

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1900.

Number 123.

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.

When President McKinley, in the face of his responsibility for the presence of 65,000 troops in the Philippines, and of his unconcealed hostility to the principles of the declaration of independence, together with his record for having settled the money question, tries to make the silver issue paramount in the presidential campaign, he is, in the shrewd estimation of the Verdict, "talking through his crown."

An assistant attorney general of Illinois has just rendered an opinion holding that natives of Puerto Rico are foreigners for all purposes of voting in the United States. To acquire the voting right they must secure naturalization, the same as any other alien. This opinion is in harmony with the McKinley doctrine of imperialism. Puerto Ricans must submit to American sovereignty, but they are not invested with American citizenship. They are subjects of the empire.

It is not a bad sign to see the political jackals who were for McKinley four years ago coming over to Bryan this year. As they are accustomed to sniffing victory in the distance their friendliness is reassuring; not because it is welcome in itself, but because it is prophetic. Happily they are not the only deserters from McKinley's to Bryan's side. If they were they wouldn't have deserted, as Sir Boyle Roche might have put it.

A good deal of McKinley boasting may be expected as a result of the placing in this country of \$25,000,-

000 of British bonds. That is an explanation, we shall be told, of what becomes of our enormous export balance of a billion and a half. Upon \$25,000,000 of it we are drawing interest from British tax payers! See? But \$25,000,000 is a very small proportion of \$1,550,000,000, which is the amount in round numbers of our export balance during McKinley's administration down to the 31st of May. Besides, our excessive exports for June alone amount to double all these British bonds. Yet we are shipping gold to pay for the bonds. Why do we ship gold if the foreigner already owes us a billion and a half? Isn't it because in fact he doesn't owe us anything? Isn't that boasted excess of exports after all a good deal of a bunco?

Gen. Otis's literary style is as blunt as his conscience. Explaining the necessity for retaining the Philippines, he sums up his answer in Leslie's Weekly in this sentence:

If we ask a reason for their retention we have only to refer to the great richness of the islands.

"If you didn't mean to steal the gold you took," asked the judge of an unfortunate, "why did you keep it?" The prisoner replied: "Because, sir, gold is valuable."

Albert L. Johnson, the well-known street railroad projector, is quoted by the American press as having called the attention of the London newspapers to a significant juxtaposition of facts. It was apropos of the success of the new electric line in London, which carries 80,000 passengers a day and has taught our cockney friends that they need no longer waste two hours on an omnibus in order to reside five miles away from their places of business. He said that while "the London public are rid-

ing in cars well lighted and well ventilated for the first time in history," "house rents at the termini of the lines are increasing." The moral is obvious.

Because savings bank deposits in Greater New York have increased during the year by nearly \$32,000,000, Mr. McKinley's prosperity touters are humming the old tune about "thrifty wage workers." As the increase is hardly more than \$1 per capita, it wouldn't make a very imposing figure, even if it were true that savings bank deposits testify to the prosperity of the wage working class. But they testify to nothing of the sort. That old superstition has long since been exposed. Savings bank accounts are the favorite investments of the comparatively well to do.

To say that Mr. Bryan's speech of acceptance is one of those great efforts to which great men rise upon occasion, is to pay him no empty partisan compliment. It is a tribute which even his adversaries cannot withhold. In conceptions of statesmanship, in clearness of thought, in preciseness and richness of diction, in manifest integrity of purpose, it is the landmark of an epoch. Whoever has really accepted the absurd notion that Mr. Bryan grasped the presidential nomination four years ago with a catchy phrase, may undeceive himself by reading this speech. Mere phrase makers do not construct such speeches. We could wish the republican party no worse luck than that every voter might read this speech and Mr. McKinley's acceptance speech together.

In all respects an admirable production, Mr. Bryan's speech is especially notable for two things. One is the elemental democracy that breathes

through every sentence. The man who could create that speech is no mere traditional democrat, but a democrat whose democracy is vital. And be Bryan elected or defeated, that quality in his speech will make it a classic in American politics. The other notable thing about it, notable chiefly because it is in such striking contrast with the timidity that distinguishes Mr. Bryan's adversary, is the clear-cut definiteness of its Philippine policy. He makes no "ifs" nor "ands." He leaves no loophole. But he promises to call congress together at once upon his inauguration, and to submit his policy, the approved democratic policy, for final settlement of the question. And without reserve he describes precisely the policy he will recommend. It is a policy to which no objection can be raised on the score of international responsibilities, and yet one which reaches out to a speedy and righteous conclusion. The opportunity to support for president a man of the intellectual and moral vigor, the patriotic stamina, the statesmanlike grasp, and the profound democratic purpose, which Mr. Bryan displayed in his Indianapolis speech, does not come to the American voter every four years.

No genuine democrat can rejoice over the result of the election last week in North Carolina. It was not a democratic victory. Most explicitly it was a victory the other way. Gen. O. O. Howard is quoted upon the subject as saying that "those who voted to disfranchise the negroes in North Carolina are all democrats." He added: "If that does not smack of imperialism, I should like to know what the word means." In saying that it smacks of imperialism he is right. This disfranchisement of the black working class of the south will eventually be followed, if imperialism goes on developing, by disfranchisement of the white working class everywhere. But Gen. Howard is mistaken when he says that "those who voted for the negro disfranchisement in North Carolina are all democrats." None of

them are democrats, except some of the dupes. The white men who voted that way intelligently are natural born imperialists of the Hanna-McKinley-Roosevelt pattern.

That this is so, is evident from the fact that North Carolina is regarded now as a doubtful state. The so-called democrats who voted for disfranchisement were kept in the democratic ranks because they feared that if they joined the republican party the white and black vote would so split up as to give the negro a hearing and put him in the saddle in state politics. But now that they think this danger past they are coming out in their true colors and openly advocating McKinleyism. This view of the matter is accepted at national republican headquarters, as appears by the following extract from headquarters news, published in the Chicago Tribune this week:

Senator Marion Butler's prediction that the result of the recent election in North Carolina will make that a doubtful state at the coming presidential election is thoroughly indorsed at the republican national headquarters. The belief is also shared at the democratic headquarters, but the men in authority there are not so willing to talk about it. The reason given for the confidence of the republican managers is this: In North Carolina, as in many other southern states, the majority of the substantial business men and the financial and social leaders are at heart republicans, and desire the election of a republican president. One thing and one thing only has kept them in the democratic ranks, and that is the fear of negro domination if the negroes are allowed to exercise their rights at the ballot box.

Two instances of lawless interference by officers of the law with the right of free speech are reported this week—one in Ohio and one in Chicago. The former relates to the Dowie missionaries, whose case we referred to last week, the men who were first mobbed at Mansfield, O., and then, instead of being protected by the local authorities, were driven by them out of the town. There is no pretense that they committed any crime. Nothing whatever is charged against them, except that in a perfect-

ly lawful and peaceable manner they preached religious doctrines which their persecutors do not accept. Yet, when, in the exercise of their unquestioned rights, they returned to Mansfield this week, the authorities used the power of their position to prevent their stopping there.

With reference to the other instance, that of the suppression of an "anarchist" meeting in Chicago, let us premise by saying that we have no sympathy with assassination, and that we are sticklers for law and order. We do not believe in violent revolution; we do believe in freedom for peaceable agitation. And because we believe in law and order and peaceable agitation, we conceive freedom of speech and of the press to be one of the most sacred charges the law imposes upon officers of the law. Let that right be invaded, and no rights are secure. Let the law for the protection of freedom of speech and of the press be arbitrarily set at naught, and "law and order" is a by-word. There can be neither law nor order, where speaking and printing, either or both, are dependent upon the irresponsible whims of policemen. And if it is thus dependent in any case, it may easily become so in all. If without legal warrant, based upon due legal proceedings, policemen may suppress free speech in an unpopular or even dangerous instance, they can suppress it whenever they please; and as it is the nature of power to breed power, they will not be slow in doing so. The danger point, therefore, is at the initial step. Not in any wise, then, as a special plea for the so-called "anarchists," but in the name and for the sake of law and order, we beg all who are not themselves "anarchists" at heart, to consider the ominous nature of the arbitrary and unwarranted act of the Chicago police last Sunday in suppressing the public meeting just referred to.

The call for the meeting in question was in these terms:

Liberty lovers, attention: Mass meeting Sunday afternoon, August 5, at two

o'clock, at the Twelfth street Turner hall, on Twelfth street near Halsted, to consider our view of the removal of the King of Italy.

There was nothing in that call to excite fears of a disorderly purpose or a dangerous act. There is no pretense to the contrary except that the words "our view" were emphasized, and that the call was issued by an avowed anarchist. The first point is childish. The second is an exposure of ignorance. Many men avow themselves anarchists who are personally as harmless as Quakers. Although some anarchists believe that the existing order will be overthrown by irresistible revolt, and some propose by criminal methods to help on the revolt, others are emphatically men of peace. The fact, then, that the call was issued by an avowed anarchist is wholly void of significance. But even if the meeting had been called by criminal anarchists, even if its purpose had unmistakably been to approve the assassination of the King of Italy, even if it had been to encourage that kind of folly and crime against other potentates, nevertheless it had not done so. It had violated no law. To go a step further: even if the meeting had been held, and had done all this, yet so long as it remained a peaceable meeting the police would have had no right to interfere. Their function in such matters is to preserve the peace, not to censor public speakers. It does not follow that meetings which advocate assassination may proceed with impunity. If speakers do advocate assassination, and there is any law against such incendiarism, they may be dealt with by the law. But if we are to have law and order, if that public dignity which comports with public safety is to be observed, if the people are to be assured that the law guaranteeing freedom of speech with responsibility for utterances made is to be upheld, speakers who transgress must be held to account by orderly legal proceedings, based upon actual utterances, in which judgment shall be pronounced by juries. Their meetings must not be disturbed by policemen acting upon their own irrespon-

sible volition and without, even the shadow of a pretense of legal warrant. Yet in the case under consideration the Chicago police, without legal complaint, without a warrant, without other authority than a self assumed censorship, suppressed the meeting mentioned and summarily arrested the leading participants in the call quoted above. They did so, moreover, before a word had been uttered or a purpose had been indicated by any speaker. In doing this they themselves became "anarchists," overriding guaranteed rights of free speech, defying the law, disturbing the peace and making a mockery of public order. Their unwarranted act was more subversive of law and order, more inimical to the public peace, and more dangerous to good government than anything that could possibly have been said at the suppressed meeting.

