

# The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse  
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1900.

Number 121.

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.

A valued correspondent asks us to kindly explain how an honest poor man, of fair average intelligence, can justify himself for intending to vote for Mr. McKinley again.

There is no explanation. The honest poor man himself couldn't furnish one.

It is a noticeable fact that the gold democrats who declare for McKinley, putting forward the danger of free silver at 16 to 1 as their excuse, are unable to quite repress their imperialistic inclinations. They thus unconsciously show that with them as with everybody else, the paramount issue of this campaign is imperialism.

"The wheat crop is unusually bountiful in Kansas and a flat failure in South Dakota," observes the Boulder (Mont.) Sentinel; "but it's dollars to doughnuts that the republican orators will point out that the Kansas crop is due to republican efforts and the South Dakota famine to impending democratic peril." That is precisely the drift of the republican prosperity argument.

It was stated not long ago that Mr. Hanna's best work in the coming campaign would consist in financially strengthening doubtful republican papers and in buying over purchasable democratic papers. Plausibility is given to this story by the action of the Los Angeles Herald, which has recently changed from the democratic to the republican side of the political fence.

In the labor department of the Philadelphia North American, which

is conducted by Henry George, Jr., with excellent judgment and in a manner to attract and hold the interest of readers, Mr. George tells in a recent issue what the truth is about the stripping of women during the recent street car strike in St. Louis. Mr. George personally investigated the strike while it was in progress. Of this stripping of women which plutocratic papers have made much of, he says that it—

was not the work of any of the strikers or any of their immediate friends, so far as I can learn. It was not the work of men at all, but of women, and of those women living in the part of South St. Louis of dense population and various nationalities—in the poorer quarters, where strong feeling produces fierce emotions.

A steady democratic hand is at the editorial helm of the Helena (Mont.) Independent. This is evident from the way the Independent treats the question of negro emancipation—a severe test for the ordinary democratic paper. Replying to the intimation of a contemporary that the American negro owes a debt to his emancipators, the Independent wisely and truly says:

The Afro-American incurred no debt when he was freed from slavery in accordance with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. It was the white man who owed a debt to the negro for having kept him in slavery.

An article descriptive of the home life of the Roosevelts, which has been going the rounds of the press, represents Mrs. Roosevelt as saying:

"I tell my children that they must not maim or kill any living thing, no matter how small, maliciously."

"Snakes?" queried a visitor.

"I can't get my boys to kill a snake, they are so fond of them. The other day they caught a big black one and put him in the croquet box, thinking they would kill him some other time. But the time never came, of course,

and after a week they opened the box and let him go with many regrets."

One cannot help wondering how such humanitarian principles can be reconciled with the "strenuous life" advocated by Mrs. Roosevelt's husband. Surely the life of a Filipino struggling for liberty ought to be as sacred as the life of a snake.

The imperial edicts regarding the present disturbance in China, refer to the attack of the European powers upon the forts at Taku as an act of war. This is a true complaint. Should the present situation develop into a terrible war—and terrible it will be if it comes—that war will date from the attack upon the Taku forts, made on the 16th of last June by the European naval squadrons. The Christian nations and not the heathen empire will be in the position of aggressor. They decided, so our own Rear Admiral Kempff officially reports, that "it was necessary to take possession of the Taku forts," and they served upon the commandant and upon the viceroy of Tientsin a notice, in the nature of an ultimatum, fixing an hour when they would do so. The forts did not wait for the actual attack, for which the squadrons took position early in the evening of June 16, but soon after midnight and one hour before the expiration of the ultimatum, opened fire. That unwarranted ultimatum began the war. It is gratifying in these circumstances to be able to congratulate Rear Admiral Kempff, and the United States which he represented, upon his refusal to act with the other naval commanders. He informed them at the outset that he was not authorized to initiate any act of war with a country with which his country was at peace, and he kept his vessels out of the fight. If, then, there should be a war the United States will be

guiltless at least of having helped start it. And for this they are indebted to Rear Admiral Kempff. He could have involved us as easily as "rolling off a log" and made a glorious jingo reputation by it besides. But he chose, even at the risk of being sneered at as a "little American" by his ambitious and strenuous countrymen, to respect the rights of the nation in whose waters his vessels lay. The true courage and true patriotism of this naval officer are worthy of grateful remembrance.

Mr. Bryan's statement of his views on the Chinese question is a model of statesmanlike exposition. There is great relief in turning to it from the rhetorical trap doors of McKinley's pronouncements on public affairs. Mr. Bryan builds no misleading phrases. There is nothing in his statement to compare with "criminal aggression," or "plain duty," but what he says has in it the ring of sincerity. And not only does it ring true, but it exhibits the insight of a statesman and displays the force of a natural leader. Realizing that the threats of European nations to dismember China would naturally arouse among the Chinese a feeling of hostility to foreigners, Mr. Bryan has no stomach for a policy of vengeance against them, but urges a policy of justice and fair dealing. This he believes will not only set an example to other nations "but will give to our citizens residing in China the best promise of security." He would endeavor, if it appears that the Chinese government is acting in good faith, to secure suitable punishment of the guilty Chinese and reparation and indemnity for Americans who have suffered. Should it appear, however, that the Chinese government has not acted in good faith, he would advise no hasty measures of redress in cooperation with other powers, but would refer the matter to congress, through which alone the American people can speak. With reference to trading and proselyting in China, Mr. Bryan throws out a hint which hon-

est merchants and devoted missionaries will not object to considering. He says:

It will be better for our merchants to have it known that they seek trade only when trade is mutually advantageous. It will be better for our missionaries to have it known that they are preaching the gospel of love and are not the forerunners of fleets and armies.

Admiral Dewey is out in a denial of the interview which one of Aguinaldo's generals, in a letter to Senator Pettigrew, recites as having occurred between him and Dewey at Hong-Kong a few days before the battle of Manila bay, and in which he says Dewey promised the Filipinos independence. Characterizing the interview as a "tissue of falsehoods," the admiral specifically denies that he gave any such promise. Had he stopped here, his word would have been enough, so far as that particular interview is concerned. But Admiral Dewey goes on until he seriously discredits himself as a witness. He says, referring to the time of the battle of Manila bay, that the Filipinos—

had absolutely no thought then of independence. That was an afterthought of their leaders during the interim between the smashing of the Spanish fleet and the arrival of the United States troops.

This assertion is positively contradicted by American official documents, which show that the Filipino leaders were not only thinking about independence but were openly working for it before the smashing of the Spanish fleet. And the circumstances are such as to indicate that Admiral Dewey must know the fact.

In an official dispatch of April 30, 1898, printed on page 342 of "Senate Document 62" of the third session of the Fifty-fifth congress, the American consul at Singapore reported that at his interview with Aguinaldo prior to the latter's arrangement to go with Admiral Dewey to Manila, at Dewey's request, Aguinaldo had—

further stated that he hoped the United States would assume protec-

tion of the Philippines for at least long enough to allow the inhabitants to establish a government of their own.

That was before the smashing of the Spanish fleet. Besides this, there was sent to the Philippines a proclamation by the Filipino leaders in Hong-Kong. It was sent in advance of the sailing of Admiral Dewey's squadron from Hong-Kong to Manila, and of course before the smashing of the Spanish fleet. The purpose was to warn the Filipinos not to oppose the Americans when they should arrive, but to rally to their support as friends and liberators. It was forwarded to the American secretary of state by the American consul at Singapore. It must be well known to Admiral Dewey. It may be found in full at page 346 of "document 62." It began in these words:

Compatriots: Divine providence is about to place independence within our reach, and in a way the most free and independent nation could hardly wish for.

Even if Admiral Dewey was ignorant of these facts at the time, which is unlikely, he must have learned them since from "document 62," which is the president's message transmitting the treaty of peace with Spain to the senate. Yet he dares to say that the idea of independence for the Filipinos was "an afterthought of their leaders during the interim between the smashing of the Spanish fleet and the arrival of the United States troops."

Quite naturally those republicans who really are republicans do not relish the thought of being called imperialists. But what else shall we call them for short if they cling to the imperialized republican party? That party is now devoted to the doctrine that the American government is empowered to rule millions of men in distant lands, without the consent of the ruled and in disregard of constitutional limitations. It demands that the flag shall never be hauled down where it has once been raised, but insists that the constitution does not follow the flag. If this is not im-

perialism, what is it? Even if it were not, in what fundamental respect could imperialism be less republican? Don't shy at the label, gentlemen! If you accept the new doctrine of your party that congress and the president are empowered to govern distant peoples without their consent and free from the safeguards of the constitution, be brave about it and pin on the imperial label. This label is no whit worse than the policy it is intended to identify.

The democratic platform is justly criticized by Goldwin Smith for its neglect, when charging the republicans with making an ill-concealed alliance with Great Britain, to distinguish between Great Britain and British Tories. Mr. Smith well says, writing for the Toronto Weekly Sun, that—

Great Britain is not an individual. It is a nation like the United States, divided into parties, and, under normal conditions, pretty equally divided, though at the present moment the liberal party is depressed by the ascendancy of the war spirit. With the tory party in Great Britain President McKinley and his followers unquestionably are in alliance. They fancy, though without any real ground, that they owe to it diplomatic support against the other European powers for their raid on the Spanish possessions. They think that, by its proceedings in South Africa, it is countenancing their proceedings in the Philippines. They probably look forward to having it as their accomplice in any expansionist designs which they may be meditating for the future. But the tory party is not Great Britain; nor is Great Britain to be treated as though she were inclined as a whole to a partnership with the government of Washington in any sort of violence or wrong. The democratic party is morally in alliance, not ill-concealed, but ill-understood, with the liberal party in Great Britain, against the spirit of imperial aggression which threatens to get possession of the world. It ought, in composing its manifestoes, to take notice of the friends as well as of the enemies of its cause in Great Britain.

