

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1900.

Number 125.

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.

Since the Grand Army of the Republic objects to the admission to membership of soldiers of Philippine campaigns, the latter might, as has been wisely suggested, organize a Grand Army of the Empire.

It is to be observed that President McKinley still keeps up a press censorship at Manila. This is not to conceal military movements from Filipino soldiers, but to conceal political movements from American voters. From the white house onward the march of empire takes its way.

Mr. Hanna needs the dexterity of a juggler to manage his two issues without their coming in conflict. He gives warning to the east, where "goldbugs" abound, that free silver is the dominant issue; but in the west, where the republicans want free silver coinage, he explains that Bryan has abandoned that issue. Can he keep both frauds going throughout the campaign?

All through the spring the Chicago newspapers accounted for the falling off in building operations here by reference to the building trades strike. They accordingly held organized workmen responsible for the depression, and the press of the country echoed their complaint. But now that the steel trust has arbitrarily reduced the price of structural steel, a building boom in Chicago is predicted. Yet the labor situation is substantially unchanged. It is the steel trust,

after all, then, and not the strike, that has been strangling Chicago building operations.

The horrible story reported by the daily press as from the lips of Mrs. E. B. Drew, wife of the British commissioner of customs at Tientsin, and which we reproduced last week on page 290, is now denied. But the denial, like the story, rests upon the authority of a newspaper interview. On one side or the other, then, here is an example of the lack of responsibility which newspaper "enterprise" has bred in the reporter. No one knows whether to believe the story or the denial.

McKinleyites are beginning to assert that "commerce is the life-blood of nations." For once they are right. But if they believe it, why have they so long insisted upon damming up the stream by their policy of protection? How happens it that they look upon commerce as vital when they seek to extend it by fire and sword and shell and slaughter, but denounce it as destructive to home industries when peaceable men seek peaceably to extend it by means of free trade?

The sensational arrest of two Italian immigrants at New York, upon a hint from the Roman police that they intend to murder President McKinley, is another bit of humbug for campaign consumption. More serious is the admission of Italian police spies officially into this country under the patronage of the federal government. To appreciate its significance, let us imagine that the federal government had at the time of the Irish troubles taken a pack of Scotland Yard detectives under its protection and turned them loose among

American Irishmen. Our republic is going fast and going far toward the home dangers of imperialism when it invites monarchical policemen officially to invade this country upon man-hunting expeditions.

"If Bryan and Stevenson are good populists," says the New York Evening Post, "they cannot be good democrats." Why not? The names are the same. Both mean government of and by and for the people. And if "democrat" is now a more reputable term among the aristocrats of democracy, it was in Jefferson's day as offensive as "populist" is in Bryan's.

The liberty congress at Indianapolis adopted the only rational course open to it when it indorsed Bryan. The paramount issue this year is the question of approving or condemning McKinley's imperial policy. It is paramount not because the democrats have declared it to be, but because McKinley himself has made it so. No one can vote or refrain from voting without either indorsing or condemning that policy. If he votes for McKinley he certainly indorses it. If he votes for Bryan he as certainly condemns it. If he stays at home or votes a "side-show" ticket, he condemns or approves accordingly as his convictions favor imperialism or oppose it. That is, if he favors imperialism, his vote for a "side-show" ticket or his refusal to vote at all, counts for Bryan, whereas if he opposes imperialism, it counts for McKinley. No voter can escape this responsibility unless he is neither for nor against imperialism. And as such a voter doesn't count in this campaign anyhow, it makes no difference which way he votes or whether he votes at all. In these circumstances the lib-

erty congress would have stultified itself had it nominated and seriously supported an anti-imperialist party. Honorably, then, as well as wisely, it refused to do this. Honorably and wisely also it advised anti-imperialists to vote for Bryan.

A few members of the Liberty congress urged the organization of an independent party upon moral grounds. They claimed to represent men who will not vote for McKinley and cannot vote for Bryan. Their objection to McKinley is his imperialism; their objection to Bryan is his populism. Yet these men, if they nominate an independent ticket, will, as we have already indicated, throw the weight of their votes in favor either of Bryan or of McKinley. If they are really anti-imperialists they will throw it in favor of McKinley. And with most of them we venture the guess that that is where they wish to throw it. Driven to the alternative of McKinley or Bryan, we suspect that McKinley would be the choice of most of them.

Mr. Hanna's system of intimidating voters, which he worked so successfully with the mechanic classes four years ago, is this year to be tried also upon classes that have been supposed to be more independent. Even corporation lawyers are bluntly warned that their votes bear a close relation to their fees. One of the men to whom this warning has evidently come is Edward M. Shepard, a prominent corporation lawyer of New York. Mr. Shepard is best known outside of his state as the author of the Van Buren biography in the American statesmen series. In 1896 he opposed Bryan. He was then as he still is a gold democrat. But now that imperialism has become the paramount issue Mr. Bryan has his cordial and disinterested support. Declaratory of his position, Mr. Shepard writes for the Brooklyn Eagle a clear-cut review of the po-

litical situation, of which the burden is that if compelled to choose between foreign aggression and a free silver bill he would instantly choose the latter. It is in this communication to the Eagle that he alludes to the attempt to intimidate professional men like himself. At the same time, he makes a manly response.

After mentioning "threats plainly enough expressed by influential journalists and not less plainly by others," Mr. Shepard says:

The men who in 1896 were steadfast for the cause of sound money and enjoy some measure of esteem in business and social life have been told, and sometimes with what is called brutal frankness, that, if they should now remain as loyal to the cause of democratic self-government when in danger as they were to sound money when that cause was in danger, they must suffer not only loss of influence, but also a sort of contempt and even ostracism. Such men have been warned—and with rather ugly distinctness—of the fate awaiting them and their reputation and even their material interests if they should persist in saying what was in their mind. These threats come measurably near to raising another issue not to be evaded. The boycott is a barbarism the privileges of which are not confined to one side, and against which, whatever its purposes or methods, we are bound to make effectual protest. Frankness and courage in speaking on public matters are absolutely essential to our ideals of government and civilization. If such threats do not of themselves make a reason to support Mr. Bryan, they have, nevertheless, driven men of intellectual self-respect out of their hesitation over to his unqualified support. I am vain enough to believe that the insolent stupidities of some of Mr. McKinley's supporters have had no part in my present determination. When . . . the question is present and crucial, and one's own view remains perfectly clear, and his conscience is peremptory, nothing remains for him but to truly speak his mind. If this mean, as it often does, a loss of personal influence, it is better that such personal influence should be lost than that it should be maintained upon the false and insincere basis of prudent concealment.

If all the subjects of Mr. Hanna's intimidation machinery prove to be as true to their convictions, at whatever loss, as Mr. Shepard, the ideals of our government and of civilization will be maintained; and no one

will lose either in material interests or personal influence. Intimidation, like blackmail, hurts only when its demands are yielded to.

If the McKinleyites had left any room for doubting their desire to throw the constitution aside, they remove the doubt by their clamor about treason, based upon American letters of sympathy sent to the Filipinos. That they aim, with reference to "our new possessions," to disregard the constitution, they cheerfully admit. It is part of their declared policy. But this treason cry shows how they itch to do away with it also as a shield for the rights of Americans at home. But for the constitution, almost anything disagreeable to the administration might be denounced as treason. Foreseeing that, the fathers inserted in the constitution (section 3, article 3) a clause defining treason against the United States as consisting "only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." It follows that no American citizen can possibly be guilty of treason, constitutionally, when the United States is not legally at war. Unless at war, the United States can have no enemies to be aided and comforted. Now, the United States is not at war legally with the Filipinos. For, according to paragraph 11 of section 8, article 1, of the constitution, congress alone has power "to declare war;" and against the Filipinos no war has been declared by congress. To accuse Americans of treason, then, for giving aid and comfort to the Filipinos, as the McKinley press and some McKinley officeholders are doing, is to exhibit either dense ignorance of elementary constitutional law, or brazen indifference to constitutional safeguards.

Whatever may be thought of the justice of the verdict against Caleb Powers, the republican ex-secretary of state of Kentucky, who has been

condemned to life imprisonment for the murder of Goebel, his conviction cannot be charged to partisanship. For on the jury were several anti-Goebel democrats and one republican. It was the republican who first spoke in the jury room, declaring his belief in Powers's guilt.

One of the incidents of the Powers trial calls for severest condemnation. The prosecuting attorney, in the course of his summing up, turned from the jury to the prisoner, and advancing step by step toward him until within two feet of his face, launched at him what the reporters called "a terrible arraignment." This is a common performance in criminal trials. But it is cowardly. The prisoner can make no reply, nor otherwise hold his assailant to account. He is shackled and gagged by the strong arm of the state. In these circumstances, though the prosecutor may be free to arraign the prisoner as bitterly as he chooses to the jury, a personal assault upon him directly is in violation of all principles of fair play. A judge sensitive to considerations of fairness would not allow it.

Dun's Review for the 11th gravely assures its credulous readers that "London sales of 40,000 shares of stocks and some bonds, and American purchases of the new foreign loan, explain why gold goes out in the face of foreign commerce returns." This Wall street jargon means that sales in London of 40,000 shares of stock to be paid for by Americans, and the placing in America of a little over half of the recent British output of \$50,000,000 of bonds, explains why we are exporting gold instead of drawing against our excessive exports of merchandise. But does it? According to the "Monthly Summary" of the treasury department for June, 1900 (page 3425) the excess of exports of merchandise for the year ending June 30 amounted to \$544,471,701. This was not paid for in gold and silver,

for on the same page of the same report it appears that the excess of exports of gold and silver amounted for the year to \$26,912,350. So the total excess of exports for the fiscal year—gold, silver and merchandise—amounted to \$571,384,051. Yet Dun's Review explains our continued exportation of gold in the face of this trade balance, by reference to the purchase of 40,000 shares of stock that could not at the outside exceed \$8,000,000, and part of a British loan amounting to less than \$28,000,000—\$36,000,000 in all. Let us put it in table form so that its absurdity may be obvious at a glance:

Excess of exports, (merchandise, gold and silver), for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900. ("Monthly Summary" for June, page 3425).....	\$571,384,051
London sales of stocks and British loan, paid for by Americans, which, according to Dun's Review, explain why we are sending out gold instead of drawing against our exports....	36,000,000

Excess of exports not explained...\$535,384,051

Partisan "business" papers are hard pressed to make their partisanship square with business records.

