The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1900. Number 107.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The Transvaal peace envoys now in Europe deny that the Transvaal forced the war upon England, and propose to prove it. Proof from them is hardly necessary. It is proved by the official dispatches published in British blue books.

From Cleveland it is reported that a manufacturing company there has been importing machinists from New York to break a nine-hour strike. The report states that there are 4,000 or 5,000 idle machinists in New York —"men who cannot get anything to do, for lack of work." What has become of all the bounding prosperity in the machinist's trade in New York of which we had such glowing reports a few months ago?

President McKinley has signed the Puerto Rican government bill, which imposes a customs tariff upon the commerce of Puerto Rico with the states. Less than five months ago, in his message to congress he said it was the "plain duty" of this country to establish free trade with Puerto Rico. Why, then, did he sign the tariff measure? Has he changed his mind? He does not say so. Have the conditions changed? Not in the slightest. Has he violated a plain duty? It looks like it.

Senator Morgan appears to have triumphed for reelection as senator from Alabama over Gov. Johnston. In Alabama only democrats—those who label themselves so—have much to say about elections to office. Consequently it is the democratic primaries instead of the official elections that determine results. These were held on the 14th, after a campaign within the party, which had been in progress for some weeks. The object of the primaries was the nomination of candidates for the legislature; and the burning issue of the campaign was Morgan or Johnston for senator. By the latest reports Morgan will probably have 116 out of the 120 democratic votes in the next legislature. This is a great republican triumph. Though Morgan is not nominally a republican, and as a declared republican could not possibly be elected to the senate from Alabama, he is one of the Hanna-McKinley representatives in the democratic party. His triumph, therefore, is a Hanna-McKinley victory, of even greater importance in the long run than the election of an Alabama republican would be.

Americanism is becoming worthily distinctive in these days when Anglo-Saxonism is off man-hunting in the Philippines and South Africa. And no one has more happily phrased the distinction than William J. Bryan. In one of the speeches of his recent triumphal tour of the Pacific Coast, Mr. Bryan said:

> Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught man to look after his own rights. American civilization will teach him to respect the rights of others. The Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to take care of himself, while the American civilization has taught the individual that he can best preserve his own rights by recognizing the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

If the republican measures in congress for the suppression of trusts were conceived in good faith, they would be harbingers of danger to democratic institutions. But they are introduced only for the purpose of supplying Hanna-McKinley stump speakers with talking material for the campaign. These speakers can read the anti-trust resolutions which their party proposes, and with dramatic gesture exclaim: "Behold how our party would crush the monstrous trusts!" But after the election, if it "went right" the measures would be pigeon-holed until the next one. For that reason we need have no fears of the adoption of a constitutional amendment such as the republicans propose, which would practically subject all the private business of the country to congressional legislation and cap the very climax of centralization of power in the general government.

It is not possible at present for an outsider to tell whether the shut down of the steel and wire trust is a stock jobbing operation or a shrewd move in anticipation of the inevitable. It is not unlikely both. There is no doubt that trust managers depend upon stock jobbing. They can afford to keep their businesses going at a loss and even to pay dividends now and then without earning them, by having recourse to the profits they make in buying their own stock upon the street when they intend to send it up and selling it when they intend to force it down. Thus the "lambs" may be made to keep trusts going when the legitimate business of the trust will not. This may be the meaning of the steel and wire shut down. There are certainly reasons for supposing that the shut down is not unrelated to a ruinous falling off of demand in consequence of the exorbitant prices to which the trust has marked up its goods. That farmers have greatly cut down their purchases of wire fencing every observer knows. This is one fact which, together with facts of like character, indicates that the steel and wire trust has reached the limit of its power for the present.

Digitized by Google

Not improbably, then, the managers of this particular trust have been the first to see that "the prosperity dodge has been played to the limit," and are playing the Wall street dodge for all that it is worth, in anticipation of the crash that is surely coming.

The National Wall Paper company is often cited as an example of a gigantic trust that flourishes without any legalized special privilege. Its control of full lines of patterns is referred to as the source of its strength as a trust. The probability is that the wall paper trust is not without legalized privileges in the way of patents, secret transportation contracts, tariff interferences with competition, and so on. Nevertheless, this trust is not unlikely a type of the trusts, so-called, that have little support from legalized privileges, comparatively. And it is beginning to go the way of all such trusts. It now transpires that this wall paper trust has been able to control only a small percentage of the wall paper output. By raising prices it so stimulated competition that more than 80 anti-trust factories sprang up in the United States, and diverted the profits of the trust. This is another exemplification of the truth that a trust which does not rest upon legalized privileges must either give the public the benefit of reduced prices or go to the wall. If it raises prices it invites its own destruction by starting up competition. In no other way can competition be prevented from pulling down a trust than by investing the trust with legal privileges.

The sensation over Turkey's neglect to pay $100,000 which she owes some American missionaries is not likely to get further than the "scare" headlines of sensational newspapers. Should it reach the bellicose stage it would be an everlasting disgrace of this nation. If Turkey neglects or refuses to pay what she acknowledges to be a just debt, the moral proprieties would justify this country in recalling its representative at Constantinople and intimating that the continuance of the Turkish representative's presence at Washington was no longer congenial. Nations, like people, when they have debts due them are at perfect liberty to decline association with the nations or people that owe and wont pay. But for this country to send warships to Turkey and seize a customhouse to collect the debt at the mouth of cannon would be an act of low down ruffianism. The custom of the ruffian nations of Europe would not condone but would rather emphasize the crime. Besides, no money debt that Turkey owes any American missionary is worth a single American life; and any American missionary who is also a Christian would say the same.

A most significant pro-Boer meeting was held at Eau Claire, Wisc., on the 5th, of which much less has been said in the press than its importance deserves. The meeting, which filled to overflowing the largest hall in the city, was addressed by leading citizens; and it adopted unanimously, with a series of ringing preambles, a resolution calling upon the American government to demand of Great Britain that she make peace with the South African Republic and the Orange Free State upon the basis of their independence. H. B. Walmsley, Esq., presided. What makes this meeting especially significant is the fact that Eau Claire, a city of some 20,000, has but a small Irish population and no Hollanders. Its inhabitants are mostly native born Americans, Scandinavians and Germans. That the resolutions express the spirit that prevails in the West and Northwest with reference to the war in South Africa is an assured fact. American friendship for the jingoes and the jingoism of Great Britain is confined very closely to Washington. The American people of the west and northwest, at any rate, have but little of it.

The complaints which the tory newspapers of England make against the Swiss arbitrators in the Delagoa matter are not at all calculated to enhance the English reputation for fair play. Portugal had granted a franchise to an American for a railroad from Delagoa bay to the Transvaal line. The American bonded his franchise in England and built a wretched apology for a road, which could not be operated. When the Portuguese government learned that it had been buncoed, and that instead of gaining a real railroad to the Transvaal it had acquired an ornamental British mortgage of the most realistic description, it notified the American who held the franchise that unless he should complete the road by the expiration of eight months his franchise would be forfeited. He paid no attention to the notification. Not until the eight months of grace had almost expired did he even move in the matter. Accordingly, the Portuguese government very properly and very justly nullified his franchise. Then the British bondholders were hot to send a fleet to Portugal and demand compensation. But the British government concluded to submit the matter to arbitrators, claiming, however, enormous damages for loss of profits. In other words, Great Britain sought to mulct Portugal in damages for what might have been made out of the road if in good faith under the franchise grant it had been properly built and kept in operation. But the Swiss arbitrators, with a keener sense of justice, ruled out prospective profits and limited the damages approximately to the value of what the grantee of the franchise had done. This was fair play. Yet the tory journals of London regard it as "a severe blow" at arbitration; which implies that in their estimation a fleet would have yielded their bondholding fellow subjects a more profitable award than did this fair minded Swiss tribunal.

President McKinley's Philippine committee, of which Schurman was president, has cost $117,185. The president transmits an itemized state-

Digitized by Google

ment of this expenditure to congress, and with it a recommendation that Admiral Dewey and Gen. Otis, who were on the committee but have received nothing for their services except their regular army and navy salaries, be paid $10,000 each. Exactly why they should be paid is not apparent. Neither appears to have done anything beyond allowing the use of his name. Otis did his best, we understand, to prevent the committee's coming to a friendly arrangement with the Filipinos, and Dewey did sign the preliminary report for campaign uses in Ohio last fall. But as Otis's interference was quite unnecessary to prevent a friendly understanding, and Dewey signed the report without knowing its contents, $10,000 should strike the frugal taxpayer as an elaborate allowance, especially as both men were drawing from the government full salaries, allowed for their full time and energies, during all their "service" on the committee.

Senator Hoar has an uphill fight before him if he really expects the republican party machine to come over to his side in the battle against imperialism. In his devotion to the traditions of the party and his veneration for its noble leaders of another generation who breathed into it the spirit of liberty, he seems quite blind to the fact that the party machinery has fallen into alien hands. Its powerful leaders are no longer democrats of the Lincoln type. They are on the contrary the most perfect types of the plutocrat in modern history. And its masses, while abundantly made up of men of democratic impulses, are largely recruited from members of the well-dressed mob, whose highest aspiration is to move in what they take to be "respectable" circles. It would have been as reasonable to expect the democratic party of the sixties, bestrided by the slaveholding oligarchy, to free the negro, as to depend upon the republican party of the new century, with its medley of plutocratic incubuses, to reverse a plutocratic policy of imperialism.

In the case of the Texas anti-trust law, the federal supreme court has decided that any state may arbitrarily prohibit corporations formed in other states from doing business within its borders. The only strange thing about this decision is that any one should ever have supposed a contrary decision to be possible. While it is true that no state can deny to the citizens of any other state the same business opportunities that it grants to its own citizens, it is not and has never been judicially regarded as bound to recognize the corporations of other states. They are only fictitious persons which may or may not be recognized as such by the states into which they go to do business. Such possible doubt as there may have been about this matter is now removed. The supreme court holds that the state of Texas had a complete right to prevent one of the standard oil corporations, created in another state, from doing business in Texas; and it places the decision squarely upon the broad ground that a corporation has no legal existence beyond the limits of the state that creates it. There is, therefore, no longer any excuse either for Mr. Bryan or for the republicans in congress to urge the enactment of federal laws against trusts. Any state can within its own borders put the ban upon incorporated trusts as completely as congress could by any law short of one repealing the protective tariff.