The single tax men of New York have done a sensible thing in organizing a "Bryan and Stevenson single tax campaign committee." Henry George, Jr., is the president, with Montague R. Levenson as secretary. The treasurer is Jerome O'Neill, one of the oldest and most active of Henry George's disciples. Not only is this a sensible proceeding, but it is an appropriate tribute at this time to the memory of Henry George. For Mr. George realized, no one better, that a vital issue was pending in this country, which even before he died had begun to take shape. On the eve of the presidential election of 1896 he wrote:

What is really in issue in the election that takes place to-morrow is the very life of the republic. It may not be a final conflict, but it must be a conflict that will make the side that wins stronger and the side that loses weaker for conflicts yet to come. And it is drawing near to the close of the century when, as I have long thought, the great struggle must in fact though not in form, be determined.

It was part of Henry George's greatness that he could distinguish essence from form. He knew that the elementary rights of men to the use

of the earth might very likely, most probably would, be determined in struggles in which that particular question would not be formally at stake. He saw it as an unnamed issue in the campaign of 1896; he foresaw it as the unnamed issue of 1900. And so it proves to be. The paramount issue of imperialism essentially involves all that Henry George contended for. With a popular awakening upon that issue there cannot fail to be a popular awakening upon the issue that is inseparably associated with George's name. A tide is rising which George's followers can, if they will, take at its flood. Or they may let the flood pass while they amuse themselves with imitation politics. The New York single tax men, with George's eldest son, his confidant and biographer, as president, have seized the opportunity. Describing themselves in their call as "dedicated to the principle of equal rights, by which all forms of privilege shall be abolished and every man shall be free to enjoy the full fruits of his labor," they declare their alliance "with the democratic party of the country in this presidential contest, with a deep and fervid conviction that such action is required by the sacred cause of human rights;" and solemnly pledging themselves for this struggle, they call upon their "single tax brethren throughout the nation" to join them "heart and soul in an earnest effort to carry to a triumphant issue the candidacy of Bryan and Stevenson."

Those who are not already informed will no doubt be interested to learn what vouchers there are for the authenticity of the appeal of the central Filipino committee "To the American People," which appeared in *The Public* of July 28—Page 252. The author of this appeal, Dr. Galicano Apacible, a Filipino scholar and patriot, is the president of the central Filipino committee at Hong-Kong. Some of our readers may remember Dr. Apacible's remarkable and thrilling letter which appeared in *The Public* June 10, 1899 (No. 62,

page 13), addressed to the Cincinnati Single Tax club in acknowledgment of a remonstrance against the war upon the Filipinos, which that club had adopted and had sent by its secretary, Mr. S. Danziger, to the Filipino junta at Hong-Kong. Dr. Apacible has lately come to this continent on the special mission of issuing the appeal of the central committee to the American people. His companion in this mission is Mr. R. D. Fontela, a native of Manila, and, like Dr. Apacible, a gentleman of high culture. These gentlemen have shown to their sympathizers in Cincinnati credentials that fully entitle them to confidence as representatives of the cause of Philippine independence and as authorized by the central committee to speak for the rights of the Filipino people in an official manner. This address "To the American People," printed in parallel columns of Spanish and English, is published in pamphlet form. It is worthy of careful preservation for its historic value. But a document so noble in its patriotism and so pathetic in its appeal to the world's brotherhood will be treasured for other reasons besides its historic value; it will command the heartfelt sympathy of every friend of liberty, justice and peace. The name of any applicant for the pamphlet will, if sent to Walter H. Beecher, box 111, Cincinnati, be forwarded as promptly as possible to Mr. Fontela, who is now distributing it free to all parts of the United States. The Filipino representatives themselves are stopping in Toronto. For obvious reasons, however, their exact address is not made public.

THE MEAN LEVEL OF ECONOMIC PHENOMENA.

The mean level of the ocean is what its level would be if there were no tides or waves. It is the level at which the tides equilibrate, and toward which wave crests fall and wave hollows rise. This common level, to which all undulations tend, is a stable basis for calculation. No one would think of objecting to it because the waves throw up higher crests and hol-

low out lower depressions. Nor would anyone for that reason discredit generalizations that depend upon it. No one, for instance, would set up the fact that some ocean waves rise higher than the Hudson river, to discredit the conclusion that the Hudson river must empty into the ocean because its mean level is higher than the ocean's. Yet in political economy, where the mean level of the ocean has its perfect analogue, just such absurd objections are gravely raised.

Political economy is a science of tendencies. So understood, it is an exact science. Just as the mean level of the ocean may be exactly ascertained, though the waves rise and fall in a way to defy calculation, so the mean level of economic undulations may be exactly determined, notwithstanding the number, variety, uncertainty and complexity of individual transactions. But some students and not a few professors of economic science, ignoring this, frequently dispute sound economic generalizations, even such as would appear to the untutored to be axiomatic, for no better reason than that they are contradicted by some transitory economic phenomenon. It is as if the greater height of a particular wave, or the deeper depression between two waves, were cited to show that the mean level of the ocean is a mere assumption which facts disprove.

A familiar example of this species of perversity is the denial by some economists that cost of production determines the value of products.

Particular products are instanced, the value of which is conceded or shown to be very much above or below the cost of their production, and also of their reproduction. This seems to invalidate the generalization and is often accepted as conclusive. But it does nothing of the sort.

Instances of this kind, like the waves of the ocean, are only undulations. At the mean level of economic phenomena, the axiomatic truth still holds good, that cost of production determines the value of products. Trade being unobstructed, no kind of production can be carried on long with the value of products either above or below their cost. If their value remains below cost, their pro-

duction must cease for lack of remuneration; if it stays above cost, competition will draw off purchasers. Whatever the undulations in value may at any time happen to be, the cost of products does determine their value.

Another example of the disposition to discredit sound general principles in political economy by reference to particular economic undulations is connected with the incidence of taxes. When levied upon a product of current labor, taxes are found to enhance the price of the product, thus shifting the burden of the taxation from the maker or seller of the taxed product to its last buyer or consumer. The principle consequently inferred is that taxes on labor products are borne by consumers.

This generalization is often denied, because there are instances in conflict with it. For example, stamp taxes on proprietary medicines are not always added to the price. But although that be true, it is only another instance of disputing the mean level by measuring the altitude of a wave crest. A one-cent stamp tax upon a dollar bottle of medicine might not be added to the price. This proves nothing, however, except that in that instance the tax is too small to produce its natural effect. A dollar stamp tax upon a dollar bottle of medicine would certainly express itself in the price. So would a tax very much less than a dollar. And if the proprietary medicine happened to be subject to keen competition, even so small a tax as one cent would be shifted to the final buyer.

Any tax upon products, however light it may be, has a tendency to increase their price, just as any pressure upon a wall has a tendency to topple it over. Whether the tendency produces its natural effect must depend in the one case, as in the other, upon such circumstances as its own persistence and the resistance it meets. When a tax is high enough on products to leave the producers no remuneration for the work, the price must go up or production must cease. Men will not produce for nothing. Though some taxes on some products may not for some time be shifted to consumers through higher prices, it

is nevertheless absolutely true that at the mean level of economic phenomena, taxes on current production are shifted from producers to consumers, just as in the specific instances of telegraph tolls and express charges our one-cent internal revenue stamp tax is shifted from the corporations to the persons who send messages and ship packages.

Still another sound generalization, probably the most important in the whole range of political economy, is often disputed with no better reason than that it is contradicted by some undulation or other upon the restless surface of economic phenomena. It is the simple but exceedingly luminous truth that demand for consumption determines the direction in which labor will be expended in production.

If, for illustration, consumers increase the demand for bread and lessen the demand for beef, producers will quickly respond by diverting some of their energies from beef-making to bread-making. Especially impressive illustrations of this great economic truth are observable when some fashionable product, such as hoopskirts once were, goes out of fashion. The expenditure of labor in the direction of producing that article ceases at once. Cessation of demand causes cessation of production. On the other hand, when a new product comes into general use, as the bicycle, labor turns in the direction of producing it in quantity and quality to meet the demand of consumers. These instances exemplify in a marked way the principle that demand for consumption determines the direction of labor in production. But the same principle operates when the change is not so marked. The tendency is universal. Any variation in demand for consumption tends to cause a corresponding variation in the direction in which labor is expended in production.

But this almost obtrusive principle is often denied or ignored, because in some industries the producer has had to create a demand for his products. From that fact it is argued that, in those cases at any rate, the direction of production has determined the demand for consumption, and the principle been thus reversed.