Utter weakness is the principal characteristic of the criticisms thus far published on Bryan's Indianapolis speech. That of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of the 11th is typical, while also conveniently brief. The Chronicle regards this epoch-making speech as chiefly noteworthy for what Bryan omitted to speak about. Because he did not give the public even a hint of what he thinks of free silver coinage at 16 to 1, the Chronicle is sorry—not for itself, but for him. It is sorry because "such a performance does not comport with the reputation he has held of being a frank, honest man." Let the Chronicle read over the speech once more and wipe its weeping eyes. At the very beginning of his speech Mr. Bryan said he would deal later with the other issues of the campaign in a formal letter. When that appears the Chronicle, and all the carping press of which it is a type, may learn what he thinks of free silver

coinage at 16 to 1. Indeed, it need not wait; for the democratic platform, while asserting that republic or empire is the paramount issue, makes no secret of its position on the silver question. Mr. Bryan, it will be remembered, wouldn't allow it to make any. He demanded that the party declare itself definitely on the silver question or nominate somebody else for its candidate. There was in this no indication of lack of frankness or honesty on Mr. Bryan's part. On the contrary it went to prove what some millions of people believe, that he would rather be true to himself and his principles than be president. For this reason he can be depended upon if elected to make good his promise on the issue of imperialism. And how refreshing it will be, after four years of McKinley, to have in the white house a man who does make his promises good!

DEMOCRACY AND THE NEGRO.

The republican party has ceased to be the guardian of negro rights. Of the truth of this assertion there can no longer be any question. Louisiana and Mississippi have disfranchised negroes without exciting any criticism from the republican party, its press, its platforms, or its leaders, or in the slightest degree arousing its rank and file. This is true also of North Carolina. A few days ago, by riotous and other lawless methods, the whites of that state adopted a constitutional amendment which disfranchises illiterate negroes while preserving the voting right to illiterate white men. It is in clear violation of the liberty amendments to the federal constitution. But the republican party has given no indication of any desire to prevent or set aside this action. On the contrary, its leaders hail the disfranchisement of North Carolina negroes as a prelude to that state's becoming republican. They argue that a majority of the white people of North Carolina, especially those of good business and social standing, are at heart republicans who have been prevented from joining the republican party

only by fear of negro domination locally, and that as that danger is now removed they will in future abandon their support of the democratic party.

This tendency of the republicans to allow the local democracy of the south to suppress the negro vote is strongly indicated in another and less negative way. Negro disfranchisement could be checked by reducing the representation in congress of the states that disfranchise; but the republican party refuses to apply that simple remedy. When Mr. Crumpacker, a republican member from Indiana, introduced a bill last winter which was designed, in accordance with the second clause of the 14th amendment of the constitution, to cut down the congressional representation of states that restricted negro suffrage, his party leaders promptly rebuked him. Both house and senate were republican, but the bill never came to a vote. It was not even debated. Mr. Crumpacker's congressional associates squelched it.

The republican party as at present constituted does not wish to prevent the subjugation of the so-called "nigger" in the south, for the excellent party reason that it is itself engaged in subjugating the so-called "nigger" in the Philippines. Imperialist republicans and "nigger"-hating democrats of the "better element" are at one.

Unfortunately we cannot say that as a guardian of negro rights the democratic party has taken the place once occupied by the republicans.

There are too many democrats, in the mere party sense of that term, who are strenuously opposed to the doctrine of political equality in its application to negroes. Most of these, it is true, are at heart imperialist republicans. Touch them upon any elementary test question and their real character comes out. They are not for the masses, but for the classes; they are not for rights and reciprocal duties, but for privileges and reciprocal profits; they are not for free trade, but for protection; they are not for democracy, but for imperialism. Of course, these men want to suppress

the negro. But there are also party democrats who oppose political equality for the negro, and yet who are not at heart imperialist republicans. Their case calls for special study. It is easy to understand the aristocrat, the snob or the imperialist who opposes negro suffrage; but the democrat who opposes it presents a problem for psychologists.

One of the best types of this order of democrat, perhaps the very best in American public life, is Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina. Senator Tillman is at the core a democrat. The aristocrats of his state know this well, and they hate him for it. But his democracy does not extend to the negro. He believes in the principles of the declaration of independence in the abstract, and except as to the negro he believes in them in the concrete. He is on the whole a better democrat than some more dainty men who at a distance from the seat of race conflicts hold better views on the race question.

To realize the essential democracy of this man's character is to make his attitude on the negro question more enigmatical than Senator Hoar's on the McKinley question. The puzzle might be solved by assuming that he modifies his democracy to suit the public opinion of the community in which he lives. And there is plausibility about that explanation, when it is remembered that no man could remain in public life in that community if he became a champion of the political rights of negroes. But Senator Tillman is altogether too rugged a character to fit snugly into this explanation. It is hard to conceive of his making his convictions subservient to local prejudice. Any explanation of his hostility to political equality for negroes must go deeper. He must be accepted as a democrat with the full courage of his convictions, who, as a conviction and not from cowardice, excepts American negroes from the benefits of democratic principles.

Light may be thrown upon this peculiarity of that southern democracy of which Tillman is the type, by reference to a private letter from Mr. Tillman himself which has

come into our hands and the publication of which he authorizes.

By way of introduction to Mr. Tillman's letter, however, we shall reproduce from the Detroit News the able article of a Michigan negro, to which Mr. Tillman's letter is a reply. Not only does this article serve as an introduction to Senator Tillman's letter, but it is in some respects also an example of the power of insight into public questions generally which comes from a clear understanding of certain elementary principles of social-industrial life. To the Michigan negro who grasps these principles, a far reaching and luminous truth appears; to the South Carolina senator who does not grasp it that truth is sealed, and the questions it would illuminate remain in darkness.

The article from the Detroit News appeared over the signature of Frank H. Warren, a well-known negro of Mackinac Island. We give it in full:

Perhaps the very fact that such a man as Benjamin Tillman had received an invitation to address the Good Government club in University hall, here among the good liberty-loving people of Michigan, is what emboldened him to make an address on that occasion, which was both frank and characteristic of the man. He knew that his unsavory reputation as a negro-hater must have long since been known to the people of Michigan, therefore, he construed the invitation as a license to unfold the unholy plan of campaign of men of his ilk in the south, and to make a scurrilous tirade against an oppressed and defenseless people who are at least deserving of better treatment.

My first impression of Mr. Tillman came from his public statement, as governor of South Carolina, that he would head a mob to lynch any negro that was accused of outraging a white woman, but he said nothing of the white men who outrage colored girls with impunity.

In the constitutional convention to which Mr. Tillman in his Ann Arbor speech referred, and of which he was a member, one of the negro delegates made the statement that "if every white man was lynched that had outraged negro girls, this convention would not have a quorum." "This statement not only went uncontradicted, but only caused laughter among the white delegates."

The negroes have absolutely no protection of law in the south against

the white men who thus debauch their wives and daughters, and they never did have. I have often wondered how (if the intense race hatred in the south was bona fide), the white women there can take white men for husbands, who, they must know, certainly before marriage, and in many instances after, committed crimes against black girls.

I say emphatically then, that the character of the southern black is what the white made it, no more and no less.

Mr. Tillman gave his whole case away when he said: "It is the fate of the negro to hoe and pick cotton always." Let's see; I believe it was Robert Toombs, of Georgia, who said about 40 years ago: "I will yet call the roll of my slaves at the foot of Bunker Hill;" but instead the good people of Boston built near the spot a monument to William Lloyd Garrison.

In both of these assertions the wish is father to the thought, and the Tillmans may as well disabuse their minds, for the negro as a race will not always be "hewers of wood and drawers of water." Again he says: "We say in South Carolina, that the negro is not the equal of the white man and, by the eternal, never will be." Now the negro cares nothing about whether he is the equal of the white man or not, all he wants is an equal opportunity to earn and enjoy a living from the earth that the God of nature provided for every living thing upon it, the negro included; and further, they demand the equal protection of the law, to the end that they may improve the moral condition of their people, which I admit is much in need of improvement in the south.

I deny that the southern negro is the black villain he is painted by Mr. Tillman. It was proven during the civil war that he was the very essence of honor itself, when he was left at home to guard, not only the property, but the wives and daughters of the confederacy, and never is there an instance quoted in history where he betrayed his trust.

The hardships of poverty go to make criminals and bad citizens generally of the individuals of any race, and the negro is no exception to the rule, except that inasmuch as he is barred out of many avenues of employment, his opportunity for earning a living is thereby diminished, and his poverty correspondingly more acute than is the case with the white races in America. If he shows a greater percentage of criminals, it may be traced directly to this cause of excess poverty.

Mr. Tillman told the truth when he said: "The war freed the slaves and it settled nothing else." When the slaves of the south were freed,

they were as infants, knowing absolutely nothing about self-reliance, much less the use of the ballot, and the government was very remiss in its duty, that it did not provide them with sufficient land to maintain themselves with and succor them until they had established themselves in their independent manhood. I have always held the Hayes administration blameworthy for withdrawing the troops from the south until this was accomplished. If the war had settled the question of the negro's self-maintenance as thus outlined, there would be no race question now. In proof of this, I point to those communities here in Michigan, Ontario, Indiana and Ohio, where the colored people outnumber the whites, and yet live in perfect harmony. "In Cross county the colored people nearly all own their own farms," and are happy, prosperous and contented, and withal good citizens. Neither are they shouting from the housetops that they are as good as the white man; in fact, that is something they care nothing about, and the whites would not be disturbed about "equality," if there was neither poverty nor fear of poverty resulting from competition between the races for the limited opportunities to earn a living.

