

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1900.

Number 122.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

In the estimation of the republicans four years ago, Bryan was a dishonest fool. Now, upon the same authority, he is a man of sterling integrity and exceptional ability who for that reason would make a dangerous president!

The conviction this week at Chicago of a little combination of photo-engravers for violating the anti-trust law of Illinois has its comic side, when one notes the fact that the conviction was secured within sight of the smoke from steel trust chimneys.

The steel trust in Chicago is trying again to coerce its employes for election purposes. McKinley clubs, marching clubs, "rough rider" companies, and so on, are being formed at the works directly under the eye of the trust. All good workmen are expected to join. Those who refuse will surely cast doubts upon their good workmanship.

It was a humiliating rebuke to the kind of Americanism that has latterly come to the front, which, according to Associated Press dispatches of the 25th, the Puerto Ricans administered last week at San Juan. They had almost ignored the Fourth of July. But when the day came for honoring the patron saint of Spain, they made a grand demonstration. It was all Spanish. Not more than half a dozen native houses displayed the American flag, while from 2,000 to 3,000 Spanish flags were unfurled. This pro-Spanish demonstration is made doubly significant by the fact that it occurred on the second anniversary of

the landing of American troops. Between the hostile spirit of to-day and the friendly one which then welcomed the Americans, a wide gulf has been made by the imperial policy of the McKinley administration—made in the face of what McKinley himself declared to be a "plain duty."

Dispatches from Berlin state that the McKinley government has communicated by circular note to the European powers its willingness to cooperate fully in the allied movement for the restoration of peace in China and the establishment of a responsible government at Peking. Notwithstanding the reliable sources from which this information is said to emanate, judgment as to its veracity ought to be suspended. Mr. McKinley has no constitutional right to make an alliance with foreign powers for any such purpose. He may cooperate to save the ministers from a mob. He may cooperate in an emergency to save the lives of other Americans from a mob. But he cannot cooperate to restore peace and establish a responsible government, without cooperating to levy war. And Mr. McKinley has no constitutional authority to levy war. That function is reserved to congress. While the administration has gone far toward ignoring the constitution and centralizing military power in the commander-in-chief, we are not yet prepared to believe that it has reached the point of confederating, without congressional authority, with the military powers of Europe for an invasive war in China.

One of the assistant directors of the federal census, Mr. Wines, in explaining why the census statistics for 1900 are likely to be late, incidentally explains something of more importance. He explains why they are likely to be

false. "A man gives the enumerator certain figures," says Mr. Wines, "as to the cost of running his establishment a year. We find that according to his own figures he has run his business at a dead loss of several thousand dollars." So it is assumed that the man has made an error, and, at the cost of delaying publication, the figures are returned to him for correction. He is expected to show that his business has been run at a profit. If his figures had shown a gain of several thousand dollars, instead of a loss, they would evidently not have been returned for correction. It would then have been assumed that there was no error. Here we have another impressive illustration of the great truth that "statistics, like sausages, depend for their value upon who makes them."

The assassination of King Humbert is not a difficult thing to explain. There is no need for weaving fantastic stories about anarchistic conspiracies, in which lots are drawn to designate the assassin who shall remove this crowned head and the assassin who shall remove that one. Stories of that kind are interesting in novels; but in newspapers they are out of place. No such conspiracy exists. If there were one, one that "meant business," the earth would soon be depopulated of its monarchs. One hundred determined men, willing to die themselves provided that in dying they could make some throne vacant, and ready to draw lots for orders, would be as deadly as Death himself and as difficult to deal with as a ghost. They might stimulate the adoption of drastic laws against men who seek to reform political and social evils by legitimate methods; they might bring down the vengeance of the powers upon such men as these; they might put back the advance of

democracy a century or more—but they themselves would be irresistible. No government could cope with a suicides' club bent on regicide, so long as one member lived. But there is no such club. The assassination of King Humbert by an Italian peasant is as logical as his death of a plague would have been had he exposed himself to its ravages. He died of a social disease.

We are told that Humbert was loved by his subjects. How does anyone know that? When popular love has to find expression through censored newspapers, in a country where free speech if critical is suppressed, its genuineness may be fairly doubted. But that by the way. The question of affection is wholly aside from the case. Humbert expressed in his person a phase of deadly social disease. Though personally of simple tastes, he lived, nevertheless, in great luxury. His splendid palaces were numerous in Italy. He had a fabulous income. And all his magnificence was maintained from taxes drained out of the ceaseless toil of a peasantry who are seldom above the verge of starvation. The relation between this terrible poverty on the one hand and Humbert's magnificence on the other is not direct. He could not have changed the condition. He was not personally to blame. Few victims of disease of any kind are themselves to blame. It only happens that they are in the path of its movement. So with him. Though no more to blame than any other among the thousands of his kingdom, perhaps less to blame than many of his less conspicuous subjects, Humbert stood out as the great personification of that subtle power of plunder to which the starving peasantry were victims. Just as a dying child at the milkless breast of a famished peasant mother would typify one extreme of this Godless social life, so King Humbert in his magnificent luxury typified the other. And so surely as the thought of that disinherited babe might stir up peasant sympathy to the point of passion

for vengeance, just so surely would reflections upon the luxury of the king suggest him as its object. It is disparities like these that generate the social disease of which King Humbert died. As swamps breed malaria, so do such conditions breed assassins. Newspaper hysterics over mythical anarchists' clubs are useless. Worse than useless is it to threaten dire vengeance. It is disease, not crime, with which governments have here to deal. And it can be stamped out only by removing its cause. The indictment for Humbert's death lies against unjust and unnecessary social conditions. It lies against the maladjustments of society which yield luxury to such as him, at the expense of disinheritance and debasing poverty to millions of his subjects.

It must be admitted that the trustees of Wellesley college were in close quarters when the question of accepting a money gift from John D. Rockefeller arose. They were in a sense in the position of Stephen A. Douglas as a candidate for president, of whom a campaign rhymester of the period wrote:

Our poor little Doug will be sadly affected,

Whate'er his political lot.

He'll be S. A. D. if elected;

He'll be S. A. D. if he's not.

Mr. Rockefeller had been approached for a gift. He replied in substance that he thought a college ought to demonstrate its ability to live within its income before he could assist it to get an income. This was an allusion to a debt, which the alumnae undertook to pay off, upon Mr. Rockefeller's promise to contribute, after the debt should have been paid, \$100,000. The debt was paid off and Mr. Rockefeller made his promise good. Then it was that the trustees realized that they would be S. A. D. if they took his gift, and S. A. D. if they refused it. On one hand, to take the gift was to condone the wickedness of the Standard Oil company; on the other, to decline it, was to lose a grip upon the main chance. In this dilemma the trustees did what any

well-informed trustees who preferred being S. A. D. with the money to being S. A. D. without it, would do. They called in as an expert on economic morality the distinguished Prof. Jeremiah Whipple Jenks, of Cornell, and made him umpire. Prof. Jenks decided that an individual and a college are different. An individual may be governed in accepting or rejecting gifts, by his personal tastes. But a college is a public institution, maintained for public ends. In a sense it holds its resources in trust for the public. Consequently, it may in honor and credit accept any money from any source. So Wellesley gets Mr. Rockefeller's \$100,000.

We are of those who approve Prof. Jenks's decision. It is in our judgment true that a college may with honor and credit—at any rate without dishonor—accept money from any source. If Capt. Kidd had left a legacy to Wellesley, supposing he had foreseen the existence and the needs of that latest Rockefellerian beneficiary, there is no good reason why Wellesley should not accept it. So with the Rockefeller gift. But as there are abundant reasons why Wellesley, in acknowledgment of Kidd's philanthropy, should not turn its professor of moral philosophy into a special pleader for piracy upon the high seas, so there are abundant reasons why, in acknowledgment of Rockefeller's, it should not turn its professor of political economy into an apologist for piracy upon the dry land. In other words, the real question is not whether a college ought or ought not to receive gifts of Rockefeller money. It is whether it ought or ought not to become a grateful advocate of the Rockefeller system of getting money. The Wellesley chair of political economy is now a proper object of surveillance.

J. Pierpont Morgan's plutocratic "Journal of Civilization"—better known as Harper's Weekly—has amended the Declaration of Independence. Instead of repealing the clause about life, liberty and the pur-

suit of happiness, as most American plutocrats would like to do, it adds this qualifying phrase: "Under treaty rights." That is truly an ingenious adaptation. We may now read in the venerable charter of our liberties that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and "that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under treaty rights." Mr. Morgan's paper applies the new version to the situation in China. It better fits the situation in the Philippines. The Filipino subjects of Uncle Sam have no rights, according to the imperialists, except treaty rights under a treaty about which they were not consulted and in which no rights are reserved to them. "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under treaty rights" in the Philippines, appears to be a license to pursue, subjugate and kill "little brown men."

And hidden in this amendment to the Declaration of Independence is a menace not only to the "little brown men" of the old east, but to the big white men of our own country. Workingmen who treat the question of imperialism as unimportant may yet realize, possibly after it is too late, that imperialism is a many-headed beast, not half so dangerous to our Asiatic subjects as to ourselves. For a colonial system means a standing army of growing proportions which will not operate in the colonies alone.

In some places imperialist orators themselves openly advocate a large army for home purposes. Among them is Congressman Dolliver, of Iowa, a man high in the counsels of the imperialists, whose nomination at Philadelphia for vice president was prevented only by the superior adroitness of Quay and Platt. Congressman Dolliver threw off all disguise regarding militarism, when he spoke last month at the Chautauqua at Ottawa, Kan. After a fulsome laudation of Grover Cleveland for rushing the regular army into Chicago during

the railroad strike of 1894, and an allusion to the St. Louis street car strike in progress as he spoke, Mr. Dolliver said:

I believe in an army large enough to maintain order not only in Chicago, but also in St. Louis or any other of our great cities.

