

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1900.

Number 113.

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.

President McKinley's new Philippine commission, just arrived at Hongkong, assures the newspaper correspondents that it confidently expects "to pacify the Philippines rapidly." But didn't Gen. Otis pacify them before he left Manila? He said he did.

"Once Lord Roberts gets control of the Johannesburg mines," says a prominent mining stock broker of London, as reported by cable, "the war is over so far as the mine owners are concerned." Doubtless. Its whole object, so far as the mine owners are concerned, will have been accomplished. But so far as the tory ministry of Great Britain is concerned, the war will not be over until the independence of the two Boer republics has been destroyed; for that was the ministry's object in getting it started.

The forty-fourth anniversary of the birth of the republican party was celebrated last week at Bloomington, Ill. The fourth anniversary of its death will be celebrated all over the United States next November. For the republican party did die when the republican principles of Lincoln were crowded out of it to make room for the plutocratic principles of Hanna.

Kansas is badly in need of 20,000 harvest hands. So the word goes around. And many is the homily to unemployed workmen in other parts of the country for which that statement will be made a text by plutocratic papers. But may not the unemployed, before mobilizing in

Kansas, reasonably ask what Kansas would do with them after the harvest is in and their labor is no longer needed?

Col. Parker, president of the Chicago Institute and a famous educator of this city, when addressing the Illinois congress of mothers strengthened a sentiment among the delegates in favor of an auxiliary organization for fathers. The idea is sound. But the new organization ought not to be auxiliary. If the interests of children are the chief object in view the congress should be not one of mothers with a masculine attachment, but one of mothers and fathers. The feminine and the masculine principles are always complementary. Neither is ever complete without the other.

An injunction has been issued by the federal court in Missouri against a postmaster of that state, forbidding his obedience to an order of the postmaster general which directs him to confiscate the mail of a firm charged with using the mails for purposes of fraud. It would be too much to hope that the injunction might be sustained. But it ought to be. It were better to let fraud flourish than to stamp it out by means of a censorship of the mails which, if not checked, will yet be extended so as to hamper freedom of legitimate communication. The matter has gone so far even now that a strong legal case, resting upon precedent, could be made in support of a law prohibiting the carrying through the mails of political documents, such, for instance, as socialist tracts.

It has just come out that the captain of an American warship in the Philippines wantonly shot and killed a Filipino in a Philippine harbor on the 21st of November, 1898. The

Filipino, in a shore boat, came within hailing distance of this naval officer's ship, and was fatally saluted with a bullet from the captain's pistol, an act for which the captain is now to be tried by court-martial. From the specifications presented to the court-martial it appears that he "did wilfully and without justifiable cause, and without the exercise of proper discretion," commit this murderous act. But he is to be tried for it? Yes, indeed! Such a crime must not go unpunished. He is to be tried for—murder? manslaughter? Well, not for either; but "scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals," and "conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline"! Conviction will doubtless bring down upon him the penalty at least of an "awfully severe reprimand."

"Government by injunction" has been overhauled by a committee of lawyers appointed by the Social Reform club of New York city. Among the members of this committee we recognize the well-known names of John Brooks Leavitt, Ernest H. Crosby and John D. Kernan. Mr. Crosby would not be classed at all as conservative, but Mr. Brooks and Mr. Kernan, the latter a son of the late distinguished Senator Kernan, of New York, are as conservative, both as lawyers and men, as is possible without some degree of collusion with the devil. The report of this committee, being unanimous, may therefore be viewed as a conservative document. So regarded, it is about the severest rebuke that government by injunction has yet encountered.

The committee took for its starting point the Debs case, as decided by the federal supreme court, regarding which it believes there has been much popular misunderstanding.

ing. Upon its analysis, that decision sustains injunctions by federal courts against such obstructions of highways as tend to impair rights of interstate commerce or interfere with the transmission of the mails; and it justifies punishment for contempt without jury trial in cases of violations of injunctions, even when the act enjoined constitutes a crime with its constitutional guarantees of trial by jury. But the decision does not warrant the punishment of persons not made parties to the action in which the injunction issues, nor the granting of injunctions against the exercise of any lawful act, such as lawful gatherings upon the highways or the exercise of the right of free speech. And the committee is of opinion that the supreme court would countenance no such "gross usurpations of judicial power." In support of this view it quotes from Judge Brewer's opinion in the Debs case, where he says that the complaint or "bill" in that case—

was only to restrain forcible obstructions to the highways along which interstate commerce travels and the mails are carried.

Stress is laid upon the word "only" in this quotation. Yet the committee finds that just such "gross usurpations" have been indulged in by lower courts upon the assumed authority of the Debs case. In the wire trust case in Cleveland a federal court enjoined strikers "from in any manner interfering with" the trust's business. In the Wheeling railway case, another federal court sent two men to jail for contempt of an injunction to which they were not parties nor the agents of parties, for "reviling" and "cursing" employes of the railway company. "If," says the committee, "these men had not actually served out an imprisonment in jail for 30 days as a punishment for contempt of corporation, it might be thought that your committee had taken this example from opera bouffe." Another instance of usurpation cited is that of a New York judge, Freedman, who not only enjoined

striking cigar makers from "picketing," an act which the highest court of the state has shrunk from holding to be unlawful, but prohibited the payment of relief money to strikers, and in describing the act of "picketing" made the injunction so comprehensive as virtually to forbid peaceable and conciliatory communications. All this is condemned by the committee, and made the basis of a charge, couched in the most temperate language, that many of our judges of late years, especially those of the United States courts, have by their usurping injunctions placed themselves in the category of those worst of offenders in a republic—men who so act as to "break down reverence for law and respect for the courts."

To remedy the manifest mischief of allowing these usurping judges to act under cover of contempt proceedings as juries in their own cases, the committee recommends certain restrictions which commend themselves to the serious consideration of a vigilant public. It proposes, in the first place, that the judges of the lower federal courts be elected by the people of their respective districts, as is done with reference to state judges in at least 32 of the most important states of the union; and that appointments of supreme court judges be made exclusively from among judges of the lower federal and of the state courts who have served upon the bench at least ten years immediately prior to appointment. That would certainly end the flagrant evil of presidential appointments from the corps of corporation lawyers. The other recommendations of the committee are that injunctions shall issue against no one but the parties to a suit and their agents; that any prohibition by injunction of a lawful use of highways, of the right of free speech, or of lawful combinations, shall nullify the entire injunction; that any act of disobedience which constitutes an indictable crime shall be tried by jury, if the person charged demands it; that upon application for

preliminary injunctions in labor cases, when there are disputed questions of fact, either party shall be entitled to demand a jury trial; and that general labor organizations be requested to carry all labor questions arising under existing law to the highest courts, to the end that "any usurpation of judicial power in any court of the land, however distant or obscure, may be effectually restrained and brought to naught." The last recommendation is a wise one, and labor organizations may wisely act upon it; but we have less confidence than the committee so conservatively professes, that judicial usurpation would thereby be brought to naught. It is the experience of history that usurpation is one of the characteristics of the judicial establishment. Though it often obstructs usurpations by other departments of the government, it most frequently double rivets its own. Some of the other recommendations are new, and all of them seem to be wise. They at any rate testify to a growing disposition, even in conservative quarters, to resist the tide of usurpation by the federal judiciary.

A very different state of affairs in the Philippines from that inferred by Bishop Potter has been discovered by George Ade, the brilliant and thoughtful journalist who was sent there by the Chicago Record to make a special investigation. While four days in the military atmosphere of Manila enabled the bishop to say that the question of subjugating the Filipinos is now merely academic, Mr. Ade finds, after three weeks' intercourse with all sorts of well-informed people, not only at Manila but in several other places on the island of Luzon, that "our 'peace' in the Philippines is of very unstable quality." The pacification is a sham, and the attempts to conceal the real state of things by characterizing the Filipino troops as "ladrones" or robber bands has become a grim joke. Every reasonably well-informed person in Manila knows that these bands, in

stead of being "ladrones," as the local newspapers are forced by the American military censor to call them, are detachments of the Filipino army, fighting for independence. When defeated in warfare, according to the rules of the game, Aguinaldo reorganized his army into small companies and ordered a guerrilla warfare. Everywhere on the best of terms with the people, these companies make it dangerous for foreigners to go beyond the outposts of a garrison, and so hold the country against American subjugation, except in the immediate presence of American soldiers with loaded guns.

Such is the hopeless situation as Mr. Ade reports it, and he gives excellent reasons for its being so. The Filipinos have no confidence in the Americans; do not believe that they tell the truth; regard every fair promise as some new trick to deceive them—suspicions that have been excited and confirmed by the vindictive spirit and merciless conduct of the American troops. Our only friends in the Philippines, according to Mr. Ade's observations, are the European business element, and one savage tribe, the Macabebes, who are hereditary enemies of the civilized Filipinos.

Mr. Ade sums up the Philippine question in three principal aspects, as follows: In the United States: "What is our duty toward the Filipinos?" With the army: "How can we stamp out the insurrection?" And with the advance guard of American business men in Manila: "What shall we do to make money?" To the Filipinos there is still another aspect. It is how to drive out the foresworn nation of mankillers and money hunters, which has displaced Spain as the cruel autocrat of their long suffering country.

When Senator Spooner, speaking on the floor of the senate, was asked what he proposed to do with the Filipinos after enforcing upon their peo-

ple the authority of this government, he hotly replied:

To give the people honest, even-handed justice and good government; to protect life and property; to fill the land with schoolhouses; to give the people such part in the government as they may show themselves fitted for; to maintain the laws so honestly and firmly that no man, however rich, shall be beyond their reach and no man so humble that he may not have their protection.

