The Public

First Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1898. Number 23.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The protocol having been signed, Mark Hanna has again begun to talk. To read his interviews, one would suppose it might be true that he keeps the president's intellect and conscience in some secret compartment of his own brain. Mr. Hanna's mission now, as made known by himself through his interviews, is to renominate and reelect Mr. McKinley. For that purpose he is no doubt ready to raise a larger corruption fund than before. But can he get up as big a scare?

It is now tolerably plain what policy the president intends to pursue regarding the scandalous management of the war department. He intends to hush up the scandal. Unless a democratic majority be secured in the next congress, there will be no investigation, and every guilty man will be allowed to escape.

The refusal of the president to thoroughly investigate the sins of omission and commission of the war department, and to place the responsibility where it belongs, is equivalent to a plea of guilty. No one knows better than President McKinley and his back-office advisers how disastrous to the administration an open inquiry into the conduct of the war would be. That is the reason why no inquiry will take place if they can help it. An attempt will be made to "shoo" down the scandals as an outbreak of yellow journalism. But all such talk is played out. It has been carried so far that every thief of high degree, when detected, has something nasty to say about yellow journalism, as if that were a complete defense to his own crimes. It makes no difference whether attention has been called to the army scandal by yellow journalism or not. The question is whether the scandals are true. And the way to find out whether they are true is to investigate mercilessly, not to snarl at yellow journalism.

It will not do to ignore the stories of unnecessary suffering in the army. These stories are abundant and abundantly proved. Throughout the country they have been carried, not by yellow journals, but by the soldiers themselves. Hardly a village in the land but has learned from sources which it trusts that men dying of fever were forced to lie upon the damp ground because there were no better accommodations; that the sick had nothing to eat that sick men could assimilate, and so in many cases died of sheer starvation; that soldiers were recklessly and uselessly exposed to disease; and that disease was generated in camps through bad management. They have heard too that starvation and typhoid fever—not the scourge of the tropics which our soldiers braved, but typhoid fever—have killed more men, five to one, since the war closed than were killed by the Spanish; and they have heard that the post of greatest danger was not in front of the enemy and during the war, but in home camps after the war. These things they know. They do not yet know who in particular is to blame, but they do know that it is President McKinley's duty to find out. If he shirks that duty he will hear from them. Time was when the people looked upon the president as a species of American monarch who, like other monarchs, could do no wrong and must be reverenced even to the extent of idolatry. But the more wholesome idea prevails now that he is a servant, to be held to strict accountability both for his own actions and those of his subordinates whom he shields. Mr. McKinley's political bodyguard may well fear to allow his administration to pass through the ordeal of an investigation upon the eve of an election. That is evidently the motive for suppressing an official inquiry. But it were better for both him and his administration to boldly bring the full truth to light — provided, of course, the truth would not be worse than its suppression for Mr. McKinley himself.

Some attempt has been made to excuse the war office scandals by intimating that the volunteers were a lot of hot-house plants who broke down under treatment with which the regulars are familiar. That is a lame excuse indeed. If it is true that the regular soldiers of the American army are familiar with such unnecessary suffering, from the ignorance and incompetency of superiors, as our army has been subjected to since the war ended, the importance of an investigation is more urgent than ever.

How mushy are those editorials of the daily press which try to coddle what they vaguely call "labor," meaning the underpaid hired-man class. They invariably speak of "labor" as being weak and needing protection. These editorials are always plentiful about Labor day, and the Labor day of the present year was no exception. Unfortunately, laborers themselves invite such trashy effusions by thinking of labor as being weak and needing protection. Isn't it strange that such a notion should have vogue? All that ever has been done in this world, all that ever will be done, except to plunder industry, has been

done by labor. Labor has built our cities, plowed our prairies, sailed our seas, made our newspapers, constructed our railroads, done everything. Some labor has invented, some has planned, some has directed, some has executed, but the work altogether has been done by labor. Yet labor must be protected, so we are told, or some greater power will "do it dirt!" What labor really needs is not protection against hostile powers, but freedom to protect itself. Give labor a chance to compete fully and freely, and laborers will quickly realize that they need no protection. Those who get rich by plundering labor cannot compete against labor in a free field with no favor. As competition is the life of trade, so it is the death of monopoly.

Labor day originated in the desire of organized workingmen to set apart a time for the general discussion of labor questions. It was first celebrated by the unions of New York city on the first Monday of September, 1882. At that time and for years afterward, the celebration was kept free from the contamination of politicians of the class whose interest in "labor" goes to the extent of catching laborers' votes, and no further. So strenuous upon this point were the founders of Labor day that even politicians in whose good faith they had confidence were denied invitations to address or even to review the assembled organizations, lest a precedent might be established under which political shysters would break their way in. Now, however, Labor day seems to be given over in many places to political demagogues, who use the opportunity to angle for the "labor" vote.

At the Labor day celebration in Chicago this year, Mayor Harrison was one of the speakers. He had the bad taste to describe his summer log house somewhere in the country, as if he were a hard-working man of the so-called labor class, so driven to it for an existence that he had to build him a log house in which to live—a log house, mind you. When it is remembered that Mayor Harrison lives quite sumptuously upon his unearned income from Chicago ground rents, and that his summer log house is a luxury, this attempt of his to herd momentarily with workingmen, as if he were in the same plight as they, was something worse than an exhibition of bad taste. It was a bit of transparent demagogy which must have disgusted the more sensible in his audience. Next we shall find Mayor Harrison speaking at Labor day demonstrations in overalls.

It must bother the ordinary reader to understand why the exposure of the Dreyfus outrage should threaten the very existence of the French nation. Had such a thing happened here or in England, the victim would be released or given a new trial, and the perpetrators of the outrage would be punished if their guilt could be proven, and that would be the end of it. But in France there is a crisis. The explanation is to be found in the fact that the French care little or nothing for Dreyfus and his suffering, little or nothing for the fact that their nation has committed an awful crime against a citizen, but very much for the integrity of the army as the instrument upon which the nation has relied for revenging the disaster at Sedan. In the exposure of the Dreyfus conspiracy they see not so much a prospect of justice at last to an outraged man, as a prospect of the disintegration of their army. They see that this exposure indicates the utter rottenness of their military establishment. It indicates that the army on which they have confidingly depended to revenge them is as much a shell as was that French army which less than three decades ago Von Moltke crushed, as it were between his thumb and forefinger. The exposure of the Dreyfus conspiracy, followed almost instantly by the czar's proposal for a general disarmament, thus leaving Alsace and Lorraine forever where the German victory placed them, within German jurisdiction, is to the French the knell of their hopes. It means to them the end of their nation as a first-class power.

It is a significant fact that this culmination should so closely have followed the breakdown of Italy in Abyssinia, and of Spain in her war with the United States. Almost in a day these three Latin powers have been exposed as all hollow within. One of them was recently described by a great English statesman as a dying nation. The description applies to all three; it applies to the Latin race. The Latin nations are dying, dying, almost dead. This is not because the blood of the Latins is inferior. Inferiority of blood is a figure of speech. The individuals of that race will compare favorably as individuals with those of the now dominant race. There is no question of blood in the matter. It is a question of liberty. Italy offers no congenial climate to liberty. How far removed Spain is from the slightest apprehension of what liberty means we have learned in the course of our war with her. And France, though organized as a republic, is a republic only in name; liberty finds no welcome there. Therefore it is that these nations are dying. For liberty is the vital force, the soul, of national life. No nation can live without it. When it dies the nation dies.

Having more money on hand than he knows what to do with, Uncle Sam announces that he will use it to anticipate the interest on United States four per cents. On the coupon bonds interest will be paid September 10, and on the registered bonds September 20, though it is due on neither till October 1. This anticipated interest is a good deal of money, when you come to figure it up; and while we are not quite prepared to suggest any better disposition of it, we are really at a loss to understand why it should be given away to bondholders. Perhaps the gift is intended as a recognition of their patriotism.

But the patriotism of bondholders does not appear to be so disinterested as it has been represented. Now that the new bonds are being distributed, the fact develops that millions of dollars' worth have been subscribed for fraudulently. Systematic schemes were set on foot to enable single subscribers to get large quantities of the bonds, though the limitation to each subscriber was $500. Many subscribers were hired to apply for bonds, which they were to turn over to their employers. Among these fraudulent subscriptions were something like a million dollars in the names of Armour & Co.'s employes. Now, why did rich men like Armour & Co. indulge in such irregularities? Was it from excess of patriotism? Permit us to doubt. Even the Armours are not so intensely patriotic as to hunt for "irregular" opportunities to spend a million of good money upon a patriotic impulse. At any rate, since the return of the million in "sound money," with a three per cent. interest attachment, was guaranteed, all these "irregular" investors are entitled to the benefit of the reasonable inference that it was the return of their money with interest, and not excessive patriotism, that induced them to play their "gum games" with the treasury department. Patriotism! What was it that old Sam Johnson said of patriotism?

A company has been organized by a set of campaign fund contributors, for the purpose of exploiting the islands which our soldiers fought to free, but which these Sam Johnson patriots seek to appropriate. The company is called the American Indies company. It is organized under the laws of New Jersey, with a capital of $18,000,000, and it is empowered to do almost anything that requires a monopoly franchise. Here we have a center of imperialism influence. Here is a manifestation of the pecuniary interests which are driving this country on to turn a war for humanity into a war for land-grabbing and monopolistic plunder. The vultures that hovered about San Juan, waiting till the battle should end that their sickening feast might begin, were very types of innocence and purity in comparison with these ghouls.

