to one important point that Mr. Hanna was

obliged to reply: "Well, I will admit that personal influence has a great deal to do with the matter, and unless a young man has a personal recommendation he stands small chances." While we cannot recommend Mr. Hanna as the best type of American, we most cordially commend his candor regarding the lessening of industrial possibilities. A few more such interviews would knock the Ladies' Home Journal recipes for getting on in the world into a cocked hat.

The city of Dayton, Ohio, boasts an editor who has been greatly stirred by the visit to Dayton of John S. Crosby, the famous single tax orator. So full are this editor's columns of weak anti-Crosby paragraphs, one might almost suspect Crosby of having subsidized him for advertising purposes. He thinks, for instance, that he has routed the single tax advocates, horse, foot and dragoons, with this question, supposed to contain a quotation from Mr. Crosby: "What is meant by 'taxing property (in cities), irrespective of improvements?'" But no intelligent friend or enemy of the single tax would suppose for a moment that Mr. Crosby, or any other advocate of the single tax ever proposed to tax "property" irrespective of improvements. The fact doubtless is that a reporter who heard Mr. Crosby propose to tax "land" according to its value, irrespective of its improvements, assumed "property" and "land" to be synonyms, and substituted the former for the latter; and that the editor, when he came to comment, failed to detect the reporter's error. Had this editor used the language that Crosby undoubtedly did use, his question would have read in this manner: "What is meant by taxing land according to its value, and irrespective of its improvements?"

If the editor could not have seen that the question in that form answered itself, any real estate agent might have helped him out. He would have known perfectly well that

the question contemplated the taxation of each site according to its value irrespective of the improvements upon it—just the same, that is to say, as if the site were unimproved but all neighboring sites were in the same state of improvement as at the time of taxation. Nobody has any difficulty in approximately determining the value of any given site irrespective of its improvements, in a neighborhood in which he is acquainted, except when he is called upon to do so for the purpose of understanding the single tax. Nor has he any trouble then, unless there is method in his stupidity.

In a mass of casuistical objections, of which the question quoted above is a specimen, this Dayton editor makes one and only one point that is worthy of serious notice. It is to the effect that the single tax advocates, if they believe in their doctrines, ought to start a colony somewhere, the same as Brigham Young did. This allusion to Brigham Young's experiment is unhappy for the purpose; for it will be remembered that as soon as Brigham's colony began to succeed, the gentile set about breaking into and governing it. That aside, however, an all sufficient reason why single tax men ought not to attempt organizing a colony, is that many extraordinarily large single tax colonies are already organized and in full operation. Several are in New Zealand; there are several more in Australia; South America has a number; so has the continent of Europe; while Canada and the United States contain them by the score. All these colonies are highly successful. Their annual wealth product counts up in the hundreds of millions. In every one of them, also, the value of land irrespective of its improvements is taxed with precision and regularity. The only defect about these colonies is that the tax so collected is appropriated by private individuals—by the so-called owners of the sites on which the colonies are located. This prevents all the colonists from enjoying the benefits of

the colonization. The colonial benefits of a pecuniary nature go to a comparatively few, some of whom do not even live in the colonies from which they draw rich incomes based upon the value of land irrespective of its improvements. But a movement has now set in in most of these colonies, and in some it has reached an advanced stage of success, for the abolition of the unjust privileges under which private individuals confiscate the profits of the colonization. With the success of that movement, the single tax colonies already established will be ideal.

The colonies alluded to above are the states and municipalities of the countries of the civilized world. No further single tax colonization is needed. What is needed, is such a reform in the existing colonies as will secure to all colonists their rights in the common benefits of their respective colonies, while leaving to each, untaxed, all the improvements and personal property that he individually earns.

Attention has been directed to a certain Dr. Woodbridge, of Youngstown, Ohio. It seems that Dr. Woodbridge has a notion as to how typhoid fever can be best treated, and is allowed a certain number of sick soldiers to experiment upon at Fort Meyer. But army surgeons generally hold to old theories and sneer at him. Now it so happens that Dr. Woodbridge's experiment has been highly successful. Out of 53 typhoid patients he has lost but 4. Yet other surgeons speak contemptuously of Dr. Woodbridge as being the only person who has found a "specific" for typhoid fever. To that we take exception. The treatment does not appear to be proposed as a "specific" at all, but as a simple compliance with natural laws. To the layman it appears to be nothing more than cleanliness. Dr. Woodbridge, according to the newspaper descriptions of his treatment, "cleans out the bowels of his patient first, and then

keeps them clean with antiseptic solutions." When a physician makes what seems to be so common sense a proposition, and follows it by saving nearly all the typhoid cases entrusted to him, he deserves something better from his profession than a sneering reference to his treatment as a "specific." This is not unlike speaking contemptuously of soap and water as a "specific" for dirty hands.

The military ring is planning to raise the regular army from 25,000 to 100,000 men. They estimate that 40,000 will be needed in Cuba. The president puts it at 50,000. Now, why shall we need 50,000 or even 40,000 men in Cuba, after the Spaniards leave? There is but one reasonable answer to that question. We could need so many men after the Spanish go, only in case we intend to be guilty of a breach of faith, and, instead of turning the government of the island over to its people, as we promised, design to conquer its people and capture their country. That being the purpose, 50,000 men will not be enough. Let us be frank about the matter with ourselves. If we do intend to "pacify" Cuba by seizing it, we should send not less than 150,000 men. The Spanish found 200,000 too few for that kind of "pacification" and they were no mean fighters, either, as our own troops testify. But if we really are to redeem our pledge, solemnly made by congress on the eve of the war, to recognize the Cuban people as free and independent, then we shall soon need no troops at all in Cuba, and the estimate of an increase of the regular army may be reduced by at least 40,000.

A remarkable procession of 10,000 people marched through the streets of Brooklyn, N. Y., last Sunday. It was under the management of the Holy Name society, and was intended as a protest against profanity. What a caricature of religion! Profanity is in very bad taste, and anyone who thoroughly respects himself and those

about him, will refrain from it; but the religion that makes a great ado in condemnation of it as in itself wicked, must be superficial indeed. Men who "swear" are no more wicked for that reason, than are men whose ejaculations are "Oh, my!" or "Goodness me!" or "Mercy on us!" or "Lord a mercy!" or any other of the many phrases which are habitually used to fill in the chinks of disconnected thought or to help out a deficient vocabulary. There was much soundness in the reply of the swearing sailor to the hypocritical deacon. The deacon having lectured the sailor for "taking the name of the Lord in vain," the sailor responded: "Oh, deacon, that's all right; there's no harm in my swearing. It's like your praying; neither one of us means it!" Profanity is not necessarily nor usually irreligious, though objectionable on grounds of good manners. Neither is abstention from profanity necessarily religious. But one of the respectable garbs of religion is abstention; therefore it is not so strange that 10,000 people should advertise their condemnation of profanity by marching as a Holy Name society. It is much easier to wear a respectable religious garb than to be in the heart a religious man. We fear that a "Love-your-neighbor-as-yourself society," one whose members could stand close cross-examination on the difference between conventional charity and the charity which means love and justice, would make a dismal failure of such a parade. How many of the Holy Name paraders could be depended upon to march?

The Conservative, of which J. Sterling Morton is the editor, replies to The Public's objection to its democracy when it insists that "the rights of the unintelligent should be defined and defended by those who are intelligent," by saying:

Probably The Public is equally averse to the definition and defense of the rights of children by parents, guardians and teachers. And how would The Public deal with the Indian ques-

tion? The Indians are a class whose rights civilization has been defining and defending for many generations. The negroes in the south too, have their rights prescribed by white men.

The puerile point about the government of children, which The Conservative thrusts into the controversy, has been so often disposed of in democratic literature that its use by Mr. Morton is enough in itself to discredit the intelligence of his democracy. The position of The Public as to that point is very simple. We recognize the fact that the life of man extends from the instant of birth to threescore years and ten or longer. We also recognize the fact that at the instant of birth man is incapable of self-government, and that no one becomes capable until he arrives at some indefinite age between the instant of birth and three score and ten. Exactly what that age is, no one can tell; but that there is such an age, except in the case of abnormalities like idiocy and lunacy, every democrat must admit or renounce his democracy. It therefore becomes necessary to fix an age arbitrarily by regulation at which men shall be regarded as having passed out of the tutelage of infancy into the freedom and equality of manhood. So long as the regulation fixing that age is reasonable and the age uniform, no objection can be made. Objections lie only when the age selected is unreasonably young or unreasonably old, or varies under the same government so as to discriminate against persons or classes. This is somewhat elementary, but it is elementary instruction in democracy that The Conservative lacks. As to the Indians and the negroes, if The Conservative is willing to rest its case upon our Indian and negro history, The Public certainly does not object. We could ask for no more pronounced corroboration than that, of our contention that when one class arrogates to itself the power of "defining" and "defending" the rights of another its tendency is to define those rights to zero and defend them out of sight.