Mr. Spooner was altogether too hot to be judicial or even senatorial. The Filipinos themselves protected life and property, until the Americans devastated their land and slaughtered their people as even the brutal Spaniards never did. That they did protect life and property is proved by the official report of Leonard R. Sargent, American naval cadet, and W. B. Wilcox, American naval paymaster, who spent two months in the very heart of the Filipino republic in Luzon a few weeks before the American tornado of death and destruction set in. Sargent wrote to the *Outlook* (September 2, 1899, page 17) that he and his companion had returned to Manila after their extended tour in the interior, "with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which" they "found the natives to be leading under the new regime." As to schoolhouses, Luzon was always well supplied with them before the American holocaust. And if Mr. Spooner succeeds in giving the Filipinos just laws so maintained "that no man, however rich, shall be beyond their reach, and no man so humble that he may not have their protection," he will perform the political miracle of extending to the Filipinos a government such as no civilized nation enjoys. If Mr. Spooner is possessed of this miraculous power, he should give his own countrymen the benefit of it to begin with. But it is to be feared that Mr. Spooner, in his heat, outspoke himself.

This seems to be one of Senator Spooner's defects. A few days before, he grew very warm because Senator Hale, one of the republican senators from Maine, referred to the

American defalcations in Cuba as a lesson to the Cubans of "fraud, speculation, cheating, misappropriation of revenues, stealing, a carnival in every direction of corruption and fraud." So badly rattled at that indictment of our Cuban occupation was Senator Spooner, that he made the tactical blunder of saying it was tiresome for him to be called upon from the republican side of the senate "to reply to a democratic speech"! His angry remark, as it appears in cold type, must look to Senator Spooner like one of those things "one would rather have put differently." To the unsophisticated republican reader, at any rate, it must certainly have a bitter flavor. It reads too much like a defiant confession that it is regarded as a party obligation among administration republicans to characterize administration frauds tenderly. It might even suggest to the irreverent that Mr. Spooner regards it as the function of democrats to denounce rascality in high places and of republicans to palliate it.

Well was it for the public, however, that Mr. Spooner grew thus warm with Senator Hale, for it brought from the latter a declaration that needed to be spoken from his side of the chamber. Said Mr. Hale:

I think there are very powerful influences in this country—largely located in New York city, largely speculative and connected with money-making enterprises—that are determined that we shall never give up Cuba. I think that the time will never come unless something earnest and drastic is done by congress that the last soldier of the United States will be withdrawn from Cuban soil. I do not think the president favors holding Cuba. I discovered very powerful influences—commercial, mercantile, money and political—that are opposed to our ever withdrawing from Cuba. I take up the newspapers that are foremost in the large cities and I find every day intimations and hints that we are never to withdraw from Cuba.

What Senator Hale said, the people, including hosts of sorely disappointed republicans, have long been thinking.

There is an accumulation of good reasons for believing not only that exploiters of the administration but the administration itself has long contemplated grabbing Cuba. Did not the president in his special message of April 11, 1896, ask for authority to establish a stable government in Cuba without recognizing Cuban independence? Did not the administration ring in congress opposite to the last that clause of the joint resolution of April 13, 1896, which recognized the independence of "the republic of Cuba?" Did not the administration evade the plain intention of that resolution by refusing to recognize the republic of Cuba? Did it not further disregard both the spirit and the terms of that resolution by subverting the republic of Cuba? Instead of obeying the resolution of congress, signed by himself and part of the law of the land, by recognizing and establishing the republic of Cuba, the president has maintained for nearly two years an American military autocracy there on pretense of organizing another republic in Cuba, because the one recognized by a law of congress did not suit him. Why has he done this? What does it portend? Does not his policy with reference to Porto Rico and the Philippines answer the question? Bound with regard to them by no specific requirements of the Cuban resolution of congress, but only by its spirit, he assumed to annex them. These are acts which, in accordance with familiar rules of proof, throw light upon his purpose. It is only by men's acts that their motives can be ascertained, and every day in the criminal court rooms that method is availed of. Taking McKinley's whole Cuban-Philippine-Puerto Rican policy together, viewing it in the light of his actions, and considering it with reference to the joint resolutions of 1896 recognizing the independence of the republic of Cuba, and there is enough evidence to convince any unbiased jury that Mr. McKinley has all along intended to deprive all these countries of independence. Senator Hale's suspicions are

not unfounded. American troops will never be withdrawn from Cuba if Mr. McKinley can prevent it.

At a recent sale of part of the site of the Auditorium Annex, Nos. 9 and 11 Congress street, Chicago, that tiny piece of ground brought \$135,000. A little figuring upon this transaction may enlighten those bucolic victims of newspaper misrepresentation who think that "farmers own all the land." The piece of ground in question is $34\frac{1}{2}$ by 102 feet in area, or $3,480\frac{1}{2}$ square feet. The sale, therefore, was at the rate per acre of \$1,698,840. As the average value of Illinois farms, as shown by the Illinois labor report for 1894, is \$2,050, one acre of Chicago land located as the Annex site is is equal in value to 828 improved Illinois farms. The fraction of an acre actually sold for \$135,000 is equal in value to 65 such farms. Observe that the price paid for this city lot was merely for the land. No interest whatever was conveyed in the improvements. It was land, nothing but land, precisely the same sort of soil as that in which farmers raise corn, and only the soil; yet its purchaser has acquired a monopoly in the earth as valuable as a monopoly of 65 farms would be. Is it not time, then, when inquiries as to American landlordism are being made, to turn public attention somewhat to these vast holdings in cities? When measured by value, most of our land is in cities, and not in farming districts. The farmers, even proprietary farmers, own comparatively little land, measuring land by its value instead of its area. And it is value, not area, that counts in land monopoly.

At the recent race conference of white southern democrats, held at Montgomery, there was nothing really remarkable in the inclination exhibited to agitate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment. The men who urged this are not democrats in

truth. If they wear the democratic label, that is chiefly because it is an inheritance from those ante-bellum days when the slave oligarchy controlled the democratic party in power as the trust oligarchy now controls the republican party in power. They know not Jefferson, with his theory that all men are created with equal rights, any more than the administration republicans know Lincoln with his theory of government by the people governed. It would be remarkable if men like these did not agitate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment. They have long wanted it repealed, and now the time for agitation must seem ripe. Have not the administration republicans invited just that agitation and indicated their disposition to support it? All this talk in the north about putting inferior peoples under tutelage, all this regret for the "mistake" of elevating the negro to equal political rights, all this official sympathy with England in her war of subjugation against the Boers, all these efforts to conquer the brave little "niggers" (as they call them) of the Philippines, all this turning away from democratic ideals—what does it mean and from whom does it come? It comes from northern republicans who have forgotten Lincoln, and it means that white men must govern and black men must serve. This is part of the "white man's burden." It means essentially more than that. Not only must white men govern black men, but the rich must govern all. Plutocracy and imperialism, these two in one, rising together above the northern political horizon as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, but black with a menace to equal rights, are what southern aristocrats of the ante-bellum type see to encourage their proposed assault upon the fifteenth amendment. Toombs democrats of the south and Hanna-McKinley republicans of the north are finding common ground upon which to meet. Political equality of the masses, black and white, is the object of their attack. They clasp hands now upon the doctrine that "superior" races must govern; in a

little while they will clasp hands upon the doctrine that rich men must rule.

At the request of friends in Australia we publish the following letter on the subject of the South African war, with the assurance to begin with that our attitude toward this war is not only not inspired by anti-British feeling, but that we are as intolerant of that species of back-action patriotism as we are of the other kind. Our correspondent, Wesley Spragg, writing from Auckland says:

Your opinions upon the Boer war are, I have reason to believe, the result of imperfect information. None of us here who know you suppose that you are allowing unworthy anti-British feelings to dictate your words. We think you are in this, as in other matters, actuated by your love of right. That is, right as you see it. I do not want to thrust opinions upon you against your will, but it may be well for you to know that reformers here are in favor of the prosecution of the present war by British arms. With a desire to give you our opinion I enclose herewith an extract from a letter by Mrs. Lewis, sister of Schreiner, the Cape Colony premier, and a member of an ultra pro-Boer family. This letter expresses what is believed by us, with some knowledge and evidence to justify our opinions, to be a fair statement of the issues concerned in this war. Some of our fellows, single taxers and ardent reformers, have lived in the Transvaal and in Cape Colony, and these men confirm the charges contained in Mrs. Lewis's letter. Indeed the insolence, oppression and inhumanities of the Boers, of which they are personally aware, have positively scorched their memories. That there are no unworthy persons, with unworthy motives, upon the British side none of us here are so foolish as to suppose. We lament that the spending of British treasure and good British blood should be taken advantage of, as it inevitably will be, by grabbers of the various kinds, who will doubtless seek for and obtain privileges and will set up injustices. This wresting of a thing, righteous in itself, and in the main making for righteousness, is apparently incidental to even the best civilization of the century. While this is a matter for the keenest regret and one calling for the most strenuous efforts of reformers to correct wrong conditions, there is in our minds no question that the present war is one for the destruction of more brutal

oppression and a preparation for the advance of right, and consequently for the good of the human race. Your war with the Philippines, I agree with you, is quite inexcusable; and your Cuban war, as some of us saw it, was only feebly justifiable as compared with Britain's present position. Even your war of independence (which no one has more cause to be thankful for than we British colonists) was a hasty needless revolt by comparison. Your civil war, which resulted in the abolition of chattel slavery, is the nearest parallel to the present just war which Britain is waging in the interests of humanity in South Africa. The quotation attached is the important part of this communication.