Evidently public opinion in Great Britain, jingo though it is, is not yet ready to face military conscription. The ministry proposed it, and one day last week the under secretary for

war made a plea for it in parliament. But he was finally obliged to withdraw the measure. It was strenuously opposed, not only by the democratic elements, but also by imperialists. The London Star pertinently asks why imperialists should have opposed conscription, saying "you cannot assert your hegemony in China, your suzerainty in Africa, claim the golden stool of Ashanti, teach France her manners, and wield a longer spoon than Russia, without either courting disaster or facing conscription." The answer, however, to the Star's question, is simple. Imperialists in England understand perfectly that if their policy continues conscription must be faced; but they also understand that while the British people are ready enough to jubilate over victories in London they are not ready to be drafted to win them across seas. They may accept imperialism, but not militarism—not yet. That is the reason the conscription measure was withdrawn. In our own country similar conditions prevail. We have not yet got so far as to propose a military draft law in congress. But this must come if we keep on with McKinley's policy. As certainly as the wheel horse follows his leader in a tandem, so certainly does militarism follow imperialism. To govern refractory colonies requires a large military force, and except when patriotism runs high, the maintenance of a large military force necessitates conscription.

Letters from imperialist warriors in the Philippines, which are percolating through the McKinley press, express great anxiety over the election possibilities. Their writers want McKinley elected because it would be, as one of this letter-writing corps puts it, "a more crushing blow to the insurgent army than we can administer to them in a dozen battles." The first thing to consider about letters of that kind is the fact that the mail of soldiers in the Philippines is under censorship. Consequently no one here can know whether the letters represent soldier sentiment in general or

not. The next thing is that soldier sentiment in favor of imperialism is, anyhow, a poor guide for voters who do not believe in militarism. The third is that Mr. McKinley, after seven full months with 65,000 troops, has failed to put down an "insurrection" which, according to Gen. Otis, was already put down before the seven months began to run. What then can be hoped for from him?

Another southern community has been disgraced by the lynching of a negro. We refer to Huntsville, Ala. This lynching was not attended with the barbarous cruelties that characterized those of Georgia several months ago. The mob merely hanged the prisoner without a trial. But it was a responsible mob, led by a well-known citizen; and if the people of Alabama do not bring him to the bar as a murderer and do their utmost to see him legally hanged for his crime, they make themselves responsible in the eyes of civilized men for his lawlessness. And they cannot excuse the mob nor themselves by pleading the infamy of the crime for which the negro was lynched. His guilt was not established. Neither the mob nor the community knows to this day whether he was guilty or not. And even if his guilt were positively known, the crime of the mob is no less. We could in that case discard sympathy for the murdered negro, saying that he had got his deserts; but we should still leave innocent negroes in danger of lynching upon unfounded accusations. The community that believes in law and order will not tolerate mob law even against the guilty. It will punish those who lawlessly execute vengeance upon the guilty, to the end that there may be security for the innocent. Nor will it allow race prejudice to swerve it from this manifest duty.

All through the fit of business hysterics, now at an end, which was generally and confidently exploited as evidence of prosperity, we insisted that the so-called prosperity was a feverish sham. All the circumstances

bore out this opinion. Some rich men were, indeed, getting richer, and many working men were finding jobs. But men out of jobs were much more abundant than jobs out of men. There was no healthy industrial activity. So manifest was this that even the prosperity touters were obliged to do most of their shouting in the future tense. And now the correctness of our view of the matter is being conceded. Not only is it agreed that times are far from good, but the conviction is growing that they were not really good while they were supposed to be so. The great Wall street operator, Keene, is the first king of finance to openly acknowledge the truth. In an interview in London on the 23d, he said:

I do not look upon the business situation in the United States as prosperous. We have had a period of four years of extraordinary excitement, which is now on the ebb. That kind of business cannot live when the excitement is over.

It was sham prosperity all the time.

Attention is called by the New York Nation to the suggestive fact that in the seven states in which the question of woman suffrage has been twice submitted to popular vote it has without exception been much better supported at the polls the second time than the first. The latest instance was that of Oregon. Earlier reports of this election described the woman suffrage amendment as "snowed under." But as an amendment to strike out of the constitution a pro-slavery clause which had been there since before the civil war had also been "snowed under," the bad defeat of the woman suffrage amendment did not appear to be significant of much except a possible deficiency of intelligence in the Oregon electorate. From the official vote in Oregon, however, it now appears that the woman suffrage amendment was not "snowed under." Oregon has, on the contrary, vastly increased her first vote for woman suffrage. Whereas in 1884 the negative vote was 28,176 to 11,223, this year the negative vote is hardly increased, being only 28,402, while

the affirmative vote is 26,265. It is interesting to note that the strength against the amendment centered in Portland. The gain in favor of it was in the country districts. This result is explained, doubtless, by the fact that slums are in cities, and slums are invariably opposed to woman suffrage.

An idea of the radical tendency of the democratic party may be had from noting the local platforms throughout the country. Some of these to which our attention has been called give marked evidence of an awakening in the rank and file to political and economic truth. An instance is the platform of the democrats of Wyandotte county, Kan., adopted on the 21st at Kansas City, Kan., by the largest democratic convention ever held in that county. In addition to reaffirming the declaration of the national platform "against private monopoly in every form," the Wyandotte county platform lays down this wholesome and far-reaching principle:

Behold this truth to be self-evident: that each laborer is entitled to all wealth due to his individual exertion. We demand the natural increase of wages that a just distribution of wealth would give. As to what is the just distribution of wealth there can be no dispute. It is that which gives wealth to him who makes it, and secures wealth to him who saves it.

Declarations of that kind, coming from the local conventions of the party, are things with which the great conventions must soon reckon.

One or two wise civic reforms are noted from Canada. In the province of Ontario all townships, villages and towns of less than 5,000 population are now required to elect their councilors by a vote of the whole electorate. Towns of more than 5,000 population and cities of not more than 40,000 may, by a by-law of the council approved by the people, adopt the same method, thus abolishing the ward system. Cities of more than 40,000 population which choose to abolish the ward system are allowed, if they wish, to make two electoral di-

visions, half of the aldermen to be elected as a body from each division. This plan, also, must receive popular indorsement to make its adoption final. The trend of these changes, as will be observed, is towards proportional representation. With the ward system abolished, a system of proportional representation in the municipal legislatures could be easily applied. In New South Wales this idea has progressed so far that the premier has decided to introduce in the provincial parliament a bill providing for the election of senators by a proportional system. Under such a system of voting, nominating conventions and primaries would be divested of their power. It is a reform, therefore, to be welcomed wherever universal suffrage prevails.

Indications of advance in the direction of proportional representation and the initiative and referendum are not lacking in this country. Very timidly, but nevertheless unmistakably, the national democratic platform indorses the latter; and in third party platforms both are frequently endorsed. So have one or the other or both been distinctly endorsed by democratic state platforms. Most significant, however, of the growing popularity of this idea in the United States is the attention it has begun to attract from the press. The truth is that the necessity for a system of voting that will enable the citizen to express himself at the polls instead of being dictated to by bosses and rings and combines is keenly felt everywhere, and intelligent politicians and newspapers alike are being influenced by it.

#### THE RIGHT TO WORK.

In newspaper and magazine, from pulpit and bar and bench, at the university and in the home, around the tables of the city club and the stove of the village store, wherever, in short, public opinion of the better sort is made, one principle has for a decade or two been universally conceded. More than conceded, it has been strenuously defended. Whoever has ven-

tured to deny it, he has been promptly and sternly and indignantly put down. This principle is described as one upon which individual independence and all social possibilities rest; and a blow at it is held to be a blow at personal liberty, at social order, at the elementary right to life itself. It is the principle that every man has a natural and indefeasible right to work.

Our great strikes have called to the defense of that right the important agencies of civilization. It is notorious that strikers obstruct the right to work. Forming organizations of their own, they assume to dictate as to who may work and who shall not; and they endeavor to enforce their decrees sometimes by wounding with weapons, sometimes by humiliating with opprobrious epithets and social ostracism, and always by coercion. Their most peaceable methods are in their very nature coercive, and aim invariably at placing restrictions upon the right to work. If anyone would understand the enormity of these outrages of labor strikers, and realize the essential wickedness of their interferences with the right to work, let him consult newspaper editorials upon the recent strike in St. Louis on the part of the street car men, and the pending one in Chicago in the building trades. He will quickly discover that in the estimation of the public, as expressed—and doubtless expressed faithfully—by its leading organs of opinion, the right to work is sacred.

There is nothing about this with which any well-ordered mind can quarrel. In all soberness the right to work is a sacred right. It is as sacred as the right to life. Since life can be preserved only by work, life is denied if opportunity to work be denied. Nor does it make any difference with the principle that labor unions do not deny the right absolutely, but attempt only to make it conditional upon union membership. Though such membership cost little, and any "scab" could at the expense of a few dollars a year become a good union man and be invested with all the privileges that unionism can secure, nevertheless, to limit the right to work to members of labor unions, is as to men who

prefer not to be members a denial of the right to work and consequently of the right to live. The lightness of the conditions is not the important thing, for a vital principle is concerned. So we must fall in with public opinion when it condemns strikers for interfering with the sacred right to work.

Where we should disagree with public opinion in this connection is in its calm assumption that the right to work is sacred only as against labor strikers. The truth is that this right is interfered with far less by strikers than by the very public which mercilessly condemns it in strikers.

Without going fully over the modes of interference by the public, through its institutions and laws, let us invoke an actual instance in exemplification of what we mean. In the same city of St. Louis where the street car strikers were but recently lambasted by the press of the country for denying to "scabs" their in-born right to work without interference, the public itself, through its own courts and by authority of its own laws, is at the present moment subjecting an honest and industrious citizen to humiliating treatment, because he claims what is conceded to labor "scabs" and will not buy the right to work in an honorable and useful calling.

John J. McCann, a real estate agent in St. Louis, is now a convict in the city workhouse. His crime consists in his refusal to pay an annual license fee for permission to work at his business. The small amount of this fee is not to be considered. In Mr. McCann's case as in that of the "scab," the question does not turn upon the extent of the interference. It turns upon the sacredness of his right to work without interference.