**USES OF THE MILLIONAIRE.**

It is not an uncommon thing for the people of an undeveloped country, especially those who own its resources, to wish that some millionaire might come among them and improve it. This is one of the errors into which our upside down industrial system leads men. Pray what could a millionaire do in developing a country? If he worked with his hands, he could at most do no more than any other able-bodied individual. If he had ability as an organizer, he could do no more than any other organizer of equal ability, not a millionaire. In either case he would have to bring men to the place. The men and not he would do the developing. Where, then, is the peculiar power of the millionaire?

That the millionaire has peculiar power no one can deny; but in what does it consist? How can the man who cannot or will not do manual labor, who has no organizing ability, or if he has does not use it, who has nothing whatever but millions of dollars—how can he develop a country? There is but one answer. He does two things. In the first place, he buys local working opportunities; and, in the second, he supports the workers while they are making improvements, by turning over to them part of the earnings which he confiscates from others of their class.

Take for example a country rich in undeveloped resources. These resources are monopolized by people who are patiently waiting like a boy at a ground hog hole, for men to mortgage themselves for a chance to develop them. The millionaire serves the purpose of releasing those resources to labor so that they may be developed. Then it may be that expensive structures are necessary. Here again the millionaire comes in. He is a millionaire because by virtue of some institution or law he is able to draw tribute from labor. For instance, he may be an Astor, owning one-ninth of all that rock known as Manhattan island. He did not make the rock, and he does not improve it; but he is allowed a "rake-off" from the earnings of those who do improve it. It is this "rake-off" that makes him a millionaire. Devoting some of the

"rake-off" to the development of the undeveloped country, he exchanges it for the labor of men who make machinery, railroads, and so on, which he allows the developers to utilize in development. Owing to restrictions upon trade they could not get this otherwise. Thus the undeveloped country comes to be developed, and everyone praises the millionaire. But after all, what essential service does he perform? Could not all the necessary exchanges be made and the undeveloped natural opportunities be availed of by the very men that make the exchanges and develop the opportunities, if there were no millionaires? What more is necessary than that all trades should be unshackled and all undeveloped opportunities be free?

**PLUTOCRATS AND SOCIALISTS.**

The difference between socialists and honest plutocrats is like that of the silver-gold shield over which the two knights fought till set of sun. Says the socialist: "The profits of the capitalist are made out of unpaid labor!" and forthwith he lays right and left against capitalism. Says the plutocrat, on the other hand: "The profits of the capitalist are not made out of unpaid labor!" and he sails into the socialist. If the plutocrat would but go a step further and try to explain whence the profits of the capitalist do come, he might remove the confusion. For the truth is that neither the socialist nor the plutocrat is wholly right upon this point, nor is either wholly wrong.

There are interests called capitalistic which do make their profits out of unpaid labor. So there are interests called capitalistic which do not make their profits out of unpaid labor. The confusion is due to the careless use of the same term for two different things. To illustrate: A storekeeper is called a capitalist; he uses capital in his business. But his profits are not made out of unpaid labor. If he paid any more for his labor than he does, he would go to the wall. The conclusion, therefore, is unavoidable that though his laborers may be underpaid, he gains nothing by that. No sane socialists pretend that such a man's profits are made out of unpaid labor. Yet they assert that it is out of

unpaid labor that the profits of capitalists are made. Clearly their generalization is too broad; they do not mean all capitalists. To illustrate on the other hand: A Vanderbilt or an Astor is called a capitalist. These men do indeed own capital—buildings, locomotives, etc.; but the most important part of their wealth is not at all like these things. The Vanderbilts own railroad franchises; the Astors own choice sites in a great city. And from these privileges they do make profits, great profits, out of unpaid labor. So it appears that some so-called capitalists make their profits out of unpaid labor, and some do not; or, to put it more accurately, so-called capitalists make profits out of unpaid labor in connection with some of their property which is called capital, and they do not make profits out of unpaid labor in connection with other of their property, which is also called capital. It is in not recognizing the difference, the radical, the significant difference between the two kinds of capital—that which does not make its profits out of unpaid labor, and that which does—that the honest plutocrat and the socialist come to blows over the proposition, asserted by one and denied by the other, that capitalists make their profits out of unpaid labor.

The distinctive qualities of these two kinds of capital, qualities which both sides to the controversy ignore, are easily understood. Capital which does not make its profits out of unpaid labor, is produced by labor; that which does make its profits out of unpaid labor, is a privilege conferred by government—a monopoly.

For the sake of more distinctly defining the issue between socialists and honest plutocrats, let us vary the terminology, giving distinguishing names to essentially different things. Let us give to that kind of capital which labor can and does produce, the name of "capital;" and to that which government confers, the name of "monopoly." Then we can tell to what extent the socialist and the plutocrat respectively are right, and to what extent wrong. With this distinction in terms, we can readily see that the socialist is wrong when he says that the profits of the capitalist are made out of unpaid labor. The



capitalist himself is a laborer, and his profits are in fact his wages. But the plutocrat cannot say that of the profits of monopoly. Should he do so he would prove at once that he is not an honest plutocrat. The profits of monopoly really are made out of unpaid labor. There is no other source under heaven from which they can be made. Let us add, that most so-called capitalists who are very rich are in truth not capitalists but monopolists.

## NEWS

Last week we told of the astonishing edicts, looking to the adoption of Western civilization and the advance of democracy in China, which the emperor had recently put forth. These edicts explained the new imperial policy, announced the establishment of a general postal service, required officials to publish monthly accounts of receipts and expenditures, and extended the right of petition to all classes in the empire. We told at the same time of a rumor to the effect that the dowager empress had regained ascendancy over the emperor, and suggested that this might imply a reaction from the reform policy which the imperial edicts had outlined. That rumor has since been confirmed. The emperor has virtually restored the dowager empress to her old position of regent, and it is reported, though the report lacks verification, that immediately after having done so he was assassinated.

The dowager empress of China was first a slave, then a concubine, and then a wife of the Emperor Hsien Fung. Upon his death she became regent for her infant son, whose name was Tung Chi. While still under age, Tung Chi died without issue. His brothers could not succeed him because they were all older than he, and were therefore unable, in accordance with Chinese custom, to worship him as an ancestor. A similar objection applied to the brothers of Hsien Fung; they could not worship him. Consequently, an infant son of one of Hsien Fung's brothers was chosen, and the dowager empress continued to rule, as his regent. His name was Kwang Hsu. When Kwang Hsu came of age, the dowager empress surrendered her authority as regent, and he entered into full pos-

session of the imperial prerogatives. Meantime he had come under the influence of a brilliant and progressive Chinaman, who inspired in him the sentiments which led to the publication of the democratic edicts already mentioned.

This nineteenth century Chinaman is Kang Yu Mei. He was born in Canton but was educated in Hong Kong, where he became thoroughly Europeanized. About two years ago he figured at the head of the reform movement, and in connection with a Presbyterian missionary, published at Peking a paper called "Chinese Progress," which advocated among other reforms the right of petition and freedom of the press. Kang Yu Mei succeeded also in establishing a personal friendship with the young emperor—Kwang Hsu. This friendship enabled him to instill into the mind of the emperor his own progressive and democratic ideas, and led finally to the promulgation not only of the decrees already mentioned but also of one looking to the establishment of a free school system in the several provinces, of another substituting modern affairs for the Chinese classics as subjects for the examination of candidates for public offices, and of another granting full freedom of the press.

But Kang Yu Mei's success in giving a democratic outline to the imperial policy was not accomplished without opposition. The emperor's tutor, Weng Tung Ho, a conservative leader, had always been one of the most influential personages about the palace, and he undertook to thwart the purposes of Kang Yu Mei. So far from making any headway, however, he excited the emperor's wrath, and for his interference was stripped of his offices and honors and forever banished from Peking. The conflicting interests of Russia and Great Britain are supposed to have played a part in this trouble at the Chinese court. Kang Yu Mei at least was affected by them. He appears to have been a friend of Great Britain and an enemy of Russia. He is said to have regarded English influence as better for China than Russian. Not only did he prefer the British form of government for its essential democracy, but he believed that Russia was maneuvering for the capture of Chinese territory while Great Britain only cared for freedom of trade. He is supposed also to have been in communication with the British minister at Peking, and to have

been instrumental in the recent reduction of Li Hung Chang.