The ominous meaning of that is plain, notwithstanding Mr. Dolliver's astute interjection about "maintaining order." The worst standing armies in history were for the purpose of "maintaining order." That is what the Russians did in Warsaw—they "maintained order." The object of the great army Mr. Dolliver advocated at Ottawa is not to maintain order in any legitimate sense; it is to be used in the interest and under the direction of great corporations in times of strikes. His words are heralds of militarism. Such an utterance, made before a nonpartisan assemblage of several thousand people in the midst of a great agricultural community, demands the most serious consideration from city workingmen. If militarism is to be advocated upon the country farm, it should at least be discussed in the city workshop.

John T. McCutcheon, of the Chicago Record, whom we have more than once had occasion to mention as one of the best, if not the very best, correspondents in the Philippines, contributes a letter this week to the Record, in which he speaks of the remarkable terror of the Americans by which the Philippine people are possessed. Telling of a trip he made last March with a military detachment to Mindanao, he says that "the coming of the Americans was looked upon as the coming of a dreaded scourge," and compares the terror they feel with that inspired by the Huns and Vandals. Mr. McCutcheon thinks the explanation easy. "The leaders of the insurgents had told frightful stories about the cruelty and bloodthirstiness of the invaders." But that explanation is altogether too easy. Doubtless such stories were told, but such stories would have been ineffectual unless they had had a basis

of truth. No terror of Americans could have been excited by stories of that kind in May, June and July, 1898, nor even in August and September, when the Americans appeared as deliverers, and a peaceable and orderly government under the Filipino flag looked to the United States for recognition of its independence. But after Mr. McKinley had proclaimed the destruction of that government in December, 1898; after he had sent a warship to wrest Iloilo from the inhabitants; after the war had begun in February, 1899, and American shot and shell, sweeping away whole villages, had slain Filipinos by the thousands; after an American army had laid the land waste and filled it with mourning and bitterness and hate—after these acts of invasive and destructive war, the people throughout the archipelago were naturally ready to welcome any story of brutality that could be invented against the Americans. At the bottom it is not these stories but the ruthless invasion that excites terror. The terror inspires the stories, and knowledge of the devastation confirms them. It would not be easy to parallel in history this instance of a loving and grateful people wantonly transformed into a terrified and embittered population.

Another imperialistic move has been made by the administration. This time it is the treasury department that acts. The general appraisers of merchandise at the port of New York decide that for all the purposes of the tariff law the territory of Hawaii is a foreign country. Accordingly they impose upon merchandise imported from Hawaii the same tariff duties that would be imposed upon similar merchandise coming from South America. This is the same in principle as if imports to Chicago from Arizona or New Mexico were subjected to the Dingley tariff. The Chicago Chronicle directs attention to the comedy feature of this latest manifestation of imperialism, when it says that—

it appears that the appraisers have overruled the supreme court and de-

decided that the effect of annexation was to make Hawaii a part of the United States so far as to abrogate the treaty under which Hawaiian products were admitted free, but left it in the condition of a foreign country so far as to make those products subject to full Dingley rates.

Democratic platforms are being lifted this year to distinctly higher levels. Particular instances have already attracted our attention, and we are now able to point to the democratic platform of Michigan as in many respects a model of what at the present juncture a state platform should be. On the subject of taxation and franchises it demands—

a specific tax upon the great mining interests of the state, levied in accordance with the value of their unearned stores of wealth, which ought never to have been given to private control. . . . A tax upon existing franchises of a semipublic character commensurate with their earning power. . . . The regulation of property taxes so as to prevent the shifting of the burden on to the shoulders of productive labor. . . . The prohibition of the granting of further franchises by municipalities except by the direct vote of the people of the territory affected.

And on the subject of trusts this extraordinarily direct attack upon the source of their power harmonizes in principle with the other principal clauses of the platform:

We look with apprehension on the progress of the trusts toward the industrial subjugation of the republic, and, recognizing that their power of oppression is founded on special privileges derived from the statutes, we pledge ourselves to repeal all laws by which special privileges are confirmed.

In this platform, then, are to be found the essential principles of sound taxation, of just land tenure, and of franchise regulation; and when the clause on trusts shall have become the accepted doctrine of the laws, trusts will be no more. Combination there will be. But combination for service is beneficial. There will be no combinations of special privileges, the only kind of combination that is harmful. For special privileges will have been abolished.

The soundest and most complete decision ever rendered by an appellate

court upon the labor question is a recent one of the appellate division of the New York supreme court. It was rendered in an injunction case. Two labor organizations were at war. Both were composed of steam fitters. They were known respectively as the "National" and the "Enterprise." The latter warned employes in the building trade that if they continued to employ members of the "National" union the members of the "Enterprise" and of all allied unions would quit work. This threat had its effect. Employers were discharging such of their men as belonged to the "Nationals;" and in defense of their organization the "Nationals" procured an injunction. The injunction has now been dissolved. In deciding to dissolve it the appellate division reasoned that every workman has the right to say for whom and with whom he will work; that the exercise of this right is absolute and cannot be affected by any motive; that every employer has a corresponding absolute right to say whom he will employ; and that from all this it follows that an individual may legally refuse to work for the purpose of inducing his employer to discharge a fellow workman. Then comes the question of combination, which is the vital one. The court conclusively disposes of it by holding that a workman having this right as an individual—

does not lose it when acting with others, clothed with an equal right, so that employers may continue to say they will not employ persons who are members of labor organizations, and laborers may continue to say they will not work for employers who engage any but members of labor organizations.

This decision goes to the root of the labor question in the law. It holds precisely what the courts should have held from the first, and what they would have held from the first had they not been class courts instead of courts of justice. That which all men have a right to do individually, all, or any number less than all, have a right to do together. Mere association or combination can make no act criminal

if both the end and the means are lawful, unless it is declared to be so by express statute. But judges in the past, striving to serve one class by interfering with the rights of another, have strained statutes and disregarded principle in order to throttle labor organizations. All the sophistries of these judges have now been swept away by this single common sense decision of the New York court.

To be sure, the decision works in favor of employers as well as workingmen. But that does not alter the situation. It is long since employers' unions have been held to any judicial accountability analagous to that to which workmen's unions have been subjected. Were this otherwise, however, the decision of the New York court would be none the less commendable. It is sound doctrine that both employers and workingmen ought to be free to make their contracts. Any workingman ought to have the absolute right, individually or in combination with others, to refuse employment whenever the terms do not suit him. So any employer ought to have the absolute right, individually or in combination with others, to deny employment to any person to whom he objects. If it be urged that this privilege might work hardship through combinations for blacklisting, let it be observed that it is not the combination that would work the hardship. Mere combinations of competitive business agencies cannot work hardship. It is because the combining persons or combinations have legal monopolies which enable them arbitrarily to close all other doors of employment as well as their own. Abolish the legal monopolies, and no workman need have the slightest fear of a blacklist.

In a comment upon the McCann case, of which we published a lengthy account last week, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 25th exhibits a curious flaw in its faculty for distinguishing differences. It defends the incarceration of McCann for re-

fusing to pay a license to be permitted to act as a real estate agent. This is not a tax upon his right to work, it argues, but upon the opportunity to work which the city of St. Louis affords him. Perhaps the point will be better understood if we quote:

Let Mr. McCann use his ability in St. Genevieve or New Madrid or in the open country, and he will find his tax for using his brains will be considerably less; perhaps he will not be taxed at all. But why should 700,000 people permit Mr. McCann to profit by their assemblage in a great city, thus giving him the opportunity to become wealthy, without charging for it—a small sum to be expended for the general good?

In that quotation, but all unknown to the Globe-Democrat, is the gist of Mr. McCann's contention. He admits that the 700,000 people of St. Louis ought not and do not allow anyone to profit "by their assemblage in a great city" without charging for it. But he contends that the sums they charge are not put into the public treasury. Let us explain. No one can do business in St. Louis without paying ground rent. Either in purchase price or rentals he must pay a premium for the privilege of profiting by the assemblage of 700,000 people in that great city. The premium will be very much higher than anything he would have to pay for equal accommodations in St. Genevieve or New Madrid. It is this higher premium that constitutes the charge which the 700,000 people of St. Louis may legitimately make for allowing people "to profit by their assemblage in a great city." The opportunity for work or business is better; consequently location rents are higher. But instead of devoting these location rents to the general good, as it should according to the very just principle suggested by the Globe-Democrat, the city of St. Louis allows the lot owners of the city to keep them. And this notwithstanding the fact that they do not earn the location rents, but that they are wholly due to the assemblage of 700,000 people. One result of this diversion of common funds is a low city treasury, which is supposed to necessitate license taxes

on business. These license taxes, therefore, instead of being a moderate compensation to the public of St. Louis for allowing men to profit by the assemblage there of 700,000 people, are arbitrary extra charges. Now, Mr. McCann insists among other things that no such charges should be made so long as the lot owners of St. Louis hold back for private use any of the location rents which the assemblage of 700,000 people in that great city enables them to exact. In other words, he demands that these location rents be expended for the general good. It is one thing to tax Mr. McCann for the privilege of doing business in St. Louis in proportion to the value of the location he occupies; it is a very different thing to allow some lot owner to levy and retain that tax for his own use, and then to make Mr. McCann pay another and wholly arbitrary tax. The former is benefit for benefit; the other is confiscation.

A very pretty illustration of the fact that the benefit of local opportunities is paid for in location rentals, comes from London. "Some time ago the London county council decided to establish and maintain a free ferry at Woolwich," says Pearson's Weekly of June 2, 1900, "and to place the charge for the same on the rates." It was to be a free ferry. "The fact," continues Pearson's, "that in six years the ferry has carried 30,500,000 passengers proves its success. But when the council attempted to buy 11 acres of land they had inspected at Woolwich before the ferry had been projected, they found the price increased by £3,000 [about \$15,000, or more than \$1,000 an acre] solely on account of the ferry they had themselves established."