Such cases do not rise to the dignity even of exceptions to a general rule. Though the producer does solicit consumers, his production is on the whole only in response to demand, even though he has himself stimulated the demand into activity. It was many years after some bicycle manufacturers began to whip up demands for the "wheel" that a great demand set in; but it is evident that upon the mean level of economic phenomena it is demand for bicycles that turns labor to their production, and not their production that makes consumers demand them. If demand for bicycles should cease, bicycle making also would cease.

It is similar with the accumulation of goods in stores in advance of the actual demand for them. Though this seems like an instance of production causing demand, it is in fact a splendid instance of demand causing production. The fact that particular goods are produced in advance of particular demand is immaterial. That is only an undulation on the surface of economic phenomena. They are produced in reliance upon a demand which experience has proved to be constant.

Particular goods in great quantity and variety are continually produced to Chicago in advance of the particular demands of Chicago consumers. But this is not because production determines demand. It is because Chicago is known to be a center to which consumers come to satisfy their demands. It is demand for goods at Chicago that brings them there; not their being there that makes the demand. Goods are not produced in great quantity and variety to prairie hamlets in expectation of creating a demand for them there. Since the usual demand at hamlets is for a few goods of meager variety, only a few simple goods are produced to the hamlet. It is the character of the constant demand for consumption that determines the production of great storehouses of goods to a Chicago, and of the small supply at cross roads stores.

That demand for consumption determines the direction in which labor will be expended in production is an indisputable truth. Any instance which apparently contradicts it is

either no contradiction at all, or is like a rolling wave that rises above or sinks below the mean level of the ocean.

The absorption of the pecuniary benefits of material progress by land values, is yet another mean level principle of political economy to which the undulatory school of economists object.

It is as plain as a pike staff that when and where land is monopolized, the pecuniary benefits of local progress must add to local land values; and that ultimately local land values will altogether measure these benefits. Instances of the truth of this principle are abundant, but no experimental proof is really needed. A celestial visitor who had never heard of political economy, of land, of land values, or of material progress, but whose logical machinery was intact, could reason it out. Given a community in which all the land is monopolized, so that no one can enjoy any of the benefits of living or working there without the consent of the landowners, obtainable only at a price in free competition, and it is inevitable that any advantages which that community has to offer will be charged for by the landowners in higher rents and higher selling prices, and that ultimately this charge will come to equal the pecuniary advantages of living or working in that community. This principle is so evidently universal that it must apply not only to a little community but to the whole world.

But it also is a principle which is assumed to have been discredited by some undulation. Such economic phenomena as the fall of farm land values in old England and New England are frequently referred to as having quite completely done away with it.

It may be true that these values have fallen as compared with what they were a few years ago. But it is not true that they have fallen as compared with what they were 300 years ago. We therefore mistake a fluctuation for a tendency, an undulation for the mean level, if we assume that these temporary depressions of value in recent years are in contradiction of the general principle that land values

absorb the pecuniary benefits of progress. Moreover, and this is the more important consideration, though farm land values have fallen in some places, other land values have risen in other places. Before the England and New England farm land values declined, Dakota and Manitoba farm land values were at zero. These have risen as the others have fallen, and manifestly in greater degree. Likewise, as farm land values have fallen or remained stationary, town values and mine values have risen enormously. The test of the principle is not whether land values for certain purposes or in certain places have risen or fallen. That test would determine nothing but undulations. The real question is whether land values have risen or fallen on the whole. That is where the mean level lies. In fact land values as a whole have risen wonderfully within the past 50 years. There is but little land now in all the civilized world which is not worth as much as it was half a century ago; and there is much that has multiplied in value a hundred, a thousand, or ten thousand fold.

Even if land values have not yet absorbed all the pecuniary benefits of civilization, their tendency to do so is manifest; and in so far as they fall short of it, the explanation lies plainly in the fact that the monopoly of the earth is not yet complete.

One very remarkable instance of the disposition among political economists to ignore the mean level of political economy, while they concentrate attention upon undulations, remains to be considered. It is, however, more interesting than important; in which respect it differs from the other instances. We refer to the cavilling over the doctrine of "unearned increment." Some economists, when they discuss this doctrine, are verily unable to see the forest for the trees.

"Unearned increment" may not be a felicitous term. It was adopted somewhat carelessly by John Stuart Mill to describe increase in land values. Mill had noticed that land values, unlike other values, tend to increase. He therefore referred to them as an "increment." And as he understood perfectly that they are

not earned by landowners, wherein they differ from other values, which are earned by laborers, he called the increment "unearned." It would be futile now, and is altogether needless, to quarrel with the felicity of this term. For all practical purposes it is excellent. It has peculiar excellence, because it directs attention to the fact that owners of land get a value which they do not earn. The injustice of that is instinctively recognized, and has suggested the propriety of taking the "unearned increment" of land for common use, upon the theory that "unearned" values are common property.

So manifestly fair is this suggestion that special pleaders for landlordism are exceedingly cautious about making frontal attacks upon it. Preferring flank movements, they admit that land does take on an "unearned increment" of value; but they assert that this is unimportant because other things besides land do the same. And from that they argue that the "unearned increment" of land cannot fairly be made a common fund unless all other "unearned increments" are similarly treated. Supposing that to be impossible, they snap their fingers and shout, "flanked!" Here is a charming example of undulatory economics.

One class of illustrations on which these special pleaders dwell comprises such unique things as rare coins and old books and pictures. But the increasing value of such objects has no more relation to political economy than your grandmother's portrait has to household economy or her wedding slippers to the shoe trade.

Another favorite illustration is the diamond found in the street. The finder does not labor; for though there is exertion in his stooping to pick up the diamond, it is wholly disproportionate to the value of the stone. This illustration is quite pointless. There is no "increment" of value, none whatever, to a lost diamond which has been found. Its value is no more after the finding than before the losing. Such value as the finder acquires is only that which the loser lost. The finder truly comes into possession of value without earning it; but the loser owns that value, and if he turns up the law will justly restore it to him.

A far better illustration of the point is afforded by the Iowa law courts. Upon a certain Iowa farm not many years ago, an aerolite dropped one night and sunk in the ground. A wayfarer who had seen it fall dug up the aerolite and sold it to a college for \$250. His labor was so slight, in comparison with that price, that it may be disregarded for the purposes of this illustration. The wayfarer, therefore, would appear to have been the owner of \$250 of "unearned increment" of aerolite. But not so. Before the college could pay him, the owner of the farm where the aerolite had fallen put in an appearance, claiming the money; and the courts decided that it belonged to him and not to the wayfarer. They reasoned, quite correctly, that the aerolite became part of the land as soon as it fell. So this \$250, instead of being an "unearned increment" of aerolite, was an "unearned increment" of land. It is so with all "unearned increments." At the mean level of economic phenomena they attach to land.

As with the Iowa aerolite so would it be with diamonds found where nature had left them. If you find a diamond in its natural state on a landowner's premises, the value of the diamond is his and not yours. It is an "unearned increment," not of diamond, but of land. It is true that it would be yours if you found it upon public land; and as to that particular stone, you might seem in that case to have acquired an "unearned increment" of diamond. But this would be in seeming only. At most it would be an economic undulation.

That the value of a diamond so found is essentially an "unearned increment" of land may be seen if we suppose, what would naturally be the case, that it is not a stray stone you have found, but a diamond deposit. Should you have found this on private land the land would rise in value as knowledge of the discovery spread, until all the "unearned increment" of those diamonds had attached to the land where they lay. The same thing, with a difference only as to beneficiaries, would occur if your "find" were upon public land. You, or some one else, would acquire private title to the site of the diamond deposit, and through the land monop-

oly thus created would as landlord appropriate all the "unearned increment" of the diamonds, thereby making it an "unearned increment" of land. The history of Kimberley tells that story eloquently.

Analyze the "unearned increments" of other things than land, and they prove at last to be "unearned increments" of land. All instances to the contrary (such as the finding of a stray diamond without an owner) which the most laborious student can discover or the most imaginative professor invent, will prove upon investigation to be to the mean level of economic phenomena what rolling waves are to the mean level of the ocean—mere transitory undulations.

Very much of the polite quarrel among political economists would cease, were the fact more clearly recognized that economic phenomena have a mean level toward which all undulations tend. If it were better understood, that is, that political economy is a science, and that it is a science of tendencies. In a way this is recognized. But the recognition is quite perfunctory. It is, indeed, only verbal, as a glance through almost any book on the subject will show. The professors seem to lose all consciousness of the mean level in their painful efforts to measure the height and depth of particular waves. Modern text books in political economy are given over largely to erecting sectional views of economic undulations. And this is not so much for the purpose of coming at the mean level in that needlessly difficult way, as to show that there is no mean level but only a vast confusion of tossing waves and tumbling billows.

NEWS

The advance of the allies in China from Tientsin to the relief of the Peking legations, reported last week (page 264) as having begun on the 1st, turns out to have been merely a reconnoissance on the part of some Japanese troops. The advance did not really begin until the night of the 4th. It was made by contingents of Russian, Japanese, English and American troops, aggregating 16,000 men, the Russians and the Japanese

predominating. After a forced march of several hours these troops encountered and attacked a force of Chinese estimated at 30,000, strongly entrenched at Peitsang, 11 miles from Tientsin, up the Peiho river. The attack was begun early on the morning of the 5th. The Chinese, who had flooded the country on their left flank and were equipped with artillery, subjected the allies to a heavy, accurate and destructive fire. After a desperate battle of seven hours duration the allies succeeded in taking the Chinese trenches. Though defeated, the Chinese retreated in good order up the river toward Yangtsun. The loss of the allied forces was more than 1,000 killed and wounded; while the Chinese loss, though not definitely known, is supposed to have exceeded 4,000. Further news of the advance movements is lacking. It is expected, however, that the allies will be delayed by the severity of their losses for a few days, and that the next battle will occur at Yangtsun, farther up the river.