The race question of the south is nothing more than the same old question of land monopoly vs. labor, miscalled capital vs. labor, and if our iniquitous laws of land tenure and taxation are ever properly adjusted on a basis of equity to all, the poverty and race problems would soon disappear.

Mr. Tillman seems to have threatened his audience with the "bogie man" of intermarriage with some success, but it is the rankest nonsense to believe that any great number of whites and blacks will ever intermarry. Jews and Gentiles seldom ever intermarry, yet there is no proscription against such marriages.

Forty years ago my father married one of the fairest belles of Pontiac in Canada, and the event created much excitement, and was used as an argument against freeing the slaves. It was said that they would marry all the fair daughters. My mother was the pioneer white woman to marry a colored man, 40 years ago, and I can count all such marriages on my fingers that have taken place in Michigan since then; so that argument proves to be nothing but a "bogie."

The land monopolist of the south wants the negroes to do all the work, while he retains all the profits, and when the negro aspires to rise above this condition the policy enunciated by Mr. Tillman is resorted to to force him back into what they are pleased to call "his place."

There are two remedies that could

be effectively applied to the southern race question: The first, and the one I should advocate, would be the single tax; the second would be the emigration to Africa of a sufficient number of negroes to bring the whites to a realizing sense that they were not only losing their laborers, but also the profits from their lands with them. This would at least insure those that remained better treatment.

Mr. Warren's article was called to the attention of Senator Tillman, by Edward Osgood Brown, a democratic democrat of Illinois, who vouched for Mr. Warren as a negro democrat, of light and leading in his race, and told Mr. Tillman of the puzzlement and distress that are felt by declaration-of-independence democrats in this part of the country about his attitude concerning negroes. Mr. Tillman's reply was not intended for publication, and on that account it is an index to his point of view all the more valuable. It follows:

Trenton, S. C., July 23, 1900.

Edward O. Brown, Esq., First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir: I have your letter of July 16, and mainly for your own satisfaction I reply at length.

The letter in the Detroit paper by Frank H. Warren is a fair sample of the garbled and distorted extracts and misstatement of facts such as one would expect to find in a republican organ. You say that Mr. Warren is a democrat, but that does not prevent his being deceived and having a great many false ideas about the race question in the south.

In the first place, my address before the Good Government club of the University of Michigan was never reported, and only a few distorted paragraphs taken out of all connection with the balance of the speech were printed for purposes which must be apparent. Mr. Warren takes these for the basis of his attack, and couples with them many other misstatements of fact derived no doubt from similar distorted representations of my utterances.

To begin with, Warren says that while governor I declared I would head a mob and lynch any negro who was accused of raping a white woman and said nothing of the white men who raped negro women; and he states that they can be raped with impunity. What I did say, and have repeated time and again and still say, is that I would head a mob and lynch any man, white or black, who would rob any woman of her virtue.

Mr. Warren next declares that a negro delegate to the South Carolina constitutional convention made the state-

ment that if every white man was lynched that had raped negro girls this convention would not have a quorum, and goes on to say that this statement not only went uncontradicted but caused laughter among the white delegates. I do not recall any such incident in the constitutional convention, but I do know that I led the fight to increase the age of consent to 16 years in that convention, and while we only succeeded in increasing the limit from 12 to 14, that was a great gain.

It is needless to follow Mr. Warren through the various accusations against southern white men, but an intimate knowledge of the facts will warrant the statement that southern white men do not ravish negro women once in a thousand cases. Whatever may have been the condition prior to emancipation, no such crime is ever committed now, or if so it is never heard of. The only case in my recollection is of a white man in this state who committed an assault of the kind and was lynched by negroes without his white fellow citizens attempting to protect him, or to punish the lynchers afterwards, for they were acquitted in court.

In declaring that it is the fate of the negro to hoe and pick cotton always, I only expressed an opinion based on personal knowledge of the conditions. There is no field in the south for any great number of mechanics or artisans; and if there were a thousand instead of one institution like Booker Washington's, the graduates would have to go to the cotton fields, for there is no opening for them in other lines of work, and no opening for them should they emigrate north, because the northern people do not permit negroes to compete in most lines of work, while in the south there is no objection, but the colored men can enter any profession or calling without let or hindrance.

As to the equality of the races, that is a matter of opinion based on history as well as personal contact. The feeling of caste or race prejudice will always make of the colored men underlings. It will always be so because it has always been so.

I did not declare that the southern negro is a black villain. On the contrary I bear willing testimony to the general good behavior and the kind-heartedness of the southern negroes; and I also gave the fullest amount of acknowledgement of what the south owed the race for their good behavior during the war. I venture to assert that three-quarters of my hearers at Ann Arbor will bear willing testimony that my address was liberal and fair, while it contained many unpleasant truths both to them and to the colored race. For instance, pointing out the magnificent record made by the slaves whose masters were absent in the

confederate army, I compared that record with that of the negroes of more recent birth and I asked the question: "If the slaves were not of a higher type of men than the freed men of to-day, and if the iniquities and crimes perpetrated on the slaves were greater than those which the negroes now suffer, why did those slaves not rise and wreak their vengeance on the helpless women and children left in their care?" If it be true that the negroes endure greater wrongs now than they did during slavery what a commentary on the civil war! Then slavery was better than the existing conditions as a moral factor, or else the negro is degenerating and this is what I asserted to be true.

Poverty alone does not breed the crimes with which the south is rife. The criminals are almost wholly from the class of young negroes who have grown up since the war. They are the direct product of that era in which the negro was taught to regard liberty as license. The pernicious doctrine of social and political equality, coupled with the habit of these young bucks of tramping from one community to another without fixed occupation or purpose except to indulge their coarser appetites as opportunity offers, is not productive of any good.

Mr. Warren is evidently not much of a negro. If his father was a full-blood when "the belle of Pontiac" married him, then he is a mulatto; but it is more likely that Mr. Warren is a quadroon tainted with enough negro blood to find it a bar to social intercourse, and is therefore driven to defend the people or race from which his father sprung. I do not blame such men and have only pity for them.

Mr. Warren will never get any considerable number of negroes to leave the south to go to Africa. South Carolina alone would willingly see the departure of a quarter of a million to emigrate to Michigan or any other place. That would leave the races here balanced so far as numbers are concerned, and it would improve our present condition.

In conclusion allow me to say I would not hesitate to repeat the lecture I delivered in any northern city, and feel sure it would open the eyes of many who would hear it, while not one would accuse me of narrowness or bigotry.

B. R. TILLMAN.

For all the purposes of our present inquiry, brief quotations from Mr. Warren and Senator Tillman would have been enough. But the publication in full of what they say is required to give the atmosphere and background necessary to understand them. It is not our intention, however, to consider the views of either in detail. We may leave that

to our readers without suggestion. What we aim to do is to find an explanation for the false note in Senator Tillman's democracy. And we believe it is to be found in his letter.

Mr. Warren points it out in advance. When Senator Tillman asserts that there is no industrial opportunity for the negro except as a field hand; when he follows with the prediction that race prejudice will always make the negro an underling; and when, finally, he says that South Carolina would be better off if a quarter of a million negroes were to leave the state—when with these expressions he discloses the operation of his mind with reference to the negro question, he puts in one form what Mr. Warren, from the opposite point of view, puts in another and truer form. According to Mr. Warren, all the negro wants "is an equal opportunity to earn and enjoy a living from the earth that the God of nature provided for every living thing upon it, the negro included." Senator Tillman does not believe that there are enough such opportunities to go around. Consciously or unconsciously he is a Malthusian. Whether he reasons it out or not, he feels that there isn't room for everybody. The earth is overcrowded. But for that feeling it could never have occurred to him that South Carolina, a sparsely-settled state, would gain by the loss of a quarter of a million of her working population. And like all Malthusians Senator Tillman inconsiderately regards the working classes as the crowding classes. This explains his variation from democracy when he confronts the negro question. In his Mind, both by tradition and education, negroes constitute the working class. They are in his community the lower class, being to him what the peasant is to the German aristocrat, what the serf is to the Russian nobleman, what slum dwellers are to the thrifty city classes, what Irish immigrants used to be to native Americans, what the "dago" and the "Hun" became to the Americanized Irishman, what the Chinese are to the workers of the Pacific coast, what the "mas-

terless man" was once in England and the landless man has at all times been everywhere.

Because the landless men of his time and place happen to be principally negroes, Senator Tillman thinks he has to do with a race question; he has in fact to do with a local phase of the labor question. And for lack of that great elementary truth which Mr. Warren perceives, the white senator slips his hold upon democracy at the very point at which the democratic negro citizen of Michigan grasps it most securely. "An equal opportunity to earn and enjoy a living from the earth," says Mr. Warren, is what the negro wants. There is the core of the whole race question. If negroes are the lower class in the south, if the criminal army there is recruited from their race, if they are the poor and shiftless class, if in any respect they are the dangerous class, it is not because they are negroes nor because the paternal restraints and influences of slavery have been removed. It is not because they are racial aliens and masterless men. It is because they are landless men.

A crude but impressive illustration of this view was furnished recently by a correspondent of the Charleston News and Courier, signing himself T. G. W. It might almost stand as a reply from a South Carolina source to the distinguished South Carolina senator's indictment of the negro race in his state. It relates to St. Helena, one of the sea islands off the coast of South Carolina which were abandoned by their white inhabitants during the civil war. This island is now almost entirely occupied by negroes. When the plantations there, virtually confiscated by the federal direct tax upon real estate during the war, were distributed in small farms among the freedmen, the act, says the News and Courier correspondent—

was looked upon as a measure harsh and cruel toward the owners, and likely to result in savagery and barbarism if not eventual extinction to which the race would be consigned without the influence and guidance of the white man, upon whom they had been dependent in the conditions of slavery.