Mr. Spragg's reference to the American civil war is not an apt comparison. The coercion of the southern states by the general government, whether right or wrong, was in no possible sense a conquest. Those states were voluntary partners with the other states in a federal compact. They insisted that the compact was not perpetual; the other states insisted that it was. There was no place to try that question except upon the battle field, and as a result the south was coerced to remain in the partnership. The slavery question, though the cause of the war, was not the issue. It was conceded on all hands that the north would have had no right to make war for the abolition of slavery; and Lincoln very cautiously defined his emancipation proclamation as a military act applying only to rebellious territory.

Aside from his comparison of the American civil war with the British war in South Africa, there is nothing whatever in Mr. Spragg's letter to challenge our position toward the latter. He appears, indeed, to rest his whole conclusion upon the extract from Mrs. Lewis's letter which he incloses, and of which he says that it expresses what is believed by him and his friends, "with some knowledge and evidence to justify" their opinions, to be a fair statement of the issues. We shall therefore print so much of the extract as can possibly, from any point of view, be

regarded as stating those issues. Mrs. Lewis says:

If ever there was a war for the Lord of Hosts, if ever there was a war for truth and right, for putting down of oppression and wrong, for the deliverance of a people powerless to deliver themselves, whose wrongs have cried up to heaven, until the Lord has come down to deliver them, this is that war. It is not the grievances of the Uitlanders, though they have been very real, and have called for justice; it is not what British subjects have had to suffer of indignities and wrongs, though they have been numerous under recent Transvaal administration; it is not the insult to England's power and prestige shown by the refusal to concede her moderate demands for justice to be done to her subjects, followed by the unparalleled act of defiance contained in the Transvaal war ultimatum—it is not these things, however they may justly stir the national heart, which call upon us as Christians to bring the united force of God's people, by the power of believing in prayer, to bear upon this war question. British soldiers are dying on African soil to-day to put an end to atrocious wrong. For over 200 years the progenitors of the Transvaal republic and their descendants have crushed, maltreated, and, as far as they have had power to do so, robbed of all rights belonging to them as fellow human beings the colored peoples of this land. On every side individual brutalities were being committed on defenseless victims, and that not by Arab slave drivers, or Moslem oppressors, but by a professedly Christian and highly religious people, who, with the Bible in their hands, and loud profession of faith and prayers, were practicing barbarities, in peace as well as war, which put to shame the records of what the savages of this land have inflicted, even in war time, upon white races.

If that "is a fair statement of the issues concerned in this war," as Mr. Spragg says it is, then the cause of the British is fully as bad as we had supposed. Observe that the whole indictment is not only vaguely general, but one which might be made against any people where slavery had prevailed and the enslaved class remained distinct after having been emancipated. If Mrs. Lewis were to read the story of American slavery for 200 years prior to 1864, and then hear an account or two from eyewitnesses of the horrible mutilation and burning of negroes at the stake in some parts of

this country within a year, she could make as strong an indictment against the United States, and one as true, as she does make against the Boers. But we doubt if Mr. Spragg and his fellow reformers in Australia would therefore favor the prosecution of a war against the United States by the British ministry, nor yet by our outraged Canadian neighbors, even though he had personal knowledge of the truth of the indictment. The question of the justice of the British war in South Africa turns not upon the goodness or badness of the Boers in their internal government. Great Britain has no more right to regulate that than she would have to make war upon Russia to abolish knouting. It depends entirely upon whether it was wantonly made by either party.

That question must be decided, and in history it will be decided, against the British. They seized the Transvaal in 1877, making an unwarranted though bloodless conquest. The Jameson raiders, officered by British army officers, manned by a British police force and carrying the British flag, with the connivance of Rhodes and in all probability of Chamberlain, tried in 1895-96 to seize and subjugate it a second time. And in September-October, 1899, the British ministry threatened its extinction as a government, by force of arms, at the same time placing their active troops in strategic positions and calling out their reserves to make the threat good. It was not until after this that the Boers issued what Mrs. Lewis calls their "unparalleled act of defiance"—the ultimatum. Unparalleled! A powerful nation would not have waited so long. And even that ultimatum, as Mrs. Lewis and all the apologists for the British ministry always conveniently omit to state, was accompanied with an offer to peaceably submit all differences to arbitration. This rejected offer would put Great Britain in the wrong even if she had been in the right before. Lest Mr.

Spragg and our other friends in Australia may still think we are writing under the influence of "imperfect information," let us add the assurance that every word we have here uttered can be verified by reference to British histories and British blue books.

A movement has been started in Chicago to abolish special assessments for street improvement and to put the cost of such improvement upon the general tax levy. The principle urged in support of this change is that street improvements confer benefits upon the whole public. This is true only in one sense, a sense that is moreover irrelevant. Street improvements benefit the whole public only by affording accommodations to the whole public. But they benefit adjacent lot owners in another and very direct and substantial way. They increase the value of their lots. A good sidewalk, for instance, is beneficial to a tenant who must use it in going to and from his residence daily. It accommodates him. But it benefits his landlord financially. His landlord's property is increased in value by it. And the tenant has to pay a higher rent in consequence. In other words, he pays the landlord for his sidewalk accommodation. And that is the rule. Such benefit as the public generally may get from street improvements, they have to pay for to their landlords in increased rents. To make them pay also for the improvements is therefore double taxation. Though special assessments have been much abused in their application, the principle is sound and should not be lightly relinquished.

It is no longer possible to conceal the fictitious character of the "prosperity" of which so much has been heard by the masses during the past two years, and so little seen. The whole flimsy fabric is flapping and fluttering, and a collapse is apparently not far off. That business did experience an improvement, no one disputes; but the activity was due to the

necessity for somewhat replenishing empty shelves. There had been such a long period of starvation that some revival of demand was inevitable. This temporary spurt, when it came, was mistaken for prosperity. But it is over now. We are on the down grade, and shall go on down until the shelves get so bare again that replenishment again becomes a necessity. It would be only human if the bi-metallists attributed the approaching depression to the new gold standard law. They would be reasoning as their adversaries have done. The truth is, however, that the new period of adversity we are entering is not a new one at all, but a fluctuation in the depression that has been with us since 1890. The gold standard law has neither lifted us out of it nor put us into it. It has had no more to do with it, one way or the other, than the color of the chips in a gambling game has to do with the fall of the cards.

Our usually phlegmatic British brethren must henceforth modestly refrain from poking fun at the hysterical French for their unbridled emotions. Irrationally excitable as Frenchmen are, they could hardly have experienced a more severe attack of hysterics if they had conquered Germany than that which overwhelmed the English when Mafeking was relieved. Yet how small the matter that occasioned that display of British weakness. It was but the relief of a British garrison at a point which it had long been conceded ought not to have been garrisoned, and this in a wantonly aggressive war for the subjugation of two little republics with a population less than that of St. Louis. The English will always have many reasons for pride in their traditions, but this outbreak of super-French hysterics over Mafeking will not be accounted among them.

There is now pending before congress a bill, introduced in the senate by McMillan and in the house by Lentz, which should be passed with-

out delay. It is intended for the relief of persons that have occasion to send or receive money through the mail in small sums, and who are now embarrassed for want of some convenient and safe means of transmission. This bill would meet that requirement while furnishing the most convenient small change ever yet devised. It provides that post-check notes shall be substituted, to a certain extent, for the paper currency now in use. These notes would be of various denominations, from five cents to five dollars, and in size $2\frac{1}{4}$ by 4 inches, and a space would be left on each for writing in the name of a payee and his post office town. So long as this space remained blank the note would pass from hand to hand as money; but by filling in the space and affixing a postage stamp of one cent for notes under one dollar and of two cents for those above that amount, the holder of a note could make it payable to a particular person at a particular post office. These notes, therefore, would be exactly like paper money, except that they could be transmitted through the mail with the same safety as a money order or check. The effect of the bill consequently would be to replace all the paper currency of five dollars and under with post checks which, while passing from hand to hand as money, would at any moment be available for transmission as checks drawn to order.

IS IT THE DEAD CAPITAL OF A DYING REPUBLIC?

One needs to spend but a few weeks in Washington to feel the influence that the party in power has over visitors that come to the city even for a short time. All hesitate to make an adverse criticism concerning the war now pending in the Philippines, however strongly they may condemn it in their own minds.

It is no longer possible for citizens of the United States to remain in doubt upon the radical departure of the present incumbent of the white house from the principles and policies which have guided all presidents

in the past. Although this cannot commend itself to the intelligence and conscience of a large number of people, yet they are silenced, or almost stifled, if they attempt to express a conviction based upon the great principles enunciated in the declaration of independence.

How thoroughly the lash of the party in power whips all its members into line is well illustrated by a conversation with a congressman held in the parlor of the Riggs house. He was a man under 40, educated, one would think, as a true American patriot. The conversation was in part as follows:

"Then you approve of converting our republic into an empire?" To which he answered:

"Most assuredly I do."

"Do you believe in a revolutionary movement which will destroy the principles of the declaration of independence?"

"Oh, fie!" he replied. "What is the declaration of independence? Merely a piece of schoolboy oratory."

From whence is the influence which can so revolutionize the minds of our young men, especially those we trust to make our laws?

Three women's conventions were held in Washington during the month of February. All were silent upon this burning question of the hour. Officers of the Suffrage association made it difficult for its members to give any public expression concerning the Philippine horror, although many of them pronounced it the greatest crime of modern times. The Daughters of the American Revolution held their annual convention during the week which includes Washington's birthday. Long reports were made of the preservation of valuable relics of the revolutionary war, many of these antiquities being mere stocks and stones; but nothing was said about preserving our immortal declaration of independence and the constitution inherited from our forefathers. Also the Woman's National Single Tax League, which was organized in Washington in February, refused to pass a resolution denouncing the Philippine policy of the administration, because some of its members were in government employ. These organizations lost an opportu-

nity to make their influence felt when they did not permit the Philippine iniquity to be publicly discussed at this particular time. But we have a consolation in the fact that men possess the Australian ballot and by their votes can give forcible expression to their opinions with impunity.