That the imperial edicts which Kang Yu Mei induced the emperor to promulgate would excite the consternation and deadly hostility of the old regime of China might well be expected. And they did. It soon became evident that some sort of counter revolution had begun, and on the 22d a rumor gained currency in Shanghai that the emperor was dead. But no details were obtainable. On the same day it was authoritatively reported from Peking that the emperor had resigned his power to the dowager. The same dispatch told of the flight of Kang Yu Mei, the reform leader, and of the failure of vigorous attempts to arrest him. Rumor had it that he was charged with murdering the emperor. This dispatch also stated, upon the authority of the Japanese statesman himself, that the emperor had received the Marquis Ito most cordially only the day before, and expressed a desire for his advice in carrying out the policy outlined in the imperial edicts. That dispatch was followed on the next day, the 23d, by a copy of the edict of abdication. It is as follows:

Now that China is disturbed and there is need that all business shall be well done, we, the emperor, agitated from morning to evening for the welfare of all affairs, and fearful lest errors may occur, observing from the beginning of the reign of Tung Chi that the empress dowager had twice given instructions to the emperor, each time with signal ability and success, so we now, considering the important interests of the empire, have begged the empress dowager to give to the emperor the benefit of her ripe experience and her instruction. The dowager empress has been pleased to accede to this request. From to-day the empress dowager conducts the business in the imperial apartments, and on the 3th day of the present month (Chinese calendar, meaning the 23rd, English calendar, we will take all the princes and ministers to perform the ceremony in the Chin Chung palace. Let the yamen (foreign office) prepare that the ceremony may be performed with fitting honors.

The reported escape of Kang Yu Mei was verified two or three days later, from Shanghai. He had found refuge there on board a British steamer bound for Hong Kong. In an interview with a London Times correspondent he said that he had left Peking on the 20th, doing so in compliance with a suggestion from the

emperor conveyed to him secretly; and he explained that the emperor had been compelled to sign the edict of virtual abdication on account of his leanings toward the reform party, which had aroused uncontrollable opposition among the officials. The charge against Kang Yu Mei is conspiracy against the dowager. He has been declared an outlaw. Latest advices give color to the report that the emperor is dead, though there is no positive information. An edict has been issued expressing regret at his increasing ill-health, and commanding the governors of all provinces to send their best physicians to Peking.

In France, progress in the Dreyfus case has been made since our last report. The cabinet had then decided to take the opinion of a special commission, as to the advisability of reopening the case. This commission had held its first meeting. On the 24th it was officially announced that the commission could come to no conclusion, being equally divided on the question; and on the 26th the cabinet, after a prolonged session and against strong opposition, decided in favor of revision. To that end they ordered the minister of justice to submit the petition of Mme. Dreyfus, for a revision of her husband's case, to the Court of Cassation, for a decision upon the legal question as to whether the conviction of Dreyfus is vitiated by the discovery of the forgery committed by the late Col. Henry. The criminal chamber of the Court of Cassation, which will act upon Mme. Dreyfus's petition, consists of 15 judges and a president. The president is a Jew.

Esterhazy's confession, which we foreshadowed last week, has been published in England. He says there was no legitimate proof against Dreyfus, but that there were ample grounds for believing him guilty. It was therefore determined by Col. Sandherr, now dead, to forge the proof. Sandherr thereupon ordered Esterhazy to forge the memorandum which has since become famous in the case, and he did so precisely as he would have obeyed any other order from his military superior. The memorandum having been forged, it became necessary to give it the air of authenticity, so it was handed to a porter of the German embassy at Paris, who is a French spy, and he gave it to one Genst, an agent of the

French secret service, as having been picked up in the embassy. Genst brought it back to the French secret service office, where it was docketed in usual course. Upon this memorandum exclusively, says Esterhazy, Dreyfus was condemned. The confession is discounted, and Henri Rochefort endeavors to show that it was probably procured from Esterhazy by bribery. Rochefort says that he and two other newspaper men were supporting Esterhazy by paying him 300 francs a month to prevent his dying of hunger while waiting for a pension, and asks why Esterhazy has abandoned this income and emigrated, and how he now pays for his meals, unless he has been bribed to confess to a forgery of which he had been twice acquitted.

Col. Picquart, who made the sensational speech in court that we printed last week, in which he said in substance that if he were found dead in the military prison, Cherche Midi, he wanted it understood that it would be murder, for he had no idea of committing suicide—thereby implying that Col. Henry's suicide was in fact a military murder,—was transferred on the 22d, from the civil prison to the Cherche Midi. But before the premier, M. Brisson, would consent to this transfer, he insisted that the war office should agree to give Picquart an open trial. It is believed in Paris that this prosecution of Picquart was sprung by Gen. Zurlinden for the purpose of getting a dangerous witness in the Dreyfus case out of the way. Zurlinden issued the order for Picquart's arrest, during his recent brief occupancy of the office of secretary of war, and then executed it as Governor of Paris. This position he had left to become minister of war, upon the express understanding that it should be kept open for him, and he returned to it upon his retirement from the cabinet.

Leaving European subjects for a moment, we find attention in our own country centered upon the bad treatment of the soldiers of the war with Spain. The president's committee for the investigation of these abuses has been completed. It now consists of Grenville M. Dodge, a major general in the civil war; J. A. Sexton, commander-in-chief of the G. A. R.; E. P. Howell, of the Atlanta Constitution; Charles Denby, late minister of China; ex-Gov. Woodbury of Vermont; ex-Gov. Beaver, of Pennsyl-

vania; Maj. Gen. Anson D. McCook, U. S. A., (retired), and Dr. Phineas S. Conner, of Cincinnati. The only original appointees are Dodge and Sexton. All the others declined, as did Gen. Weld, of Massachusetts, to whom a vacancy was offered. The committee met for the first time on the 26th, and decided upon the form of requests for information to the heads of bureaus to be investigated. Requests are necessary, as the committee has no legal power to make demands. On the 27th a second session was held at which it was decided to give out for publication the letter of Secretary Alger to the president asking for the investigation; a letter from the chairman, Gen. Dodge, enclosing the list of inquiries to the secretary and the heads of the various divisions of his department; and an address to the public. The address to the public states that the committee invite and are "ready and will receive and consider any complaints about the management of any of the various branches of the war department from any person or persons;" and that they "respectfully request that such complaints be made in writing, stating facts that the party may know of his own knowledge, plainly and in detail, giving names of any officers or enlisted men who may be charged with misconduct or incompetency." Before their first meeting, the committee called upon the president at the White House, where he addressed them. Thanking them for their willingness to serve, he assured them of his earnest desire that they should thoroughly investigate the charges of criminal neglect of soldiers in camp, field, hospital and transports, and make the fullest examination of the war department, with the view of establishing the truth or falsity of the charges. He added: "I put upon you no limit to the scope of your investigation. Of all departments connected with the army I invite the closest scrutiny and examination, and shall afford every facility for the most searching inquiry."

American interest in the Philippines, pending the action of the peace conference, is directed toward the movements of Aguinaldo and his government. During the week the text of his appeal to foreign powers has been published. This declares that the revolution dominates 14 provinces, besides the capital city of Manila; and that in all these, order and tranquillity reign and the laws of the re-



publican government are regularly administered. In testimony of this, and of the ability and desire of the Filipinos to govern themselves, a document signed by the chiefs is submitted with the appeal. The prayer of the appeal is for the recognition by foreign governments of the belligerency and independence of the Philippines.

The national assembly of the Philippine republic is still in session. It has decided to request the Americans, first, to recognize the independence of the islands; second, to establish a protectorate over their external affairs, and to induce the powers to recognize their independence; third, to appoint a joint commission of Americans and Filipinos for the arrangement of details to "reciprocate the Americans' services."

A representative of the Philippine national assembly has been sent to the United States. His name is Philippo Agoncello. With his secretary, Jose Lopez, and in company with Gen. Francis Vinton Greene, who returns with messages to the government at Washington, Agoncello arrived at San Francisco on the 22d and in Washington on the 27th. His ultimate mission is to endeavor to secure the recognition of Philippine independence by the United States. He says that the Filipinos will lay down their arms as soon as they have the assurance of the United States that their islands will never be given back to Spain. If the United States will not recognize their independence, they will ask for a United States protectorate; and upon the denial of that they will as a third choice ask to become a colonial possession of the United States. Agoncello's purpose, however, is to lay before President McKinley the claims of his government to be represented at the sessions of the Paris peace commission. He has not yet called upon the president.

