

# The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1900.

Number 120.

**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 Lyman Abbott regards the axiom that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed as a baseless assumption, it would be interesting to know his opinion of the golden rule. The doctrine of consent in government is but an application of the golden rule to politics.

It will delight Mr. Hanna, though it cannot surprise him, to learn that the "Commercial and Financial Chronicle," a Wall street trade paper in whose estimation the stock exchange is the center of the moral universe, sticks to his presidential protege. With the indorsement of that paper, Mr. Hanna's corruption fund is assured.

With some 60,000 troops in the Philippines, Gen. MacArthur finds himself unable to hold our Philippine subjects under control. From every department of the islands, said an Associated Press letter of June 12 from Manila, published here on the 16th of July, "'more soldiers' is the demand which is coming to Gen. MacArthur." Imperialism is an expensive military luxury.

With the apparent purpose of making it appear that the famine in India is not due to the exportation of Indian products, a New York dispatch is in circulation which states that there have been no exportations of wheat from India since the famine was officially announced. This fact is said to be reported by the weekly cable returns of the New York produce exchange. But it makes no difference whether there have been exportations

of wheat. It is not particular exports, but excessive exports in general that contribute to the impoverishment of India.

A majority of the stockholders of the National Wall Paper company, known as the wall paper trust, have decided to dissolve. This decision was made on the 17th at a stockholders' meeting in New York. The reason for it is that the trust was unable to stand up against outside competition. No better example could be desired of the truth that trusts not buttressed by legalized monopolies are of few days and full of trouble. No trust can long resist outside competition with no better weapon than organization. To succeed, it must have, either directly from the government or indirectly as the lessee of some governmental beneficiary, a monopoly of trade, transportation or land. Monopolies of trade are made by protective tariffs. Monopolies of transportation are made by railroad franchises. Monopolies of land are given by title deeds. These are the things that make trusts possible. Mere organizations in restraint of competition cannot long survive. Of that fact the dissolution of the wall paper trust is one more illustrious example.

It is well that the policeman's statue that used to mark the spot of the so-called anarchist riot at the Haymarket in Chicago has been removed. It were better buried. But since it will no longer falsify the history of the riot, its existence above ground is of little importance. Standing where it did, as a riot monument, it perpetuated a falsehood. "I command peace!" says the statue. "I command this meeting to disperse!" said the policeman whose interference with a peaceable meeting precipitated the riot. As the fact that the meeting was peace-

able until attacked by the police, and the further fact that the police commanded it to disperse, are matters of unquestioned and indisputable public record, the inscription on the police statue, in so far as it alludes to the riot, is, as it was intended to be, a brazen lie.

According to a dispatch from Deadwood the output of gold from the Black hills will be one-third more this year than any previous year. The increase is attributed to recent discoveries and improvements in the cyanide process for treating low grade ores. Two years ago, says the dispatch, it was unprofitable to mine gold ore that yielded less than ten dollars a ton, but now a profit can be made out of two-dollar ore. These improvements are equivalent to the discovery of new gold mines, and if their promise is realized we may expect a reversal of political parties in the next monetary campaign. The gold men will be fighting for silver as the only honest money, while the silver men plead for the rights of the debased gold dollar. Only Mr. McKinley will be unchanged. He will continue to dodge and straddle.

Although the fate of the foreign legations in Peking is still uncertain, notwithstanding persistent reports of a horrible massacre, some light is breaking through the mist in which the general situation is enveloped. The outer world begins to understand the origin and nature of the conflict. Evidently the boxers' uprising is a revolt against the Chinese government. It was engendered by the government's policy of conceding Chinese territory and other privileges to foreigners, and is made formidable by the excitation throughout China of that brutal instinct which is characteristic of all peoples, including our

own, the instinct of contempt and hatred for "outside barbarians." In the beginning the Chinese government tried to suppress the uprising. But when the foreign powers bombarded the Chinese forts at Taku, their wanton act created an entirely new situation. The Chinese government was thereby forced to assume toward the powers a warlike attitude. To have shown friendliness toward them after that would have been to the people positive proof of treachery. The bombardment instantly made the boxers' cause the cause of China. From the Chinese point of view the situation may be appreciated by imagining the effect upon our own people of a naval assault upon American fortifications under similar circumstances. Our nation would be a unit instantly in resisting the common enemy. It was so in China. The revolt of the boxers became a secondary matter when the powers made war upon the empire. For a time the fiction of assisting the Chinese government in putting down an insurrection may be kept up. But China rejects the assistance; and the fact, already patent, must soon be acknowledged, that they are at war with her.

There is a point up to which this war may be justified, in spite of its having been wantonly begun by the foreign powers. That point is the relief of the foreign legations and the rescue of foreigners from massacre. If the Chinese government is unwilling or unable to protect these places and people from outrage, it is within the right of the powers to march through the country to their relief. But the rescue once effected, or the massacre once completed, so that relief ceases to be a factor, all present justification for war is at an end. At a later time, when the heat and bitterness of the period shall have passed and the confusion have had opportunity to disentangle, demands for indemnity and assurances for the future might be properly made and in some circumstances justly enforced if possible with arms. But now the sole consideration is one of rescue.

There can be no justification for a passionate war of retribution or vengeance. Such wars do not serve any useful purpose. They only minister to some of the wickedest cravings of the human heart. Neither can there be any justification of a war in aid of the Chinese government in putting down domestic violence, except for purposes of rescue. With the domestic affairs of the Chinese empire the powers have no right to meddle. And clearly they have no right to make the present emergency an excuse for a war of conquest. To rescue endangered foreigners and for that alone can foreign troops be justified in firing a shot upon Chinese soil.

Yet the spirit of retaliation is in the air. We who call ourselves Christian and civilized respond like barbarians to the impulse of vengeance and racial hatred. To be sure, we appeal in testimony of our good intentions to the precepts of religion, but so does the barbarian. His is another religion, that is all. And it is a safe guess that at the worst it is no more vicious than ours can be made by letting the devil interpret that saying of the Prince of Peace: "I came not to bring peace, but a sword." With a common sense interpretation this saying is an expression of a simple fact which in one of its phases every martyr for truth's sake since time began has experienced. But in the mouth of canting bishops of the strenuous sort it becomes a commission to kill and lay waste and conquer in the name of Him who said: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The cry for vengeance goes up from press and pulpit in one monotonous note. In London we are told, diplomatic and parliamentary circles are calling for a war of vengeance. A member of parliament is quoted as saying that the powers must "crush the reactionaries or get out of China." One New York paper, the Tribune, demands "the sternest possible retribution." The emperor of Germany puts on his armor to chastise the Chinese. A Chicago

bishop, devout and lowly as becomes his sacred office, wants China "humbled and punished" at any cost. In Shanghai a mass meeting of Americans calls for retribution. And so the barbarous cry goes on. If the nations keep out of a terrible war of blind hate and revenge in China it will be in spite of Christianity and civilization, as they are taught.

It need hardly be added that the spirit of revenge in which a war in China would be waged, would serve the objects of even worse motives. The member of parliament from whom we quoted above, makes the motive threefold—"vengeance, commercial establishment and zeal for Christ." And he says this not as a grim humorist, but with the serious piety of a Sunday school superintendent. Something in the same line is said by the strenuous bishop already mentioned. He looks for ultimate peace, but "peace by conquest." All through the cry for vengeance upon the Chinese there runs this strain of sordid selfishness. Conquest is the ultimate object—conquest for vengeance, conquest for commerce, conquest for proselyting. Thus far the United States has in this respect been guiltless. The American admiral at Taku refused to participate in the attack upon the Chinese forts. Secretary Root has limited the right of invasion to purposes of rescue, and when urged to increase the American troops has objected that the object of rescue and relief does not warrant additional reinforcements. In other respects, also, the purpose of this government appears to be to refrain at any rate from prosecuting a war of conquest in China. But there are substantial reasons with respect to the other powers for the complaint of the Chinese minister at Washington that they have sacrificed their ministers to the mob at Peking in order to make a crisis to serve as an excuse for the dismemberment of the Chinese empire. And while our government has not yet manifested a disposition to avail itself of this crisis to secure a share in the spoils, there are indications that it may yet do so.

Not the least significant of these is afforded by Congressman Hull, of Iowa, chairman of the house committee on military affairs, who is in close personal, political and official touch with the administration. In an interview published in the Chicago Record of July 17, Mr. Hull said:

I have no doubt that the democratic members of congress will vote for any measure looking to the suppression of lawlessness in China and securing reparation to this government. Any party which would oppose a vigorous course in these circumstances would be swept out of existence, and the party which advocated letting the other powers do the work to be done in China and then we step in and claim part of the fruits would meet a similar fate.

If it is not intended to make the war on our part a war of conquest, why should our chairman of the committee on military affairs be so solicitous to put us in a position to step in, after the work is done in China, and "claim part of the fruits"?

When the imperialists "plead the baby act" by trying to shift responsibility for imperialism upon Mr. Bryan, they expose an unsuspected consciousness of the weakness of their cause. Yet that is what they are doing. Because he advised the adoption of the Paris treaty rather than advocate an amendment which would have involved a nominal continuance of the Spanish war, they charge him with responsibility for the policy of imperialism which McKinley has erected upon the basis of the treaty! Mr. Bryan's advice as he gave it is printed in full this week in our department of Miscellany.