LOUISA SOUTHWORTH.
Cleveland, O.

THE GREATEST WANT OF THE AGE.

This boasted nineteenth century of progress, of social activity and of so-called philanthropy has had many critics and detractors. Plenty of men have detected the hollowness of its civilization, and the questionable nature of its philanthropy. They have seen that material progress does not mean human happiness, that intellectual culture is not the same thing as moral culture, and that the moral progress of the human race is almost brought to a standstill by the huge spectre of international distrust. What the age wants is not somebody to tell it that there is "something rotten in the state of Denmark," but somebody to act as if he believed that there was.

In short, what we want is some indication on the part of those who know the truth, that they really believe it, and are prepared to make some sacrifices for it.

Let us for a moment "survey mankind from China to Peru." Do we not find that the best energies of the men of all nations are devoted to the manufacture of machines for slaughtering their fellow men, who have the same right to live as themselves? Do we not find that nations, even when not at "war" in the physical sense, are still in the habit of erecting tariff barriers on the boundaries, thus preventing that natural interchange of labor which God intended, and insuring the maximum of human exertion with the minimum result? Do we not find that the throne of the world is occupied by capitalization with its callous disregard for all the nobler aspects of human nature, that for its sake governments are prepared to make war, the law courts are prepared to decide that black is white, the newspapers are prepared to blacken the character of inoffensive tribes, the church is prepared to pour its mercenary bless-

ings upon its selfish designs, and national sentiment is, alas! only too ready to spill its blood in the diabolical cause without regard to the rights or wrongs of the quarrel? These are some of the prominent features of the present age, and they are so familiar to us that one has almost to apologize for mentioning them.

Yet, why should familiarity with evil slacken and dissolve our resolution until we become part of the evil itself? That is the great danger—the indifferentism that comes from familiarity. Men talk of wars in progress and wars about to be declared with as much indifference as if they were talking about the weather or the theater. The idea of slaughter entirely escapes their notice. Yet the same people would be shocked with the details of a single murder. For murder on a wholesale scale they have no compunction. All the same the murders that are being committed by the orders of fallible or corrupt governments with the approval, more or less, of the misguided peoples they rule, are identical in moral texture with the isolated cases which excite the indignation of ordinary citizens.

The guilt may be more difficult to localize, but it is there. Every one of these murders is committed in violation of the principle none the less true because it is not recognized—that the highest interests of the peoples of all nations are identical. It is a principle written clearly on the face of nature. England to-day, for instance, cannot injure the Boers without injuring herself. The war that will annihilate the two republics will also cost England the lives of 40,000 or 50,000 of her subjects, and (what is of more importance to the capitalist mind, for blood is cheap in these days of foolish patriotism), £60,000,000.

In the same way a nation cannot enrich itself by trade without enriching the nation with whom it trades. Cobden taught the English people the sound doctrine of the interdependence of nations, and with remarkable success, too, for his time. By his efforts he brought about greater freedom of trade between England and France, to the mutual benefit—till political ambition stepped in and usurped the place of common sense—of both countries.

There is, in short, no natural quarrel between the German and the Frenchman, between the Englishman and the Irishman, between the Russian and the Pole; the interests of all alike, being to live and let live. But there is a natural quarrel between me and the man who—be he foreigner or fellow countryman—takes away my right to live, or prevents me from buying and selling with my fellow man in any part of the world.

War has its uses in this world, but it must be a war not for the furtherance of personal or political ambition, nor for vengeance, nor for swelling the gains of capital, but for the defense of some clearly defined human right which is endangered. We have too many wars of the former class, and not enough of the latter. We want to declare war against monopoly and privilege and against all those artificial ordinances which place equal beings upon an unequal footing in the race for life. We want men who will carry the banner of political and economic truth and disentangle its teachings from the illusions of a spurious and hypocritical patriotism. We must bestir ourselves if we are what we say we are. Falsehood and Fraud can find millions of soldiers to fight for them, and why not Truth.

Liverpool, Eng.

T. SCANLON.

NEWS

At the close of our last report of the progress of the British war in South Africa, Lord Roberts had begun to advance with his center from Kroonstad northward toward Pretoria, and had reached the Rhenoster river, about half way between Kroonstad and the Vaal, the Boers, apparently outflanked, retreating in good order before him. This was on the 23d. For two or three days thereafter Lord Roberts was delayed at the Rhenoster, the stream not being fordable. A pontoon bridge was thrown across, however, and on the 26th his advance proceeded. The advancing line was 30 miles long, with Gen. French's cavalry on the left and Gen. Hamilton's mounted infantry on the right. Before this long line the Boers continued their retreat, apparently unable to cope with the vastly superior force that confronted them, either by concentrating, since that would expose

their flanks, or by extending their line, since that would fatally weaken it. On the 26th they had withdrawn to the north side of the Vaal. A crossing had already been effected by the British left at Grobler's drift, which is not far from Parys, a Free State town a few miles west of the railroad. At that time little news of the situation had been received, the censorship having been tightened; but it is now known that Roberts's force of 50,000 men crossed the Vaal on the 27th without opposition and was moving over the desert upon Johannesburg, 50 miles to the north, a suburb of which it occupied on the 29th. There was no serious fighting. The Boers continued their retreat, carrying their guns and supplies with them, and every effort on the part of Lord Roberts to surround and capture them failed. This is the situation from authentic sources of information as we go to press (May 31); but from unauthentic sources it is positively reported that both Johannesburg and Pretoria have been surrendered by the Boers, without the slightest resistance, and that President Kruger has fled from Pretoria to Waterfalboven, a small station on the Delagoa bay railway some 120 miles east from Pretoria.

On the 28th Lord Roberts formally declared the Orange Free State a British colony by right of conquest, under the name of the Orange River colony.

The British war office has decided to send 11,000 more troops to South Africa in June. The number already sent there is in round numbers 300,000, including colonials. No reports of British losses have been recently cabled, but the estimates of correspondents vary from 15,000 to 70,000.

An indication of British sentiment on the subject of the war in the Transvaal is supplied by the by-election at South Manchester, held since our last issue, for the purpose of filling the seat in the house of commons of the Marquis of Lorne, who goes to the house of lords as Duke of Argyll in place of his father, the late duke. South Manchester was formerly a liberal constituency, but it was carried in 1896 by the Marquis of Lorne by a majority of 78 in a poll of 8,836. At the recent election the seat was contested by a radical, and the issue was distinctly jingo. The radical opposed subjugation of the Boer republics and

his jingo adversary favored it. Though nominated by the liberal party, the radical was opposed by Lord Rosebery's wing of that party. His election would have sounded Rosebery's political death knell. The jingo candidate was elected by a majority of 2,039 in a poll of 8,955, the vote for him being 5,497 and that for the radical 3,458: Though this minority vote indicates a strong sentiment against subjugation, it clearly shows that the subjugation sentiment is dominant; and for that reason the Tories are urging an early general election, so that they may get the benefit of the wave of war feeling before it subsides.

The Boer envoys—Messrs. Wesels, Fischer and Wolmarans—whose arrival in this country was reported last week, are next week to be in Chicago, where elaborate preparations are making for their public reception. A committee of 200, with Judge Dunne at its head, is arranging to receive them at a mass meeting on the 5th at the Auditorium and Studebaker hall, where Webster Davis, Judge Moran, Judge Brentano, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, John F. Finerty, Dr. Thomas, Clarence S. Darrow, William P. Black, ex-Gov. Altgeld and the envoys themselves will speak. Other cities to be visited by these South African representatives are Baltimore, Philadelphia, Providence and Boston. The envoys have succeeded no better with the senate than with the president. A resolution of sympathy was on the 29th defeated in the senate by a vote of 40 to 29. Mason, Hoar and Hale were the only regular republicans to support it.

News from the American expedition of subjugation in the Philippines, though meager, is full enough to show that the pacification of the islands is not yet complete. Aguinaldo was supposed to have been located in the mountains of Benguet province, Luzon, to the northeast of Lingayen gulf; but the American detachment which attempted to run him and his party down, has returned to Aparri without having found the slightest trace of him, although several forces of insurgents were encountered. From Manila comes the report that on the night of the 29th the insurgents "rushed" the town of San Miguel de Mayumo, 45 miles

from Manila, killing eight men, including a captain, and wounding seven. No Filipino dead were discovered. An engagement without casualties is reported from Masbate island. From Samar island comes a report of another engagement, but not without casualties. Four Americans, including a lieutenant, were killed near Catbologan on the 9th. It was from this island that an engagement at Caterma, was reported last week with an American loss of three wounded. The loss on that occasion is now reported to be one wounded and one killed. An escort party moving between Ilang and Silang, within 25 miles of Manila, was attacked by insurgents and three of the party killed. Other scouting engagements are reported, but with little or no detail.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to May 30, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900, (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900	2
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16,	23
<hr/>	
Total deaths since July 1, 1898.....	1,872
Wounded	2,129
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July 1, 1898.....	4,001
Total casualties reported last week	4,001
Total deaths reported last week.....	1,872

In American politics the most important partisan event of the week is a call by Chairman Jones for a full meeting of the democratic national committee at Kansas City at noon on the 2d of July. The democratic executive committee of Kings county, including Brooklyn, New York, has refused to recommend a pledge to support Bryan and the platform of 1896. Of nonpartisan events the important one is a declaration by the board of directors of the commercial travelers and hotel men's anti-trust league, pledging the league to support the Kansas City nominee, on the ground, expressed in resolutions, that the trusts, created by the republican party, have forced 50,000 commercial travelers out of employment and reduced the salaries of those remaining. A committee was appointed to arrange for a mass meeting of commercial travelers at Kansas City on the 4th of July. This action is pe-

culiarly important because in 1896 the commercial travelers as a body supported McKinley.