In eastern Cuba Gens. Lawton and Wood are progressing satisfactorily both in improving the government of Santiago and in restoring the confidence of the Cubans which Gen. Shafter forfeited. Gen. Garcia visited the city on the 23d and was welcomed by Gen. Wood who, with part of Gen. Lawton's staff and a number of other officers, went outside the city limits to meet him and escort him into the city. The Cuban general was accompanied by many Cuban officers

and 200 Cuban cavalry. The streets were thronged as he passed, and it was estimated that 10,000 people filled the plaza in front of the palace. Enthusiastic cheering greeted the procession. At the door of the palace, Gen. Lawton met the party and tendered Garcia an informal reception. In a thoughtful speech which Garcia made on this occasion he closed with the words, "Our gratitude will long live for America." Gen. Wood's jurisdiction is now extended so as to embrace the whole province of Santiago de Cuba, and the Cuban general, Castillo has, with the approval of Lawton and Wood, been appointed counselor and assistant to the civil governor. Maj. McCleary, formerly attorney general of Texas, has been appointed Mayor of Santiago, and Spanish officials generally are being displaced by Cubans.

At the western end of the island, also, a better feeling is growing up. This is particularly noticeable in the declaration of the radical members of the colonial house of representatives, part of the autonomist government which Spain sought to establish, a declaration that has been forwarded from Havana to Washington. It contains 10 signatures, and is an unreserved submission to the new situation. The signers offer allegiance to the new political status, and swear within the limits of that status to defend "the absolute independence of the Island of Cuba." They also recommend all autonomists to take an active part in the politics of the island "but without attempting or pretending to exercise a controlling influence or power in the management of political affairs, which logically and justly belong to those who have always been the consistent supporters of the cause of independence."

By order of Captain General Blanco the remains of Christopher Columbus have been removed from the cathedral in Havana to the palace, for transportation to Spain. The little lead coffin contained only a handful of brown dust and a few small fragments of bone, besides two parchment documents. One of the documents was a certificate of the transfer of the remains from Sevilla to San Domingo in 1524, and the other of their removal from San Domingo to Havana in 1795.

On the 27th, the war department made public an order for the forma-

tion of the first military division to go to Cuba. It is to go not later than October 20. No commander of the division has yet been officially announced, but it is expected that he will be Gen. Wade, who with his staff arrived in Havana on the 27th.

The American peace commissioners—Day, Davis, Frye, Reid, and Gray,—arrived in Liverpool on the 24th, by the Campania. They went immediately to London, and after remaining there over Sunday reached Paris in the early evening of the 26th. They were received in Paris by the American ambassador and a representative of the French government. On the 27th they held a private sitting at the Continental hotel. A meeting of the Spanish commissioners was held at the same time at the Spanish embassy.

Passing back now from American to foreign affairs, it appears that the rumors reported last week of the occupation of Fashoda by Gen. Kitchener were well founded. Kitchener has returned to Omdurman after establishing a post on the Sobat river, about 60 miles south of Fashoda, and one also at Fashoda. No fighting was done. Gen. Kitchener upon finding a French force under Maj. Marchand at Fashoda, notified Marchand that the French must retire. He offered to transport them to Cairo. Maj. Marchand declined to retire, whereupon Gen. Kitchener hoisted the Egyptian flag, left a garrison under Col. Jackson to protect the flag, sent an official report to London, and went his way. The Egyptian flag is planted 500 meters from the French flag. Maj. Marchand was offered an opportunity to enter a protest, but he declined. The question of rightful occupation will now be made a subject for diplomacy. For his work in Egypt Gen. Kitchener has been raised to the British peerage.

The last stronghold of the dervishes, Gedaref, was captured by the Anglo-Egyptian troops on the 22d, after three hours of hard fighting.

And now Italy and Colombia are becoming entangled in war producing relations. The trouble arises out of the Cerruti claim, which was supposed to have been settled. This claim was allowed by President Cleveland, as arbitrator, and as it remained long unpaid Italy sent war vessels into Colombian waters to demand an ad-

justment. That occurred during the past summer, and was reported in these columns at the time. After some weeks delay, during which the United States extended friendly offices, an arrangement was effected whereby Colombia promised to make a satisfactory settlement within eight months, whereupon the Italian fleet withdrew. This it was understood ended the trouble. But on the 22d advices came from Bogota, the capital of Colombia, announcing that amicable relations with Italy had been broken off; and on the next day it was reported that all Italian consulates in Colombia had been closed. No explanations came until the 24th, when it was reported in the vaguest way that the reason for the action of Colombia in severing relations was due to the extraordinary means employed by the Italian government to collect the Cerutti claim. Two days later advices from Colombia were to the effect that the government there had finally decided to decline to pay the Cerutti claim altogether. The ground for this is that the republic is now able to prove Cerutti's complicity in the political troubles of 1875-85, out of which his alleged damages grew. The president of Colombia has therefore been directed to ask Italy to re-submit the case to arbitration, and upon refusal to oppose force with force to the last extreme. Cerutti, in whose favor the award was made, is dead; and the claim is being pressed through the Italian government by his creditors.

In American politics the most important event of the week is the nomination by the republicans of New York of Col. Theodore Roosevelt for governor. He was nominated on the first ballot by 753 votes, against 218 cast for Gov. Black. Col. Roosevelt had been selected some weeks ago by Mr. Platt as his candidate; but Gov. Black, whom Mr. Platt brought out at the last gubernatorial election, obtained the support of Payne, Lauterbach and other lieutenants of Mr. Platt and made a contest, with the rather unsatisfactory result recorded above. In the course of their campaign against Roosevelt, Gov. Black's supporters made public what seemed at the time to be absolute proof of Roosevelt's ineligibility on account of non-residence. It was an affidavit which had been used last Spring to secure the remission of personal taxes levied on Roosevelt in the city of New York. In this affidavit Roosevelt

swore that he was not a resident of the city of New York, but resided in Washington, D. C. The question came up in the conversation, and Roosevelt's lawyer read letters which Roosevelt had written on the subject of his taxes at about the time of the affidavit. It appears that he had been taxed on personal property both in New York and in Washington, and his object, according to the letters, was to avoid paying in both places. In one of the letters he spoke of being then a voter at Oyster Bay, N. Y., and of paying his personal taxes there; while in another he said: "I don't want to lose my vote this fall, and therefore I will pay the penalty and pay those taxes in New York. Is it practical to alter matters so as to have me taxed at Oyster Bay? Would this be practical or not? If not, then I will pay in New York. Any way I don't want to seem to sneak out of anything, nor do I wish to lose my vote two years in succession." The first of these letters was dated Jan. 20, 1898, and the second March 25, 1898; the affidavit of residence in Washington was dated March 21st, 1898.

The Independent republicans had nominated Roosevelt for governor on their ticket, but he declined the nomination. The committee therefore decided on the 25th to run a candidate against him. They are organized in opposition to the management of the party by Mr. Platt.

Circumstances make the platform of the republican convention that nominated Roosevelt exceptionally important as possibly foreshadowing the administration policy. But it really throws little if any light upon the subject except in one particular. Referring to the Philippine question it declares that "wherever our flag has gone, there the liberty, the humanity and the civilization which that flag embodies and represents must remain and abide forever." Aside from this point, and an explicit declaration against free silver and free trade, the platform is perfunctory.

Ex-Gov. Altgeld opened the democratic campaign in Illinois at the Auditorium in Chicago, on the 24th, to an audience which packed the building; and the following week the republicans of Chicago announced that their campaign would be made on the lines of "sound money, protection and expansion." At the convention

on the 24th, the republicans of Montana abandoned the free silver doctrine and endorsed the St. Louis platform. Senator Foster W. Voorhees was nominated for governor of New Jersey on the 22d by the republicans of that state, after a speech from Attorney General Griggs, of President McKinley's cabinet, urging the importance of preparing our national government for the maintenance of a colonial system. In Ohio, Mayor McKisson, of Cleveland, the republican candidate for senator last winter against Mr. Hanna, has announced his intention of seeking the next republican nomination for governor on a platform of opposition to trusts and monopolies. The democrats of New Jersey have nominated Alvin W. Crane for governor, and in their platform they ignore the Chicago platform of 1896. A minority report of the committee on resolutions specifically endorsing the Chicago platform was voted down.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Richard Malcolm Johnston, the novelist, died on the 23d at his home in Baltimore.

—Miss Fanny Davenport, the famous actress, whose married name was Mrs. Melbourne MacDowell, died on the 26th, at Duxbury, Mass.