Mr. Bryan may have been wrong in advising the prompt adoption of the Paris treaty. He is not inerrant, like the great and good protege of Mr. Hanna. But if he was wrong, many other anti-imperialists were wrong also. As it has turned out, they do seem to have been mistaken. It would have been far better to force an amendment of the treaty, no matter how long that might have kept up the Spanish war nominally, than to have given McKinley an excuse for

destroying infant republics, subjugating distant peoples, establishing crown colonies and turning the republic into an empire. But who could have foreseen that President McKinley would have done this? Senator Hoar did, indeed, foresee it; but Senator Hoar, as a copartisan and personal friend of McKinley's, was in an advantageous position to know what to expect from such an administration. Bryan was in no such position. He could only infer that the foundation principles of the republic would be respected even by McKinley. The imperialists are in a bad way when they raise this defense. But by no such baby plea can they shield themselves in the coming campaign from full responsibility for the policy of imperialism.

To urge that the McKinley crown colony policy is not imperialism is only to "plead the baby act" in another way. Two federal judges, one in New York and one in Chicago, and both republicans, have recently decided, one as to Puerto Rico and the other as to the Philippines, that these lands are not within the protection of the American constitution, but are foreign countries subject to the sovereignty of the United States. That is the relationship that McKinley is trying to perpetuate, and it is the essence of imperialism. It is the relation that the empire of Rome established with her provinces. If "imperialism" is a distasteful term to our fastidious imperialists let them use another. They might prefer "forcible annexation," "criminal aggression" or something of that kind. But they would be no better off. It is not the name but the essence of the thing that shocks the republican sense of America; and the essence of it is that Mr. McKinley would have the American republic extend its sovereign power over peoples to whom it denies citizenship rights, and who would therefore be American "subjects."

With reference to the boast of the republican platform, commented upon

at page 181, that "in the short three years of the present republican administration an excess of exports over imports in the enormous sum of \$1,483,537,094" has been rolled up, we are asked to explain why that increased excess means increased impoverishment of the country. This is the question:

Of course the persons who manufactured (or grew) and who sold those exports got paid in money, and it was to their advantage to sell them. Then why was it not an advantage to the country at large?

Undoubtedly it was to the advantage of the producers, all things considered, to sell their products. Else they would not have sold them. It is true, also, that they got money or its equivalent in return for their goods. But it by no means follows that the country is richer. To understand this more clearly, consider a tributary country,—such as Palestine, for instance, under the Roman empire. The producers of Palestine got pay for their products, and it was to their advantage to sell them; but the tribute that went out of the province as excessive exports to Rome was of no advantage to Palestine. She was impoverished by it. So with Ireland. The producers there get pay for their products, and it is to their advantage to sell them; but the rents that go from the island as excessive exports make Ireland poor. This is true also of Egypt. The fellahin are paid for their products, and it is to their advantage to sell them; but the interest on Egyptian bonds held abroad is a form of tribute which tends, by making excessive exports, to impoverish Egypt as a whole.

Keeping in mind the principle suggested above, turn to our own country. Our producers are paid for their products, and it is to their advantage to sell them. But some of these producers pay rent to an Astor or a Lord Scully, and products to the amount of the whole or part of that rent are exported, because these men live abroad. That makes no direct differ-

ence to the rent payers as individuals. Since they would have to pay the rent anyhow, it does not immediately concern them individually that it goes ultimately to a man in London, instead of going to a man in New York. Yet the country at large is poorer. That is, there is less wealth in the country if that wealth becomes an export to London without an equivalent import, than there would be if it remained here. This is true likewise if the excessive export be for the purpose of paying tourists' expenses. The tourists have their enjoyment for their expenditure, but the aggregate of wealth in their country is thereby lessened. It is also true of wealth shipped abroad for dividends and interest on stocks and bonds. The individuals who pay the dividends and interest to foreigners are no poorer as individuals than if they paid them to their compatriots; but there is consequently less wealth in the country. And so of all shipments of wealth abroad for which no return shipments of wealth are made. Individuals may be no worse off as such and directly, but the country is thereby drained of wealth.

With characteristic pithiness, Mr. Bryan describes the inner motive of opponents of imperialism who refuse to support the democratic ticket because of the silver plank in the platform, when he says that they prefer a gold standard empire to a bimetallic republic. And he pays to anti-imperialists generally the compliment of believing them to be intelligently patriotic when he adds:

When the test comes I believe that those who adhere to the doctrine that governments derive their just powers not from superior force but from consent of the governed will support our ticket even though they do not indorse the silver plank. A large majority of the democrats believe that a restoration of bimetallicism would prove a blessing, but the anti-imperialists who dispute this will admit that any evils that might arise from bimetallicism could be corrected more easily than the evils which would follow from the deliberate indorsement of militarism and imperialism.

Some voters who, for economic reasons opposed Bryan four years ago, are in doubt as to the course they ought to follow this year. The problem should not be difficult. If they believe in plutocracy, they should vote for McKinley, regardless of any particular issue. If they believe in democracy they should vote for Bryan. Not that Bryan is altogether democratic, nor that McKinley is altogether plutocratic. But Bryan represents the democratic tendency, while McKinley represents the plutocratic tendency; and tendencies are in these times all that anyone can vote for or against. There are political periods when the voter can help along a particular reform by voting for the party that advocates it and against the party that has opposed or betrayed it. But when broad principles are manifestly at stake in party contests no one can by his vote adjust the details of government to his liking. A vote for or against civil service reform, for instance, or for or against a certain ratio in the coinage of gold and silver, counts for nothing at such times. All that the voter can do then is to strengthen one of two great tendencies, and weaken the other. He can this year strengthen the tendency toward plutocracy or the tendency away from it. He can do nothing more. It was the same four years ago, and those who voted for McKinley then have got a taste of imperialism, which is one of the phases of plutocracy.

If it is true, as some of the administration papers are claiming, that the gold standard law enacted last spring is not an honest gold standard law, but that it could be circumvented by a hostile secretary of the treasury, the laugh is on the gold standard democrats. They were assured by Mr. Hanna's party, and they went about assuring others, that the wicked Bryan couldn't possibly disturb their gold fetish for years to come, because Mr. McKinley had put it into a glass case with a time-lock attachment. It must be heartrending to learn now that they were buncoed.

But Mr. McKinley offers to give them a sure-enough gold standard law next time if they will indorse his imperial policy. It is a bargain, a splendid bargain. A yellow dollar for the privilege of turning the republic into an empire! What assurance is there, though, that if Mr. McKinley be given his empire-building authority he will make a more honest gold standard law next time than the last?

We do not wholly agree with the criticisms of Senator Hoar upon his decision to support President McKinley. By this we refer to the man and not to his reasons. Worse reasons could hardly be put together. But as to Mr. Hoar himself, he has grown up in the republican party, and naturally shrinks from severing his relations by an act so supreme as opposing its unanimous choice for the presidency. Some men can do such things. All men cannot. It would be the harder for Mr. Hoar because his alternative is to support a party which in the days of its power was the champion of chattel slavery. Many of us can see that this is not now the party it once was. We know it to be a new liberty party, as truly a new party as if it had been organized yesterday. But all men who love liberty, especially those who went through the antislavery fight with the democratic party as completely dominated by the slave power as the republican party is dominated to-day by the ugly spirit of imperialism, cannot see this change so plainly, and Mr. Hoar is one of them. We sympathize while disagreeing with him. It is to be hoped, however, that though he support McKinley for the presidency he will not allow his partisanship to silence him in this vital conflict for republic or empire.

Attention is called by the Nation to the growing necessity of relegating national conventions to the political lumber room. They have become vast mass meetings which do not and cannot act as deliberate assemblies. In the same connection the old system of nominating presidents by congress-

sional caucus is referred to as something which a democracy could not and did not long endure. Here, then are the two extremes. A close caucus which arbitrarily and absolutely controls nominations and thus controls elections, and a great mass meeting which represents nobody but the people who succeed in getting into the hall and which while democratic in form is not at all democratic in fact. The convention must, indeed, meet the fate of the close caucus. But what can be substituted? To make the convention a deliberative body would be a step back toward the caucus, and that would be followed by others until King Caucus would reign once more. The only remedy is to restore to the people fully a free power of choice. This can be done by any system of effective voting, whereby the voter declares his first, second, third, etc., choice. When voters can do that, they will lose all fear of helping a strong candidate whom they detest by voting for a weak one whom they prefer. They will vote for the weak candidate as first choice, confident that if he fails of election their second choice, or third, or fourth, will still count against the objectionable candidate. And if voters did lose this fear of throwing away their votes or indirectly helping an objectionable candidate, it wouldn't make much difference how nominations were made.

"The Land of Sunshine," Charles F. Lummis's dollar magazine, published at Los Angeles, contains a department called "The Lion's Den," in which Mr. Lummis himself comments with characteristic brevity, wit and force upon subjects of perennial interest. In the July number he pays his respects to those thoughtless people who seem to regard letters of introduction as certificates which anybody ought to give to anybody else upon demand. Mr. Lummis—aims to remark that he gives "letters" to people whose paper he would indorse in the bank—and they are fewer than a few. He thinks as much of his word of honor as of his innumerable dollars. Possibly one reason why he has some

respectable friends is that he does not lie to them for the sake of being "polite" to strangers. A letter of introduction ought to mean something. And it is just as well to begin to make it do so.

This is a word in season. The man who asks a letter of introduction which suggests an acquaintanceship that does not exist, and the man who gives it, conspire to defraud. There is no palliation for these introductory letters, unless it be that people to whom they are addressed seldom give them more than polite attention, when the writer does not vouch for them by emphatic direct communication.

#### SERVICE FOR SERVICE.

So accustomed have men become to the association of elegant leisure with civilization, that they realize only with considerable mental effort that civilization depends neither upon leisure nor the leisure class, but altogether upon interchange of work. Service for service is the condition of civilized life. It is this that gives us comfortable shelter and clothing, that keeps us supplied with food, that furnishes us with all our implements, and that enables us to accumulate knowledge.