The safety of the foreign ministers at Peking, which by our last week's report was assured down to the 24th, is now positively assured to as late a date as the 3d. This assurance comes from the American Minister Conger and the British Minister Macdonald. Mr. Conger's dispatch was received at Washington on the 8th. It was sent from Tsi-Nan, in the province of Shantung, on the 7th, and is as follows:

Still besieged. Situation more precarious. Chinese government insisting upon our leaving Peking, which would be certain death. Rifle firing upon us daily by imperial troops. Have abundant courage, but little ammunition or provisions. Two progressive Yamen ministers beheaded. All connected with legation of the United States well at the present moment. This message practically confirms the Chinese reports, and it is believed to have been sent from Peking not earlier than the 2d or 3d.

On the 8th a message from the British minister, Sir Claude Macdonald, was received in London in response to a cipher message from his home government. It was dated at Peking on the 3d, and is also in cipher. It is as follows:

I have to-day received your cipher telegram forwarded to me by the Chinese minister. The shell and cannon fire ceased on July 16, but the rifle fire has continued from the Chinese posi-

tions held by government troops and Boxers, intermittently ever since. The casualties since then have been slight. Except one private of marines, all the wounded are doing well. The rest of the British in the legation are well, including the whole garrison. The total of killed is 60 and of wounded 110. We have strengthened our fortifications. We have over 200 women and children refugees in the legation. The Chinese government has refused transmission to telegrams in cipher until now.

The efforts of the Chinese government to force the ministers to leave Peking, as indicated in Mr. Conger's message, is explained from Chinese sources by the text of an imperial edict of the 2d, which was received by the Chinese minister at Washington on the 7th. It is as follows:

Throughout the disturbances recently caused by our subjects on account of Christian missions, which have resulted in a conflict of forces, it has been found necessary to afford protection to all the foreign ministers in Peking. On repeated occasions the tsung-li-yamen sent notes inquiring after their welfare. And as Peking has not yet been restored to order and precautionary measures may not secure absolute safety, the foreign ministers are being consulted as to the proposed plan of detailing troops to escort them safely to Tientsin for temporary shelter, so that they may be free from apprehensive anxiety or fear. We hereby command Jung Lu to appoint as a preliminary step, trustworthy high civil and military officials, who, together with reliable and efficient troops, shall at such time as the foreign ministers may agree upon for leaving Peking escort and protect them throughout their journey. Should lawless characters manifest evil designs upon the ministers, or attempt to rob them or in any way create trouble, they (the high officials) shall at once repress them without fail. If the foreign ministers, before leaving Peking, should desire to communicate with their respective governments, and if their telegraphic messages should be in plain language, the tsung-li-yamen shall at once attend to them without the least delay, thus manifesting the utmost friendliness of the imperial government.

Supplementing the news of military operations in China there come reports of further fighting in the Philippines. A skirmish occurred near San Isidro, about 50 miles north of Manila, which Gen. MacArthur reported officially on the 4th. He said that "First Lieut. Alstaetter, corps of Engineers, United States army,

with an escort of 15 men, was attacked on August 1 on the road between San Miguel de Mayuma and San Isidro by an armed band of insurgents reported to be 350 strong. The entire party was killed, wounded or captured. The wounded were sent to San Isidro with a note from Lacuna Maraimo announcing that the prisoners would be well treated." To this information is added an Associated Press dispatch of July 13 from Manila, which, coming through the mails, was not published here until the 8th. It describes the Filipinos as troublesome in the vicinity of Cayagan, on the island of Mindanao. They were so troublesome, indeed, at the time of the dispatch that the necessity of strengthening the American force at that point was feared.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports, given out in detail at Washington on August 9, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847..
Killed reported since May 16, 1900. 42	
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900	305
<hr/>	
Total Deaths since July 1, 1898..	2,194
Wounded	2,202
Captured	10
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July 1, 1898..	4,406
Total casualties reported last week	4,333
Total deaths reported last week....	2,134

A further step looking to civil government in the midst of this fighting is promised for September 1. It is announced that on that day the president's commission, headed by Judge Taft, will turn itself into the legislative body of the Philippines, assuming control of the financial, judicial, educational and other legislative affairs of the islands, and making appointments of judges and other officials. Gen. MacArthur is to be the executive head of the system, to enforce the laws of the commission.

In South Africa, the other seat of war, there are reports through British channels of the complete disintegration of the Boer forces. These reports lack confirmation. But it appears that 750 more Boers surrendered on the 2d in addition to the 986 and the 1,200 reported last week; and it seemed that on the 5th Chris-

tian de Wet, the Boer general, was so completely surrounded near Reitz, in the Orange Free State, that escape was impossible, but on the 6th he did escape and at latest accounts had crossed the Vaal river to the north and was being pursued by Methuen. Lord Roberts reported on the 6th that Harrismith, to the southeast of Reitz, had surrendered to the British on the 4th; and on the 7th he reported his fear that the British garrison at Elands river had been captured.

On the 7th mail advices from Cape Town were published here, giving extended accounts of the first Afrikaner people's congress, held on the 31st of May, at Graaf Reinet, in Cape Colony. The resolutions adopted were as follows in their important particulars:

That a settlement of the South African situation on the following basis would prove a blessing to South Africa and the empire—namely, that the two republics should have their unqualified independence; that the colonies should have the right to enter into treaties of obligatory arbitration with the republics for the settlement of all disputes affecting the internal affairs of the South African continent; that the colony, and any other colony so desiring it, should have a voice in the selection of its governor. . . . That a settlement on the above basis would make the majority of the people who have made South Africa their home the warm friends and staunch allies of the British empire, and that in no other way known to us can that end now be attained. . . . That such a settlement would make it as unnecessary for the republics as for the empire to maintain standing military forces in South Africa, seeing that the independence of the republics would no longer be threatened, and that, in the event of a foreign invasion of British South African territory, the citizens of the republics as well as the colonists would be prepared to repel the attack. . . .

That it is the opinion of the majority of Cape Colonists that the chief and most immediate cause of this war was the unwarrantable and intolerable interference by the British ministry at London in the internal affairs of the South African republic. . . . Were the two South African republics now to be definitely annexed after the repeated declarations by her majesty's ministers, both before and during the early part of the war, that their policy in no way threatened the independence of the republics, nothing but the restoration of independence could restore the confidence of the majority of Cape Colonists in British good gov-

ernment and in British justice and honor. . . . Were the republics annexed, the majority of Cape Colonists would feel themselves bound morally to work unceasingly by every right and lawful means for the restoration of independence to the republics, and to make that end their first political object. . . . We, on behalf of the majority of Cape Colonists, do hereby declare our solemn and profound conviction that the annexation of the two South African republics would be disastrous to the peace and welfare of South Africa and of the empire as a whole.

The attitude of the British ministry towards this question of annexation was indicated in the house of commons on the 7th by Secretary Chamberlain. In reply to a question he said he had already made himself acquainted with the views of Canada and Australia in regard to the main points of the South African settlement, and added that they were completely in accord with the British ministry as to the necessity for the annexation of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal to the British empire and the establishment of a government supported by a military force, with the ultimate purpose of establishing representative self-government. And on the 8th in the speech from the throne proroguing parliament, the queen was made to formally confirm Chamberlain's policy. She said:

Believing the continued independence of the republics to be a constant danger to the peace of South Africa, I authorized the annexation of the Free State as a first step to the union of the races under an institution which may in time be developed so as to secure equal rights and privileges in South Africa.

In American politics the supreme event of the week's news was the formal notification by the democratic party to Bryan and Stevenson of their nomination for president and vice president respectively. The notification was made at Indianapolis on the 8th. The candidates had met the day before at Chicago, where they received an informal popular welcome, and proceeded to Indianapolis, arriving there the same evening. Upon receiving on the 8th the tender of the nomination made in behalf of the party by Congressman Richardson, of Tennessee, Mr. Bryan accepted in a carefully prepared, eloquent and statesmanlike speech, which he de-

voted wholly to the question of imperialism.

Promising a formal letter of acceptance at a future day, in which he would discuss the various questions presented by the platform, he advanced to an explanation of his reasons for having advised the ratification of the Paris treaty, and for his belief that if the Filipino independence resolution of the senate, offered by Senator Bacon, had not been defeated by the influence of the administration and the casting vote of the vice president, but had been adopted and observed in good faith, there would have been no war in the Philippines. Then dwelling for a time upon the paralyzing influence of imperialism which has already placed our former expressions of sympathy with Greece and other peoples struggling for liberty in contrast with our indifference to the struggle of the Boers, he outlined the difference between expansion and imperialism, saying:

The forcible annexation of territory to be governed by arbitrary power differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into states as a monarchy differs from a democracy. The democratic party does not oppose expansion, when expansion enlarges the area of the republic and incorporates land which can be settled by American citizens, or adds to our population people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other tracts which have been secured from time to time enlarged the republic, and the constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory already more densely populated than our own country, and to force upon the people a government for which there is no warrant in our constitution or our laws. A colonial policy means that we shall send to the Philippines a few traders, a few taskmasters and a few officeholders and an army large enough to support the authority of a small fraction of the people while they rule the natives.