Clarence Moeller, the populist candidate for county assessor of Cook county, Ill., makes a point worthy of consideration by people who are imperialists because they want to extend American markets. "There is a way," he says, "to open up, at once, a market right here at home for $1,000,000,000 worth of labor products." The way he proposes, and that which the populist platform advocates, is to shift the entire tax burden from consumers to land values. "This," says Mr. Moeller, with point and force, "will lower rent, thus permitting the doubly-taxed, rent-ridden tenant class to buy labor products instead of buying rent and taxes." That hits the nail on the head. There can be no prosperity so long as the great working class are compelled to spend so much in "buying rent and taxes." Let taxes be lifted from their shoulders by the abolition of taxes on labor products, and rents be lessened by driving vacant and poorly-improved land into the market through exclusive taxation of land values, and those who now buy so much rent and taxes could buy labor products instead. That would increase the home market enormously.

J. Sterling Morton, formerly Mr. Cleveland's secretary of agriculture and now the editor of The Conservative, of Nebraska City, Neb., appears to have fallen from grace as a democrat much further than we had supposed. In his prospectus, it will be remembered as we quoted him not long ago, he advocated equal rights for intelligent citizens. We then ventured to ask what he proposed for unintelligent citizens, suggesting that upon democratic principles equality of rights can be made to depend no more upon intelligence than upon property or birth or any other consideration except manhood. Answering our question, Mr. Morton puts forth the astounding proposition—astounding as coming from a professed follower of Thomas Jefferson—that "the rights of the unintelligent should be defined and defended by those who are intelligent." The rights of one class to be defined, marked out, limited, arbitrarily regulated, by another! What would Thomas Jefferson have said to that? How abhorrent must such a sentiment have been to the great democrat who declared for "equal rights for all, special privileges for none!"

Can it be possible that Mr. Morton realizes the full force of the sentiment he expresses? We hope not. For in that sentiment lies the germ of autocracy. It is a sentiment which acquires vitality only as it deadens democracy. All monarchical and oligarchical theories—from that of the divine right of kings to govern, down to that of the right of a man to vote in virtue of the jackass he owns instead of the natural rights he has to guard against encroachment—proceed from the essential principle of Mr. Morton's undemocratic doctrine. The white men of the south, before our civil war, acted upon it. They defined the rights of the unintelligent. How they did it, is not that written in their slave codes? For the rich whites alone, the subjugation to a state of slavery of such of the unintelligent as could be distinguished by their color, resulted doubtless in a more comfortable state of affairs than came forth from the black governments following the war; but for the southern people as a whole—black and white, rich and poor, intelligent and unintelligent—the black governments of reconstruction days, bad as they were, were infinitely better than the slave governments that preceded them. Fraudulent bonds are altogether less infamous than slave codes. Nor was there anything exceptional in the way in which the intelligence of the south diverted the functions of government from the equal protection of all to the enslavement of the

masses. Never since the world began have the few pleaded superior authority to define the rights of the many, without making the plea a pretext for riding upon their backs. And of all the forms which the plea takes, the most specious is that which bases the superior authority upon an assumption of superior intelligence.

We have thus far accepted Mr. Morton's theoretical distinction of the intelligent from the unintelligent. But in practice how shall we make the distinction? He himself belongs, of course, in the ranks of the intelligent; and he would doubtless concede the same privilege, as matter of courtesy if for no other reason, to the editor of The Public. That fixes his status and ours. But there are others. Now how shall he and we assign them to their proper class? What shall be the test of intelligence? Would it be skill in accumulating property without rendering commensurate service for it? One might jump at that as Mr. Morton's idea, for he urges that the suffrage be restricted to taxpayers. By taxpayers Mr. Morton does not mean indirect taxpayers, those who pay their taxes in the prices of the goods they buy and the rooms they rent; that would include the whole population, as no one knows better than he. He means the persons who secretly collect and in part openly pay over to government the taxes for which in so great measure those whom he would disfranchise for their poverty do the sweating and moiling and toiling. These are the taxpayers—these persons who are intelligent enough to manipulate the laws so as to appear to pay all the taxes, while in truth they pay hardly any—to whom Mr. Morton would limit the right to vote. He likens them to the stockholders in a corporation. He does not also say, but the logic of his proposition would require it, that in full analogy with his corporation simile, the highest taxpayers should have the most votes. We can hardly believe, however, that Mr. Morton would to this extent make mere money grubbing the test of voting intelligence. Surely he would not give more votes to Mark Hanna than to Carl Schurz. Yet upon the taxpaying theory of suffrage, Mark Hanna has a stockholding interest in the state as much greater than that of Schurz as Schurz's is greater than that of the day laborer who never pays a tax except through storekeepers and landlords. The truth is that there is absolutely no analogy between a money corporation and the state or any other grade of public government. A money corporation is a voluntary association, of which no one becomes a part except upon his own volition; a state is a body of which everyone becomes a part by the mere fact of birth—no one can let it alone, for it won't let him alone. A corporation concerns only the funds invested in it; a state concerns rights to which mere money rights are subsidiary—the right to life and the right to liberty. It is appropriate, therefore, that voting in money corporations should not only depend upon the fact of stockholding, but should be in proportion to stockholding; but to propose to regulate public government in that way argues a lack of intelligence respecting government which should disfranchise the proposer, if Mr. Morton's theory of government by the intelligent were adopted. This aside, however, it must be clear that the possession of wealth cannot properly be made the test of civic intelligence.

What, then, can be made the test of civic intelligence? Should it be reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic? Apparently that would be Mr. Morton's choice, for he says that anyone who cannot read should be denied the right to vote. But the three "r's" afford no conclusive test of intelligence. Many men who can read and write, and even some who can cipher, are woe-begone fools; while it is often a matter of common observation that illiterate men are clear-headed. Human rights would be in as safe keeping with illiterates as with snobs.

Neither wealth nor book learning is a test of voting intelligence, any more than voting intelligence is a test of the right to govern. Intelligence, let it not be forgotten, may be inspired by bad motives as well as good; if a first class banker is intelligent, so is a first class forger. The only right to govern is that which comes from the consent of the governed; and the governed are not one class in the community alone—not the rich, the poor, the intelligent or the unintelligent—but all. Without their consent, no one has the right to govern them. To deny this is to deny the principle of individual liberty, the essence of democracy. When rights are in question, they must be defined by a consensus of those to whom they belong, and not by one man for other men, nor by one class for other classes. This, apparently, is not Mr. Morton's view. Evidently it is not. But it is the democratic view, and Mr. Morton still professes to be a democrat.

In discussing the question of rights, Mr. Morton drops, quite thoughtlessly we incline to believe, into a little bit of plutocratic cant. He says that citizenship is too much regarded as if it were all rights and no duties. But it is impossible to dissociate the idea of rights from that of duties. With a little introspection, Mr. Morton will see that he cannot claim a right as to another without asserting a corresponding duty on the part of the other; and if he asserts a right in the other as against himself, he thereby admits a corresponding duty from himself to the other. Consequently, to assert that civic rights are universal, is to assert that civic duties are universal; to assert that all have the right to life and liberty, is to assert the duty of each to respect the life and liberty of the others; to assert that all have the right to vote in order to guard their own natural rights against encroachment, is to assert that all are under an obligation to use their votes for the protection of the natural

rights of each. That civic duties are fearfully neglected we freely admit; but it is not the class whom Mr. Morton would disfranchise for unintelligence who neglect them most flagrantly. Nor is it "the everlasting twaddle about equal rights for men who are mentally, morally and socially unequal," to quote Mr. Morton's ill-considered phrase—it is not that "twaddle" that puts the idea of civic duties and obligations in the background. On the contrary, it is the turning of a deaf ear to that "twaddle." Were civic rights effectively denied, civic duties would be scouted. Meanwhile, to the extent that the idea of rights is made the subject of unintelligent sneers, we must expect the idea of duties to fall into noxious desuetude.

Mr. Morton fears anarchy, turmoil, bloodshed and destruction, as the sequence of an organized majority of unintelligent voters. Let him calm his fears. If there is really so little civic virtue among the unintelligent, the intelligent will not fight them when they rise up in the strength of an organized majority. They will either fool them or buy them off. Should we ever have anarchy, turmoil, bloodshed and destruction in this country it will not be because unintelligent voters become an organized majority. There is no danger of that, and there would be almost as little danger from that. It will be because "intelligent" voters, the professional "taxpayers," succeed in acquiring their coveted power to "define" away the rights of the "unintelligent."

We should feel like apologizing for devoting so much space to what may at first seem like idle controversy with a contemporary; but the importance of the subject of discussion removes it from that category. In these days there is a perceptible drift away from the fundamentals of democracy. As a rule, however, great caution is exercised to conceal the real character of the drift. Old democratic names are retained, old democratic epigrams are exploited, all the old democratic landmarks are kept in sight, while the essential principles of democracy are abandoned. Thus under the banners of democracy we are passing into despotism. What we therefore have to thank Mr. Morton for is his extraordinary candor. He blandly repudiates the democratic epigrams along with the principles they express. For that reason controversy with him offers a tempting opportunity to discuss Jeffersonian truths, than which no subject is to-day more vitally important.

While we abhor Mr. Morton's brand of democracy, as a stray from the flock of monarchism, we are glad to be able to agree with some of his miscellaneous observations. His idea of the legal tender quality of money, for instance, strikes us as excellent. Here it is, short and sharp, from the columns of the Conservative:

> **Why not deprive both gold and silver of the legal tender quality when those metals are used in coin as money?**

That would surely settle the coinage question; for its vitality, as a coinage question merely, depends upon the discrimination involved in demonetizing silver alone. Let gold also be demonetized, and the metals would be as truly upon an equality as if both were full legal tender, while the sort of government protection which creditors have and silver miners want, would be abolished. But is Mr. Morton quite sure that his yellow friends would join him in his proposition to demonetize gold?