It was in the nature of an experiment suddenly to convert thousands of hitherto dependent and untutored slaves into owners of real estate by deeds of gift of the lands of their former owners, and to turn them loose upon their own resources. It was confidently predicted that they would drift into a condition of thriftlessness and would be proof against educational improvement.

So far as the Island of St. Helena is concerned, where there is the largest number of negroes living, and owning their own lots of ten, twenty and thirty-acre farms, and where there are the fewest number of white residents in proportion, the experiment was best tested when the island was diverted almost exclusively to negro colonization and comparative separation from contact with the white man.

The older generation of negroes had had the advantage of agricultural training and discipline derived from their owners, and their moral and religious exercises were a part of that patriarchal system that was the boast of that civilization. It was the younger generation that was growing up without these restraints and environments who caused a pessimistic view of the situation.

To a great extent the comparative good condition of this large body of negroes, thus left almost to themselves upon the withdrawal of their white masters in 1861, is due to the excellent influences exerted over them by Miss Laura Towne, a truly philanthropic and intelligent northern lady, who came down, not as one of that class invidiously referred to as "school marm," who followed in the wake of the invading army as fanatics. Some of that class became offensive and many of them abandoned the work in disappointment.

Miss Towne, with ample means of her own, and of family and influential connections in Pennsylvania, actuated by generous missionary and evangelistic motives, purchased a home and settled upon St. Helena island and established what she chose to call the Penn school for the training and education of the negroes upon the island. She called to her assistance some of the most advanced educators among her well-bred associates, among them Miss Ellen Murray, also from Philadelphia. These ladies have exercised a most wholesome and beneficial influence upon the young as well as the old former slaves in moral, religious and educational spheres, that sufficiently refutes the prejudice that might have existed that they are incapable of receiving the benefits and of profiting from the teachings and advantages afforded by educators of a high order who have sacrificed their lives to the objects espoused many years ago.

These ladies have not confined themselves to teaching mere reading, writ-

ing and arithmetic, but have stimulated industrial occupations among the grown as well as the young pupils, and have fitted many of them for services in the several occupations of life; some for higher schools of learning which they have been aided to enter and others to fill positions of confidence and trust as servants and as helpers. The environments and the influences of the school are wide-spread and creditable and extort praise for the good done and the benefits conferred upon a people, who, in comparison to negroes in other sections, exhibit a marked contrast.

There is another wholesome influence that has been at work upon this island, and it is in accord with the expressed influence of these goodly ladies, who have the respect of the white people who live upon the island.

Messrs. Nichols & Co., who did a large and almost the entire business of handling the crops of the negroes, advancing for them and acting as their agents and shippers of their cotton, never allowed liquor to be handled or sold at any of their stores or branches; and their fair and honest dealing with their patrons and their conscientious regard for their welfare and temperate habits have been kept up by their successors, Messrs. McDonald & Wilkins, two northern gentlemen of high character who have supplemented all the good teachings that emanated from the Penn school. The consequence is that no riots, murders or egregious transgressions of the law are ever heard of in this almost model community of several thousand negroes among a mere handful of whites.

Although the policy of liquor prohibition, and the educational facilities, are regarded by the writer of the above account as of prime importance in the social experiment at St. Helena, a fair measuring up of wholesome influences will surely put the extraordinary distribution of natural opportunities at the head of the list. Drunkenness is not a peculiar vice of negroes. And while shiftlessness and ignorance would naturally be the chief vices of a recently freed class of any race, yet thrift and intelligent industry can flourish only as natural opportunities are available. The one fundamental explanation of the development of the negroes on St. Helena is the fact that there they have what Mr. Warren demands for his race—"an equal opportunity to earn and enjoy a living from the earth." They are masterless men, but not landless men.

If this condition prevailed

throughout South Carolina, that state would blossom as the rose. The negro race would no longer be a source of fear to the whites. On the contrary, it would become the recognized sinew and strength of the state; and Senator Tillman would sooner think of parting with the Carolina phosphate beds than with a quarter of a million of the negro population.

It may be that we have not read Mr. Tillman aright. The rift in his democratic lute may be otherwise explained. But we have done our best upon the evidence his letter affords. Of one thing, however, we are certain. In the great gathering of hostile forces, in which the economic liberties and political rights of all so-called "inferior people"—the American negro included—are involved, Senator Tillman is on the right side for right reasons. He may be opposed to equality of political rights and economic opportunity for the negroes of the south, and his reason for this may be one thing or another, good, bad or indifferent, but his heart and influence are with the great human current that leads on to the equal liberty and equal rights of all the sons of men. Whatever he says, whatever he thinks, he cannot oppose the force of imperialism as he does without thereby strengthening the cause of negro equality. That is involved in the issue.

And the sum of it all is that this has come to be the case with the democratic party as a whole. However bourbonism may cling to it for traditional reasons, however some who support it may stultify its newly adopted principles of right, its trend as a party is on toward human equality, while the trend of the degenerate republican party is back toward distinctions of caste and class and condition and race.

Two antagonistic forces are always at work in human society. One pushes forward to the ideals of the declaration of independence, the other pulls backward to the anchorage of divine right, whether of kings, or of classes or of races. At one time in the history of this coun-

try, the progressive force, personified by Jefferson, overcame the backward force with which Hamilton was identified. At a later period Jefferson's party turned backward and the party of Lincoln moved onward. And now we find Lincoln's party giving way to a later Lincoln, whose name is Bryan and whose mission is to carry forward the banner of liberty and equality. In this new and virile democracy, and no longer in the party that in passing under the domination of its Hannas and its Roosevelts has lost its former democratic principles, lies the hope for liberty and equal rights of all "inferior" people both at home and across the seas.

NEWS

The first stage of the foreign war in China was completed on the 14th by the entrance of the allies into Peking and the relief of the beleaguered ministers.

The capture on the 11th of Matow, 12 miles from Peking, a report of which closed our account of last week, was followed on the same day by the occupation of Chang-Chia-wan, a few miles beyond, after a battle in which 500 Chinese were reported killed. On the 12th the allies took the walled town of Tung Chow, which is only eight miles from Peking and is the real key to the city, the Chinese retreating in haste toward the capital. Arriving at the gates of Peking on the night of the 13th and, alarmed at the sound of artillery and rifle firing in the neighborhood of the legations, the allied commanders decided to attack and force an entrance through the eastern gates of the city on the morning of the 14th. This was done, and on the afternoon of the 14th the Americans and English succeeded with slight loss in forcing the most southerly of the east gates. They were supported by both the Russians and the Japanese, who shortly afterward effected an entrance through the other two gates. Several detachments of the allies immediately relieved the legations and, after some street fighting, drove the demoralized Chinese garrison within the inclosure known

as the imperial city. Here the Chinese made a stand, but on the 15th the allies forced their way inside and drove the Chinese to the inclosure of the palace grounds, where as we write (on the 23d) they still hold out.

The earliest authentic report of the rescue of the foreign ministers came from the Chicago Record's correspondent, John F. Bass, who was attached to the relief expedition and was among the first to reach the legations. His interview with Mr. Conger, dated the 14th, is as follows:

They tried to annihilate us the day before you got in. Prince Ching, president of the tsung-li-yamen, sent word that his officers had received orders to cease firing on us under pain of death. At seven o'clock in the evening of the same day the Chinese opened fire, and they continued all day. If the relieving column had not arrived we would have succumbed. The Americans lost seven marines killed and 15 wounded and one child died. The whole movement is purely a governmental one. The Boxers are only a pretense, having no guns. The confidential adviser of the empress was the leader of the imperial troops here. In 11 days over 2,000 shells fell among us. The American marines under Capt. Myers held a position on the wall throughout the siege. Upon the allies passing the wall, the Chinese retreated.

Since this interview Mr. Conger has sent an official report to Washington. It is dated at Peking the 19th and is as follows:

The entire city, with the exception of the imperial palace, is occupied by Japanese, Russian, British, Americans and French. It is being apportioned into districts for police supervision. The Chinese army fled.

The imperial family and the court have gone westward, probably to Singan-Fu, in the province of Shen-See. No representatives of the Chinese government are in sight in Peking and the conditions are chaotic. The palace is expected to be taken immediately. Many missionaries have started for home, while others remain in charge of the Christian refugees, numbering about 1,000.

Besides this news directly from Mr. Conger, Admiral Remy reports on the 19th that there is renewed activity by the Chinese in the neighborhood of Tientsin, the apparent intention of which is to threaten the communications of the allies between Peking and Tientsin and to

prevent the further reinforcement of the relief expedition.

After the rescue of the foreign ministers, Li Hung Chang renewed proposals for peace, under the imperial authority reported last week on page 298. In his proposals he asked the powers to appoint their ministers in China as peace commissioners to negotiate with Chinese commissioners. Our government has prepared a reply which was delivered to Minister Wu on the 22d. At the hour of this writing (August 23) the reply had not been made public.

In South Africa the elaborate plans of Gen. Roberts for capturing the Boers under Gen. De Wet are now conceded to have failed. De Wet had at the time of our last report already escaped the British cordon in the Orange Free State and was being chased by British troops. British dispatches of the 15th reported him as having crossed the railroad between Krugersdorp and Patchefstroom (southwest of Pretoria) and as making to the north to join the Boer force under Delarey, which was holding Rustenburg. Kitchener was then pursuing him. Dispatches of the 16th from the same source told of his eluding Kitchener by marching at night over ground upon which the British dared not venture except in daylight, and on the 18th it was known that he had effected a junction with Delarey. His breach of the British cordon near Bethlehem in the northeast of the Orange Free State and his march from there to Rustenburg in the Transvaal west of Pretoria, are regarded by military experts as one of the finest performances of the kind in modern warfare. De Wet was next heard of in front of Gen. Baden-Powell, whose surrender he demanded. Baden-Powell was reported from British sources on the 18th as having asked him for terms. There the British reports stop short. From Boer sources, however, it was reported at the same time that De Wet and Delarey, after joining forces, had turned upon the British and captured 4,000 prisoners; but this report needs confirmation. On the 21st Gen. De Wet engaged the British in battle within 15 miles of Pretoria. No other news of this engagement is yet at hand. The British garrison at Elands river, which

was holding out last week, has been relieved.