Passing from imperialism to its necessary correlative, militarism, Mr. Bryan led up to a specific expression and promise of what he will do regarding the Philippines if elected. On that point he said:

There is an easy, honest, honorable solution of the Philippine question. It is set forth in the democratic platform and it is submitted with confidence to the American people. This plan I un-

reservedly indorse. If elected I shall convene congress in extraordinary session as soon as I am inaugurated, and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose, first; to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in the island of Cuba; second, to give independence to the Filipinos, just as we now promise to give independence to the Cubans; third, to protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba. A European protectorate often results in the exploitation of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a shield to neighboring republics, and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burdens upon us. After the Filipinos had aided us in the war against Spain, we could not honorably turn them over to their former masters; we could not leave them to be the victims of the ambitious designs of the European nations, and since we do not desire to make them a part of us, or to hold them as subjects, we propose the only alternative—namely, to give them independence and guard them against molestation from without.

Mr. Bryan's acceptance speech concluded with an eloquent peroration on the destiny of the American nation, as a republic proclaiming to the world and applying in practice the sublime equality doctrines of the declaration of independence and thereby—solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of a universal brotherhood—a republic which shakes thrones and dissolves aristocracies by its silent example, and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness. Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a republic whose history, like the path of the just, "is as the shining light that shineth more and more into the perfect day."

The announcement of the vice presidential nomination was then made by Gov. Thomas, of Colorado, to Mr. Stevenson, who responded with a speech discussing the platform declarations. He laid special stress upon imperialism, upon the indifference shown by the republicans to the cause of Boer independence, and upon trusts. The trust evil he traced to the

protective tariff and applauded the proposition to put trust goods upon the tariff free list

Concurrently with the tender of the democratic nominations to Bayan and Stevenson, the papers published Mr. Towne's letter declining the vice presidential nomination of the people's party. Mr. Towne refers to his having been a candidate before the democratic convention and to the decision there in favor of Stevenson, whom he describes as—

a man of unimpeachable character and of ripe political experience, who, as a member of congress more than 20 years ago was a close associate and co-laborer of Gen. J. B. Weaver and other great leaders in the reform political movements of the day, and who as vice president from 1893 to 1897 distinguished himself by rebelling against the betrayal of democratic principles by President Cleveland.

Because of this decision of the democratic convention, Mr. Towne explains that he advised the Silver Republican convention to endorse Mr. Stevenson, advice which it adopted; and for the same reason he declines the People's party nomination. His language is worthy of preservation:

Everybody knows that either Mr. Stevenson or Mr. Roosevelt is to be the next vice president of the United States. I am expected to take a laborious part in the campaign. I shall, of course, advocate the election of Bryan and Stevenson. The democratic convention, before which I was a candidate, nominated Bryan and Stevenson. The silver republican party, of which organization I was the official head for nearly four years, has nominated Bryan and Stevenson. In what light should I appear before the American people if, while advocating the election of one ticket, I should be going through the form of running on another? Nobody in the United States would think I had the slightest chance of being elected, and nobody would believe that I considered myself seriously as a candidate unless at the same time he believed me to be absolutely lacking in common sense. Whom could such a phantom candidacy deceive? What respect should I deserve, indeed, if in such a matter I should attempt to deceive anybody whatsoever? I know the people's party to be composed of men most exceptionally keen and expert in political judgment. So obvious a sham could not elude their vision. Either they would resent my implied uncomplimentary estimate of them, or they would be justified in forming one of me which could result only in injuring the cause which it had been the professed object of my mistaken folly

to advance. Consistency and candor in politics, therefore, my own self-respect, a proper deference to the people's party, and a sincere regard for the welfare of the cause of political reform in the United States all counsel that I now respectfully replace in your hands the honorable trust which your great party committed to me in contemplation of a different complexion of affairs than that which has resulted.

Another political letter of the week is from Eugene V. Debs, who accepts the nomination of the social democratic party for president of the United States. In doing so he describes his political philosophy in these terms.

Fully imbued with the philosophy of socialism, I seek no personal preference, and I claim consideration only as a representative of the principles of international, class-conscious socialism. In that capacity and that alone I appeal to the working class and my countrymen for their support.

The only other political item of importance is the state election in North Carolina, which was held on the 2d. This election derives its importance wholly from the fact that it involved popular action upon an amendment to the state constitution proposed for the purpose of disfranchising the negro race. The amendment seeks to evade the federal constitution as to race discrimination, by making an educational test which election officers can enforce with a strictness in their discretion that would almost exclude a negro college professor. But to prevent the amendment from operating against white illiterates, an exception is made in favor of all persons who were voters at the time when the suffrage was conferred upon the negro; and the benefit of this exception is extended to the descendants of such persons. The amendment was suggested by the democratic party and opposed by the populists. It was carried by about 40,000 majority, and a state legislature was chosen which it is understood will insure the defeat of Marion Butler for reelection as United States senator. Negroes generally remained away from the polls. They were intimidated by threats of violence. In some instances, under the impulse of fear, they actually voted to disfranchise themselves.

Immediately after the assassination of the king of Italy, which we reported last week, his son and suc-

cessor, Victor Emmanuel III., assumed the throne, from which on the 3d he issued an address to the Italian people, promising to govern his reign by the policy of unity and independence for Italy which his grandfather secured and his father jealously guarded. At the commemoration ceremonies in honor of the assassinated king, which took place in the chamber of deputies on the 5th, a socialist deputy who essayed to speak in sympathy with the general expressions of grief was hissed down.

In consequence of the hysterical fears of an assassination conspiracy which the Italian king's death has excited and the sensational press has been intensifying, the Chicago police arbitrarily suppressed a public meeting on the 5th. The meeting was called at a public hall to give expression to the views of anarchist-communists upon the assassination; and Mrs. Lucy Parsons was announced to speak on "The History of Italy." Upon learning of this meeting the police warned the owner of the hall that he would be held accountable for any disturbance, in consequence of which he refused to open the doors. Only a few persons appeared, and finding the doors closed, they, with Mrs. Parsons, assembled on the opposite side of the street. There was no attempt at speech making, nor does there appear to have been any breach of the peace. But a posse of 20 detectives attacked the party, using both clubs and fists, and arrested Mrs. Parsons and four men. The case is now under investigation before a magistrate.

BOOK NOTICES.

—Ecclesiastical marriages in Cuba, prohibited by Gen. Brooke a year ago, have been restored by order of Gen. Wood.

—It is estimated that over 5,000 Jewish emigrants from Roumania passed through Vienna in July on their way to Canada.

—In Paris on the 5th 4,000 cab drivers struck work, and scenes of violence in consequence are reported by the press dispatches.

—A man unknown to the police attempted on the 2d upon a street in Paris to assassinate the shah of Persia, but failed to injure him.

—On the 7th the glucose sugar trust declared its twelfth quarterly dividend of 1¾ per cent. on preferred and its eighth of 1½ on common stock.

—Count Lamsdorff was named by the czar on the 8th as the Russian

minister of foreign affairs to succeed Count Muravieff, recently deceased.

—The Standard Oil trust declared a dividend on the 7th of eight per cent. It had declared a ten per cent. dividend in June and one of 20 per cent. in March.

—On the 8th the British houses of parliament after hearing the queen's proroguing speech and passing the annual appropriation bill adjourned for the session.

—On the 7th the great socialist leader of Germany, Dr. Wilhelm Liebknecht, died. He was editor of the socialist organ, the Vorwaerts, and had long held a seat in the reichstag. At the time of his death he was 74 years old.

—To restrict overproduction of steel and check falling prices the Bessemer association in the Ohio district has decided to shut down its furnaces on the 1st of September. Thousands of workmen will be thereby disemployed. Some of the furnaces of Chicago have already been closed.

—The Philadelphia Single Tax society calls upon the mayor of St. Louis to release John J. McCann, as a man who is now suffering imprisonment in the St. Louis workhouse for refusing to pay a license tax to be allowed "his God-given right to work." The circumstances of Mr. McCann's case were discussed in these columns two weeks ago at page 244.

MISCELLANY

By an unfortunate oversight several credits were omitted from this department last week. "The 'George Junior Republic,'" on page 268, should have been credited to the Friends' Intelligencer, of Philadelphia. The two-line jest on page 271 should have been credited to Puck, and the two ironical political squibs on the same page, beginning respectively, "Oh, for a lodge," and "I thought you told me," should have been signed with the initials of our clever and valued contributor, George T. Evans.

THE DEED AND THE CAUSE.

For The Public.

A deed of horror stirs the whole earth's heart!

A cry of grief from land to land swells on!
A yell of rage breaks from each nation's lip;

"Unloose the dogs of war and let them slip!"

"Revenge! revenge! revenge!" they hoarsely call;

"A thousand lives for one! five thousand! ten!"

Let Christendom unite and wipe from earth
These yellow dogs of loathsome heathen birth!"

So rave the nations, set on quick redress.
Yet, pause a moment, where doth rest the blame?

What cause was there from whence this deed did flow,
 As bolt from o'ercharged cloud to strike below?

Who kindled those dark hearts to murderous rage?
 Who sharpened up their knives and charged their guns?
 Who set their brains on fire with deadly hate
 Of "foreign devils" changing creed and state?

Who threatened to divide the "Flowery land?"
 Who planned to parcel out its broad domain
 As though the soil were vacant virgin sod,
 Untenanted by any child of God?

"Partition"—aye, the nations coolly schemed,
 As though those millions there were horde of flies,
 And none felt love for home and native land,
 But those who dwelt on favored Christian strand.

What! talk of "cutting up," and think them deaf?
 "Dismemberment," without a by your leave?
 And not expect a wince or dying thrust
 From victims of this great Imperial Trust?
 Would we, think you, sit still and let them plan
 To sever state from state, and pick and choose
 Fair harbors on our coast, and marts for trade,
 As eagles pick a carcass ere death laid?