The socialists of California have united with the Southern Pacific railroad republicans to oppose the election of James G. Maguire as governor. Maguire's good luck clings to him.

Besides nominating James G. Maguire, a Henry George man of international fame, for governor, and James H. Barry, another prominent George man for congress in Maguire's place, the California fusionists have nominated for one of the railroad commissioners William M. Hinton, who was George's partner in the publicotion of the San Francisco Post. Under pressure they abandoned that paper to the railroad monopoly and walked out upon the street, poor men, rather than conduct it in obedience to railroad dictation. Hinton is a man of the strictest probity, who has earned a reputation in San Francisco for square dealing which will make it extremely difficult for the allied monopolies to defeat him at the election.

Gov. Altgeld threw a bombshell last week into a little plan which the republicans of Chicago had concocted for turning a peace jubilee into a partisan glorification. Though peace has not yet been established and will not be until after election, these republicans must needs fix the date for their peace jubilee a few days in advance of the election. They explain this move on the ground that the president could not be present at any other time, the good faith of which explanation is put under some suspicion by the other things the promoters of this partisan celebration did. For instance, the orators they had invited were prominent republicans. Suggestions that they invite Bryan, who stands as the leader of over 5,000,000 voters, was superciliously scouted. His Post-Prandial Windiness, Chauncey Depew, of Vanderbilt fame and connections, the man who was sued for compensation by the penny-a-liner who wrote one of his centennial orations, was to stand at the top as the orator; but Bryan was not good enough, though his power as an orator goes unquestioned, for a place anywhere in the list. His patriotism lacks gilt. These earmarks of partisanship aroused Altgeld, who induced the democratic state committee to denounce the jubilee for what it was, and advise against participation in it, unless its promoters would consent to postpone it until after election. The shaft struck home. In the first place it waked up some of the pseudo-democrats on the jubilee com-

mittee, who were there to give to the affair the superficial appearance of nonpartisanship which it needed to make it effective; and they induced the committee to compromise by inviting Bryan. The real object of this demonstration, it might as well be said, aside from its partisan political object, was publicly stated, quite ingenuously, by one of the promoters. At one of the public committee meetings he said he supposed everyone understood the purpose to be to bring money into town!

Apropos of our article on vaccination, in which we gave space to a letter from M. R. Leverson, M. D., Ph. D., denouncing it, we are in receipt of a criticism of Dr. Leverson. It comes from William N. Hill, M. D., of Baltimore. Dr. Hill says he is a believer in what Dr. Leverson calls the "murderous superstition" of vaccination, and expects to continue in that belief until the overwhelming evidence of its evil character, to which Dr. Leverson alludes, is brought out. He bases his belief on an extended acquaintance with the literature of the subject, as well as direct personal observation. Dr. Hill especially protests against Dr. Leverson's three statements, that vaccination affords no protection against smallpox, that smallpox is generally a mild disease, and that cowpox is a dangerous one. Smallpox is characterized by Dr. Hill as a very dangerous as well as loathsome disease; as to its dangerous character he points to the record of deaths from it among the Indians where vaccination was not used, and in civilized communities prior to the introduction of vaccination. Dr. Hill also refers to the fact that although there was smallpox in Cuba before the war, and although our army was badly mismanaged and various fevers attacked it, not one case of smallpox is known to have occurred. "To what," he asks, in conclusion, "can be attributed this absence of a disease which has always followed armies, if not to efficient vaccination?" With these conflicting presentations of the question—Dr. Leverson's and Dr. Hill's—we drop the subject.

A BUSINESS TENDENCY.

I.

One of the most marked tendencies of modern business is towards production on a large scale—towards business concentration, as it is often called. This tendency, observable in nearly every department of industry, is notable in connection with manufactures and merchandising. The great factory has completely displaced the shop, and department stores are thought to be driving small stores out of business. Even in agriculture, the bonanza system is supposed to place independent farmers at a sore disadvantage.

Opinions as to whether the tendency thus indicated is beneficial, depend greatly, no doubt, upon the point of view. The head of a large and flourishing establishment would naturally look upon it very differently from the small producer whose field of industry has been invaded and his living possibly taken from him. But there must be some test by which to determine, regardless of narrow personal interests, whether or not concentration is socially injurious. To us it seems that the question depends upon the character of the impulse back of the concentration.

II.

When the reason for changes from production on a small scale to production on a large scale—the reason for concentration in business, as the phrase goes—is that the new method requires less labor than the old, then the tendency is normal and therefore calculated to be beneficial.

Concentration from that impulse is but a form of labor-saving invention. It produces more or better things with no more labor than before, or the same things with less. What the steam car was to the horse cart, normal production on a large scale is to production on a small scale.

The factory is an example. Advances in manufactures, from the production in little shops of 50 years ago to the wholesale production in great modern establishments, has been because the latter method is cheaper—because, that is to say, it yields better results with less labor. The change is normal, and if in practice it has hardly been altogether beneficent, this is not due to the change from a small to a large scale of production, not to concentration so-called, but to social maladjustments which prevent the benefits of the improvement from being shared by all.

But concentration may come in response to a very different impulse. When it is adopted not as a cheapener of production, but as a method of killing competition, then the tendency it expresses is abnormal and unwholesome. Of concentration from this impulse, the trust is the great example. Trusts have for their object and effect not the object and effect of labor saving inventions, not the lessening of the labor of production, but the forcing of wages down at one end and of prices up at the other, by diminishing production.

Prices of trust products have indeed been known to go down, but that has always been in spite of the trust and not because of the trust. It has been because the trust was too weak for its purpose. No trust has ever yet lowered prices except in response to competition or in fear of it, a force which it is the sole aim and object of trusts to destroy. Though trusts wear the garb of normal concentration, and so mislead both those who oppose and those who favor them into confusing them with normal concentration, as if the two were identical, trusts are no more the same as normal concentration than the wolf wearing Red Ridinghood's cloak was Red Ridinghood herself.

This distinction between normal concentration for increasing production, and trusts for diminishing it, should be borne in mind in considering industrial questions that relate to production on a large scale. If the change from a comparatively small to a comparatively large scale of production be arbitrary, if it be a mere combination of individual establishments to prevent competition between them—if, in a word, it be a trust—then the change is abnormal and oppressive. But if the change be a genuine labor saver, something which instead of lessening production increases it, instead of weakening

competition intensifies it, then the change is normal and the result will be beneficial.

III.

Put to this test, the department store would appear to be beneficial. It belongs in the category of labor-saving devices. The object and effect of the department store is not to increase prices but to lower them, not to lessen production but to augment it, not to prevent competition but to intensify it, not to obstruct the consumer but to accommodate him. Like the great factory, therefore, it is an example of the normal and beneficent tendency toward production on a large scale, an instance of legitimate concentration. And as the factory has displaced the small shops or changed their character, so the department store will in great measure, if not wholly, as related improvements come in, displace or change the character of small stores.

Should this seem hard upon the small storekeeper, it is not more so than the railroad was upon the stage driver. Even if the change could be prevented, the prevention would be unjust. It might seem to benefit small store keepers, but it would actually injure consumers. But being a normal concentration and therefore a natural development, the change cannot be prevented. It is a condition which, like rain and sunshine, must be taken as it comes. And but for social maladjustments which obstruct the diffusion of its benefits, no one, not even the displaced storekeepers themselves, would for one moment desire its prevention.

IV.

As to bonanza farming, there is reason to doubt that it is in fact a labor-saver, though it is said to have driven out the farmers of New England, and to threaten small farming even in the West.

The argument as to New England rests upon an asserted decline in farm values. This basis does not support the argument. While it is true that some farms in New England have fallen greatly in value, it by no means follows that this has been caused by the competition of bonanza farms. It is more likely to have been caused by the shifting of the uses of land in New England, a view which is confirmed by the fact that while some land values in New England have fallen, land values there in general have enormously increased. The region has been going through a transformation, from farming to more advanced industrial purposes. It may be that this change has been brought about by Western farming. If so, however, that is because the greater fertility of the West has been made available by railroads, and not because there are bonanza farms there.

If small farming in the West is in danger from the bonanza farm, the fact has yet to be shown. It may be in danger from discriminations by railroads; but farmers are not wanting who assert that in the absence of special railroad privileges, bonanza farming cannot compete with farming upon a small scale.

Assuming, nevertheless, that production on a large scale is as normal in agriculture as in manufactures and merchandising, the time must some, upon that assumption, when small farming will give way to bonanza farming, just as small shops have given way to large factories, and as small stores are giving way to department stores. If bonanza farming can produce the same results as small farming, with less labor, or better results with the same labor—if, that is, it is truly more economical—then bonanza farming is destined to be the farming of the future. It will, in that case, be beneficent, even to the small farmers, unless social maladjustments interfere with the normal distribution of its benefits.

What makes the prospect of production on a large scale so ominous, and it is ominous indeed, is the thought, expressed or felt, that the change implies in its culmination a state of society in which the few will be bosses and the many serfs. We think of large factories as being under the mastership of manufacturing barons, whose employes are slaves without the ordinary slave guarantees of support. Department stores associate themselves in imagination with merchant princes and cringing clerks. And it would be difficult to conceive of bonanza farms without bonanza farmers and their gangs of dependent hands. Such, too, will most assuredly be the outcome if we allow social maladjustments to perpetuate themselves, and to extend into the era of production on the largest scale.

V.