But the public of St. Louis and Missouri, instead of defending the right when Mr. McCann asserts it in behalf of himself and of all persons subject to similar interference, as it did when street car "scabs" asserted it against street car strikers—this same public punishes him worse than trade unions have ever punished "scabs." Stop a moment to consider this punishment. Mr. McCann, who was born and educated in St. Louis,

who has been what is usually termed a good citizen, who has served two years upon the board of education, and who has by his public spirit and devotion to public affairs saved the city and state thousands of dollars—this exemplary man was arrested on the 16th and detained for the night in a cell in the city jail. On the following day, to pursue the story of his experiences as told by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, he—

began suffering for his convictions, when, handcuffed to a petty law-breaker, he passed through the workhouse gate to the tolling of the deep signal bell which announced the arrival of the Black Maria at 3:30 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.

The lumbering conveyance backed up to the entrance over which the little wooden figure of a convict wielding a pick welcomed the man who refused to pay for liberty. The other prisoners in the manacled file looked doggedly ahead.

McCann's eyes taking in the scene roved from the pretty home of Superintendent Kempf with its well-trimmed green lawn to the grim prison wall and stopped with a stare at the wooden convict.

His face blanched and something like horror shone in the heightened brilliancy of the eyes. An ashy pallor overspread the face, a quiver ran over the frail body, and the mouth gasped for breath. Then his eyes fell to the earth.

"Forward!"

It was the sharp command of the police guard.

The line moved through the gate under the wooden convict. McCann and Arthur Cross, handcuffed together, were the second couple to enter.

"This way," ordered another guard. He pointed to a door opening into the receiving room in the outer office of the workhouse. The prisoners filed in. Five women bound to one another with steel bands followed the men. When they stood in line before the prison clerk they presented every condition of life. There was a petty larceny thief, two negroes convicted of stealing chickens, two young girls, one old woman 60 years of age who was making her 25th visit to the penal institution and a brazen-faced middle-aged woman sentenced for robbery.

McCann, neatly dressed, looked out of the place. He stood close to Cross as though the man who had made a disturbance while drunk was the last friend he had in the world.

"Your name?" questioned the clerk in short words.

"John J. McCann."

"Your age?"

"I am 52."

"Born?"

"In this city."

"One hundred and thirteen dollars and twenty cents," the prison clerk said, consulting the commitment. "That will do. March."

"This way," ordered a guard. The manacles were struck from the prisoner's wrists. Over the spotless cobblestones of the prison yard the file was led. McCann recognized an acquaintance who had followed him. His livid face lighted for a second, and clutching the small bundle of belongings under his arm he passed on, bowed and silent. Not a word had been uttered by any prisoner except in answer to the questions put to them.

"Halt," commanded the guard. "In here," he added, indicating a low doorway. The file entered the bathroom of the prison; a low ceiling made it gloomy. In the stone floor were sunk two pools about twelve feet square. They were full of muddy river water. Benches stood against the brick walls.

"Take off your clothes," was the order. Two "trusty" prisoners in the garb of the workhouse came into the room with armfuls of prison clothing, brown overalls of roughest material and woolen shirts. They were parceled out to the prisoners.

A keeper came around to each new prisoner and took from him his citizens' clothing and everything that it contained.

McCann asked to be allowed to retain his spectacles. The request was denied.

"May I retain my memorandum book and some papers?" he asked.

"No, against the regulations," was the reply. McCann completed the removal of his garments. All of them were immediately taken away.

"Get into the water," was the next command. McCann obeyed. He was the last to enter the pool, being slow and hesitating in his movements.

With the first dash of cold water his spirits seemed to revive a little. He sank into the water and swam several strokes across the pool. The other prisoners laughed. McCann stood up and then tried it again.

"This is the first time I have tried to swim since I was a boy," he exclaimed. He arose from the bath and joined the laugh, but it was a hollow attempt at merriment.

McCann crawled slowly from the pool and, seating himself on the bench, picked up the woolen shirt and brown overalls. He examined the shirt carefully and with sudden resolution pulled it over his head and thrust his arms through the sleeves. The overalls were a world too large. The guard noticed it and another pair were brought. McCann looked about for his undergarment. It was missing. Then he realized that he was to put on the overalls next his skin and that his feet must be thrust into shoes without stockings.

In his strangely misfitting and coarse covering McCann and his fellows were taken once more across the cobblestones to cell three in the ground floor tier, fronting on the yard. They were all huddled together there to await assignment to their respective cells and cellmates.

"Call McCann," said the guard through the heavy iron grating as the Post-Dispatch representative asked to talk with him.

McCann, now known only as No. 239, appeared behind the bars. In the dim light of the cell his features were deadly pale and the bristly gray mustache added to the despair that was written upon the face for the first time. His hands clutched the bars for support.

"It is good in you to come out here to see me," were his first words. "I feel, now, my utter loneliness. When a man is locked behind these—these things"—he did not say bars—"he feels for the first time in his life something akin to the lost hope of many a miserable creature.

"Come and see me sometimes. It will be hard, indeed. I would not be here if I did not think that the example would set many another man who may be placed in the same extremity to thinking of the injustice of the law. I will miss many comforts, but I will pray that I shall be given strength, notwithstanding my illness, to endure to the end.

"Good-by." McCann broke down as he seemed to see slipping away the last tie that bound him to the outside world, to respectability and citizenship. The man leaned against the iron and wept.

At six o'clock he was given the prison supper of dry bread cut into slices, no butter, a cup of coffee with sugar and no milk, a little meat cut into bits and one tomato.

Wednesday morning he commenced to work out his sentence of six months, imposed in the police court, which fixes the rate of allowance at 50 cents a day. McCann's fine is \$100. This would make 200 days, but the law only permits a person to be held six months for debt. There is \$13.20 in court fees to be expiated. This may add several days to the six months, as the costs constitute a separate debt.

Friends will be permitted to see McCann only on Sunday for half an hour. They will not be able to grasp him by the hand. He must sit in a cage while the visitors are seated behind a barrier six feet away.

McCann's assignment in the prison routine is the cleaning of the jail and stable yard, an occupation which will keep him in the open air. If he is placed on the trusty list of prisoners he will be allowed more liberties than the ordinary prisoner.

McCann's sentence will expire December 15, unless death, pardon or other interposition occurs.

That is the way in which the public of St. Louis punishes one of its own good citizens for peaceably asserting his sacred right to work.

It is a pregnant fact that while Mr. McCann was beginning his lessons as a convict scullion in the yard and stable of the St. Louis workhouse, the state board of tax equalization was hearing arguments in behalf of the monopoly corporations of the state against the taxation of franchises. For Mr. McCann was the author and unwearied promoter of the movement to tax that species of property. His own imprisonment for asserting the sacred right to work is a result of his efforts thus to place the burdens of taxation upon monopoly values as distinguished from labor earnings.

Three years ago Mr. McCann noticed that the owners of street franchises and of valuable real estate sites, very largely escaped taxation, and that the consequent shortage of public revenue was made up by what he justly calls "depredations on the people in the name of revenue, made up for the most part of licenses permitting persons to use their brains and bodies" industrially.

Regarding this as a gross abuse, he appeared before the city board of tax equalization and demanded that franchises and land values be properly taxed. The board refused to take any action. He then brought about the organization of the Equal Taxation committee, and in 1898 again appeared before the city board of equalization. On this occasion he drew attention to 100 specific items of franchises and other property of the privilege kind, including valuable city sites, in which the exemption amounted to \$100,000,000. He met now with more success. The board increased the assessments of street railways from \$5,500,000 to \$23,000,000. But the law adviser of the city came to the rescue of the privileged classes, rendering an opinion that the board had acted beyond its power. So the new assessment was reduced to \$7,000,000, which, however, was \$1,500,000 higher than it had been before.

McCann did not stop here. He carried his fight before the state board of tax equalization. There he was supported by Gov. Stephens and Attorney General Crow, and through their efforts the matter was taken before the supreme court of the state on a question of the jurisdiction of the board. The court decided that the state board had jurisdiction. Mr. McCann then presented to the state board a list of about 50 of the largest franchise owning corporations in Missouri, including all the street railways of St. Louis, in which he showed that the franchise values of these corporations were grossly under-assessed. Through these proceedings he augmented the public revenues thousands of dollars, but the corporations made the fight a long and bitter and costly one and they are prosecuting it yet.

Meanwhile, as a protest against the system of exempting landlordism and other forms of monopoly from taxation while imposing license taxes on competitive vocations, Mr. McCann announced through the press that he would thereafter refuse to pay license taxes on his vocation unless the lawful taxes on franchises were paid. The license for his vocation is \$25, and the penalty for non-payment is \$100 with costs, to be enforced by confinement in the workhouse if not paid. He took the position that such a tax is a tax on the right to work, or, as he put it at the time, a tax on liberty.

In due time Mr. McCann was sued for the penalty of non-payment of his license for 1897. He appealed the case, and finally carried it, along with similar cases for other persons whose vocations had been subjected to license taxes and who had refused to pay, to the supreme court of the state, where it was finally decided last spring.

The defendants had relied in these cases not only upon the general principle that the right to work is a sacred right, with which even the taxing power cannot interfere so long as monopoly values are available for taxation, but also upon a peculiar specific provision in the Missouri constitution in support of that principle.

It may be found in the constitution of 1875—section 4 of the bill of rights. So far as pertinent it is in these terms:

All persons have a natural right to life, liberty and the enjoyment of the gains of their own industry.

With reference to this constitutional safeguard, the supreme court decided that the right of an individual to the gains of his own industry, thus secured, "is not an absolute right, but is subordinate to the police power of the state," delegated in this instance to the city of St. Louis, and that under that power the St. Louis license taxes on vocations are valid. But as the court seemed to rest its decision primarily upon decisions made under the old slave constitution, Mr. McCann moved for a rehearing on the ground that the court had failed to give full force to the more recent constitutional provision quoted above.