Mr. McKinley's junior partner was not always the strenuous advocate of conquest that he now sets up to be. There was a time when his policy of expansion was the same as that of the democratic platform of Kansas City which he now contemns. It was ex-

pansion without imperialism. He formulated this policy once in a life of Benton, which he wrote. Considering in that book the question of annexing the Canadian provinces, he said:

Of course no one would wish to see these or any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our union; the time to have taken those lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts, which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors. We, wiser in our generation, have seized waste solitudes that lay near us, the limitless forests and never-ending plains, and the valleys of the great lonely rivers, and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession.

Congressman Grosvenor, of Ohio, forecasts the result of the forthcoming presidential election in dangerous detail. We give his figures because they may be interesting later in the season:

Certainly Republican.	
California	9
Connecticut	6
Delaware	3
Illinois	24
Indiana	15
Iowa	13
Kansas	10
Maine	6
Maryland	8
Massachusetts	15
Michigan	14
Minnesota	9
New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	10
New York	36
North Dakota	3
Ohio	23
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	32
Rhode Island	4
South Dakota	4
Vermont	4
Washington	4
West Virginia	6
Wisconsin	12
Total	278
Certainly Democratic.	
Alabama	11
Arkansas	8
Florida	4
Georgia	13
Louisiana	8
Mississippi	9
Missouri	17
Nevada	3
North Carolina	11
South Carolina	9
Tennessee	12
Texas	15
Virginia	12
Total	132

Two instances of mob assaults for the suppression of freedom of speech are reported since our last issue. One occurred in North Carolina and the other in Ohio. The Ohio outrage was perpetrated at Mansfield upon four missionaries of what is known in Chicago as "Dr. Dowie's Zion church," but which distinguishes itself as the "Christian Catholic church." These men were obeying the law, and in a congregation of their church at a private house were peaceably exercising their religious rights, when a mob of a thousand people dragged them out of the house and stripping them of clothing daubed their bodies with paint. Instead of protecting the mis-

sionaries the local authorities forced them to leave the town, and then wired the governor that everything was peaceable! The North Carolina outrage occurred in Cherokee county, the victims being a congregation of sanctificationists of some sort. Their church was burned to the ground by a mob, while the Rev. Gay Bryant, a Methodist preacher, egged the mob on with what the dispatches call a sermon. Six people out of 116 who were called out to perpetrate this outrage proved to be good men in Sodom. They refused to act, insisting that everyone had a right to worship according to his own conscience. Outrages like these are so manifestly criminal that no law-abiding person can hesitate to denounce them. The fact that they are supported by local public opinion makes their criminality all the worse. It is not a question of whether the religion of the victims is good or bad. It is a question of the right of each man to choose his religion for himself, and of the duty of everybody else to let him alone.

It is reported of the emperor of Germany that upon addressing a German military force as it left Berlin for China last week he used this language:

If you close with the enemy remember this: Spare nobody. Make no prisoners. Use your weapons so that for a thousand years hence no Chinaman will dare look askance at any German. Open the way for civilization once for all.

Since it is denied that these words were used, and as they do not appear in the official report of the speech, we prefer to believe that they were never uttered. But they do express the strenuous idea of civilization almost with Rooseveltian elegance.

Mr. J. W. Bengough, the well-known Canadian illustrator and caricaturist, puts to us the following question concerning the sacredness of national independence for which we contend:

As an abstract proposition, I am disposed to accept your contention that no nation has or can have the right to deprive another nation of its independence. Applying this principle

to the case of the South African Republic (and waving the question as to whether or not the Transvaal is in the full sense an independent state—let us presume it to be so), I wish to ask for your opinion upon the very practical point which has arisen in this instance, and may arise in many others, viz.: Must we regard such national independence as involving absolute home rule? In other words, must each government be permitted to do what it pleases within its own political borders; treat its citizens or its residents with any measure and degree of cruelty, injustice or oppression it may see fit to inflict, and no outside power have the right under any circumstances to interfere? If we are to accept the doctrine of the sacredness of national independence absolutely, it simply means that if people do not like their treatment in any given country, they can get out, leaving their property, if they have any, behind them. British uitlanders in the Transvaal and American residents in China must simply grin and bear the treatment meted out to them, or leave. No appeal to their home governments is permissible. Perhaps you are not prepared to go quite so far as this. You would still retain the right of every nation to protect its citizens living under foreign governments. Then, just here arises the practical point I refer to. How far shall such protection extend? In the British-Boer case its first stage was friendly appeal on the part of Britain. This proving ineffectual, diplomatic conference was next tried, with no better result; at last armed intervention had to be resorted to. I assume that this meets your approval up to this point. You will say a nation has the right to protect its citizens to the extent of even "licking" their oppressors, but it must not, under any circumstances, divest said oppressors of their national independence. But what if, notwithstanding the "licking," the oppression is likely to be continued as before? What if there is no guarantee of reform in the matter? In view of the notorious character of Kruger and his allies, and the past history of their promise-breaking and compact-ignoring tendencies, no sane man or nation would be disposed to rely upon their word. What, then, is to be done—what could be done in any similar case?—for I am using the Transvaal only as an illustration. Does not the doctrine of national independence, I repeat, involve the abolition of the hitherto admitted right of a nation to protect its citizens abroad?

Since the principle for which we contend is accepted by Mr. Bengough as an abstract proposition, it is incumbent upon him to present an actual

case in which either the rights of foreign residents must be left unprotected or the independence of the nation where they reside must be abolished. This he must do before he can ask if the doctrine of national independence does not involve the abolition of the hitherto admitted right of a nation to protect its citizens abroad. Recognizing that he must do so, he brings up the Transvaal case. But that case has never involved Mr. Bengough's alternative. Whatever the grievances of British subjects in the Transvaal may have been, the Boer government was always ready to submit them to arbitration. Armed intervention on the part of Great Britain was never necessary. It came because Great Britain would not arbitrate. Moreover, the British government assured the Boers of its belief that these grievances could be effectually cured without in any wise jeopardizing Transvaal independence, by simply giving full voting rights to foreigners and allowing them a minority representation of about one-fifth in the law-making body. Grievances so easily cured could not have been sore enough to justify abolition of Transvaal independence, even if the alternative had been presented and it were conceded that such a penalty, so dangerous to all small nations, and so menacing in its possibilities to the peace of the world, could be justified by any personal grievances whatever. We note what Mr. Bengough says about the untrustworthiness of Oom Paul and his allies—that no sane nation would be disposed to rely upon their word. A Boer might take the same position with reference to Mr. Chamberlain. But in fact Great Britain, whether sane or not, professed to be willing at the Bloemfontein conference of June, 1899, to rely upon the word of the Transvaal, provided the Transvaal would promise what she demanded. Yet the bad faith of the Transvaal, if there was any, ante-dated that conference. How, then, can Great Britain now insist upon destroying Transvaal independence because no sane nation

can rely upon the Transvaal word? If the Boers could be trusted then they can be trusted now. Nothing has happened since to discredit their good faith. The Transvaal case does not challenge the abstract proposition. Whether some case in the future might challenge it, it can hardly be profitable to discuss. There is no case in modern history yet which has fairly done so.

Recurring then to the abstract proposition, the danger regarding the abrogation of a nation's independence by force from without is that it places weaker nations at the mercy of stronger ones with which they may quarrel, and makes the question of independence not a matter of peace and order but of conquest and rapine. Once admit the right, and international comity breaks down. The world would soon become a vast centralized and despotic empire.

Some weeks ago the New York Journal of Commerce called Mr. Bryan to account, with a supercilious sneer, for pointing to the increase of farm tenancy in the west as evidence of economic decadence. It admitted the fact, but disputed the inference. Since then it has been bombarded, apparently, with remonstrances upon the subject, to which it replies in the same arrogant spirit in which it criticized Mr. Bryan, and with evident marks of high bred irritation. Its view of the question may be gathered from this extract: "The increase of tenant farming is not due to the impoverishment of farmers, but to the increasing value of farm land." Reducing these two assertions to one by eliminating the least important, we have this result: "The increase of tenant farming is due to the increasing value of farm land." That assertion, whether true or not as an inclusive statement, is true as far as it goes. The increasing value of farm lands does cause increase of tenant farming. But what causes the increasing value of farm

lands? According to the editor of the Journal of Commerce it is greater productivity. He argues, therefore, that higher values are evidence of the prosperity of the tenant as well as of the landlord. That is to say, the landlord could not get higher rent if it was not worth while for the tenant to pay it. Right here the Journal of Commerce does what it arrogantly and with the light touch of a consciously superior pen charges upon its critics. It neglects to distinguish and reflect. To assert that the tenant would refuse to pay higher rent if it were not worth his while is to leave the assertion incomplete. The full statement is that he would not pay it if it were not worth his while under the circumstances. And the circumstances are that the land of the country is so completely monopolized as to create fictitious land values. Tenants must pay rent for land out of proportion to its productiveness because land is made abnormally scarce by monopolization. It is not, therefore, land that makes higher values, but its greater scarcity. Greater productivity there may be; but the greater productivity does not equal the higher rents. Scarcity is the principal factor. It is the only one. Without scarcity of such land, greater productivity would not increase rents at all. But scarcity has the effect of taking the benefit of greater productivity from the user and giving it to the landlord. And when scarcity is complete, as it almost is in the west—that is, when there is no free, or virtually free, land within reasonably convenient access to markets,—rack-renting sets in. That process has well begun in the west. Owing to the great market-scarcity of land, rent absorbs so much of the product that tenants have little chance to accumulate capital. Increasing tenancy in the west means increasing dependency of the tenant class upon the landowning class; and the Journal of Commerce is entitled to all the credit of discovering that this condition is significant of prosperity.