How shall that be prevented? Many devices are suggested, but they are mere devices, mere schemes to circumvent the operation of natural law. Only one proposition takes natural law into consideration and aims to overcome the effect of maladjustments by establishing normal adjustments. That is the proposition of Henry George.

He advocates the abolition of land monopoly, and as a simple yet effectual means of doing so, the retention in lieu of all other taxes, of the tax we already have upon the value of land—namely, that part of the real estate tax which is measured by the value of the site as distinguished from the value of the improvements. To put his proposition in another form, he would abolish all taxes except the one which is measured solely by land values. He would trust to the resulting increase in the rate of that single tax to transfer from land monopolists to the public treasury the annual ground rent, potential as well as actual, of all kinds of land—mines and city lots as well as agricultural land—each holding paying in proportion to its value as mere land, irrespective of its improvements.

Space is too limited to explain in detail the way in which this single tax would operate to secure to everyone, as it certainly would, what he earns by his work. Suffice it here to say that it would do so by promoting, instead of obstructing, the free play of natural forces in the distribution as well as in the production of wealth. But there is one question regarding the efficacy of the single tax, which bears directly upon the subject of discussion, and to that we invite a moment's attention.

How would the single tax benefit the small storekeeper and the small farmer? That is the question. Since large farmers with the advantage of improved and valuable machinery can produce at lower cost than the small farmer, could they not drive him out of business? In like manner, could not the department store with its vast capital drive out of business

the small storekeeper? How could the single tax offset the great difference between the capitalist farmers' machinery and the small farmers' rude methods, or the large store and the small one?

VI.

The question assumes that it is desirable in behalf of producers on a small scale to perpetuate small modes of production, like small farming and small store keeping. But that, as we have already seen, is not necessarily desirable. In every department of industry in which production can be carried on with greater economy of labor on a large scale than on a small scale, it is desirable that production on the small scale should cease. Whether or not the single tax would permit department stores and bonanza farming to put an end to small storekeeping and small farming is therefore beside the question. The real question is whether the single tax would secure to those who now keep small stores and do small farming, their equal share in the benefits of the change.

Henry George had no expectation of interfering by the single tax with normal concentration in production. On the contrary, he expected the single tax to encourage it. But he expected also that the single tax would open the way to all who so desired, to be equal partners in production—equal, that is to say, in proportion to their contributions of labor. He expected, in other words, that the single tax would bring about in the field of production on a large scale, a system of voluntary co-operation; or, to use his own language in Progress and Poverty, that under the single tax "we should reach the ideal of the socialist, but not through government repression."

This ideal would be reached through the radical change in the distribution of wealth which the single tax would effect. The system, being of general application, would automatically distribute products in two funds. The first fund would be the distinguishable earnings of individuals. The second would be the rent or value of exceptional opportunities for production. Among individual workers, the first fund would be divided in proportion to their usefulness; the other fund would go to the community as a whole. The law or force by which this equitable distribution would be made, is the natural law of competition, which, like air pressure, so long as it exerts itself not in one direction but in all, produces equilibrium.

VII.

To those who understand the true nature of normal competition, and do not confound it with the monopolistic phenomena of the present day, which superficial writers mistakenly confuse with competition, it is perfectly clear how the result outlined above would come to pass under the single tax. But there are those who fail to grasp the idea. They either lack the imagination to forecast the logical result of a given cause operating in a given way, or their minds are so taken up with the evils of monopolistic "competition," as to leave no room for consideration of the nature of free competition. Without attempting the impossible task of satisfying such minds, we venture a suggestion to others to whom their criticisms may at first seem important.

How would the small farmer and the small storekeeper fare under the single tax, with the bonanza farm and the department store to compete with? Would it not be more pertinent at the outset to inquire how the department store and the bonanza farmer would fare, if they could get no one to work for them?

Think a moment of the effect the single tax would have upon the labor market. Everyone who claimed to own land that other people wanted, would have to pay a tax upon it which would be so high that he could never hope to get it back unless he used the land to its full capacity. But he could not use the land without employing men, no matter how much machinery he had. Machinery won't work itself. Consequently everybody who owned land would either have to give it up or hire enough men to work it to the full. If he gave it up, somebody else would take it. In either case the effect upon the labor market would be the same, namely a brisk demand for labor, in all departments and of all grades, a demand that would constantly exceed the supply. Jobs would be hunting for men, instead of men hunting for jobs. The inevitable effect of that would be the disbandment of the army of the unemployed, increase of wages, and the consequent independence of workmen.

Workmen, though hired, would then have to be treated as industrial equals. They could no longer be treated as serfs. If they objected to their treatment, others would be glad to hire them; and if they objected to being hired, they would be in position to refuse, for they could themselves become producers on a large scale, hiring one another.

This suggests one of the opportunities which the single tax would afford to small farmers and small storekeepers to protect themselves against bonanza farms and department stores. They could adapt themselves to the large scale of production, and produce as economically as their big competitors. This they could do by forming co-operative organizations of their own, something that they are prevented from doing successfully now because the anti-single tax condition of the time allows peculiar privileges as to transportation and taxation to their great competitors. A bonanza farm is only a co-operative farm. The evil about it is that the owner of the farm also virtually owns the men who help him. Under the single tax that evil would disappear, and the bonanza farm instead of being a farm on which the co-operators are a master and his serfs, would be one on which the co-operators would be partners. Labor in general would be in such demand that help could be got on bonanza farms upon no other terms.

VIII.

The one thing to bear in mind with reference to the single tax principle is that it contemplates the abolition of monopoly and the freeing of labor. It would accomplish this by making competition free. Competition is the antithesis of monopoly. To abolish one is to establish the other. To make competition free, therefore, is to apply the natural remedy to the ills that flow from monopoly.

Now, all the ills which seem to come from normal production on a large scale, are caused by the monopolistic circumstances in which it is

carried on. To get rid of them, free competition must be established. That being established, monopoly and all its brood of evils would disappear.

Whoever will consider what free competition means, will realize the beneficently revolutionary character of the effects that would be produced by the introduction of a principle like that of the single tax, which is simply an appropriate method of unshackling competition. With competition freed and monopoly abolished no one could fail to secure his equitable share in the benefits of social growth. To all such the new modes of production which were more prolific and required less labor, would be welcomed as a boon. It is the operation of the principle of monopoly, not of free competition, that makes them now a menace. If the great factory, the department store, capitalistic farming, or any other normal species of large production is a menace to any industrial class, it is not because such method is in itself bad, but because the injured class is disinherited of its competing power. Restore that power, by abolishing monopoly, through making competition free, and special difficulties of adjustment which now seem to be insuperable obstacles, would prove to be the merest shadows in the path. What labor of all grades needs is not to be helped but to be freed. Being freed, it would help itself.

NEWS

Once more the center of general interest has shifted. Attention is now diverted from the Spanish-American war, the Czar's peace proposition and the Dreyfuss exposure, to the British war in the Soudan. Khartoum, the scene of the Gordon massacre 13 years ago, and the objective point of the British army in Egypt, has been captured. The British and Egyptian flags were hoisted there on the 5th.

The British movement upon Khartoum began last spring with a battle at the Atbara river, which flows into the Nile near Berber, the most advanced post the British had yet occupied. The battle of Atbara, fought on the 8th of April, resulted in a complete victory for the British, though with severe loss. The loss of the natives was greater, however, amounting to 2,000 in killed alone; and Mahmoud, the dervish commander at Atbara, was taken prisoner. Since then the British and Egyptian troops have been steadily pushing their way up the Nile to Omdurman, which lies at the confluence of the White Nile and the Blue Nile, not far below Khartoum. Omdurman was the headquarters of what is called the rebellious movement, for it is to be understood that the British are supposed to be engaged not in invading dervish territory, but in assisting the Egyptian government to put down a dervish rebellion. On the 1st of September the Anglo-Egyptian army, under Gen. Kitchener, encamped within eight miles of Omdurman, and within three miles of the rebel army. At dawn on the following day the dervishes were advancing for an attack. Preparations to receive them were made and at half-past seven their attack was anticipated with artillery fire. The dervishes replied with rifles, following with a sweeping rush upon the British flank. Driven back by a withering storm of bullets from the whole British line, they swayed toward the British center and concentrated there for an attack in full force; but the large body of horsemen which led the attack literally melted under a continuous fire, and the main body withdrew behind a ridge in front of their camp. Gen. Kitchener's army followed them. As it came over the crest of the ridge the dervishes bore down upon its right with 15,000 troops which had been massed for a supreme effort to retrieve the dervish losses of the day. To meet this movement Gen. Kitchener seized an eminence with his main body and wheeling to the right caught the dervishes in a depression where he poured in upon them a cross fire with infantry and artillery which fairly mowed them down. They fought bravely, however, until there was but a remnant left, and these broke and fled. Gen. Kitchener's cavalry drove them 30 miles into the desert. Meanwhile British gunboats on the Nile bombarded Khartoum, destroying all the forts and incidentally injuring the tomb of the original mahdi, who died in 1885. By noon the battle had been won, and in the afternoon the British occupied Omdurman. On the 5th, as already stated, the British and Egyptian flags were raised above the neighboring city of Khartoum, which Gen. Kitchener reports as a complete ruin. The loss to the Anglo-Egyptian army was 46 killed and 341 wounded; the dervish loss is reported as high up in the thousands. The dervish leader, Khalifa Abdullah, escaped.