Should we altogether cease serving one another, civilization would quickly collapse. Though men may live without serving, it is only through some degree of interchange of service that they can live civilized lives. The less intense and just this interchange, the lower the grade of civilization; the more perfect the interchange, both in its economic and its moral qualities, the higher the civilization it will generate and maintain. Service for service is the central law of social development.

In the civilized state with which we of this generation are acquainted, most exchanges of service take the form of exchanges of substantial objects which have been shaped by human art, by work. Some exchanges are indeed of work itself. For barbers, physicians, teachers, some classes of household servants, actors, lawyers, and so on, do not shape substantial objects and trade them; they render direct personal service. But most

exchanges of service take the form of exchanges of artificial objects.

The exchange of these objects, however, depends upon the principle of service for service. They are congealed or crystallized service. A familiar type is bread. By no immediate service could anyone furnish us with bread. The field must be plowed and seeded, the mill must be made and managed, and the flour must be baked in an oven that must be built, before anyone can be served with bread. When bread comes to the table, therefore, it is an embodiment of all the different kinds of service which have brought it there; from that of the farmer to that of the baker, from that of the miner and machinist to that of the transporter. And as with bread, so with all artificial things in the way of food, clothing, shelter, luxuries, and the artificial materials and machinery for producing them. They are products of labor, and in exchanging them we are essentially exchanging service for service.

Hardly less evanescent, however, are these things than direct personal service. Some kinds of artificial objects thus embodying service are quickly consumed, and even those that are lasting last but a little while—a month or two, a year or two, or possibly a generation or two. Though we often speak of saving, such things cannot be saved. The civilization of to-day rests not upon the saved-up products of earlier generations; but upon interchanges of service in this generation, and to a great degree in this year, or month, or week, or day.

It is often explained that the idle rich are living upon the accumulated savings of their ancestors. They live upon nothing of the kind. Imagine a rich young man as breakfasting luxuriously upon toast which his great-great-grandmother had made, and eggs that his great-great-grandfather had saved up! So far from his doing that, the toast and eggs he eats are those which some of his own fellow inhabitants of this planet have caused to come to him at this very time. Some of his brethren have rendered him a service by working for him, and if he has rendered in ex-

change no equivalent service for others with his own work, then some of his brethren have to that extent given service for which they have not received service.

Service cannot be saved. Even when congealed in consumable things, it can be saved for only a little while. Society as a whole lives almost literally from hand to mouth. The work that is done to-day serves the wants of to-day. We cannot save it for future generations.

But we can and do save obligations to work. And this is what is really meant by saving wealth.

Nor is such saving necessarily incompatible with the principle of service for service. If a farmer, for example, works a day for his neighbor in corn planting time with an understanding that the neighbor is to help him in harvest, he will in effect have saved a day's service from corn planting time till harvest time. Or if a farmer delivers 100 bushels of grain to the storekeeper upon an agreement that he shall have its equivalent in dry goods upon demand, and he does not demand them for a year, he will in effect have saved the dry goods. Suppose, however, that instead of giving the farmer credit for his wheat the storekeeper pays him money for it, and that the farmer does not spend that money until the next year, then the farmer will in effect have saved the things he ultimately buys. But the storekeeper, instead of giving either credit or money, may give the farmer his note payable in a year, and by mutual agreement this note may be renewed from year to year, until the farmer dies, leaving it to his son; and after successive renewals it may come to his grandson, to whom finally it is paid with money and the money used to hire a cook to toast bread and boil eggs. The principle will be the same. The service or goods so procured will in effect have been saved up through those three generations, though in fact the cook was not born until after the wheat for which the note was given had been consumed, nor the eggs laid until the day before they were served. In all these instances there is an exchange of service for service.

The fact that the service in one direction was rendered long before the

service in the other makes no difference. So long as all the processes of the transaction are voluntary on the part of all parties concerned, it is immaterial whether or not the exchange is concurrent. The essential thing is that when a service is rendered it shall be in exchange for an equivalent service, whether the equivalent service be rendered concurrently or in the past, or is to be rendered in the future. This is what constitutes service for service.

If all obligations to serve represented service rendered or to be rendered, there would be no volcanic rumblings in the development of civilization. No one could then complain of undeserved poverty, nor would any be unjustly rich. For if each rendered service only as he received an equivalent in service, suffering from poverty would imply voluntary idleness and the possession of great wealth would imply great industry and usefulness. It is an indisputable truth, however, that most of the obligations to serve which constitute the so-called wealth of the leisure classes represent neither service rendered nor to be rendered by the possessors, but only power acquired.

To illustrate this side of the matter, let us suppose a ten-dollar bill extorted by a highwayman from a workingman whose wages it is. The workingman had rendered service, and this bill was his certificate of title to receive service in return. But now he must lose the power to demand that service. The robber has acquired it. So the workingman will have rendered ten dollars' worth of service without getting any service, and the robber will have gained ten dollars' worth of service without rendering any.

In that case the workingman is plundered in defiance of law. But there would be no essential difference if the law justified the act. There are instances in which the law does justify precisely such acts. The institution of slavery is one. A master's title to his slave is an obligation upon the slave to serve. He must serve as his master orders. The law compels him to. Yet he never has received and never is to receive any adequate service in return. As with the robbed

workingman, the slave must render service without getting service, while his master gets service without rendering any. The principle of service for service is ignored. It is the same, though the process is more subtle, when private monopolies are given control of public business. When, for instance, the streets of a city are turned over to private corporations for street car purposes, and the corporations charge for fares more than could be exacted for the same service in competitive conditions, the excess is upon a footing precisely with the ten dollars extorted from the workingman in defiance of law, and with the labor extorted from the slave pursuant to law. To the extent of that excess the passengers are forced to render service without getting service, and the corporations get service without rendering any.

The most universal method, however, as it is the fundamental one, of getting service without giving service, through the enforcement of legal obligations to serve, is that of land monopoly. This method operates to effect the result in two ways: First, by extorting private compensation for the enjoyment of a common right; secondly, by abnormally lessening opportunities to use land, and thereby abnormally reducing the price of service.

All incomes from land—not from its use, but from the mere power of forbidding its use—are unearned. That is, they consist of services rendered by others for which no service is rendered in return. For no man can render his fellow man a service by "allowing" him to use land, any more than he can render him a service by "allowing" him to breathe. There is no service in either case unless it has been preceded by a commensurate injury. If an enemy grabs my throat and chokes me, he may indeed do me a service by "allowing" me to breathe. But if he had in the first place recognized my right to breathe, there would have been no need for his permission. It would be wrenching language to call such permission a service. The same remark is true of the "service" of allowing men to use land, to which all men's rights are equal if there is such a thing as morality in the universe. It is only by divesting

men of their natural right to land that they can ever be made to feel that permission to use land is a service. The principle of service for service demands that service by work shall be repaid with service by work. Nothing else satisfies it. Consequently rent exactions for private benefit as compensation for permission to use land, are hostile to this principle. They enable the beneficiaries to that extent to get service without giving any, and therefore compel others to the same extent to give service without getting any.

The system of land monopoly which thus enables land monopolists to get service without giving service, produces the secondary effect noted above. It is infinitely more subtle and vastly more oppressive than the first. Through occasional phenomenal rises of some land in rent-yielding qualities, whereby families have become very rich—acquiring thereby great power to exact service without rendering any—a craze for buying land and holding it for a rise has become chronic, in consequence of which the whole earth, though but slightly used, is almost completely monopolized. One result of this is to set the service-rendering elements of society into deadly competition with one another for opportunities to use the earth in rendering service. For use of the earth is necessary in all occupations. A city store-keeper, for example, requires more land for his business than a country farmer does for his,—measuring the land by value. The inevitable effect of that competition has been to reduce the value of service, as compared with the value of opportunities to render service, until those who render it must invariably give more service than they receive. So the principle of service for service in society is turned topsy-turvy.

The two kinds of obligations to serve which we have thus attempted to distinguish—those that represent service and those that extort it—are commonly confused by the habit of speaking of all interchange or rendering of service in terms of money. It is by money, that is, that we measure service, whether we measure it for purposes of exchange or for purposes of extortion. If we hire a man to

work for us, or buy a consignment of goods, we fix the value in terms of dollars or of pounds sterling. We do the same if we buy a lot of land to hold for a rise or buy a slave to do our work. Yet in the one case the expression in dollars or pounds means that we are arranging to exchange service for service; whereas in the other it means that we are arranging to exchange a power of extorting service without rendering service. The moral nature of the transactions is confused by the terms in which they are expressed.

There arises, therefore, a feeling that money itself is in some sense an unholy thing. In some churches, for instance, collections are not taken up, because the jingle of money in church is felt to be offensive. And in many churches where collections are taken, they are regarded as unavoidable evils; a sense of incongruity is felt and often expressed. Yet there should be no such feeling regarding money that has been earned by service. To drop such money into the contribution box of any society is to say: "I have done this much work for this cause and here is the certificate." But so much of the money that goes into contribution boxes represents not service for the cause, but extortion for the cause, that it is little wonder a sense of incongruity between money boxes and church worship is felt and expressed both within and without the churches.