RECIPROCIITY A TENDER TO PROTECTION.

Statistics of our trade with Brazil have been recently quoted in support of an assertion that it has suffered a great decrease. The falling off thus indicated is attributed to the repeal, during Cleveland's administration of the reciprocity treaty with that country. But the figures quoted forcibly illustrate a danger ever lurking in statistics, and the necessity, if we desire to arrive at true conclusions, of considering every factor of the problem.

In comparing the imports from Brazil, the writer referred to—William E. Curtis, in the Chicago Record—fails to consider the fact that coffee, which constituted nearly 80 per cent. of our imports from that country in 1895, the year following the passage of the Wilson bill, has declined in price over 60 per cent. Consequently, though our imports of this article, measured in dollars, declined over 41 per cent., the number of pounds imported increased over 44 per cent.

Our imports of coffee, as reported by the bureau of statistics were as follows:

	1895.	1899.
Pounds	435,871,706	628,417,812
Dollars	\$60,316,677	\$35,253,010

The figures are for the fiscal year ending June 30.

Thus we have a great increase in the quantity of coffee received, at a greatly reduced cost, requiring a much smaller export of our own products to pay for it. This, to a person of ordinary intelligence, would seem an advantage to our country, though to persons of the extraordinary intelligence required to comprehend the beneficence of protection and the emasculated species of free trade for which Mr. Blaine designed to safeguard that policy, it is doubtless different. To be thus flooded with the cheap goods of other countries is, according to their profound philosophy, a calamity to be guarded against.

Coffee, together with India rubber, sugar and cocoa, constituted over 97 per cent. in value of our imports from Brazil in 1895, and over 96 per cent. in 1899. Excepting sugar, all of these articles were on the free list

prior to the enactment of the McKinley law providing for reciprocity treaties, and have remained on the free list to the present time. The McKinley law placed raw sugar such as is imported from Brazil upon the free list, but both the Wilson and the Dingley laws placed a duty on such imports.

Of India rubber, the second in importance of our Brazilian imports, there has been an increase in both quantity and value, the increase in value being most decided. These imports were 26,489,207 pounds, valued at \$13,195,255, in 1895, and 27,464,756 pounds, valued at \$16,999,345, in 1899.

Of cocoa there was an increase from 4,264,701 pounds in 1895 to 4,631,201 pounds in 1899.

The only import in which we find a decrease in quantity is sugar, which decreased from 180,262,039 pounds, valued at \$2,701,287, in 1895, to 41,222,162 pounds, valued at \$810,276, in 1899. As we find the imports of this article for the preceding year to have been 139,426,195 pounds, valued at \$2,317,987, it appears that the principal decrease in imports of sugar from Brazil occurred after the enactment of the Dingley tariff. There being other causes than changes in tariffs for increased or decreased imports, we may not perhaps properly infer that this great decrease in importation of sugar was caused by the Dingley tariff, but such conclusion is certainly more reasonable than that it was the result of the action of President Cleveland and a democratic congress.

Thus we find, instead of a great decrease, a very considerable increase in our imports from Brazil of every article of any importance except the comparatively insignificant import, sugar; and that the principal decrease in imports of this article occurred under a republican tariff.

Looking to our exports to Brazil we find them greatest in the year succeeding the passage of the Wilson tariff.

This law went into effect June 30, 1894, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, our domestic exports to Brazil amounted to \$15,135,025, as against exports of \$13,827,914 in the preceding year under the

McKinley tariff and the reciprocity agreement.

It is true that there was an increase in our exports for the year ending June 30, 1891, to \$14,049,273, from exports of the preceding year amounting to \$11,902,496. But as the McKinley law did not go into effect until October 6, 1890, and the reciprocity dickers were not arranged till some months after, they could have had little or no effect to increase our exports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891.

That the increase must be attributed to some other cause is evident from the fact that our exports to Brazil for the year ending June 30, 1893, fell to \$12,339,584, and did not again reach the figures of 1891 and 1892 until after the enactment of the Wilson tariff, when, in 1895, they reached their highest point.

These figures of our trade with Brazil indicate how trivial and inefficient were the measures for extending our foreign trade proposed by Mr. Blaine and advocated yet by his blind followers who failed to comprehend that the real purpose of reciprocity was, as declared by Mr. Blaine, to "safeguard protection." This was accomplished through deluding the public with the idea that something substantial was being done toward freeing commerce, while in fact the fetters were being more closely riveted and trusts and combinations in restraint of trade more strongly entrenched in privilege.

Chicago.

H. L. BLISS.

NEWS

The safety of the foreign ministers in China, as late as the 24th, is now positively assured. This with the exception, of course, of the German minister, whose murder by a mob the Chinese government promptly announced.

At the time of our last report upon this subject (page 248), the only evidence of the safety of the ministers was a cipher message from Mr. Conger, the American minister, received through Chinese channels. This indicated that the ministers were alive but hard pressed on the 18th. It was accepted as genuine by the American government, but the European pow-

ers with one accord denounced it as a clumsy Chinese forgery. They were unanimously of the opinion that all the ministers had been massacred very early in the month.

But on the 26th a message reached Chefoo from Sir Claude Macdonald, the British minister at Peking. Though this message was dated as early as the 4th it indicated that the legations could hold out for a short time, which had the effect of weakening the theory that the ministers had been massacred early in the month. That theory was further weakened by a second dispatch from Macdonald. Its date was the 6th and its tenor as follows:

We are receiving no assistance from the authorities. Three legations are still standing, including the British. The Chinese are shelling us from the city with three-inch guns and some smaller ones which they use for sniping. We may be annihilated any day. Our ammunition and food are short and we would have perished by this time only the Chinese cowards have no organized plan of attack. If not pressed we may be able to hold out for a fortnight longer. Otherwise not more than four days at the utmost. I anticipate only a slight resistance to the relief force, which I advise approaching by the eastern gate or by the river. Our losses until to-day have been 40 killed and 80 wounded.

On the 27th a servant of the murdered German minister reached Tientsin and reported that the legations were safe as late as the 8th. This was confirmed and the period of assured safety extended to the 19th by a cipher dispatch brought by a Japanese runner to the Japanese consul at Tientsin. The consul had sent the runner to Peking on the 15th. On the 19th he left Peking to return with the dispatch, which was as follows:

We are defending ourselves against the Chinese very well, but now the attack has stopped. We will keep up to the last of the month, although it will be no easy task.

A third message from Sir Claude Macdonald brought the date of safety down to the 21st. He said:

British legation, Peking, June 20 to July 16 repeatedly attacked by Chinese troops on all sides. Both rifle and artillery fire. Since July 16 an armistice, but a cordon is strictly drawn on both sides of the position. Chinese barricades close to ours.

This note was rapidly followed by messages from different directions

containing the same and further assurances, though indicating that the danger was not past. One was from Mr. Conger, who said that by agreement there had been no firing since the 16th. Another was from Lieut. Col. Shiba, Japanese military attache at Peking, who wrote on the 22d that the legations were then impatiently awaiting reinforcements, and explained that they had been blockaded since the 13th of June, and since the 20th of that month had "been attacked continually, night and day, by the Chinese soldiers from more than ten encampments." He added:

By a supreme effort we are still defending. We are daily awaiting with the greatest anxiety arrival of a reinforcing army, and if you can't reach here in less than a week's time it is probable that we will not be able to hold out any longer.

Finally, on the 2d, a fourth message from Sir Claude Macdonald virtually testified to the safety of the ministers down to its date—the 24th. In this note Macdonald said:

We are surrounded by imperial troops, who are firing upon us continuously. The enemy is enterprising but cowardly. We have provisions for about a fortnight and are eating our ponies. The Chinese government, if there be one, has done nothing whatever to help us. If the Chinese don't press the attack we can hold out for say, ten days. So no time is to be lost if a terrible massacre is to be avoided.

Dispatches from Chinese sources are in harmony as to the safety of the foreign ministers with the dispatches quoted above; and they bring the date of safety down to the 27th—five days later than the legation messages. An imperial decree of the 24th stated that "all the foreign representatives, except Baron Von Ketteler," were then "in safety and unharmed," and that "provisions in the shape of food-stuffs, vegetables and fruits" would be "supplied to the legations in order to show" the courtesy of the emperor. And on the 27th Li Hung Chang telegraphed from Shanghai:

Pekin reports ministers alive. Safety assured. Allied forces entrance Peking unnecessary.

As we write (August 2) it is believed that the allied army at Tientsin is advancing upon Peking. It is certain that a movement from Tientsin began on the 1st; and Gen. Sir Alfred Gaselee, commanding the British

forces, had announced his intention on the 31st of making an immediate advance upon Peking, expressing his hope of having the cooperation of the other forces. The report of last week that Gen. Dragiminoff, the Russian, would command the allies was not without foundation, though it is settled that he will not have command. He declines the appointment, said to have been proffered by the czar with the consent of the other powers, pleading advanced age and feeble health.

Italy divides the world's attention for the moment with China because of the assassination on the 29th of King Humbert. The king had attended a gymnastic exhibition at Monza, his summer home, for the purpose of distributing prizes, and was in his carriage about to drive to the palace when he was shot by a bystander named Bressi. He died almost instantly. Bressi, who made no attempt to escape, was immediately arrested. He declared himself an anarchist who had come from Paterson, N. J., especially to commit this murder.