The amalgamation of the socialist labor party and the social democratic party (referred to in these columns, No. 101 at page 10, 102 page 10, and 105 page 5) is not likely to be perfected. As heretofore explained a plan of amalgamation was agreed upon in March by a joint committee of the two parties, which, however, was to be submitted to a referendum vote of each party. The referendum vote of the social democratic party discloses a negative majority. It stands for the amalgamation 939 and against it 1,213. In consequence of this unfavorable result a unity conference, composed of eight members from each party, assembled in New York. Three delegates from the social democratic party withdrew, however, for lack of authority to act; but the remaining 13 have extended the time for the referendum vote by both parties until June 26.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the dominance of jingo sentiment as indicated by the South Manchester election reported above, has given rise to rumors of a coalition between Rosebery and Chamberlain, both jingo imperialists with liberal followings, for the formation of a new party. The effect of such a coalition would doubtless be a realignment of both the great parties and probably the evolution of a pronounced radical party. In Italy the question of parliamentary liberty is before the people in what we in this country would call a "hot campaign" for the election of members of the chamber of deputies. Both sides claim to be guardians of parliamentary liberty, the party in power charging the other with assailing it by means of disorderly obstructions to parliamentary procedure, and the opposition charging the party in power with assailing it by means of arbitrary rules cutting off debate. Elections in Belgium were held on the 29th under a new system of proportional representation. They resulted in a reduction of the Catholic majority in the chamber of representatives from 102 to 85, the socialists gaining by the change. Another attempt was made on the 28th to break up the French cabinet. Count Castellane (Anna Gould's husband), a member of the chamber of deputies, interpellated the ministry upon the course it intended to take with refer-

ence to an insinuation by one Reinach that the ministry had agreed that the Dreyfus case should be reopened after the Paris exposition, provided the friends of Dreyfus would be quiet meanwhile. The premier denied any such agreement. His speech was interrupted with a disorderly outbreak which necessitated a suspension of the proceedings. It is described as one of the most disorderly ever witnessed in the chamber. A vote of confidence in the ministry was carried by 288 to 247. Two days later the minister of war, Gen. Gallifet, resigned, and Gen. Andre was appointed in his place.

Hints of a cordition which may afford the civilized powers their coveted excuse for an invasion and parcelling out of China are getting into the news in half intelligible form. A Chinese secret society, known to the dispatches as the "boxers," is regarded as heralding a movement against foreigners. A demand for the suppression of this society was made on the 24th upon the Chinese government by the Spanish minister, who threatened that if that were not done all the powers concerned would land troops in China. On the 27th the diplomatic corps at Peking agreed to ask the Chinese foreign office to define explicitly the measures the government had taken, if any, for the suppression of the "boxers." The Peking correspondent of the London Times telegraphed on the 30th that opinion is widespread that the powers should compel China to defray the expense caused by the summoning of foreign guards for the protection of the legations, that measure having been necessitated by the apathy of the Chinese government. Among the foreign guards so summoned is a party of marines from the United States cruiser Newark, at the port of Taku. All the foreign ships at this port landed marines on the 29th and prepared to march to their respective legations in Peking, but were refused permission by the Chinese government to pass the Taku forts. Serious concern for the safety of Americans in China is expressed at Washington, and the American government has instructed its minister to warn the Chinese government to stamp out the "boxers" promptly and thoroughly and to provide proper guarantees for the maintenance of peace and order and the protection of the life and property of Americans in China.

To what extent the "boxers" is an organization for the extermination of foreigners in China, or whether that is its real import at all, cannot be told. Its purpose and origin are probably unknown to foreigners even in China, and only wild guesses at the matter can be made in this country upon such data as comes to light in the press. Probably the society is something like the old kuklux clan of our own southern states, which was organized to "regulate" an objectionable race and not primarily to affect political conditions. The Chinese have undoubtedly been oppressed by aliens, and not unnaturally they hate foreigners intensely and without discrimination. This hatred may very well have inspired organization for protection against real or fancied wrongs or for revenge; and having met with some successes, the organization may have developed into a revolutionary movement. Whatever may have been the origin of the "boxers," however, they are represented now as destroying railroad tracks and bridges and threatening a massacre of foreigners at Peking. In a skirmish with imperial Chinese troops on the 29th not only were they victorious but many of the imperial soldiers joined them. They are believed to have the sympathy of the empress dowager.

Rioting still characterizes the St. Louis street car strike. In that respect the situation has been worse this week than before. It is now more than three weeks since the strike began, but the tie-up is so nearly complete that business in the city is paralyzed. No attempt is made to run cars at night, and the service is next to useless in the daytime.

NEWS NOTES.

—Sig. Guiseppe del Puerte, the once famous baritone, died at his home in Philadelphia on the 25th from apoplexy. He was 60 years old.

—Japan has joined China in a strong protest against the compulsory inoculation of their subjects in San Francisco with anti-plague serum.

—Chief Justice Albert F. Judd, of Hawaii, died on the 20th at his home near Honolulu, aged 62 years. He was born in Honolulu and was a graduate of Yale.

—A. J. Auchterlonie, one of the editors of the "New Earth" and well known throughout the east as a follower of Henry George, died suddenly on the 29th in New York from heart disease.

—A total eclipse of the sun occurred on the morning of the 28th, lasting for nearly two hours. The path of the totality in this country was a strip 50 miles in width from Norfolk, Va., to New Orleans.

—Gen. E. S. Otis, who arrived in San Francisco from Manila on the 30th, has been promoted to the rank of major general by the president, and will succeed Gen. Merritt, who retires on the 16th.

—The Welland canal dynamiters, Dullman, Walsh and Nolan, charged in Canada with blowing up a lock of the Welland canal, were sentenced to imprisonment for life on the 25th. The trial failed to confirm the Canadian suspicion of a Fenian plot.

—The United States supreme court decided on the 28th that the naval force under Admiral Dewey at the battle of Manila was not inferior to the Spanish fleet, a decision which cuts down the award of prize money to Dewey and his men from \$4,000,000 to \$2,000,000.

—The annual convention for North America of the Church of New Jerusalem, commonly known as the Swedenborgian, closed its sessions at Cincinnati on the 29th. Rev. S. S. Seward, of New York, was elected president and Rev. L. P. Mercer, of Chicago, vice president.

—The Methodist general conference closed the sessions of a memorable conference at Chicago on the 29th. The conference inaugurated many important and radical changes in the policy of the church, chief among them being lay representation and representation by women delegates.

—Bubonic plague continues its ravages. Rio Janeiro and Port Said, Egypt, report increased fatalities, and San Francisco still maintains a strict quarantine over the Chinatown district, which is surrounded by a double cordon of police. The Chinese have applied to the courts for an order restraining the board of health from continuing the quarantine.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

May 21-26, 1900.

Senate.

On the 21st a message from the president was laid before the senate conveying important information relating to the war in the Philippines. The message is printed on page 6,227. Several resolutions were acted on, among them being one by Morgan calling for an investigation of the companies interested in the construction of an inter-oceanic canal in Central America. This was agreed to. It is printed on page 6,230. Allen's resolution, according the privileges of the senate floor to the Boer envoys during their visit in this country, was reject-

ed by a vote of 36 to 21, after a somewhat acrimonious debate. The resolution is printed on 6,234. Hoar introduced a bill, which provides for extradition with Cuba (printed on 6,233), and which was referred to the committee on the judiciary. Morgan's motion that the senate consider the Nicaragua canal bill was lost by a vote of 28 to 21. Consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed. On the 22d a resolution of inquiry regarding military statistics in the Philippines, introduced by Kenney and printed on page 6,292, was agreed to. Carter presented the credentials of W. A. Clark, of Montana, announcing his appointment as senator from that state by the lieutenant governor, A. S. Spriggs, with the request that they be tabled. Consideration of the bill relating to the war in the Philippines and the establishment of a government in the islands was resumed. Spooner spoke at length for the bill, and, unable to finish his speech, continued it on the 23d, when, during an allusion to Cuba, he was interrupted by Hale, of his own party, who said he had grave doubts whether the United States would ever withdraw from Cuba. Spooner concluded his speech on the 24th and Bacon addressed the senate on his resolution calling for an investigation of the Cuban revenues, which is printed on page 6,404 and was referred to the committee on contingent expenses. The conference report on the Indian appropriation bill was adopted. A communication from Gov. R. B. Smith, of Montana, announcing the appointment of Martin Maginnis as senator from that state, presented by Carter on the 25th, was tabled and consideration of the Philippine war and government bill was resumed. Consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill was then begun. The conference report on the post office appropriation bill was agreed to on the 26th and consideration of the sundry civil bill continued.

House.

On the 21st a bill was passed limiting the hours of labor on all government contract work to eight hours per diem, and also one to protect free labor from prison competition. This bill is printed on page 6,255. The conference report on the fortifications appropriation bill was adopted. Consideration of the Alaska civil code bill was resumed on the 22d, after which the conference report on the army appropriation bill was agreed to. A bill to provide for Cuban extradition was passed after a long debate on the 23d. The house then voted to non-concur in the senate amendments to the post office appropriation bill and appointed conferees. On the 24th the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill was adopted and consideration of the Alaska civil code bill was resumed and continued on both the 25th and 26th.

MISCELLANY

TRUTH'S ARMY.

For The Public.

He who would war for Truth must bide his time;
He shall not hear his name sung loud in rhyme,
And what he striveth for he shall not see
Till other generations reach their prime.
Truth's hosts are not a conquering army
borne

Along with lifting note of fife and horn;
They go to meet, what warriors blanch to face,

The poisoned arrows of a deadly scorn.

And yet they sow what generations reap;
The swords that fall from hands of nerveless sleep

Become the steel in other hands to win
Truth's kingdoms on the land and on the deep.

