The Public

First Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1898. Number 24.

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.

In his official letter of condolence to the Emperor of Austria, whose wife had been murdered by a lunatic, President McKinley correctly phrased American sentiment. He conveyed the sympathy of his countrymen to the head of a friendly nation overwhelmed with personal grief, without implying that his grief was essentially more important than that of the humblest man or woman in the empire. President McKinley thus exhibited an unusual sensitiveness to the spirit of democracy, which does after all animate American sentiment in spite of the external snobbery that has of late years become so common.

With the Austrian emperor in his sorrow we all sympathize, deeply and sincerely. A man like the rest of us, his grief is in degree our own. Whoever believes in the universal brotherhood of man, must feel for the emperor somewhat of the thrill of sorrow one would feel if his own nearest neighbor suffered a similar affliction. This seems to be the sentiment of President McKinley's letter, and his expression of that sentiment all American democrats will cordially approve.

Some newspapers, however, as well as some public men, have not been so thoughtful as the president. They voice the sentiment of American snobs, those despicable creatures who look upon monarchs as something above men. These creatures profess on an occasion like that of the assassination of the Empress of Austria, the utmost regard for the sanctity of life. But it is not life that they look upon as sacred; it is only some lives. Common human life has to them no sanctity comparable to property rights. Here is a woman, a good woman according to report, but neither better nor worse than millions of other women. She had a husband who loved her, but not more than millions of other husbands love their wives. In the prime of life she is assailed by a madman and stabbed to the heart. It is indeed a sorrowful event and utterly unjustifiable. But not more so than the tragic death of any other of the millions of good wives might be; not so much so as the deaths, and the misery culminating in death, which at this moment afflict thousands of less prominent but not less virtuous wives even in the very empire over which her bereaved husband presides—death and misery caused by hunger produced by the laws. Yet upon her death these American snobs shed crocodile tears, while they are indifferent or worse to the hourly hunger tragedies that afflict this world of plenty. Is it because her death was sensational, or because they regard her as superior to her sisters, and her life as more sacred? Be it either way, they are contemptible all the same. If they would be credited with sincerity in their professions of regard for the sanctity of life, let them supplement their sorrow and indignation at the murder of the Empress of Austria, with some approach to sorrow and indignation over that multitude of hunger murders, in comparison with which her assassination was like sinking into peaceful sleep. Our emotions in connection with the assassination of the Empress of Austria should be the same as would be excited by the assassination of any other woman, neither less sorrowful and indignant nor more.

It is said that the murderer of the Empress of Austria is not a lunatic but an anarchist. This cry of William of Germany is echoed throughout the courts of Europe and repeated here. Its motive is to arouse a wild passion which can be utilized in the name of law to put down men and movements that, though they neither assassinate nor encourage assassination nor look to assassination as a mehod of revolution, are infinitely more dangerous to the greedy beneficiaries of hunger-murder, crowned and uncrowned, than have been all the assassins since the days of Cain. In response to that cry, it is seriously proposed to make an international compact that would outlaw such peers in the society of the promoters of the world's peaceful advance, as Prince Krapotkin and Elisee Reclus. Even the gentle Tolstoi would come under its ban. William himself proposes if possible to make the event an excuse for suppressing the socialist party of Germany.

These passion provokers know full well that the murderer of the Empress of Austria is probably a lunatic. That his lunacy should have taken the form of a mania against royalty is not remarkable in a country where royalty personifies the oppression which drives men crazy. But if he were in fact what for evil purposes he is asserted to be, an anarchistic conspirator against crowned heads, what folly it would be to attempt to put down his co-conspirators by international outlawry or any other kind of force. Force is futile against men who have no fear of death. This man admits his act. He makes no effort to escape punishment. He even offers to go from Switzerland where he can be only imprisoned, to Austria where he would be beheaded. And through it all he sings as if he

were a youth on his way to his wedding. If in fact, then, this man is not a lunatic but a murderous conspirator, one of a band like himself sworn to assassinate royal personages, what protection could there possibly be in international outlawry, or in killing off "anarchists," unless the decree were as sweeping and undiscriminating as Herod's against the innocents? If not a lunatic, that man is affected with the kind of fanaticism that leads men joyfully to death in pursuit of their objects; and if there be in truth a society of such, neither outlawry nor fear of death will suppress them. If there be a society of such men, which we do not believe any more than we believe in the ogres of fairy lore, they will make it more dangerous to wear a crown than to go to battle; and the more they are "suppressed," the more dangerous they will become.

But be there such a society or not, be the assassination of the Empress of Austria the work of an "anarchist" or of a lunatic, the remedy is not the international outlawry of people accused of being "anarchists." Besides being futile, that would itself be anarchy; and it would degenerate into something akin to the old witchcraft persecutions. The remedy is to remove the cause of anarchy; it is, in the language of one astute American editor, to "stamp out the ignorance, stupidity, idleness, and moral obliquity from which modern anarchy is hatched." This ignorance, stupidity, idleness and moral obliquity, however, is not located where the astute editor supposes. It is the "ignorance" and "stupidity" of the titled fools who imagine that they can stop progress toward liberty by taking advantage of maniacal crimes to persecute political adversaries; it is the "idleness" of those who though they toil not, live in luxury upon the earnings of such as do; it is the "moral obliquity" of those who think of the world as their oyster and of their fellow men as menials designed by a plutocratic God to open it for them. Stamp out these base things, and anarchy would indeed disappear. There would be then no more lunatics driven by what they see of undeserved hunger to insanely murder people whom they see revelling in unearned luxury.

The principal specification of the charge that the Cubans are incapable of self-government was to the effect that they fired upon Cervera and his surviving officers and men after they had surrendered. This was the especial ground of complaint of that industrious journal of plutocratic civilization, Harper's Weekly, which denounced the act as placing the Cuban republic "outside of the pale of civilization." It seemed to us at the time that this indicated a sad lack of real grounds of complaint against the Cubans, and implied that the plutocrats of this country were willing to seize upon the flimsiest kind of excuses to justify their purpose of wresting the Island of Cuba from its people. We were unable to see that this act charged against a few Cubans as putting the whole Cuban people outside the pale of civilization, was a whit worse than that of the Spanish sharpshooters who fired upon our wounded, our Red Cross and our surgeons, deliberately picking them off, a barbaric act which nobody thought of imputing to the whole Spanish nation. Moreover, there was no good reason for believing that the Cubans knew Cervera had surrendered. He appeared to be running away, and we could see as a matter of civilization no difference between the act of Cubans in firing upon him as he ran away, and the action of our own troops in firing upon Spanish soldiers at San Juan as they ran away. The indignation of our plutocrats impressed us as similar to that of the wolf when the lamb muddied the stream. And so it appears to have been. For now, and from Spanish sources at that, it is shown not only that Cervera had not surrendered but was running away to escape capture, when the Cubans fired upon him, but also that as soon as he did surrender —and it was to the Cubans, mind you, that he surrendered—they treated him with civilized consideration and turned him over to the Americans. It begins to look as if proof of the incapacity of the Cubans for self-government would be at a premium at Washington before Mr. McKinley succeeds in "pacifying" their island sufficiently for the civilizing purposes of the American-Indies Company.

These are distracting times for Mark Hanna's White house protege. The management of the war was like a holiday to him in comparison with the troubles which its mismanagement has brought upon his administration. At first he was determined to ignore the universal complaints, to regard them as scandalous emanations from yellow journals; but his complacency was rudely disturbed by the election returns from Vermont. This green mountain state always goes republican, but the rise and fall of the republican majority there is as invariably an indication of the condition of the political weather elsewhere. So when Mr. McKinley heard that while the democrats of Vermont had polled as large a vote last Tuesday as they polled at the presidential election two years ago, the republican vote had fallen off 25 per cent., he hurried to set on foot the army investigation which the people had urgently demanded, but which until then he had regarded as quite unnecessary.

This investigation was requested by the secretary of war, it is true, but that detracts nothing from the inference that it was really set on foot by the president. It must be remembered that the secertary of war plumply opposed any investigation. He was proud of his department. The charges of ill-treatment of soldiers he denounced as silly. There had been but one complaint, he said, and that was without foundation. The truth was, so he asseverated, that the soldiers had had too much to eat, too much of fruit and harmful food;

they bought things that were not good for them, and against orders drank unboiled water. He deprecated the sensational attacks upon the department as malicious, and stood upon his record. He would have no investigation. That was his attitude until the president had heard from the Vermont election, whereupon the secretary of war asked for an investigation, and the president promptly appointed investigators. So promptly did the president act that Vermont election returns, Secretary Alger's unexpected request for an investigation, and the president's action upon it, were all mixed up. It requires a close examination into the order of the events to tell which came first, but there is no doubt that it was the Vermont election. Some lively telephoning must have been done between the White house and the war office after the closing of the polls in Vermont.

Be that as it may, however, the president was right in ordering an investigation, and we need not inquire too closely into his motives. The important thing is that he has started an investigation, and except in one particular seems to have done so with the object of securing an impartial report. The exception is his appointment upon the investigating commission of a close personal friend of Alger's, whose department is to be investigated. The president appears to have thought that the accused ought to have an advocate on the jury. Still, enough able men were selected for the commission, men presumably above personal influence, to be a guarantee against white-washing, and the public will wait patiently to learn from them upon whom rests the blame for the mismanagement which has already so completely proved itself.