In support of this motion for a rehearing Mr. McCann argued that the decisions referred to by the court as precedents, and which had been made under the slave constitution, could not stand as precedents for the question at issue. That constitution had contained eight separate declarations, each confirming the legality of chattel slavery, whereas the present constitution not only omits the slavery clauses but distinctly declares that "all persons have a natural right to life, liberty, and the enjoyment of the gains of their own industry." The questions therefore arise, urged Mr. McCann—

Whether or not the people of Missouri are yet, and now, subject in their natural rights to the slave constitution declarations, made in slave times a half century or more since, in consequence of court decisions founded on said slave constitution doctrines, notwithstanding the new bill of rights; whether slave constitution doctrines and court decisions founded on them are yet alive; and whether the declarations of the bill of rights \* \* \* are altogether and alike simple bombast, idle chatter and mummeries.

And as to the court's ruling that the right of a person to the gains of his own industry is subordinate to the police power Mr. McCann asked the court whether it meant that—

the police power is superior to the constitution decree; that a branch of the government of the state may, at

its fancy, deny, destroy or forfeit a right which government in the state is established to secure. These and like often used expressions need to be elucidated. They are too often recklessly and carelessly used to annul rights instead of to safeguard them, to be allowed to longer pass without an explanation of what is meant by them. The police power is rather held subordinate to the constitution decree than that the constitution decree is held subordinate to the police power. No court in this country has ever yet held to the contrary of this suggestion. No court in this state has ever yet denied it. The courts of this country and state have held, whenever the question has been raised, that the police power acts in aid of, not in opposition to, the constitution. Does this court hold otherwise?

Beyond this Mr. McCann argued that in following his business as a real estate agent he did not exercise his right to work in any manner contrary to police policy. That the city ordinance was distinctly not in aid of police policy, but was for revenue, and that—

as a mere revenue measure the ordinance in question, purporting as it does to provide a summary action whereby a penalty of 400 per cent. instanter, with the contingency of punishment by imprisonment, may be inflicted upon them who become delinquent for the "man" taxes it assumes to assess, while others who become delinquent for "property" taxes are, by the general revenue laws of the state, liable merely to a civil suit, in a formal proceeding, with a penalty of one per cent. a month on the amount of their delinquencies at the sole risk of a levy on their possessions, is a deprivation of the class of the taxpayers affected by it of the equal protection of the revenue laws, is in conflict with the federal constitution, and for this reason, if for no other, is manifestly null and void.

But Mr. McCann invoked in vain the principle of the sacred right to work, the guarantee by the constitution of the enjoyment of the gains of his own industry, the doctrine that the constitution is superior to the police power, and the principle that it is a pernicious violation of both the state and the federal constitutions to make nonpayment of taxes on vocations a criminal act punishable by imprisonment while nonpayment of taxes on property is a subject only for the civil courts. The supreme court refused to reverse its decision. Mr. McCann is accordingly now a convict,

suffering imprisonment in the St. Louis workhouse.

Martyrdom is not always useful. It is an experience to be accepted cheerfully when it cannot be avoided without treason to the right, but it is seldom to be sought for. There are occasions, however, when self-sought martyrdom is one of the most useful contributions a man can make to the progress of his kind. And we believe that Mr. McCann has availed himself of one of these occasions. The martyrdom he is suffering is worth to the best interests of the people now and to come far more than it is costing him.

He has brought to public attention in the most impressive way a fact of the greatest importance—the fact that industry is mercilessly taxed to eke out the public revenues that are shortened by exemptions of monopoly. He has shown that this is no oversight of officials, but that it is deliberately promoted by the law making power. Above all he has at great personal cost bravely asserted the fundamental right to work, at the source of greatest interference—the taxing power.

To resist in this way a tax of \$25 a year is in itself to make much ado about a little matter. So was John Hampden's refusal to pay a trifling ship tax. But Hampden's act stirred English thought and helped set in motion a series of events that culminated in the glorious revolution of 1688 and the firm establishment of the English declaration of rights. It is within the possibilities that a sacrifice such as John J. McCann is now making in St. Louis may promote a greater revolution than this which put to rest in England the blasphemous doctrine of the divine right of kings. It may lead on to the recognition not merely in a small and narrow and selfish and hypocritical way against trades unions, but in a large way against all combinations, including that of the state itself, of the divine right to work.

The notion of selling for certain bits of metal the Iliad of Homer, how much more the land of the World-Creator, is a ridiculous impossibility.—“Past and Present,” by Thomas Carlyle.

## NEWS

There is another rift in the cloud that obscures the situation in China. The foreign legations at Peking appear to have been safe as late as July 18, but in imminent danger then of massacre. The authority for this is an official cipher dispatch purporting to come from the American minister, Mr. Conger, which was received by the state department at Washington on the 20th. Minister Conger's dispatch was apparently a reply to one which the state department had requested the Chinese minister to send him. That request grew out of the presentation on the 11th by the Chinese ministers over the world to the foreign offices of the respective powers, of an imperial decree explaining the outbreak in China and the efforts of the Chinese government to suppress it, and giving assurances of the safety of the legations. The decree was mentioned at the time in these columns at page 216. When Minister Wu delivered this decree to Secretary Hay, the latter called Mr. Wu's attention to the evidence which its delivery furnished as to the possibility of communication with Peking, and demanded that the Chinese government put the American government in immediate communication with the American minister. Mr. Wu having expressed his willingness to do his best in the matter, Mr. Hay gave him for transmission a dispatch to Mr. Conger. To assure the genuineness of such reply as might come, Mr. Hay wrote his own dispatch in cipher and asked Mr. Conger to do the same with his. Mr. Wu undertook to forward Mr. Hay's dispatch, and nine days later, on the 20th, he produced what purports to be Mr. Conger's reply. It was in the state department cipher, and when deciphered read as follows:

In British legation under continued shot and shell from Chinese troops. Quick relief only can prevent general massacre.

The dispatch itself was undated, but the Chinese dispatch forwarding it to Minister Wu bore date at Peking July 18.

Accepting the dispatch from Minister Conger as genuine, the American authorities at Washington decided to urge immediate action on the part of the allies in China with a view to relieving the legations. Accordingly, the secretary of the navy telegraphed as follows on the 20th to Admiral

Remey, in command of the Asiatic squadron:

Conger telegraphs that he is under fire in British legation, Peking. Use and urge every means possible for immediate relief.

But the other powers were not so well disposed to accept the Conger dispatch as genuine. They declared with one accord their firm conviction that the foreigners in Peking had been already massacred. It was consequently impossible to secure the necessary cooperation for an immediate relief expedition. In addition to the supposed futility of such an expedition, the European powers set up the folly of attempting a march upon Peking at this time with the inadequate equipment of the allied forces; and on the whole, their replies to the appeal of the United States for a united relief expedition immediately were evasive.

A second dispatch purporting to be from Mr. Conger reached Washington on the 25th. This dispatch, signed “Conger” and bearing date July 4, had been received at Tientsin on the 21st, whence it went to Taku, and was sent from there to Washington on the 23d by the senior officer of the American squadron. It is as follows:

I have been besieged two weeks in British legation. Grave danger of general massacre by Chinese soldiers, who are shelling the legation daily. Relief soon if at all. City without government, except by Chinese army. Determined to massacre all foreigners in Peking. Entry of relief force into city probably will be hotly contested.

Another edict of the Chinese emperor has been brought to the attention of the powers. It is dated the 17th, and has been given out by way of assurance that the Chinese government is affording all possible protection to foreigners and endeavoring in good faith to establish order. This decree attributes the origin of the present conflict to “the long standing antagonism between the people and Christian missions,” and its precipitation to the attack upon the Taku forts. Reference is made to former decrees for the protection of foreign legations and missionaries, and commands are given to subordinates to protect all foreigners. The decree expresses the regret of the emperor at learning of the killing of the chancellor of the Japanese legation and of the German minister, and commands the speedy arrest and punishment of

the murderers. Investigation is ordered into the claims of foreigners who have suffered loss, with a view to ultimate settlement. And directions are prescribed for the punishment of rebellious subjects and the restoration of order.

Two days after the date of the foregoing decree, the emperor addressed the president of the United States, referring to the increasing seriousness of the situation and expressing gratification at the assurances of friendly relations through the Chinese minister at Washington. The explicit purpose of the communication was to invite the president to "devise measures and take the initiative in bringing about a concert of the powers for the restoration of order and peace." To this request the president replied on the 23d. He expressed his inference that the disturbers in China had received no encouragement from the government but are actually in rebellion, and proposed, upon that assumption, that the Chinese government (1) give public assurance whether the foreign ministers are alive and if so in what condition; (2) put the diplomatic representatives of the powers in immediate and full communication with their respective governments; and (3) place the imperial authorities of China in communication with the relief expedition, "so that cooperation may be secured between them for the liberation of the legationers, the protection of foreigners and the restoration of order." A similar imperial message to that received by the president of the United States appears to have been sent at the same time to the president of France. The French minister of foreign affairs informed the Chinese minister in acknowledgment that the reply would be addressed to the French legation at Peking, but would not be sent until assurances of the safety of the French minister at Peking had been received. Another was sent to Germany, which also returned a curt reply.

The attack by the Chinese upon Russian territory on the Amur river, of which we told last week, is reported from Moscow as having been completely repulsed; and the report of last week that the Russian government had in consequence of the attack dismissed the Chinese envoy at St. Petersburg is confirmed.

A provisional government has been

established at Tientsin by the allies, and they have issued a proclamation saying they are engaged in suppressing rebellion and are not making war upon China. As commander in chief of all the allied forces it is announced from St. Petersburg that Russia has, with the consent of the other powers, appointed Gen. Dragomiroff. But in Washington it is asserted that the supreme command has not yet been decided upon. Russia figures suspiciously in another way. She is said in a dispatch from Tientsin to have assumed control of the railway line between Taku and Peking, and to have announced that she will retain control until the conclusion of hostilities and then restore the line to the Chinese. The number of foreign troops now actually mobilized on Chinese soil is estimated at from 30,000 to 40,000.