It should be in order to castigate the supreme court of the United States for deciding, as it has done, in a case coming up from Michigan, that express and telegraph companies may lawfully shift the one-cent tax on messages and packages from themselves to their patrons. But if the supreme court were always as loyal to principle when deciding cases in which great monopolies are interested, there would be no outcry against it. In their opinion in this case, the judges say:

> **To say when and how the ultimate burden of a tax shall be distributed among all members of society must necessitate taking into view every possible contract which can be made and compel the weighing of the final influence of every conceivable dealing between man and man. A tax rests upon real estate. Can it be said that the law imposing such a tax intended to prevent the owner of real property from taking into consideration the amount of taxes thereon in determining the rent which is to be exacted by him? A tax is imposed upon stock in trade. Must it be held that the purpose of such a law is to regulate the price at which goods must be sold, and restrain a merchant therefore from distributing the sum of the taxes in the price charged for his merchandise? It is apparent that such a construction of the statute would be unnatural and strained.**

Most assuredly such a construction would be strained. Even if the legislature were to specify the persons or interests upon whom the ultimate burden of taxation must rest, its law would be a dead letter. There is a higher law than any that legislatures can enact, which determines the ultimate resting place of tax burdens. It is that law of human nature that every man, be his desires good or bad, seeks to satisfy them with the least exertion. This law is to social adjustments what the law of least resistance is to mechanics. And under its operation, no matter what legislatures may decree or courts decide, the burden of all taxes levied upon services to be rendered—whether in the form of goods or of direct labor—rests ultimately upon the person who seeks the service, just as it has done so obviously all over the United States in this stamp tax on telegraph messages and express packages. The only considerable taxes that stay where they are put, are those that fall upon the value of past services, as income taxes, or upon the value of monopolies.

Let no Bryan democrat be deceived by the acquiescence in the inevitableness of Bryan's nomination of those unhorsed "democratic" leaders who supported McKinley four years ago.

Digitized by Google

There are plenty of anti-Bryan democrats who in good faith have accepted Bryan as the next candidate. They may be trusted. But the plutocratic gang who were eager to ruin when they could not rule, are only watching for an opportunity to recover control of the party organization. They rely chiefly upon the law of democratic conventions that a two-thirds vote is necessary to nominate; and in order to avail themselves of this law, they are opposing the instruction of delegates. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that all democratic constituencies that oppose reactionary proceedings at the national convention should instruct their delegates for Bryan. Not the least important temptation to uninstructed delegates at Kansas City will be Hanna's campaign fund. The Hanna plutocrats are just as anxious to defeat Bryan at the democratic convention as are the "democratic" plutocrats. Let him who doubts it read the Hanna newspapers.

Friends of municipal ownership of public utilities should at least hesitate about giving to the city of New York the credit of having applied that principle to the underground transit system now in process of construction. The application appears to be only nominal. It is a reasonable presumption from the facts that the existing railroad interests of the city have succeeded in vesting in a state commission, controlled by themselves, the power to dispose of rapid transit franchises upon its own terms. It has express authority to lay out routes, to acquire property, to contract for construction without competition, and, also without competition, to lease roads when built and paid for by the city for terms of 50 years with privilege of renewal. Pursuant to this extraordinary power, the commission has made a contract for the construction of the underground road. It agrees, in behalf of the city, to pay the contractor for construction and equipment $36,000,000; and upon the completion of his work to turn the road over to him upon a 50 years' lease, with the privilege of a 25 years' renewal. For this he is to pay an annual sum equal to the annual interest payable by the city on construction bonds—not including bonds for rights of way, etc.—and a contingent sum not exceeding one per cent. on such bonds. This is an astounding contract. The only feature of municipal ownership about it is the fact that the city pays for the road. Observe that the lessees get possession for 75 years of an invaluable franchise for not more than one per cent. of the cost of construction. All above that sum they are to pay is nothing but rental for the plant. When other terms of the lease are considered the lessees are really to pay nothing at all for the franchise. For they are guaranteed exemption from taxation, both as to franchise and equipment, for the entire period. Moreover, at the end of the term, the city is to purchase the equipment of the lessees. Under this contract the people of New York will some time wish to know whether the city owns the road or the lessees own the city.

The secretary of the British humanitarian league circumstantially denies the assertion made by John G. Shortall, of Chicago, that highway robbery with violence was suppressed in England by the use of the lash. The league explains the probable basis of Mr. Shortall's assertion. In 1862 there was a sudden outbreak of garroting in the streets of London. This criminal epidemic lasted only four months, and no person convicted of the crime was flogged. It was not until six or eight months after the garroting epidemic had subsided that the bill to authorize flogging for violent robberies was introduced. Evidently the English flogging act is not a valuable precedent for citation in support of the brutal notion that flogging lessens crime.

In an editorial of March 28, on the Philippine question, the Chicago Times-Herald, Mr. Kohlsaat's paper, made a fatal admission for a protection organ. Referring to the prophecy from certain quarters that American industries would suffer if Philippine products were admitted to the states free of duty, it said:

> **This is the cheapest sort of political clap trap. None of the products of the Philippines will come to the United States except those whose natural market is here and for which American consumers have need.**

That is sound doctrine. But it smashes the protection theory to flinders. If foreign products will not come to this country unless this is their natural market and our consumers need them, we require no protection tariff to prevent foreigners from overwhelming us with cheap goods. To say that we do is, in the language of the Times-Herald, "the cheapest sort of political clap trap." The Times-Herald is right. It is American consumers, not foreign producers, who bring foreign goods to this country. And by that same token it is American consumers whose needs all protective tariffs interfere with.

Col. Alexander S. Bacon has published a pamphlet in which he charges Col. Roosevelt, now governor, with being a "quitter." In substantiation of the charge Col. Bacon quotes from the official report of Maj. Reed, to be found at page 102 of the inspector general's report. Maj. Reed there states, says Col. Bacon, that while the American army lay before Santiago and Shafter was negotiating for a surrender Col. Roosevelt said to his superior officer:

> **Twenty-five per cent. of my rough riders can't carry a pail of water from the creek to the trenches. No man can decry me or my regiment, but we must accede to the next proposition from the enemy.**

This quotation sounds much more like a whine than an expression of that strenuous spirit which Col. Roosevelt affects.

It is not an easy thing for a political candidate who sincerely believes in removing the legal obstacles which put workingmen at the mercy of great capitalists, to refuse to pledge

Digitized by Google

himself to do in office what some workingmen sincerely think they are entitled to have done, but which to him seems opposed to those principles of equal human rights to which his conscience clings. And when a man of that kind actually appears in a political campaign he is a sufficiently unique figure to be pointed out. Such a man is James W. Hill, who was a candidate last Tuesday for alderman in Peoria. Mr. Hill was asked this question: "If elected to the city council will you vote for the employment of none but union labor on all city work? Yes or no." He replied:

I am in favor of organized labor and all things that will tend to give labor its full earnings. I am well aware that labor now does not get what it earns. I also favor shorter hours for labor in order that the worker may have time to improve his mind and enjoy life. If elected to serve in the city council I shall vote for the building of an assembly hall on condition that it be free and open for all time for free discussion on every phase of the social or labor question. I would also vote that the union scale of wages shall be paid for all work done in the construction of said assembly hall and on all public works. But having contended all my life for equal God-given opportunities for all men to earn a living, I cannot now promise to favor one class of men at the expense of another. I stand for equal rights to all men, union or non-union, white or black, rich or poor—special privileges to none.

The new English vaccination act is said to be more tyrannous in operation than the one it superseded. Parents who have conscientious objections to the vaccination of their children must procure a certificate to that effect from a bench of magistrates, who, it is reported, browbeat them and often refuse the certificate, as if it were a matter of the magistrates' consciences rather than one of the parent's conscience. Besides this, the vaccinating officers are paid in fees, and to earn these they visit the parents (usually the mother while her husband is at work), and use various devices to secure opportunities to vaccinate the children. Still other forms of pressure are reported. One correspondent sums it up by saying that "never before in the history of the English government has there been a law under which more injustice, tyranny, browbeating, bull-dozing and intimidation has been used than is now being used to secure compliance with the vaccination acts." Possibly this condition may account for an announcement from the English local government board, made some weeks ago, that voluntary vaccination had increased since compulsory vaccination had been abolished.

PUERTO RICAN FRANCHISES.

Whether or not the senate and house of representatives of the United States, in passing the Puerto Rican government bill, deliberately and wilfully intended to throw to greed and corruption the rights and property of the people of Puerto Rico, it is certain that this is the result of their work.

The bill, as passed, provides for two houses which shall constitute a "legislative assembly." One is a "house of delegates" to be elected by the qualified voters of Puerto Rico. The other is to be an executive council composed of eleven members and the governor. All these twelve members are to be appointed by the president of the United States and only five of them need be native inhabitants of Puerto Rico. As to the others, they are merely compelled to reside in Puerto Rico during their term of office. Now while the concurrence of the legislative assembly is required in other matters of local legislation it is expressly provided—

that all grants of franchises, rights and privileges or concessions, of a publis or quasi public nature, shall be made by the executive council with the approval of the governor, and all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

Throughout the whole of the debate in the Senate and in the house of representatives upon this bill, the only comment which appears to have been made by either side, upon thus taking away from the people of Puerto Rico any voice whatever in the disposal of what is their most valuable property as a community—that is, the use of their streets and roads, the right of eminent domain, the right to exercise and enjoy and use for the welfare or profit of the community its communal functions—was an apparently incidental remark of Mr. Foraker who had charge of the bill and who was explaining its provisions. He said that the committee would have left the granting of franchises to the legislative assembly except for the fact that the legislative assembly cannot be in session in accordance with the law, more than sixty days in any one year. "The granting of franchises," he continued, "is something that may come up at any time, and the executive council and the governor will always be there to act upon such application." (It may be remarked in passing, that of the truth of this proposition of the senator I think there can be no doubt.)