For the purpose of ascertaining the fact of mismanagement, no investigation is needed. One is needed only for the purpose of fixing the blame. The fact of mismanagement is proved in a thousand ways to the apprehension and satisfaction of every impartial man. It is proved by the great number of deaths from disease since the war, deaths caused mostly by typhoid fever and not by fevers to which the troops were necessarily exposed in Cuba. It is proved by the experience of regiments in home camps, regiments that never reached Cuba yet suffered death losses far in excess of the battle casualties of any regiment at the front. It is proved by the condition in which the troops from the front reached Montauk, a worse condition than that in which they left Cuba. It is proved by the unanimous testimony of disinterested witnesses who visited Montauk. It is proved by the notorious fact that weak and invalid soldiers were forced to go to New York by the Long Island railroad, suffering all the miseries of railroad travel in summer on the most exasperating line north of Florida, when they could have been transported more comfortably, and often more directly to their destinations, by water. It is proved by the unvarying testimony of the soldiers themselves, when among friends at home they feel that they can speak freely without incurring the penalties of military discipline. It is proved by the ineffectually suppressed official inquiry into the sanitary conditions at Chickamauga. It is proved by the fact that the whole press of the United States, regardless of party, and without other exceptions than a few thick and thin administration supporters of the Hanna breed, agree in their reports that the mismanagement was scandalous. There is no denial of the mismanagement outside of the war department and its environs. The only point of disagreement, and the only point upon which investigation is needed, except as a basis for further inquiry, is as to where the blame should rest.

There has been a strong tendency to lay the blame upon the regimental officers of volunteer regiments. That these regiments had among their officers a full complement of incompetents, martinets, and sluggards, is doubtless true. But the war department cannot shift responsibility for that. The national guard regiments were not accepted as regiments. They were not allowed the right to select their own officers. The government asserted absolute control in that particular. And though national guard regiments did in great degree retain their own officers, it was at all times within the power of the war department to displace them. If then the volunteer officers were incapable of caring for their men, and the department knew it as it professes, then the department itself is responsible for not putting competent officers in their places. From some of the war department reports, however, we are inclined to believe that the department is responsible in a more reprehensible way for the inefficiency of officers of national guard regiments. These officers are charged by the department with not understanding the red tape of supply-getting. If that charge be well founded, why did not the department furnish them with specific instructions? If supplies are kept in secret places, like the goat of a masonic lodge, it was the duty of the war department to see that inexperienced officers promptly learned the mystery of getting at them. Could no worse complaint be brought against the national guard officers than that they did not know how to untie department tape so as to get supplies for their men, their record would be good enough. When the department endeavors to shift responsibility to them on that score, it only adds to its own condemnation.

But the weakest position in this matter is that of the fellows who attempt to throw the blame upon congress. Congress has many faults to answer for, but this is none of its sins. It voted money abundantly for the prosecution of the war. While in session it made no effort to direct the war, and of course it made none after it adjourned. The whole matter was left to the management of the commander-in-chief. He appointed offi-

cers; he had the power to remove them. He was as absolute as Napoleon in all that related to the management of the war, and his supplies were practically without limit. Even when he appointed sons and nephews, at the solicitation of congressmen, it was upon his own responsibility. To attempt then to shoulder the responsibility for mismanagement upon congress is utterly without justification. That responsibility, no matter who may be immediately to blame, must rest upon the president himself.

A double purpose can be readily discerned in the first effort to pick a quarrel with the Philippine natives. The war was over so quickly that there was embarrassment in finding excuses for keeping under arms a considerable number of volunteers, who might be insensibly transformed into that increase of the standing army which has so long been conspired for; and the fight in the streets of Manila, which was unquestionably started by the Americans, afforded a splendid excuse for sending out there a large body of troops whose disbandment might otherwise have been demanded by public opinion. So the quarrel helped on the large standing army scheme. But a still more important inducement to foment trouble is the excuse it would offer for establishing a military protectorate, under which the pirates that surround and to no inconsiderable extent make up the administration might find a free field for plunder.

One would suppose that the exposures already made in connection with the management of the war might warn these delinquents to be cautious; but it must be remembered that they have every reason to suspect that public indignation will not leave them long in possession of their present opportunities, or at any rate that the simple confidence which might have allowed McKinley to go on unquestioningly parcelling out the Philippines among his favorites has been destroyed. The necessity with them is therefore strong to make a bold stroke, and what could be bolder or more likely to succeed than to stir up native hostility? Nothing. Nothing, that is to say, unless our own people awake to the fact that it is no impertinence on the part of Aguinaldo and his followers to seek to manage their own affairs without foreign interferenee.

Treasury officials are cautiously putting out an intimation that it will be necessary to continue the present stamp taxes until the Dingley tariff law can be so revised as to be more productive of revenue. Is it so, then, that the Dingley law is such a failure as a revenue raiser that even treasury officials admit it? What a blessing the war has been to Mr. Dingley! If there had been no stamp taxes to eke out the customs revenues how would he have made even himself believe that his bill is what he claimed it to be? With opportunities for employment as scarce as ever and wages as low as ever, while customs revenues are too small to meet public expenses more than a year after the Dingley bill went into operation, the Dingleyotic promises of McKinleyism look more than ever like a grand bunco game.

American editors who indulge in sneers at Aguinaldo, the Philippine president, for making "an innocent demand for a share of the booty captured by the Americans at Manila," need to be reminded that the making of war an opportunity to get booty is still a civilized proceeding. Let us not sneer at Aguinaldo for having an appetite for sharing booty, until the episode of our army and navy officers quarreling over the captured ships at Santiago shall have been quite forgotten.

In his letter of acceptance as the populist candidate for member of the board of county assessors of Cook county, Ill., Clarence Moeller makes a remarkable statement. He says that more than 90 per cent. of the land values of Cook county is owned by less than 10 per cent. of the voters. Is this true? If not, it can be easily refuted. If it is true, it is evidence of a concentration of wealth which should make every thoughtful man pause. If 90 per cent. of the area of a county like Cook were owned by ten per cent. of the voters—90 acres in every 100 by only 10 voters in every 100—we should be appalled. But really it is much more appalling to consider that 90 per cent. of the land values are so owned. For land values are the pecuniary measure of the social advantages which a locality has to offer. The meaning, therefore, of Mr. Moeller's statement is that 10 per cent. of the voters of Cook county own 90 per cent. of the social advantages. It means that here is an instance of the universal tendency of social progress to enrich the few. To counteract that tendency Mr. Moeller proposes the abolition of taxes on the kinds of property which men earn by their labor, and the concentration of all taxes upon land values. Even the simplest mind should be able to see that if that reform did nothing else, it would produce a more equitable distribution of social benefits. Under such a system of taxation the profits of merely owning land would fall and the profits of using it would rise.

The Southern Pacific railroad republicans of California could have rendered Congressman Maguire no greater service in his campaign for governor than by adopting the plank in their platform in which, referring to the fact that he is a follower of Henry George, they "oppose the doctrine of the single tax, of which the democratic nominee is the apostle, as being socialistic and anarchistic, and the practical workings of which will be to release stocks, bonds, corporations and usurers from taxation and place all its burdens on the farmers and owners of homesteads." The foregoing plank shows how low in demagogy the republican party has fallen, since it drifted away from the traditions of Abraham Lincoln and

accepted the guidance of the De-Youngs and the Hannas. This plank is welcomed by Joseph Leggett, editor of the single tax department of the San Francisco Examiner, as something which is "as unexpected as it is gratifying to single-taxers."

And well it may be. To say nothing of the crass ignorance which could describe the single tax, or anything else, as both anarchistic and socialistic—two ideas that are antipodal—this plank will soon bring its sponsors to grief for having attempted, with that little knowledge which is a dangerous thing, to fool California farmers. It is easy to say in a platform that the single tax would exempt stocks and bonds from taxation; but it is very much easier to prove on the stump that the stocks and bonds that the California farmer hates are the kind which the single tax would wipe out of existence. So again it is easy to say in a platform that the burdens of taxation under the single tax would fall wholly upon farmers; but it is ever so much easier to prove to the satisfaction of farmers that they pay the great burden of taxes under the present system, whereas under the single tax they would pay a comparatively small tax. The value of farming land, irrespective of improvements, is a trivial part of the working farmer's possessions; and that would be the basis of his single tax. But the value of land is a very large part of the possessions of big ranchers, railroad moguls, and city landlords; and that would be the basis of their tax. Congressman Maguire is to be envied. He has in his campaign not only a good cause and the support of a host of shrewd friends, but what is often of more use in a fight, the opposition of a fool enemy.

The democratic party of Iowa has taken a stand from which it ought never to recede, and to which the national party and the people themselves must come if this country is to be saved from the clutch of plutocracy. It has demanded an amendment of the amending clause of the federal constitution, to the end that any alteration of that instrument may be thereafter made by a majority vote of the two houses of congress, confirmed by a majority vote of the people at the succeeding general election. The author of the plank in the democratic platform of Iowa which makes this demand, is John H. Quick, mayor of Sioux City. He argues for it in this vigorous fashion:

> The United States constitution is a tool to promote the public welfare. Only the intellectually dead look upon it as a fetish to be worshiped. People who delight in using the brains of a century ago to do their thinking with are apt to froth at the mouth when constitutional amendments are spoken of. Yet, nobody can deny that the only safeguard of the constitution is its power of growth, and it can grow through amendment only. The stagnationists will always oppose amendments. But if the constitution is to live, it must change, for life is only another term for change, and the constitution of the United States, as it now stands, is, to all intents and purposes, practically unamendable.

It is unfortunately true, as Mayor Quick says, that the federal constitution is practically unamendable. It cannot be amended unless a two-thirds vote in both houses of congress is secured for the amendment, followed by a ratification by the legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the states; and while it is true that a convention for proposing amendments may be called by two-thirds of the states, yet the amendments so proposed, like those proposed by congress itself, do not become valid until the legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the states have ratified them. With such restrictions upon amendments, no amendment is possible without virtual revolution. A more unelastic system of government could not be conceived. No other nation is so trammeled. Even autocratic Russia could be changed to a democracy with greater ease than we could substitute direct for indirect taxation. The voice of the people is said to be the voice of God, and properly understood that saying is a true one; yet in our constitution we have placed insurmountable obstacles in the way of its expression. Mayor Quick's proposition would remove those obstacles. To what he proposes no one can object who does not wish to keep the people in a strait-jacket. Any change that congress might adopt and a majority of the people ratify could do no real harm. To oppose this reform is to oppose the doctrine that the majority should rule.