Next in point of interest to the war-like situation in China is the war in South Africa. When Lord Roberts took possession of Pretoria it was confidently predicted by the British that the war would not last into July. And more than a month ago (see page 185) Lord Roberts was preparing an enveloping movement with the intention of crushing the Boer army in the Orange Free State. Of that movement nothing encouraging has since been heard. But attacks upon Roberts by Boers from all directions in the region of Pretoria have been reported from week to week. This week's budget of news yields reports of similar operations. Among them are accounts of the cutting of Lord Roberts' communications twice, with the capture of 100 Highlanders on the first occasion and 200 Welsh fusileers on the second. The cut communications have since been restored. From London it was given out on the 25th that Lord Roberts had on the 24th begun a general advance from Pretoria, but no details were mentioned. The advance appears to be in a southwesterly direction, instead of in the easterly and northeasterly directions of his previous maneuvers. Regarding the number of troops in South Africa it was stated in the house of commons last week that 12,000 had been sent out from England since the capture of Preoria; and the Spanish military attache, Maj. Esteban, just arrived in London from the seat of war in South Africa, publicly states that "at no time have" the Boers "had in the field more than 25,000 fighting men."

From the Philippines the only news of the week giving accounts of hostilities is contained in an Associated Press dispatch of the 22d from Manila. This dispatch tells of continued guerilla fighting throughout the islands, in which more than 200 Filipinos were killed and wounded, with an American loss of 12 killed and 11 wounded. There is no other news except that the peace resolutions adopted at the meeting of prominent Filipinos held in Manila June 21, of which we gave an account together with Gen. MacArthur's reply on page 186, have been forwarded to Aguinaldo from whom an answer is soon expected.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to July 25, 1900, are as follows:

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91) .....                                  | 1,847 |
| Killed reported since May 16, 1900. . . . .                                 | 41    |
| Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900 ..... | 193   |
| <hr/>   |       |
| Total deaths since July 1, 1898....   | 2,081 |
| Wounded .....   | 2,199 |
| <hr/>   |       |
| Total casualties since July 1, 1898. . . . .                                | 4,280 |
| Total casualties reported last week .....                                   | 4,269 |
| Total deaths reported last week. . . . .                                    | 2,074 |

In American politics the most important news of the week is the call in behalf of the anti-imperialist leaguers for "a national liberty congress," to meet at Indianapolis on the 15th of August. The call is very brief. After naming time and place and specifying the purpose to be "to deliberate and act with reference to the coming campaign," it proceeds:

This congress is to be composed only of those who deny the power of congress and the president to rule vast territories and millions of men outside and in disregard of the constitution.

The remainder of the call relates to credentials. It is signed by ex-Gov. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, as chairman of the executive committee of the National Anti-Imperialist league and by William J. Mize, of Illinois, as secretary.

The national committee of the gold democratic party met on the 25th at Indianapolis. At the same time and place representatives of the New York meeting of anti-McKinley and anti-Bryan men, reported last week on

leagues for "a national liberty conpage 233, also assembled. These representatives, whom the press dispatches have incorrectly identified with the anti-imperialists, endeavored to persuade the gold democratic committee to take steps looking to the nomination of a third ticket, but the proposition was voted down, 26 to 1. The gold democratic committee then decided to reaffirm the Indianapolis platform of 1896, to recommend state committees to keep up their organizations, to indorse the action of congress in passing the gold standard bill as a step in the right direction, and to urge voters not to be deceived by the plea that the money question has been finally settled. The last clause was regarded by Louis R. Ehrich, of Colorado, one of the most prominent members of the party, as an indorsement of McKinley, for which reason he withdrew from the organization.

When the petition of the anti-McKinley and anti-Bryan representatives for a third ticket had been denied by the gold democrats, the former issued a call for a mass convention on the 14th of August, the day before that set for the liberty congress, with a view to placing a ticket in the field on the basis of independence to the late Spanish possessions, a single gold standard and a sound banking system, the abolition of all special privileges, and a merit system of civil service.

The democratic national committee has established headquarters at the Auditorium hotel, Chicago. It is noted as a curious fact that part of the suite of rooms now occupied across the street by the republicans were occupied by the democrats in 1896, while the rooms now secured by the democrats were then occupied by the republicans.

Complete fusion of democrats and populists has been effected in Kansas, with John W. Breidenthal, populist, as the candidate for governor. In Michigan the democrats have nominated Mayor William C. Maybury, of Detroit, for governor.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Col. W. J. Bryan has accepted the invitation of the G. A. R. reception committee to be present August 30 at the Chicago encampment.

—Mt. Azuma, in Japan, one of the

world's few active volcanoes, broke into eruption on the 17th. Several villages were destroyed and more than 200 persons were killed. This volcano was the scene of a great disaster in 1888.

—W. K. Vanderbilt, Jr., has succeeded with his new French automobile in making the trip from Newport to Boston and return, a distance of 160 miles, in less than four hours, maintaining an average rate of more than 40 miles per hour.

—The long standing boundary dispute between Nicaragua and Costa Rica was terminated on the 24th by the signing of the new maps by representatives of both countries and Gen. E. P. Alexander, of South Carolina, who was appointed by President Cleveland to act as arbitrator in the dispute.

—W. W. Rockhill, chief of the bureau of American republics, and ex-minister to Greece, was appointed by President McKinley on the 19th as special envoy to China. He will go to China in a civil capacity and report upon conditions there. Mr. Rockhill, who was formerly connected with the embassy at Peking, is a good Chinese scholar.

—International surveyors have completed part of their work of locating the boundary line between Alaska and northwest Canada in accordance with the terms of the modus vivendi agreed to by both the Canadian and American governments last October. The new provisional line places the Porcupine mining district and parts of the road leading to it within the Canadian line. As this district was formerly on the American side great indignation prevails among the miners, who have forwarded a protest to President McKinley.

## MISCELLANY

### HAPPINESS IN HADES.

I had a vision, a vision of—Well,  
The word's not nice, but the place was  
hell,  
There thousands of devils lay on their  
backs,  
Or were playing cards with asbestos  
packs.

Accosting a demon, I said to him,  
"I thought you devils all worked with  
vim."  
"We used to," said he, in a pleasant  
way,  
"But now we are taking a holiday.

"The Jingo parsons so vigorously  
Are discrediting Christianity,  
That we feel good work's being done for  
hell,  
So we're loafing during the heated spell."  
—"Rhymes Without Treason," by James  
J. Doolling.

### "LIFE" ON THE ISSUES.

We are not going to support Mr. McKinley—nor Mr. Bryan. We are not going to support imperialism or free silver. The issue of this campaign is imperialism. The election of Mr. Bryan would not mean free silver. He could not force it upon the country if he tried. Congress is for gold, and will so remain.

Mr. McKinley's reelection—especially with Mr. Roosevelt at his elbow, would promise a prolonged and bloody orgie of imperialism—that is, of conquest, debt and dishonor.

As to the two candidates personally, we prefer Mr. Bryan. He has convictions—such as they are—and he carries a spine.—Life for July 12.

### THE POOR AND THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Prof. Graham Taylor, of the Chicago Commons Social settlement, said in Evanston recently, in the course of a talk on the sufferings of the poverty-stricken in Chicago, that he considered the protective tariff an evil, and that this opinion has been strengthened by living among the poor. He cited an instance of a scrubwoman who is never paid more than a dollar a day, and whose family is almost starving now because of high prices. In protecting, we should study to protect the poor and needy; and in doing this I am inclined to place more confidence in the words of the great-hearted Graham Taylor, the friend of men, than in the words of Marcus A. Hanna, the friend of trusts.—Edwin F. Walker, to the Young Men's Republican Club of Evanston, Ill.

### THE UNKNOWN CHINESE.

An extract from an editorial on "The Chinese Tragedy," published in the London Speaker of July 7.

It would, alas! be impossible to imagine a more horrible situation. And yet, what is most striking about the crisis is not that it should have occurred, but that it should have taken Europe so completely by surprise. The one factor which has been consistently ignored by the several powers in their Chinese policy during the last few years has been the people of China itself. Her ports have been appropriated, her control of various provinces has been usurped, her government has been blackmailed into making concessions, and all the time the different powers have been watching and growling at each other, too absorbed in their mutual rivalries to reflect that there might be a China over and above the China of ports and harbors, of corrupt and impressionable officials, the hap-

py hunting ground of concessionaires and syndicates, a China human in its prejudices and instincts, and as it has unhappily proved inhuman in its revenges. To the bitter end they have acted on the assumption that China was a mechanical entity. The bombardment of the Taku forts and Admiral Seymour's fruitless expedition were devices of men possessed by the idea that there was no kind of nationalist spirit in China which could present any serious obstacle to the coercive energies of the powers.

#### ONE WAY TO KEEP YOUNG.

She was as fresh in color as a girl, her hair without a touch of gray, her face without a wrinkle, and she felt, I am sure, as she certainly looked, far younger than I. So I asked her finally:

"How do you keep so fresh and young with all your great family?"

She looked at me a moment and then laughed a merry little laugh. "You see," she said, "I haf my von little naps."

"Your what?" I asked, puzzled to understand her.

"My von little naps," she repeated.

"But tell me, I do not understand," I said.

"Vy, so," she said, in her pretty broken English. "Aboud twelf o'clock, or maybe von or maybe two, as you like it besser, I takes de baby, vichever iss de baby, and I goes to de room and takes my naps."

"But if the baby won't sleep at that time?" I objected.

She shrugged her shoulders. "Oh, he sleep all right."

"But there are so many things to do while the baby sleeps," I went on.

"I vill haf my naps," was her smiling answer.

"But," I urged, "supposing something happens to the other children while you and the baby are asleep?"

Then she did stare at me.

"There could be noting happen to dose children vorse dan I not get my von little naps," she said, indignantly.

I gave it up. This closed the argument.—Clarissa Sergeant, in Harper's Bazar.

#### CHINA IS ALIVE.

The Boxers, in so far as China alone is concerned, seem to be rather a praiseworthy lot of men. Their idea is China for the Chinese, and that in itself is a good idea for Chinamen to hold. They won't work out their idea intelligently of course. They will do a lot of killing and other mischief; they will try to shut all the open doors and pitch foreigners and foreign notions out of China. They are fanatics, and

represent ignorance and superstition, but they also represent the strenuous life and reform. They are a sign of life in the Chinese people. Dead people don't have diseases, neither do dead nations. The Boxers have broken out on China like the measles, and their uprising means, among other things, that China isn't dead yet. There was ample occasion for them. Little as most of us know about the imperial government of China, we think we know that it is a government of conspiracies, moribund, inefficient, unworthy; hopelessly bad and hopelessly feeble. For years past it has seemed bound to go down, and the only question has been how, and when, it would go. That question the Boxers seem to be answering. The ferment in China, of which they are the most conspicuous part, is the sort of smash that precedes reorganization. The smash will doubtless include the Boxers who brought it on, but the reorganization is inevitable, and in the end it must lead to the modernizing of the Chinese. China needs strong medicine, and the more she gets from the inside, the less work there will be left to be effected by external applications.—Editorial in Life for July 12.