Such is the kind of money that people would get were their wishes granted when they wish to be rich. To wish to be rich is to wish to be able to get service without giving service. It is therefore the most selfish possible wish. Yet it is often made in what purports to be a philanthropic spirit. We sometimes wish we might be rich so that we could lighten the burdens of the poor. But why not wish that they might be rich so that they could lighten their own burdens? Zangwill's Jew understood this thing to a nicety. After praying the Lord to give him \$100,000, upon his promise to distribute \$50,000 of it among the poor, he added: "But Lord, if you can't trust me, then give me \$50,000 and distribute the other \$50,000 among the poor yourself." It all comes back to our original proposition that obligations to serve are of

two kinds, those which certify to exchange of service and those which certify to a legal power of extorting service. This distinction must always be kept clear.

Of the justice of the former species of obligation there can be no question. When men freely contract for an exchange of service, whether in the form of direct personal service or of substantial products of labor, or partly in one and partly in the other, the obligation of him who gets service to return its equivalent is a moral obligation. But the obligation which represents power to extort service without certifying to the rendering of service must be condemned.

Simple ethics condemn it. If one gets without working, others must work without getting; and that is something which no school of ethics can frankly approve. It is essentially robbery.

The Bible also condemns it. That venerated volume admonishes us to do to others as we would have them do to us, and to love our neighbors as ourselves—neither more nor less, but the same; and in it we are distinctly told that he who will not work shall not eat, a text which is frequently enough quoted against parasitical tramps but seldom against parasitical millionaires. In fact the Bible is replete with condemnations of extortions of service. In this way only are its otherwise incomprehensible condemnations of the rich to be explained. For the rich, in the opprobrious sense, are not those who have much in the way of obligations requiring others to serve, but those who have anything in the way of such obligations which do not represent service rendered by themselves. Says Henry George (in chapter 19 book 2 of the "Science of Political Economy):

Is there not a natural or normal line of the possession or enjoyment of service? Clearly there is. It is that of equality between giving and receiving. . . . He who can command more service than he need render, is rich. He is poor who can command less service than he does render or is willing to render; for in our civilization of to-day we must take note of the monstrous fact that men willing to work cannot always find opportunity to work. The one has more than he ought to have; the other has less. Rich and poor are thus correlatives of each

other; the existence of a class of rich involving the existence of a class of poor, and the reverse; and abnormal luxury on the one side and abnormal want on the other have a relation of necessary sequence. To put this relation into terms of morals, the rich are the robbers, since they are at least sharers in the proceeds of robbery; and the poor are the robbed. This is the reason, I take it, why Christ, who was not really a man of such reckless speech as some Christians deem him to have been, always expressed sympathy with the poor and repugnance of the rich. In his philosophy it was better even to be robbed than to rob. In the kingdom of right doing which he preached, rich and poor would be impossible, because rich and poor in the true sense are the results of wrong-doing. . . . Injustice cannot live where justice rules, and even if the man himself might get through, his riches—his power of compelling service without rendering service—must of necessity be left behind. If there can be no poor in the kingdom of heaven, clearly there can be no rich! And so it is utterly impossible in this, or in any other conceivable world, to abolish unjust poverty, without at the same time abolishing unjust possessions. This is a hard word to the softly amiable philanthropists who, to speak metaphorically, would like to get on the good side of God without angering the devil. But it is a true word nevertheless.

Verily it is a true word. If the extortion of service is to be abolished and the world left free to exchange service for service, then those obligations to serve which represent naked legal power and not service rendered must be unconditionally abolished. To pay their beneficiaries for their loss of extorting power would be merely to substitute one form of extortion for another. Whoever is rich because he possesses legal power to compel the rendering of service without rendering or having rendered therefor an equivalent service, must in justice lose that power. So long as he retains it the natural law of service for service cannot operate. It is only by his losing his power to extort service that others can be restored to their right to exchange service.

## NEWS

Though news of the Chinese situation has not much altered in any important respect since our last report, it is impossible to escape the conviction that a great world war has fairly begun. The foreign powers still

maintain the fiction that they are aiding the Chinese government to establish order, and no declarations of war have been made. But China has carried the fight into the enemy's country by firing on a Russian transport steamer on the Amur river, which is the boundary between Chinese and Russian territory, and attacking a city on the Russian side—the city of Blagoveshchensk, in Siberia. This attack, which was made on the 14th, is not in itself important, but it attracts attention because it makes an opportunity for Russia to declare war if she chooses. And as we write there comes a report from London that she has in effect done so by handing to the Chinese envoy at St. Petersburg his passports and requesting his withdrawal from the country. Significance is attached also to the fact that Li Hung Chang went from Canton on the 18th to Peking in response to an edict of the Chinese government.

The fate of the foreign colony in Peking is still involved in mystery. All the news consists of rumors of doubtful character. A dispatch from the Russian Admiral Alexieff, at Port Arthur, telling of the torture and murder by boxers of the Russian minister, M. De Giers, and his wife, was received at St. Petersburg on the 11th, but was discredited by the Russian government on the day following its publication. On the 14th a report from Shanghai, purporting to come from Sheng, the Chinese director of telegraphs at that point, told with much grewsome detail of the destruction of the legations and the massacre of all the foreigners on the night of July 7th, after repeated attacks had been made upon them by Chinese troops and boxers under the command of Prince Tuan. This report was disavowed by Sheng on the 17th, and was followed on the 18th by a dispatch from the American consul at Chefoo, reporting that the courier of the governor of Shantung, who left Peking on the 9th, reported the legations as still holding out at the time of his departure.

Our last week's report told of the retaking of the native city at Tientsin by the Chinese and closed with the news that on the 9th they were fiercely bombarding the allies in the foreign quarter, which is outside the walls of the native city. This bombardment, which was very destructive, was continued on the

10th, 11th and 12th, and was accompanied by repeated infantry attacks, all of which were repulsed. Though the allies made counter attacks, they were, nevertheless, gradually hemmed in; and on the 13th they decided upon a general assault on the native city and the forts commanding it. This assault, which lasted all day on the 13th, was most sanguinary, and at nightfall the issue was still undecided. But the attack was renewed on the 14th, when, the walls of the native city having been breached by a heavy artillery fire, the allies succeeded in capturing both the city and the forts. The Chinese were completely routed. For the two days' fighting the allied loss was nearly 800 killed and wounded. The American loss was especially heavy and included Col. Liscum, of the Ninth infantry. He was killed on the 13th. This decisive defeat of the Chinese puts Tientsin out of danger.

When news reached this country of the repulse of the allies in their first attack upon the native city at Tientsin, President McKinley was urged by members of the cabinet to call a cabinet meeting to consider the advisability of summoning congress in extra session and asking for supplies and additional troops. The president accordingly cut his vacation short and left Canton on the 16th, having called a cabinet meeting for the 17th. When the cabinet assembled Admiral Remey, of the Asiatic station, had been heard from in a report which explained that although the allies at Tientsin were at first repulsed with terrible loss, they had since secured complete control of the forts and the native city. The cabinet concluded, therefore, that the present situation does not require the expenditure of more money nor the use of more American troops than the president already controls, and for that reason it was decided not to call an extra session of congress. This decision was in harmony with the views of Senator Hanna, who, in an interview given out the day before the cabinet meeting, said:

The president has full power to meet all conditions as they may arise. He has a full treasury and is empowered to call on all the troops he may require. There seems now to be no reason why congress should be called together. Subsequent developments, however, may make such a step necessary.

Evidently, however, it will not be easy, in the absence of further au-

thority from congress, to supply many more American troops for service in China without crippling the service in the Philippines. An Associated Press letter of June 12 from Manila, which escaped the censor by coming by mail, reports that "more soldiers" are demanded from every department in the islands. "The present force is not large enough," says this letter, "to garrison more than half the important towns, and in some of the most important islands—among them Cebu, Panay, Samar, Leyte and the great Mohammedan empire of Mindanao—only the commercial ports are occupied." An outbreak in Mindanao is confidently expected by American officers familiar with the conditions there; and Gen. Young, who holds seven provinces in Luzon, looks for renewed fighting during the rainy season. Other newspaper dispatches report that rumors constantly reach Manila which indicate that Aguinaldo is putting out proclamations urging the people to continue their struggle for independence. One of his proclamations is devoted to the Taft commission, explaining to the people that this commission is unauthorized by congress and nothing but President McKinley's personal instrument, and that he is committed to the policy of subjugation.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to July 19, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91) .....	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900. 34	
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900 .....	193
<hr/>	
Total deaths since July, 1, 1898....	2,074
Wounded .....	2,195
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July 1, 1898.	4,269
Total casualties reported last week .....	4,206
Total deaths reported last week....	2,016

From South Africa nothing has been heard of Lord Roberts's enveloping movement in the Orange Free State, described at page 185, since the taking of Bethlehem, which was reported last week; but in the Transvaal the Boers are active close up to Pretoria. After failing in an attack upon the British near Pretoria on the 9th, they made another on the 11th about 18 miles west of Pretoria, in which they were successful. This lit-

tle victory was achieved at Nital's nek, on the road from Pretoria westward toward Rustenburg, where the road crosses the Crocodile river. The place had been fortified and was garrisoned by a squadron of British cavalry and five companies of infantry, along with part of a battery of artillery. The fighting began at dawn, and lasted throughout the day. British reinforcements were sent from Pretoria, but before their arrival at Nital's nek the garrison had been overpowered and the guns and most of the men captured.

Simultaneously with the Boer attack at Nital's nek, one was made at Durdepoort, about ten miles north of Pretoria, but there the advance of the Boers was checked. An engagement occurred, also, at about the same time, near Krugersdorp, to the southwest of Pretoria and only a short distance west of Johannesburg. On the 14th Lord Roberts reported that fighting had taken place east, southeast, northwest and southwest from Pretoria, and that Buller was being harassed along the railroad running from Pretoria to Ladysmith. And on the 17th he reported another engagement in the neighborhood of Pretoria. It is suspected that these Boer operations in the Transvaal are intended to draw the attention of the British and thus relieve the Boers in the Orange Free State whom Lord Roberts is trying to envelope.