—Col. William J. Bryan, who has been in Washington for several days on business connected with his regiment, lies there sick with fever.

—A trust of the pressed glassware concerns of the United States was organized on the 28th at Pittsburgh, with A. H. McKee as president.

—Queen Louise of Denmark, mother of the prince of Wales' wife, of King George of Greece, and of the widow of the late czar of Russia, died on the 29th, aged 81 years.

—It has been discovered that Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., having been disinherited by his father, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Sr., is earning his own living as a civil engineer in connection with the Vanderbilt railroad system.

—The supreme court of Wyoming has decided that communications between free masons are not privileged, but that a witness must disclose any such communications whenever required to do so on the stand in court.

—Fires are raging along the Rocky mountains, from New Mexico to Wyoming. They are beyond control and must be left to burn out or be extinguished by the rains. The known losses are as yet confined to horses and timber.

—Chili and Argentina signed an agreement on the 22d for the submis-

sion to arbitration of the question of the boundary between them south of latitude 26 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds. The boundary north of that point is still under negotiation.

—Lieut. Hobson, of Merrimac fame, has made good his pledge to raise the Spanish cruiser, Infanta Maria Teresd. She was floated from the rocks of the Cuban coast on the 23d and towed into Guantanamo bay, where she is undergoing repairs preparatory to her voyage north.

—A terrible cyclone passed over St. Catharines, Ont., on the 26th, doing much damage and killing many people. The same storm passed along the Welland canal, lifting the water so that where it passed the channel was dry. It finally caused death and destruction of property at Tonawanda, N. Y.

—Hamlin Garland, the author, laughs at the stories we referred to last week as to his having nearly starved in Alaska. He was there, however, and has seen the Klondike country, which he denounces as a fake and a fraud. Most of the gold found there, he says, is found by well paid liars hired by the transportation companies.

—The Cretan troubles, reported last week and the week before, have been made the subject of an international agreement between Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy. Whether in obedience to that agreement or not, the sultan has recalled Edhem, the Turkish military governor of Crete, who is blamed for the recent massacre, and appointed Cheiki in his place.

—Dr. Todd, assistant superintendent of the Ohio state hospital for the insane, is suffering from hydrophobia. While defending some of his patients from the attack of a dog, he was bitten by the dog, which proved upon dissection to have been mad. Dr. Todd is now at the Presbyterian hospital, Chicago, and his disease has progressed so far that a cold draft of air or the taste of cold water throws him into convulsions.

—Thomas F. Bayard died painlessly on the 25th near Dedham, Mass., at the residence of his daughter. He had been ill six weeks, and for days his condition was hopeless. Mr. Bayard was born October 29, 1828. He had been federal secretary of state, minister to Great Britain and United States senator from Delaware. The latter office had been held by his grandfather, his father's brother, his father and himself. He was a democrat of the ante-bellum school.

—The eruption at Vesuvius grows worse, and great destruction is apprehended. Three streams of molten lava are flowing down the sides of the mountain. The largest is 750 feet wide and about 50 feet high. It moves like a huge serpent, at the rate of 11

feet an hour, in the direction of the sea. Each of the streams flows toward a village. The village of Resina, one of the three, is seriously threatened. Resina lies on the coast, about five miles southeast of Naples, and has a population of 13,000.

—Prof. Gore, of Columbia university, who accompanied Walter Wellman's arctic expedition, has returned. He left Wellman at Vardoe, on the north coast of Norway. Wellman went on in search of a passage through the ice to Franz Joseph Land. As early as June 26th he had got as far as latitude 74, where he was stopped by the ice, which has reached lower latitudes this year than usual, owing to the north winds. After cruising for a month in search of a passage, he returned to Vardoe for coal, whence he set out again as stated above.

—The Pana, Ill., labor troubles were marked by a riot on the 28th. The imported negro miners were being marched through the principal business streets, heavily armed, at a time when a strikers' meeting was in progress. One of the negroes stopped at the meeting hall, and a quarrel arose between him and a striker. The negro was arrested, whereupon his comrades demanded his release, threatening to shoot. Upon that, the strikers with shotguns attacked the negroes, and were resisted with Winchesters. Several hundred shots were exchanged, but no one is known to have been hurt.

## MISCELLANY

### A PRAYER.

For the Public.

Carpenter of Nazareth,  
By thy solemn life and death,  
By thy many toiling years,  
By thy bitter, blinding tears,  
Come and make the blind to see,  
As of old in Galilee.

Where the blind world, weeping, waits,  
Begging by her birthright's gates,  
Cast, O gentle One and wise,  
Cast the scales from her sad eyes.  
Open are the gates unseen;  
Suffer her to pass between.

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

### VICTOR HUGO ON CUBA IN 1876.

Those whom the world calls the insurgents of Cuba have written to pray me to express publicly my opinion on their cause.

Here it is:

In this conflict between Spain and Cuba, Spain is the unlawful combatant. For I do not speak of the laws of man. I speak of the justice that God demands from man to man. The might of discovery does not give the right to martyrize; and martyrdom has ever been the portion Spain has meted out to Cuba.

True, new possessions must be colonized, and guardianship is not slavery.

All guardianship, by the laws of God, ceases when the minor becomes of age, whether this minor is a child or a people.

To carry it beyond minority is to encroach on another's rights; and when such encroachment is imposed by force it is a crime. And this crime, whenever I see it, I shall denounce.

Cuba is of age. Cuba belongs but to herself.

Cuba to-day, haggard and bloody with her struggle against the ferocities of oppression, is yet a thing for men to kneel to.

Conquer her? Maybe. But meanwhile she will bleed, and die.

And it seems almost like a monstrous joke to notice that with her long succession of rulers, the name alone is changed; as if the mountebank of many parts had simply turned his coat.

For he is always the same murderer.—Selected.

### THE COMING CHURCH.

Christ prayed: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven." The church prays: "The devil's kingdom come, the devil's will be done on earth, if only we get to Heaven."

Among the things which the church must accept from modern thought is the truth that no man wholly determines his own character. Environment is a factor. Conditions help to make or unmake men. If the church is sincere in its desire to save men, it will see that the water and food are pure, that the streets are clean, that justice is done, that poverty is abolished, that toilers receive all they produce, that men be given the opportunity to rise above the grime and filth and degradation that blight the soul and arrest its development.

When I think of the old church, I recall the words of the Prophet Ezekiel: "I will overthrow, overthrow, overthrow it; and it shall be no more until he comes whose right it is, and I will give it to him." The church was intended to be something more than a select order of saints. It is not even that to-day. Its purpose is to emancipate and hallow the common life of men. Its mission is to humanity. And as a minister of the church of Jesus, I now declare that in so far as it lies in my power, I will overthrow, overthrow, overthrow it, and it shall be no more until the people are drawn back to it by a purer and a braver Gospel; and to the people whose right it is I will give the church, to be their

help in time of trouble, to be their encouragement in every struggle for liberty, to be their constant inspiration, that they may keep the faith of him who thought it worth while to live in disgrace and die in shame for truth and man.

I am proud to number among the friends of this church and congregation Jews and Catholics and all sorts and conditions of Protestants. They come here, not because they have changed their opinions. They come because their minds have been emancipated so that they can see that the truth is too large and catholic a thing for any creed form or for any church organization.

When the church is seen to be the constant inspirer of human progress, there will be no skeptics but those to whom human progress is a matter of indifference.—Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of the Cincinnati Vine Street Congregational Church, as reported in the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune.

#### HE EXCITED THEM.

"See here, you little fellows," said three or four of the big boys, as they lounged into a corner of the schoolyard; "come and pitch pennies for keeps. We'll put up five cents apiece, and you chip in a penny apiece, and then we'll pitch on sides."

Their affability was delightful. The little boys were proud and happy. Out came the pennies.

"Here goes," said the big boys. "Heads we win; tails you lose. Ah, heads! The bank is ours. Try again."

Out came more pennies.

"Heads we win; tails you lose. Ah, tails! You've lost. Try again."

Out came a few more pennies, but the little boys looked puzzled and rueful.

"Heads we win; tails you lose. Ah, heads again! Hand over!"

The red-headed boy, who sold cheap newspapers to the factory hands out of school hours, was looking over the fence.

"Hold on, you big fellows! That's too bad! Aren't you ashamed of yourselves to rob those babies! You are regular pirates, you are!"

"Oh, come now," said the big boys, "you'd better not say that again. Clear!"

"Not yet," said the red-headed boy, excitedly. "Say, you little kids, they're just cheating you right and left! They are bound to win every time!"

Howls broke from the little boys.