#### THE UNCONQUERED BOERS.

Editorial in Manchester (England) Guardian of July 3.

It is four weeks to-day since Lord Roberts occupied Pretoria, and half the London papers declared the war to be over. These four weeks have been amongst the most disappointing of the war, and it is as fortunate for the government as it is unfortunate for the country that Chinese affairs have distracted the attention of the public from South Africa and prevented it from fully understanding the meaning of recent events there. The lessons of the past month, however bitter, would be salutary if we would only heed them. They have shown that the Boer government and the Boer peoples are absolutely united. We may annex the Free State and declare all the burghers who remain in the field to be rebels, but the fact remains that the wandering president has the sympathy of every Dutchman in the Free State to an extent that he never had before, and that the allegiance of our newest colony is measured simply by the range of our rifles. After our armies have been four months in possession of the capital, we are now beginning a formal campaign against the burghers whom we were assured at the beginning of the war it would be a positive advantage to have against us in our quarrel with the Transvaal. From our experi-

ence in the Free State we may learn what we have still to expect in the Transvaal. There is now a theory that the Free Staters are much more terrible fellows than the Transvaalers, and that the occupation of the latest Free State capital will do away with the necessity of further fighting in the Transvaal. That is nonsense. After the Free State campaign is over, Lord Roberts will have Botha's army to disperse; and that done, he will have to occupy the whole country and hold it down by sheer force for months before peace is in sight. It will not be any easier to make peace in the Transvaal by a proclamation of annexation than it was in the Free State. We cannot destroy every vestige of the old political organization in the two states and yet look forward to the luxury of a formal peace. This is a war of conquest, and there are no signatures of peace between the nation that destroys and the nation that is destroyed.

The public has not realized the complete change that has come over the character of the war. "Why do not the Boers make peace, now that they are beaten?" one hears it asked. The answer is that it is for the conqueror, not the conquered, to make peace, and that in this case the conqueror has repeatedly refused to offer any terms whatever. Unconditional surrender is not a condition of peace that has ever been accepted by any community of white men in modern times. The war, then, in South Africa will continue just so long as our terms remain unchanged and there is a single district of the Transvaal or the Free State that remains unoccupied by our troops. This is not the kind of war that the public had in mind last year when the negotiations for the franchise were in progress. It looked forward to a couple of big battles, an apology from Mr. Kruger, and a general handshaking afterwards. It now finds that it has made the Boers heroes in spite of themselves, and driven them into a fanatical resistance. The Boer temper can be changed. We have only to treat them as reasonable beings entitled to respect and to withdraw our demand for unconditional surrender, and we can obtain their surrender on any reasonable conditions that we like to impose. England need only lift its finger to obtain everything it went to war for, and more besides, and to save thousands of British lives. We cannot understand the mind or heart of the man who is moved to nothing but hate and contumely by the last dying struggles of a nation. Such a man, it appears, is Mr. John Stuart. "On Monday last," he writes

from Pretoria, "I visited Boksburg, and found the Boers inclined to be impudent. . . . A few stringent 'examples' are urgently needed. The majority of the burghers are only sulkily submissive, and are praying the Almighty to send them other early chances of attacking us." In other words, we are to treat our beaten enemies as rebels and punish them for disloyalty. Such suggestions take us back many generations in the morality of warfare, and the fact that they can appear in a great London paper is evidence of the extent to which the sensitiveness of the public is weakened as to the things that concern the honor of a belligerent nation. It is for the country to dissociate itself from this spirit of persecution, and to protect itself against the double charge of folly and inhumanity which posterity is sure to prefer against it if the war is allowed simply to run its course without any attempt on our part to soften its brutality.

ADDRESS OF THE CENTRAL FILIPINO COMMITTEE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

God Almighty knows how unjust is the war which the imperial arms have provoked and are maintaining against our unfortunate country! If the honest American patriots could understand the sad truth of this declaration, we are sure they would, without the least delay, stop this unspeakable horror. And that they may have a just understanding of it, we entreat them to hear our voice, to meditate on our exhortations and to weigh our statements against the misrepresentations under which imperialism seeks to conceal its designs. Turn not away from our prayer, Americans, but listen, and give judgment according to reason and conscience.

We, the Filipinos, are a civilized, progressive and peace-loving people. Many impartial writers and speakers have testified that we are advanced in civilization, that many of our people for two centuries have enjoyed the advantages of university education, that the number of illiterates among our people is small, and that as artists, scientists, magistrates, generals and dignitaries of the church, the sons of the Filipinos have distinguished themselves greatly and have achieved many positions of eminence, especially so in Spain. That we are progressive was well shown by the conduct of our whole country when, at the time of the capitulation of the city of Manila, the inhabitants of our islands, supposing themselves to have entered

upon a career of national independence that was to be assured to them by the United States government, instead of abandoning themselves to any revolutionary fever and excess, established with careful thought and scrupulous regard for justice a prudent government which respected all rights created legitimately; they convoked a congress whose legislative work has not been justly criticised by anybody; they reorganized the administrative machinery which had been disturbed by recent struggles; telegraphs, railroads and means of communication began to work regularly; we had adopted the electric light in some of our towns, and we had established a new university, four high and several primary schools. In brief, the new nation had entered upon a path of progress which already promised a bright future. All this progress the imperialists have disturbed; all this progress have they destroyed.

For proof that we love peace, we ask you to remember the story of our relations with Spain. For 300 years our country has been at the mercy of Spanish domination; we were the subjects of that monarchy; the government of that nation denied us any voice in the enactment of remedial legislation; they denied us representation in the Spanish cortes. They allowed themselves to be directed by the most reactionary elements, and took counsel chiefly from the friars who sought to estrange the mother country from us and to deny us the blessings of liberty, so that they might the more completely exploit us at their will. They denied us freedom of the press, restricted the right of peaceable assembly and violated the security of our homes. They created the so-called administrative process (expedientes gubernativos); so that, often, without hearing and without trial, the most peaceable citizen was snatched from his house and condemned to the miseries of banishment. In brief, the Spanish government, whose despotic cruelty American imperialism now imitates, and in some respects surpasses, denied to us many of the liberties which you were already enjoying when, under pretext of oppression, you revolted against British domination.

Notwithstanding these great wrongs we submitted quietly, confining our protests to earnest prayers for reparation; such was our love of peace. Only when we became convinced that our requests were absolutely disregarded, that the most worthy officials were removed from

office, even those of eminent character, when it was made known that they had manifested even a slight sympathy for us, when we had lost every hope of peaceful remedy and all faith in the oft promised liberal reforms, the Philippine revolution, the most justifiable of all revolutions, began. It was an uprising void of every feeling of hatred and revenge toward Spain, the country that we respected and loved; it was a revolt against her bad government, just as we now revolt, not against America, whose power and greatness we recognize, and whose justice we still hope to see proven, but against her unworthy rulers. Those who tell you that we are an adventurous and seditious people, ready to go to war at the least pretext, basely deceive you in this as in many other calumnies invented by the imperialists. If, yesterday, we fought against Spain, and, to-day, are resisting your powerful arms, even though sure to be vanquished, it is because we have been forced as a last resort to an unequal and bloody war for the attainment of an aspiring people's legitimate ambitions. Thus we can repeat proudly and with the firmness of one who carries the truth on his lips and in his heart, that if our character and culture entitle us to independence, still more do we show ourselves entitled to it by the high motives which have always inspired our resistance. Why, then, do you deny us liberty? Why, forgetful of all your history and the noble precepts of your illustrious forefathers, are you fighting against the cause of independence, of progress and of justice, which is our cause? What has come to pass between you and us that should cause you to permit this incredible and monstrous war to be waged against us?

When you declared war against Spain you proclaimed to the world at large that you had appealed to arms only in order to free oppressed peoples; and when your flag waved before the coasts of the Philippines on powerful vessels which easily destroyed the weak fleet of the enemy, it was an emblem of liberty then. Your diplomatic representatives invited the most famous of our Filipino leaders, Hon. E. Aguinaldo, to an offensive alliance against those whom you represented to us as a "common enemy," in order that by vanquishing them, we might achieve our aspirations for peace and happiness. It was then that your idol, Admiral Dewey, and your distinguished generals, Merritt and Anderson, treated us as friends and

allies, even more so, as the admiral asserted, than the Cubans to whom you have with equity promised to give it. It was then that the flag of the new Philippine nation waved in the shadow of the stars and stripes at Manila bay. It was then that the independence of the Philippines was proclaimed at Cavite, within range of your cannons, without any opposition, and in almost the very words of your immortal declaration. It was then that your soldiers hailed the new nation, while ours were cheering the American liberators. It was then, to save your cause, since you had assured us that your cause embraced our freedom, that the Filipinos gave their blood for you in your fight against a valiant and obstinate enemy, and at the same time placed in your reach all available resources and aid. You were at that moment almost at the point of breaking into hostilities with another nation which had manifested her sympathy for Spain by attempting to bar at Subig bay the course of what you yourselves had called "an army of liberation." That was the hour of the beautiful fiction; now we seem to have come to the time of the bitter reality, the cruel disenchantment. Then we were received and treated as allies; now we are scourged back into the mountains and denied every right except that of fighting the very flag in whose beneficent shadow we had expected to find freedom and happiness.