"Partition"—light we've used the fateful word;
 What wonder that the savage heathen rage!
 What wonder that the people rise at last,
 To guard their future and avenge the past!

"Barbarians?"—aye, so-called, but truth is truth.
 Are we so perfect yet that we can pose
 As models for their race? so free from greed—
 We worshippers of trusts that grind and bleed?

Have we no sand-lot memories to recall?
 No "persecutions," "riots," "howling mobs?"
 Is our door "open" and our welcome warm,
 When they would find a shelter from life's storm?

Their "open door" we've sought; be frank,
 for what?
 To save their souls? Not so. A traitor's kiss
 We proffered them for trade and gold;
 The Christ again by wily Judas sold.

Away with cant and hypocritic guile;
 Let's face the issue squarely, race by race;
 'Tis conquest all desire, though in His name,
 And gladly hail excuse for war's grim game.

"Barbarians?" may be, but not fools. Ah, no!
 In their own way they've done what we would do;
 (They know, alas, too well the white man's thirst)
 And bland and childlike, they have done it first!

TOWNSEND ALLEN.

CHINESE GORDON ON "THE YEL-LOW PERIL."

Sir William Howard Russell reports in the Army and Navy Gazette a conversation he had many years ago with Chinese Gordon just as he was starting from London for India. Gordon said, speaking of the Chinese: "They do not fear death, and I have seen Chinamen stand up bravely sometimes and fly like sheep afterward. But what Europeans have to consider is the awful consequences of a general movement, when we least expect it, in the vast inert mass of hundreds of millions of men to overwhelm the 'foreign devils,' whom they hate like poison; and the danger of such an outburst becomes greater every year, for the Chinese are continually harassed by the European states with demands for compensation, in some cases very just, in others quite frivolous; and, as they see that their only means of meeting the aggressions is to organize an army with improved weapons, you may depend upon it that they will buy guns and rifles and ships, and with the aid of Europeans, who will always be found ready to drill and organize them, that some fine day you will have to face a formidable army. Of one thing be quite sure. The days when you could march up to Chinese troops in position, or in defense of a position, and sweep them away like flies, will soon be over. No more military promenades by a few hundred British and French troops through the country, driving thousands of Chinese before them. Never trust a mandarin, great or small. I was only too glad when I left their service. With all their hideous superstitions, their vices and their ignorance, the Chinese are far too good for their nobles; or whatever you like to call the rulers of the people. The government of France, Russia and England have treated them most scandalously for the last 40 years."—Army and Navy Journal.

IN THE FRENCH CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

Guide (to a noble stranger)—Pray take a seat.
 Stranger—Where are we?
 Guide—In one of the boxes of the chamber of deputies, in that one which is especially reserved for noble strangers who come to visit the marvels of the Universal exhibition.
 Stranger—Does the chamber of deputies then form part of the exhibition?
 Guide—it is outside the bounds, but forms part of it all the same. It is,

I venture to say, one of the principal curiosities in it. Attention. They are beginning.

(The president declares the sitting open. At the end of a few minutes a frightful row is heard below. Cries, shrieks and divers imprecations.)

Stranger—Oh, How very curious, to be sure!

Guide—Didn't I tell you?

Stranger—I do not regret having come here. It is as amusing as the Rue de Paris. (Pointing to some one) Who is that gentleman who yells so loud?

Guide—He is a member of the opposition. He is about to attack the government.

Stranger—He yells magnificently. There are few men in my country who have so fine a voice. Ah! and who is that who yells just as loudly? Is he also attacking the government?

Guide—No; he is defending it.

Stranger—Capital!

(All of a sudden an even more fearful tumult arises. Cries of "Thief!" "Assassin!" "Traitor!" "Scoundrel!" dominate the row.)

Guide—There, are you satisfied with it?

Stranger—Have they then allowed an assassin and a bandit to enter the hall?

Guide—Oh, dear, no! It is merely the prime minister who is ascending the tribune.

Stranger—He does not appear to mind it at all.

Guide—It is all the same to him. These are politics. Now look at the president of the chamber who is putting on his hat. No one in France puts on his hat so well as M. Deschanel. Everybody who wants to know how to put on a hat comes here to take lessons. There are even some deputies whose sole reason for forcing him to cover himself is this. Ah! it is not all over yet. You are now going to hear a concert.

(They sing the "Marseillaise" and the "Carmagnole.")

Stranger—These gentlemen sing marvelously. But do you not find, you other Frenchmen, that these are somewhat strange political customs?

Guide (seized with patriotic shame and risking a pious fib)—But I beg pardon, all that is not serious. The deputies do that to amuse strangers, to offer them an extra attraction, and they will give two performances a week to the end of the exhibition in order to make their stay longer. But you must not think that such a state of things seriously happens. Ah, sir!

for whom do you take us? It is a mere show like the Auteurs Gais or the Maison de Rire—a mere show.—Figaro.

A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

A quotation from a letter written by Richard Harding Davis to the Chicago Record, dated Pretoria, May 17.

"An Englishman's house is his castle," and he can defend it accordingly, is the oldest of English adages. The Boer has merely been defending his castle. You can make nothing more of this war than that. The Englishman will tell you there is much more to it than that; he will talk glibly of a franchise which he never wanted, of unjust mining laws and restrictions which are much more generous than those he has instituted in British Columbia, and which he could have avoided, had he not found he was growing rich in spite of them, by simply remaining in his own country; he will try to blind you by pleading that the war was forced upon him by the Boers' ultimatum, an ultimatum which came only after he had threatened the borders of the Transvaal with 20,000 soldiers.

He will present every excuse, every sophistry, every reason save one, which is that he covets the Boer's watch and chain and is going to kill him to get it. It is too late now to go into the injustice of this war. The Boer has lost heart and is falling back, leisurely, as is his wont, but still falling back. Before this letter reaches America the end may have come and the English will be pumping the water out of the gold mines they have fought so long and so hard to win.

It is possible that the gold may repay some of them for their losses, but it will not bring 7,000 men back to life again; it will not restore the lost prestige of the British army, nor pay for the ill feeling of Europe, nor for the loss of what was once Great Britain's hope—an alliance with the United States.

"Never envy a man his riches until you know what he did to gain them," is a saying as old as Epictetus, and who will envy England her slaughtered, bleeding republics, now that we see the price they have cost her?

Except for the excellence of her transport service it has cost her her former place as a military power, her position as a religious nation. Even her archbishop of Cape Town is today with thumbs down howling in the name of "peace" for the complete

and utter extermination of the two prostrate states. It has cost her the right to speak again in the name of Christianity, for the chief loot of her soldiers is the Bibles they find upon the dead bodies of the men they have killed. It has given her a Dreyfus scandal of her own, and by the light of the homes she is burning in the Free State she can read her acts as she read the "Bulgarian atrocities."

This may seem hysterical and unjust, but it is time, now that it is too late, that we should see clearly what has been taking place while the world sat idly by. We have been misinformed and blinded by a propaganda against the Boer, a manipulation of press and parliament which has never been equaled in dexterity of misrepresentation nor audacity of untruth, not even by the boulevard journalists who live on blackmail and the Monte Carlo sustenance fund.

The murder and robbery of a Boer on the veldt is no less a murder and robbery than though it had taken place in Whitechapel or Fifth avenue.

The Boer has been murdered and robbed, and the fact that before his life was attempted his character was attacked and villified is not the least of the sins for which the "empire builders" of Kimberley, Johannesburg and the colonial office must some day stand in judgment.

CIVILIZATION AND ANARCHY.

For The Public.

What is the difference between civilization and anarchy? While 30,000,000 French peasants were held in hopeless subjection civilization was supreme; when they rose up and chopped off sundry thousands of aristocratic heads, anarchy reigned. While the troops of saintly King Humbert were shooting down the hungry Italians clamoring for bread, civilization was on top, and its only fear was that the hungry ones might win out; now that an assassin has served King Humbert with his own medicine, civilization gasps at the horror of it all, and the nations are straining every nerve to stamp out the terrible crime of plotting against the Lord's anointed. While England was waging the war to force the opium traffic on China and preparing to appropriate Hong-Kong, she was extending civilization; now that the Chinese, seeing the fate of every land where the white man is master, have decided that he shall not be master in their land if they can prevent it, they naturally represent anarchistic forces opposed to order and civilization.

If it would do any good I could look with equanimity on the extermination of the royal litters of every land on the face of the earth. But how can it do any good? "It is not kings, or capitalists, or landlords that anywhere really oppress the people; it is their own ignorance." If this ignorance, then, could only be exterminated, there might be something doing. But as long as one king succeeds another and institutions remain unchanged and the people prefer amusement to instruction, Isaiah's lament will be the real trouble with the world: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."

It is said that the schoolmaster has been abroad in the world, and that enlightenment has taken the place of intellectual darkness; it is difficult for a man who has seen the color of the coming day to believe it. A burnt child dreads the fire, but mankind has not yet learned to dread imperialism. Sacred and profane history abounds with warnings uttered by prophets and wise men, all testifying that "Whoso liveth by the sword shall perish by the sword," but it is of no avail. It would be well for us did we deify our prophets less and do something in the way of carrying out their doctrines in practice.

For upwards of 70 years the colony planted in Pennsylvania by William Penn got along peaceably and amicably with a race of men admittedly as savage and bloodthirsty as any that ever lived. The broad-brimmed hat of the Quaker was the badge of an honest man who wanted nothing which was not his own, and it was a better bodyguard than an army. The experience of the Quaker settlement at Philadelphia gives the lie to those who stand for imperialism, no matter what their plea may be. It is as possible for the white man to colonize in savage lands and remain at peace with the inhabitants thereof as ever—if he will but adopt the methods so successfully used by the Friends.