King Humbert was born in Turin March 14, 1814. He was the son of Victor Emmanuel II. of the house of Savoy, and succeeded to the Italian throne on the death of his father, January 9, 1878. He had taken a prominent part, though but a youth, in the events leading up to the unification and consolidation of the Italian states into one kingdom. In 1868 he married his cousin, Margherita of Savoy, and his only son, Victor Emmanuel III., the prince of Naples, succeeds him upon the Italian throne. His reign in general was monotonous, varied by only two great events: the formation of the "triple alliance" with Germany, and Austro-Hungary, which he is supposed to have effected, and the disastrous war with Abyssinia.

Notwithstanding the excitement over the assassination of King Humbert, and the supreme importance of the situation in China, the war in South Africa still demands attention. When we wrote of this subject last week Lord Roberts's enveloping movement reported on page 185 had not yet culminated in success, and he had just begun an advance from Pretoria apparently toward the southwest, the details of which were not yet known. A day or two later he reported a heavy engagement south of

Bethlehem, in the Orange Free State, where his original enveloping plans are supposed to be in operation. The engagement occurred on the 24th and 25th, and in the course of it the British were forced out of some of their positions. New positions, however, were secured, and on the 27th Lord Roberts reported the Boers as closed in upon. On the 30th, after heavy fighting, they surrendered at Fouriesburg unconditionally. The number surrendering was at first reported as 5,000; but a dispatch of the 31st from Lord Roberts made it 986. This number was augmented, however, in a dispatch of the 1st, which told of the surrender of 1,200 more.

Instead of advancing southwesterly from Pretoria, as last week's reports indicated, Lord Roberts appears to have moved eastwardly along the railroad from Pretoria to Lourenzo Marques. On the 25th he reported from Balmoral, one of the stations on the road, that part of his force had fought an engagement the day before six miles south of that point and had routed the Boers by a flank movement. The British pursued, crossing Olifant's river on the 25th and occupying Middleburg on the 29th. But they did not succeed in surrounding the Boer force, and Lord Roberts returned to Pretoria.

In the Philippines also fighting goes on. At Oroquieta, in northern Mindanao, it is reported that in revenge for the murder of an American soldier, who was bolloed while buying food in a native store, a company of the Fortieth infantry killed 89 of the villagers, and that the gunboat Callao afterwards shelled the village. In the general fighting of the week ten Americans were killed and 14 wounded.

An Associated Press dispatch of the 29th from Manila reports the attempted celebration of the amnesty proclamation to have been a complete failure. The natives showed the utmost indifference, and Judge Taft and others of the commission refused to attend the banquet, as they learned that speeches in favor of independence under American protection would be made.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in

detail at Washington to August 2, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)1,847
 Killed reported since May 16, 1900. 41
 Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900 246

Total deaths since July 1, 1898...2,134
 Wounded2,199

Total casualties since July 1, 1898...4,333
 Total casualties reported last week4,280
 Total deaths reported last week...2,081

Cuban news affords momentary relief from this monotonous story of slaughter. On the 31st the American secretary of war made public the war office order for an election in Cuba to choose delegates to a constitutional convention, with a view to organizing a permanent Cuban government. The election is to be held on the 15th of September and the convention is to meet in Havana on the 1st of November. The number of delegates to this convention are apportioned as follows: Havana province 8, Santiago province 7, Santa Clara province 7, Matanzas province 4, Pinar del Rio province 3 and Puerto Principe province 2.

Another part of the world reports peace after sanguinary warfare. This is Colombia, in South America. A revolution had been in progress there for nearly two years. References to it may be found in these columns at page 9, No. 86 in volume 2, and at page 152 of the current volume. The revolutionists had advanced on the 24th to the outskirts of Panama. On the 25th they demanded the surrender of that city, threatening to bombard in case of refusal. The American consul there was immediately instructed from Washington to protest against a bombardment, and in support of his protest to call attention to the treaty of 1848 with New Granada, in which the United States agrees to insure the neutrality of the isthmus of Panama. He was further instructed that the United States would preserve the neutrality of that territory. There was no bombardment. But furious fighting occurred on the 25th around Panama, in which, after great slaughter, the revolutionists were defeated. On the 26th a treaty of peace between the government and the revolutionists was signed. In the treaty formalities Gen. Alban, governor of Panama, represented the gov-

ernment, and Dr. Mendozze and Belisario Perras represented the revolutionists. The revolutionists made a complete surrender, agreeing to give up all their arms, ammunition and ships, and the government granted full amnesty.

NEWS NOTES.

—Prof. David Felmley, a prominent single taxer, was elected on the 31st as president of the Illinois State Normal university.

—The Ohio Association of Democratic Clubs opened its sessions in Toledo on the 1st. Ex-Gov. Altgeld was the principal speaker.

—London, England, is installing a new municipal telephone system at a cost of \$5,000,000. It is expected that there will be 40,000 subscribers at nominal prices.

—The national democratic party (the gold democrats of 1899) will maintain headquarters in Indianapolis during the campaign. Gen. Charles Tracy, of New York, is the chairman of the executive committee.

—Dr. James Gordon Bennett, of Halifax, N. S., is the discoverer of a cure for typhoid malarial and scarlet fevers. The preliminary tests which have been given it at the Cook County (Chicago) hospital have been remarkably successful.

—A world's conference of the negro race was in session in London from the 23rd to 27th. The social, industrial and intellectual condition of the negro was discussed. A large number of prominent American negroes were present.

—The trial in Missouri of Alexander Jester for the murder in 1871 of a brother of John W. Gates, the steel trust magnate, ended on the 1st with Jester's acquittal. John W. Gates had furnished funds liberally for Jester's prosecution.

—The Illinois state campaign was formally opened on the 1st by both of the two great parties. Mr. Alschuler, the democratic candidate for governor, spoke at Peoria, while Mr. Yates, the republican candidate, addressed a meeting at the Chicago Auditorium.

—John Clark Ridpath, the historian, died in New York on the 31st, aged 59 years. His best-known works were his "Popular History of the United States," "History of all Nations" and "Great Races of Mankind." He was formerly editor of the Arena magazine at Boston.

—The bread riots which occurred in British Honduras last week were caused by the increased taxes on the necessities of life. The mob which attacked the palace of the governor general, who is at present on a visit to

London, had to be driven off by a bayonet charge.

—The United States statute which provides that all railroad companies shall equip their cars with automatic couplers went into effect on August 1st. The bill, which was passed by congress in April, 1896, and has been extended several times, provides a penalty of \$100 for each offense.

—Western meat packers, principally of Chicago and Omaha, have advanced the prices of their canned beef from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per dozen for one pound cans and other sizes in proportion. The present heavy demand due to the Boer and Chinese wars is given as a reason for the increase in price.

—Alfred, duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, the second son of Queen Victoria, died suddenly at Coburg, Germany, on the 30th. His son and successor, Carl Edward, the young duke of Albany, will not attain his majority until 1905, and the duchy will in the meantime be governed by his guardian.

—An interparliamentary and press peace conference opened its sessions in Paris on the 31st. A resolution was adopted on the 1st expressing the hope that the armed intervention of the powers in China would not result in new conquests. The object of the congress is to secure international arbitration.

—Secretary of Treasury L. J. Gage began the issuing of the new two per cent. bonds due in 1930, on the 31st, in accordance with the currency law of March 14th. The new bonds are to take the place of such of the old 3s, 4s and 5s as were surrendered for extension. About \$320,000,000 of the new bonds will be issued during the month of August.

—Race riots in New Orleans, which originated in the murder of two policemen by a negro criminal on the 25th, resulted in the death of ten innocent persons, the wounding of a score of others and the burning of a negro school. During the rioting it was found necessary to call out the militia as the police were in sympathy with the mob.

MISCELLANY

CONFESSIONAL.

For The Public.

O woodland ways amid whose scenes I roam!
 Ye 'wake a sense of pleasure in my veins
 Like that which thrills the wanderer nearing home,
 When sight of that dear, hallowed spot he gains;
 Or like to that which, as in evening's gloam
 Devoted ones draw near their rev'renced fanes,

Dilates their souls, and in each bosom reigns.

What time I take me from your much-lov'd scenes
And wander through the busy haunts of men,
No lapse of my affection intervenes,
And so with eager heart I come again;
A child that from the breast enticed has been,
But still returns and on that bosom leans,
For nothing long from your delights me weans.

Necessity has forced my straying feet,
Love of my fellows held me in their ranks;
To serve them as I could I deemed it meet,
But a loet trait with men, it seems, is thanks.
So when long while I'm hindered from the banks
Of your clear runnels fringed with herbage sweet,
I long with quickening pulse for your retreat.

My heart is weary of men's sordid strife,
Their selfishness, and their ambitions low;
Their recklessness of others' weal, and life
Grows irksome and almost I fain would go.
They prate of prayer, on faith impassioned grow,
And still the world with pain and woe is rife,
War rages still—I hear its drum and file;

The seed of right and justice, long time sown,
Has sprung to but a shrub of stunted size;
The bud of liberty is yet unblown;
Humanity's sweet song doth scarcely rise.
The very lands that boast it as their own
Peculiar plant, have least of freedom's prize;
Though none has much, and their great boasts are lies.

But here, in Nature's verdant fane, a rest
From thankless toil and deeds without esteem,
O woodland ways, awaits the pilgrim's quest;
Where graciousness and peace float down each stream,
Where every bough waves welcome to the guest,
And the low-whispering breezes ever seem
Sad if the face they fan is slow to beam.

Here ev'n the sordid and self-poisoned mind
May feel a sympathy more strong than gold;
For Nature, e'en to wildest moods inclined,
Wakes to our sense some semblance that we hold;
Speaks with soft voices of the ties that bind
Unbreakably until our falling mould
Rests from life's combat in her tender fold.

And since we here anon may strength regain,
By thoughtful rest, for strife that hopeless seems,
Somewhere, perhaps, a better day remains,
And some faint ray of hope aforward gleams.
A nobler race may rise to cleanse the streams
So long befouled, to wipe away the stains,
And break in righteous wrath long-chafing chains.