Hostilities are now confined to two points in the Transvaal. De Wet and Delarey roam the western country, to the north of a line drawn from Pretoria to Mafeking; while President Kruger and Gen. Botha are in the mountains at Barberton, the terminus of the branch railroad from the Lourenzo Marques line. De Wet's force numbers about 7,000 and Botha's about 10,000.

From the Philippines there is no news, though a battle at Catubig, on the island of Samar, which occurred on the 15th of April and in which 20 of an American force of 30 were killed (page 56) is reported in more detail. Besides that, an Associated press mail dispatch from Manila, dated July 15, and just published, gives information about Don Pedro Paterno, a prominent Filipino, which is valuable chiefly because it shows that the American censorship is still in full operation at Manila. It seems that Paterno, while a military prisoner, was allowed to leave the jail for the purpose of helping Buencamino to work up the meeting of leading Filipinos of June last, which was held in Paterno's house (reported on page 186), under the auspices of the American military commander, for the purpose of recommending terms of peace, and over which Paterno presided. After the meeting he issued an address proposing Philippine independence under an American protectorate, and inviting a further meeting at his house. Thereupon the American military authorities forbade the proposed meeting and returned Paterno to jail, where he was held as Weyer used to hold Cuban prisoners — "incommunicado." Upon taking the oath of allegiance to the United States he was released, but he has since voluntarily returned to jail, saying he will remain there until all political Filipino prisoners have been set free. Buencamino, however, who was the prime mover in assembling the meeting of June 21, has proceeded, upon the basis of the propositions of that meeting (see page 186) and Gen. MacArthur's reply, to appeal to the Filipinos generally to accept the terms of President McKinley's 90-day amnesty proclamation. It would appear inferentially from the Associated Press dis-

patch in question, that the weight of Filipino sentiment is not with Buencamino in this matter, but rather with Paterno. What is of more importance to Americans, however, is the introductory statement of the dispatch that Paterno's conduct has "received but little comment in the local Spanish press because the press censor prohibited the publication both here (Manila) and in the United States of this man's strange doings."

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to August 23, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900.	48
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900	333
Total deaths since July 1, 1898...	2,228
Wounded	2,220
Captured	10

Total casualties since July 1, 1898.	4,458
Total casualties reported last week	4,451
Total deaths reported last week.	2,226

The Philippine question furnishes material for the most important political news of the week—the final action of the Liberty congress which met at Indianapolis on the 15th. When our report of this congress closed on the 16th (page 299) the platform was under consideration. Col. Charles R. Codman, of Massachusetts, read it on behalf of the committee on resolutions, which consisted of 25 delegates (of whom 1 did not vote in 1896, 7 voted for Palmer, 7 for Bryan and 10 for McKinley), and which had unanimously adopted the report. An amendment was moved on the floor of the congress by Thomas M. Osborne, in behalf of the independent party men, striking out the clause advising "direct support of Mr. Bryan as the most effective means of crushing imperialism." After full discussion on the 16th the amendment was defeated and the resolutions adopted as reported, with only 15 dissenting votes. A resolution with reference to the American negro was then added; and after a closing speech by Charles A. Towne, the congress adjourned. The platform and supplementary resolutions will be found in full in the department of Miscellany.

The independent party imperialists, whose meeting at Indianapolis on the 14th was noted last week (page 299) adjourned on the 16th to meet at New York, September 5, for the purpose of nominating a presidential ticket.

At the convention of the International Typographical union on the 17th at Milwaukee, a socialist resolution was adopted by a vote of 87 to 73. It was offered by Robert Bandlow, of Cleveland. After reciting that "private property in the natural sources of production and in the instruments of labor is the obvious cause of all economic servitude and political dependence, which condition aggravates the ever-increasing discontent of the wage-working class, because of the impossibility to get access to opportunities to apply its labor power in the production of things necessary to sustain life," the resolution proclaimed—

to the workers of these United States of America, and all toilers of the universe, that the time has come to recognize the necessity of carrying on the war against capitalistic oppression simultaneously on the political and industrial field, and we therefore call upon our membership to ally itself with the socialist labor party, the only political organization that unflinchingly stands for the abolition of the wage system, under which labor is robbed of the product of its toil.

This resolution was to be submitted to the referendum, and, when approved, to be made a part of the constitution of the I. T. U. But on the 18th, by a vote of 91 to 61, the resolution was reconsidered and laid upon the table.

The only other news of the week of importance relates to the political imbroglio in Kentucky, our last reference to which appears on page 10. It is the conviction of Caleb Powers, the republican secretary of state of Kentucky under Taylor's administration, as accessory to the murder of Goebel. Facts had been testified to at the trial which showed that the fatal shot came from Powers's office; and upon this and other circumstances, the jury—composed of 1 republican, 4 anti-Goebel democrats and 7 Goebel democrats—agreed upon a verdict of guilty in 45 minutes after retiring. The jury fixed the punishment at imprisonment for life.

NEWS NOTES.

—Carl Rohl-Smith, the Danish-American sculptor, died at Copenhagen on the 22nd.

—A new commercial treaty between the United States and Spain has been provisionally signed.

—Gen. Santos J. Zelaya has been re-elected president of Nicaragua. It is his third term of five years.

—The twentieth annual convention of the Farmers' National congress met on the 21st at Colorado Springs.

—According to the official count of the census for 1900 the population of Chicago is 1,698,575, as against 1,099,850 in 1890.

—The pool of eastern iron and steel companies has reduced the prices of bridge and building materials eight dollars a ton.

The governor of Iowa has appointed Congressman J. P. Dolliver as United States senator to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Gear.

—John J. Ingalls, of Kansas, died at Las Vegas, N. M., on the 16th. He was of Massachusetts birth, had been United States senator from Kansas for 18 years, and was 67 years old.

—A national convention of tramps held at Britt, Ia., on the 22d, nominated Admiral Dewey for president and Joseph Brazell—known as "Filipino Red," a hobo veteran of Santiago, Leech Lake and Manila—for vice president.

—A mob at Akron, O., seeking on the 22d to lynch a negro prisoner charged with assaulting a girl of six years, precipitated a riot in which two children were killed and eight persons badly wounded. At the mayor's request the governor has ordered out the militia. The negro prisoner was safely lodged in jail at Cleveland.

—An experiment by Dr. E. E. Smith, of New York, is announced, which proves that animal life may be prolonged in sealed compartments by the decomposition of bioxide of sodium. A guinea pig was placed in a large bell jar containing the chemical, and another in a bell jar which had not been so prepared. The jars were then sealed, and the guinea pigs left, each to exhaust the air in its crystal chamber. "The pig which had the benefit of the chemical," says the report, "was as unconcerned as though it were sitting in the midst of some country meadow, whereas its brother animal, which did not have the benefit of the chemical, soon began to show signs of exhaustion. Its breathing became labored and rapid, and it soon reached the convulsion stage and would have died of asphyxia had it not been removed from the jar."

—A large body of the more prominent members of the well-known Chicago Single Tax club withdrew their membership last week. The reason they

give is that an attempt was made by a single tax political party faction to force an endorsement of the party upon the club unfairly. One of their objections to the single tax party, aside from the unfairness of its attempt to coerce the club and the inexpediency of organizing a party at all at this time, is that it purposes supporting candidates for assessors with the understanding that if elected they shall violate their oaths of office and disregard the law by refusing to assess anything but land values. This policy, it is claimed, misrepresents the single tax movement, which proposes to reform the law and not to defy it. The leaders of the single tax party faction are Walter F. Cooling and Thomas H. Rhodus. Among the members of the club who have resigned are the president, Frederick H. Monroe; the corresponding secretary, M. J. Foyer; and Edward Osgood Brown, John Z. White, Leonora Beck, Frank D. Butler, M. F. Bingham, Judge William Prentiss, Theodore J. Amberg, Louis F. Post, Hiram B. Loomis, H. L. Bliss, Jay D. Miller, H. H. Hardinge, Franklin H. Wentworth, W. H. Burke, Stoughton Cooley, George V. Wells, L. G. Bostedo, Charles Rubins, H. W. Macfarlane, and about 50 others.

MISCELLANY

APPEAL TO AMERICA.

For The Public.

For shame, O America,
That thou in these latter days hast stained
Thy God-given garments of liberty
With the blood of other souls
Striving to obtain the priceless boon
Which unto thee wast given—
Yea, given and bequeathed to thee
By brave and freedom-loving men,
Who, without murmur, laid their lives,
Their all, upon the altar of human progress.

II.

Canst thou not recall, O America, the tyrant's heel,
The oppressor's wrongs, the bitter foe
Of liberty and equal rights for all;
And then the awful carnage,
The fearful cost of blood and agony
Which these, thy noble sires,
Didst pay for thy redemption?
Was it for this thy fathers bled and died—
That thou, in turn, shouldst grind
The iron heel of tyranny
Upon the necks of dark-skinned men
Across the heaving sea?
Was it for this they raised
A bold but righteous arm
Against a haughty king and all his retinue—
That thou, proud thyself to be free,
Shouldst send forth all the engines of war
To pillage, conquer or destroy
Those who, like thy sires of old,
Will fight for liberty, or gladly
Lay down their lives in its defense?

III.

For shame, thrice shame, that thou too
Art blinded by Mammon's gold,
Deafened by the shouts of martial fame,
Puffed up by satiate greed and power;
That thou dost play the Tyrant's part,

And will not hear nor heed
The earnest cries of Right,
Or comprehend that these appeals for justice
Are but the far-off echo
Of thy forefathers' groans
A century ago.

IV.