Senator Pettus, of Alabama, had originally proposed an amendment to the section, providing that the legislative assembly as a whole should have the granting of the franchises; but upon Mr. Foraker's explanation and his cheerful adoption of the rider not found in the original draft of the bill as it came from the committee, that congress "reserves the power to annul or modify" such franchises, Mr. Pettus withdrew his amendment and declared himself satisfied. And so seemed all the other opposition senators.

In the house, indeed, where the senate bill was rushed through with scarcely an opportunity for anything to be said upon it, Mr. Williams, a democratic congressman, found opportunity to declare—

The territorial part of this bill is simply infamous. The executive council or upper branch of the legislature is appointed by the president, 11 in number, and six of them may be residents of the United States outside of Puerto Rico. These 11 men appointed by the president have the power to dispose of all the franchises and public privileges in that island, and yet they are in no way responsible to the people of Puerto Rico. This provision is sure to breed corruption. It is a public shame to rush such an unjust and vicious bill through this house without debate and without any opportunity for amendment.

Digitized by Google

These were words of truth and soberness. But so far as the dominant majority was concerned, they fell upon entirely unheeding ears, and no other voice seems to have been raised against this provision. The newspapers, indeed, report that in the republican caucus, objections were made to it by one or two representatives; but there was no expression of such objection on the floor of the house. And thus the most valuable property—for that is what franchises and government privileges really are—of a million people, were placed entirely at the disposition of a body of which the majority may be and in all probability will be foreigners appointed by a foreigner; and the only reservation is that of the power of modification or annulment by a foreign legislature in which the people of the island have no representation.

Although in the senate the fundamental question of the right of the people of Puerto Rico to have a voice in the disposition of their own property was thus carelessly ignored, there was quite a little discussion as to whether this reservation of power should be to the congress of the United States or to the president. The original bill as reported from the committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico read as follows:

"That all grants of franchises, rights and privileges or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council with the approval of the governor, subject also to the approval of the president of the United States, who shall report the same to congress."

The first amendment proposed was by Mr. Foraker to make this read:

"Provided that all grants or franchises, rights or privileges or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council with the approval of the governor, subject also as to railroad, telegraph or telephone franchises, to the approval of the president of the United States, who shall report the same to congress."

This amendment, which altered the original bill in making the approval of the president necessary only in what Mr. Foraker termed the "more important franchises," leaving such things as electric lighting, gas lighting, etc., to the unchecked disposal of the executive council, seems to have been proposed by Mr. Foraker at the instigation of an American lawyer at San Juan, who declared in a letter to Mr. Foraker, read by him in the senate, that it was very important to avoid the expense and delay of a reference to the president in the case of many local and municipal franchises, which were already demanded. Mr. Foraker's fellow senators did not seem to care much about the approval of the president of the United States being required, but some of them were quite sensitive about the power of congress, and as Mr. Foraker obligingly said, that he had no personal objection to reserving expressly to congress the power of annulment, the distinction between the "important" and "less important" franchises was given up, and the approval of the president to any franchise dispensed with; but when Mr. Allen, of Nebraska, proposed that the congressional power should be reserved in this form—

"Said franchise shall not have any legal force or effect until approved and ratified by congress,"

Mr. Foraker declared that this would unreasonably delay enterprise and the development of the island; and again Mr. Allen and the other senators promptly acquiesced in his suggestion, and the clause was adopted as it stands.

It seems to me that both the principle and the practical results involved in this part of the Puerto Rican legislation are more important so far as the people of Puerto Rico and indeed of the Philippines, and it may be of Cuba and other prospective dependencies, are concerned, than even the much debated and discussed question of the tariff.

This Puerto Rican bill is explicitly avowed to be the model upon which legislation for other dependencies is to be based hereafter, and I have little doubt that despite their seeming carelessness in discussing this question the people really behind this bill knew exactly what they were about. We have heard much by the advocates of imperialistic expansion of the advantages which would accrue to the business interests of the United States from such a policy. Arguments either a priori or from statistics, irrefragable as they can be made, against the absurd doctrine that "trade follows the flag," have no effect upon the "business men" who believe in the policy in question. This is because trade and commerce in their legitimate meaning are farthest from their thoughts when they speak of "business interests." That which these shrewd, able, wealthy men desire is new fields for franchise grabbing. Not that the crop of such opportunities to make money out of government concessions is gone in this country by any means, but that a country in the process of new development always furnishes for many years a more inviting field than any other for such enterprises. It is altogether too common, as Mr. Bryan in his notable speech at the convention of 1896 declared, to confound the business interests of the country with the interests of stock-jobbers and bond-traders. It is these "business interests" that have apparently convinced the present administration that both "destiny and duty" require that we should possess ourselves of "Islands beyond the Sea."

If special privileges are still to be granted by government, citizens of the United States will undoubtedly always have a certain advantage in dependencies of the United States. But it would seem that if these governmental functions in various quarters of the globe are to be farmed out to American citizens, doubtless to their great enrichment, the people whose property they are should, as a matter of decency, have something to say concerning their disposition; and that such disposition should not be given to a body appointed by the president of the United States for the time being the members of which will be almost sure to be under deep personal and political obligations to rich individuals and corporations in the United States, and too likely to regard the salaries which they are to receive for temporary residence in their respective satrapes as the most important thing about their office.

It certainly is needless to discuss the futility of the reservation to congress of the power to "annul" or "modify" the franchises. It affords no safe-guard to the interests of the people, although it is conceivable that

Digitized by Google

it opens the door to additional corruption and blackmail.

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN.

Chicago, Ill.

NEWS

The military situation in South Africa is practically unchanged since our report of last week, when the Boers were attacking Wepener. British reports from Bloemfontein on the 13th described the Boers as in full retreat from this point, but this was contradicted on the 17th by reports from Boer sources; and on the 18th Lord Roberts reported Wepener as still surrounded. He declared, however, that the Boers were now fighting half-heartedly and exhibiting uneasiness about the security of their communications. For their uneasiness there would seem to be reason. Lord Roberts is reported to have "spread his net far and wide" to catch the Boer detachments that are operating before Wepener and throughout the southeastern part of the Orange Free State; and on the 17th his forces were said to be converging. His forward movement to Pretoria is at a standstill. The explanation offered is lack of horses.

Gen. Gatacre has been called home for incompetency, and Gen. Chermenside assigned to his command. This change made a slight sensation in London; but it was followed by one of much greater proportions, caused by the first publication, on the 18th, by war office authority, of a dispatch written by Lord Roberts as far back as February 13, and which had been in the possession of the war office for five weeks. Lord Roberts in this dispatch very freely criticised both Gen. Buller and Gen. Warren for the Natal campaign for the relief of Ladysmith. The publication of the dispatch at this time is regarded as intended either to force the resignation, or prepare the public mind for the recall, of both Warren and Buller.

On the 15th the Boer peace delegation, consisting of Messrs. Fischer, Wolmarans and Wessels, arrived at The Hague. These delegates were first mentioned in these columns at page 7 of No. 104, as being on their way to some of the European capitals and Washington to negotiate for intervention in behalf of the independence of the two republics. They were received at The Hague enthusiastically with cheers and cries of "Long live the Transvaal and the Orange Free State."

The Boer general, Cronje, with his family and staff were landed on the 14th at St. Helena, as prisoners of war. Other Boer prisoners of war were landed at the same time, and others still were reported as having been sent to St. Helena from Cape Town. The Boers complain of this disposition of prisoners, asserting that the humid atmosphere of St. Helena means death to men accustomed to the dry climate of the African veldts, and they threaten to retaliate.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all official reports given out at Washington to April 18, 1900, are as follows:

Killed	473
Died of wounds, disease and accidents	1,205
Total deaths	1,678
Wounded	2,092
Total loss	3,770
Total loss reported last week	3,725
Total deaths reported last week	1,653

In the Philippines, the petty warfare of which we wrote last week continues. On the 16th 300 Filipino riflemen and bolomen had attacked the American garrison at Batoc, in the province of North Ilocos—which is in the northwest of Luzon—and were repulsed. A few days before this an American detachment had surrounded a Filipino recruiting village in Benguet province—on the western coast, about half way further down toward Manila—and after capturing several prisoners had burned the village. Another American capture was that of Gen. Montenegro, who, with Gen. Macabulos, had been trying to reorganize the Filipino army in the province of Pangasinan, which is on the same coast, still farther south. Montenegro surrendered, but Macabulos escaped. Along with these reports came others of futile attacks by Filipinos upon San Jose, in the province of Batangas, which is on the southern coast, and Santa Cruz on the lake. On the island of Mindanao, the most southerly of the group, at Cagayen, the Americans were attacked on the 7th. A street fight of 20 minutes' duration followed, in which the Filipinos were worsted and withdrew to the mountains.

The Philippine question was elaborately and impressively discussed in the senate on the 17th by Senator Hoar. The extracts and descriptions given by the daily press indicate that Mr. Hoar's speech was one of great power and eloquence and the occasion historic. His references to Aguinaldo and his compatriots were brave and discriminating. Aguinaldo he ranked with "that small band who have given life and everything dearer than life to their country in a losing cause," and predicted that "he would live with Kossuth, with Oom Paul, with Joubert, with Emmet, with Egmont and Horn, with Nathan Hale, with Warren, with all the great martyrs of history whose blood has been the seed of the church of liberty." And as one indication of the qualifications of the Filipinos for self government Mr. Hoar declared that—

> the state papers of Aguinaldo, the discussion of the law of nations by his attorney-general, the masterly appeal of Mabini, are products of the Asiatic mind. They are not unworthy of the Asiatic mind, the vehicle through which came to us the scriptures of the old and new testament, the poetry of David, the eloquence of Isaiah, the wisdom of Solomon, the profound philosophy of Paul.

The most dramatic feature of Mr. Hoar's speech appears to have been an imaginary roll call of distinguished Americans voting on the question of imperialism. It began with Washington, who briefly gave his reasons and voted "No," and ended with McKinley, who was made to say:

> There has been a cloud before my vision for a moment, but I see clearly now; I go back to what I said two years ago: "Forcible annexation is criminal aggression; governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, not of some of them, but all of them." I will stand with the fathers of the republic. I will stand with the founders of the republican party. No.