Of Great Britain's difficulty with Africa further north, that with the Ashanti, regarding which we reported last week that Gen. Hodgson had escaped from Coomassie, the only news this week is that the British relief expedition, referred to at page 152, reached Coomassie on the 15th.

The field of American politics yields no news of importance except the formal notification to President McKinley of his renomination by the republican party for president of the United States. The ceremony took place at Mr. McKinley's home at Canton on the 12th. Senator Lodge read the speech of notification, and Mr. McKinley replied at length, promising in the course of his speech to communicate his acceptance more formally at a later day by letter. Other speeches were made by Postmaster General Smith, a Col. Parker of Hawaii, and Senators Fairbanks and Hanna. On the same day Gov. Roosevelt was notified at his home in Oys-

ter Bay, New York, of his nomination for vice president. Senator Wolcott made the notification address, and Gov. Roosevelt replied with a speech. At the luncheon that followed wine was tabooed in compliance with a direct and emphatic request from President McKinley. The western headquarters for the republican campaign have been located at 223 and 224 Michigan avenue, and 19 and 21 Congress street, Chicago. They will be under the management of Perry Heath, of Ohio, and under the general supervision of Henry C. Payne, of Wisconsin.

Bryan and Stevenson are to be formally notified of their nominations at Indianapolis, on the 8th.

The republicans of Kentucky have nominated John W. Yerkes for governor. In South Dakota and also in Nebraska the populists and the democrats have nominated fusion tickets. The fusion candidate for governor in the latter state is Gov. W. A. Poynter, a populist. All the other candidates are populists except the candidate for lieutenant governor, who is a silver republican, and the candidate for attorney general, who is a democrat. On account of the Coeur d'Alene labor troubles in Idaho, where martial law still prevails, strong opposition to the renomination of Gov. Steunenberg was manifested in the democratic, silver republican, and populist conventions, which met on the 17th, but at this writing no nomination had been made.

Pursuant to a call headed by Thomas M. Osborne, the agricultural implement manufacturer of Auburn, N. Y., a meeting was held on the 18th at New York city for the purpose of organizing to put into the field another presidential ticket, so as to enable voters who oppose Bryan for his "financial illusions" and McKinley for his imperialistic policy to express their convictions at the poll. It authorized a call for a meeting at Indianapolis on the 25th, with a view to nominating presidential candidates upon a platform demanding (1) a return to the principles of the declaration of independence and the constitution; (2) the recognition of the independence of the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Hawaii, as well as Cuba; (3) genuine monetary reform; (4) civil service reform; and (5) "the abo-

lition of special privileges, whether of tariff or any other origin."

Less exciting than election politics but in some respects more important, are those subsurface movements which aim at economic reform. Of that order is the action last week of the railway commission of the Chicago city council. This commission was appointed to investigate and report upon the subject of street railways. Its work is not completed, but on the 11th it decided in favor of recommending municipal ownership of street railway plants. No decision has yet been made by the commission as to the ownership of rolling stock, power houses, etc., nor as to the question of municipal as opposed to private operation; but those questions will be considered in the report. The question of street car strikes is also under consideration, and the commissioners seem inclined to recommend that all grants of street car franchises contain a clause for compulsory arbitration.

**NEWS NOTES.**

—On the 16th the Zionists, who are followers of the Rev. John Alexander Dowie, of Chicago, consecrated the site of the Zion temple, near Waukegan, Ill., with elaborate ceremonies.

—The national convention of republican clubs met at Minneapolis on the 17th. It was addressed by Gov. Roosevelt, of New York. Isaac M. Hamilton, of Chicago, was elected president.

—An automatic telephone switchboard is the invention of E. A. Clark, of Sioux City, Ia. The invention will do away with central exchanges and render unnecessary the employment of a large force of operatives.

—India, in addition to the terrible famine, has also to fight a cholera plague, which claimed 13,000 victims last week. The summer rains, while heavy in some districts, have proven generally insufficient.

—A world's Christian Endeavor convention opened its sessions in London on the 13th with an immense attendance, including several hundred American delegates. Rev. Francis E. Clark, of Boston, the founder of the society, was reelected president.

—Attorney General Crow, of Missouri, instituted quo warranto proceedings against the St. Louis Transit company on the 17th, to test the constitutionality of the law permitting the consolidation of the St. Louis street railways.

—A call has been issued by the Farmers' federation for a farmers' conference, to be held at Topeka,

Kan., August 7, for the purpose of federating all agricultural organizations of the Mississippi valley into one central company for the sale of farm products.

—For the month of June, 1900, American exports and imports, as reported by the treasury department, were as follows:

	Exports.	Imports.
Merchandise .....	\$108,282,897	\$60,808,884
Gold .....	8,092,738	1,984,849
Silver .....	5,187,920	4,879,970
	\$121,564,555	\$67,673,703

Excess of exports. 53,890,852  
—For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, American exports and imports, according to the report of the treasury department, were as follows:

	Exports.	Imports.
Merchandise ....	\$1,394,417,214	\$849,714,329
Gold .....	48,266,229	42,851,984
Silver .....	56,712,275	35,237,287
	\$1,499,395,718	\$927,803,550

Excess of exports. 571,592,168  
From October 1, 1834, to June 30, 1900, American exports and imports as reported by the treasury department, have been in the aggregate as follows. M. for merchandise, G. for gold and S for silver:

	Exports.	Imports.	Excess of Exports.
M ...	\$31,062,753,052	\$28,046,011,063	\$2,956,741,989
G ...	2,270,534,356	1,351,851,532	918,682,824
S ...	1,237,513,288	679,578,089	557,941,199
	\$34,510,800,696	\$30,077,440,684	\$4,433,366,012

The total excess, therefore, of outgoing wealth over incoming wealth, for the 65 years and 9 months, ending June 30, 1900, was \$4,433,366,012.

**MISCELLANY**

**A PRAYER FOR LIGHT.**

For The Public.  
Because with thieving clutch the blood-smear'd hands  
Of Indian empress, German kaiser, Russian tsar  
Are laid in lust upon the ancient lands  
Of age-old China, see a hideous star,  
Big with red portent, bursts! Their greed out blown,  
The sons of those the Monguls had mowed down  
To leave in grinning windrows of bleached bone  
Must measure swords against a Mongul throne.  
And fair America, so late to yield  
Her fate, her future to this pirate crew,  
Must see her own, their flag no more the shield  
Of this world's helpless, stricken with them, too.  
God help the gulltless! And God speed His Light  
To thieves and murderers, yellow or white!

WALLACE RICE.

**IDLE TALK OF VENGEANCE.**

It is well to remember that the Chinese of the different provinces, or even of different neighborhoods know very little about one another. The destruction of the Chinese sum-

mer palace by order of Lord Elgin in 1860, which was expected to make all China shudder, was scarcely heard of in Peking, hardly 12 miles away, and not heard of at all elsewhere in the empire. An English traveler in the region of the upper Yang-tse last summer found that the common people and many officials of whole provinces had never heard of the war of their country with Japan.

How are you going to wreak vengeance on such people? You might as well try to break a refractory mule in Virginia by flogging another one in Georgia.—Chicago Chronicle.

**INDIA'S "FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE."**

The following items are taken from an article published in the Boston Pilot of July 7, under the title of "Starving India." This article had a number of facts and figures taken mostly from "Yearly Famine in India," by George E. Buell, of Rochester, N. Y.

The wheat crop in India in 1899 was 232,585,000 bushels. The average annual wheat crop for the last eight years was 234,067,750.

Over 35,400,000 bushels of wheat were exported from India in 1899; 16,509,740 bushels is the average amount annually exported from India for the last eight years.

Note from the above figures that India raised a little less than the average of wheat last year; but that she shipped out of the country two and one-eighth times more than the average shipped.

The Pilot comments as follows upon the foregoing paragraphs:

According to the "favorable balance of trade" theory, India is the most prosperous of countries, for her exports are always in excess of her imports, and especially so in famine years.

J. W. F.

**HOW THE BOER ENVOYS WERE RECEIVED IN WASHINGTON.**

I will tell you the way the representatives of two sister republics were received by the representatives of the greatest republic of the world. Soon after they were ushered into the presence of the secretary of state, and before they could possibly tell their simple story of British cruelty, inhumanity and injustice, before they could tell their mission in the interests of men, women and children who were fighting and dying for liberty and a republican form of government, the secretary of state—the same man who, while the representative of this republic at the court of St. James, was idolized as the chiefest of English snobs—drew from his pocket a typewritten document and proceeded to read it to the astonished Boer representatives as the

course the administration had determined to take in their cause. While he was doing this Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at Washington, sat peacefully and contentedly in the adjoining room.

Is it any wonder that great tears stood in the eyes of those republicans from South Africa when they returned to their hotel in Washington? Is it any wonder if multiplied thousands of American freemen, who love justice and fair play, will turn against a party that will not even place a word of sympathy for liberty-loving people in its platform, and will not even so much as maintain absolute neutrality between a selfish monarchy and two little republics?—Hon. Webster Davis.

#### MALADMINISTRATION IN LUZON.

Telegram to Chicago Chronicle from Fort Dodge, Ia., under date of July 6.

Ernest Wheelock, of Algona, formerly private secretary to Gen. Wesley Merritt in Manila, and who has just returned from the Philippines, has given out an interview on information concerning the conditions existing there that is in startling variance with the generally accepted idea of the subject. Mr. Wheelock enlisted in the Thirteenth Minnesota, but was made Gen. Merritt's secretary, which position he occupied during that general's stay in the islands.