O Americans—a sovereign race,
Arise in might,
And cause to cease once and for aye
This unjust, cruel, medieval war
Against thy brothers o'er the Peaceful sea.
Quench not the vital spark of Freedom's
light
Which has been fostered on thine own fair
shores;
But rise to justice, liberty and fraternity
For all mankind!
Let daisies grow in cannon's mouth;
Let children skip from ball to ball;
Peace spread her wings from north to
south,
And muskets rust upon the wall.
Give God-speed to the Philippines,
Which must, and ever shall be free;
And in the Eastern heavens set
The first bright star of liberty!

HELEN SCHLIEMANN EVANS.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS AT A FILIPINO WEDDING.

Thomas W. Jones, a private in troop G, Eleventh cavalry, writing from Santa Cruz, Philippine islands, tells how 60 members of his regiment were ordered out to kill or capture a famous Filipino general, known to be living in the neighborhood. The general's house was located and the Americans crawled through the underbrush until they secured positions but a few yards distant. Then they discovered that they had unwittingly chanced upon a wedding. There was a large crowd present to take part in the festivities. Most of them, of course, were women and children, but there were about 75 men present, who were armed. The Americans were ordered to fire a volley from ambush, and then charge, which they did with terrible results.

"The scene that resulted was horrible," writes Private Jones. "On the ground near the house lay the body of the bride, whose brains had been blown out. The groom, who had received a bullet in the stomach, was lying near by, dying. Twelve of the Filipinos had been killed and about the same number wounded. An elderly woman was shot through the leg, and a little child had her arm shot off.

"But we got the old general, all right, and we burned the insurgents' quarters before we left," ends the letter.—Washington (D. C.) Telegram to Chicago Chronicle.

THE BOSTON HERALD ON BRYAN'S ACCEPTANCE SPEECH.

Mr. Bryan's speech in Indianapolis yesterday, in reply to the formal notification of his nomination, will, of

course, be thoughtfully read. It affords a double surprise. The first surprise is that it refers to no issue except that of "imperialism," so-called. In this respect, it suggests President Cleveland's famous tariff message. It ignores every other issue between the parties as secondary and inferior, and it postpones consideration of them to a more convenient season. The introductory paragraphs, arraiging the republican party for subserviency to the money power, might be thought, in a superficial view, to be an exception to the singleness of the purpose of the speech; but they are not. They are basic with respect to the main argument, for Mr. Bryan's contention is that the policy he calls imperialism is the resulting manifestation of the money greed which has, he claims, taken possession of the republican party and warped its nature. . . . The second surprise is the soberness, dignity and statesmanlike quality of the style of the speech. The Herald, as is well enough known by this time, does not take the same view of the subject discussed that is held by Mr. Bryan, and does not support his candidacy. But to say of this address that it lacks the quality of full manliness, intellectual or moral, would stultify our judgment. It is the utterance of a robust, earnest, competent disputant on a high theme of statesmanship. We have no motive to overpraise it; but our feeling is that this speech will give Bryan higher rank among the statesmen of the nation than he has had before. . . . Hence, we are inclined to regard the challenge of this speech as one that must be accepted. The question must be "threshed out," as the saying is, before the people. It is an important question; none is more important, as respects the future of the nation, its spirit, its prosperity, its fame.

WHY ONE INDEPENDENT WILL VOTE FOR BRYAN.

An extract from a letter written by Francis Fisher Browne, of Chicago, to the New York Evening Post, and published in the Post of July 31.

One can easily understand how objectionable to you are Mr. Bryan's "financial vagaries." They are objectionable to many of your readers who will still, on a general weighing and balancing of considerations, give their votes to him and against Mr. McKinley. At their worst—or best—Mr. Bryan's financial views are something theoretical and doctrinaire; a "barren idealism," it seems to me, in comparison with the frightful and ghastly realities which Mr. Mc-

Kinley has brought actually upon us. Mr. Bryan favors the free coinage of silver on an arbitrary ratio by the United States "without waiting for the aid and consent of any other nation." But he does not say "without the aid and consent of congress." He does not propose, if elected president, to revolutionize our currency system, as Mr. McKinley declares war, on his own responsibility. Everything in Mr. Bryan's history and utterances warrants us, I think, in believing that he will stand squarely on the constitution and the laws that he swears to defend and execute. The talk of his election marking the triumph of the forces of lawlessness and disorder, which was so conspicuous a feature of the last campaign, is disappearing from this. There seems to me very little in it worthy the attention of serious and fair-minded men. I have taken the trouble to go carefully through the "Chicago platform," plank by plank, and piece by piece, and am satisfied that even a Chicago platform may not be as black as it has been painted. The clause about the income-tax decision, fairly considered, contains no covert threat against the integrity of the federal judiciary, as has been charged; the clause about federal interference in local affairs is but the pretext, and not the justification, for the charge of sympathy with riots (a charge which, as applied to the Chicago riots of 1894, has been abandoned by even the partisan press of Chicago, as too decrepit for further campaign duty); and the protest against the judicial innovation called "government by injunction" is not more forcible than I have read in the editorial columns of the New York Evening Post. We should not overlook the tariff reform plank of this somewhat maligned platform—a plank which represents Mr. Bryan's consistent attitude during his whole public life, and which we might have expected to see made more of than has been made by a journal so persistently devoted to tariff reform as the one I am now addressing. Those of your older readers who are acquainted with your long and distinguished services in this cause may have felt that more recognition might have been given by you to Mr. Bryan in this regard, and that some offset might fairly have been allowed him, on the score of economic soundness, for the financial unsoundness which you have kept so prominently and unsparingly in view.

But the significant and controlling thing with me, as an anti-imperialist, is that all the issues of this campaign are, by Mr. Bryan's own statement, regarded by him and his party as distinctly subordinate to the issue of imperialism. The democratic platform says: "The burning issue of imperialism involves the very existence of the republic and the destruction of our free institutions. We regard it as the paramount issue of the campaign." This declaration Mr. Bryan repeats and emphasizes. Mr. McKinley, in his bold avowal of imperialistic designs, since the Philadelphia convention, leaves nothing indefinite on his side. The islands are "ours"—not the people's who live in them, but "ours;" there will be "no scuttle policy," "no abatement of our rights;" "our" authority (not that of the inhabitants of their own country) must be made "supreme." This is Mr. McKinley's position and programme. The policy of death, destruction and dishonor will not be relaxed by him. The issue, so vital to us anti-imperialists, is thus sharply defined and accepted by the candidates of the two great political parties by whom the appeal to the country is to be made. Anti-imperialists should welcome the issue thus presented. The American crime in the Philippines is not yet, thank God, the crime of the American people. It will not be, if, in the coming election, the wicked acts of those temporarily in power are disapproved by a majority of American citizens, and the stain upon us as a nation—lesser only than the stain of negro slavery—becomes, as far as may be, wiped away. This should be, to those holding these views, an end worth the sinking of any lesser differences to attain. It is this that gives the contest its chief moral significance, and stirs deeply the hearts of so many patriotic Americans. On this issue, many of us have already resolved to cast our votes for Mr. Bryan, and to influence as many as we can to do likewise.

A PRAYER FOR THE USE OF ANTI-IMPERIALISTS.

The prayer offered by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, at the opening of the Anti-Imperialist Congress at Indianapolis, August 15.

Almighty God, may the spirit of truth preside over the deliberations of this convention. We know that the judgment of man is fallible; but we believe there can be no honest difference as to the cardinal principles that govern

moral conduct. We seek to prepare ourselves for the work that is before us by making sure of our devotion to those simple precepts that must appeal with equal force to all those who are pure in heart. We believe that Thou hast created of one blood all the nations of the earth. We believe, therefore, that we do not err in judgment merely, but that we commit sin if we treat any of Thy creatures as we would not wish to be treated. We believe that in Thy sight all men have the same right to live, and that when we take the lives of others we do that which we know to be wrong. We believe that the right to live means also the right of self-government, by which men secure their lives; and we believe that when we kill other men to keep them from adopting our political faith, we do that which we would all acknowledge to be a crime if our moral judgment were not perverted by pride or prejudice or corrupted by greed of gain.

We believe that these self-evident moral principles apply with equal force whether we act collectively as a nation or whether we act as individuals. We believe that what is wrong for a man to do is wrong also for the nation. We believe that when a government commits any act which is wrong for the individual citizen, the citizen who votes to support that nation becomes involved in moral guilt and that his loyalty to such a government is treason against the law of heaven. We do not believe that good ever comes out of evil. We believe that national prosperity must be founded upon national righteousness, and that every departure from the path of rectitude must be atoned for either by national repentance or national ruin.

Grant us a Christian citizenship. Hasten the day when men shall cease to vote for policies which they would not execute. May we feel the reproach of increasing armies, and learn to loathe the man who glories in war. May we have too much faith in the sovereignty of Thy laws to fancy that we may lay the foundations of civilization upon the ruins of popular liberty. May we sheathe our dripping sword for shame, and be content to pave the way for the advance of civilization by the practice of plain and simple justice. May the physical courage of the battlefield find a nobler expression in the moral courage to trust the divine intuitions of the soul—to speak the truth and do the right always.

In this and in every moral conflict may we be guided by an unclouded inner light, which, if trusted, will lead

us all aright and keep our hearts in accord with the eternal forces that make for righteousness and peace.

PLATFORM OF THE LIBERTY CONGRESS OF ANTI-IMPERIALISTS, ADOPTED IN INDIANAPOLIS, AUGUST 16.

This liberty congress of anti-imperialists recognizes a great national crisis which menaces the republic upon whose future depends in such large measure the hope of freedom throughout the world. For the first time in our country's history the president has undertaken to subjugate a foreign people and to rule them by despotic power. He has thrown the protection of the American flag over slavery and polygamy in the Sulu islands. He has arrogated to himself the power to impose upon the inhabitants of the Philippines government without their consent and taxation without representation. He is waging war upon them for asserting the very principles for the maintenance of which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. He claims for himself and congress authority to govern the territory of the United States without constitutional restraint.

We believe in the declaration of independence. Its truths not less self-evident to-day than when first announced by our fathers, are of universal application and cannot be abandoned while government by the people endures.