Aaron Burr alone answered "Yes," explaining: "You are repeating my buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi; I am to be vindicated at last."

It was not expansion that Mr. Hoar argued against but imperialism. He found authority enough in the declaration of independence for expansion, but, he said, this is—

> the expansion of freedom and not of

Digitized by Google

despotism; of life, not of death. Never was such growth in all human history as that from the seed Thomas Jefferson planted. It has covered the continent; it is on both the seas; it has saved South America; it is revolutionizing Europe; it is the expansion of freedom; it differs from your tinsel, pinchbeck, pewter expansion as the growth of a healthy youth into a strong man differs from the expansion of an anaconda when he swallows his victim.

But Mr. Hoar spoke as a republican and a party man. "I do not expect," he said, "to accomplish anything for liberty in the Philippine Islands but through the republican party. Upon it the fate of these islands for years to come is to depend. I cannot look with any favor upon Mr. Bryan as an alternative." Yet he fully recognized that perseverance in the administration's present policy will not only—

be the abandonment of the principles upon which our government is founded, that it will change our republic into an empire, that our methods of legislation, of diplomacy, of administration must hereafter be those which belong to empires, and not those which belong to republics; but I believe persistence in this attempt will result in the defeat and overthrow of the republican party.

On the constitutional question Mr. Hoar maintained that the "acquisition and governing of territory can be only a means to a constitutional end," and reminded the country that in every previous accession of territory we have "recognized fully the doctrine of consent of the governed and the doctrine that territory so acquired must be held to be made into states."

The policy which Mr. Hoar announced his willingness to support was this:

I would declare now that we will not take these islands to govern them against their will. I would reject a cession of sovereignty which implies that sovereignty may be bought and sold and delivered without the consent of the people. I would require all foreign governments to keep out of these islands. I would offer to the people of the Philippines our help in maintaining order until they have a reasonable opportunity to establish a government of their own. I would aid them by advice, if they desire it, to set up a free and independent government. I would invite all the great powers of Europe to unite in an agreement that that independence shall not be interfered with. I would declare that the United States will enforce the same doctrine as applicable to the Philippines that we declared as to Mexico and Hayti and the South American republics. I would then, in a not distant future, leave them to work out their own salvation, as every nation on earth, from the beginning of time, has wrought out its own salvation.

Another congressional event of historical importance, though in a minor way, was the adoption by the lower house of congress on the 13th of a resolution for the amendment of the constitution so as to require federal senators to be elected by the direct vote of the people of their several states instead of being elected by the legislatures in accordance with the present system. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 242 to 15. When it came up in the senate on the 16th, Senator Butler moved to place it upon the calendar at once, without referring it to a committee, arguing that the subject had been so thoroughly and generally discussed that no committee investigation was necessary. In the course of his remarks he intimated that the resolution would be smothered in committee. This intimation was resented by Senator Chandler, the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections, to which the resolution was referable, and to which, upon Senator Butler's withdrawal of his motion the resolution was referred.

Congress has been also shaping anti-trust legislation. The subcommittee of the house judiciary committee has formulated an amendment to the Sherman anti-trust law, besides an amendment to the federal constitution of a most revolutionary character. The amendment to the Sherman law would require the branding of trust-made goods, so they could be easily identified; the prohibition of interstate commerce traffic in goods made by trusts which are not branded; and prohibition of the use of the mails to concerns and their officials proven to be trusts. It would also authorize injunctions against combinations sending trust-made goods from one state to another or a foreign country, and require corporations having a capital of $1,000,000 and doing a business of $1,000,000 a year to make a report to the secretary of state. These provisions are commonplace, however, in comparison with the proposed constitutional amendment, which provides that—

all private corporations, copartnerships and joint stock companies in the United States shall be under the control of congress; that congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, repress and dissolve all trusts and monopolies and combination or conspiracy to monopolize any part of trade or commerce, and all contracts and combinations in form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce; that congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation; that in the absence of legislation on the part of congress all powers conferred upon congress by this article may be exercised by the several states.

The chairman of the judiciary committee explains that this amendment is made necessary by the decision of the supreme court, which holds that manufacture is no part of inter-state commerce, even though the manufacture be a monopoly affecting interstate commerce. Consequently manufacturing trusts cannot now be reached by congress under the interstate commerce clause of the constitution.

While congress was preparing anti-trust legislation the managers of the American Steel and Wire Company, one of the great beneficiary trusts of the protective tariff which congress maintains, gave the public a shock by shutting down 12 out of its 44 plants, and throwing 6,200 workmen out of a job. The mills shut down were three at Pittsburg, two at Cleveland, three at Joliet, and one each at De Kalb, Ill., Waukegan, Ill., Anderson, Ind., and New Castle, Ind. The effect of this action was apparent at once in the price of stocks. Common shares of the trust fell from $51 to $43, and preferred shares from $85 to $80.50 in a few hours, the loss in these speculative values aggregating nearly $6,000,000. When pressed for explanations, the managers of the trust who were willing to talk attributed the shut down to over production, the high prices of their products having so checked demand that supply had run ahead of it. Over against this explanation are the assurances of others in the iron and steel industry that they cannot keep up with the demand. It is suspected, therefore, that the shut down was ordered arbitrarily for the purpose of affecting the value of the stock on the market, to the end that the managers who unloaded several months ago at high prices caused by persistent rumors of dividends might buy in again at depressed prices. This suspicion derives slight confirmation from the

Digitized by Google

announcements of some of the trust managers, after the stock had dropped, that the plants would be set going again in the course of a couple of weeks; and also from the fact that after a shut-down lasting three days the mills at Braddock, Pa., and De Kalb, Ill., were on the 18th again opened for work.

Evidences of the approaching presidential campaign are thickening. Four conventions were held in Oregon last week at which delegates to national conventions were chosen. The Oregon republicans met on the 12th, and besides nominating national delegates and a state ticket, including presidential electors, approved the recent currency legislation of congress, declared for the gold standard, and commended the course of the administration in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. The democrats and the populists met on the same day in separate conventions and on the following day, the 13th, named a fusion ticket. Both conventions endorsed Bryan for president, but the populist electors on the fusion ticket were instructed to vote for a populist for vice president and for no other democrat than Bryan for president. The fusion platform reaffirms the Chicago platform and demands the election of federal senators by popular vote and the adoption of the initiative and the referendum. On the 13th also, the middle-of-the-road populists of Oregon elected delegates to the convention at Cincinnati. In Iowa the populists met on the 17th and endorsed Bryan, condemned imperialism, sympathized with the Boers, endorsed the initiative and the referendum and the principle of electing federal senators by popular vote, denounced trusts, the new currency law and the Puerto Rican tariff, and chose delegates to the Sioux Falls national convention, with Gen. James B. Weaver at the head of the list. On the same day the New York republicans met at New York city. The convention was harmonious. Delegates were chosen to represent the party at the Philadelphia convention, and the platform endorsed the McKinley administration. Efforts were made to commit the party on the question of the vice-presidency—Roosevelt or Woodruff—but they were suppressed.

Notable among the political speeches of the week was one by ex-Gov. Altgeld, who was the principal speaker at the banquet of the Albany (N. Y.) Bimetallic League. His subject was "What Would Jefferson Do?" The especially significant part of the speech with reference to presidential politics was that in which he said:

> This campaign is going to be a campaign of mighty questions and not of candidates. Those men who imagine that if they could by hook or crook, by trick or trade, nominate some hero in the national democratic convention, that then, with the aid of money, they could carry the country, had better be disillusioned, for they could not carry six states in this union. What is it that gives Mr. Bryan such a hold on the democracy of America as no man has had since the days of Jackson? It is his principles and his earnestness. There is no hero worship about it. They favor the principles he advocates and have absolute confidence in his honesty and courage. He is an idol, not a hero. People love him because they believe he sympathizes with them. I hear some good man say, Why could not Bryan consent to modify some features of the Chicago platform so that we could all unite, and then we could win? The moment Mr. Bryan consents to modify the Chicago platform in any particular that moment he is destroyed. He would at once sink to the level of the ordinary politician who was trimming his sails to catch votes. He would at once cease to be the idol of the democratic heart. Now you respect him for his sincerity—then you would despise him for his weakness.

The religious world as well as the political is apparently about to be deeply stirred. The center of the disturbance is the Presbyterian church. Not long ago, the Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, of Plymouth church, Brooklyn, who, though a Congregational pastor, was a member of the Chicago presbytery, publicly renounced the doctrine of predestination as outlined in the Presbyterian confession of faith. This led to complaint against him in the presbytery, whereupon he renounced the authority of the presbytery. For the latter act and not the former the presbytery erased his name. This might have ended the matter. But the presbytery took advantage of the opportunity to adopt an overture to the general assembly of the church looking to a revision of the confession of faith in the particulars to which Dr. Hillis had objected. The action in this respect of the Chicago presbytery was more than seconded by the Rev. C. H. Parkhurst, of the Madison Square Presbyterian church, New York. In his Easter sermon Dr. Parkhurst declared among other things that—

> If we are thorough Presbyterians and believe what our own doctrinal prospectus advertises us as believing we believe it probable that some of the children in your homes, little children, perhaps the babe of your bosom is damned, already damned before it was born, damned from everlasting to everlasting—and then you are invited to come into the church and say "Our Father." Why, any man who should become a father for the sake of the joy and the 'glory' he would use in burning and racking his own offspring, deliberately creating a child with a view to the agony into which he was going to torture it, would be chased from the earth as a fiend and an ebullition from hell. It does not meet the case to say that it is only in the "book" and nobody preaches it. It is true that nobody preaches it, and equally true, I doubt not, that nobody believes it. Nevertheless, it is printed on the flag beneath which the Presbyterian army is marching and it hurts us as a denomination. Men are staying out because it is there and men are going out because it is there.