Khartoum and all that region in the Soudan were, until July, 1881, under undisputed Egyptian control. About that time the original mahdi, Mohammed Ahmed, led a religious crusade which in January, 1885, captured Omdurman and Khartoum. Gen. Gordon, known as "Chinese Gordon," had been in command there for a year, in behalf of the British government, which had intervened to put down the rebellion; and when the city of Khartoum fell into the mahdi's hands, he was massacred by a mob of the mahdi's followers. The dramatic incidents connected with Gordon's death have been supreme in exciting English public opinion against the Soudan rebels, and arousing English enthusiasm over the recapture of Khartoum. The recapture affects the public mind in England as being in the nature of revenge for Gordon's death.

An American correspondent reports conduct on the part of the British at the battle of Omdurman which is hardly believable; yet the report is apparently confirmed by so conservative a paper as the London Standard. He says that no wounded mahdists were left after the battle, because the British deliberately and under orders massacred them. He also says that this has been the custom ever since Gordon's death. The excuse given for it is that wounded mahdists on the battlefield are as dangerous as if they were unhurt. They never stop killing while life remains. British officers and surgeons, it is said, have been killed or wounded while passing over battle fields trying to relieve the suffering of wounded mahdists—killed by the wounded mahdists themselves. For this reason it has become the practice to send over the battle fields small bodies of the Soudanese troops under command of the Sirdar, Gen. Kitchener, expressly to kill the wounded rebels. The London Standard refers guardedly to the matter in these words:

> Some of the Sirdar's Soudanese were cautiously making their way across the field of battle, their duty being one which, however hateful it may seem to the theoretical humanitarian, warfare against a savage horde like the followers of the Khalifa makes imperative. There is no need to dwell on such

incidents. It is enough to say that as everyone with experience of fighting in the Soudan knows too well a wounded Baggara may often be more dangerous than a Baggara without a scratch on him. Concealing his agony and feigning death, he can still deal a fatal blow at his unwary enemy.

Following closely upon the recapture of Omduran and Khartoum by the British in the Soudan, the British government has become involved in sanguinary difficulties in the Island of Crete. A collision began on the 6th between Mussulmans and Christians in Candia, and at the height of the rioting a British warship in the harbor fired shells into the city. The British military authorities had appointed a council of internal control to administer tithe revenues. It was composed of Christians. By way of precaution the British had stationed a detachment of soldiers outside the office of the council, and, a crowd of Mussulmans who had menaced the Christians, attempting to force an entrance into the office, the soldiers fired upon them, wounding several. The Mussulmans then ran for arms. Securing these they returned and fired upon the soldiers. From this the riots spread rapidly through the Christian quarter, the Mussulmans firing through windows into Christian houses and burning many houses and shops. A party of marines was landed from the British warship, and four other British warships started from other ports for Candia. Among the killed was the British vice consul; he was burned to death in the burning of his house. Both the British and the German consulates were burned. At last reports nearly 100 British soldiers had been killed.

The Dreyfus case is still the one subject of public thought in Paris. When we last wrote, Col. Henry had confessed to forging one of the important documents against Dreyfus, which the ministry had accused Dreyfus of having written, and he had been arrested and put in prison, where he had committed suicide. Since then, Col. Paty de Clam, who with Henry and Esterhazy have been conspicuous in their hostility to Dreyfus, has been arrested. He is charged with complicity in manufacturing evidence against Dreyfus, but no particulars have come nor have any further developments transpired.

Cavaignac, the French minister of war, has found it necessary to resign. In his letter of resignation he explains that he resigns because of disagreement in the ministry over the Dreyfus case, he being still firmly convinced of Dreyfus's guilt. M. Cavaignac insists that no revision of the Dreyfus case should be had without facts to show that there was error in his trial. Inasmuch as the forged document played no part in the trial, but only by way of justification in the chamber of deputies two years after the trial, he argues that nothing has occurred to justify the revision which some of the ministry favor. Gen. Zurlinden has been appointed minister of war in the place of M. Cavaignac; and on the 7th it was credibly reported in Paris that the ministry had unanimously agreed upon a revision of the Dreyfus case.

The Czar's peace proposals are reported from Rome to have met with favor in Italy, the ministry having decided, it is said, to send a representative to the peace conference. From St. Petersburg it is announced that almost all the European powers have sent favorable replies to the Czar's disarmament note. From the same sources come reports to the effect that the principal subject for consideration at the peace conference will be the Alsace-Lorraine question. It is expected that the peace conference will meet in November. Meanwhile, the Russian war office is strengthening the Czar's field artillery service.

Early in the week rumors of an understanding between Great Britain and Germany became current. It was spoken of in some quarters abroad as a preliminary to the peace conference, it being supposed that these two countries would unite in the conference in order to hold the demands of France within what they might regard as due bounds. Later details of a pending treaty were reported, but nothing authentic is yet publicly known. The treaty would seem to be chiefly commercial, though it may furnish a basis for the adjustment of differences as to territorial questions arising between Germany and England in different parts of the world. This much is probably certain, that the enmity between those two nations has somehow been smoothed away, and that hereafter they will find their interests to be very much in common.

While making a new treaty with England, Germany has been claiming rights under an old one with the United States. She objects to the tariff discriminations made in the reciprocity agreement between this country and France. It will be remembered that during the present year President McKinley made a reciprocity agreement with France, under which certain American products are admitted into France at a reduced duty in consideration of the admission into this country of certain French products on similar terms. To this Germany objects. She wants to send her goods into the United States at as low a rate of duty as France does, claiming a right to do so under the treaty of 1828, which accords to Prussian products the same duties as may be put upon the products of the most favored nation. On the American side it is claimed that the treaty of 1828 was superceded by that of 1868 and that in practice both Germany and America have repeatedly ignored the "most favored nation" clause, in legislation affecting each other. John A. McKasson, special reciprocity commissioner, made the reply for the United States, which has been delivered at Berlin through the German ambassador to the United States. Its receipt in Berlin was reported on the 5th.

A hitch has occurred in the arrangement of the details of peace between Spain and the United States. Judge White, of the supreme court, who was appointed one of the peace commissioners to represent the United States at Paris, has positively declined the appointment, and as yet no one has been found to fill his place. The Spanish commissioners, so it was reported in Madrid on the 3d, were named on the 2d. They are Eugenio Montero Rios, Rafael Cerero y Saenz, and Senor Villaurutia, the under secretary of state for foreign affairs. The Spanish ambassador to France declined an appointment on the ground that the American ambassador to France was not one of the American commissioners.

For the purpose of passing upon the peace conditions, the Spanish cortes met on the 5th. Senator Rodrigues, from Puerto Rico, sent a letter refusing to obey the summons to attend. Sagasta proposed a decree authorizing the renunciation of Spanish sovereignty over the colonies in accordance with the peace protocol. It does not appear yet to have been passed. The reports of proceedings

in the cortes relate chiefly to an attempt to force the government to raise the press censorship, which is very galling. The sessions of the cortes are held behind closed doors.

The American commissioners for arranging for the evacuation of Cuba have gone to Havana; and the commissioners for the evacuation of Puerto Rico have already met in San Juan, and made their ceremonial call upon the Spanish captain general.

Questions of army mismanagement were stimulated by the arrival of Gen. Shafter at Montauk on the 1st, and his giving out of an interview in which he placed all responsibility upon "the men who ordered a summer campaign in a fever infected country." About the same time the Chicago Tribune published the results in detail of a special investigation of its own, which showed that while only 350 persons were killed in battle or died of wounds, the number that had died without a wound up to the 31st of August was above 1,299. The names of these were given with full details. Several hundred more, whose records could not be traced, should be added to the above total. The same investigation showed that 75 per cent. of the deaths from illness were caused by typhoid fever. With reference to the camp at Chickamauga, where according to Gen. Boynton's report only 198 had died, the Tribune publishes the death records of 352.

Camp Wikoff, at Montauk Point, has been visited by the president for a few hours. Immediately after his visit several regiments of regulars were ordered back to their posts as soon as they could be got away. This is the camp of which Dr. Senn said two weeks ago that within a month, if the troops remained there, it would be a pesthole of typhoid fever. Continuing his trip from Cleveland, the president went to Paterson, N. J., as the guest of the vice president, with whom he remained over Sunday, after which he returned to Washington.

From the Philippines this week the news has been scrappy. The insurgents are said to have invaded the southern islands, capturing two and taking several Spanish prisoners and treasure; and the Spanish have asked permission of the United States to send out gunboats from Spain with which to fight the insurgents, a request that this government will not grant. Railroad communication has been reestablished between Manila and Dagupan, upon the condition, however, imposed by Aguinaldo, that the railroad shall not be used to transport foreign troops. Besides this evidence of his growing power, it appears that Aguinaldo has effected an alliance with a native party which has hitherto opposed him, whereby he brings 5,000 more armed troops to his support. His army is now said to number over 30,000 well armed and well equipped men. Among other reports from Manila is one to the effect that on the 5th, at a meeting of 20 Philippine leaders, 18 favored annexation to the United States, while two stood out for independence. The insurgents are convening a mass meeting about 30 miles north of Manila, for the purpose of considering the future of the islands. Meanwhile Aguinaldo retains his strategic positions and strengthens them, lest the Americans might withdraw and leave the insurgents at the mercy of the Spanish.

The Hawaiian commissioners from the United States found themselves for a time at loggerheads with President Dole of the former Hawaiian republic. Regarding himself as the president of the country to which the American commissioners had come, Mr. Dole refrained from calling upon them, but waited for them to call upon him. Senator Cullom, upon learning of Mr. Dole's attitude, informed him that he could be recognized only as one of the commissioners, President McKinley being the only president the American commissioners could recognize in the territory of the United States. Mr. Dole then appeared as one of the commissioners without waiting further for a ceremonial call. But upon its being discovered that the Hawaiian flag was flying over the executive building in which the commission was in session, he requested, in response to objections, that this might be allowed as an indication to the natives that Hawaii is represented in the proceedings. The request was denied. On the 22d, the date of the latest news from Hawaii, preparations were in progress for the celebration of Queen Liliuokalani's birthday on the 2d, at which it was expected she would put out an address or proclamation advising her people as to their future action.