And they who fight the war of truth shall find

When all the things of earth are left behind

Their crown of victory—they who fight not men,

But Error, with the weapons of the Mind.

For 'tis God's army—and His great shield bends

Above them—like a mighty sun extends
His watchful smile above the host who bear

His royal purposes to deathless ends!

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

JOHN STUART MILL ON THE IRISH LAND QUESTION.

Those who think that the land of a country exists for the sake of a few thousand land owners, and that so long as rents are paid, society and government have fulfilled their function, may see in this consummation a happy end to Irish difficulties. But this is not a time, nor is the human mind now in a condition, in which such insolent pretensions can be maintained. The land of Ireland, the land of every country, belongs to the people of that country.—John Stuart Mill.

AN HISTORICAL ANALOGY.

For The Public.

In 1778, while the war of American independence was on the stage, and in the vain hope of arresting its progress, the British parliament that had passed the stamp act and put a tax on tea renounced the claim of the mother country to impose taxation in the colonies for the augmentation of the imperial revenue. It also promised to impose only such duties as might be necessary for the regulation of commerce, the net product whereof was to be applied to the use of the colony wherein they were levied. But the application of the ointment did not cure the sore from which it was exuded, and the war went on until equity was established. Our revolutionary sires could hold the eye on a "plain duty" until it was performed,
ELROY M. AVERY.

JUST COMMONSENSE.

It is always well to remember that parties and nations are simply collections of men, therefore liable to the weaknesses of men, and in all things to be judged as men are judged, by their fruits.

Now, if you observe two men in con-

troversy, and one of them keeps arguing: "We have no right to do that way; it is unjust, dishonest, wrong." And the other keeps arguing: "You're a liar! You're a copperhead! You're a traitor!" Which of these men do you presume to be right? And which do you fancy feels surest of his ground?

If you were a tourist from Mars and saw two great crowds of men debating a policy; and one crowd appealing to history, to reason, to liberty and justice and the eternal standards of right, even as against their own usual party; and the other side appealing to party spirit, and passion, and chances to make money and "glory"—which would you think was probably in the right of it?—Charles F. Lummis, in the Land of Sunshine.

THE SULTAN OF JOLO ASKS QUESTIONS.

From an article on "Our Friend, the Sultan of Jolo," published in the May Century, and written by Charles B. Hagedorn, adjutant of the Twenty-third United States infantry, and secretary of the acting governor of Jolo.

Before the sultan arrived there were many conjectures concerning his personal appearance. Some described him as a dignified man of the world, others as a Moro of the ordinary type; but a Polish trader from Sandakan told us that he was "just like a monkey." His description was a very accurate one. He is a small man with a most repulsive face, his thick, protruding lips, flat nose, and swarthy skin showing his Malay origin.

Meeting him at the gate, I escorted him and his followers to the acting governor. The sultan, his secretary, Datto Joakanine, Datto Dakola, and seven or eight other less influential dattos followed us in. We all shook hands, their awkward grasp and handshake telling us that our custom was not theirs.

Seated about a table, we had a long and tedious conference. The sultan came in to look at us, and to see what Americans were like. He had never seen an American before, but had heard of our country, and that we were very rich and had much land. "Why did you come here to get more land?" was one of the first and rather awkward questions he asked. "I am poor, and my people are poor. Why are the Americans here?" The acting governor at once began to talk about Cuba and "humanity's sake," described oppression and the blowing up of the Maine; but this was not an altogether satisfactory explanation of our presence in Jolo. After carefully preparing a goodly portion of

betelnut and placing it between his stained lips, the sultan repeated the question: "Why are you here?" The governor was forced to abandon diplomacy, and said he was a soldier and came to Jolo because he was ordered; that all questions of state must be referred to a higher authority, and that it would take some time to get satisfactory explanations.

"What do you intend to do?" the sultan asked. He may not be a man of many words, or of great capacity, but he asked awkward questions.

HARD TO FIND EMPLOYMENT.

One of the most active business men of Boston has been telling some of his experience and observation of the difficulty experienced by young people in getting situations. He spoke of graduates of colleges, both men and women, though his remarks may well apply to others. He is in a position where educated persons would be more likely than others to imagine that there would be an opening with him for them. He says that he averages about one application a day, from young men and women. He told of his experience in helping a young friend in getting employment. He was a bright, educated fellow, and it seemed, with the older man's introduction and guarantee, as if he could find a situation. With his letters the young man went from one place to another, but only to find absolutely nothing for him to do. He could not get a foothold anywhere. The singular fact about his rebuff in almost every place was that it was connected with the trusts. The business house would say either that it had just gone into a trust and was discharging help, instead of taking on any more, or that it had been squeezed by the trust so that it was not able to do much business, or that the trust operations had made the business so uncertain that they did not know what they should do in the future, but if they should have any occasion to take on any additional help, they preferred to take experienced men who had been thrown out by the trust, and whom they knew to be experienced and all right, rather than take a young man. The upshot of the matter was, that, for one or another of these reasons, the young man could get no encouragement anywhere. My informant says that he knows of a dozen of similar cases, of college graduates of a few years' standing, smart and capable men, who are anxious to get work, but find the doors closed to them. One of

them remarked to him that he was willing to begin by washing windows, if it were with any assurance of anything better afterward. He knows of a case where one graduate of this class is acting merely as errand boy for a business house, because he could get nothing better to do.

Another business man, speaking in a similar line, said that he knew of a well-educated and competent graduate of the institute of technology, who is a civil engineer by training, who is to-day selling baking powder, in lack of anything better to do, and who finds a better opening in that line than in civil engineering. Another case was that of a young physician, who helps to keep the wolf from the door by soliciting advertising. These things are happening right here, in the midst of our good times.—Springfield Republican, of May 18.

SOME POINTS IN FAVOR OF DIRECT LEGISLATION.

Its adherents triumphantly point to the fact that frequently there is a small vote on constitutional amendments which are submitted to the people by their so-called superior body, the legislature, and they say the people will not vote on measures. This is true at times, but the corresponding fact is invariably overlooked, that often these things are not worth voting on. They are either trivial matters or else they are so ambiguously—not to say dexterously—worded that they have either no vitality in them or that vitality is extremely liable to be taken out by decisions of the courts. In fact judges and attorneys regularly complain that they cannot tell what these things mean, and honored judges have been known to completely change their minds within two weeks' time on their meaning. Is it any wonder then that oft-times the people should not think these things worth voting on? The fact that so many do go to the polls and vote on utterly unimportant matters is surprising.

Now if these things came from below up, if the people could really start an issue from themselves, as they can in Switzerland, by the initiative, then we would have the real, vital questions coming up for decision, and then we would find the people really voting on them. . . .

What happens when measures are disentangled from men and the people have a chance to vote directly on them? Those who are interested in the measure, vote on it. Those who are ignorant of it or who are not in-

terested in it, do not vote. Hence there is an automatic disenfranchisement of the ignorant and uninterested by themselves. You are much more likely to get a proper decision when the posted and interested vote. As long as no class are shut out from voting, this disenfranchisement by themselves is not injurious. . . .

Under direct legislation, if there is a small vote, it will simply show that either the matter is of small importance or else that opinion is all one way, so that many do not think it worth while voting because they are sure. This is what actually happens in Switzerland, where they have had direct legislation for years. One of its ex-presidents has said that whenever the people are vitally interested in a matter they come out and vote, and that though some things which he wanted carried were defeated by the people, he found, when he got some years off, so as to get a proper perspective and see these things in their true light, that the people were always right, even when they defeated the things he wanted carried. Thus in February, 1898, over 80 per cent. of the voters voted on the question of the nationalizing of the railroads of Switzerland, and there was no ballot-box stuffing to vitiate the figures, as here. I doubt if so high a percentage has ever been honestly cast in any large election in our country.

Let us take advice from our legislators, but not government. We have done away with the middle-man in religion, in business, in most every concern of life, let us do away with him in politics by having the power to pass on our laws whenever we see fit. In this way we can abolish political peptinoids and take such food as we need.—Eltweed Pomeroy, in The Direct Legislation Record.

A FEW ARGUMENTS FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Extracts from a paper read before the women of the Mississippi Suffrage association, at their annual meeting in Clarksdale, April 5 and 6, 1899, by Mrs. Quincy Ewing.

As one of the great American questions agitated for the past 40 years, and growing daily in the interest it excites, the question of suffrage for women early won my attention and allegiance. Looked at logically and dispassionately, it is one of conscience, of abstract right. In order to prove this we have but to recollect the fundamental principles announced in the Declaration of Independence: Governments derive their just powers

from the consent of the governed. Can the political condition of women be reconciled with this?

A reason sometimes given for the political non-existence of women is that their interests are identical with those of their fathers and husbands. But there are women who have no fathers and brothers, and, for those who have, laws are made for protection against fathers and brothers, if a sad fate makes such protection necessary. The reason, therefore, is worthless.

It has been urged that the mass of women do not wish to enact laws, though they feel their pressure. It may be so—but the noblest and best women are not so indifferent, having thought for themselves on the question; and their intelligent wish should decide it.

It would be well to quote to those who acquiesce in the old order of things, the ringing words of James Freeman Clarke:

I leave it to others to speak of Woman Suffrage as a right or privilege; I speak of it as a duty. Is this not your country as well as men's? And are you not bound to contribute whatever faculty God has given you to make it and keep it a pure, safe and happy land?

It has been urged by self-satisfied objectors that households would be divided by endless quarrels if women were given the ballot. The law does not, however, compel women to adopt the religious creeds of their husbands; practically this freedom has made no difficulty, and equal freedom in politics would make as little; for in history we find differences in religion have bred far more quarrels than differences in politics.