"Chatin', is it!" cried little Timmie O'Rooney; "then that's for yez!" And a stone flew, and others followed.

The two boys who were sitting up in the tree carving Latin mottoes on cherry stones, tumbled down and ran for the master.

"It was all the fault of the red-headed boy," explained the dusty and bruised but intensely virtuous big boys. "We were just playing with the younger boys, and he came up and made a row and got the little boys all excited. We haven't touched them or him, nor thrown a stone nor broken a rule."

The weeping little boys were frightened and confused, but they were clearly out of order. Had they not thrown stones at the big boys, and even been found with missiles in their hands?

The two boys who had been carving cherry stones corroborated the true statements of the big boys.

The red-headed boy whistled softly as he walked out of the schoolyard that day. And who was he, anyway, asked the master, to set himself up as a judge of boys bigger than himself.

The red-headed boy whistled softly as he walked out of the schoolyard that day.

"Anyhow, my birthday comes tomorrow," he said, "and then I shall be a year older. See here, you little fellows," he continued, calling after a cowed group slinking through the gate; "brace up and go home and eat lots of oatmeal!"—Alice Thacher Post, in *New Earth*.

#### A "NEW" PRINCESS.

The Princess Victoria of Wales is now 30 years of age. Heirs presumptive, dukes and peers with wealth untold have sued for her hand, but all have been coldly rejected. The heart of the princess has been given to one of whom even the name horrifies the queen and is calculated to bring her to the verge of apoplexy. The princess has been struck with admiration of work and of one particular worker; she is in love with a banker. Some years ago this banker's firm was threatened with ruin; the owner took the management of the business into his own hands, and ere long the financial world was filled with wonder at his energy, persistence and executive ability. He inspired confidence, and in a short time had not only liquidated all the debts of the house, but was able to magnificently endow his sisters. Just as a little shop girl will choose a sweetheart because of his industrious habits, so did the princess fall under the charm of one in whom she recognized a man of resources and a worker.

To the queen who reminded her of what was due her rank she said: "I

attach no value to such things; social distinctions are worth nothing without personal excellence. Those orators are right who at the meetings in Hyde Park maintain that work and workers alone are worthy of consideration."

To the prince of Wales, who remonstrated in his turn, she retorted: "Princes and dukes do not interest me. I despise three-fourths of the men whom I meet at your social functions. Let me marry the man whom I love. I would not hesitate to give my hand to a workman in the docks if I loved him."

The queen and the prince of Wales turned a deaf ear to her arguments, and the princess was very unhappy. She now consoles herself for an unfortunate love affair by another affection. Having loved a man who can work she is fond of working people. Plainly dressed, enveloped in a mackintosh and wearing heavy shoes, she takes in the early morning a two-penny omnibus and goes to the attics, the wretched tenement houses and the slums of London to visit the poor and to aid them. One day she took part in a socialist meeting at Deptford which favored the rights of women. The court and high society were amazed. From that time she was seen no more at official and social reunions.

"Fashionable society is full of hypocrisy and deceit," says the princess. "Both its men and women wear masks; I detest it."

The princess in the course of her visits found in a miserable lodging in the neighborhood of the Seven Dials a whole family perishing of starvation. Having relieved their immediate wants she had their wan and death-like faces photographed. Taking this witness of wretchedness and misery to her father, she said: "We are responsible for their suffering; it is we who should remedy the evil," finishing with the meaning if not the exact words of Hamlet: "There is something wrong in your kingdom."—Told as gossip in the *Chicago Evening Post*.

#### HOLLAND'S PLACE IN EUROPE.

Extracts from an article in the *London Spectator* of September 3.

It may be said without fear of contradiction that in nearly every art which heightens and adorns human life, in nearly every aspect of human endeavor, Holland has added to the intellectual and moral resources of mankind, and has contributed as much as any nation to the fabric of European civilization. We are all accustomed to think of Holland as a bulwark of civil and re-

ligious freedom. We have all read the heroic story of the resistance of Holland to Philip and Alva, and the story of the siege of Leyden ranks in our minds with the tale of Thermopylae. The Spanish empire would have crumbled in any case, but it was given to Holland to strike the first and the most fatal blow at that huge and monstrous organism. . . .

In science, art, philosophy, law, Holland has ranked with the first states of the world. By her generous principle of affording an asylum to the victims of persecution, she honored herself by becoming the adopted land of Spinoza. She produced Boerhaave in natural science, and Grotius in jurisprudence; and if she had no other names to show, these would have secured for her immortal fame. The visitor to Rotterdam cannot fail to remember the great name of Erasmus, and the great hall of the University of Leyden with its portraits reminds us of the contributions made by that seat of learning to modern culture. The school of Dutch art is only second to those of Italy and Spain; indeed, in power, in fidelity, in variety, it may perhaps be held superior to the Spanish school, and he would be a very consummate critic who should be able adequately to balance the claims and genius of Rembrandt and Velasquez. In our own times Holland has made some of the most important contributions to theological criticism and to the history of religion, alike from the strictly orthodox and the liberal sides. . . . The Dutch liberal school has never lent itself to the extreme vagaries of advanced German criticism; it has always remained cool, balanced, solid. Indeed, that is the essential character of all that Holland has done alike in politics, religion, art, science, philosophy. The same patient but deep, perfervid spirit which opened the dikes and flooded the land, and submitted to the terrors of a siege the account of which makes us shudder across the intervening gulf of three centuries, not only built up the great commerce of Holland, made of it a financial center for Europe, and made it a colonizing and a great maritime people, but also penetrated its ideal and artistic work, its thinking, its learning, its culture. There is less of intellectual veneer in Holland than in any other country in Europe; there is more solid and abiding culture of the very highest kind.

Such has been the history, such is the character, of this remarkable little nation which has made of a barren corner of Europe one of the most

prosperous and enlightened nations of the world. How vital it is for the well-being of both Holland and of Europe as a whole that this nation should endure intact! That it is absolutely safe from aggression few can believe who understand the policy of the German government, and who see how useful the ports of Holland might become to a nation which has scarcely adequate marine border for its vast and growing commerce. It is an open secret that, since the establishment of the empire, possibly since the accession of Bismarck to power in 1862, the Prussian power which sways Germany has had an eye on Holland. Now, we believe in maintaining intact all the small states of Europe (excepting Portugal, which ought to coalesce with Spain), as being the freest, the best-governed, the most cultured, and as lending that element of variety which has characterized Europe since the Franks crossed the Rhine, and which, it is certain, has been a vital agent in the intellectual and esthetic life of Europe. If we seek to-day for the most original work in criticism, music, philosophy, romance, we are likely to find it at Stockholm, Copenhagen, Geneva, Brussels, Amsterdam or Christiania. The inhabitant of a small country also, for purposes of travel, is bound to learn other languages than his own; hence his mind becomes flexible and his culture is enlarged. The ablest recent work on Shakespeare comes from a Dane, and every educated Dutchman knows French and English, not only as weapons of conflict with waiters and railway officials, but as instruments of culture. Moreover, the smaller countries are, for the most part, a perpetual standing protest on behalf of liberty of thought, speech and action. Therefore from every point of view it is essential that they should remain as national units on the map of Europe, the friends and guardians of liberty and cosmopolitan culture, and the enemies of dreary monotony of life and thought. Of these countries, next to Switzerland, none touches one more closely than Holland with its great memories and its well-ordered and refined civilization. Were outside hands to be laid violently on Holland a very deep feeling would be engendered alike in this country and in America. We had our struggle with Holland in the seventeenth century (a not very wise or just contest on our part, as Mr. Gardiner has shown), but since then we have lived on terms of growing amity and respect, and the two lands are united by the ever-growing and complex meshes of trade. Our

American friends, looking to the Pilgrim Fathers as the chief, if not the only, founders of the great republic, cherish a peculiar veneration for Holland. If any attack should be made on the Netherlands, we may safely assert that England and America would want to know the reason why.

#### ELECTING A MAYOR BY PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

The following "best way of electing a mayor," taken from the "Citizen and Country," of Toronto, is an adaptation of the Hare system to the election of a single officer.

Let us clearly realize the distinction in principle between the election of councillors and the election of a single officer, such as a mayor. In the former case, the object is to represent all the voters, as nearly as you can come at it. In the second case, the main point is that the man elected should have a clear majority of the votes cast, and should not be elected by a minority.

So far as the election itself is concerned, the ordinary system of voting for single officers is all right when only two candidates run for each office, but where three or more candidates are running, the successful one may be, and often is, elected by a minority of the voters—which is not right.