The democrats of Ohio are to be numbered hereafter with the political parties that have demanded the adoption of the initiative and referendum. In their platform of this year L. A. Russell, of Cleveland, secured the insertion of the following plank: "That as this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we favor a reference of all laws to the people themselves, so far as practicable, under the mode first devised and successfully practiced by the enlightened republic of Switzerland, known as the initiative and referendum." Under this wise system, as we have frequently explained, no legislation could be foisted upon the people without their consent. The occupation of the lobby in all its forms would be gone. The boss would lose his greatest power. No laws would be valid under that system, no steals could take effect, unless the people had voted upon them directly and approved them. Legislatures would be what they ought to be, committees to frame bills and discuss legislation; the act of legislation would be performed by the people themselves.

The tin plate ring, which drummed up tariff protection for tin plate, all for the benefit of the American workingman, is now preparing to establish a tin plate trust. According to the statements of some of the leaders in this laudable scheme for the protection of American industry, tin plate production in the United States

has been overdone, and for that reason the trust is to be organized, so as to shut up superfluous establishments. The closed establishments, however, as in all cases of trusts, are to be paid their dividends the same as if they were at work. Thus the production of tin plate is to be lessened so as to increase its price, and by reducing the number of employes to reduce wages. The profits of the ring are to go up, while the benefits to the public are to come down. What a great and glorious thing is the policy of protection!

In a recent magazine article, Whitelaw Reid boldly advocates the acquisition by this country of land beyond seas, without the slightest reference to the wishes of the inhabitants. Worse still, he proposes that these acquisitions be made with the definite purpose of never admitting the acquired territory to statehood, but of always holding it as private property of the United States. This proposition, in manifest defiance of the principles of the declaration of independence, has but one quality to recommend it. It is free from hypocrisy. Believing in imperialism, Mr. Reid advocates imperialism. Most of the statesmen who agree with him object to being called imperialists. But it is evident from his magazine article that he would rather glory in the name than not, and that his neglect to claim it is in deference only to the sensitiveness of his thin-skinned fellow imperialists. In these days of Satanic respectability, it is delightful to listen to a man who, when he pleads for a devilish policy, minces nothing.

Political reformers who adopt a theory diametrically opposed to the sound democratic maxim, that "principles not men" are the essential thing, are often as confiding as a bird with salt on its tail. A case in point is that of the New York reformers who have gone solemnly at work to nominate an independent ticket with Rough Rider Roosevelt as candidate for governor. In doing so they announce it as their purpose to break down bossism and the party machine. Yet Roosevelt is of the machine machiney, and he is the choice of Boss Platt himself. That shrewd manipulator of party politics, that very god of the machine, with the reluctance he always displays when pretending to be forced into doing what he particularly wants to do, has given out instructions to his "cappers" and "heelers" that the regular convention must nominate Roosevelt for governor of New York. The reformers think they have captured the boss, but the boss knows that he has "done" them.

That Roosevelt is in the "deal" with Platt is evident from his own interviews and the whole situation; and it is in entire accord with his political history. Roosevelt made his debut in politics along with "Willie" Astor. Both were rich, and both negotiated for the nominations which the proper boss secured for them of the proper machine. Both were ingloriously defeated at the polls. Then Roosevelt renounced bosses and machines, and in 1884 came to the front side by side with George William Curtis, in a movement to defeat the great boss, Blaine, before the republican convention. Beaten there, they took the ground that their opposition had been based upon principles that rose higher than party fealty, and withdrew from the convention. Curtis and most of his supporters conscientiously held out; but Roosevelt, after wabbling for awhile, fell back into the machine. He was rewarded two years later for his treachery to anti-machine politics and anti-bossism, with a machine-made and boss-directed nomination for mayor. This was in the famous Hewitt-George campaign, and Roosevelt came out third in the race. Most of the next ten years he spent in pottering over the Chinese variety of civil service reform, while other young men who interested themselves in politics were eagerly debating questions of currency and taxation; and when he entered real political life again, it was at the head of a police department not one single act of which appears to have been in opposition to or even independent of the Boss Platt machine. The reformers who expect to accomplish things by electing "good men" to office, and choose Roosevelt for their standard bearer, might progress faster in the same direction if they substituted Roosevelt's boss for Roosevelt himself.

SUGGESTION AS TO FEDERAL TAXATION.

I.

The first federal government established by the American states after the recognition of their independence by the king of Great Britain, was under the Articles of Confederation, article eight of which reads as follows:

All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States, in congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several states in proportion to the value of land within each state, granted to, or surveyed for, any person, as such land and the buildings and improvements thereon shall be estimated, according to such mode as the United States, in congress assembled, shall, from time to time, direct and appoint. The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the several states within the time agreed upon by the United States, in congress assembled.

Here we had proposed a uniform ad valorem system, operating on land and its improvements alone.

II.

There are two features to be noticed as pertaining to this system. First, the character of the property named as a basis of taxation; and, second, the inherent weakness and impracticability of the system in allowing the tax to be laid by one law-making power, and then to be dependent for collection upon the will of another.

The system was in some respects a fair one. The lands of each state were to be treated alike—each valued under the same conditions and by the same body of assessors, and all standing on the same footing. It was

taken for granted that the ability of the people to bear the federal burden was to be measured in each state by the amount and quality of the lands that had been reduced to a state of productive cultivation, increased by the value of the improvements made. This had in it many of the elements of fairness and equity. But in leaving the collection of the tax to the legislatures of the states respectively, the system contained a provision which in part caused the necessity for a new constitution. The want of power in congress to collect taxes was one of the chief reasons which led to the adoption of the "more perfect union" alluded to in the preamble of our present constitution.

III.

In our present constitution the first clause of the section conferring powers on the general government is that "congress has power to lay and collect taxes"—not only to lay taxes, but also to collect them. But preceding this clause and in the very opening section of the constitution, the character of the taxes to be laid and collected was indicated.

The preamble is merely a resolution that we do form a new government. Given a government, the question is, Where is the law-making power? The constitution promptly answers: The law-making power "shall be vested in a congress of the United States, which shall consist of a senate and house of representatives." But given a government with laws to be executed, how will you raise the money to pay for their execution? Again the constitution promptly answers: "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers," etc. Then come provisions for the census.

Now, this does not mean that if you conclude to lay and collect an occasional direct tax, you can do so only according to numbers. It means that the main system of taxation shall be a system of direct taxes, requiring the several states to contribute in proportion to the representation. This tax was to be laid by the congress and be collected by the congress, under a system operating uniformly throughout and upon all the states.

Taking the constitution itself, and without going outside its text, any candid mind must admit that the naming of direct taxes in the very beginning of the instrument, in such manner as to answer in its proper place the logically arising question, If you have a government how will you support it? was intended to indicate the main method of raising federal revenues. Especially is this so since the only other allusion to taxes is in a section which treats of some 18 or 20 other subjects, and is clearly intended only to grant powers. Surely the power there conferred of laying and "collecting duties, imposts and excises" could not in these circumstances have been intended to be the main source of revenue. The framers of the constitution clearly intended the people to understand that the great body and bulk of our tax burdens were to be borne in a way that would create a proportion between the tax paid and the representation enjoyed, and this under a fixed system unaffected by the vagaries of trade.

IV.

Under the old system of the Articles of Confederation, a scheme of direct taxes had been provided. But that was not the evil intended to be corrected by the new constitution. It was not an evil at all. The evil was the weakness of the old Articles in failing to confer appropriate power for the collection of direct taxes.

THE WEALTH OF THE COUNTRY.

An authority in the brush-heap school of political economy asserts that no economic knowledge can be attained by approaching social problems in a metaphysical way — meaning by "metaphysical way," the way of reasoning from first principles. The true method, according to the philosopher of confusion, is the statistical. He would call that reasoning from facts.

But the trouble is that statistics are not facts. Very often they are not even sense. Take for example the statistical method of computing the wealth of a country, one of the most important computations in the whole range of statistical investigation, and essentially one of the simplest. What is the wealth of a country? Is it the aggregate of individual wealth? Obviously that depends upon what individual wealth consists of. But the statisticians pay no attention to this difference.

If individual wealth consisted only of useful things, which had been brought into existence by man, then the aggregate of individual wealth would of course constitute the wealth of the country. But suppose slaves are part of individual wealth. Then the man who owns $1,000 worth of slaves more than he owned last year is $1,000 wealthier. But the country would not be any wealthier on that account. The slaves as well as their owner are part of the country, and their master's gain simply registers their loss.

Or, suppose that a legislature vests in some favored citizen the exclusive right to sell beer in a certain locality. That citizen then has a privilege which he can trade for money, for $1,000, let us say, and be accounted that much richer than before. But the country would be no richer. What he gains by his special privilege others must lose; and when both he and they are considered, as must be done in estimating the wealth of the country, there is no general gain, his profit being offset by their loss.

Once more, suppose that a piece of bare land increases in value $1,000. Then the owner is $1,000 richer than before. But the country would be no richer on that account. It is the same land. Nothing has been done to it to make it any more useful. Its increase in value is due to nothing that its owner has done, or that anyone else has done for him. This increase is merely a capitalization of the higher ground rent which he is now able to exact from others. It is an increase of value from greater scarcity, greater scarcity of that kind of land, and not from greater plenty. What the beneficiary gains, others must lose. Therefore, though he is richer, the country is no richer.

Yet just such items as these enter into the regular statistical accounts of general wealth. Whatever is accounted wealth to its owner is treated as part of the general wealth, even though it may be the value of a street railway franchise, of a steam railway franchise, of a mining privilege, of

ordinary land values, or of any other mere legal power of the owner to exact tribute from others. If we still had slaves they too would be accounted part of the public wealth by these scientific economists of the brush-heap pattern.