Yet another objection is this: "Will not the delicacy of womanhood suffer hurt if women be enfranchised?" Let us change the form of the question. Is political non-existence a school for the development of perfect womanhood? This query is important in itself and and what it involves. Is the character of one-half of the human race bettered, or dwarfed, by the absence of the grand notion of public duty engendered by public responsibility?

Let us ask the question: What is the sphere of woman? Is it one appointed by her guardians, and bounded by the ideas of narrow propriety inherited by the women who may read, but never think? Or is it a

broader and fuller one, appointed by God, and bounded but by the powers he has given? The acquiescence of women in any state but this latter proves nothing but their own want of intellectual and spiritual freedom. An acquiescence like this is an argument that cuts the wrong way for those who use it. Let women look to it, if they make no effort to secure privileges and duties they were meant to enjoy and fulfill; for it is sure that in despising such privileges they disgrace themselves.

If she be small, slight-natured, miserable, How shall men grow?

INCENDIARY TALK IN HIGH PLACES.

A paragraph among the editorial notes of the *Congregationalist*, of Boston, in its issue of last week, though very brief, must be esteemed significant. It calls attention, without distinct disapproval, to a sentiment which no one, even a very short time ago, could have expected as at all likely to appear in its columns—a sentiment which, both in expression or form and in purport, has apparently seemed to not a few excellent people as at least dangerous; that is, incendiary or revolutionary. It quotes thus:

The real issue that men of the future have got to meet is the struggle between plutocracy and democracy.

Of course, it is important to know who says this. This seems almost a first consideration with certain ones—not so much the truth of what is said, and its force on that ground, but the authority with which it comes. The statement is commented upon by the *Congregationalist* as follows:

These are not the words of W. J. Bryan or John P. Altgeld or Eugene Debs or any other supposed dangerous character from the inflammable and covetous west, although much like their utterances in tenor. They were spoken to the New England Free Trade league last week by Prof. William G. Sumner, professor of political and social science in Yale university since 1872. He supplemented the remark with the other statement that in every land with parliamentary institutions organized capital was trying to control legislatures for corporate profit and industrial exploitation.

The singularly ungracious reference to the west—not to characterize it as it more fully deserves—only renders more signal the significance of this editorial note. It is simply being forced upon the attention of the people of this country—what the west has long known and been ready, exposed to much obloquy, to speak of plainly, though assumed leaders of the people and editors in the east have tried their utmost to keep it out of sight—what a contest is going on in our land. What

Prof. Sumner, of Yale, says is true, but is not a particle more acceptable on that account than as said for years by men who have been persistently and malignantly discredited just for saying that. Representative government among us has come to be a thing of name only. It is so in our cities, in our states, and swiftly it is getting to be that in the nation. The representatives, legislative and executive, represent not the people, but, so far as effective action is concerned, they represent a power more masterful than votes, dominant over and not subject to the people. "Parliamentary institutions" are but a stalking-horse to cunning schemers. "Organized capital"—no matter who says it, providing it be true—is not only trying to control," as the Yale professor states, but has often succeeded in controlling, as is widely known, "legislatures for corporate profit and industrial exploitation." This is one of those things that so thoroughly ought to be said that he verily is guilty who keeps his tongue from saying it.—*City and State* (Philadelphia), of May 17.

A ROAD OF SORROW.

An extract from a letter describing the famine districts of India, written at Dhulia, Khandesh, April 3, to the *Manchester* (England) *Guardian*, by its special correspondent.

The drive of 34 miles from Chalisgaum to Dhulia, one of the taluka towns of western Khandesh, gave evidence enough and to spare of the state to which famine has reduced the richest district in the Deccan. Khandesh was thought to be proof against any serious famine, for it has a fertile soil and enjoys, as a rule, a sufficient rainfall. When the poorer provinces of the Deccan were suffering from the famine of 1896-7, Khandesh had only 16,000 people on relief works, and the official estimate for the present year, when things are indefinitely worse, was 33,000. The forecast was strangely wrong, for a quarter of a million men, women and children have found their way to the famine camps, and there is another 10,000 in the village—old, blind and village peasants—who get their dole of grain from government. So, then, the happy district which may be said to be almost a stranger to famine finds itself naked and helpless, like its famine-seasoned sisters of the Deccan, stripped at once of all reserves of fodder, food, cash, and even credit. There must be something wrong with India when one finds a collapse like this. The road along which I drove the other morning

was a dismal one to travel, over-brown wilderness spreading to right and left as far as the hills, and scarcely a soul or a beast to be seen on the country-side. The cattle preferred to snuff at the fallen leaves by the roadside, with the chance of finding a few worth munching here and there. Outside the station we had passed lines of children making a move in the direction of the bunga's grain-heaps, to forage for breakfast, I suppose. People in these parts tell me that it is no uncommon thing to see the children following a cart and picking like birds at any stray grains of corn or rice that fall in the dust. I myself have seen the babies on the works grubbing round the bunga's stalls in the same way, and getting their mouths all slobbered with earth in the process. We met a train of bullock wagons coming into town with loads of leaves, which are in great request for fodder; so much so that trees are being destroyed in thousands by the ruthless stripping of branches that has been carried on. The avenue we drove along had been badly handled, the branches of many of the trees being torn and ripped from the trunks as though a hurricane had passed.

The beasts on the Dhulia road were to be pitied; they were bearing their sufferings as submissively as their masters, allowing themselves to be pushed and pulled and almost lifted along the road to market. Here was a pair of bullocks, weak as water, yoked to a wagon load of hides, whilst further on a woman strode along with a bundle of stiffened skins upon her head. One bullock wagon had a strange load—the wreck of a splendid beast, with the glaze of death over its eyes. Another bullock had fallen upon the road, and lay there, too weak to get up again. I have seen two women and a boy shedding tears through sheer disappointment because the sahib did not listen to their plea for food. I have seen the people lifting their hands to heaven and throwing themselves on the ground in the hope of gaining the Englishman's ear; but that is the common oriental fashion, and there is nothing in it. As to the people on tramp to the works, whom we passed about every mile or so, nothing could be more prosaic or further removed from the drama. Here in Khandesh each family had actually got a deal box of its own, which the father carried on his head, an indubitable sign of the wealth and respectability of the district. The gaunt old fellow on the bank by the road-

side, in a red turban and not much else, who, with his wife, was watching a woman's figure collapsed at his feet—why did he sit there and not rush out and seize the horses' heads and in the name of God insist on food and help for his dying daughter? The red turban did lift as we went by, and the arms shot up for a moment and then fell again. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" he seemed to be asking. "No, nothing," said the dropped arms and hanging head; "I might have known it." It is idle, perhaps, to speculate on the feelings of people who are half comatose with famine, but the stupor and the silence become intolerable at times, and you wish that the unspoken horror of these sapping months could be given a shape.

THE REAL TRUST EVIL.

The indiscriminate defenders of all trusts are being forced to admit that in certain instances the trust is an undoubted evil. And this puzzles them. They feel, intuitively, that the right of combination is unassailable outside of an absolute monarchy. Yet they see or perhaps feel the oppression of some trust. One of this class writes:

. . . . Up to a year or so ago Baltimore had one of the best street car services in the world. Thirty odd lines were owned by four separate companies, and as competition was active, the public was benefited. Six tickets were sold for a quarter, each company gave free transfers to its different branches, and the cars were run at close intervals. The companies consolidated, and in a very short time the service deteriorated. Tickets were no longer sold six for a quarter, transfer privileges were curtailed and the cars were run at longer intervals. There is no chance for competition from new companies, as the old companies have charters giving them control of practically all our streets, and the courts have decided that these charters are irrevocable. It is useless to talk about the sufficiency of the law of supply and demand to remedy such a condition, as, except very remotely, there is no chance for the operation of that law; and in the meantime the public is at the mercy of a trust. What do you think of it?

Our correspondent says the law of supply and demand does not operate here. But if not, why not? The demand is there. And if the supply has been limited, who did it? Did the companies forming the trust limit it? This is fine. It is delightful. We hope the street car trust of Baltimore will continue to gouge the people of that town good and hard. May it employ every known device of corporate greed to rob and inconvenience them, and may it invent a lot of new ones. May it do all that is necessary, in short, to drive into their stupid heads that

the one and only evil in this country and every other country, monarchy or republic, in all the time since human association began, in every phase of it, national, state and municipal, is—special privilege.

You make a life contract to buy your provisions of two grocers. You bind yourself never to buy so much as a pound of tea of any other. Your two grocers form a trust. Why shouldn't they? They are in business to make all the money they can, and you have parted with your right to trade with anyone else. They agree to put up prices on you. You are at their mercy, but who put you there? And you whine about the trust evil, instead of seeing that the only evil in the case is your own criminal asininity in making such a contract. How long would the street car trust of Baltimore be a "criminal" trust if it did not have its special privilege?—if, in a word, it had to compete for this privilege with good service and low prices, precisely as the dry goods dealers and grocers of Baltimore have to do.