In eastern Cuba, Gen. Lawton appears to have brought about a better state of feeling on the part of the Cubans than existed before he took command. He was notified on the 1st by Gen. Cebreco, commanding the Cuban forces at El Cobre, of the purpose of the latter, acting under the orders of Gen. Gomez, to place himself at the disposition of the American commander. Similar letters have been received by Gen. Lawton from other Cuban generals acting under similar orders from Gen. Gomez. Gen. Lawton has decided that in establishing the civil government at Santiago he will appoint Cuban officers as far as possible. In the west of Cuba, it is reported that the Cuban forces are concentrating near Caibarien for the purpose of disbanding.

Capt. General Blanco, at Havana, has prevented the landing by the Red Cross society of supplies for suffering Spaniards and Cubans, by strictly enforcing the tariff duties. Miss Barton took 1,000 tons of supplies to Havana on board the steamer Clinton but was not permitted to land them without paying $6,000 duty. The steamer Kenneth carried 25 tons of supplies for the same charitable purpose, but was charged $3,000 duties. Gen. Blanco has explained that Havana does not need aid from America, being able to take care of her own poor, and that no supplies will be allowed to land without paying full duty. In view of this attitude of the Spanish officials in Cuba, President McKinley issued the following proclamation on the 6th:

By virtue of the authority vested in me as commander in chief of the army and navy of the United States of America I do hereby order and direct that upon the occupation and possession of any ports and places in the island of Cuba by the forces of the United States beef cattle and other food supplies intended for the starving inhabitants of the island may be admitted free of duty, subject to the discretion of the commanding officer of the United States forces at the port of entry, who is hereby charged with the responsibility for the gratuitous distribution of said food supplies for the starving inhabitants of the island.

At Pana, Ill., the labor situation remains practically unaltered. As our past reports have explained, the coal miners at Pana are striking against a reduction of wages, the employers refusing even to submit the question to the arbitration of the arbitration authorities of the state. To break the strike the employers sent to Alabama to contract with negro miners, and

carloads of these have been brought on. There appears to be good reason for believing that the negroes were deceived. Some of them say, at any rate, that they were told that work was abundant at Pana, and contracted to go there upon that supposition. They had no idea that a strike was in progress. It is very difficult, however, to get much information from the negroes, as most of them are kept in the mines under guard, few persons being allowed to see them at all, and nobody except in the presence of foremen. Such information as has come from them has been given by some who escaped and by others who were intercepted before they reached Pana. On the 1st, a mob of the strikers seized two employers and held them in custody, for what purpose is not very apparent, though no personal harm seems to have been done to them or attempted. When this had been done, the sheriff telegraphed to the governor for troops, but gave no facts to show the necessity for his call, and the governor responded with a request for facts. The answer he got was unsatisfactory. The governor said that the sheriff seemed more intent upon protecting imported miners than the property and lives of its citizens. He ordered a battery to Springfield, however, and sent David Ross, the secretary of the labor bureau of the state, to Pana to make a personal investigation for him into the situation. Mr. Ross was unable to learn whether the negroes are under restraint or not; the operators would not accord him a private interview with the negroes. This was on the 2d. On the same day the battery ordered out, reported at Springfield. Meantime, proceedings for an injunction were instituted to restrain the negroes from working in the mine, the state bureau having reported that with a few exceptions they were incompetent under state laws. On the 6th the battery had not yet been sent to Pana, and the sheriff had sworn in 300 deputies with whom he was guarding the town, the mayor, a son of one of the coal operators, having requested him to take entire charge. At this time fears of a pestilence have arisen, in consequence of the unsanitary condition of the negroes' camp.

American politics furnishes very little news for the week. The democrats have carried Arkansas against the populists and the republicans, and the republicans have carried Vermont by a significantly small majority. In Wisconsin the populists, having failed to make a fusion with the democrats, have nominated a full state ticket of their own. The "middle-of-the-road" populists, chief among whom were Ignatius Donnelly and Jacob S. Coxey, met at Cincinnati in national convention on the 5th, and on the 6th they nominated for president in 1900, Wharton Barker of Pennsylvania, and for vice president, Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota. According to hostile reports 13 states were represented by 58 delegates. This party opposes itself unalterably to fusion with either of the old parties under any circumstances. The Iowa democrats not only made a fusion with the populists and the silver republicans, but they indorsed the Chicago platform without equivocation and indorsed Bryan for president. Some of the leaders tried to modify the platform so as to make it easy for the gold democrats to return to the party, but the body of the delegates overruled them.

NEWS NOTES.

—The national encampment of the G. A. R. met at Cincinnati on the 7th.

—The National association of letter carriers met at Toledo on the 6th.

—The Elgin watch strike has been settled. The terms are not made public.

—On the 6th the new queen of Holland was inaugurated sovereign of the Netherlands and their colonies.

—Gen. Wheeler's son was drowned, along with another officer of the army, while bathing at Camp Wikoff on the 6th.

—A single tax congress will be held at Omaha on the 16th and 17th of September, under the auspices of the Trans-Missisippi and Industrial exhibition.

—President Wilford Woodruff, of the Mormon church, died at Salt Lake City on the 2d. He was 91 years old, had been president of the church for ten years, and was one of the Salt Lake pioneers of 1847.

—Li Hung Chang, the Chinese minister, has been dismissed, in obedience to the influence, it is supposed, of the British minister at Pekin. Li had supported the Russian as against the British pretensions in China.

—Gen. Miles has arrived in the United States from Puerto Rico. He authorizes a long interview showing his relations to the conduct of the war, and confirms previous interviews, in which he criticised the war department.

—On the 13th, 14th and 15th of the present month, a national currency convention will be held at Omaha under the auspices of the exposition. The first day is "gold day," the second "silver day," and the third "paper day."

—Gladstone's will, which has just been admitted to probate, shows that his personal property is worth $297,530. It leaves souvenirs to servants, bequeaths letters and books presented by the queen and patents of crown offices to his grandson, expresses his desire to be buried where his wife's body may lie also, and requires that his own burial be simple and private. He forbids the placing of any laudatory inscription over him.

—The second Zionist congress, having for its object the reestablishment of the Jewish nation in Palestine, met at Basle, Switzerland, last week. Among the prominent Israelites who participated were Dr. Nordau and Dr. Theo. Hertzka. Dr. Nordau delivered a brilliant oration on the Jews, and Dr. Hertzka presented a report prepared by Dr. Motzkin, on the availability of the land of Palestine for Israelites in their ancient occupations of farming and herding.

MISCELLANY

UNTO THE JUDGE.

O Master Fate that so relentlessly
Whips men adown the world; thou, only known
By thy twin burdens, ever wearier grown,
Life's certain woe and death's uncertainty—

Sender of life and death, hearken and give
As tyrant lord to wretch condemned to die
His last poor wish. Out of my chains I cry
For one sole boon to me condemned to live.

I will not waste that grace to beg long life
Nor sue that death come mercifully swift,
Not one of all the wealths within thy gift,
Not even rest from pain nor peace from strife.

But this alone, Master of Death, whose might
Rules him who rules the mightiest, hear and give—
That only so much life be mine to live
As I may live to fight my brother's fight.

Let not the soft-winged days with drowsy songs
Smother my protest at the world's misrule,
Nor chill oncoming years avail to cool
Love for the poor and fury at their wrongs.

Because thou madest manhood, answer yes—
Suffer me not to live to shame thy plan,
To traffic in the birthright of a man
As harlot to the pulpit or the press.

The day that I would turn from common men
To those accounted great and set in power,
Grantor of Death, though it should be this hour,
Let me be spared the shame to live till then.

—Frank Stephens, in The Conservator.

YANKEE VS. CUBAN CIVILIZATION.

"Well," said Mr. Hennessy, "I think Shafter done wrong. He might 've asked Garshay in f'r to see the show, seein' that he's been hangin' ar-round f'r a long time doin' th' best he cud."

"It isn't that," explained Mr. Dooley. "Th' trouble is th' Cubans don't understand our civilization. Over here freedom means hard wurrk. What is the ambition iv all iv us, Hinnessy? 'Tis ayether to hold our job or to get wan. We want wurrk. We must have it. D'ye raymimber th' sign th' mob carried in th' procession last year? 'Give us wurrk or we perish,' it said. They had their heads bate in be polismen because no philanthropist'd come along an' make thim shovel coal. Now, in Cuby, whin the mobs turn out they carry a banner with th' wurrds: 'Give us nawthin' to do or we perish.' Whin a Cuban comes home at night with a happy smile on his face he don't say to his wife and childrn: 'Thank Gawd, I've got wurrk at last.' He says: 'Thank Gawd, I've been fired.' An' the childer go out an' they say: 'Pa-h pah has lost his job,' and Mrs. Cuban buys herself a new bonnet, an' where wanst there was sorrow an' despair all is happiness an' a cottage organ.

"Ye can't make people here understand that, an' ye can't make a Cuban understand that freedom means th' same thing as pinitintiary sintince. Whin we try to wurrk he'll say: 'Why shud I? I haven't committed any crime.' That's goin' to be th' trouble. Th' first thing we know we'll have another war in Cuby whin we begin distributon good jobs, 12 hours a day, wan-seventy-five. Th' Cubans ain't civilized in our way. I sometimes think I've got a touch of Cuban blood in me own veins."—Tacoma Ledger.

THE TAXATION DEBATE.