We are now witnessing the first skirmish in a struggle which may outlast the Crusades, in the course of which the supremacy of the white race will be powerfully threatened, and in the outcome of which civilization itself may be destroyed as it has been before. The races heretofore encountered by the white man have been comparatively feeble in numbers and fighting powers, and have been swept away or reduced to subjection without the real exertion of his power. But he has at length waked up some-

thing which may prove as strong as himself.

The Chinese empire is larger than Europe, and contains more people. They have outgrown the custom once in vogue of frightening their enemies to death with horrible pictures, and are using modern arms. Their military education is still in its infancy, but it is not going to stop there. They have lived in China a long time, and are not going to be pushed off the earth this year nor next.

The child has not been born who will see the end of this struggle. There are 300,000,000 of brownies in India who will take a hand in the battle against white supremacy before it is finished. The islands of the sea contain yellow and brown people in profusion, and they do not love us. A gigantic Asiatic empire animated and directed by Japanese brains and making a strong bid for the empire of the world, is to my mind not a mere possibility, but a probability of the closing years of the century about to open, if not sooner. Circumstances bring forth men, and Asia is as certain to develop a yellow or brown Napoleon in the next generation or two as the sun is to rise.

And is there no escape? I hear some sneering imperialist ask. Of course there is, you blockhead, but you do not know enough to take it, and you are the majority. Substitute justice and righteousness for fraud and violence in your dealings with these people. Cease plaguing them with superstition and inculcate morality both by word and by example. Civilize yourself, in short, and then you may with some reason presume to civilize others. Go to the Quaker, thou fool; learn of his ways and be wise. But you will not. You will have your way, as you always have had; and you will bring things to universal smash, as you always have done.

There has never been a time when the world has more needed the full gospel of justice and fraternity; there never was a time when the world was on the whole less inclined to listen to it. It begins to dawn on me that our work has been in vain, and that, like the Physiocrats who were buried under the ruins of the French revolution, we shall be buried under a colossal crash of nations that will dwarf anything the earth has known. Of course the truth will ultimately triumph, but not "in our own times, or in times of which any memory of us remains."

But Truth and Justice have their consolations, which "everyone who

has felt their exaltation knows." Therefore, Physiocrats, who know the natural and right order of social development, talk and write against this horrid specter of imperialism which threatens once more to destroy the world. Who knows but we may yet stem the tide and again get a hearing? Perhaps Charles Mackay was right when he wrote these lines:

Men of thought, be up and stirring night and day!

Sow the seed—withdraw the curtain—clear the way!

Men of action, aid and cheer them as ye may!

There's a fount about to stream,
There's a light about to beam,
There's a warmth about to glow,
There's a flower about to blow;
There's a midnight blackness changing into gray.

Men of thought and men of action, clear the way!

Once the welcome light has broken, who shall say

What the unimagined glories of the day?
What the evil that shall perish in its ray?

Aid the dawning, tongue and pen!
Aid it, hopes of honest men!

Aid it, paper! aid it, type!
Aid it, for the hour is ripe,

And our earnest must not slacken into play.
Men of thought and men of action, clear the way!

Lo! a cloud's about to vanish from the day,
And a brazen wrong to crumble into clay.

Lo! the right's about to conquer! Clear the way!

With the right shall many more
Enter smiling at the door.

With the giant wrong shall fall
Many others, great and small,

That for ages long have held us for their prey.

Men of thought and men of action, clear the way!

STEPHEN BELL.

AN EVENING AT THE TRUSTLEYS.
For The Public.

"Madam!" snorted Mr. Trustley. His wife's knitting needles moved steadily, and his helpmeet gave no sign that she had heard the ungracious address of her husband.

"Mrs. Trustley!" he snarled in a tone that would have caused most women to drop a whole row of stitches. But Mrs. Trustley knit on without a tremble.

"Emily!" The click of the needles was silenced, and Mrs. Trustley with an effort to repress a smile that threatened to ripple along her lips replied: "Well, Henry?"

"Well, Henry!" Is that the way you greet me after four weeks of silence on my part?"

"Four weeks, dear? Is it really as long as that?"

"Is it? Isn't it exactly 28 days since you returned from that trip to the Kansas City convention—that trip

that disgraced me and the rest of the Trustley family? Isn't it precisely 28 days since I swore that I would never speak to you again?"

"I don't know but that you are right, Henry; how times does fly! And to think that you have been so persistent in keeping your vow! Wasn't it very hard for you to hold out, dear?"

"Emily, of course it was hard, considering the spirit of forgiveness that I had to fight against. If it had not been for my tender nature, which compelled me to pity your isolation, you would be thirsting in vain and forever to hear the welcome sounds of my salutations."

"Oh, Henry, I am so glad that you are so good as not to afflict me with such a horridly long thirst. But, dear, don't you think that you were influenced, at least partly, by a desire to be free to speak so you could ask me to sew on the four buttons that are missing from your vest?"

"Emily, Emily! Please do not be so trifling at such a serious time as this. I do confess that forgiveness was not the sole factor which was instrumental in effecting the mitigation of my resolution. But it was not the sordid desire to which you have seen fit so irrelevantly to refer that has contributed to move me. No, Mrs. Trust—Emily; it was the voice of Duty which bade me confer with you in regard to our unlike political faiths, and to strive to come to an understanding so that our house would no longer be divided against itself politically."

"But, Henry, are you really so very anxious that our political views should be the same?"

"Emily, without exaggeration, I can say that I would not hesitate to make any sacrifice to bring about the consummation."

"Oh, Henry, I am so glad to hear you say that. I was afraid that you would never be willing to become an adherent of Mr. Bryan's cause."

"Bryan! What do you mean by uttering that man's name in this house, and insinuating that I will be his follower?"

"Why, dear, you said you would be willing to make any sacrifice to—"

"Goodness gracious! Can't you understand? I meant any sacrifice that would result in removing you from the position of political falsity, to which you, with fanatical vehemence, seem determined to cling; and which sacrifice would further result in so strongly convincing you that the

tenets of the republican party are founded on righteousness and truth, that you would hasten with enthusiasm to become with me a combatant in the coming national conflict."

"But, Henry, I don't see what bearing your sacrifice could have to the changing of my belief. It seems to me that a proof of the claims you make for your party would be more to the point."

"Proof! Proof! Isn't my word sufficient?"

"Henry, my husband dear, was your word sufficient 20 years ago when you asked me the important question of our lives, and you talked so hopefully of your prospects? Don't you remember that I asked for documentary evidence, and that you showed me your bank book and your life insurance policy? You didn't seem to think that I was unreasonable, then, to ask for proof."

"Oh, Emily, how childish you do act! If proof is really necessary, just look out over our land and observe the prevailing prosperity. You will see that there is not a man who has no employment."

"Why, isn't there, Henry? I thought the crowds of people this morning that answered Mr. Naber's advertisement for a laborer were men?"

"Emily, Emily! Will you force me to lose patience? The isolated exception to which you allude, only proves the rule."

"Proves that it is false, do you mean, dear?"

"No, I don't! And if you gave a little more of your time and attention to literature you would know what the expression signifies, and you would not exhibit your ignorance by asking absurd questions. It is not at all unlikely that Mr. Naber's experience is only an apparent exception. He may have offered to pay more than the current rate, and the men you saw had probably left their jobs to obtain the increase."

"I hope that is the reason. It would be so nice if Mr. Naber has suddenly become generous. Only last week he refused to raise the hired girl's wages to one-fifty a week."

"What incongruity! What has the miserable servant girl question got to do with the important matter we are trying to consider? Do be reasonable, Emily, and stick to the subject. Another eloquent and undeniable proof of our prosperity may be seen in the numerous immense buildings that are springing up everywhere. Look on—"

"Pardon me, Henry, for interrupting you, but your reference to large buildings reminds me that our Eddie wants me to ask you if the largest building in the county will be our new poorhouse?"

"How do I know? Do you suppose that I am a volume of 'Curious Questions Answered?' Do you think that I am an encyclopedia of trivialities? I'm going to bed. I'm not going to stay here and allow my valuable time to be frittered away by you!"

"But, Henry, please stop, wait a minute. What time will you want breakfast in the morning?"

"Whenever I get to the restaurant. I'm going to eat my breakfast in peace."

"But don't be in a hurry, dear. I may not see you in the morning, and I want to ask you if you will please order ten yards of bunting for me at the dry goods store?"

"What do you want the bunting for?"

"Why, I thought it would be so nice to make a small Bryan banner to hang from the house, and—"

Mr. Trustley did not express his feelings until he had ascended the stairs. Then there was a series of reports that would have alarmed a less experienced woman than Mrs. Trustley. But Mrs. T. quietly smiled, for she recognized the familiar medley of door slams in which so often her husband would indulge.

When the noises had ceased and were succeeded by a silence broken only by Mr. Trustley's snores, his wife went to the kitchen and directed the cook to have beefsteak and onions for breakfast. She knew that when the odor of this combination reached Mr. Trustley not even a Delmonico restaurant would entice him from home.

GEO. T. EVANS.

THE WHITE SLAVERY OF AMERICA.

For The Public.

Disguise thyself as thou wilt, still
Slavery! said I—still thou art a bitter
draught.

—Sterne.