It may be that metaphysics is not the best way of approach to the investigation of social problems, but it is more than certain that no better way is proposed by statisticians whose perceptions are so dull that they can't distinguish between things that add to the well-being of the country as a whole, and things that add only to the well-being of some of the inhabitants at the expense of others. A primary course in common sense metaphysics would do such philosophers no harm even if it did them no good.

NEWS

Charges of mismanagement in connection with the war, especially regarding food supplies and medical attention, have accumulated since the time of the battle of San Juan, but until Thursday, September 8th, all reports from Washington were to the effect that they were unfounded and would be disregarded. On the 8th, however, the Associated Press sent out word from Washington that Secretary Alger and Adjutant General Corbin had joined in a request to the president for a searching investigation. According to this report the president had the matter under advisement, not yet having determined whether to grant the request; but special reports of the same date announced that he had decided to appoint an investigating commission. This was confirmed on the 9th, when the president appointed nine commissioners. They were Lieut. Gen. Schofield, former commanding general of the army; ex-Senator John B. Gordon, of Georgia, formerly of the Confederate service; Greenville M. Dodge, of New York, a corps commander in the Federal service during the civil war; D. C. Gilman, president of Johns Hopkins University, of Baltimore; ex-Senator Charles F. Manderson, of Nebraska, a division commander in the Federal service during the civil war; ex-Secretary of War Robert T. Lincoln; ex-Secretary of War Daniel S. Lamont; Dr. W. W. Keene, a leading physician of Philadelphia; and Col. James A. Sexton, Commander-in-Chief of the G. A. R.

The specific object of the investigating commission named above, as stated by the president in his notifications of appointment, is "to examine into the conduct of the commissary, quartermaster and medical bureaus of the war department during the war, and into the extent, causes and treatment of sickness in the field and in the camps." Gen. Gordon promptly declined to serve. So did Gen. Schofield, Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Lamont, as is currently though not authoritatively reported. Gen. Manderson also declined. Col. Sexton accepted. Among the persons subsequently invited by the president to serve in the place of those declining are Charles Denby, of Indiana, formerly American minister to China, and Eben P. Howell, editor of the Atlanta Constitution.

Evidence of the army mismanagement multiplies. In the six days ending the 14th the number of soldiers who have died is 121. Of these, 68 died of typhoid fever. In 15 cases the cause of death was malaria, in 5 it was dysentery, and in 3 yellow fever; while in 22 cases no cause of death was assigned. Of the total number of deaths, 97 occurred in the United States, 17 on board transports and hospital ships, 8 in Puerto Rico and 9 in Cuba. The total sick at Santiago on the 14th was 911.

Chief Surgeon Charles R. Greenleaf has reported as to the health of troops in the Puerto Rican campaign, explaining how large losses of life were avoided, and attributing the good showing in that campaign "to a carefully followed plan, the execution of which was made possible by the strict discipline and personal attention of Gen. Miles," who, as Dr. Greenleaf says, "saw to it that the sanitary regulations were kept and the orders of the surgeons obeyed." But the good health of the troops in Puerto Rico does not seem to have been maintained. Gen. Brooke reported on the 13th from Ponce, that the sick numbered 1,886, about 18 per cent.; and that of these cases 177 were typhoid fever and 447 malaria. All the troops at Ponce have been removed to camps outside.

Regarding the causes of the unsanitary conditions at Chickamauga, a report was filed by the board appointed to make inquiry, consisting of Gens. Charles F. Roe, J. P. Sanger, and Charles P. Mattocks, but it has been suppressed. From a copy surreptitiously procured it appears that the board reported that the water used was not safe without boiling and that unboiled water had been generally used up to August 1st, for lack of boiling utensils; that there were insufficient facilities for bathing; that tents were over-crowded, the supply being deficient; that the rapid increase of typhoid fever was due mainly to the unsanitary condition of the camps; that much sickness would have been avoided if the tents had been floored, but that lumber was lacking for this purpose; that while the prevalence of typhoid was attributable in some degree to the inexperience of the men and of officers in immediate command, yet there had "also been neglect on the part of the officers largely responsible for the administration of Camp Thomas prior to August 1;" and that but for the reduction of regimental hospitals to mere dispensaries in order to provide for division hospitals the sick would have been more effectively cared for.

Camp Wikoff, at Montauk Point, of which Dr. Senn said some two weeks ago that it would be a typhoid fever pesthole within a month, is being rapidly vacated. One of the infantry volunteer regiments, the 9th Massachusetts, was a mere remnant when it left; company M, which had originally been 77 strong, marched away from the Camp Wikoff with only seven men and no officers.

The first step toward the formal evacuation of Puerto Rico was taken on the 10th, when the American and the Spanish commissions met together in the council chamber of the palace at San Juan. The American commission consists, it will be remembered, of Admiral Schley and Gens. Brooke and Gordon. A similar joint meeting for the evacuation of Cuba was held at Havana on the 11th. The American commission, consisting of Admiral Sampson and Gens. Wade and Butler, had arrived the day before and was received with official ceremony by Gen. Blanco.

The governing council of the provisional government of the republic of Cuba has issued a manifesto to the

Cuban people, giving the history of the movement for Cuban independence, and taking initial steps for the establishment of a permanent government. The document, which is signed by President Maso and Vice President Capote, is a dignified state paper. It declares in behalf of the council that "we should not dissolve, and that the powers we have received from an assembly elected by the people under arms should not vanish," but that the council "should remain as a nucleus and guide for those who have vested such power in us." The manifesto, therefore, calls another assembly to be elected by the people of Cuba, for the purpose of determining the political future of the island. Incidentally, the manifesto expresses fervent gratitude to the United States and supreme confidence in her good faith. The council has also officially declared the war at an end and granted amnesty to all persons guilty of political crimes against the republic.

From the Philippines news reports have suggested difficulties between the Americans and Aguinaldo, but the facts are cabled vaguely. On the 8th it was said that Gen. Merritt had advised Aguinaldo that he must vacate the suburbs of Manila, and that though the time for doing so had not yet expired it was expected that a satisfactory arrangement would be made. On the same date reports from Washington had it that the order to Aguinaldo to vacate the Manila suburbs had been made by Gen. Otis, and that it was in direct obedience to orders from the war department. The latter report added that Aguinaldo, instead of leaving, had taken possession of the works controlling the city's water supply, and was otherwise strengthening his position, conduct which had resulted in orders from Washington for the shipment of 7,000 more troops to the Philippines. On the following day it was predicted by a reliable correspondent with Dewey's fleet, that unless better relations were soon established between Aguinaldo and the Americans serious results would follow. From other Manila sources on the same date, the 9th, the American newspaper-reading public were informed that representatives from all the principal provinces of the Philippines, men who at the same time represented the financial backing of the insurrection, were at Manila endeavoring to influence Aguinaldo to dissolve the Philippine republic and support the policy of American possession of the islands. Further news of the same character came on the 10th. Aguinaldo was said to have demanded the right to occupy a portion of Manila and to have been refused, the refusal being accompanied with an ultimatum that he withdraw his forces from the suburbs "by a given day, in order to avoid friction." It was explained in this report that the disaffection of the natives was due to representations by Spaniards that the United States intended to return the islands to Spain. Then on the 11th, the story of Gen. Otis's ultimatum was repeated with the date for compliance again omitted; but on the 12th the Associated Press reported that on that day the ultimatum had been given fixing the 15th as the outside limit for compliance. On the following day, the 13th, the Associated Press announced that Aguinaldo was then maintaining a role of extreme friendship toward the United States; and on the 14th it appeared that all difficulties had been smoothed over. On that day Aguinaldo sent an officer to ask permission to move a detachment of troops from Lodo, one of the suburbs of Manila. The request was promptly granted and a large detachment of insurgents evacuated Lodo that afternoon, marching through the American lines in the direction of the waterworks and receiving proper military honors en route. The evacuation of the Manila suburbs was completed on the same day by the withdrawal of 13,000 Philippine troops, in a grand march. They were given full military honors by the Americans, and as they marched with arms, colors and bands, they shouted: "Viva Americanos!" "Viva Filipinos Libres!"

Aguinaldo has forced the surrender of the last Spanish garrison on the island of Luzon, and the whole of that island except Manila, which is held by the Americans, is now in his hands. He claims that the republican provisional government is operating in 28 provinces, that 67,000 armed troops are under his command, that he can raise 100,000, and that he holds 5,000 military prisoners. When asked whether his policy would be absolute independence, he declined to answer, asking instead what America intended to do. He remarked, however, that he considered the Americans as brothers, and that "the two sovereign republics were allied against a common enemy." Aguinaldo has sent a commission of three of his adherents to Washington to confer with President McKinley upon the future of the Philippine islands. They sailed from Hong-Kong on the 6th.

Spain's attitude toward the Philippines is indicated by an argument received this week from the Spanish ministry by the French ambassador at Washington. In this argument Spain protests against the capitulation of Manila because made two days after the protocol was signed. She also urges that the United States compel Aguinaldo to liberate 1,000 prisoners, most of whom were placed in his custody by Admiral Dewey.

The Spanish cortes have granted the requisite legislative authority to the ministry to carry out the terms of the peace protocol. The authority is in this language: "The government is authorized to renounce rights of sovereignty and to cede territory in the Spanish colonies in accordance with the peace preliminaries agreed upon with the government of the United States of America." This sanction passed the senate on the 12th, and the chamber of deputies on the 13th. The sessions of both houses were held behind closed doors, but accounts of the proceedings gleaned from members show that a stormy time was experienced. Bitter charges were made against the ministry; and the Spanish generals in Cuba, including Weyler, were unsparingly scored. One senator said of them that they should have sashes tied around their necks instead of their waists. The violent scenes were in the senate. A body composed of republicans, Carlists, and dissenting conservatives joined in a protesting manifesto, and absented themselves from the chamber of deputies, refusing to participate in the proceedings because the sessions for the discussion of the protocol were held in secret. It was expected that a ministerial crisis would come after the sanction of the protocol had been adopted, but as soon as that work had been done the government suspended the session of the cortes. This took place on the 13th, in the midst of an acrimonious debate in the senate. The cortes must be again convoked to ratify the final treaty of peace.