We believe in the constitution of the United States. It gives the president and congress certain limited powers and secures to every man within the jurisdiction of our government certain essential rights. We deny that either the president or congress can govern any person anywhere outside the constitution.

We are absolutely opposed to the policy of President McKinley, which proposes to govern millions of men without their consent, which, in Porto Rico, established taxation without representation and government by the arbitrary will of the legislature unfettered by constitutional restraint, and in the Philippines prosecutes a war of conquest and demands unconditional surrender from a people who are of right free and independent.

The struggle of men for freedom has ever been a struggle for constitutional liberty. There is no liberty if the citizen has no right which the legislature may not invade, if he may be taxed by a legislature in which he is not represented, or if he is not protected by fundamental law against the arbitrary ac-

tion of executive power. The policy of the president offers the inhabitant of Porto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippines no hope of independence, no prospect of American citizenship, no constitutional protection, no representation in the congress which taxes him. This is a government of men by arbitrary power, without their consent; this is imperialism.

There is no room under the free flag of America for subjects. The president and congress, who derive all their powers from the constitution, can govern no man without regard to its limitations.

We believe that the greatest safeguard of liberty is a free press, and we demand that the censorship in the Philippine islands, which keeps from the American people a knowledge of what is done in their name, be abolished. We are entitled to know the truth, and we insist that the powers which the president holds in trust for all of us be not used to suppress it.

Because we thus believe, we oppose the reelection of Mr. McKinley. The supreme purpose of the people in this momentous campaign should be to stamp with their final disapproval his attempt to grasp imperial power. A self-governing people can have no more imperative duty than to drive from public life a chief magistrate who, whether in weakness or of a wicked purpose, has used his temporary authority to subvert the character of their government and to destroy their national ideals.

We, therefore, in the belief that it is essential at this crisis for the American people again to declare their faith in the universal application of the Declaration of Independence, and to reassert their will that their servants shall not have or exercise any powers whatever other than those conferred by the constitution, earnestly make the following recommendations to our countrymen:

1. That, without regard to their views on minor questions of domestic policy, they withhold their votes from Mr. McKinley, in order to stamp with their disapproval what he has done.
2. That they vote for those candidates for congress in their respective districts who will oppose the policy of imperialism.
3. While we welcome any other method of opposing the election of Mr. McKinley, we advise direct support of Mr. Bryan, as the most effective means of crushing imperialism.

We are convinced of Mr. Bryan's sincerity and of his earnest purpose to secure to the Filipinos their independ-

ence. His position and the declarations contained in the platform of his party on the vital issue of the campaign meet our unqualified approval.

We recommend that the executive committee of the American Anti-Imperialistic league and its allied leagues continue and extend their organizations, preserving the independence of the movement; and that they take the most active part in the pending political campaign.

Until now the policy which has turned the Filipinos from warm friends to bitter enemies, which has slaughtered thousands of them and laid waste their country, has been the policy of the president. After the next election it becomes the policy of every man who votes to reelect him, and who thus becomes with him responsible for every drop of blood thereafter shed.

[The following resolution was adopted later.]

Resolved, That in declaring that the principles of the Declaration of Independence apply to all men this congress means to include the negro race in America as well as the Filipinos. We deprecate all efforts, whether in the south or in the north, to deprive the negro of his rights as a citizen under the Declaration of Independence and the constitution of the United States.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE LIBERTY CONGRESS.

When the Anti-Imperialists assembled in Tomlinson hall, Indianapolis, on the morning of August 15, they read these words in strong black letters clearly printed on a white banner hung conspicuously over the stage:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of. That, by our code of morals, would be criminal aggression.—William McKinley.

Because William McKinley had violated the principle he so rashly gave voice to before foreign temptations raised their heads, this Congress had assembled. It was first of all a congress of men protesting against a policy which they regarded as most inimical to the life of the Republic. Secondly, it was met to advise as to the best methods of defeating an administration responsible for that policy. Their ideal for the Republic was expressed in words placed just below Mr. McKinley's famous repudiated principle:

Behold a republic standing erect, while empires all around are bowed beneath the weight of their own armaments—a republic whose flag is loved, while other flags are only feared.—William Jennings Bryan.

Beneath these inspiring negative and positive statements of the same thing from the lost leader and from the ascendant leader, men from all parts of the nation, of diverse political training and party affiliation, American and foreign born, white and black, cultivated men, strong men, able men, deliberated earnestly and carefully, with unusual regard for the rights of all who were there, or who were in any respect represented.

Standing here Prof. A. H. Tolman, of Chicago, read the declaration of independence as perhaps it has never been read before, placing delicate emphasis upon such portions of King George's acts of misgovernment as were like the violations of human rights of which the present administration has been guilty. The audience showed by its startled applause at these points its discovery of a new value in the historic part of the declaration.

Able speaking as well as careful deliberation characterized the Congress.

Edwin Burritt Smith, of Chicago, evoked a double round of applause by the declaration:

There are currents of destiny, but they set away from despotism toward human freedom.

The venerable ex-governor of Massachusetts, George S. Boutwell, in accepting the presidency of the congress made a most impressive and affecting speech. Among other things he said:

Mr. Long says what we call imperialism is only a cry and that the anti-imperialists are few in number and of no considerable importance. He says their voice is only a cry. That may be true; a census has not been taken, and we do not boast of numbers. But 19 centuries ago a cry was heard in the wilderness of Judea—heard by only a few; but now the echoes of His voice are heard the world over. And now we are crying for an open path of justice for all people, repentance for the wrong that has been done in the past and reformation in the future. . . .

China has always followed the maxim: "Use that which is thine own, so as not to injure others." That contains every provision of the decalogue. Through centuries the Chinese empire has gone on, while Assyria and Rome and Carthage have withered and died—died because they took into their possession that to which they had no right. It is to such an entertainment that we are invited; it is to such a history as these nations have made that our eyes are turned, and we are asked to imitate it. . . .

How is the overthrow of the administration to be accomplished? In my youth I had no disguises. I turned aside and left the democratic party when it surrendered to slavery. In my age I leave the republican party, now that it has surrendered itself to despotic and tyrannical motives. (Great applause.) I helped create the republican party, a party at that time of justice and principle and honesty. I now believe it is a party of injustice and despotism, and I will help to destroy it. And how? There is but

one available means and you know what that is. I am for Bryan. . . .

The important business of the Congress was the adoption of a platform and recommendations. A canvass of the committee of 25 which prepared these showed that at the election four years ago one member had abstained from voting, seven had voted for Palmer, seven for Bryan and ten for McKinley.

Over the platform as presented by the committee there was no debate. Its terse, vigorous and frank statements seemed to receive unqualified approval. The debate was wholly over the question as to whether the Congress should advise the support of Mr. Bryan.

The opposition to such an indorsement of Mr. Bryan came almost entirely from members of the National party, who had been received also as members of this Congress, and who hoped the Congress would indorse a third ticket. The anti-imperialism of these men, who declared that they would not vote for Mr. McKinley, and could not vote for Mr. Bryan, seemed to be of an academic type. As George Gluyas Mercer, of Philadelphia, said, the trouble with the third party people was that they were "trying to take a whack at the universe," while the antis merely had the limited ambition to prevent imperialism.

It developed that the members of the National party distrusted Mr. Bryan's anti-imperialism. They pointed to the words of Senator Hoar which were hanging among the decorations:

They talk about giving good government; that one phrase conveys to a free man and a free people, the most stinging of insults. In that little phrase, as in a seed, is contained the germ of all despotism and of all tyranny.

And they declared Mr. Bryan had proposed to do that very thing, for had he not stated that if he were elected he would convene congress in extraordinary session and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose "to give independence to the Filipinos?"

The answer given by George Gluyas Mercer to this argument over a phrase, not a principle, was that as we had shot the original Filipino government to pieces, we should have to commit a momentary act of paternalism while repairing the consequences of our crime.

The Congress desired that the third party men should have the fullest encouragement to work against the reelection of Mr. McKinley and bade them Godspeed in their nomination of a National ticket; but the majority

believed in going to the greatest lengths in opposition to Mr. McKinley, and as this requires the casting of full votes, rather than half votes, against him, the congress passed its platform as originally offered.

The proceedings closed with a speech delivered on the evening of August 16 by Charles A. Towne—a speech which few who heard it will ever forget. Mr. Towne's brilliant arraignment of the administration policy in the Philippines was remarkable for its absolute freedom from the exaggeration and overestimate so common in partisan speech as to be discounted in advance by the sophisticated. It was still more remarkable for its vitalization of our ideals of a righteous national life. At the points in his speech where Mr. Towne appealed to these ideals his words dropped one by one into a breathless stillness. Justice, human rights, national integrity, stood forth the paramount political issue, and we knew what a great campaign we had entered upon.

ALICE THACHER POST.

THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST.

Every thoughtful traveler in Europe must be impressed with the superfluity of folks—that is to say, folks with nothing to do. In Italy this plethora seems more pronounced than elsewhere. At every hotel there are four servants where only one is required.

At Genoa there lined up in the hallway to speed my parting a fachino, four porters, three waiters, two chambermaids and a boots, while tapering off into the street were various able-bodied loungers, several old women and a full dozen small brigands. Each and every one in the line expected—aye, more, demanded—legal tender. All had rendered services, or said they had, and to omit any one from the pay roll was to call down curses loud and deep. The amount of tax ran from one lira (20 cents) to five centesimi (one cent), and a small handful of coppers was then required for the mob to struggle for in the street, so escape could be made under cover of the smoke.

At Venice you pay your gondolier a tariff rate per hour, and as he calls off the names of the palaces you pass (when you wish he would not) in a gibberish he thinks is English, you must pay him extra. Besides, if you are so reckless as to land along the way, the "hooker" who holds the boat expects a copper. At all churches old women open the doors and offi-

cious loungers offer information that is not desired, for expected coin.

To refuse to give to the beggars is to invite insult and insolence. Desperation is written on the dark faces that beseech you, and when you remember how, not many moons ago, this superfluous Italian populace exploded in one wild yell and made a dash for the baker-shop windows, you do not wonder.