Another disadvantage of the present method is that it restricts the choice of candidates. When two fairly strong men are nominated, others dislike to enter the field, because they might injure the chances of one or other of the candidates by cutting into his vote, and because many electors will not vote for a man, however good, unless they think he is one of the strongest candidates.

Organizations such as political conventions take several ballots in order ultimately to secure a majority. The friends of the weaker candidates give up the man of their first choice and cast their votes for the one they like next best; and the process is continued until some one gets a clear majority. But the plan is open to serious objection. It consumes much time, and tends to log-rolling and other evils. The order of the voter's preference for the candidate ought to be fixed at the time of the first votes, not left to subsequent influences.

In several European countries what is called the second ballot is in force; that is, that when there are three or more candidates, and none of them gets a clear majority of the whole vote cast, there must be a second election.

These roundabout and expensive

methods are needless. There is a simple and scientific way of getting a majority by one balloting. Use the "elimination" feature of the Hare system, as follows:

Suppose that Smith, Brown, Jones and Robinson are running for a city mayoralty. Each voter marks his ballot for all the candidates in the order in which he prefers them. For instance, take the voter who wants Smith to be elected and who thinks Robinson the most objectionable of the candidates, and who prefers Brown to Jones. The voter will mark his ballot thus:

Brown .....	2
Jones .....	3
Robinson .....	4
Smith .....	1

At the close of the poll the votes are sorted out according to the "number one" votes for each candidate. Then the candidate who has the smallest number of these first-choice votes is declared "out of the count," and his ballots are distributed amongst the other three candidates in accordance with the second-choice thereon—that is, the names marked "2."

Then the lowest of these three remaining candidates is eliminated, as was the fourth, and his ballots are similarly transferred. Then whichever of the remaining two is found to have the greatest number of votes, transferred or original, is declared elected.

An illustration will show how fully the voter's choice is given effect to: Suppose that when the ballots are sorted, Smith is at the bottom of the poll with the smallest number of first-choice votes. The voter whose ballot is shown above cannot have his vote count for Smith, because Smith is "out of it;" but the ballot is still effective to give a lift to Brown, the man whom the voter liked better than Jones and Robinson, and for whom he would have voted if Smith had not been running. Then suppose Brown be eliminated, our voter's ballot is "not dead yet;" it still takes a hand in, by counting one for Jones and against Robinson, the man most objected to by our voter. Finally the contest is narrowed down to the two best men in the opinion of the majority of the voters; and the better of these two men gets it by a clear majority.

In the British colony of Queensland, the law provides that the above system is to be used in parliamentary elections when there are more than two candidates for the seat in a single-member district.

You will notice how the foregoing

plan favors the full and free choice of the electors, by encouraging the nomination of more than two candidates. In the illustration above given, Smith's friends are not afraid to give him their first-choice votes, because they know that this will not injure the chances of any other candidate if Smith cannot be elected. They know that in that event their votes will go to a stronger candidate whom they have marked as next or next choice on their ballots.

To insure a clear majority in every case, it is desirable to have a rule that any voter who does not mark every candidate on his ballot with the numbers signifying his preference, will spoil his ballot—or rather, every candidate except one, because it would be understood that the one omitted candidate was intended to be the last of the lot. It will perhaps be objected that this might lead to a good many spoiled ballots. The obvious answer is that the spoiled ballots would be those of the least intelligent and least desirable class of voters—those who were too indifferent or too dull to understand the system under which they were exercising their franchise. Such a voter does a service to the public by spoiling his ballot.

#### "WHERE ROLLS THE OREGON."

At the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Pacific university at Forest Grove in Oregon, in July last, Mr. Harvey Scott, editor of the Portland "Oregonian," with far more seriousness than his remarks were received by his auditors, insisted that the residents of the east—the dwellers in New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Chicago—are provincial, and that those who live on the northwest Pacific coast are cosmopolitan. The insistence was earnest, and, literally interpreted, absurd; but it is probable that Mr. Scott did not desire to be literally interpreted. He wished properly to characterize that narrowness of vision which overlooks the fact that there is a manhood quite as noble and a culture quite as fine in the extreme west as in the older east. And Mr. Scott so far was right. Of course, there is also another side to the same mistake. Quite as often persons are found in the newer parts of our country who imagine that a "practical man" needs no training, and that the east, and especially the university towns, are, of all places, the most narrow, the most impractical, and, adapting words used by Mr. Frederick Harrison, "the least to be trusted." No man can be truly practical who is not broadly educated—

especially so far as to know what has been done in other times and other lands. Provincialism is the monopoly of no section and of no nation. Dr. Alexander Mackennal said, at the anniversary mentioned above, that he had often felt that London was the most provincial city in the world.

He who visits the northwest Pacific coast, and by that I mean the states of Oregon and Washington, will find himself as vitally in contact with all the world-currents of thought and life as if he were to remain in New York or go to England. Indeed, there is little room to doubt that the common people of those states are more alert, intellectually, more eager to learn, and better informed concerning the affairs of the world than the same class in any other country. This statement is made after careful investigation in many lands.

The characteristics of the northwest, of course, are best studied in the three cities of Portland, Ore., and Seattle and Tacoma in Washington. In all that constitutes the physical environment, those cities are more beautiful than any other in the United States. New York and San Francisco have larger harbors, but neither can compare with those western towns in natural beauty of location. From the streets of Portland may be seen Mount Hood and Mount St. Helens, on whose sides is perpetual snow, and the spectacle is grander and more splendid than that of Mount Blanc from Geneva. Mount Adams is also a noble snowpeak clearly visible, while still farther away, to be seen from other parts of the town, are Mounts Tacoma (or Ranier), Jefferson, and the Three Sisters. Large ocean-liners may also be found at the piers on the Willamette, which enters the Columbia about 100 miles from its mouth. Tacoma will long be the admiration of all who are fortunate enough to visit her when the skies are clear. At her feet is the picturesque Puget sound, and rising, apparently, directly from the water is Mount Tacoma, 15,000 feet high. Two statements in the last sentence require qualification. I call the noblest mountain in the United States, outside of Alaska, Tacoma instead of Ranier, because the former is the Indian name, and the more beautiful and appropriate. It would be a graceful and proper thing for the people of Seattle, the rival city, to unite with the people of Tacoma in asking that the Indian name be henceforward and forever the official name. (I hope my friends in Seattle will forgive me for this suggestion, which would be approved by



nearly all eastern people.) The other statement needing qualification concerns the height of the mountain. It is down in the books as about 14,444 feet, but I am assured that the latest surveys make the height 15,003 feet.

The location of Seattle is only less beautiful than that of Tacoma, while as a commercial center it is already apparently in the lead. Portland has about 100,000 population, and the other cities about 50,000 each, Seattle being a little the larger. No cities of equal size that I know in any part of the world are more beautifully located, and none except Geneva and Zurich can be compared with them. The Swiss cities, however, have no outlet to the sea, while those in our northwest have already a large and growing trade both with Europe and Asia. If, in the future, the Pacific becomes the great waterway of the world, these cities must grow in influence and importance. Their location compels them to be cosmopolitan in character; and the beauty of their environment makes itself manifest even in the thought and speech of their citizens. Turning from what nature has done for this region, we find that the people have already accomplished much for themselves. Their business houses would be a credit to any eastern city. Their homes are attractive, and show the same evidences of culture and refinement as are found in New York and Boston. Even the spirit of bravado and boastfulness which was common 20 years ago has almost entirely disappeared. The faces of the men do not have that eager and worn look so frequently seen on the streets of cities like Chicago and St. Paul. In one respect, however, there is a decided difference. The northwest Pacific coast shows traces of oriental and aboriginal life not found elsewhere. The Chinese and Japanese jostle the American Indian, and the comparison, in some respects, is not unfavorable to the latter. The Indians are given to practical joking and indulge their propensity in ways that the more demure Chinese greatly dread. On a steamship on which I was a passenger were many Indians and Chinese, and the former gave their oriental brethren little peace. There was no malice, but there was exquisite ingenuity in the mischief. In what may be called "the higher life" of the northwest coast, great progress has been made; as will be seen from the following illustrations: The newspapers of these cities are unsurpassed and rarely equaled in the interior or the east. The Portland

Oregonian is the oldest, and the peer of any paper in New York, and better than most that I know in Boston or Chicago. The late Charles A. Dana, of the New York Sun, is reported to have said that Mr. Harvey Scott, of the Oregonian, was one of the three greatest of American editors. This estimate is frequently repeated to strangers by Oregonians. A former associate of Mr. Scott is now editor of the Leeds Mercury, one of the greatest of the newspapers of Great Britain. The Post-Intelligencer, of Seattle, is a worthy rival of the Oregonian.—Dr. Amory H. Bradford, in The Outlook.