Mr. Wheelock indulges in a scathing criticism of the administration of affairs in our island possessions. He says that our rule in those lands is a maladministration, and that it is so recognized by all Europeans in Manila. He states that we have proven false to our promises to the Filipino leaders, and we have grossly ill treated the native people.

As to the drinking of the men there, he says that he has never yet seen a statement of it that was overdrawn, and confirms the statement of Miss Shonts regarding the multiplication of saloons in Manila since the American occupation. Wheelock does not blame the administration for this, but makes the statement in the interest of truth, being himself a republican.

"The misapprehension of the people of the United States," says Mr. Wheelock, "regarding the Philippine islands and the conditions of affairs there is only equalled by the ignorance of the Filipinos of what constitutes good, true Americanism. Why is it that after two years of occupation the Filipino and the American understand each other no better? Why is it that the people that received the armies of the United States in '98 with childlike glee should now despise with an awful

hatred the Americans and things pertaining to them?

"We found them suffering from heavy taxation and we increased their taxes. The cotton cloth that they use for clothing has been imported from Spain and passed through the custom house at Manila by paying a small preferential duty, and we put the imports of Spain on an equal footing with imports from other countries, greatly increasing thereby the cost of clothing in the island. The Filipinos accepted these increased taxes with great patience, waiting from August, 1898, to January, 1899, for the United States to declare their intentions with regard to the government of the archipelago. The proclamation of President McKinley promising everything to the islanders to a people who had become accustomed to broken promises during many generations, and its utter failure was most bitterly received and widened the breach that became a battlefield in February, 1899.

"Before leaving Manila I took pains to interview the leading business men to ascertain with as great a degree of accuracy as possible the consensus of opinion regarding the present condition of affairs, together with the cause and effect leading up to and from the same. It was the general opinion that it was more unsafe in the interior at the present time than ever before. It is true that there are no large armies of insurgents, but the islands are literally covered by bands of from 20 to 100 men, who lie in wait to pick off small detachments of Americans.

"To the uncertainty of the administration in dealing with the Philippine islands for so long a period after occupation by American troops must be attributed the trouble that has cost our country so much. About two months before I left Manila a gentleman by the name of Coombs, who was purchasing agent for the railroad, told me that a conductor on the road by the name of Messick had been arrested two weeks before and that no one had been allowed to see him or find out upon what charges he was confined. I went to the law office of John H. Voslef and detailed the facts to him and he took hold of the case, with the result that in two days he had succeeded in getting to Messick, and in a short time the latter was on trial and a free man. This is only one of the hundreds of acts of injustice that cast reproach upon the fair name of the United States. Until civil government is established and the army relegated to the barracks and the field,

there will never be peace and prosperity in the Philippines."

#### ST. LOUIS AND THE STRIKE. PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS.

For The Public.

A strike may be a strike the world over, even, as a spade is a spade. Yet as the utility of the spade depends somewhat on the nature of the material to be handled, so the significance of the strike is qualified by the character of the community in which it occurs.

St. Louis is not a city, and there are not wanting, among the inhabitants, those who despair of its ever being such. Though possessed of a complete municipal outfit, it is a big overgrown town, given over to blatant boasting of the biggest this, that and the other; utterly devoid of the civic sense; in all but material things (and in very many of these even) about half a century behind any city of its size in the country. Its distinguishing characteristic is individualism run to seed. Its local deity is creature comforts. Of public spirit there is next to none. Approach a typical prominent citizen with a measure purely pro bono publico, and he will tilt back in his chair, gaze at you with a half amused, half disgusted expression, and virtually say: "I am minding my own business. Why don't you mind yours?" Among the many causes assigned in explanation of this local temper, the most reasonable seems to be the climate. From four to six months of combined and continuous humidity and high temperature is apt to be demoralizing anywhere; but particularly so away from the coast with its occasional alleviating sea change. Be that as it may, it was upon such a community, such a conglomeration of individualists, each immersed in his own affairs, that the street railway strike was sprung on the 8th of May last; and if it be possible for one to regard such occurrence in the light of compulsory education he would have to hunt far and wide to find a place in sorer need of such a visitation. Whether or no the lesson taught will be retained and heeded remains to be seen. This much is certain; that eyes have been opened, the social conscience has been stirred, men formerly steeped in unthinking self-satisfaction have been made heartily ashamed not only of their municipal and state governments, but also of themselves as responsible therefor; "good citizens" who, when the charter and franchises of the Transit

company were corruptly procured, thought it none of their business to protest against what everybody in the town knew to be colossal robbery, have at last found their tongues. Not all will be able to forget very soon. But disgust and remorse are not repentance, and without the latter there is no more salvation for the city than for the individual. If the individual must come to himself, no less must the city. If it be true that he who ruleth his own heart is better than he who taketh a city, no less true is it that the city must own itself and run itself if it is ever to attain to the goal of justifiable self-satisfaction. These truths are beginning to percolate and find lodgment. Nevertheless, it is not because of social repentance, general enlightenment and devotion to tardily recognized but eternal and unchanging principles of right, that those in a position to know declare such another strike to be utterly improbable here. No. But because "it is money that talks," and the million or so of dollars which the strike has cost the Transit company—to say nothing of the losses borne by the large retail establishments—will cause the holders of public franchises to think long and hard before they permit a self-seeking and ambitious general manager to involve them in such an expensive experiment. This view gains weight from the fact, quite generally recognized and admitted, that the fight was won by the men who made it and from well-nigh unavoidable conviction that victory belongs to unionism, now and in the future.

The strike was a blow for unionism—all statements to the contrary notwithstanding. It was not superinduced from without by the wiles and machinations of "professional agitators"—those naughty men from elsewhere. It was home sown and home grown on soil specially prepared for it by the good citizens of St. Louis. It was, to change the figure, a turning of the worm against the heel of a combine more distinctly devoid of soul than any of the smaller corporations which preceded and were absorbed in it. It was the quoad hoc of suffering labor—that ultimate as inevitable as death. For, deny it, as we may, and conduct business and found empires on the denial, as we do, the truth remains that things were made for man, not man for things; and "God's still in His Heaven."

There is, after all, much sense packed into that somewhat over-worked phrase: "Soulless corpora-

tions." A case in point is that of a St. Louis mercantile house, having a continental reputation. Time was when its founder was its head and heart, when his individuality permeated the whole concern. It was then a happy place in which to work and dishonesty was practically unknown. It grew and became a corporation or stock company. The head retired; and his successor in authority having but one idea, viz.: the indefinite increase of this year's dividends over those of last year, deterioration of the personnel at once set in and proceeded until now the relations between employer and employed and between the employes themselves are such as to give the house the local soubriquet of "a hell on earth." This is practically what took place in the case of the railway business and was the radical cause of the strike. Before the consolidation the condition of the employes may not have been—indeed was not—ideal. But the relations between them and the superintendents of the various lines were sufficiently human to have prevented anything like what has recently occurred. It is the independent testimony of individual strikers, that had they been working under their old managers, they would have told the strike movers to go to grass, sooner than follow them. Consolidation, brought about by political jobbery and accompanied by immense watering of stock, meant elimination of soul and degradation of the human. Blind as it doubtless was and absurdly extravagant as the demands with which it opened may have been, the protest made by the strike was natural, human and just.

In his "Story of the Strike," published on June 14, the editor of the *Mirror* said: "The strikers were identified with lawlessness chiefly through the incapacity of chicanery or ambition of small politicians. The disgrace of union labor, as of the city of St. Louis and state of Missouri, is due to bad government. Bad government is due to the bad citizenship of good citizens," and he closed with this question: "When will we all leave off politics and choose our leaders for character, for calmness, for principle, for common sense?"

His statements are unquestionably true. The most deplorable thing about the whole wretched business, worse than the killings and maimings and the denuding of women—worse because less excusable—was that same "bad citizenship of good citizens" which lay at the bottom of all else

and out of which the whole thing grew. To it is to be traced not merely bad government—government indescribably bad because unfaithful and inefficient, from the occupant of the gubernatorial chair down to the collector of the garbage at the area gate—but also that upon which bad government thrives and propagates itself, viz., the unnatural and irrational connection between public utilities and private corporations, the prostitution of the civic service.

If democracy is not an illusion, things are as they are simply and solely because those who know and care are so vastly outnumbered by those who neither know nor care, and conditions will remain unchanged for the better until those who know care enough to sacrifice themselves upon the altar of social service. As Stephen and Mary Maybell have so well put it:

There must be a repentance, a renunciation of the social crime, a turning of the spirit of each one from using into serving society—from living and working for self, unto living and working for society.

We shall elect decent, capable and honorable men to office just so soon as we ourselves are decent and honorable enough to be ready and eager to serve in any capacity for which we are fitted. Not before.

The self-styled Son of Man said he came not to be waited on but to wait on others. He made himself a servant of servants. We call ourselves Christians. Wherein is our right to the name?

GUSTAVUS TUCKERMAN.

#### A SOCRATIC DIALOGUE.

"I think I got some capacity for cross-examining witnesses, which was very useful to me afterwards, from reading Plato's dialogues and getting familiar with Socrates's method of reducing a sophist ad absurdum."—Senator George F. Hoar in his *Scribner* article on "Harvard College Fifty-Eight Years Ago."

Socrates Redivivus—Well met, Gorgias. I have been anxious to hear you explain, as your friends tell me you can with an unrivaled mastery of the rhetor's art, a passage in your oration to the Ephors which puzzled my poor understanding.

Gorgias Hodiernus—What passage was that, Socrates?