HARRY BLUNT

AN EFFECT OF POVERTY.

The writer knows a little Italian lad of six to whom the problem of food, clothing and shelter has become so immediate and pressing that although an imaginative child, he is unable to see life from any other standpoint. In his mind the goblin or bugaboo of the more fortunate child has come to be the need of coal, which caused his father hysterical and demonstrative grief when it carried off his mother's inherited linen, the mosaic of St. Joseph, and, worst of all, his own rubber boots. He once came to a party at Hull House, and was interested in nothing save a gas stove in the kitchen. He became excited over the discovery that fire could be produced without fuel. "I will tell my father of this stove. You buy no coal; you need only a match. Anybody will give you a match."

He was taken to visit at a country house, and at once inquired how much rent was paid for it. On being told carelessly by his hostess that they paid no rent for that house, he came back quite wild with interest that the problem was solved. "Me and my father will go to the country. You get a big house, all warm, without rent." Nothing else in the country interested him but the subject of rent, and he talked of that with an exclusiveness worthy of a single taxer.—Howard's American Magazine.

THE ONLY DIVINE MATING.

The day will yet dawn when we will see that it takes two to generate thought; that there is the male man and the female man, and only where these two walk together hand in hand is there perfect sanity and a perfect physical, moral and spiritual health.

We will yet realize that a sex relationship which does not symbol a spiritual condition is a sacrilege.

We reach infinity through the love of one, and loving this one, we are in sympathy with all. And this condition of mutual sympathy, trust, reverence, forbearance and gentleness that can exist between a man and a woman gives the only hint of Heaven that mortals ever know. From the love of man for

woman we guess the love of God, just as the scientist from a single bone constructs the skeleton—aye, and then clothes it in a complete garment.

In their love affairs women are seldom wise nor men just. How should we expect them to be when but yesterday woman was a chattel and man a slave-owner? Woman won by diplomacy—that is to say by trickery and untruth, and man had his way through force, and neither is quite willing to disarm. An amalgamated personality is the rare exception, because neither church, state nor society yet fully recognizes the fact that spiritual comradeship and the marriage of the mind constitute the only divine mating.

The love of a man for a maid or a maid for a man can never last, unless the two mutually love a third something. Then, as they are traveling the same way, they may move forward hand in hand, mutually sustained.—"Little Journeys to the Homes of English Authors: Robert Burns," by Elbert Hubbard.

CHRONOLOGY FOR JULY.

(By Our Own Statistician.)

1. Art of writing without thinking discovered by Karl Max, 1867.
2. Spanish bandits left Cuba and American bandits took their place, 1898.
3. Mahomet goes to the hill; Arabia 621. Hill goes to Mahomet; Nebraska, 1900.
4. "Understanding" between tories in England and tories in America repudiated by American people, 1776.
5. Renewal of "Understanding," made between Salisbury, representing tory party in England, and Hay, representing tory party in America, 1899.
6. Boer envoys found marble heart and wooden ear in Washington, 1900.
7. Benevolent assassination of Filipinos by McKinley, 1899.
8. First known experiment in state socialism: Tower of Babel begun B. C. 2346.
9. Open door (to a trap) discovered in China, 1899.
10. Republican party causes eclipse of sun, 1870.
11. Chauncey M. Depew appointed court jester to plutocracy, 1885.
13. Gold standard set up by Israelites, B. C. 1481.
15. Ananias, father of the newspaper press, died 33.
16. Patriotism discovered by Dr. Samuel Johnson, 1760.
18. Torch of liberty lighted in France, 1789.
19. Duke of Argyll picks up the hot end of a poker, 1884.
20. Great famine in India and great

prosperity in the United States caused by exports exceeding imports, 1899.

21. Our infant industries protected by assassination of workmen, at Pittsburgh, 1877, at Homestead, 1892, at Chicago, 1894.

24. First ship built by Noah, strictly hand-made and without the aid of a subsidy, B. C. 2448.

31. Mr. Wilson tries to temper the tariff wind to shorn workmen, 1894. —Wilmington (Del.) Justice.

THE "GEORGE JUNIOR REPUBLIC."

What impressed us most was the freedom from restraint, without lawlessness or disorder. The children from five to eighteen years were happy and interesting, could go anywhere over the farm without restraint. We were given in charge of a boy and girl to show us around, and we were introduced to all the "citizens" as we met them. Father had a list of the children from Syracuse, 18 in all, and checked them off as he met them. They were an interesting lot. We took dinner and supper with them, and were surprised to see the politeness and consideration they had for one another. They had a ball game with a Cortland ball team, and had as merry and happy a time as any school team could have.

The whole time we were there we did not hear a profane word, a quarrel, or witness an unpleasant incident of any kind. It seems remarkable, when you consider there are nearly 150 children from all over the United States, all of whom have committed all sorts of offenses, from murder and arson to horse-stealing, yet in a few years, under the influence of the republic, have become good citizens of the republic, and are ready and willing to help the new incorrigible as soon as he is willing to be helped.

We were shown the worst boy the authorities of the state of Massachusetts could find, whom they sent to the Republic as a test case, and were told the state authorities were very well satisfied with the result. He was playing on the ball team, and had just as much liberty as any. Boys and girls, white and colored, were around together freely, sat together at the tables, could romp and play without restraint. The boys showed more politeness and consideration for the girls than one often sees.

A little girl had charge of one of the buildings to keep clean and in order.

We saw the "prison gang" going lock-step from their work in the ditch,

to their cells for dinner, in charge of a boy policeman; not a word of jeer or taunt was heard. They were required to work all day at digging ditches, and not allowed to speak to each other. For good behavior they are paroled, but are compelled to wear a striped suit until their sentence has expired. We saw several paroled prisoners with the others.

The girls have separate prisons, with girl caretakers and a girl judge to try such cases as should not come before the Republic. The girl prisoners work in the laundry for punishment.

The Republic motto is "Nothing without labor," and if they don't work they starve, or are committed for vagrancy, and have to work for the Republic without pay until such time as they are willing to work for themselves.

A POINTED QUESTION FROM JAPAN.

The Literary Digest tells us of The Orient, a Tokyo magazine edited in English by Japanese for the avowed purpose of enlightening the Anglo-Saxon world with regard to Japan. Its editor is very anxious for an explanation of the apparent divergence between Christian theory and practice. The Digest condenses his article as follows:

Japan enjoys the unique distinction of being the only non-Christian power that has been admitted into what is called the comity of nations on a footing of perfect equality, and to judge from the utterances of the European and American press she is by no means the least respected power. Unfortunately, the cause of this respect is not such as to satisfy all Japanese. Japan has made great progress in the arts of peace, but that is not really why she is respected. That respect was earned in a short nine months by the achievements of the Japanese army and navy. Now, that sort of thing is pleasing enough to a nation's amour propre, but on calmly thinking the matter over some Japanese would wish that the respect of western nations had been earned by something else than by mere proficiency in the art of slaughter conducted on modern scientific principles. Russia, too, is respected and feared. Yet she is the only non-constitutional country in the comity of nations. The liberty of the individual and of the press is under the tyranny of mere administrative orders in Russia, and official peculation is nearly as rife as in China. And this gives rise to strange misgivings. Are the so-called Christian nations really followers of the religious cult they

so ostentatiously and proudly profess?

Without going so far with Count Tolstoy as to say that his rendering of the real meaning of Christianity is the correct one, we do go so far as to say that the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount are the most important in the so-called Christian code of morality. And these precepts unquestionably are against war, and all against according honor to any nation or any man on the mere grounds of success in the exercise of brute force, much less of success in slaughtering enemies. And yet it is precisely on these grounds that non-Christian Japan has been accorded the respect of so-called Christian Europe and America!

We can very well understand the old Hebrews respecting us for success in war, for the old Hebrew God was a God of battles. But we have always understood that the Christian Father in Heaven was no mere tribal war god, but a God of love. The present situation is not a little puzzling to us benighted heathens of Japan, who have earned the respect of those who profess to follow the precepts of Christ on the mount by success in slaughtering our enemies, and by that alone. Will real Christians kindly explain what it all means?

SOME FACTS ABOUT PUERTO RICO.

Extracts from a speech made in the house of representatives by the Hon. Charles E. Littlefield, of Maine, February 23, 1900.

It is inhabited by about 1,000,000 people. Seventy thousand of them are dark-skinned people; 100,000 of them are of mixed blood; 830,000 of those living upon that island are white, Caucasian people, made up of Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, English, American, Scotch and Irish. Its area is about 3,650 square miles, giving, say, 273 persons to the square mile.

The intelligence of these people is not measured (as was suggested, I have no doubt, with honest intent as to accuracy) by the assumption, that only ten per cent. are able to read or write. The result of the last census, taken under the authority of the United States by Col. Dingman, who returned to this country within three weeks, shows that about 25 per cent. can read and write. The island has a property valuation of \$160,000,000 to \$180,000,000. Before our flag was raised upon its soil it was under Spanish domination. It had an autonomous local government, with universal suffrage.

The people of Puerto Rico had the same pro rata representation in the Spanish cortes as the citizens of the empire, in Spain itself. They had 16 members in the lower house, and four members in the upper house. Every citizen of Puerto Rico had the same legal rights as a citizen of Spain. With reference to tariff conditions, for several years preceding the advent of Miles upon their soil, they had a ten per cent. preferential tariff between themselves and Spain. By virtue of a budget which had been adopted and accepted, and by a statute which had been enacted by the Spanish cortes, this tariff of ten per cent. was to expire on the 1st of July, 1898, so that on, and after that date, there would have been perfect free trade between Puerto Rico, and the parent state, Spain. * * * For years, has this island been populated by this white, Caucasian population. It never has had a dollar of public indebtedness. Time, and time again, the island from its own taxation, has loaned to Spain money with which to carry on its various wars; and it has loaned to Santo Domingo and Cuba money for their public purposes. When the American flag was raised over this island, it had a surplus of a million and a half dollars in its treasury.