From the outset our country took sides with the United States in the war with Spain, and we marched proudly with your sons as comrades in arms, as soldiers in the same cause, to victory. At all times during that war, and for months afterward, the civil, military and naval authorities of the United States caused us to hope for independence. Papers and pamphlets advocating this ideal were published in Manila under the protection of the United States authorities; with their consent the revolutionary army had been conquering the Spanish positions and establishing in them provincial governments dependent on that of the Filipino republic. America was then a great republic, releasing the Cubans and the Filipinos from the iron grasp of an imperial government and conducting them to emancipation and freedom; and our people hailed the stars and stripes as an emblem of freedom, as the token of liberty for the living and the badge of honor for the patriots dead. With renewed energy, with proud alacrity, with fearless determination they pressed on, side by side

with your noble sons, to the end. What reward did we get? Did the expected freedom come to us? No! As a requital for our sacrifices and as a reward for our loyalty, subjugation is offered to us instead of freedom. We may have a colonial government of the United States, administered in a foreign language, instead of the colonial government of Spain, which, at least, was administered in a language already known to us and which we have made ours. We are to have a colonial government which will deny us the citizenship of its nation. In spite of their imperialistic tendencies, the Spanish government never went so far as to deny us citizenship!

When, on a day of sad recollections, we declined to accept this shame, when we protested against this iniquitous ingratitude, then the guns of the United States were turned upon us; we were denounced as traitors and rebels; you destroyed the homes to which you had been welcomed as honored guests, killing thousands of those who had been your allies, mutilating our old men, our women and our children, and watering with blood and strewing with ruins the beautiful soil of our fatherland. Behold, therefore, Americans, and consider not only our right to independence but what your conduct has been, and what your plain duty is towards us in good faith, and then judge, in view of these antecedents, whether the crusade of extermination which the imperialists have inaugurated against our unfortunate country is a worthy one, whether it is just, and whether it is in the least degree excusable.

These and only these are the true terms of the simple problem. Do not give ear to the specious arguments of those who, in order to excuse a political crime and in order to disguise their greed and covetousness, tell you the contrary by means of assertions whose falseness is as great as the bad faith of their authors. They tell you that we are incapable of self-government, as if the accomplished facts had not proven the contrary; and as if, also, all the Americans who had calmly judged us, previous to this war of conquest, had not unanimously asserted otherwise. They assure you that there exist deep divisions among us and that the withdrawal of the American troops would create anarchy and misgovernment in our country, as if it were not evident that the most complete order prevailed there until the imperial troops had, with their unjust war, brought confusion. They tell you that the government of the Filipino re-

public had never been recognized by the whole country. This is a manifest falsehood, because it had been recognized even by the Mohammedans in the south, whom the imperialists, their friends and allies, boast so much of having reduced to submission; and by the mountain races of Luzon, who always refused to recognize the Spanish government and who will do the same to the American government. The Filipino government is the only one which can conciliate and redeem them, for in that government only have they confidence—a success for civilization which imperialism could never accomplish. They assert that the existence of these mountain races makes the Filipino independence impossible. This is an absurd assertion, which would be equal to maintaining that you are incapable of self-government simply because there are Indians on your soil in a proportion almost equal to that which the Ingorrotes, Aetas, etc., represent among us. They mislead you with the idea that because the Tagalogs, the Visayos, the Ilocanos, etc., speak different dialects, it is not feasible for us to constitute a national unity. This is an objection of gross ignorance which forgets that in the most civilized European nations people speak different dialects and even different languages as in the highly civilized Switzerland; it is also a sophistical objection which overlooks the fact that in all the provinces of the archipelago, in the Tagal, the Visayan, and the Ilocos provinces, etc., whose inhabitants are of the same ethnical condition and culture, the only language officially spoken is the Spanish. They allege that the majority of the Filipinos are in favor of the American sovereignty, and that they would rather be colonials of America than be independent. This is a base falsehood, which belies the fact of the thousands of soldiers which the imperialists have had to put on the islands, and of the regime of military tyranny, more terrible than was ever known before by us, of which they were compelled to avail themselves, imprisoning thousands of honest people, suppressing serious newspapers, and other endless abuses against all law, in order to smother the cries for independence. They also tell you that we were the aggressors in the present war, as if it were not evident how much we have done in order to prevent the outbreak of hostilities with which we were daily provoked, and how many times we proposed a cessation in the fight in order that we may come to an agreement, a demand which your rulers have always refused to grant us. They

further tell you that our country has great and unexploited riches and that with it America would gain. This is a new deception of imperialism, because such treasures, even the mines, have already been carefully exploited by Spaniards, Germans and English, and they never obtained the marvelous success of which imperialism now dreams; on the contrary, the record of these exploitations shows more failure than success. They go on to say that there are in our country rich lands to distribute and cultivate. To this the deceived American immigrants who, believing such promises, shall go and succumb to the rigors of the climate, so fatal to their race, will answer accusing those who made them leave their rich and habitable land. That the higher interests of Christianity demand the retention of the islands, is another deception, because if our subjugation becomes a reality, we could never forget how much religious fanaticisms have had to do with it, and our present Christian belief would stagger and perhaps we would look with distrust on the creeds of our subjugators. Finally, the imperialists say that God trusted in their hands the government of the future destinies of the Filipinos, as if the Supreme Spirit could have been incarnated in the gold of the \$20,000,000 which were paid to Spain, and in the steel of the quick-firing guns which are mutilating the unfortunate Filipinos.

No, do not listen to the false assertions of the imperialists, listen only to the voice of reason and justice. Heed not the suggestions of those who pretend to excite your national self-love and your innermost feelings, in order that you may convert yourselves into docile instruments of their cupidity and ambition, of their immoralities and scandals which are peculiar to every colonial administration, and which have already dishonored the until now immaculate name of America and her foreign policy. Do not be deceived by false charges, nor allured by false promises. Give judgment without hypocrisy and without self-deception. On the one hand your honor and your glorious traditions are calling upon you to accord to us our rightful and well-earned independence. On the other hand the distorted dreams of avarice, the dark conspiracies of greed and remorseless ambition, nurses of imperialism throughout all time, these counsel you to uphold the war of subjugation which your rulers, but not your people, have authorized and forced upon us. Choose, then, sons of Washington, of Jefferson and of Lincoln, between these two alternatives:

Freedom for the hapless peoples who are in your power, and thus, under God's just laws, the recompense to you of a larger freedom for yourselves, or, tyranny and destruction for your struggling but helpless victims, whose wrongs the Great Ruler of all will in due time avenge by the mournful destruction of your own liberties. Shall it be generosity, or colonial greed? Shall it be right, or wrong? Give ear to your own conscience, and we are sure you will incline yourselves toward mercy, toward justice, and toward the only honorable course that will restore peace to our ransacked homes and to our devastated fields, stopping at once and forever this horrible war which has already cost so much in treasure and blood, and which, if not abandoned, will yet cost much more, because our resolution is fixed: Liberty or death; independence or annihilation.

Why do the imperialists wish to subjugate us? What do they intend to do with us? Do they expect us to surrender—to yield our inalienable rights, our homes, our properties, our lives, our future destinies, to the absolute control of the United States? What would you do with our 9,000,000 of people? Would you permit us to take part in your elections? Would you concede to us the privilege of sending senators and representatives to your congress? Would you allow us to erect one or more federal states? Or, would you tax us without representation? Would you change your tariff laws so as to admit our products free of duty and in competition with the products of our own soil? And thus would you allow the American trusts to utilize our cheap labor in the manufacture of goods that would compete with the products of your own factories? Would you permit the trusts to bottle up our people to subserve their own ends, depriving us even of those liberties which you are enjoying? Would you admit our artisans, mechanics, laborers and servants to take employment in your country on an equal footing with American citizens, Indians and negroes? Would you allow us to prohibit Chinese immigration? Would you permit us to retain our own language and not force us to adopt yours? Would you let us elect our own local officers? Would you allow us to share your offices, your honors and your privileges? And, as for the saloons (which were almost unknown in Manila before) would you allow them to go on multiplying at the appalling rate at which their number has increased there within the past two years? Would you allow the lands in

the Philippines to remain at all untaxed, as formerly, simply because some religious corporations have acquired enormous and fraudulent properties in them? Would you remove your American soldiery and permit us to create an army of our own? Or, if you were determined to maintain a powerful army and fleet in order to protect your newly-acquired "property" from foreign ambitions, and from our natural and perpetual anxieties for liberty, would you do this solely at your own expense, because the revenues of a poor country like ours could not do so? You who so ardently protest against the destruction by England of two small republics which challenged her to war, would you continue to remain indifferent whilst your rulers are engaged in annihilating a weaker republic which is much more helpless than those of South Africa, and which, far from declaring war against you, was your obliging friend, your successful ally? What would you do with the Philippines and with the Filipinos if you refused to allow them to become a new American state, if you refused to allow them to enjoy your citizenship?

Imperialism knows not how to answer these questions. It is inspired only by greed, by a vile thirst for gold and by the lust of spoliation. But, ever misled by its ruthless impulses, it cannot determine which would be its better plan, which should be its settled purpose for the future, or how far it may safely indulge its insatiable appetites. For the dilemma is inexorable; either the retention of the Philippine islands, if it is realized with a noble purpose, will result in great harm to your industries and your commerce, or, it will become a system of merciless and shameful colonial spoliation which will forever blot out the honor of whatever there is that is lofty and noble in your history. Can it be possible, sons of America, that you will allow us to become subjects or slaves? Should this happen, how will you reconcile it with the wise and noble principles set forth in your Declaration of Independence: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Will you transform these beautiful and honorable sentiments into specious deceptions, fraudulent promises and high-sounding but hollow words? No! You cannot belie your whole history. You cannot tolerate the violation

which imperialism is so evidently working against your most venerable and fundamental principles. Until congress succeeds in redressing the illegal aggressions of which we are the victims, and shall suppress these violations of reason, of solemn contracts and of the elementary conceptions of gratitude, we shall rely upon and appeal to the high sense of justice which has hitherto so honorably characterized the free American conscience. We do not believe you will allow us to be enslaved; it would be a dishonor to yourselves.

Influence, then, as soon as possible your legislators and rulers to give us self-government, which by right belongs to us, and peace will be restored immediately, to your benefit and ours, ending the now incessant and fruitless bloodshed entailed upon us by the present war.