Socrates—The one where you said that it "was due to Mr. Bryan, more than to any other man," that the treaty of Paris was not defeated, or at least amended so as to put the Philippines on the same basis as Cuba.

Gorgias—It is true, Socrates, I made that statement to the Ephors, and by

Ammon, the god of Cyrene, I will defend and maintain it in all places.

Socrates—Then you will say that a man who does not defeat an evil deed is more guilty than the man who plans and carries it through by all the means in his power?

Gorgias—What do you mean, Socrates? What I said is clear and certain. If Mr. Bryan had not persuaded the democratic Ephors, the treaty would have been rejected or amended. Therefore the guilt is on his head.

Socrates—Well, let us follow the argument, Gorgias. Who is the real housebreaker, the man who plots a violent entry for robbery, or the man who fails to eject him?

Gorgias—It would be the former, Socrates.

Socrates—And you would say the same of political robbers?

Gorgias—I do not know what you mean, Socrates.

Socrates—Well, I will ask you what you would say if a Spartan general should agree with a Persian satrap to corrupt the Lacedaemonian state by introducing Persian customs—whom would you blame, that general or a private citizen who weakly acquiesced in his plot?

Gorgias—The general would be the man, Socrates.

Socrates—That is, you distinguish between the principal and the accessory?

Gorgias—All men do, Socrates.

Socrates—Then, by the dog of Egypt, tell me who was the principal in the matter of the Paris treaty. Was it Mr. Bryan?

Gorgias—No, but he "frustrated" the attempt to defeat it.

Socrates—But President McKinley might have frustrated the treaty itself, might he not? He negotiated it, did he not? When you were opposing its ratification, he was urging it, night and day, was he not?

Gorgias—I cannot deny it.

Socrates—Then, in the name of Zeus and Athene at once, how can you, who denounce the accessory, praise the principal? How can you say that the man who is chiefly responsible for what you describe as an attempt to "change our republic into an empire," is the "best beloved president who ever sat in the chair of Washington?"

Gorgias—But I expressly said that I had never questioned the honesty of purpose of President McKinley.

Socrates—Yet you question Mr. Bryan's honesty, Gorgias.

Gorgias—How so, Socrates?

Socrates—You said you thought he wanted the treaty ratified so as to

"keep the question for an issue in the campaign."

Gorgias—Yes, I said that, Socrates. Socrates—But how could the deed of an honest and beloved president be an issue in the campaign?

Gorgias—It might seem, nevertheless, bad for the state.

Socrates—Then an honest and beloved man might ruin the republic?

Gorgias—That is so, Socrates.

Socrates—A dishonest and hated man might save it.

Gorgias—It would seem so.

Socrates—Then it is better to be right than to be beloved?

Gorgias—Better in a public man, I admit. Mr. Bryan, however, was both wrong and disliked. He was for ratifying the treaty, and that meant a continuation of the war.

Socrates—Yet he said he wanted to end the war, did he not?

Gorgias—He did.

Socrates—And he urged his friends to vote for the joint resolution putting the Philippines on the same footing as Cuba?

Gorgias—Even so, Socrates.

Socrates—And they did so?

Gorgias—They did.

Socrates—You voted for it yourself?

Gorgias—Assuredly, Socrates.

Socrates—And it would have ended the war, if adopted, and prevented the republic from becoming an empire?

Gorgias—I have no doubt of it.

Socrates—Yet McKinley was against it? All his friends among the Ephors voted against it? It was defeated only by the casting-vote of the vice president? Are not all these things so?

Gorgias—They are.

Socrates—Then must you not admit that Bryan and his friends wanted to end the war and save the republic, and that McKinley and his friends were really the ones who prolonged the war and threaten now to convert our state into an empire?

Gorgias—No, Socrates, I do not admit it. By Here, I never will admit that!

Socrates—But why not, if truth and argument compel you?

Gorgias—Because I am a republican, Socrates.

Socrates—Exactly. I merely wanted to know if it was the truth you were in search of, or an excuse for supporting your party. Well, good by, Gorgias. Send me word if the entrails indicate that you will be chosen Ephor again.—N. Y. Nation of July 12.

It is as much a theft to steal with a long head as with a long arm.—John Ruskin.

RATIFY THE TREATY—DECLARE THE NATION'S POLICY.

An article written by William Jennings Bryan and published in the New York Journal at the time when the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain was pending in the United States senate. It is to this article that Mr. Bryan's adversaries (including Senator Hoar) allude when they charge him with being responsible for the ratification of that treaty, without amendment, and the consequent purchase of the Philippines.

I gladly avail myself of the columns of the Journal to suggest a few reasons why the opponents of a colonial policy should make their fight in support of a resolution declaring the nation's purpose rather than against the ratification of the treaty.

The conflict between the doctrine of self-government and the doctrine of alien government supported by external force has been thrust upon the American people as a result of the war. It is so important a conflict that it cannot be avoided, and, since it deals with a question now before congress, it must be considered immediately. It is useless to ask what effect this new issue will have upon other issues. Issues must be met as they arise; they cannot be moved about at will as pawns upon a chessboard.

The opponents of imperialism have an opportunity to choose the ground upon which the battle is to be fought. Why not oppose the ratification of the treaty?

First, because a victory won against the treaty would prove only temporary if the people really favor a colonial policy.

That a victory won against the treaty would depend for its value entirely upon the sentiment of the people is evident. A minority can obstruct action for a time, but a minority, so long as it remains a minority, can only delay action and enforce reflection; it cannot commit the nation to a policy.

When there seemed to be some probability of the rejection of the treaty the friends of the administration began to suggest the propriety of withholding the treaty until the new senate could be convened in extra session. As soon as the new senate will have a considerable republican majority it would be quite certain to ratify the treaty. Thus an effort to prevent the ratification of the treaty would be likely to fail in the very beginning. But let us suppose it possible to defeat ratification in both the present and next senate—what would be the result?

Would the imperialists abandon the hope of annexing the Philippines so long as they could claim the support of

the president and a majority of both houses? Could a minority of the senate prevent the annexation of Hawaii? As we are now in possession of the Philippine islands, the advocates of a colonial policy might secure an appropriation sufficient to pay the \$20,000,000 agreed upon and leave the rest of the treaty for consideration. In other words, if the opponents of imperialism have a majority in both houses they can declare the nation's policy; if the imperialists have a majority in both houses, they cannot be permanently thwarted by a minority in the senate.

A resolution declaring the nation's policy recognizes that the destiny of the United States is in the hands of all the people and seeks to ascertain at once the sentiment of the people as reflected by their representatives.

If that decision is in harmony with the policy which has prevailed in the past the question will be settled and the people will return to the consideration of domestic problems. If, however, the advocates of imperialism either postpone consideration or control the action of congress an appeal will be taken to the voters at the next election. So great a change in our national policy cannot be made unless the authority therefor come directly and unequivocally from that source of all power in a republic—the people.

In answer to those who fear the question of imperialism, if discussed, will draw attention away from other questions, it is sufficient to say that the people cannot be prevented from considering a question which reaches down to the foundation principles of the republic. Instead of avoiding the issue it is the part of wisdom to deal with it at once and dispose of it permanently.

Second, The rejection of the treaty would be unwise because the opponents of the treaty would be compelled to assume responsibility for the continuance of war conditions and for the risks which always attend negotiations with a hostile nation.

The rejection of the treaty would give the administration an excuse for military expenditures which could not be justified after the conclusion of peace, and the opponents of the treaty would be charged with making such appropriations necessary. It must be remembered that in case the treaty is rejected, negotiations must be renewed with an enemy whose ill will is not concealed. Who is able to guarantee the nation against new dangers and new complications? In order to form an estimate of the risks which would thus be incurred, one has only to recall the unexpected things which have hap-

pened since war was declared. Is it wise to so make the attack as to assume all the risks when the same end can be gained by a plan which throws the risks upon our opponents? If the imperialists vote down a resolution declaring the nation's policy or postpone its consideration, they become responsible for any loss of life or expenditure of money which may follow as a result of such action.

I suggest below a few reasons in support of a resolution declaring it to be the nation's purpose to establish a stable government in Cuba and the Philippines and then to give the inhabitants independence under an American protectorate which will guard them against molestation from without.

First, such a course is consistent with national honor.

Our nation owes it to the nations with which we have dealings, as well as to the inhabitants of Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines, to announce immediately what it intends to do respecting the territory surrendered by Spain.

The president has said that the only purpose the nation has in taking possession of Cuba is to assist the inhabitants to establish a stable and independent government. It can do no harm for congress to reaffirm this purpose, and it may do much good. The Cubans, having fought for independence for many years against great odds, are naturally jealous of the liberty which they have won, and no doubt should be left as to the sincerity and good faith of our government in its dealings with them. Such a declaration would not only be harmless, but it is almost made necessary by the flippant, if not contemptuous, tone in which some United States officials speak of the intelligence and patriotism of the Cubans and of their right to independence.

The duty of declaring our national policy in regard to the Philippines is even more imperative. The Filipinos were fighting for independence when the United States declared war against Spain. In the formal protest filed with the peace commissioners in Paris the representatives of Aguinaldo asserted that they received friendly assurances from United States officials, and acted upon those assurances in cooperating against the Spaniards. Whether or not such assurances were given, frankness and honesty should characterize our dealings with them.

If we announce to the world that we hold the Philippine islands, not for pecuniary profit, but in trust for the

inhabitants; if we declare that our only purpose is to assist the Filipinos to establish a stable and independent government, friendly relations will be maintained and there will be little need of troops. If, on the other hand, the Filipinos are not to have independence, but merely a change of masters, we should break the news to them at once and send over a large army to instruct them in the principles of a government which, in one hemisphere derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and in the other derives its authority from superior force.