All history shows that there may be despotism without monarchy, and that absolutism may exist under the guise of freedom. The subjects of a monarchy may not seldom enjoy a liberal measure of freedom, while the most degrading tyranny may at times be enacted under the authority of a nominally free government, in the name of Freedom and by sanction of Law. Where men do not enjoy equal opportunities to labor and live upon

the earth, there cannot be freedom. You may call it "industrial depression," or what you will—it is not freedom. I have heard a man, vain in his rags, boasting of his liberty, when as a matter of fact he had no more real liberty than a Spartan helot, bound to the soil and doomed to a life of servile drudgery for the bare means of existence.

In most minds the idea of slavery is associated with that of manacles, of chains and other implements of physical restraint, and men are apt to think that where this outward insignia is lacking slavery cannot exist; which is as much as to say that the various drugs of an apothecary would all be the same in substance but for the difference in the labels on the bottles. But strychnine is strychnine, whether it be labeled capsicum or attar of roses.

The lexicographers say that slavery "is the state of entire subjection of one person to the will of another; a condition of subjection characterized by lack of freedom of action or of will; bondage; servitude, vassalage." If these are proper definitions—and their correctness, it seems to me, will hardly be questioned—then there is more slavery in the north to-day than there was in the south before the civil war, and there is probably as much slavery in the south now as there ever was.

We are told that this nation is prosperous and free; but you cannot tell the prosperity of a nation merely by counting its millionaires, nor can you judge of the measure of popular freedom by the high-sounding phrases of constitutions and political platforms. To quote Mrs. Browning:

You have . . .
Princes' parks and merchants' homes,
Tents for soldiers, ships for seamen—
Aye, but ruins worse than Rome's
In your pauper men and women!

There are more tramps and paupers in the United States to-day than there were men, women and children in the original 13 colonies at the time of the revolutionary war. They are, as James H. Hammond said in a speech delivered in the United States senate in 1858:

The very mudsills of society. * * * We call them slaves. * * * But I will not characterize that class at the north with that term; but you have it.

Nearly 70 per cent. of the American people are homeless; renters, mere tenants by the courtesy of another, owning no land or having no right to a foot of the soil. The majority of these men are not freemen in any

proper sense of the term, and to them the constitution can be but

A gilded halo hovering 'round decay.

The percentage of homeless bread-winners in some of the larger cities of this nation to-day, is as great as 95 per cent! In view of these conditions, how strikingly apropos are the words of Galusha A. Grow, spoken in congress September 30, 1852:

It is in vain you talk of the goodness of an Omniscient Ruler to him whose life from the cradle to the grave is one continued scene of pain, misery and want. Talk not of free agency to him whose only freedom is to choose his own method to die. In such cases, there might, perhaps, be some feeble conceptions of religion and its duties—of the infinite, everlasting and pure; but unless there be a more than common intellect, they would be like the dim shadows that float in the twilight. If you would lead the erring back from the paths of vice and crime to virtue and honor, give him a home—give him a hearthstone, and he will surround it with household gods.

In a speech by Robert Toombs, of Georgia, delivered at Boston, in 1856, the following quotation from President John Adams was used in argument to show that the black slavery of the south at that time was no worse than the white slavery of the north:

What matters it whether a landlord employing ten laborers on his farm gives them annually as much money as will buy them the necessaries of life, or gives them those necessaries at short hand?

There can be indeed, but little difference. This is plain upon the slightest reflection. The same thought was expressed by Schopenhauer when he wrote:

The difference . . . between the serf, and the tenant, occupier, mortgagor, etc., is more in form than in fact. Whether I own the peasant, or the land from which he must obtain his nourishment, the bird or its food, the fruit or the tree, is practically a matter of small importance.—Parega and Paralpemena, vol. 2, section 126.

The man who dares not vote contrary to the will of his employer, is certainly "characterized by lack of freedom of action or of will," and has as little voice in the government as he would if completely deprived of the elective franchise. The man who is obliged to pay tribute to monopoly is certainly in "bondage." The man who is obliged to do the will of a master in order to obtain a living for himself and family, is most assuredly in a state of entire subjection to the will of another. What is this, if not slavery? Whoever must beg employment as a boon, who is not at liberty to choose either his labor, his wages or his employer, and whose political acts are dictated by the man who gives him work to do, is as much a slave as though his person were the

property of another. You do own my body when you control the means whereby I live.

But the black slave was at least sure of his board and clothing, and of medical attendance when sick. The white slave is not valuable enough to receive such attention, for when he dies, or becomes disabled, there are too many others to be had for the asking. The slave market is glutted. And to render his condition still more distressing, the white slave is tantalized by the sight of that freedom which he is told belongs to him, but which is just beyond his reach; like the poor wretch whom Verres crucified in plain view of the Italian shore, that he might, in the last agonies of death, behold his native land of liberty and draw fresh torment from the thought that he, a Roman citizen, was helpless 'neath the very shadow of his country's laws.

No man is wholly free while his neighbor is partly slave. The taint of involuntary servitude affects us all. He who to-day possesses privileges which entitle him to be called master, may to-morrow be cast among the serfs, and find himself under the wheels of that juggernaut of special privilege in which he lately rode so proudly. The lords and masters of this nation are not themselves secure. The transition from oppressor to oppressed is often but the work of an hour. In forging chains for other men you never know when you will chance to forge your own. The villainy you teach the people, they may execute. This consideration, if no other, should weigh with that bold band of conspirators who are exhausting the power of human ingenuity in devising further means whereby to rob labor of its just rewards.

What is the remedy? It is simple. The annihilation of privilege must precede the restoration of freedom. You cannot give to labor its earnings without divesting monopoly of its privileges. It is not difficult to restore to men their natural rights, if the will to do so is not wanting. Liberty cannot be withheld from any people who unitedly and earnestly desire it. No power can give liberty to men who fear to take it, or secure its possession to those who will not keep it.

Men can receive but one thing in exchange for liberty, and that is slavery. Those who yield up their convictions at the beck of a master will not long scruple to accept his chains. Where bad government ex-

ists we cannot expect its beneficiaries to be first in proposing reforms, or to be the most active in establishing the reforms proposed. That work is for the people to do. The people, as a whole, are the only competent judges of their own rights. Those who know not their own rights, if they persist long enough in their ignorance, are apt to discover that they have no rights worth knowing. Know thy government, and thy government will know thee. Ignorance of government is an offense for which no people ever yet went unpunished. Therefore it behooves the American people to look to their rights and defend them. Love justice and you shall know it; seek it and you shall find it; do it and it shall be done unto you. Political convictions derive their real value from the acts which they inspire. Honesty of purpose and fairness of judgment, backed by sincere and courageous action, are the really virile forces of a nation's life. Who gives alms helps but a few persons, and helps them for a short time only; but he who works for justice helps all mankind, and not for one generation merely, but for all time.

Freedom is of God. The right to it is the gift of no human power, nor can such a power acquire the right to destroy or withhold it. It exists for any people who will reach forth and grasp it. It is not for the knave or coward, but for the man who dares to call his soul his own.

They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;

They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.

So long as men have no settled convictions of right, or having such lack the courage to avow them, just so long will slavery endure, although an emancipation proclamation be issued at every change of the moon, and just so long will the hand of privilege "press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns."

SPEED MOSBY.

Jefferson City, Mo.

A VOICE FROM THE VELDT.

For The Public.

Courage, O little peoples! Courage! Lift up your head;
Put the palsy of fear from off your souls; come forth from the caves of dread! For God hath strengthened the unhelped arm, with the power of His own right hand;
He stands our shield on every field, the fence of the little land!

O'erarched by the skies of Heaven—ringed 'round by the fires of hell,
The radiant death of our rifles' breath guards the little country well.
Brain and hand and time have made strange arms for our foes to wield;

But that new-found power we take this hour to make the defenders' shield!

Courage, O land of cliff and fjord! Courage, O Nippon's Isle!

Courage, lone Ethiope sentinel at the fountains of the Nile!

Children of William and Maurice, sons of the Beggars of Zuyder Zee,

We fight once more the fight that keeps the little peoples free!

Look thou, O bear with the outstretched claw, and thou lion of earth-wide leap; Cast up the count of gain and loss ere ye hold the weakling cheap!

Send of your bravest and hardiest, not two, but ten to one!

See that your throne-rooms tremble not ere the pigmy's fight be done!

Then, courage, O Isles and mountains and plains where the little peoples dwell;

Gird up your loins, make bare your arms, cast off your terror's spell!

We die in the smoke of the flaming veldt, that, borne on our cannon's roar,

The little peoples may hear and heed this message of the Boer!

J. H.

NEWS NOTES.

"Jonathan's New Boy," by Pythias Damon, author of "The King, the Knave and the Donkey," (Chicago; T. S. Denison, 163 Randolph street, 25 cents) is a juicy satire upon the present disposition of the United States to take practical lessons in imperialism under the tuition of Great Britain. The form is threadbare and in places crude; but the dialogue is lively, and the arguments for imperialism are delightfully satirized.

In "A Full Century of Communism," M. Catherine Allen (Mount Lebanon, N. Y., free) briefly tells the story of the "Aethians," commonly called "Shakers."

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 CENTS

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

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.

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,

60 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.
Program for Friday, August 10th.

MR. W. H. HARVEY,

Author "Coin's Financial School," etc.
"The Paramount Issue."

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE.
ALFRED T. JOHNSON,
JORAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.
LA WYERS,
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.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

EDUCATIONAL.

THE KATHERINE L. MALTBY
HOME AND SCHOOL.

NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS,
160 Joralemon 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.

He was overboard struggling for life and shouting for help. Some one threw him a crowbar. The intention was kindly, but the act was inconsiderate. Consider the aid you intend for your family. Consult

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. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conneaut, Ohio. Catalogues FREE.

To Smoke
or
Not to Smoke
is

Not the Question
if they are

MOOS' CIGARS.

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