Naples, Rome, Florence and Milan were placed under martial law, and at Milan alone in the month of May, 1898, 200 people were shot by the soldiers in the streets during my brief stay.

I saw volleys fired into crowds. The living would scurry away like frightened rabbits, into alleys, houses, side streets, cellars. But there on the sidewalks and in the streets lay the fallen and tumbled dead—men, women and children. In less than five minutes' time wagons with soldiers dashed up; the dead and dying were thrown like cordwood into the springless tumbrils, and with a cracking of whips the horses and wagons dashed away. Some of the soldiers remained and with hose and buckets and brooms every vestige of blood was washed away.

The newspapers made no reports—some of them denied that a volley had been fired.

And now the king of Italy has gone by a quick and painless route into the Beyond. He was only a man—not a great man, neither was he a bad man. Only a vain, ignorant, selfish man—with transient moods of wanting to do right—whose feet had been caught in a mesh of wrong, and he hadn't the power to get away. To kill him was absurd, for the wrong for which he stood still exists. It is the institution and policy, not the man. More volleys will be fired into the crowds that cry for bread. The death-carts will dump their victims into coffinless graves.

I shed tears for the homeless, the harassed the oppressed—for the women who hold hungry babes to famished breasts—for the ignorant and brutal who wrench at their bonds, and who by violence hope to achieve freedom.

For the dead king I waste no pity. He himself caused thousands of men to be killed. He lived by the sword and died by the bullet. What else could he expect? He invited his fate. He was only a slave at the last, and death has set him free.

Italy has less than one-half the population of the United States, yet she

has a navy that outmatches ours. She maintains an army of 250,000 men in time of peace, and there is one priest for every 60 persons.

She might maintain the priests, but she cannot possibly advance and carry the army that rides upon her back. Italy is the extreme type of all European countries, except Switzerland, Holland, Norway and Sweden. These last stand for intelligence, sobriety, beauty and worth.

Italy is rotten at the core. The moss is at work pulling down the palaces that Caprino planned; the grass springs from between the paving stones where Michael Angelo trod, and the noble Romans and courtly Florentines, like the crawling lizards, only bask in the sun in winter and move but to keep in the shade in summer.

Conscription kills ambition. Men will not work where the government demands half their wages, as Italy does. Only two careers worth mentioning are open to aspiring youth in Italy—the army and the church. Manual labor is held everywhere in contempt, and this accounts for the seeming superfluity of folks and the brazen beggardon. The rich set the example of idleness. Italy's art is a thing of the past. Italy was.

Governments cannot be done away with instantaneously, but progress will come, as it has in the past, by lessening the number of laws. We want less governing, and the ideal government will arrive when there is no government at all.

So long as governments set the example of killing their enemies, private individuals will occasionally kill theirs. So long as men are clubbed, robbed, imprisoned, disgraced, hanged by the governing class, just so long will the idea of violence and brutality be born in the souls of men.

Governments imprison men and then hound them when they are released. Hate will never die so long as men are taken from useful production on the specious plea of patriotism, and bayonets gleam in God's pure sunshine.

And the worst part about making a soldier of a man is not that a soldier kills brown men or white men, but that the soldier loses his own soul.

In America just now there are strong signs of following the example of modern Italy. To divert the attention of men from useful production to war, waste and wealth through conquest is to invite moral disease and death. The history of nations

dead and gone is one. They grew "strong" and died because they did. Insurance actuaries say that athletes are very bad risks.

Switzerland to-day is the least illiterate as well as the most truly prosperous country in the world. She is, in fact, the only republic, for the people themselves make the laws. Her government is of the people. In Switzerland to work with your hands is honorable—manual training for both boys and girls is a part of the public school system. Her gilded social aristocracy is either English or American.

Switzerland has no navy, for the same reason that Bohemia has not; and while every man is a soldier, yet three weeks' service every year is only a useful play spell. In Switzerland there is no beggardon and little vice. Everywhere life and property are safe. The people are healthy, prosperous and happy. Switzerland minds her own business and the chief tenet of her political creed is: "We will attend to our own affairs." She will only fight if invaded, and fortunately she is not big enough to indulge in jingo swagger.

The flag of Switzerland is the white cross—white on a red background—and this is the symbol of peace and amity the wide world over. The "Geneva Cross"—a red cross on a white background, designed in compliment to Switzerland, is the one flag upon which no guns are trained.

And now at the parting of the ways would it not be wise for America to choose between the example of Switzerland and Italy?

America is a giant; it is well to have a giant's strength, but not well to use it like a giant. This is the richest country the world has ever known—in treasure and in men and women. If we mind our own business and devote our energies to the arts of peace we can solve a problem that has vexed the world from the beginning of time. Shall we make our country blossom like the rose, or shall we follow the example of Italy?—Elbert Hubbard, in *New York World* of Aug. 5.

"Jump from the frying pan into the fire? Change McKinley for Bryan? Never!" cries the superficially-posted Filipino. "To our 9,000,000 of people McKinley opposes 72,000,000. It is horrible—eight of his to one of ours. But it cannot be more than half as horrible as sixteen to one would be!"

G. T. E.

OOM PAUL. For The Public.

Over and over we read of the fall
Of Oom Paul of the pipe, the grand Oom
Paul

Who has been so long a beleaguered wall;
But we never believe the story—
So used are we grown to our censorship,
To the half-truth phrase and the lying lip;
Each time the words from the memory slip
Like our Dewey's aforesaid glory.

Over and over the conquerors say
That now they have captured their slippery
prey—

At some nek or other brought them to bay;
And the only question to settle
Is, how to dispose of the paltry pelf,
And how above all of Oom Paul himself,
Whom they dare not leave to rust on the
shelf,

So well have they tested his mettle.

But ere they can light on feasible plan
To anchor this most invincible man,
He's at them again—is soul of the van,

And by no means easy to banish.
For wherever their sturdy chief may trek
His people warily follow his beck,
And, routed anew at kopje or nek,
Will pick up the pieces and vanish.

The Boers were doomed when war had be-
gun;

And so many times have they been undone,
So often has some new victory won

By the British, made London merry;
Why their host is still on the Boer trail
As though each defeat were of no avail,
That a Boer is left to tell the tale,
The credulous reader may query.

But we have grown wise, as I said before;
Most dearly we paid for the home-taught
lore,

Since our own war a score of times or more
Has been brought to peaceable ending.
Yet our island blood is still freely spilt,
The brown man's mostly; ours ever the
guilt;

Not warfare, but murder up to the hilt,
With impulse of freedom unbending.

So when British gourmands are fain to hie
To vallant division of Chinese pie,
Where laurels for sundry generals lie

Awaiting their turn to be taken;
We smile at the new surrender and fall
Of Oom Paul of the Pipe, the grand Oom
Paul—

Long may he stand an impregnable wall,
The old faith in his God unshaken.

D. H. INGHAM.

On his last visit to England Bishop Potter, of New York, was addressed as "your grace" until the phrase became a nightmare. When he arrived home again it happened that the first person to address him as he walked down the gangplank was a longshoreman who knew him. "Hullo, bish, how are you?" said the man, and the bishop fell to thinking which of the two styles he preferred.—*Chicago Chronicle*.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "Lincoln's Words on Living Questions" (Chicago: Trusty Publishing Co., 418 Roanoke Building. Paper, 25 cents; cloth, 75 cents), which is reliably edited by H. S. Taylor and D. M. Fulwiler, the demo-

cratic and populist speaker and editor will find abundant quoting material for the campaign, with definite references to its sources. Republican editors and speakers are not likely to find it very useful, for quotations from Lincoln do not help their side of the burning issues of the time. The book purports to contain all the recorded utterances of Lincoln upon the questions of the day, and Messrs. Taylor and Fulwiler have in their work as editors classified the quotations with excellent judgment for purposes of ready reference. The classifications themselves are significant, and we repeat them: "Declaration of Independence," "Liberty," "Government and the People," "The Constitution and the Law," "The Courts and the People," "Suffrage and Elections," "Capital, Land and Labor," "Foreign Policy and Expansion," "Money, Greenbacks, Silver and Gold," "Tariff," "Party Policy," "War, Peace, Temperance, Emancipation." It may be seen from this list of subjects that the book will prove useful not only to speakers and editors, but also to every voter who reveres the name and respects the opinions of Abraham Lincoln.

"Representative Democracy," by John R. Commons (New York: Bureau of Economic Research, 35 Lafayette Place. Price 25 cents) is especially at this time a most desirable publication. It is a compendium of the principal arguments for direct legislation and proportional representation, and contains, in addition to a great variety of other luminous matter, a full account of the Belgian proportional representation law of 1899.

The June number of "Municipal Affairs" (New York: Reform Club, 52 William St. Price, 25 cents a number and \$1 a year), that excellent quarterly which has become indispensable to civic students, is devoted chiefly to municipal politics, on which subject in its various phases John W. Keller, Edwin Burritt Smith, John R. Commons, Thomas R. Slicer, Bolton Hall and Ernest H. Crosby appear among the contributors. But room is made for an illustrated leader by John DeWitt Warner on "Advertising Run Mad," in which Mr. Warner's high-grade qualities as an intellectual pugilist are usefully and splendidly displayed.

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 Three Cents the single copy or \$1.25 per hundred. Address: **THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.**

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

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

LAWYERS,

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

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 Jerome 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.

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

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

Read and Return

These books sent to any person, on condition they are returned or price remitted in ten days.

- Japanese Notions of European Political Economy 25c
- Our Farmers of the Revenue, by Wm. S. Rann..... 25c
- Natural Taxation, by Shearman..... 30c
- Progress and Poverty, Henry George 30c

PRICES INCLUDE POSTAGE.
ANY BOOK ON EARTH SUPPLIED.

H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter,
Catalogues Free. **CONNEAUT, OHIO.**

WE DON'T SELL OUR

CIGARS

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

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