While our nation is not prepared to draft a complete code of laws suited to the peculiar methods of the Filipinos, we ought to be able to decide at once whether we intend to deal with them according to the principles of our own government or according to the customs prevailing among European monarchies. Even a republican congress ought to be able to choose without hesitation between a policy which establishes a republic in the orient and a policy which sows the seeds of militarism in the United States.

The trade relations possible under a protectorate would be of more value to the United States than any which could come as a result of forcible annexation.

The people of Puerto Rico have not manifested any desire for political independence and would, in all probability, favor annexation; yet it is only right that they should have an opportunity to choose. The resolution authorizing intervention recognized the right of the Cubans to independence. To be consistent we must also respect the wishes of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico. The resolution could without impropriety offer annexation to Puerto Rico.

In a recent interview I suggested that the United States should retain a harbor and coaling station in the Philippines and in Puerto Rico in return for services rendered, and added that Cuba should be asked to make a similar concession on the same ground.

Second. A resolution declaring the nation's purpose presents a plain and clear-cut issue between the theory of self-government and the colonial policy. It presents a positive affirmative method of dealing with the question. In opposing the treaty we would be on the defensive; in outlining a policy we shall be aggressive. The strongest arguments which could be used in support of the treaty will lose their force entirely when Spain is eliminated and the American people are able to dispose

of the question according to their own ideas and interests.

Third. It secures, by easier means, every end that can be secured by a rejection of the treaty.

If an officer of the law arrests a person in possession of stolen goods, he can either compel the return of the goods to the owner or he can first rescue them and then return them himself. We find Spain in the possession of a title to a part of the Philippines. She has not yet conquered all the native tribes, but the title which she has was acquired by force and has been held by force. We can either compel her to surrender her title to the Filipinos, as we compelled her to surrender Cuba to the Cubans, or we can accept possession and then of our own accord turn over the islands to the inhabitants.

The peace commissioners might have demanded independence for the Filipinos as they did for the Cubans. If they did not properly interpret the wishes of the people of the United States, the blame must fall upon them and not upon the people. Certainly 70,000,000 citizens are under no obligation to abate their devotion to the ideals which they have cherished for a century in order to indorse the work of a peace commission or to approve of the instructions of an executive.

If it is urged that the ratification of the treaty imposes upon us an obligation to pay \$20,000,000 to Spain, I answer, first, that this amount can probably be secured from the Filipinos in return for independence; and second, that if it cannot be secured from them, it is better to lose the amount entirely than to expend a larger sum in securing a modification of the treaty.

It is better to regard the amount paid as a contribution to liberty than to consider it the market price of land, improvements, or people.

To terminate the war upon the same high plane upon which it was inaugurated is worthy of a great republic; to descend from a sublime beginning to the purchase of sovereignty (for our own profit) from a nation whose title we disputed in Cuba would lay us open to the charge of Punic faith.

A Rhode Island Yankee proposes to settle the war against the ice trust by manufacturing portable machines that will enable every housekeeper to evolve ice cakes like biscuits, at a cost of two to three cents a pound. By the evaporation of concentrated ammonia the temperature of the little water tank can be lowered to 15 degrees Fahrenheit.—Chicago Chronicle.

THE INSTINCT PRIMAL.

For The Public.

Boers and Britons' men and brothers,  
Plous heathen, savage moderns,  
Clowns and flunkies, peers and peasants,  
Masters of Earth's dusky races,  
Of the Hindoo, of the Kaffir:  
Classic lore nor wider thinking—  
New nor old interpretation  
Of the law—divine or human,  
Yet hath tamed your instincts primal,  
Inborn of the Goth and Vandal.

Now behold the southern rivers  
Redden, and the rocky passes  
Dripping with the Aryan life-stream,  
Spilled in lavish Teuton fashion.  
See the savage in the shepherd  
And the zealot mad with combat.  
Grim and sickening the drama  
Of the century departing.

Whirl, ye wild winds, o'er the brown  
veldt.

Heap the dust and hide the fragments—  
Oh, the quiv'ring shell-torn fragments.  
Briton, lie beside Tugela,  
Burgher, rest beneath the Modder,  
Sleep! For know that spirit dies not.  
Torn the mortal, yet the tearing  
Shrapnel cannot stay the race life;  
Nor the ancient hates recurrent  
And the making of machine guns  
Bar forever works fraternal.  
For a power that mates with progress  
Yet the darker moods shall conquer  
Of the Atavar Teutonic.

F. HARMER.

After the census man had jotted down the answers to the preceding questions, he asked:

"Do you speak the English language?"

"Say," replied the "gent" who was under examination, "what kind of a spiel is this you're uncorkin' on me, anyway? Me speak the English language? Well, my boy, if you think I'm talkin' Choctaw to you now you're up against one of the emptiest propositions that ever come down the pike. Say, if the man that invented the English language could hear me spiel on my larynx he'd holler for help, and that's no josh neither. You don't haft to have no translator to git my meanin' into your headpiece, do you, huh? Me talk English! Old man, if I'm trowin' anything else into you rite now you give me a map of it on a roller, will you?"—Chicago Times-Herald.

God has given the earth in common to all, that they might pass their life in common, not that mad and raging avarice might claim all things for itself; and that that which was produced for all might not be wanting to any.—Lactantius, Divine Institutes (A. D. 300).

"Anna, what must you do before everything else, to have your sins forgiven?" "Commit the sins."—Woman's Journal.

HOUSING THE POOR.

For The Public.

Building nests for birds,  
Scratching holes for hares,  
Choosing sites for spawning beds,  
Digging dens for bears.

Fish and flesh and fowl  
Can house themselves the best.  
Then let the poor possess the land,  
And they will do the rest.

W. D. McCRACKAN.

In Utica, N. Y., a block of new apartment houses has just been furnished with complete installation of electric cooking utensils in each flat. The electric kitchen furniture consists of three round platters or "stoves," an oven and a broiler. It is declared, apparently with reason, that meats broiled on the electric gridiron are much more palatable than those charred and storched in the ordinary way over hot coals. The most remarkable feature of these electric kitchens is that the stoves, etc., are simply placed on an ordinary kitchen table, and when the cooking is completed can be stowed away in a convenient closet, leaving the kitchen free of even a trace of cookery. Space is thus saved.—Chicago Chronicle.

An Irish member of the house of commons, having made a speech in which several peculiar passages occurred, the reporter, to call public attention to these peculiarities, underlined them. The printer of the paper in which the report appeared, being called to the bar of the house to answer for his offense, offered to prove that the report was an exact transcript of the member's words. "That may be," exclaimed the irate Irishman, "but did I spake them in italics?"—Woman's Journal.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Municipal Ownership," by Henry Allen Bell (Springfield, Ill.), is a thoughtful plea for a system of making public improvements by issuing instead of interest-bearing bonds circulating notes indorsed by the

CAMPAIGN OFFER:

To extend its circulation and influence during the presidential campaign,

THE PUBLIC

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

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

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

federal government as national bank notes are now. All objections foreseen by the author are replied to in the pamphlet with painstaking care.

**Pingree  
Shoe Talk**



The happy gift of being agreeable, unlike most useful arts, requires no laborious study,—only the desire. Thousands are anxious enough to please, but they cannot,—their feet ache!! *Pingree Shoes* afford the most efficient remedy,—they fit snug, but feel loose.

There are Pingree Shoes for Women, Men and Children. Genuine ones are always stamped Pingree & Smith. They cost from three to five dollars, according to fineness. They come in all shapes and in various leathers.

**AT FIRST-CLASS STORES**  
ASK YOUR DEALER!!

**"Gloria"**  
\$3.50,—for Women

**"Composite"**  
\$3,—for Women

**"Governor"**  
\$4,—for Men

are *Pingree Specials* and the best shoes in the world for these prices. The genuine are always stamped with these trade-names.

**"PINGREE SHOE TALK"**  
just off the press, is an exceedingly interesting booklet. It will be sent you upon application,—free, together with a *clever souvenir*.

**PINGREE & SMITH**  
Established 1866.      DETROIT

**CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB**  
MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING  
**HANDEL HALL,**  
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.  
Program for Friday, July 20th.  
**REV. WM. WHITE WILSON,**  
Rector St. Mark's Church, Cor. Cottage Grove  
Ave. and Thirty-Sixth St.  
"Professionalism in Politics."

**ATTORNEYS.****Chicago.**

**CHARLES A. BUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 3711.

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

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

**LAWYERS,**

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 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. MALBY**  
**HOME AND SCHOOL.**  
NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS,  
160 Joralemon Street.  
Highest city advantages. Academic, Collegiate  
and Special courses of study. Regular resident  
students, \$500. Twelfth year.



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

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

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

**The Public**

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with **THE PUBLIC** will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

**Subscription, One Dollar a Year.**

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by  
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,**  
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

Certain things are possibilities,—fire, accident, disease. Death is a certainty. He's a poor reasoner who provides against the uncertain and yet neglects to insure his life. It may be done at low cost. Consult

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

**A FAIR OFFER.**

I will mail to any person a copy of

**JAPANESE NOTIONS OF EUROPEAN Political ECONOMY,**

paper, 142 pages, upon condition that it be returned, or price, 25c, remitted within 10 days.

It will be better than a vacation to change the current of your thought. **H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conneaut, Ohio. Catalogues FREE.**

**To Smoke**  
or  
**Not to Smoke**  
is  
**Not the Question**  
if they are  
**MOOS' CIGARS.**

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