#### HOW THE SINGLE TAX WOULD AFFECT THE FARMERS.

An extract from Judge James G. Maguire's opening campaign address, made in San Francisco, September 14, as reported in the Call. Judge Maguire is running for governor on the nomination of the democrats, the populists and the silver republicans.

Although the single tax is not and cannot be an issue in this campaign, for the republican party by declaring negatively against a principle cannot commit the other party to the principle—it can only act for itself; yet I am not willing that my personal opinions on the question of taxation should be misrepresented in this campaign for the purpose of creating prejudice. They say that the single tax is intended to shift the burden of taxation from the wealthy people to the farmers. Their sympathy for the farmers may be questioned, but I shall not stop to question it now. I shall attribute the statement to ignorance. Let us see about that. The farmers of this state now pay more than 50 per cent. of the taxes for the support of the state in their direct taxes upon their homes and personal property, and indirectly upon the commodities on which the taxes paid by merchants and others are passed to them. If the farmers could have their share of the state taxes reduced to 25 per cent. on the whole they would be doing well. Let us see how they would fare under the single tax system. Land values are now assessed separately from improvements in this state, and the total amount of the land values assessment for 1897 was, I believe, \$654,000,000—the figures will be found in the reports of the state controller. Of that amount of land values assessed the city of San Francisco alone contains nearly one-third. Seven cities of the state contain more than 55 per cent. of all the land values in the state. The other cities and towns certainly contain another 20 per cent., making 75 per cent.

Of the remaining 25 per cent. not half, nor nearly half, is owned by occupying farmers; more than half is owned by speculators, by others, domestic and alien, who farm the farmers. (Applause.) Under the single tax system the farmer would pay not exceeding 12½ per cent. of the state taxes, as against 50 per cent. that he now bears. His proportion of the tax would not be more than ten per cent., because his exemptions would amount to vastly more than the increased tax upon the land value, and to the farmer the single tax would be a beneficence (applause), and it can be demonstrated from the official records, and tax rolls, I am not now advocating the expediency of adopting the single tax, because I will not be drawn aside from the issues of the present campaign to discuss questions that are not in issue. But I do say that the statement which I have just controverted is glaringly untrue.

Leading republican organs are declaring and have repeatedly declared that the single tax would drive capital from the state. Let us see about that. What is capital? Capital is movable property applied to the production of new wealth. Now all such property would be exempt from taxation under the single tax system. Would exemption from taxation drive capital out of the state? Is there any man who thinks so outside the editorial room of a railroad paper, or outside of the platform committee of a republican railroad convention? It would not drive capital out of the state. It would bring capital into the state; whether it is good or bad it would bring capital into the state instead of driving it out. Would it drive other forms of movable wealth out? No, they would be exempt, and they would flow into the state upon the same principle.

Exemption from taxation never drives wealth out of a state. But they say—they don't say it, but they intimate it—oh, it would drive the land out, there is nothing else that is useful to be driven out. So the utter fallacy of that statement becomes perfectly apparent. The trouble with all these people is that they are ignorant of the subject they are discussing, utterly ignorant of it; so ignorant that men who understand it dislike the simple task of answering them.

But they say it is a measure for the confiscation of land. Not at all. It is not a proposition to confiscate land. The confiscation of land would put an end to the single tax. Can the single tax apply to land belonging to the state? Certainly not. If it is to be taxed it must be in private occupation, and it must be

in private occupation under a tenure that will admit of taxation. If the single tax is to be continued the segregation of land into private holdings, with exclusive right of control of the private holdings, such as gives the basis and foundation for taxation, must continue to exist. And that is the purpose; that is the purpose. But I will tell you what it would stop. It would stop two men like Miller & Lux from holding 14,000,000 acres of the land of these three or four Pacific coast states and territories in comparative idleness for speculative purposes, while barring hundreds and thousands of American families from the opportunity to make homes upon the land. (Applause.)

It would distribute the burdens that are now borne by the farmers and by the manufacturers and by the merchants and by the laborers upon their homes and business and industries over all these holdings, including the holdings of the speculators, and it would impose less taxes upon the homestead owner, be he farmer or the owner of an urban home, than falls upon him now. Have you thought what a princely possession Miller & Lux have—one of them is dead, but the firm goes on—have you thought what a princely possession they are barring the people of this country away from for the mere purpose of speculation?—14,000,000 acres of land, 23,000 square miles of land nearly; 23,000 square miles of land extending across the earth at the equator would form a belt around the earth, or within a thousand miles of reaching around the earth, a strip a mile wide.

Now, if the single tax were in issue in this campaign I would point you to that kind of land monopoly on the one hand, and to the degradation of the people excluded from the land by this monopoly as one of the things that the single tax is intended to extirpate.

Cubans are incapable of self-government, say their American champions now. They will not work, it is said; but for many decades they have raised two crops annually on their soil and supported an army of officials and soldiers, besides sending many millions of dollars every year to Spain. They will not fight, it is said, also. Those who say so are defamers. The bravery of Cubans in the battle field, unarmed, unfed and unclothed during months and years of hardship and disaster, has excited the admiration of the world. Cubans can govern themselves better than Americans will be able to do; and if they are not permitted to do so, it will be an enduring shame to those who have so woefully deceived

and betrayed them.—Citizen and Country, Toronto, Canada.

Lord Glenelg told a story of Mr. Labouchere, father of the first Lord Taunton. He was employed as a young man in the great mercantile house of Hope. He applied to Sir Francis Baring for leave to pay his addresses to his daughter. Sir Francis demurred, as Labouchere, though a rising young man, had no fortune. "But if Hope takes me into partnership?" said Labouchere. "Oh, yes, if Hope takes you into partnership." Labouchere then went to Hope and intimated his wish for this arrangement. Hope in his turn demurred. "But if I marry Baring's daughter?" "Oh, if you marry Baring's daughter—" So Labouchere married Baring's daughter and became a partner in Hope's.—London Spectator.

I understand that St. Thomas' hospital is the only one of the large hospitals in London which has not suffered a considerable loss of income on account of the general depression in land values. The trustees of St. Thomas' were shrewd enough to invest their money in city property, which has steadily increased in value, yielding a corresponding income; while Guy's hospital, St. Bartholomew's and others had their property invested in rural farms, the rents of which are so much reduced that the managers find it difficult to make both ends meet.—Dr. W. S. Brown, in American Practitioner and News.

Both Saint Ambrose and Saint Augustine believe in the common ownership of land as a basis of spiritual liberty. The feeling of Saint Francis for the land, and for all the natural elements, amounted to a religion. Among thoughtful economic and religious students the conviction increases that the land problem lies behind every other problem—the problem of society, the problem of art, the problem of culture, the problem of morals, the problem of healthy living and ultimate liberty.—Dr. Geo. D. Herron.

Residents of Ponce are changing the pronunciation of the name of the town to one syllable, "Ponce," because that's United States, and they want to be like us. At the same time, people of the United States are changing their pronunciation to "Pon-tha," because that's Spanish, and they want to appear well educated.—Hartford Courant.

In a recent annual report of a benevolent society having its headquarters in Dublin, the following delightful

sentence occurs: "Notwithstanding the large amount paid by the society for medical attendance and medicine, very few deaths occurred during the year."—The Kingdom.

Villager—I'm quite well, thank yer, miss; but I ain't seed you afore. Y're fresh at it, ain't yer, miss?

District Visitor—Certainly I haven't visited you before, Mrs. Johnson.

Villager (after dusting chair)—Well, yer sits down 'ere, an' yer reads me a short psalm, yer gives me a shillin', an' then yer goes.—London Fun.

The Czar—I will build two big battle-ships.

John Bull—I will build four.

The Czar—I will build eight.

John Bull—I will build sixteen.

The Czar—Let us have peace.—Hamilton (Canada) Spectator.

"I suppose that this season," said the Elastic Skin Man, "you'll go as a Cuban reconcentrado?"

"Bah!" said the Living Skeleton, "you're outdated. I'm just a plain, ordinary United States volunteer, returned from camp."—Life.

Mrs. Dearborn (of Chicago).—Where did you say your friend lived?

Mrs. Wabash (also of Illinois).—At 2,119,226,415 Prairie avenue.—Yonkers Statesman.

"Do you really think the czar wants to disarm Europe?"

"Well, perhaps he only wants to disarm suspicion."—Puck.

## THE PUBLIC

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

### Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

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

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.

### SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

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

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St  
West.