England has a new problem to confront in connection with her expedi-

tion up the Nile valley. Soon after the capture of Omdurman and Khartoum, of which we told last week, news was received by the English at Omdurman that a white military force had taken possession of Fashoda, which is located where the 10th parallel of latitude crosses the Nile, about 400 miles north of Omdurman. Upon receipt of this news, Gen. Kitchener refused to allow any newspaper correspondents to go farther up the river, but sent them all down to Cairo. Consequently there has been a dearth of news from the Soudan. It was expected at that time that Gen. Kitchener would immediately proceed to Fashoda, and this expectation has increased since the confirmation of suspicions that the white military force referred to above is the French expedition under Major Marchand. Fashoda controls the whole of lower Egypt; the Nile at that point could be easily dammed so as to divert the course of the river and turn lower Egypt into a waterless desert. Then, too, French occupation would cut off the English from gratifying their ambition of extending a chain of posts throughout the length of Africa, from Cairo on the north to Capetown at the south. In the occupation of Fashoda by the French, therefore, lies the possibility of a war between France and England. There seems to be little doubt that Gen. Kitchener,—taking advantage of his original orders to unite forces with Major Macdonald, who left Uganda, in British East Africa, early in May en route to Fashoda,—has pushed forward, first cutting his communications so as to avoid embarrassing modifications of his orders and that he intends to dislodge the French.

In France the occupation of Fashoda by a French expedition, which would have excited universal enthusiasm a few weeks ago, is totally overshadowed by the interest in the Dreyfus case. The ministry has not yet agreed to revise Dreyfus's conviction, as it was expected last week that they would. Wire-pulling in the interest of the army, appears to have prevented it. The new minister of war, Zurlinden, who was expected to give his support to the revisionists, disappointed every one. Two explanations were jumped at for this, first that his army friends had influenced him, and second that he had discovered the corruption to be so wide spread in upper army circles that he feared to let in any light. Still it was supposed that the cabinet would take decisive action on the 12th; but this expectation, too, was disappointed. President Faure gave the deciding vote against revision. It is announced in the Paris press that rather than permit a revision he will resign and seek reelection by the national assembly convened to elect his successor.

In the massacre of Christians by Mussulmans in Crete, reported last week, about 600 men, women and children were burned alive or otherwise murdered. The British vice consul whose murder was noted in last week's report, proves also to have been the American consular agent, and reparation will be demanded by the United States. It was stated at Washington on the 13th that four American warships would be sent to Crete. This, however, may be doubted. The British admiral has demanded of the Turkish military commander of Crete that he deliver up the ring leaders in the massacre, surrender the fort and ramparts defending the town, and disarm the Mussulman troops. In this demand for disarmament, the other admirals of the international fleet have joined. All the admirals, also, have joined in requesting their respective governments to insist upon the expulsion from Crete of the bashibazouks (irregular and unpaid volunteers in the Turkish army), upon the recall of the regular Turkish troops and authorities, and upon the appointment of a governor general acceptable to the Cretans, who are mostly Christians. In view of the admiral's ultimatum, the Mussulman authorities at Candia have arrested several ringleaders of the massacre, but the Porte is stubborn. It has sent a circular note to the powers accusing the British of having provoked the massacre, and announcing its decision to refuse to recall the Turkish troops from Crete.

The most sensational event of the week, though of minor importance historically, was the assassination of the consort to the Emperor of Austria. This occurred at about 2 o'clock on the afternoon of the 10th, in Geneva, Switzerland. The empress was on her way to a steamer, accompanied by ladies of her suite, when a strange man struck her a violent blow upon the chest. Her assailant ran away, while her friends carried her to the boat. It was not supposed that she was seriously injured, until attempts to restore her to consciousness revealed a drop of blood upon an under garment, which led to the discovery that her heart had been pierced with a three-cornered stiletto. The wound was one-sixth of an inch wide.

The assassin of the Austrian empress was arrested. At first he said he had come to Geneva to assassinate her, but afterwards claimed that the Duc d'Orleans was his intended victim. The assassin's name is Lucheni. He is an Italian. When asked to explain the motive of his crime, he said he was an anarchist, doing his duty "as executor for those who are in the world without work and are denied even necessary food and drink." He expressed himself as ready and willing to die. Asked why he chose as a victim an inoffensive woman, he replied that she was the only person holding a position of importance whom he could reach. He denied having any accomplices. To the inquiry, would he have murdered King Humbert or Crispi had he been able, he answered: "Humbert, oh, yes, with pleasure; not Crispi. Crispi is a thief; he stole 500,000 lire. I should have taken more in his place. I take off my hat to thieves. I never murder a thief." Then he laughed. He laughs and sings cheerfully, and to remove any embarrassment due to the fact that capital punishment is not lawful in Switzerland, he offers voluntarily to go to Austria, hoping, he says, that he may be beheaded. The man makes the impression upon American observers that he is a cunning lunatic full of bravado.

Lucheni's crime has had the usual exciting effect. Numerous arrests have been made, and one man has confessed to being an accomplice, though no evidence can be obtained which incriminates him. In the excitement all sorts of lawless proposals are gravely made for setting aside the laws of Switzerland so as to put down this kind of lawlessness, and England and the United States are again appealed to in behalf of autocratic governments of the continent to join them in denouncing what they vaguely call "anarchists," as international outlaws.

In the field of American politics, there have been one election and four nominating conventions. The election was in Maine. That state was carried by the republicans as usual, but by a majority considerably be-

low that of the election of 1896. The republican vote was about 35 per cent. less than in 1896, and the democratic vote about 12 per cent. more. The democrats gain 12 members in the lower house of the legislature. Speaker Reed's vote fell off 4,000. The republican majority for governor was in round numbers 25,000 as against 48,000 for the same candidate in 1896. This result is claimed by the democrats as confirming the impression created by the Vermont election of a week ago, that the elections this year are going against the republicans. In Vermont the republican vote fell off from 38,000 in 1896, to 24,000. Fusion between the populists, the silver republicans and the the silver republicans and the democrats has been accomplished in Colorado, the governorship going to the democrats. In Delaware the democrats nominated on the 13th, and on the same day the republicans nominated in New Hampshire. The democratic convention of Utah was chiefly notable for its presentation of the mismanagement of the war as a campaign issue.

NEWS NOTES.

—Gen. Miles arrived at Washington on the 9th.

—The International Plasterers' association met at Indianapolis on the 12th.

—Roosevelt's rough riders were mustered out on the 13th at Camp Wikoff.

—The organization of the gold democracy in Massachusetts was disbanded on the 9th.

—The Turkish government has forbidden the entrance of foreign Jews into Palestine.

—Thomas M. Cooley, the famous constitutional lawyer, died on the 12th at Ann Arbor, Mich.

—A heavy snowfall occurred on the 9th in eastern Colorado and western Kansas and Nebraska.

—A silver manufacturing trust, with $15,000,000 capital, has been formed under the laws of New Jersey.

—The sixth biennial convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen met at Toronto on the 12th.

—Lorenzo Snow has been elected president of the Mormon church, in place of the late President Woodruff.

—The fifty-third annual convention of the Order of United American Mechanics met on the 13th at Cleveland.

—Col. James A. Sexton was elected on the 8th as commander in chief of the G. A. R., at the encampment at Cincinnati.

—The National Association of Newsdealers, Booksellers and Stationers met in annual convention at New York on the 13th.

—The whole business portion of New Westminster, B. C., was destroyed by fire on the 10th, the loss being over $2,500,000.

—The National Single Taxer has begun publication from New York City, with James R. Brown as business manager and Joseph Dana Miller as editor.

—Admiral Cervera with his staff and 1,700 other Spanish prisoners sailed on the 12th, by the City of Rome, from Portsmouth, N. H., for Santander, Spain.

—The town of Jerome, near Prescott, Ariz., was completely wiped out by fire on the 11th, with a loss of over $1,000,000 in property and a score of lives.

—The single tax party of Delaware has nominated a full state ticket in that state. It expects to increase its last vote, which was considerably more than 1,000.

—Carl Smith and Louis Sass, popular newspaper men of Chicago, were drowned on the 9th, while shooting the rapids of the Grande Discharge of the Saguenay river.

—It is announced in Rome that Italy has severed diplomatic relations with the Republic of Colombia, because the latter refuses to recognize the British minister as the Italian representative.

—The Barbadoes islands, in the Windward group of the Lesser Antilles, have been swept by a hurricane, which killed hundreds of persons and made thousands homeless. Kingston, the capital of St. Vincent, a town of 4,500, is totally destroyed.

—The national committee of the gold democracy met at Chicago on the 14th. Chairman Bynum resigned and George Foster Peabody, of New York, was elected in his place. The treasurer's report showed the expenditures since the presidential campaign to have been $22,000, and that $10,000 remains in the treasury.

—At the session of the British association at Bristol, England, on the 8th, it was announced that Prof. Ramsey and Mr. Travers had discovered another elemental gas, which they called xenon. Its spectrum is analogous to that of argon, but the position of the lines differs, and it seems to exist only in minute quantities.

—The currency congress met at the Omaha exposition on the 13th. Papers were read or speeches made that day by J. Sterling Morton, Edward Atkinson, Horace White and Louis H. Ehrich, on the gold side, and by H. F. Bartine on the side of silver. On the 14th, the speakers were Senator Allen, ex-Congressman Towne, George Fred Williams, Anson Wolcott and Judge Sheldon on the silver side, and ex-Senator Carey and Congressman Fowler for gold. President Wills, of the Kansas Agricultural college, also spoke.