The people who inhabit this island are a self-respecting, valorous and heroic people.

Four times, during the eighteenth century, unaided and alone, the citizens of Puerto Rico repelled the attacks of the English navy, once under the command of Drake, and once under the command of Abercrombie, and preserved Puerto Rican soil, for Puerto Rico, against the most powerful of foreign invaders, although it was then a dependency of Spain.

Puerto Rico, in 1873, manumitted its slaves without tumult, without disturbance, without bloodshed, without murder, without outrage, and without revolution. With the consent of the Spanish cortes, upon motion of a representative of Puerto Rico, in one moment 39,000 persons who before that time had been in human bondage, became freemen. One day found them slaves; the next day they continued in their employment for the same masters, but working for hire—their own masters. On one day they bent down, bondmen. The next day they stood erect, freemen. This great change was wrought as quietly and silently as the dawn precedes the rising of the sun.

The little island of Puerto Rico paid

for those slaves, by its own revenue, from its own prosperity. Seven million eight hundred thousand dollars in 1873, with a loan that required only 14 years to pay, and, adding the interest and principal, aggregating the magnificent sum of \$12,000,000—paid by whom? By the people that live to-day in Puerto Rico. For what? To emancipate 39,000 human bondmen. This nation of "illiterates," this people to whom we now propose to act the part of a "good Samaritan!" That was a deed worthy of the highest triumph of Christian civilization anywhere. The mechanics of Puerto Rico, consisting of masons, blacksmiths, leather workers, and silversmiths, are superior in their various branches to similar mechanics in nearly every part of the civilized world. The carpenters and cabinetmakers do not rank so high.

THE CRISIS WE FACE.

For The Public.

Every page in the world's history is an oft-told tale. The scenes and incidents of each vary, but the plot is the same—always it is the struggle of the weak with the strong, the "irrepressible conflict" between justice and injustice.

At every crisis in a people's history there have been men wise beyond their times who pointed out the way of right and prophesied the inevitable result of deviation from that way. These prophecies are as applicable to the crises of to-day as they were to the times in which they were first uttered.

More than 125 years ago Lord Chatham stood up in the parliament of England and spoke in defense of the American revolution. With the change of a few words here and there that memorable speech might be aptly spoken again by any English patriot in sympathy with the Boers.

Half a century ago William H. Seward said of the collision between free labor and slave labor.

Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between two opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will sooner or later become either entirely a slaveholding nation or entirely a free-labor nation.

There are men to-day who think that the collision between capital and labor is "accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral," whereas it is but another "irrepressi-

ble conflict," the issue of which will decide the nation's fate and place her among the slaveholding or the free-labor nations.

We are on the eve of a presidential election which will decide between imperialism and anti-imperialism, and we have again the warning of Theodore Parker, spoken a generation ago:

Do you know how empires find their end? Yes, the great states eat up the little: as with fish so with nations. Aye, but how do the great states come to an end? By their own injustice, and no other cause. Come with me, my friends. Come with me into the inferno of the nations, with such poor guidance as my lamp can lend. Let us disquiet and bring up the awful shadows of empires buried long ago, and learn a lesson from the tomb.

Come, old Assyria, with the Ninevite dove upon thy emerald crown. What laid thee low? "I fell by my own injustice. Thereby Nineveh and Babylon came with me to the ground."

O queenly Persia, flame of the nations, wherefore art thou so fallen who troddest the people under thee, bridgedst the Hellespont and pouredst thy temple-wasting millions on the western world? "Because I trod the people under me and bridged the Hellespont with ships and poured my temple-wasting millions on the western world. I fell by my own misdeeds."

Thou muse-like Grecian queen, fairest of all the sisterhood of states, enchanting yet the world with thy sweet witchery, speaking in art and most seductive song, why liest thou there with the beauteous most dishonored brow, reposing on thy broken harp? "I scorned the law of God; banished and poisoned wisest, justest men. I loved the loveliness of flesh embalmed in Parian stone; I loved the loveliness of thought and treasured that in more than Parian speech. But the beauty of justice, the loveliness of love, I trod them down to earth! Lo, therefore have I become as those barbarian states—as one of them." Oh, manly, majestic Rome, thy seven-fold mural crown all broken at thy feet, why art thou here? 'Twas not injustice brought thee low, for thy Great Book of Law is prefaced with these words: Justice is the unchanging everlasting will to give each man his right. "It was not the saint's ideal, it was the hypocrite's pretense! I made iniquity my law; I trod the nations under me. Their wealth gilded my palaces—where thou mayest see the fox and hear the owl—it fed my courtiers and my courtesans. Wicked men were my cabinet counselors—the flatterer breathed poison into my ear. Millions of bondmen wet the soil with tears and blood. Do you not hear it crying yet to God? Lo, here have I my recompense, tormented with such downfall as you see! Go back, and tell the new-born child who sitteth on the Alleghanies, laying his either hand upon a tributary sea, a crown of thirty stars above his youthful brow—tell him there are rights which states must keep, or they shall suffer wrongs. Tell him there is a God who keeps the 'brown' man and the white, and hurls to earth the loftiest realm that breaks his just eternal law. Warn the young empire that he come not down dim and dishonored to my shameful tomb! Tell him that justice is the unchanging, everlasting will to give each man his right. I

knew it, broke it, and am lost. Bid him to keep it, and be safe."

As Chief Justice Story said:

We stand the latest, and if we fall, probably the last experiment of self-government by the people.

Within the next few months it will be decided whether the people will preserve "what they themselves have created," or whether America "is to be added to the catalogue of republics, the inscription upon whose ruins is, 'They were, but they are not.'"

LIDA CALVERT OBENCHAIN.

WHAT PATRIOTISM DEMANDS.

We have sympathized with all oppressed peoples—with Ireland, Greece, Armenia, Cuba. To emancipate the slave we gladly sacrificed the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers. And now the American soldier, who should never shoulder a gun except in a righteous cause, is sent 10,000 miles across the ocean to shoot men whose real crime is that they wish to be free, wish to govern themselves.

To say that they are unfit for freedom is to put forth the plea of the tyrant in all ages and everywhere. The enemies of liberty have never lacked for pretexts to justify their wrongs; but, in truth, at the root of all wars of conquest there lies lust for blood or for gold.

If the inhabitants of the Philippines came gladly to throw themselves into our arms, we should refuse to do more than counsel, guide and protect them until they form themselves into a stable and independent government. What then is to be thought of those who seem resolved either to rule or to exterminate them, believing probably that the only good Filipino is a dead Filipino?

The thought of ruling over subject peoples is repugnant to our deepest and noblest sentiments. It is part of our good fortune, of our providential position and mission in the world, that our country is vast enough and self-sufficient enough to make all desire for conquest an unholy and meaningless temptation. We have room for three or four hundred millions of human beings. If more are required, and we are true to ourselves, British America will come to us without there being need of firing a gun.

We have money enough already and our wealth is increasing rapidly. What we have to learn is how to live, how to distribute our money, how to take from it its mastery over us and make it our servant.

Commercial and manufacturing competition is becoming a struggle

for existence fiercer than that which makes nature red with ravin in tooth and claw. Whereas the tendency of true civilization and religion is to convert the struggle for life into co-operation for life, into work of all for all, that all may have those inner goods which make men wise, holy, beautiful and strong—whereas, this is the tendency of right civilization, our greed, our superstitious belief in money as the only true God and Saviour of men, hurries us on with increasing speed into all the venalities, dishonesties and corruptions, into all the tricks and trusts by which the people are disheartened and impoverished.

We are hypnotized by the glitter and glare, the pomp and circumstance of wealth, and are becoming incapable of a rational view of life. We have lost taste for simple things and simple ways. We flee from the country as from a desert, and find self-forgetfulness only amid the noise and rush of great cities, where high thought and pure affection are well-nigh impossible. How far we have drifted from that race of farmers who threw off the yoke of England and built the noble state; who believed that honor was better than money, freedom than luxury and display! Their plain democratic republic is no longer good enough for us.

We are becoming imperial. We must have mighty armies, and navies which shall encircle the earth to bring into subjection weak and unprotected savages and barbarians.

We are the victims of commercialism; we have caught the contagion of the insanity that the richest nations are the worthiest and most enduring. We have lost sight of the eternal principles that all freedom is enrooted in moral freedom, that riches are akin to fear and death, that by the soul only can a nation be great.

If we but have the courage to look steadfastly and to see things as they are, we shall easily perceive that our true work lies here, and not 10,000 miles away. We are the foremost bearers of the most precious treasures of the race. In the success of the experiment which we are making the hopes of all noble and generous souls for a higher life of mankind are centered. If we fail, the world fails; if we succeed we shall do more for the good of all men than if we conquered all the islands and continents. Our mission is to show that popular government on a vast scale is compatible with the best culture, the purest re-

ligion, the highest justice, and that it can permanently endure. In comparison with this what would be a thousand groups of Philippines? What the most brilliant career of imperial pomp and glory?—"Opportunity," by Bishop John L. Spaulding, of Peoria, Ill.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD. For The Public.

Extract from a sermon preached by the Rev Quincy Ewing, in St. James Episcopal church, Greenville, Miss., from the text: "Be not conformed to this age," etc.

The apostle's advice was not superfluous, was no platitude, 18 centuries ago; it was needed, then, for the strengthening of tempting, struggling, Christ-led human souls, and it has spoken to the deeper need, it has appealed to the eternal heart-yearning, of every generation since.