Rev. Dr. S. P. Sprecker, of Cleveland, one of the ministerial delegates from that city to the next Presbyterian general assembly, has also publicly ranged himself with the Presbyterians who wish to have the confession of faith revised; and on the 18th the presbyteries of Milwaukee, Wis.; Elmira, N. Y., and Northumberland, Pa., unanimously petitioned the general assembly to the same effect.

NEWS NOTES.

—Holger Drachmann, the celebrated Danish lyric poet and dramatist, arrived in Chicago on the 16th for a two weeks' visit.

—The Trans-Mississippi congress for the promotion of trade opened its eleventh annual session on the 13th at Houston, Tex.

—Charles H. Allen, assistant secretary of the navy, was appointed by President McKinley on the 12th as the first American civil governor of Porto Rico.

—Gold has been discovered in paying quantities in the province of Vigan, Luzon, by an American miner, William Odun, who states that Luzon will some day yield as much gold as South Africa.

—Resolutions urging congress to abolish the war revenue tax were adopted by the Illinois Manufacturers' association on the 12th and a committee appointed to go to Washington to bring the same to the attention of both houses of congress.

Digitized by Google

—Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews handed in his resignation as superintendent, to the Chicago school board on the 18th, and announced his intention to accept the chancellorship of the University of Nebraska after the close of the present school year.

—John Addison Porter, secretary to the president, has offered his resignation and the president has accepted it to take effect May 1. Mr. Porter was forced to resign because of continued ill health. George B. Cortelyou, the assistant secretary, has been appointed to Mr. Porter's place.

—A movement is on foot for the formation of an international agricultural trust to restrict production and thereby increase the prices of agricultural products. Most of the prominent farmers' federations in this country are promoting the plan. They hope to have it adopted at the international agricultural conference in Paris in July.

—The Paris exposition was opened on the 14th with magnificent inaugural ceremonies in the Salle des Fetes by President Loubet and his cabinet. Alfred Picard, the director-general of the exposition, was decorated with the grand cross of the Legion of Honor. The grounds were thrown open to the public on the 15th. Although the exposition structures are well advanced, it will be fully six weeks before they receive the finishing touches and the exhibits are all installed.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

April 10-16th, 1900.

Senate.

On the 10th Hoar spoke on the resolution relative to the seating of M. S. Quay as senator from Pennsylvania, after which memorial resolutions on the late Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, were adopted. The bill for the construction of the Pacific cable from San Francisco to Hawaii (printed on page 4295) was passed on the 11th, and on the 12th the motion of Morgan that the senate proceed to the consideration of the Nicaragua canal bill was rejected by a vote of 15 to 33. Pettigrew addressed the senate on his resolution of sympathy with the South African republics and the senate voted to adjourn over Good Friday. Consideration of the Alaska civil government bill was resumed on the 14th, and on the 16th the joint resolution, passed by the lower house, in favor of the election of senators by direct vote of the people (printed on page 4524), was referred to the committee on privileges and elections, and consideration of the Alaska bill was resumed.

House.

On the 10th the agricultural appropriation bill was passed, and on Wednesday, April 11th, the Puerto Rican tariff and civil government bill came up for final action. The committee on rules submitted a resolution to limit the time of debate on this bill to 5 p. m. of the same day, which was agreed to by a vote of 158 to 142. In the debate upon the bill as it came back to the house from the senate, Richardson, of Tennessee, quoted contradictory decisions on the constitutional question, from the official report of Charles E. Magoon, chief of the legal department of insular affairs (quotations printed on pages 4334-5-6-7-8-9). The final vote, 161 to 153, was a strict party vote with the exception of 9 republicans who voted against the bill, and 2 democrats who were paired in its favor. On the 12th the conference report on the legislative, executive and judicial appropriation bill (printed on page 4403), was adopted; and the bill authorizing the secretary of the treasury to designate one or more banks in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines as depositaries of public moneys was passed. A joint resolution to amend the constitution so as to permit the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people was passed on the 13th by a vote of 242 to 15. On the 14th the session was devoted to memorial resolutions on Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, and the acceptance of his statue, as a gift from the state of Indiana, to be placed in the rotunda of the capitol. On the 16th consideration of the naval appropriation bill was begun.

MISCELLANY

THE PEOPLE'S POWER.

The people is a beast of muddy brain,
That knows not its own strength, and therefore stands
Loaded with wood and iron; the powerless hands
Of a mere child guide it with bit and rein;
One kick would be enough to break the chain.
But the beast fears, and what the child demands
It does, nor its own terror understands,
Confused and stupefied by bugbears vain.
Most wonderful! With its own hands
It ties and gags itself, gives itself life and and war
For pence doled out by kings from its own store.
Its own are all things between earth and heaven;
But this it knows not, and if one arise
To tell this truth, it kills him unforgiven.
—Campanella (an Italian Monk). A. D., 1600.

"A DIMMYCRAT, BE A POINT RAYPUBLICAN, DIMMICRAT."

Mr. Dooley, according to the Chicago Journal, thus describes Admiral Dewey's statement of his political belief:

"Ar-re ye a raypublican or a dimmycrat?" says the rayporter.

"What's that?" says Cousin George.

"D'ye belong to th' raypublican or th' dimmycrat party?"

"What ar-re they like?" says Cousin George.

"Th' raypublicans ar-re in favor iv expansion."

"Thin I'm a raypublican."

"Th' dimmycrats ar-re in favor iv free thrade."

"Thin I'm a dimmycrat."

"Th' raypublicans ar-re f'r upholdin' th' goold standard."

"So'm I. I'm a raypublican, there."

"An' they're opposed to an income tax."

"On that," says Cousin George, "I'm a dimmycrat. I tell ye, put me down as a dimmycrat. Divvie th' bit I care. Just say I'm a dimmycrat with sthrong raypublican leanings. Put it this way: I'm a dimmycrat, be a point raypublican, dimmycrat. Anny sailor man'll undherstand that."

CARL SCHURZ ON "TRUE AMERICANISM" MORE THAN 40 YEARS AGO.

Liberty and equal rights, common to all as the air of heaven—liberty and equal rights, one and inseparable. With this banner we stand before the world. In this sign there is victory. And thus we mean to realize the great cosmopolitan idea, upon which the existence of the American nation rests. Thus we mean to fulfill the great mission of true Americanism—thus we mean to answer the anxious question of down-trodden humanity—"Has man the faculty to be free and to govern himself?" The answer is a triumphant "Aye" thundering into the ears of the despots of the old world that, "a man's a man for a' that;" proclaiming to the oppressed that they are held in subjection on false pretenses; cheering the hearts of the despondent friends of man with consolation and renewed confidence. This is true Americanism, clasping mankind to its great heart. Under its banner we march; let the world follow.—Speeches of Carl Schurz.

ARE YOU A TAXPAYER?

If you pay rent, yes.

If you pay your meat bills, yes.

If you pay for the clothes you wear, yes.

If you pay for the clothes your family wears, yes.

If you pay your coal bills, yes.

If you pay your tobacco bills, yes.

If you pay for what you drink, yes.

If you pay your laundry bills, yes.

If you pay your railroad fare, yes.

If you pay your freight bills, yes.

If you pay your street car fare, yes.

Yes, my dear sir, you are a taxpayer. If you are not a taxpayer, you are the most consummate and successful deadbeat on earth. There is hardly a moment of an honest man's life but he pays taxes in one way or another.—Living Issues.

NEED OF A REVISED DICTIONARY.

Imperialism has made necessary new definitions of old words—equally applicable in England and in this country. For example:

Digitized by Google

Liberty—The rule which a strong nation imposes upon a weak one.

Freedom—Such measure of local self-government as a conquering nation deems safe for its subjects.

Civilization—Our way of doing things.

The constitution—A rubber blanket when the executive needs to stretch his authority; a woolen blanket when it is necessary so to shrink it that it will not cover island possessions.

Good faith—A readiness on the part of Boers, Puerto Ricans, Filipinos and Cubans to accept whatever the governments that have them in charge may offer.

Benevolent assimilation—What the lion gives to the lamb.

Duty and destiny—A freebooter's commission.

The flag—A nation's "best commercial asset."—Cecil Rhodes.

A new edition of the imperial dictionary will be awaited with much interest.—New York World.

THE QUESTION OF EXPANDING BULLETS.

The following is from the English publication, "War Against War in South Africa." We reprint it from Life.

There is some angry talk in the camps of murdering the Boer prisoners who are found in possession of expanding bullets—the illegal bullets they are called. It is worth while to remind these irate gentlemen of one or two facts which they have forgotten:

First. England invented the Dum-Dum expanding bullet.

Second. At the conference at The Hague England defended the Dum-Dum against the unanimous condemnation of every European and Asiatic Power.

Third. That in consequence of her opposition no unanimous interdict on the use of expanding bullets was obtained.

Fourth. That even if it had been secured it would not have bound the Transvaal which was shut out of the Conference by England, and forbidden to adhere to its conventions.

When we remember that the troops employed in the Omdurman Expedition were ordered by our officers to convert their bullets into expanding Dum-Dums, this newborn holy zeal against the use of the soft-nosed bullets by the Boers must appear to the outside world the very climax of cant.

The contrast between the rich and the poor here in New York is enough to stare one out of countenance.—Extract from Private Letter.

PROCLAMATION BY GENERAL MILES TO THE PUERTO RICANS, JULY 27, 1898.

In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States, in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the Island of Puerto Rico.

They come bearing the banners of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose, to seek the enemies of our government and of yours and to destroy or capture all in armed resistance.

They bring you the fostering arms of a free people, whose greatest power is justice and humanity to all living within their fold.

Hence, they release you from your former political relations, and it is hoped this will be followed by your cheerful acceptance of the government of the United States.

The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and give the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation.

They have not come to make war on the people of the country, who for centuries have been oppressed, but, on the contrary, they bring protection not only to yourselves but to your property, and will promote your prosperity and bestow the immunities and blessings of our enlightenment and liberal institutions and government.

It is not their purpose to interfere with the existing laws and customs which are wholesome and beneficial to the people so long as they conform to the rules of the military administration, order and justice.