MISCELLANY

"THE OLD-TIME WAIL."

Still Dives hath no peace. Broken his slumber,
His feasts are troubled and his pleasures fail—
For still he hears from voices without number
The old-time wail.

They gather yet, in field, and town, and city,
The people, discontented, bitter, pale;
And murmur of oppression, pain and pity,
The same old wail.

And weary Dives, jaded in his pleasures,
Finding the endless clamor tiresome—stale—
Would gladly give a part of his wide treasures
To quiet that old wail.

Old? Yes, as old as Egypt. Sounding lowly,
From naked millions in the desert hid,
Starving and bleeding while they builded slowly
The Pharoah's pyramid.

As old as Rome. That endless empire's minions
Raised ever and again the same dull cry,
And even Caesar's eagle bent his pinions
While it disturbed the sky.

As old as the dark ages. The lean peasant,
Numerous, patient, still, as time went by,
Made his lord's pastimes something less than pleasant,
With that unceasing cry.

It grew in volume down the crowding ages—
Unheeded still, and unappeased it swelled,
And now it pleads in pain, and now it rages—
The answer still withheld.

A century ago it shrieked and clamored
Till trembled emperors, and kings grew pale;
At the gates of palaces it roared and and hammered,
The same old wail.

It got no final answer, though its passion
Altered the face of Europe, monarchs slew;
But ere it sank to silence, in some fashion,
Others were wailing, too!

And now in broad America we hear it
From crowded streets, from boundless hill and vale.
Hear, Dives! Have ye not some cause to fear it?
This old-time wail?

Louder, my brothers! Let us wail no longer,
Like those past sufferers whose hearts did break;
We are a wiser race, a braver, stronger,
Let us not ask, but take.

So Dives shall have no distress soever,
No sound of anguished voice by land or sea;
The old-time wailing shall be stilled forever
And Dives shall not be!

—Charlotte Perkins Stetson.

AT THE FUNERAL OF BISMARCK.

The emperor asked to be shown the floral tributes, and expressed amazement at their size and cost and numbers as Prince Herbert led him from room to room on the ground floor, which was literally heaped with these tributes. . . . I remained two days at Friedrichsruh, and during all that time, by night as well as day, wreaths kept coming to the station in vanloads. Each one was boxed in a packing case, and some of these were eight feet long and nearly as wide. One wreath took up the body of a barouche. All day and far into the night these were hauled into the garden of the castle, until it too was burdened with them like the castle itself. They lay all over the lawns, against the trees and ornaments—everywhere, on every side. There were thousands of them, all huge circlets of palms and flowers or cypress and flowers, and always with long silken ribbons bearing a motto and the names of the senders. They came from sovereigns, princes, parliaments, councils, states, towns, German colonies, clubs, societies, from Li Hung Chang, even from Empress Frederick. Indoors the furniture of the great ground-floor rooms was submerged beneath them.—Julian Ralph, in Harper's Weekly.

IMPERIALISM FATAL TO SELF-GOVERNMENT.

With the acceptance of Hawaii from the hands of the conspirators who captured it by the naval connivance and aid of the United States, a new creed must be evolved to perpetuate the unjust conditions there existing. A justification has to be found for the diminutive oligarchy which controls, without the consent of the governed, a people as much entitled to self-government as President Dole.

The denial of suffrage rights to the Hawaiians, treating truth as geographical, is a betrayal of democracy at home. What shall it profit a nation to conquer all the islands of the sea if thereby the surrender of its own vital principle is the price? . . .

To gain the Hawaiian islands by the loss of our belief in "a government of the people, for the people, and by the people," is a costly exchange. . . .

Lincoln's Gettysburg address and Lowell's classic defense of democracy must be suppressed at Honolulu because they are dangerous utterances under a despotic oligarchy. Every politician henceforth must keep two sets of principles, one for home, the other for colonial consumption, and speak with double tongue. . . .

Republics are unfitted by their principles for holding colonies in practical slavery, no matter how benevolent the intention may be. Hands off the dangerous Philippines!—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, before the Peace Union, Aug. 25.

THE WANT THE NEWSPAPER FILLS.

Philosophically considered, the capture of its great position in the modern world by the newspaper is due to the growing sense that we all belong to one another, that in this immense, complex mesh of civilization each man has a vital interest in what others do. Our closest interests may be affected by something in China or Peru, and we must know about it. The drunkard in the next street has broken out in a mad frenzy, and we must know about that, too. A growing sense for all the facts of life, for all the news we can get about the affairs of this great world, has taken possession of all men, and the newspaper is the organ through which that taste is gratified. Would that it were gratified, we are often tempted to say, in a more intelligent way! But that will come in time. Plato thought it an evil that the art of writing had been invented because it had sapped the powers of memory. What would he say to-day of the "yellow journals" of New York, or the varieties of penny "bits" in London? We must, however, pass through this phase, which is a crude and often vulgar way of supplying what is a great and inevitable need—the demand by the modern man for knowing more and more about his fellow-men. Literature, however attractive, will not meet this demand, because it is a demand for the instant fact, not for the historic event. The demand can only be met by the newspaper; and so the excitement of Chicago for the loss of her journals can, after all, be perhaps justified at the bar of reason.—The London Spectator.

THE VALUE OF TRIAL BY JURY.

An extract from Joseph H. Choate's defense of the jury system before the American Bar association at its twenty-first annual meeting lately held in Saratoga.

A thrilling event of prime importance in its relations to jurisprudence has occurred in France, which must have arrested the attention of every thoughtful observer, and have led especially those sagacious theorists who have never tired of denouncing trial by jury, and those experimental philosophers and legislators who are always seeking to limit or to mutilate it, or tamper with it in some way or other, to reconsider the matter and think once more whether we should not do better to let it alone, or only sustain and improve it so as to reserve it inviolate, as the Constitution of the United States and those of most of the states require.

You will readily recall the main incidents of the trial of Zola. Every safeguard of personal liberty enjoyed in England and America for two centuries had been violated. We could not read the account of the trial without contrasting it with our own trial by jury, or without the pious utterance from every lip: "Thank God! I am an American."

Heroic Zola! It is pleasant to think of him enjoying the free air of Switzerland after all, having taken French leave of his country, instead of rotting in the dungeon to which her despotism under a republican mask would have consigned him.

This signal event, so shocking to our sense of justice and right, has done more, I am happy to believe, than whole volumes of argument to strengthen and perpetuate our faith in our wholly different system of procedure for the ascertainment of facts on which life, liberty or property are to be brought in judgment. It will help to preserve in its integrity our precious trial by jury, by which no man can be deprived of life or liberty by the sentence of a court until his guilt has been proved beyond all reasonable doubt to the unanimous satisfaction of 12 of his fellow-citizens, and no man can lose his reputation or his property by judgment of a court until by a clear preponderance of evidence his right to it has been disproved before a similar tribunal.

IS HARPER'S WEEKLY A YELLOW JOURNAL?

The other day the remnant of the Seventy-first regiment which was spared by war and disease came home to recover or to die. The men who rode could not have walked from the battery to their armory without disastrous consequences. The regiment went to the war 1,043 strong. It lost 14 killed in battle, and 64 were wounded, and 331 were in line or in the cars. The rest were dead, or on furlough, or in hospital in Cuba and at Camp Wikoff, and those who returned were, most of them, gaunt and yellow images of the men they had been, some of them so weak that they wept because of the kindness of their reception, while others stared at the cheering crowds with the wild strange look of men to whom the things of earth are of little moment. . . .

A terrible episode has occurred in the history of the country—an episode so criminal that the glory of war and victory has been dimmed by the wrath caused by the wrongs and sufferings of the soldiers who have fought the war and achieved the glory. . . .

Thirty-three years ago we saw the soldiers coming home after a war that had endured for four years. Many of them had lived in camps and fought over fields from which the skeletons of to-day are carried to the hospital. We saw the veterans of that great conflict march home. Their ranks were thin. Some companies brought back a file or two led by a non-commissioned officer. Some men rode in carriages; but they were wounded men, not men sick with fevers. The men who marched moved with the vigorous stride of health. In that day we did not see such ghastly reminders of the war as we are seeing now in camp and on the return of the men who enlisted for the war, unless we saw the victims of southern prisons. Then we saw men starved because their captors had nothing for them. Now we see men starved and fever-stricken because their government has not the capacity to take care of them, and even seems indifferent to their suffering.

The sufferings of our soldiers must not be forgotten. If the people of the country permit this scandal to find a grave before some one is punished, they will thereby make themselves accomplices in the crime.—Harper's Weekly.

THE REAL DESTROYERS OF CIVILIZATIONS.

An extract from a review of Rodolfo Lanciani's "Pagan and Christian Rome," by Prof. George D. Herron, published in The Kingdom.

Who were the real destroyers of Rome; of its palaces and monuments of immense art and marble splendors? Upon this subject I learned much from other authorities in Rome as well as Prof. Lanciani. But in the book under discussion, "Pagan and Christian Rome," Prof. Lanciani makes quite clear that the real destroyers and spoilers of ancient Rome were not the Huns and Vandals of our school-day histories, and of Macaulay's declamation, but the priests, property owners and politicians of Rome itself. The Coliseum was for centuries the great marble quarry from which the popes and nobles took the materials for the building of their palaces, tombs and churches. No historic structures or monuments were sacred to these political and priestly Vandals. Anastasius IV. "removed the remains of a canonized empress from" a "noble sarcophagus in order to have his own placed in it." The best frescoes, the finest tombs, the most beautiful paintings, some of them dating from the first century, manuscripts and relics of priceless value, were stolen, and finally scattered far and wide. Catacombs were destroyed and tombs rifled, purely for the sake of finding treasure that could be turned into gold or money. Speaking of a certain church, Prof. Lanciani says:

> Here, also we find the evidence of the gigantic work of destruction pursued for centuries by the Romans themselves, which we have been in the habit of attributing to the barbarians alone. The barbarians have their share of responsibility in causing the abandonment and the desolation of the Campagna; they may have looted and damaged some edifices, from which there was a hope of a booty; they may have profaned churches and oratories erected over the tombs of martyrs—but the wholesale destruction, the obliteration of classical and medieval monuments, is the work of the Romans and of their successive rulers. To them, more than to the barbarians, we owe the present condition of the Campagna, in the midst of which Rome remains like an oasis in a barren solitude.