Trusts cannot destroy competition. Competition can never be more than artificially limited, and only the people themselves, by their own free acts, can do even that. They may do it by parting with franchises, as in Baltimore. They may do it on a larger scale by maintaining a protective tariff which gives special privileges to a few manufacturers at the expense of the whole people; or they may do it as in New York city by giving the special privilege of "governing" them to a political trust. The "people" have never been robbed without their freely-given consent. Wherever you find an oppressive trust be sure that it rests on a special privilege freely granted by the people, either in the way of a franchise, a subsidy, a tariff schedule or a monopoly bestowed at the ballot box. This is the cause of all trust evils, and the effective remedy must go to the cause and not trifle with unrelateu phenomena or surface indications. The principle of combination for economy will prevail increasingly, because it is the expression of a natural law in economics. No law of man can do more than temporarily pervert it. The real evil will be remedied when its nature is understood. The trust that does not rest on special privilege may or may not thrive. It is subject to every menace of competition that the individual business man is, and it enjoys positively no immunities that are denied to him. In so far as its profits are

proportionately greater its risks will be found proportionately greater. The economic laws are the same whether applied to one man with a capital of one hundred dollars or to 20 men with a capital of 20 millions. And further, the special privilege is just as iniquitous when enjoyed by the one man as when enjoyed by the 20. It only becomes more apparent in the latter case. It has taken the growth of trusts in this country to show its iniquity; but there was just as much injustice in the days before trusts. Only it was too much scattered to attract attention. The stoutest republican papers we know of are now declaring that the tariff privilege must be withdrawn from the trusts. It will take but a little more thinking to show them that it was just as unjust to scatter the benefits of that privilege among the same individuals before they formed themselves into trusts. And we say, blessed be the name of trust if it will bring the people to their senses!—Puck of May 23.

THE NEW EDUCATION.

There has been lately drawn up a rough draft of the prospectus of the University of the Benevolent Assimilation, which is to be founded, as soon as conditions make it wise, at Manila. Indeed, preparatory work is now being carried on there. The finished prospectus is to appear shortly before the November elections. The plan discloses some startling novelties in pedagogy, to which we shall doubtless accustom ourselves, as does the preceptor of the abattoir, when he gently but firmly dims the soft eyes of his bovine pupils.

Politics is the specialty. A course on "Modern Political Methods; or, Every Man His own Electorate," is conducted by Prof. Hanna (assisted by Mr. McKinley). Special attention is called to the danger of having definite lines of policy. For a degree, this course may be substituted for either (or both, at the option of the student) of the two courses on government and statesmanship, those in charge of these courses being on leave of absence.

Prof. Roosevelt has a very interesting course in Strenuosity. During the first term, occasions for the exercise of the strenuous life will be furnished pupils. But as the course advances, these extraneous aids will be dispensed with. The administration has appointed the state of Kentucky for purposes of illustration, for which gift it piously repays itself by repeating: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Cursory examination does not reveal whether or

not this quoting of appropriate Bible texts is designed to catch the church vote. As this course is sustained by heavy endowments, there is no extra fee for breakage.

There is a seminary course in anthropology, whose work for the first year is to inquire into the status of the man who is neither a citizen nor subject of any country. The instructor is ordered to keep the class from formulating anything positively.

Really an interesting document. Some points are left vague—everything seems to be tentative. For instance, no reason is given for putting study of the constitution and declaration of independence in the department of dead languages. But such obscurity will surely be cleared up when the plan is put into operation.—Life.

PHILIPPINA; OR, AMERICA UP TO DATE.

Thy country 'tis for me,
We'll take the liberty
To thee to cling.
Land where the panthers glide,
Land where the apes reside
On every mountain-side,
To thee I sing.

We'll guard thy rocks and rills,
Thy "rocks" shall foot the bills,
To thee we'll cling.
Land of the coconut,
We shout for freedom, but,
In every Tagal hut,
Let's freedom wring.

—"Rhymes Without Treason," by James J. Dooling.

Wherever there is in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right. The earth is given as a common stock for men to labor and live on.—Thomas Jefferson.

Dawkins—Your dog Towser has greatly changed since I saw him a few years ago.

Kennalham — Yes; and I have changed his name. I call him "Dewey," now.

Dawkins—Dewey?
Kennalham—Yes. He, too, has had his "Day." G. T. E.

"I suppose you have learned some valuable lessons from the United States recently," said the stranger.

"Yes," answered the Puerto Rican, "the only trouble is that we can't find any islands littler than ours to play the same trick on."—Washington Star.

Is your title recorded in heaven, then? Did you bring your land from a neighboring planet? What power have you that you do not hold from society?

You are in possession only by public consent.—Necker (afterwards Louis XVI.'s Minister of Finance), Essay on the Corn Laws (1775).

Dutcher—The English act the part of savages in sending all those Boers to Saint Helena.

Frencham—Don't worry about it. The English will hardly be so rash as to neglect the reenforcing of their garrison. G. T. E.

"Yes, my child," explained the parent. "When the Indian women become civilized they stop painting their faces."

"Why, mamma!" exclaimed the little one, with wide open eyes, "doesn't they go to the opera ever?"—Yonkers Statesman.

Firstnite—I hear that Rantam is not playing "Hamlet" in the Philippines?

Deadede—No; the poor fellow found the conditions there so unfavorable that, in order to make a living, he was forced to take the part of a literal "grave digger." G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

No. 3 of volume I of C. F. Taylor's "Equity Series" (1520 Chestnut St., Philadelphia), is a special number devoted to the idea of the city for the people. It was prepared by Prof. Frank Parsons, and is a compendium of valuable facts relating to public ownership of public utilities, direct legislation, home rule, civil service reform, etc.

Prof. Richard T. Ely's "Monopolies and Trusts" (New York: The Macmillan Co.), while marred by that common defect of university economics—infinite classification—does get at the core of the trust question. "There is, strictly speaking," he says by way of summary, "no trust problem." But he does not mean by this that there are no problems at all in connection with the trust agitation. On the contrary that agitation suggests and is caused by problems of the most serious nature. He classifies them as, first, a monopoly problem; secondly, a problem of industrial concentration; and thirdly, a problem of wealth concentration. When Prof. Ely's work is boiled down to its last meaning, all these problems fall into the first classification. In other words, he places monopoly at the root of evil trusts. Of mere combinations without monopoly privileges he rightly enough has no fear, believing that competition will hold them in wholesome check.

In "The Custom of Barter" (Kansas City, Mo.: Press of Burd & Fletcher Printing Co.), Henry Western Miller considers economic principles from the viewpoint of believers in money as the fundamental social institution. "There is no greater natural right," he says, "than the use of money without interest." And he regards interest as a tax upon barter, bearing the same relation to domestic trade that tariffs bear to foreign trade. But for "these embargoes upon commerce," he urges,

"compensation would take place in the business world as it does in the physical and the people would act in harmony and there would be neither panics, wars nor rumors of war." Mr. Miller gives no clear-cut definition of what he means by interest, but he evidently regards all interest as a premium for the use of money, making no allowance for the theory of economic interest that it is related to wealth wholly apart from money. A circular quoted in the book, purporting to have emanated in 1893 from "the bankers' association," contains a request to national bankers to create a money stringency. The genuineness of this circular has been so frequently and circumstantially denied that its further use without proof of authenticity is not quite justified.

"Natural Taxation" (New York: Doubleday & McClure) is the appropriate and suggestive title of a little book by Thomas G. Shearman, which has become familiar, since the appearance of the first edition, to students of fiscal questions. The idea that there is a system of taxation that may properly be termed natural, rests upon the theory that government is a natural agent of society, and like all natural agents must have food. Consequently, says Mr. Shearman, "Just as certainly as the existence of the body implies a science of food, the existence of human society implies a science of taxation." In search of this science he first explores the subject of taxation as it has been generally understood and applied, rejecting in turn as unscientific and unjust, all indirect taxation—"crooked," as he calls it,—personal property taxation, and the taxation of landed improvements. But coming to the taxation of land values, he approves that as just, automatic and natural. Mr. Shearman's book is invaluable not only as an adjunct of Henry George's works but also as an original contribution to economic literature, especially with reference to public finance.

"The Lust of Empire" is the title given by the Tucker Publishing Co. (Park Row Building, New York), to Senator Hoar's great speech on the Philippine question, which it issues as a 25-cent number in the Bacon Library series of selections from the current periodical literature of the world. This is a speech which all intelligent citizens will wish to read during the summer, and we know of no better publication in which to find it.

An article by Frederick Verinder originally published in the British cooperative

wholesale societies' "Annual" for 1900, on the subject of "A Just Basis of Taxation," has been reprinted (London: English Land Restoration League), in pamphlet form. Mr. Verinder commends what in this country is known as the single tax especially to the favor of cooperative societies. His pamphlet is well fed with facts and figures illustrative of fiscal matters in England.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CCHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Telephone, Main 711.

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE,
ALFRED T. JOHNSON,
JORAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.
LAWYERS,
SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 2644.

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

Houston.

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

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.

Program for Friday, June 1st,

HON. WILLIAM PRENTISS,
"Jefferson."

OLD BOOKS! Any obtainable BOOK,
PAMPHLET, or PERI-
ODICAL, supplied.
Libraries, or small lots of Books bought

Catalog free upon application.
H. H. TIMBY, (Book Hunter)
P. O. Box 927. 731t Conneaut, Ohio

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.

Subscriptions, 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.

Volume 2 of the Public

Complete Volumes, including Index,
Unbound, sent postpaid at Regular
Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes. Price, \$2.00.
Express charges to be paid by consignee.

Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

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

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

**TAKE NOTICE
THAT THE CIGARS**

**YOU SMOKE
OUT OF BOXES**

**BEARING
OUR NAME**

**INVARIABLY
SATISFY....**

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



**AFTER DINNER
JAVA COFFEE !**

This coffee is the finest blending of Choice Arabian Mocha with best mellow Old Government Java, and makes the most delicious cup of coffee in the world. Having a delicate aroma and a wonderfully fine flavor, yet possessing strength and character. It is superior to any 35 or 40 cent coffee elsewhere. We exercise the greatest care in selecting the coffees for this brand; it is fresh roasted and ground every day. You always get fresh coffee.

Ground ready for use, . . . 25 cents per lb.
Packed in 6-lb. Bright Air-Tight Tin Cans, \$1.50
Packed in 25-lb. Air-Tight Wood Drum, . . 6.25
Packed in 70-lb. Air-Tight Wood Drum, . 17.50

H. R. EAGLE & CO.,
76 and 78 Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.