This is not a war of devastation and desolation, but one to give all within the control of the military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

WHAT THE PUERTO RICO FLASHLIGHT HAS REVEALED.

To turn a republican government into a despotism the basest and most brutal, it is not necessary formally to change its constitution or abandon popular elections. It was centuries after Caesar before the absolute master of the Roman world pretended to rule other than by authority of a senate that trembled before him.

When Henry George wrote these words no sign of foreign war was on the horizon, but he saw daily the things that make for war. They were embodied in the description of Chicago by the Correspondent Stevens, whose life recently went out at Ladysmith:

Chicago, queen and guttersnipe of cities, cynosure and cesspool of the world!—the most beautiful and the most squalid, girdled with a two-fold zone of parks and slums; where the keen air from the lake and prairie is ever in the nostrils and the stench of foul smoke is never out of the throat.

From such vicious social conditions imperialism is a natural growth.

For the machinery of government is in possession of the great commercial monopolies. They thrive upon privileged laws. It is essential for their supremacy that the law-making power should be in their hands. Further, they must control the military arm in order to enforce their authority. Militarism is the necessary complement of commercialism. Property rights are superlative and human rights subordinate. Humanity dictated to the President the "plain duty" of immediate free trade with suffering Puerto Rico. The interests of the great sugar and tobacco trusts ran counter to that duty, and the President was forced to recognize them, the menace being a withholding of contributions for the impending campaign. The universal protest against this cowardice is the most encouraging sign of awakening that the trustful people have thus far shown. The Puerto Rico flashlight has revealed the unofficial masters of our passive Government.—Wm. Lloyd Garrison at Providence, R. I., April 7.

HOW ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON GAVE AWAY HIS BIRTHDAY.

I, Robert Louis Stevenson, advocate of the Scots bar, author of the "Master of Ballantrae" and "Moral Emblems," civil engineer, sole owner and patentee of the palace and plantation known as Vailima, in the island of Upolo, Samoa, as British subject, being in sound mind and pretty well, I thank you, in mind and body;

In consideration that Miss Annie H. Ide, daughter of H. C. Ide, in the town of St. Johnsbury, in the county of Caledonia, in the state of Vermont, United States of America, was born, out of all reason, upon Christmas day, and is, therefore, out of all justice denied the consolation and profit of a proper birthday;

And considering that I, the said Robert Louis Stevenson, have attained the age when we never mention it, and that I have now no further use for a birthday of any description;

And in consideration that I have met H. C. Ide, the father of the said Annie H. Ide, and found him as white a land commissioner as I require, I have transferred and do hereby transfer to the said Annie H. Ide all and whole of my rights and privileges in the 13th day of November, formerly my birthday, now,

Digitized by Google

hereby and henceforth, the birthday of the said Annie H. Ide, to have, hold, exercise and enjoy the same in the customary manner by the sporting of fine raiment, eating of rich meats and receipt of gifts, compliments and copies of verse according to the manner of our ancestors;

And I direct the said Annie H. Ide to add to the said name of Annie H. Ide the name of Louisa—at least in private—and I charge her to use my said birthday with moderation and humanity, et tamquam bona filia familias, the said birthday not being so young as it once was, and having carried me in a very satisfactory manner since I can remember;

And in case the said Annie H. Ide shall neglect or contravene either of the above conditions I hereby revoke the donation and transfer my rights in the said birthday to the president of the United States of America for the time being.

In witness whereof I have hereto set my hand and seal this 19th day of June, in the year of grace 1891.

Robert Louis Stevenson. (Seal.)
Witness, Lloyd Osbourne.
Witness, Harold Watts.

A DEFINITION OF PATRIOTISM.

If patriotism means "our country, right or wrong," then patriotism is clearly nothing more than a form of selfishness. Such crude patriotism is merely one of the many modes of the monopolistic instinct. There is, of course, a higher and truer kind of patriotism; but then the people who display this kind are generally twitted by the vulgar and selfish "patriots" with being unpatriotic. A true patriot, in any good sense of the word, is a man who, finding himself born into a particular community, and, therefore, to some slight extent, sharing the responsibility of its corporate acts, desires to see the community of which he is a member behave always in the most upright and honorable manner. If his country did so behave, he might naturally be proud of her; unfortunately countries in the concrete oftener give one cause for shame and humiliation.

If such a man could see his land striving, not to find new markets for her iron and her cotton by unjust aggression, not to slaughter helpless savages at the instigation of her merchants, not to force opium or gin on unwilling lower races, but to act with such scrupulous justice that her name should be a synonym for fair dealing among the nations, then, indeed, he might justly be glad he belonged to her. But if she does wrong, a true patriot ought to raise his voice against that wrong, even if it enriches her millionaires and gives congenial employment to her major generals.

Your true patriot would even desire to see his country defeated and humbled whenever she embarked on a course of oppression; he would desire to see her stripped of squalid dependencies which sap her manhood and degrade her moral sense; he would long to save her from the fate of the later Roman empire, to which every modern state is eagerly aspiring. Better, for example, a free England, made great by industry, honor, virtue, manliness, literature, science and (if she can ever evolve it) art, than an England which holds half the world in slavery, which crushes revolts on a thousand frontiers, which sends forth crowds of filibusters to South Africa and New Guinea, which wastes her efforts in military enterprises, doomed in the end to bring their inevitable retribution of national decadence. Empire has always destroyed every country that held it, because empire is only a masked name for slavery, and slavery is far more killing and debasing for the master than for the slave. What a true patriot would wish to see is not a "little England," but a great England; what he will always remember is that a great England and a big England are mutually contradictory.

No country can be great which enslaves others. Greatness is a moral, not a physical, quality.—Grant Allen, in The Idler (London), Colonial Edition, March, 1898.

THE GREAT AWAKENING.

A part of a paper read at the Cincinnati Literary Club, March 31, by Chas. B. Wilby.

The Puerto Rican incident, small as it is, is large enough to cause many to awaken to the difference between the theory of harmless beneficent expansion and the fact of cruel, despotic imperialism. The catch words about "trade following the flag," for which there was never any foundation in fact, are now giving way to theory, which sounds quite as well and has more to warrant it, about "the constitution following the flag." The present revolt, however, does not depend upon any catch words; it rests on the innate sense of justice which is strong in the people of this country. As to those people who are called "rebels," and during the pendency of that struggle which is called an "insurrection," many of our citizens have not paused to consider the justice of the position taken by the administration; but when the same despotic hand was laid on those trusting islanders who relied upon the promises which were made to them to the extent of offering no resistance to the invasion of their country (probably owing to their lower degree of intelligence), then the injustice stood out unbefogged and our people have cried out their disapproval of it. In addition, the selfish or protectionist view of the situation has made many others, who a year ago were floating with the tide, pause and consider.

During the debate in the senate on the Puerto Rican tariff bill the other day, a very distinguished senator from the great middle west (the same gentleman who parried a troublesome constitutional point which was thrust at him by saying that the question had "passed beyond the law book stage"), frankly admitted if this country could not levy any duty on goods brought from Puerto Rico here, or any duty on goods taken from our ports to Puerto Rico, that we might as well, to quote his words, "dismantle our custom houses and go out of the business of collecting tariff revenue." And when the senator was asked what he would do with the Philippines, under those circumstances, his answer was: "That might make a very great difference in regard to our policy there." And when further asked what then would become of the philanthropy, the flag, the glory and the humanitarian pretext, he very adroitly changed the subject.

The humanity, duty and destiny mask is rapidly being discarded, and the most strenuous supporters of the administration have honestly planted themselves on the "might makes right" platform, otherwise politely called the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. I heard one of those speeches the other night which told all about how the march of civilization excused what we have been doing in the Philippines. The speech was charmingly phrased and well delivered. But the same argument would have excused anything ever done by Cortes or Velasquez or in the most cruel war of conquest ever waged. The orator drew some remarkable parallels between the invasion by our forefathers of this practically uninhabited country in the temperate zone, and our invasion of those tropical islands uninhabitable by two generations of Anglo-Saxons, and more thickly settled than the United States; but he took care not

Digitized by Google

to get so far down in our colonial history as the year 1776!

WHO ARE THESE WHO KILL KINGS?

For The Public.

Who are these who kill kings?
They are those who seek death
While the careless kill time
And forget what God saith.

Who are these who kill kings?
They are those who lack bread
While the idle feed high
And malign the great dead.

Who are these who kill kings?
They are those who born wrong,
Rot beneath their hard work,
Hence can never grow strong.

They are those who lose hope,
They are those whom wrong brings;
'Twas for such that Christ died;
These are they who kill kings.

W. D. McCRACKAN.

HOW THE DEVIL QUOTES SCRIPTURE IN DEFENSE OF POVERTY.

An extract from a sermon delivered in the pulpit of the Vine Street Congregational Church, Cincinnati, Sunday evening, March 25, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

Poverty, that state of destitution from which there is no honorable escape, is slavery. Like chattel slavery, such poverty is the creation of human law. The preachers who quote Scripture to prove that such poverty is a divine institution are only doing what was done commonly a generation ago—they are quoting the Bible in defense of slavery.

Slavery exists whenever one man is protected in the ownership of another man's labor. When chattel slavery was abolished the planters still owned the plantations. The negroes were compelled to work on those same plantations. They were compelled to take what their former masters would give them. Except for the fact that they are usually free to change masters, and are not so liable to personal violence, it is a question whether they are much better off now than before the war. No man is obliged to feed them now. No man is obliged to keep them in sickness and old age. No man is obliged to give them work. If the freedman's wage is the least bit greater than the keep of the slave, the slave was sure of his keep, but the freedman is not sure of his wage. How many are compelled to bend their neck to the yoke and perform in hopelessness the slave's task for the slave's pay—a bare living!

But what part is the church taking in the great work of the hour, the abolition of economic slavery? Listen to some of the representative men of the church:

Dr. Talmadge says: "I think that when an entertainment that will scatter $100,000 is given, the man who can't see that $90,000 of it will reach the poor needs a pair of spectacles."

If we were not living under a form of slavery by which it is impossible for women to make clothes for their own children without the permission of their masters, it would never occur to us that there could be any profit in seamstresses spending their labor upon elaborate costumes that could serve only a moment of vanity. It only illustrates how insane our life is that waste should seem profitable.