So the great ruins that remain in Rome, that spread out over the Campagna, which the traveler is in the habit of viewing as the work of barbarian invaders, is really the destructive work of the Roman upper classes. The devastated splendor which makes Rome seem like the graveyard of history to one who looks out upon it from the hills of the Caesars, is a vast monument to the wolfish selfishness which was always the chief characteristic beneath the pomp and strut of Roman knight and orator. The Huns and Vandals who destroyed Rome were the Roman rulers. The politicians and preachers still work the Huns and Vandals, with the destruction of Rome, as warnings of what will happen to civilization if we listen to social agitators and permit them to arouse the people. But the priests and politicians, and the propertied classes whom they serve, are the real barbarians who destroyed not only Rome; they are the Huns and Vandals of all arts, nations and institutions. The barbarians whom the people need to fear, and who are preparing the destruction of both civilization and the peoples, are these same Huns and Vandals—the great property owners, the ecclesiastical managers, the politicians; these are ever the destroyers of liberty, faith and all that is good.

VERY INTENSIVE FARMING.

In that part of Chicago known as Brookdale, about nine miles out on the Illinois Central railroad, is located a small plat of ground which is put to more varied use, perhaps, than any tract of similar area in the entire city. The neighbors refer to it as the "menagerie," though the term is applied in no ill nature, as a better-behaved, better-kept menagerie never existed than the aggregation of flesh and fowl whose members thrive and grow fat on this little Brookdale lot.

The lot is owned by Addison Foy and faces Madison avenue, near Seventieth street. Its dimensions are 25 by 125 feet. An enumeration of the various fowls of the air and beasts of the field that are quartered there, to say nothing of the variety of vegetables and flowers growing thriftily out of the soil, would make the very shade of old Noah turn green with envy. There are dogs and cats, chickens and rabbits, a horse and a canary bird, peas and beans, goats, turkeys, lettuce, squash, ducks, radishes, cucumbers, cabbages, tomatoes, onions, geese, corn, flowers, doves, and a small boy. There are hencoops and duckhouses, kennels, and barns, and tiny gables wherein old mother hens and their large broods of fluffy chicks are kept, to say nothing of the snug cottage which occupies at least a good one-third of the 25 by 125 foot lot, and in which Mr. and Mrs. Foy and their small son are comfortably housed.

The following is a list of the inmates of the yard: One horse, 246 chickens, 15 hens, 1 rooster, 2 rabbits, 1 goat, 1 kid, 26 ducklings, 3 goslings, 1 dog, 3 turkeys, 1 canary bird, 1 cat, 1 kitten, 2 doves, and 3 guinea chicks.

But this is not all. Five hens are now sitting, each with from a dozen to 15 eggs under her, so there are prospects of new broods of from 60 to 75 additional hatchable things.

There are some inconveniences as the result of the crowded conditions. For instance, the number of gates must be reduced to a minimum, as gates require space wherein to swing. As a solution of the gate problem, therefore, so far as the goat's pen is concerned, that animal is each evening gently and submissively lifted over the low fence into the pen in which he is confined at night, and in the morning lifted out again to roam a vacant lot adjoining the Foy premises. Here the chickens are also allowed occasionally to taste the blessedness of comparative freedom.

The barn in which the horse is kept is pretty small for the horse to stand in and feed in at the same time, so the animal eats his oats from a box inside the south fence, standing the while in the same vacant lot next door and eating over the fence.

The marvel of it all would appear

to be how the numerous charges of the Foys are kept in healthy condition. That they are healthy is apparent. Never did sturdier chicks scratch for bugs than those that Mrs. Foy's watchful eye espies just as they are about to commit depredations in the garden. Never were there lustier peeps and quacks than these same chicks and the ducklings, which, by the way, are rapidly developing into ducks, emit when the breakfast hour draws nigh and they are released from the little coops and pens with which the small yard bristles. The yard is a wonder as to cleanliness. A casual glance would indicate that it was a well-kept garden, with a few fowls in pens. Upon walking through it, however, one discovers in every conceivable nook a pointed coop, nestling under the shade of a tomato vine, or overhung with morning glories, in which a mother hen contentedly clucks, and about which fluffy bits of animated down are darting. One cannot step without danger of crushing little chickens that are allowed the run of the yard during the day.

Every morning Mr. Foy drives several miles out into the country and returns with the box of his buggy filled to overflowing with tender wild lettuce, which is given to those older fowls that are not allowed to roam at large. As the hundreds of growing things become large enough, they are sold. As a matter of fact, were they all fully grown, the small area of the back yard would not hold them, even were they packed in as closely as they could stand. Under the present circumstances, as they grow, the garden space is encroached upon to enlarge the pens and build additional ones. But this makes little difference to the Foys, as with wise forethought they saw to it that the vegetables first out of season were planted nearest the pens. By next spring they expect to have disposed of the majority of their poultry, and will thus be in a position to begin operations all over again. Let Mr. Pingree, of vegetable garden fame, come to Chicago and take lessons in economy of the soil.—Chicago Inter Ocean.

LOVING YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF.

An extract from an editorial in the New Church Messenger.

If we were actuated by the higher form of neighborly charity, by that love described in the "new commandment" the Lord gave his disciples, in which we are told to love each other as the Lord loves us, and if we should seek to carry out practically that divine law by always putting ourselves last, and ever externally and outwardly laying down our life for the neighbor, our method of life would defeat its own purpose. There is a conceit in the outer humiliation of self more than others, in which the love of self would flourish. There is a vanity in making self different from the neighbor (even when that difference consists in seemingly trampling self under foot) in which self-love can be satisfied and grow strong. Self-righteousness, the most subtle and deadly of all evils, is cultivated in man's heart when he outwardly humiliates himself under the inspiration of the notion that by so doing he manifests a diviner love than others possess. No height, then, of love to the neighbor, no interior quality of self-sacrifice for others, can be expressed by a purer and more efficient law than that which teaches you to treat your neighbor as you treat yourself.

But were it possible to make one's self better than others by placing self last, we should have no right to do it. If it were to make one most heavenly by always yielding one's own wishes, and by always giving one's self to others, then we should have no more right to the heavenly glory of thus giving up self than we have the right to the earthly glory of usurping the wealth of others. If to make one's self last outwardly, is to make one's self first spiritually, it would be no more just for us to insist upon making ourselves last for this purpose, than it is just for us to insist upon being made first for the earthly glory of the position. Others would have as much right to the glory of being last as we. The ambition to excel our neighbors in heavenliness, is more hellish than the ambition to be greater than they in worldly position. If we avoid taking certain positions in life because they involve the question of earthly pride, we have no right to put our neighbors there and subject them to the danger of that pride; so that we are brought back to the law of life described in these words: To love our neighbor as ourselves.

To love one's neighbor as one's self is, in the practical affairs of life, simply to identify one's self with others. It is to look upon one's self as absolutely one with the enighbor. It is to treat one's self as one treats others. It is to enjoy with others equally and justly the pleasures of life. It is to bear with others equally and justly its pains. It is to receive with others of the Heavenly Father's bounties, without claiming either a high reward or expecting a more grievous punishment. It is to look upon the great and good, however much above us they may seem, as being not different from us, but as fellow-mortals, to the Heavenly Father's eye the same as ourselves. It is to look upon those who seem beneath us, and those who are stained with sin, perhaps involved in crime, as in themselves not different from us. To love one's neighbor as one's self is then given to us as such an identification of self with all others that with the angels of Heaven and the devils of hell we recognize ourselves as one, belonging to the former from the Heavenly Father's mercy, extended as much towards us as towards them, and linked with the others by the nature of our own self-love.

THE CHURCH AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT.

An address delivered by the Rev. H. S. Bigelow at the Henry George Birthday Supper in Cincinnati, Sept. 2, 1898. Condensed for The Public.

What is the labor movement? What is the church? What can the church do for the labor movement? What can the labor movement do for the church?

Those who see in the labor movement simply the demand for a larger wage, may regard it as a symptom of the materialism of the age, another evidence of the lust of gain. If it is materialistic for a hungry man to want something to eat, then we are all materialists. If it is materialistic for an idle man to want employment, then who is not guilty of materialism? Material comforts are indispensable to the higher life. If a demand for more of these comforts is born of a desire for this higher life, this demand is quite the reverse of materialism.

Good Deacon Anxiety says to me: "The church should be a spiritualizing power. I regret seeing it engulfed in the materialism of the labor movement." Precisely so. God save the church. God save us all from whatever there is of sordidness in this movement.

Emphatically, however, the labor movement is not all sordid; it is not all materialistic. Whatever selfishness may be present does not pertain to this movement, but rather to our common human nature, as revealed in every movement. This is a materialistic age. Few of us are untainted. Yet, if there is a voice crying out against the materialism of the age it is that voice which utters the aspiration of the labor movement. The ideal of this movement is not charity but justice. It does not seek a division of wealth. It is not opposed to any

class. It demands that no man shall be deprived of the wealth which his labor creates. It demands the abolition of those laws which have had their origin in an age of violence and are the relics of a time when might was right.