There are signs that the question of taxation is coming to the front again and that it is destined very soon to acquire a prominence which it has not had since the beginning of the last quarter of the eighteenth century, when the American colonies laid down the principle and defended it with fire and sword, that taxation without representation is tyranny; and when, in reply, Dr. Samuel Johnson, the greatest of English literary men then living, wrote his book, "Taxation No Tyranny."

The present signs point to a root-and-branch discussion, more thorough and searching than the world has ever seen before, of the ethical basis of taxation, in an attempt to get at some principle or principles which shall guide legislators in framing tax laws. Everybody who has looked into the matter agrees with everybody else who has looked into it on just one thing, namely, that all existing systems of taxation are bad, with various and multitudinous kinds and degrees of badness.

One thing that is bringing the question to the front all over the world is the great world-stir produced during the past 20 years by the extraordinary genius of Henry George. Another cause is the movement everywhere in Europe among recently-enfranchised voters to get rid of what they passionately believe to be the excessive and unjust proportion borne by them of tax burdens and to shift them back upon the shoulders of the richer classes, who, so long as they had in their own hands the making of the laws, naturally adjusted the taxes to suit themselves.—From Editorial in Boston Daily Advertiser.

THE EXPENSE OF OUR COLONIAL POLICY.

It is stated that the naval board of experts, to whom the subject was referred by the secretary of the navy, has agreed upon a programme calling for the building of not fewer than 15 warships at an estimated cost of between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000. We are told that "this addition to the present navy is made absolutely necessary by the acquisition of Hawaii and the possible retention of a portion of the Philippines."

When the proposition was made to annex Hawaii a contention of those who favored it was that the islands would have a defensive value for the United States, since they would give us a coaling and supply and telegraphic station in the Pacific and would be of great advantage to us on our Pacific coast in the event of war with a strong naval power. Now, the islands having been annexed, it is declared that we must at once appropriate from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 to defend them and to defend other possessions in the Pacific, the retention of which is possible.

From the army department we have not yet heard. How much of an increase of our regular army shall we need for the defense of Hawaii, one of the Ladrone islands, a portion of the Philippines (or all), Puerto Rico and Cuba? How much less than an increase of 100,000 men after all the volunteers shall have been mustered out?

And what is to be the compensation to this country for all the expenditures of money that have already been made and that will have to be continued indefinitely for the retention and defense of these island colonies? How much will the 70,000,000 people of the United States be benefited? How much will the taxpayers gain by our holding under military rule islands inhabited by millions of half-civilized people?

Dingley says that the additional expenses are going to be permanent and that the continuance of the internal revenue tax will be necessary. And of course he expects the protective tariff tax also to be retained. This will be necessary to help the contributors to the campaign fund, while the internal revenue tax will be necessary to meet current expense, including that of constructing new warships and supporting a large standing army.

The millionaires, trusts and syndicates that operate in these islands will make money and incidentally the development of their resources will give work to many who shall go thither; but such openings for a long time at least must be at the expense of the great mass of people who bear the burden of taxation.—Quincy (Ill.) Daily Journal.

MUSIC IN VACATION SCHOOLS.

Interest in the system of music taught in the five vacation schools maintained in Chicago during the summer was of the most vivid kind, particularly among principals and teachers of music in the public schools. The results obtained by the singing teachers in the vacation schools were so phenomenal as to astonish people who had made music the business of a lifetime.

Children were induced not only to sing out, but to modulate their voices for the production of tones necessary to express ideas underlying the musical notation.

The children learned in the six weeks of the vacation school term 30 songs, each one of which made an epoch in their lives. The material for these songs and the songs themselves came from the folk music of all lands and related to nature, to the industries and to military life. Their power in making character as well as their value in voice-building was in view when they were chosen. Their ethics was as carefully scanned as their musical correctness when selection was made.

No attempt was made to teach the children to read music. The airs were played and sung to them until they took them up. The words were taught with a view to getting an understanding of the thought, and when words and music were memorized the children, imbued with the spirit of the

songs, made their voices instruments to be played on at the will of the imagination. They seized the dramatic element in the songs and responded to its demands quickly because of the freshness of their natures.

"Fair Snow White," one of the songs, related the story of the snowflake, and was as delicate in sentiment and treatment as a Mendelssohn spring song. This was a great favorite with the newsboys, many of whom were in the schools. They delighted in its dainty measures, and their efforts to soften the quality of their voices, made strident and harsh by the necessities of their calling, was almost pitiful. Frequently the only result was an inaudible, inarticulate gasp, but they had learned to know that delicacy of treatment of such a theme was necessary.

Folk songs have all a note of sadness that bespeaks the toil of the day. They were made to lighten the cares of labor and express in a subtle and illusive manner its drudgery. This undercurrent of pathos caught the attention of the children, and in their singing the cadences of tenderness showed their appreciation of the sentiment.

Before teaching any of the songs the minds of the children were prepared for them by suitable and applicable myths, stories, traditions. These got them in sympathy with the subject, whether it was in the domain of nature, the industries, religion or battle.

A German guild song, centuries old, "The Wandering Journeyman," told of the trades. In preparation for it the story of laborers in past times was related. The youth served his seven years' apprenticeship; then, becoming a journeyman, took his kit of tools and wallet of provisions and clothing and went out into the world to work and learn. At last, years afterward, he came back to his native village, a master workman to whom the lads of the place now came for instruction.

Overhearing one of the boys say to another, contemptuously: "Humph! your daddy ain't nothin' but a cobbler!" a teacher took the occasion to talk of the dignity of labor with the hands, and told the class of the story of the old guilds and the meetings for music and jollity, of the trials of strength and the song contests. She then asked each of the class to find out what trade had been followed in his or her parents' families in the fatherland —the children attending the vacation schools were almost without exception of foreign parentage. Next day the children came into the classroom and with brightened eyes and glad voices told of their ancestors' trades. For them the whole storehouse of the past had been opened, and tradition had poured her plenty into their minds. The sad ones in the class were those who had nothing to tell of centuries of labor in one direction.

A spinning song which the girls sung over their sewing was taught after the story of Arachne and her weaving had been told and explained. The spinning songs of Liszt, Wagner and Mendelssohn were played for the girls, and they caught the idea of the whir of the wheel and reproduced it in their voices.

"The Blacksmith" song was accompanied with an abundance of myths. Vulcan in his smithy where the armor of the gods was forged, and Siegfried welding the sword of his father, became familiar figures to the children. With the Siegfried story, Wagner's music—the sword motif and the bird's song—were played for the classes, which were delighted with them. So thoroughly in sympathy were the pupils after their preparation of story, that when the "Clang, clang!" of the sledge on the anvil came in the song they reproduced it vocally with almost perfect intonation at the first trial. Another of the songs, "The Carpenter and His Tools," contained passages representing the noise made by a saw cutting through wood and the tap of a hammer driving nails. The "dz, dz!" of the saw and the "Rap, rap, rap!" of the hammer pleased the classes immensely, and when the sharp staccato of the latter had to be indicated it came with a will and without much drilling.

An old Russian song, a "Vesper Hymn," fed the religious side of the child nature, as well as the Russian national hymn, which was sung each morning at the opening exercises with words composed by Miss Mari Ruef Hofer, who originated the system of teaching. The "Vesper Hymn" contained as its chief musical motif the sound of church bells ringing. To produce the effect the children learned to use the crescendo and diminuendo without knowing they were getting technical training of the utmost value. The story of the angelus was told in the preparatory lessons on this song, and an engraving of Millet's great painting was shown to the children.

Speaking of her work, Miss Hofer said: "Every child is an artist. His imagination is free and unspoiled. He will follow wherever you lead him, and he will fill out a picture if you give him the outlines. It is to the foreign element in our population that I look for future musical artists. Children whose parents have come from the peasant classes of Germany, Italy, France, Hungary, Bohemia and other countries, especially in the north of Europe, have behind them ages of history and tradition in which music has been the principal factor in their amusements. In elaborating the song themes the schoolrooms are often turned into animated scenes from nature. The stirring military and the rhythmical industrial themes give episodes of the heroic, with gay cavalcades and processions of soldiers with flags and drums, horses in stately parade or galloping bands of merry workmen driving their trades. All phases of life are correlated in this system. The songs have an educative and moral value aside from their intrinsic musical worth, and they are 'gems of purest ray' as mere musical compositions."

Some of the remarks made by the children during the summer are characteristic. One small boy jogged his companion and whispered: "Say, Jimmy, do youse hear dem bees a-buzzin' in de pianer."

A little miss, delighted with the rhythm of a dancing song, exclaimed, ecstatically: "The moosic dust makes us put our feet in 'e right place eve'y time!"

On the closing day of the term the children were taken to Momence, Ill., for a picnic. They begged to be allowed to sing and act "Fair Snow White" under the trees, and chose a little negro, black as the ace of spades, to impersonate the fairy snowflake.—George Curtis Warren, in Chicago Record.

THE FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT IN PUBLIC UTILITIES.

The land of every country is the common heritage of the people of that country and of all who come to it either by birth or immigration. It is just as truly the common heritage of the people as are the air and the sunlight, and it is as inalienable because it is, equally with air and sunlight, necessary to the sustenance of human life. To part with the right to the use of land is as fatal to the natural right of life as would be the alienation of the right to breathe the atmosphere. But, unlike air and sunshine, land cannot be used in common, and, unlike air and sunshine, it can be made the subject of aggression and monopoly by the strong and the cunning to the extent of interfering with the equal rights of the weak and undesigning.