No man ought to need a pair of spectacles to see that no man who depended upon some form of honest labor of hand or brain could afford to squader $100,000 on a night's revel. This wealth belonged to the laborers of New York, and it was neither justice nor charity to allow them to redeem a portion of their own property by earning it the second time.

I would not dictate to a man how he should spend his money, if it is his. But I would not call robbers philanthropists, even though they chose to spend their plunder in riotous living.

A woman came into the free clinic of one of our hospitals showing signs of distress. The physician inquired what was the matter. She replied: "A gentleman kicked me." We are being robbed by gentlemen. They break no law. But even though the oppression they practice is legalized, the wine that flows at their revels is the blood of crushed and broken hearts, the spoil of the poor is in their houses, and their gold drips with the tears of bondmen.

But what of our industrial order has the elements of slavery in it? The Rev. Dr. Holland, of St. Louis, says: "Enough that signs of remaining bondage are not now; that in so far as the bondage remains it is necessary and good, both for the bondsman and the society that binds him." When would chattel slavery have ceased if men had acted on the assumption that in so far as bondage remains it is necessary and good? What a pity Jesus did not know of the modern doctrine that in so far as evils exist they are necessary and good! He might have taken things easy; he might have gotten a sinecure under Caiaphus, and let evolution reform the world.

Dr. Theodore Cuyler says that the best cure for the perils of a growing plutocracy would be the multiplication of men like Cornelius Vanderbilt.

A prominent clergyman of our city said recently that we should have the poor with us always, because Jesus said so, and that the rich and the strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak and the poor. Charity tells the rich to bear the burdens of the poor. Jesus tells the rich to bear their own burdens. The poor can take care of themselves if you give them a chance. They bear their own burdens now, and a good share of the burdens of the rich besides. How many mothers there are who do the rich woman's work in the daytime and who go home at night to bear their own burdens, to clean their own home and suckle their own young! The poor build the rich man's houses, cook his meals, supply his table, nurse his children, fight his battles. And yet the rich man's preacher continues to indulge in pulpit pleasantries about the helpless poor who need the protection of the rich.

The greatest enemies of mankind are the priests who flatter men that they may please God by anything less than the performance of complete justice. In this last as in all former struggles for liberty,

The solemn priest to Moloch, on each God-deserted shrine,
Breaks the bondman's heart for bread, pours the bondman's blood for wine.

Then let, O God, thy servant dare
Thy truth in all its power to tell,
Unmask the priestly thieves, and tear
The Bible from the grasp of hell!

THE REAL ENEMY OF LABOR.

To many capital has power, not only to grant or withhold employment, but to exact and oppress labor, a power that needs God's grace to restrain it. Capital has no such power; never had, never can have. Capital is labor's faithful henchman, ally, partner. Capital is labor's seven-league boots, telescope arms and multiple fingers. Capital is labor's creation and dependent. Withhold labor and capital pines away and dies. Labor can subsist without capital. Capital cannot exist without labor. The oppressor and exactor is not capital but a certain devilish force that will task the united grace and energy of pulpit and pew to exorcise it.

Let us discover this force and trace its genesis.

God, the Universal Father, giveth "to all life, and breath, and all things." Gifts all. Man can maintain the life that God gave him only by drawing sustenance from the earth. Land is among the gifts of God. But lo! we have wrested this gift and have perverted it into an article of merchandise. Land being everywhere in civilization withheld from use or offered at a price, labor in the primary in-

Digitized by Google

dustries, to retain its full earnings, must forsake civilization and betake itself to a spot distant from the benign influences of neighborhood. Or unable thus to migrate, it comes into the towns and cities, there to contend for employment with labor already located.

Land ownership, atheistic and inhuman, is the force mistaken for capital. It and it alone drives labor into submissively accepting a "fair living wage" so-called, or into thankfully accepting a wage based on the supply of labor.

The continuous, persistent act of simony in turning God's gift into something to be bought for money, is a crime of which society must repent —a crime it must cause to cease.

When this act of repentance is performed, then, and then only, can we ascertain easily what labor really produces. Labor restored to the free use of the earth can employ itself and retain all it produces, and its earnings while thus employed afford a standard by which to measure its wage when it decides to enter the employment of another.

Between society and peace and good will among men, between mankind and the kingdom of heaven on earth, rises the barrier—the monopoly of earth's resources. . . .

Men now buy land, not to use it, but to reap future profit as its value increases. Destroy this sordid hope, and men will hold land only to produce on it. Land develops value, when, and only when, men appear on it and stay, and labor, and act righteously. No one individual can give value to land. It is produced by the many, and therefore only to the many, to the public, to the community it righteously belongs.—James T. Barnard, in Hamilton (Can.) Herald.

"THE MAN WITH THE HOE."

Extracts from notes on "The Man With the Hoe," made by the author, Edwin Markham, and recently published with the poem, illustrated, by Doubleday and McClure, of New York.

From boyhood till this hour I have wondered over the hoary problem that has been passed down to us from Job. Why should some be ground and broken? Why should so many go down under the wheel of the world to hopeless ruin as far as human eyes can see?

I had also been stirred by the faith of Isaiah, by his great faith in the coming of social justice when men "shall not build houses and another inhabit them; when they shall not plant and another eat."

Then, too, I knew how the world's injustice had forced from Christ's strong heart that cry against the mouths that devour widows' houses, and that other cry against the feet that walk over graves.

Fourteen years ago I came upon a small print of Millet's picture of the Hoeman; and it at once struck my heart and my imagination. It was then that I jotted down the rough "field notes" of my poem. For years I kept the print on my wall, and the pain of it in my heart. And then (ten years ago) I chanced upon the original painting itself.

Millet's "Man With the Hoe" is to me the most solemnly impressive of all modern paintings. As I look upon the august ruin that it pictures, I sometimes dare to think that its strength surpasses the power of Michael Angelo. To me it comes wrapped around with more terror than the fearsome shapes in Dante. This Hoeman is on earth; he walks among us.

For an hour I stood before the painting, absorbing the majesty of its despair, the tremendous import of its admonition. I stood there, the power and terror of the thing growing upon my heart, the pity and sorrow of it eating into my soul. It came to me with a dim echo in it of my own life—came with its pitiless pathos and mournful grandeur.

I soon realized that Millet puts before us no chance toiler, no mere man of the fields. No; this stunned and stolid peasant is the type of industrial oppression in all lands and in all labors. He might be a man with a needle in a New York sweat-shop, a man with a pick in a West Virginia coal mine, a man with a hod in a London alley, a man with a spade on the banks of the Zuyder Zee.

The Hoeman is the symbol of betrayed humanity, the Toiler ground down through ages of oppression, through ages of social injustice. He is the man pushed away from the land by those who fail to use the land, till at last he has become a serf, with no mind in his muscle and no heart in his handiwork. He is the man pushed back and shrunken up by the special privileges conferred upon the Few.

In the Hoeman we see the slow, sure, awful degradation of man through endless, hopeless and joyless labor. Did I say labor? No—drudgery! This man's battle with the world has been too brutal! He is not going upward in step with the divine music of the world. The motion of his life has been arrested, if not actually reversed. He is a hulk of humanity, degraded below the level of the roving savage, who has a step of dignity, a tongue of eloquence. The Hoeman is not a remnant of prehistoric times; he is not a relic of barbarism. He is the savage of civilization.

The Hoeman is the effigy of man, a being with no outlet to his life, no uplift to his soul—a being with no time to rest, no time to think, no time to pray, no time for the mighty hopes that make us men.

His battle has not been confined to his own life; it extends backward in grim and shadowy outline through his long train of ancestry. He was seen of old among the brickmakers of Egypt, among the millions who lifted wearily the walls of Ilium, who carved the pillars of Karnak and paved the Appian Way. He is seen to-day among the stooped, silent toilers who build London and beautify her tombs and palaces.

These were some of the memories and agitations that pressed upon my soul as I stood in the presence of this dread thing—the Accuser of the world. So I was forced to utter the awe and grief of my spirit for the ruined majesty of this son of God. So the poem took shape. It sprang from my long purpose to speak a word for the Humiliated and the Wronged. I have borne my witness. It is said; it is truth; let it stand.

A certain few who obviously have not read Millet's letters are saying in the public prints that the Hoe-poem does not interpret the thought of the painter. They say that he saw only idyllic grace and beauty in his earthworn figures of the furrow. But here is the way Millet writes to his friend and biographer, Alfred Sensier:

My "Man With the Hoe" will get me into trouble with the people who do not like to be disturbed by thought of any other world than their own. But I have taken up my position, and mean to make a stand there. . . I see the haloes of dandelions and the sun, also, which spreads out beyond the world its glory in the clouds. But I see as well in a rocky place a man all worn out, who tries to straighten himself a moment and breathe. . . . Is this the gay, jovial work some people would have us believe in? But, nevertheless, to me it is true humanity and great poetry.

These are the words of Millet.

Again there are a few who say that the hideous Hoeman does not exist anywhere in the world. Do they hope to dispel this Shape by denial? Happy the day when a shrug of the shoulder can dispel this imbruted man—this Accusation.

But those who have eyes to see can

Digitized by Google

see him. Carlyle, than whom there is no greater authority on the wage-slaves of Europe, gives this eloquent testimony:

Two men I honor and no third. First the toilworn Craftsman that with earth-made implement laboriously conquers the earth and makes her man's. . . . Hardly entreated Brother! For us was thy back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed; thou wert our Conscript, on whom the lot fell, and fighting our battles were so marred. . . . But what I do mourn over is, that the lamp of his soul should go out; that no ray of heavenly, or even earthly, knowledge should visit him; but only, in the haggard darkness, like two specters, Fear and Indignation, bearing company. Alas, while the body stands so broad and brawny, must the Soul lie blinded, dwarfed, stupefied, almost annihilated!