We are ready to make peace, and, in order to facilitate this end, we propose:

First. That we will pay back to the United States the \$20,000,000 paid by them to Spain.

Second. That the most amicable and perpetual commercial relations shall exist between us for our mutual benefit and for the greater progress of our country.

Third. That we will grant the United States whatever space is reasonably necessary for coaling stations outside of our established cities.

Fourth. That we will not allow monopolies of any kind in the islands, and that we will give to your citizens all the guarantees and protection accorded to our own citizens for the security of life and property.

Fifth. That we are ready to entertain whatever terms you may desire for yourselves, so long as they do not infringe upon our individual and political liberties, or upon the integrity of our nationality.

After these offers, it only remains that you, the free citizens of America, for the glory of your name throughout the world and for the honor of your flag, shall do justice. Thus shall the hands of your noble sons be no longer stained with innocent blood. Thus shall it not be said that the vile inspirations of greed have banished from your hearts those lofty traditions of liberty and philanthropy which you have inherited from your honest forefathers.

For the Central Filipino Committee,  
G. APACIBLE.  
Toronto, June, 1900.

Doctor of the Old School—The child appears to be teething.

Doctor of the New School—Impossible! The bacteriological diagnosis discloses no trace whatever of the characteristic teething bacillus. — Detroit Journal.

An Atchison (Kan.) man points with pride to the honesty of inhabitants of that city as exemplified in the fact that a woman left a well-filled pocketbook on a chair in front of a hotel there and found it safe and unripped on returning several hours later. A jealous contemporary in a rival town comments on this circumstance as follows: "As a rule people pass along the streets of the place oftener than this. It really isn't so bad as the story would indicate."—Chicago Chronicle.

Trusts in industries naturally competitive may safely be left to the operations of natural law after they have been deprived of the special privileges and protection which the law may now confer or tolerate. Discriminating railway privileges and tariff protection alone enable them in the long run to impose upon the public. They will become harmless so far as they exist at all after these aids to monopoly building and extortion have been withdrawn.—Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

It is noted with considerable concern that the American flag has been raised in China. Of course, it can never be hauled down, and there are several times as many millions of Chinese for "benevolent assimilation" as there ever have been Filipinos.—Manchester (N. H.) Union.

He—In case of doubt play a trump!  
She—But, dear me! I haven't that many trumps!—Puck.

She—I wish I could be as contented as you!

He—Oh! I ain't contented—only I don't think it's wuth while to worry about it!—Puck.

### BOOK NOTICES.

Another valuable contribution to the literature of taxation is from the pen of William S. Rann—"Our Farmers of the Revenue" (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth). Mr. Rann, who is assistant corporation counsel of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., writes as a lawyer. His object is to show that the farmers of the revenue, to whom in former times the function of collecting taxes was farmed out under contract, were prototypes of the owners of street franchises, railroad franchises and the title deeds to land of our day. The point is that franchise values and land rent are naturally public revenue. That being so, their owners are, indeed, farmers of the public revenue. They buy the right to collect and retain public funds. But Mr. Rann's book does more than draw this suggestive parallel. It lucidly discusses the legal aspects of the single tax with especial reference to its fiscal characteristics. One of the illustrations is an exceedingly interesting outline story of the old patron system of New York. Another is the story of the Holland land purchase. In an appendix Mr. Rann pays his respects in a brief but delightfully effective manner to Prof. Sellgman, of Columbia college, whose

whimsical attack upon the single tax is more comical than profound.

A pamphlet on "Wages the Mother of Profit," by E. H. Putnam, published by the author at Moline, Ill., looks to high wages as the necessary basis of prosperity. It accordingly proposes as the sovereign cure for hard times that wages be increased until the demand for goods, stimulated by the greater purchasing power of working men, equals the supply. "From this basis," says the author, "human society will advance with bewildering rapidity to a condition of universal affluence." Mr. Putnam offers no suggestion of a method for raising wages. Having demonstrated his proposition that an average wage rate is the basis of universal prosperity, he contents himself with the assurance that when this shall be generally recognized as true men will find means for establishing the rate.

### Public Libraries and Reading Rooms which receive THE PUBLIC weekly:

Mobile, Ala., Ettel's Restaurant, 72 Dauphin St.  
Mobile, Ala., Reading Room, Y. M. C. A. Bldg.  
New Westminster, B. C., Public Library.  
Berkeley, Cal., Public Library.  
Pasadena, Cal., Public Library.  
San Francisco, Cal., Mechanics' Institute Library.  
Colorado Springs, Col., Free Reading Room.  
Como, Col., Reading Rooms.  
Denver, Col., Public Library.  
Wilmington, Del., Institute Free Library, 5th and Market Sts.  
Wilmington, Del., Young Men's Single Tax Club, 4th and Shipley Sts.  
Orlando, Fla., Direct-Legislation Reading Rooms.  
Chicago, Ill., C. L. & A. Club, 38th St. & Cottage Grove Ave.  
Chicago, Ill., E. M. & I. Club, 39th & Wabash Ave.  
Chicago, Ill., L. & A. Asso., 61st & State Sts.  
Chicago, Ill., Reading Room Atlantic Hotel, cor. Van Buren and Sherman Sts.  
Chicago, Ill., Six Branch Reading Rooms of Public Library.  
Chicago, Ill., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, Hyde Park.  
Elgin, Ill., Gall Borden Public Library.  
Elgin, Ill., Y. M. C. A. Library.  
Geneva, Ill., Public Library.  
Maywood, Ill., Public Library.  
Normal, Ill., Public Reading Room.  
Peoria, Ill., Public Library.  
Urbana, Ill., University Library.  
Muncie, Ind., Trades' Council Library.  
Terre Haute, Ind., Reading Room of Central Labor Union.  
Cedar Rapids, Ia., Public Library.  
Des Moines, Ia., Public Library.  
Sioux City, Ia., Public Library.  
Atchison, Kan., Public Library.  
New Orleans, La., Fisk Free Library.  
Boston, Mass., Public Library.  
New Bedford, Mass., Free Public Library.  
Stoneham, Mass., Public Library.  
Stoughton, Mass., Public Library.  
Wakefield, Mass., Public Reading Room.  
Worcester, Mass., Free Public Library.  
Kalamazoo, Mich., Library of Kalamazoo College.  
Midland, Mich., Free Reading Room.  
Minneapolis, Minn., Public Library.  
Meridian, Miss., Reading Room, R. R. Y. M. C. A.  
St. Louis, Mo., Free Reading Room of St. Stephen's House, 520 Rutger St.  
St. Louis, Mo., Public Library.  
St. Louis, Mo., Reading Room of Aschenbroedel Club, 604 Market St.  
Helena, Mont., Public Library.  
Newark, N. J., Free Public Library.  
Albuquerque, N. M., Public Library.  
Brooklyn, N. Y., Brooklyn Library, Montague St.  
Brooklyn, N. Y., Pratt Institute Free Library, Ryerson St.  
Buffalo, N. Y., Public Library.  
New York, N. Y., Manhattan Single Tax Club, 119 E. 23d St.  
New York, N. Y., Social Reform Club, 45 University Pl.

Riverhead, N. Y., Free Reading Room.  
 Syracuse, N. Y., Central Library.  
 Wyoming, N. Y., Free Library.  
 Fargo, N. D., Equal Suffrage Library.  
 Cincinnati, Ohio, Public Library.  
 Cleveland, Ohio, Case Library.  
 Columbus, Ohio, City Public Library.  
 Newark, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.  
 Toledo, Ohio, Library Travelling Men's Assn.  
 Troy, Ohio, Public Library.  
 Youngstown, Ohio, Haselton Public Library.  
 Youngstown, Ohio, Hotel Radcliffe.  
 Youngstown, Ohio, Public Library.  
 Youngstown, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.  
 Portland, Ore., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.  
 Silverton, Ore., Library Liberal University.  
 Allegheny, Pa., Carnegie Library.  
 Braddock, Pa., Carnegie Library.  
 Conemaugh, Pa., P. R. Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.  
 Du Bois, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.  
 Homestead, Pa., Carnegie Library.  
 McKees Rocks, Pa., R. R. Reading Room Y. W. C. A.  
 Philadelphia, Pa., Economic Library, 1315 Filbert St.  
 Philadelphia, Pa., Free Reading Room of Henry George Club, 27 No. Juniper St.  
 Pittsburgh, Pa., Carnegie Library—Lawrenceville Branch, West End Branch and Wylie Ave. Branch.  
 Pittsburgh, Pa., Central Library.  
 Pittsburgh, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, 43d and Butler Sts.  
 Reading, Pa., Library, 5th and Franklin Sts.  
 Willmerding, Pa., Public Library.  
 Peacedale, R. I., Narragansett Library.  
 Providence, R. I., Public Library  
 El Paso, Tex., Public Library, City Hall.  
 Houston, Tex., Houston Lyceum.  
 Seattle, Wash., Public Library.  
 Milwaukee, Wis., South Side Branch of Public Library  
 Seattle, Wash., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.  
 (The Public is not admitted to the Y. M. C. A. Reading Rooms at 7th & Penn Ave. and at the East Liberty Branch at Pittsburgh, Pa.)

THE DOCUMENTARY OUTLINE  
OF THE

Philippine Case

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

CAMPAIGN OFFER:

To extend its circulation and influence during the presidential campaign,

THE PUBLIC

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

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

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

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING

HANDEL HALL,

40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.

Program for Friday, July 27th.

MR. CLARENCE MOELLER,

"The Single Tax."

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE.

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

LAWYERS,

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

NELLIE CARLIN.

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

1302 Ashland Block, Chicago.

Telephone Central 925.

Houston.

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

EDUCATIONAL.

THE KATHERINE L. MALTBY  
HOME AND SCHOOL.

NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS,  
160 Joralemon Street.

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



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

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

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

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

A mortgage is like Deacon Smith's mule, "dreadful sot in its ways." It has a habit of bobbing up regularly. While you live you can take care of it. After that,—well, you'd be wise now to 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. M. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conneaut, Ohio. Catalogues FREE.

JOIN THOSE  
WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn  
Street, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.