For, my friends, no age has dawned upon earth since St. Paul wrote his epistle to the Romans that any Christian could conform himself to and yet remain a Christian. It is simply flattery of the centuries past and the century present to call them Christian. There has never been a Christian century, or one Christian day, in any land since the Gospel was taught from Olivet and from Calvary. There has never been a time when the strong, sure voice of some apostle was not needed to say to the men and women of it: "Be ye not conformed to this time, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God!"

The Gospel of Jesus—it has been through all the centuries a steady, white, unique light, blazing upon the highest mountain top of human aspiration; and steadily has it been seen by the eyes of the noblest of the race, and steadily approached by their upward-climbing feet; but there have been lesser low lights innumerable, shining, and flickering, and sputtering, here and there, in the wide valley of human desire, and human passion, and human weakness, and these have lighted the level pathways of most men and women in every age. Always the spirit of the time has attacked and overpowered and undone the Christianity of most Christians, by subtly, gradually, indirectly, conforming them to its less than Christly vision, its less than Christly aim.

It were perhaps an excess of optimism, or lack of true spiritual perception, which should lead us to declare that in our age the apostle's appeal has lost aught of its original timeliness.

The church, which scarcely existed as an organized institution in St. Paul's time, and in its feeble strength was joined in bitter battle for existence with the black army of paganism—the church we know now as a mighty, recognized factor in the thought and life of the race; and, because this is so, we are likely to imagine that the spirit of the age in which we live, the age in which the church plays so notable a part, is necessarily the spirit of Christ. The church, and that portion of the world outside the church, we are accustomed to think of as opposites; we contrast the one with the other, and imagine that the Christ-ideal, already dominant—as we say—by reason of the church's work and influence, will be everywhere fully accepted, and everywhere entirely loved, as that work is continued and extended; as, day by day, that territory, that province, is claimed and possessed by the church, where formerly was planted the standard of the world.

So we think and say. But we forget that, while the church is engaged in conquering the world, the world may be engaged in conquering the church. We forget that, while the church's ideal may be felt as an upward-lifting force in the world, the world's ideal may be acting as a downward-pulling force in the church. We forget that the spirit of the world, the unchristly spirit, is not a thing passive and quiescent, while the spirit of the church acts and works—nay, but is at all times itself active, aggressive, militant—changing its tactics, revising its strategy, from age to age, from day to day; adopting this method when that fails, fighting here when defeated there; making never in our time any open, direct, foolhardy attack, attempting to destroy the church from without; but employing all its energy, concentrating all its forces in the steady, silent, unceasing effort to destroy the church from within; to destroy it, by lowering its moral and spiritual standard to a depth where it reflects no light from the face of the Living God; to destroy it from within, by joining with it in the soulless worship of a fictitious Christ, after the real Christ has been driven from its sanctuaries!

As the Great Master struggled in the grappling embrace of His supreme foe when He was tempted to possess the world by becoming Himself worldly—by unchristing his Christliness—so the supreme temptation of the church is now, and has ever been, to possess the world by adopting for itself the kind of Christ that the world approves of and is willing to accept, rather than

by grimly struggling and battling for the recognition of its own high Christ on the part of the world unwilling!

Is there no black shadow of paganism hovering about us and threatening the existence of our Christian life by paganizing its sentiments and its aims? Do we—who could find our places in these pews, or at altar rail, blind-folded—do we hold fresh in memory no sound of any voice bidding us reach and take and possess the perishable blessings of worldly well-being, on condition that we stoop and pay with the worship of an eternal soul? And is conscience clean of all memory that we accepted the condition and fulfilled it? Are we, by the white purity of our purposes, the pure whiteness of our endeavors, making it impossible for the world not to behold the Great Christ resurrected, lifted up, in us?—or are we eager to follow the world's standards, to win the world's provinces, willing to wear its stains to reap its rewards—making it quite possible for the world to believe of Him we name and bend the knee to, that He was lowered from His cross, long ago, and laid away, and never lifted up, never resurrected, in the hearts of His followers? Are we, in brief, fighting Christ's battle for Him and with Him, and conquering though we seem to fail, by declining to compromise His ideal? or are we fighting our own small battles—and failing though we seem to conquer—by dwarfing our Christian discipleship to so poor and pitiful a stature, that no worldly eye needs to look at it, and measure it, by looking up?

PEACE.

Written on reading the noble address of Charles M. Sturgis on "Hast Thou Killed and Also Taken Possession?"

O Christ, who didst bestow thy gift of peace,

Sweet offspring of thine own eternal love,

And bid the blasting curse of war to cease,
That earth might mirror forth thy heaven above;

Grant, that our country, guardian of the free,

No more may wander from thy holy sight

To rob and murder by the eastern sea
The races that look up to us for light!

Grant, that thy church may not condone the crime,

Nor gloss with specious words this act of sin;

But, rising in her majesty sublime,
O'er hate and strife a glorious victory win;

That peace may be our heritage once more,
And liberty our song from shore to shore!
—John Anketell, Presbyter of the Diocese of New York, in Springfield Republican.

"'Oh, for a lodge in some vast wilderness!'" sighed a weary listener during a great speech at the mass meeting.

But the speech was not shortened on his account, for sometimes it takes more than a mere expressed wish to make Henry Cabot accommodating.

I, as a Catholic, lest there should be any mistake, a Roman Catholic, who lived in Ireland until I was a man big, and understand all about landlords, the glebe lands, and the established church, I don't want to see my church going into the landlord business in the Philippines or anywhere else under the protection of the American flag.—Capt. Patrick O'Farrell, of Washington, at Cooper Union, New York.

Jimmy—I hear yer an uncle, Billy?

Billy—I'm two—it wuz twins!

Hays—I thought you told me that Castic, the canning factory man, was in favor of Bryan?"

Flowers—I did.

Hays—But you must be mistaken. All his products are labeled: "The Real McKinley Brand."

Flowers—Do you know what his products are?

Hays—No.

Flowers—Boneless cod fish and chicken.

BOOK NOTICES.

When a famous British visitor to this country was asked to summarize the vital difference between his people and ours, he said that the English had got their rights one by one, with great difficulty, and were jealous of them all, whereas the Americans had got theirs in a lump, and were letting them go one by one. This is the keynote of Orlando J. Smith's "The Coming Democracy" (New York: The Brandur company), for at page 32 he says: "The history of England for the century is a story of the curtailment or of the abolition of privilege; the recent history of America is a record of the growth of privilege." By England, however, Mr. Smith means "the England which recognizes the dignity, freedom and sovereignty of its own people—democratic England," and not imperial England. These reverse changes are accounted for by the differences in the constitutions of the two countries. The founders of the American government, to forbid retrogression, framed a constitution which forbids progress and obstructs popular action. But in England the popular mandate is absolutely and immediately effective. Mr. Smith's specific remedy for the apparent failure of democracy in the United States, caused by our past-Iron constitution, is what he calls the "free man's ballot"—a system of proportional representation which seems to have over other proportional systems the advantage of great simplicity. His ideal is a government in

which industries "monopolizable in their nature" shall be owned by the state, while all other industries are left open to free competition. Though the divisions or chapters of "The Coming Democracy" are linked together, both in form and sense, they constitute rather a series of essays than a unified composition; but they are vigorous and crisp, and in many other respects characteristic of a high grade of editorial writing.

Copies in cream-tinted plaster of the

LIFE SIZE BUST OF HENRY GEORGE

which was modeled from life by his son RICHARD F. GEORGE and is not only recognized by his friends as EXCEPTIONALLY LIFE-LIKE, but is pronounced by competent judges to be a SUPERIOR WORK OF ART, will be furnished by the editors of THE NEW EARTH, packed in cases ready for shipment for

TEN DOLLARS

provided orders are received to the number of two hundred.

Address: Editors, NEW EARTH,
540 Pearl Street, . . . NEW YORK CITY

THE DOCUMENTARY OUTLINE
OF THE

Philippine Case

which appeared in THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900, has been put into tract form, and will be sent to any address, postage paid, for Two Cents the single copy or \$1.25 per hundred. Address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

CAMPAIGN OFFER :

To extend its circulation and influence during the presidential campaign,

THE PUBLIC

will be mailed weekly to any address in the United States, Mexico or Canada, from the present date to and including the issue of November 10, 1900, for

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

Address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,

40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.
Program for Friday, August 3rd,

MR. V. FALKENAU,

President Building Contractors' Council.

"The Root of the Present Labor Trouble
in Chicago."

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE.

ALFRED T. JOHNSON.
JOHAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.

LAWYERS,

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 2644.

NELLIE CARLIN.

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
1202 Ashland Block, Chicago.
Telephone Central 925.

Houston.

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

EDUCATIONAL.

THE KATHERINE L. MALTBY

HOME AND SCHOOL.

NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS,
160 Jerusalem Street.

Highest city advantages. Academic, Collegiate
and Special courses of study. Regular resident
students, \$500. Twelfth year.



The Best Flour is H. R. Eagle & Co.'s BEST

Made from the finest
Minnesota Hard Wheat
by the Most Improved
Process. TRY IT.

H. R. EAGLE & CO., 76 and 78 Wabash Ave.,
CHICAGO, ILL.

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.

They said he owed nothing when he died. A little inquiry showed he had not provided for his chief creditors,—his family. This debt is best discharged through a life insurance policy. Advise with

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

A FAIR OFFER.

I will mail to any person a copy of . . .
JAPANESE NOTIONS
OF EUROPEAN
Political ECONOMY,

paper, 142 pages, upon condition that it be returned, or price, 25c, remitted within 10 days. It will be better than a vacation to change the current of your thought. H. M. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conneaut, Ohio. Catalogues FREE.

WE DON'T SELL OUR

CIGARS

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE
WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE
TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE,
NO MORE, NO LESS.

J. & B. MOOS,
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn
Street, . . . CHICAGO, ILL.