It is not the mere poverty of the Hoeman that I deplore, but the impossibility of escape from its killing frost. There are two kinds of poverty. There is that of the pioneer, which is bracing and endurable. Hope has its roots in such poverty, because the means of self-help are not removed. The pioneer has no obstacle between himself and success except his own inertia. There is nothing degrading in the hardship he endures. No middleman comes between him and nature. He has ready access to the land and to other natural resources. With all of his limitations, there is still a path of escape into the heights.

But there is another kind of poverty—hopeless, enervating, destructive of ambition; the poverty of the toiler depicted by Millet, lamented by Ruskin and grieved over by Carlyle; the poverty of the bent drudges in the sweat shops, the factories, the mines.

Do I need to say that the Hoe-poem is not a protest against labor? No; it is my soul's word against the degradation of labor, the oppression of man by man.

I believe in labor, as some believe in creeds. I have little respect for an idler, whether at the tramp end or the millionaire end of the social octave. It is against the public good, against the economy of nature, for any man to be at the same time a consumer and a nonproducer.

I believe in labor; I believe in its humanizing and regenerating power. Indeed, I believe that a man's craft furnishes the chief basis of his redemption. While a man is making a house he is helping to make himself. While he chisels a corner stone he is invisibly shaping his own soul.

And it does not matter much what a man does—whether he hoes a field of corn or builds a poem, whether he guides a plow or directs the destinies of a nation. The thing of importance is the way he does his work. It must be done thoroughly, and in the spirit of the common good, in the spirit of the social welfare. Work of this order is a living sacrament, a perpetual prayer.

The spirit of loving service sends a gleam of the ideal into every labor; and man needs the ideal even more than he needs bread. The ideal is the bread of the soul.

But while it is true work is beautiful and holy, it is also a fact that excesses are evil—a fact that joyless, hopeless, endless labor, overwork and underpaid work, tends to break down both men and nations. And this waste of life is as evident in the pallid faces and buried sympathies of the office and boudoir as in the distorted bodies and torpid minds of the factory and field.

So, in a large sense, the Hoeman is the stunted man in any walk of life. He is any man who has not had outlet for the sleeping forces of his higher self. He may be an editor, a banker, a merchant, a soldier—any man who forgets that we do not live by bread alone; who has let things get into the saddle; who is smothered under the weight of material concerns; who has died to the higher world of ideas and aspirations.

Men have achieved political liberty. The next forward step must be the achievement of industrial freedom. This will be an event greater than was the achievement of political freedom. It will mean the effacement of the barriers that interpose between the common man and the achievement of the common destiny.

And this freedom will be the freedom of all. It will loosen both master and slave from the chain. For, by a divine paradox, wherever there is one slave there are two. So in the wonderful reciprocities of being, we can never reach the higher levels until all our fellows ascend with us. There is no true liberty for the individual except as he finds it in the liberty of all. There is no true security for the individual except as he finds it in the security for all.

It is therefore the obligation of the all-of-us to withdraw the foolish permission which we have given to the Few to own the things which should be the common possession of the People. The withdrawal would be in the interests of the primary rectitudes—in the interests of justice and brotherhood. All that the happiest of us possess should be made possible to the least and the lowliest. It is our sacred duty to keep open the gates of opportunity, "so that every creature, from the least to the greatest, may make his life a moral adventure and a joy."

Am I then my brother's keeper? . . . A Voice answers from Eternity: "Thou art, and as thou keepest him, so will God keep thee."

Clusters of grapes on a lofty tree;
"Pooh!" said the Fox, "too sour for me!"
Just then an inspiration came—
On a low branch he placed his name.
Happening soon a Crow to spy,
"Nice grapes!" he cried; "Miss, won't you buy?"
Said she: "I'll buy, and pay you well,
Only first prove they're yours to sell."
"No fear!" he cried, "behold my name!"
MORAL:
No grapes too high for some to claim!
—Oliver Herford, in Scribner's Magazine.

In his book entitled "The Railway Problem" Mr. A. B. Stickney, President of the Chicago & Great Western Railway, shows the power of railways to tax, and says that the small increase in freight rates of one mill per ton per mile will annually increase the revenue of the C. & N. W. R. R. Co. $1,804,701.00; C., M. & St. P. R. R. Co., $1,620,923.00; N. Y. C. & H. R. R. Co., $2,775,582.00; Pennsylvania & Ft. Wayne Railroads, $5,470,108.00.—Jay D. Miller.

Donohue—Phwat d' yez suppose would happen if wimmin wor allowed t' vote?

Hogan—Bad luck t' thim! Sure, they'd do it so chapely th' min would give up votin' in disgusht!—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, publish William Liebknecht's paper on the question of political trading, which has become a burning one in the socialist party of Germany (of which he is one of the famous leaders), owing to efforts within the party to minimize the socialist economic programme and make the organization a party of opposition in politics. The paper, which has been translated by A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch, is entitled "No Compromise—No Political Trading," and, as the title suggests, it opposes the efforts to divert the party from its original aims. Mr. Liebknecht's essential point is that the socialist party must stand for proletarian class consciousness, or cease to be socialistic.

"The Social Forum" (published monthly by the Social Reform union, 822 Association building, Chicago) devotes the April issue, a special ten-cent number, to the production of the suppressed part of the ninth biennial labor report of Illinois. When George A. Schilling was secretary of the labor bureau of Illinois, during the Altgeld administration, he prepared two biennial reports. In point of usefulness and popularity, they lead the list of all

Digitized by Google

the labor bureau reports of the country, both state and national. The eighth biennial, the first of the two, which appeared in 1895, dealt comprehensively and profoundly with the subject of taxation in Illinois in its relation to labor interests. That report is still in demand from all parts of the world. The second of Mr. Schilling's reports, the ninth biennial, dealt in the same exhaustive way with franchises and public utilities. It did not appear until after Mr. Schilling had gone out of office. His successor published it, but only in part. This part may be had at the cost of postage, upon application to the labor bureau at Springfield. The suppressed part appears, as stated above, in the Social Forum for April, and is accompanied by a valuable introduction by Mr. Schilling himself. Taken together, suppressed part and all, this ninth biennial report of the Illinois labor bureau is a contribution to the statistics and literature of the subject of public utilities which all impartial students will appreciate for its exceptional value.

In "The Principles of a New Politcal Economy" (Indianapolis: William W. Hampton), Henry Rawie enunciates a "value" theory of political economy, which is calculated to hoist Marxian socialists and the so-called Austrian economists with their own petard, and bring them into the Henry George camp in spite of themselves. Mr. Rawie, in common with the Marxians and the Austrian school, regards "value" as the primary subject of economics. Human labor he treats as an effect instead of a cause of value, arguing that it is in itself a froce generated by society. It compels or encourages labor, he argues, "to work along certain lines and carry forward a plan of building the body politic of which human beings are unconscious." And as value is a force, "the conservation of energy in physics has its true parallel in the conservation of value in economics." That is, value is in a sense indestructible. It persists. It is "a constant force, continuing with the life of society itself." Declining as to some things, it is not lost, but is transferred to others; and "is identical, whatever the nature of the object to which it attaches." Value, as the force which causes labor, being supplied by "something in the growing society," increases "in quantity with the increasing activity of society"—with the discovery, that is, of labor saving methods. But this increase in the quantity of value, instead of attaching to goods, has been diverted to and absorbed by land—by "watered securities" and "property in space," to use Mr. Rawie's phrases. This is the explanation of social maladjustments. It is part of Mr. Rawie's philosophy that the idea of demand and supply as raising a question of commodities is a mistake. It raises a question of values. The equilibrium of demand and supply is not, however, a law of value, but an axiom arising from the operation of the most general law of value, namely, "the law of equality whereby a multitude of separate and distinct quantities of values and of things are kept in equal relation to each other and in harmony with the entire plan." Mr. Rawie's theory is quite as simple as he claims it to be, and simpler than his necessarily metaphysical exposition makes it appear. We have only to consider value as something substantial and capable of being carved up and transferred, to think of it as we think of the force of electricity, and to bear in mind the applicability of the physical law of the conservation of energy. That intellectual feat once accomplished—and to students of the Austrian school of economics it should not be difficult—all the rest is both simple and rational.

"The Love of Money," by Perry Marshall (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.), is an historical drama in verse, in which descriptions of economic conditions sometimes do, and sometimes do not mar the rhythm.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Telephone, Main 2711.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS.
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
805 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE,
ALFRED T. JOHNSON.
JOHAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.
LAWYERS,
SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

ESTATE OF MARY FRY, DECEASED.
All persons having claims against the estate of Mary Fry, deceased, are hereby notified and requested to attend and present such claims to the Probate Court of Cook County, Illinois, for the purpose of having the same adjusted, at a term of said Court, to be held at the Probate Court Room, in the City of Chicago, in said Cook County, on the third Monday of May, A. D. 1900, being the 21st day thereof.
Dated, Chicago, April 7, 1900.
SAMUEL C. FRY, JR., Administrator.
105, 106 and 107.

WHEN IN DOUBT, TRY

MOOS' CIGARS

THEY WILL SATISFY YOU.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON LECTURES
BEING DELIVERED AT
HANDEL HALL, 40 E. RANDOLPH ST.,
Will be continued till June 1.
ADMISSION ALWAYS FREE!
Sunday, April 22nd, 3 p. m. sharp—
MR. CLARENCE S. DARROW,
"The Taxation of Personal Property."

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,
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

Volume 2 of the Public

Complete Volumes, including Index, Unbound, sent postpaid at Regular Subscription price, $1.00.

Bound Volumes, to be Ready in a Few Days. Price, $2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee.

Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

If you could buy U. S. bonds on the installment plan and have all unpaid installments canceled at your death, you'd do it, of course. In effect you can do just that if you consult

HENRY C. LIPPINCOTT,
Life Insurance Expert,
921 Chestnut Street,
Philadelphia.

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB
MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.
Program for Friday, April 20th.
DR. HOWARD S. TAYLOR,
"Washington on Living Issues."

OLD BOOKS! Any obtainable BOOK, PAMPHLET, or PERIODICAL supplied.
Libraries, or small lots of Books bought
Catalog free upon application.
H. H. TIMBY, (Book Hunter)
P. O. Box 927. 73tf Conneaut, Ohio

Digitized by Google