It is, therefore, part of the function of democratic government in dealing with this equal natural right of the

whole people to prevent the interference of the unscrupulously aggressive with the equal rights of their fellows, and, in the exercise of that negative power, to determine, by just and general rules of uniform application to all citizens and to all lands, the terms and conditions upon which the acknowledged natural right of each citizen to his share in the soil shall be exercised. Let me give a few illustrations of the application of what I conceive to be the true function of government to what are commonly called "public utilities."

In the course of the development of civilization new problems of general public or common interest arise. As the rich lands of natural fertility, requiring neither irrigation nor drainage to prepare them for cultivation, become insufficient to satisfy the needs of population, immense areas of rich lands requiring care and drainage systems to prepare them for use must be resorted to, and later vastly greater areas of rich arid land are required for the support and comfort of the increasing population. How are these lands to be prepared for human habitation and use? The individual citizen cannot go upon such land and, taking the amount required for his use, prepare it for cultivation and for a place of abode.

Communities may organize great partnerships or cooperative schemes embracing hundreds or thousands of intending settlers, as the extent of the areas to be irrigated or drained may suggest, and by unusual, and I may almost say unnatural, fidelity and forbearance on the part of all who join in the enterprise, may successfully carry it out, but such cooperative enterprises generally fail because of inherent defects in the constitutions and minds of men. What then? There remain but two possible courses to accomplish the desired result. One is to create a great corporate subgovernment, clothed by franchises with the power and legal right to take possession of the territory to be drained or irrigated, with adjacent watersheds or other ground necessary to the successful execution of the purpose, allowing the corporation so organized to carry out the plan of drainage or irrigation and obtaining its return by levying a tax, in the form of ground rent, measured only by the business considerations suggested by the avarice of the company, as the condition upon which the member or settler may establish his home or industry upon the land.

This plan is absolutely contrary to democratic principle. It is so undemocratic as to be incapable of acceptance by the democratic mind. True, it is the system now in vogue and tolerated by democrats and by the democratic party, but it is equally true that it is not only an undemocratic system but an anti-democratic system.

The other method is the preparation by drainage or irrigation of the land desired for use, at the expense of the whole people, through their trustee, the government, the government being reimbursed for its expense by charging the individual citizen who chooses to use the land, or any part of it, the economic value of the use of that portion of the common heritage of the whole people, the government thus promoting civilization and industrial progress and the general happiness of the citizens of the state without permitting the slightest interference by monopoly with any of their natural rights, and without imposing the slightest burden, either upon those who establish homes on the reclaimed lands or upon other citizens of the country.

Other problems that concern every people and every government as civilization advances are the necessity for the artificial lighting of the streets and the houses and other public and private buildings of cities; the accumulation of a sufficient supply of pure water to satisfy the abnormal demand for pure water in the particular locality, and providing means of safe and rapid transit for the people of the city from place to place with the least possible injury to life and property and with the least possible inconvenience to the business for which cities are established. . . .

As long as water can be supplied in sufficient quantities and sufficient purity by private enterprises under conditions of perfect freedom of competition, without asking any privilege or favor from the government, let the government keep its hands off the private business of supplying water. But when that point has been passed and a franchise or special privilege of any kind becomes necessary to enable a private enterprise to furnish the water supply, the franchise should be denied. But must the city be arrested in its growth or compelled to submit to inconvenience and unsanitary conditions because of an inadequate water supply? Certainly not.

To the governing function of municipal authorities there must be added a function necessary to the proper execution of the first—namely, to prevent the interference of one citizen with the rights of another through the exercise of monopoly powers or otherwise, by making the provision of a water supply for the city a public function to the extent necessary to eliminate the monopoly and not further.

In the particular matter of furnishing a water supply, after viewing the whole field, I am unable to find any point short of providing the water supply and distributing it to all citizens desiring to use it at which the government can stop, with the assurance that it has guarded the people against monopoly interference. Therefore, in my opinion, upon the soundest of democratic principles, the furnishing of the water supply of a city becomes properly a function of the municipal government of the city.

All that I have said of the development of a demand for a water supply beyond the capacity of strictly private enterprise and of the general considerations that enter into the question as to whether the supply shall be furnished through public or private enterprise applies with equal force to the function of supplying artificial light, and, upon the same reasoning, the satisfaction of that general public want must be regarded as a public function of the municipal government.

With respect to street railroads, it is clearly not necessary for the city to engage in the transportation of passengers, because by the construction of tracks with suitable appliances for the use of the best possible means of street-railroad transportation and opening such tracks and appliances to the general use of all who desire to compete for passenger traffic over such street upon such terms and conditions as to construction and operation of cars as may be imposed, the provision of skilled attendants in charge of cars, and such other incidental conditions as the expedition, transportation and the safety of life and property may require, the whole business of street railroad transportation may be left to private enterprise and free competition among all who may desire to engage in the business, and may be relied upon as certain to reduce transportation charges to the reasonable value of the service without such clumsy and necessarily abortive efforts at control as are involved in our federal and state commissions for the control of railroad monopolies. . . .

The difficulty of applying the public-highway plan to street railroads is infinitely greater than that involved in applying it to steam railroads; yet as applied to street railroads it is thor-

oughly practical, perfectly feasible, and indeed the only satisfactory solution of the street railroad problem short of municipal operation. The application of the public highway principle to steam railroads would eliminate the whole evil of railroad influence in politics without injecting the socialistic evil of a vast increase in the force of civil servants employed by the government. . . .

Believing, as I do, that civilization must ever continue to progress, as it has in the past progressed, under the laws of and along the lines of individual development, a theory that finds its most perfect expression in the abstract term democracy; and believing that the way to industrial emancipation, to the highest possible condition of universal happiness, is not through the elimination of competition which would bring all men to the dead level of social and industrial stagnation, but by making competition free in every department of home industry, I stand absolutely for confining the function of government, with respect to enterprises of general utility, to the elimination of monopoly, leaving everything else to private enterprise under free competition.—Hon. Jas. G. Maguire, in the House, Feb. 4. 1898.

Officer—Now, remember, Ole, the password is "fish."

"Ay, weel," replied Ole; "ay bane one fiskerman myself in Minnesotey an' I tank I skall remembar."

And Ole made his way to the sentinel, who said:

"Who comes there?"

"Von sucker," said Ole, in a loud tone of voice that showed that he knew his lesson well.—Bozeman (Mont.) Chronicle.

"Who is that young man?" inquired the hostess.

"We don't know much about him yet," replied her daughter. "He has either mingled in circles far more exclusive than ours, or else he is wholly unused to the manners of good society."

"How do you reach that opinion?"

"He has an absurd way of shaking hands that none of us ever saw before."—Washington Star.

M. de Vogue has recently declared that the list of cosmopolitan classics must finally be restricted to two books, "Don Quixote" and "Robinson Crusoe." He declares "Don Quixote" to be the most pessimistic of all books and "Robinson Crusoe" the most optimistic. He discovers in the first the whole history of Spain, and in the latter the true portrait of the English-speaking race. He sees in the shipwrecked solitary the type of the mythic hero of the north—stout-hearted and devout, ready with his hands and sure of himself. De Foe's hero is a type of all mankind; Robinson Crusoe's struggle for existence is ours also; and in his adventures we foresee our own—every man fighting for his own hand, every man with his back against the wall.—Prof. Brander Matthews, in The Forum.

A mother noticed a remarkable change in the deportment of her six-year-old son. From being rough, noisy and discourteous, he had suddenly become one of the gentlest and most considerate little fellows in the world. He was attending the kinder-garten, and his mother naturally inferred that the change was somehow due to the teacher's instruction.

"Miss Smith teaches you to be polite?" she remarked, in a tone of interrogation.

"No," said the boy, "she never says a word about it."

The mother was puzzled, and all the more when further questioning brought only more emphatic denials that the teacher had ever given her pupils lessons in good breeding.

"Well, then," the mother asked, finally, "if Miss Smith doesn't say anything, what does she do?"

"She doesn't do anything," persisted the boy. "She just walks around, and we feel polite. We feel just as polite as—anything."

That was all he could tell about it, and his mother began to see through the mystery.—Christian Companion.

There was a strong claim from us that the cause of humanity demanded our interference in the affairs of Cuba. In making such a claim, we must remember that there is no position which a party or a people can take that challenges more an investigation as to its honesty than when they pose as the correctors of abuses in others. No nation can successfully take that role in the drama of history whose citizens are puffed up with notions of national greatness and virtue. It requires national modesty and humbleness rightly to undertake such a mission, and a mighty national integrity properly to fulfill it.—New Church Messenger.

"What outlandish words the editor of the Boomer is using. I can't understand half of them."

"The Boomer is offering dictionaries as premiums."—N. Y. Weekly.

"We ought to keep a regular account of receipts and expenditures," said the practical politician's wife.

"What for?"

"So that you can show just what money you have and how you got it."

"Great Scott! That's just what we're trying not to let on about."—Washington Star.

That dreadful Michigan anarchist, Pingree, has broken loose again. His latest political heresy is the dogma that every one should be made to pay his just share of taxes.—Chicago Journal.

"You ought to have been at our house last night," said little Jimmy Summerlea to Freddy Tillinghast.

"Why?"

"We had an eclipse of the moon."—Puck.

"Open your mouth, dear, and let the dentist see what he can find there."

"All right, mamma;—but findings ain't keepings, remember!"

If the kitten had been provided with a slightly longer tail it would have been deprived of a great deal of innocent amusement.—Puck.

And there is no other way,
Since man of woman was born,
Than the way of the rebels and saints,
With loving and labor vast,
To redeem the world at last
From cruelty and greed;
For love is the only creed,
And honor the only law.
—Bliss Carman: Elegy on Henry George.

THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

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

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

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

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