The labor movement believes in the golden rule. It believes in it as a sound principle of economics. It believes in it not only for those whose undeserved poverty deprives them of the opportunities which make life worth living, it believes in it for those who are supposed to profit by social wrongs. The labor movement is the "effort of men to live the life of men." It is born of the faith that no man profits by a wrong. It is born of the faith that every man will gain when society shall be organized on the principle of justice. The labor movement has been called the uprising of the best in men. It is humanity aspiring to be more than a beast of burden. It is humanity asking for the fruits of its toil; asking for deliverance from the thraldom which enslaves the mind and imprisons the soul.

Materialism honors the man who has the power to amass a fortune. The labor movement pities the widows and orphans who pay tribute to the millionaires. Materialism honors wealth and power. The labor movement says: "An honest man 's the noblest work of God." Materialism demands larger dividends; the labor movement asks for better men. Emerson said: "Let there be worse cotton and better men." The labor movement sees that there is no break in nature, that better men will make better cotton. The labor movement is the supreme ethical fact of this age, believing, as it does, that the greatest material blessings can be secured only by doing justly, and loving mercy, and calling upon men to labor in this cause, not for themselves, but for the sake of a race that must either gain economic freedom or lose the liberty already purchased with so great a price.

The labor movement "is opposed to all conceptions of religion which makes it a matter of greater importance to the dead than to the living." Yet it is the one supreme religious fact of this age, believing, as it does, that God is in his world, that there are social and economic laws as well as laws of hygiene and mechanics, that to discover and obey these laws is to obey the will of our Maker, and that only through seeking the righteousness of God as revealed in these laws can we find the solution of our problems and the realization of our dreams.

What is the church? Mr. Stead describes it as the union of all who love in the service of all who suffer. The church that seeks to save men's souls from the wrath to come belongs to the dark ages. The church that seeks to save men from the wrath already here is the church we need. Those religionists who dream of golden streets while they give the world over as lost —they are the materialists and atheists of this age. It is the duty of the church to work for a redeemed earth.

As thought precedes action, so souls must be embodied—so a church must preach doctrines and have some sort of organization. But in the true church doctrines are not the end, but the means to an end, and should be such doctrines as will accomplish the end; while organization is merely a weapon of warfare—a means of more efficient service. Salvation does not depend upon subscription to creed. Neither is church membership a duty unless it be found to be helpful to our cause. Coming into church is like joining a single tax club. It is organizing for the world's work.

The supreme concern of the churches to-day is Peace. Nothing must disturb the rest of the saints. Politics must not be touched. Economics must be avoided. Not even the larger religious thought should be whispered, for some one may be offended, a subscription may be cut off. The result is that the church is playing at religion. It is trying the impossible. It is trying to preach religion in the abstract. In consequence the church has lost its hold on the mind and heart of the nation.

Its only remedy is to preach religion in the concrete. Let the church become identified with the labor movement. Let its sympathies be so democratic that no plutocrat will apply for admission. Let its teaching be such as to inspire those who are engaged in this cause. Let it preach a message calling men to the work of the hour. That will vitalize religion as nothing else can. That will purge the church of the hypocrites and Pharisees. The cravens will desert such a church, as rats desert a sinking ship.

This conception of a church is not consistent with the maintenance of an ecclesiastical establishment. Such establishments are like political parties. They may be likened to the tree of truth, which was planted in the day of small beginnings, which battled with the winds of adversity; but when the struggle was over the cowardly birds of the air came and lodged in the branches thereof. Ecclesiastical establishments very soon go to seed and serve only to furnish shelter to those who are willing to court Truth when she is popular. The true church is the servant of truth. It will scorn to maintain its own existence at the expense of truth. It will not idle its days away with quilting bees and leave the seers to struggle alone.

If the labor movement is to-day's form of humanity's upward struggle and if it is the business of the church to uplift humanity, then it is evident that there is a logical connection between this movement and the church. Is there doubt in any man's mind that the labor movement needs the church?

The church in the development of the modern city has been going through a painful stage in its evolution. The supporting members have moved to the suburbs. The city churches are stranded. Nobody knows what to do with them. Twenty-five men could capture almost any one of them and switch it out of the old rut and into the new cause. Suppose one such stand were made. You have a home, a place of meeting where the friends of the cause come to know each other, and the movement develops self-consciousness. You have rooms for clubs and lectures. There grows up a people's university, a school of economics. The new seed is sown. The preaching appeals to those who are seeking light and encouragement. The hymns are labor hymns. Numbers grow. Enthusiasm kindles. The cause is advocated as a religious cause. It is shown to be the cause of Christ. The Bible is appealed to in its support. The movement gathers momentum. Your church becomes the center of agitation, education, inspiration. Nothing succeeds like success.

That church is respected which gets the crowds. Its methods are copied. Many preachers whose sympathies are right are encouraged to take the step. Where they were timid they now become bold. It becomes less and less possible to suppress these questions in the name of religion. At last the gospel of social regeneration becomes orthodox and the cause is won.

This is what the church can do for the labor movement.

And what can the labor movement do for the church? It may rescue the church from the hands of scribes and Pharisees, and save it for religion pure and undefiled.

"Fight not with ghosts and shadows; let us hear
The snap of chain-links. Let our gladdened ear

Catch the pale prisoner's welcome as the light
Follows thy ax-stroke through his cell of night.
Be faithful to both worlds; nor think to feed
Earth's starving millions with the husks of creed.
Servant of him whose mission high and holy
Was to the wronged, the sorrowing and the lowly.
Thrust not his Eden promise from our sphere
Distant and dim beyond the blue sky's span;
Like him of Patmos, see it now and here—
The new Jerusalem comes down to man."

As to the possibility of capturing the church for the labor movement there can be no doubt. And there can be no question either that the movement needs the church or that the church needs the movement.

Moreover, it is something eminently fitting that the single taxers of all reformers should be the ones to make use of the church. Henry George was more than a master of political science. He was a preacher inspired of God. He was a seer of truth, the prophet of a religion as profoundly spiritual as it was intensely practical. He was one of the most faithful interpreters and one of the most loyal disciples of the religion of Jesus the world has ever had. His gospel was the gospel of the Galilean adapted to the needs of an age beset with peculiar problems. Of all places it is in the Christian church and the Christian pulpit that this gospel should be preached.

Ah, what a pentecostal day that will be for the world when the church begins to labor with the martyr spirit for the realization of this prophet-dream! If we would feel the deeply religious character of the man and the message let us listen again to his own imperishable words:

With want destroyed, with greed changed to noble passions, with the fraternity born of equality taking the place of the jealousy and fear that now array men against each other; with mental power loosed by conditions that give the humblest comfort and leisure; and who shall measure the heights to which our civilization may not soar? Words fail the thought. It is the Golden Age of which the poets have sung and high-raised seers have told in metaphors. It is the glorious vision which has always haunted man with gleams of fitful splendor. It is what he saw whose eyes at Patmos were closed in a trance. It is the culmination of Christianity, the city of God on earth, with its walls of jasper and its gates of pearl. It is the reign of the Prince of Peace.

Do not flatter yourself that you are intelligent because you have graduated at some college or made a financial success in the present methods of robbery called business. Men followed the same course in the dark centuries of the past, each generation assuming itself the most intelligent. They and their works are forgotten, but the works of those who sought the why and wherefore of existence, and especially of society, have come down to all the ages, gathering truth as they descended. Those who learn not these truths are not possessed of wisdom—are not wise—are not intelligent.—Appeal to Reason.

THE BLIND MEN AND THE ELEPHANT.

It was six men of Hindustan, to learning much inclined,
Who went to see the elephant (though all of them were blind),
That each by observation might satisfy his mind.

The first approached the elephant, and happening to fall
Against his broad and sturdy side, at once began to bawl:
"I surely think the elephant is very like a wall."

The second, feeling of the tusk, cried: "Ho! what have we here
So very round and smooth and sharp? To me 'tis mighty clear
This wonder of an elephant is very like a spear."

The third approached the elephant, and happening to take
The squirming trunk within his hand, then boldly up and spake:
"I see," quoth he, "the elephant is very like a snake."

The fourth reached out his eager hand, and felt about the knee,
"What most this wondrous beast is like is mighty plain," quoth he;
"'Tis clear enough the elephant is very like a tree."

"The fifth, who chanced to touch the ear, said: "E'en the blindest man
Can tell what this resembles most, deny the fact who can,
"This marvel of an elephant is very like a fan."

The sixth no sooner had begun about the beast to grope,
Than seizing on the swinging tail, that fell within his scope,
"I see," quoth he, "the elephant is very like a rope."

And so these men of Hindustan disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion fixed, exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right, and all were in the wrong.
—John G. Saxe.

We must have direct legislation before we can reach the ideal social state. I am ready for it. Certainly it would seem that when the people make their own rules (or laws), through the initiative and referendum, there would be nothing more to be desired, but even if direct legislation will not eliminate human selfishness, and though we had that form of government tomorrow, I am inclined to think it would require a marked change in our moral standards, before society would be redeemed. As long as we point to a "successful man" or a "leading citizen"—simply because he started a poor boy and devoted his life to accumulating the fruit of other men's toil (and this is just what we do), direct legislation will only be a palliative, but it will be that and I am in favor of it.—Hon. S. M. Jones, Mayor of Toledo, in The New Time.

Amateur Farmer (showing round friend from town)—Yes, my boy, and for breakfast to-morrow you will have milk from my cows, and eggs laid by my own hens, and as good a drop of honey as you ever tasted.

Friend (absent minded)—Then you also keep a bee?—London Fun.

There seems to be a large and wholesome moral to be drawn from the capture of Manila. It is asserted that the Spanish general practically suggested the manner in which the American troops should advance to prevent loss of life on both sides.

This was an inspiration. Why not adopt it as a ruling principle in future warfare?—Life.

"I didn't know what a protocol was at first, did you?"

"No; I thought it might be some Spanish trick."—Puck.

Imperialism is international kleptomania.

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.