

# The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse  
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1900.

Number 117.

**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.

The nomination of Samuel Alschuler by the democratic party for governor of Illinois, makes it possible for Illinois democrats of the Jeffersonian type to vote the state ticket without feeling that they have put their democracy in pawn. Mr. Alschuler, like ex-Gov. Altgeld, is distinguished as a democrat by more than the party label. He is a democratic democrat.

Nicknames for presidential combinations, which went out of fashion with the "Buck and Breck" of the Buchanan-Breckinridge campaign of '56, may be revived by the Philadelphia nominations. It has been suggested that "Manifest Destiny and Strenuous Duty" would describe the combination, but Gov. Altgeld proposes something briefer as well as more accurately descriptive in "Cant and Strut."

A laudable effort has been made by a Chicago civic club, led by Mrs. Lydia Avery Coonly Ward, to head off an ordinance appropriating \$10,000 of public money for the decoration of Chicago streets on the occasion of the meeting here of the Grand Army of the Republic. As this club explains, the amount so appropriated to a street display, transient in its nature and of questionable value, would support five vacation schools accommodating 2,000 children for the whole season; yet the council refuses appropriations for vacation schools for lack of funds. This objection alone condemns the appropriation for the street display. But the same club makes the stronger because more fundamental objection,

that "public money cannot rightly be withdrawn from public purposes to such as concern only a portion of the community." That objection gets at the heart of the matter. The city council of Chicago and the mayor, who has ignored the protests and signed the appropriation ordinance, have no more right in good morals to pay out city money for street decoration, on the occasion of a private parade, than they would have to pick a pocket. It happens that these men are not the only delinquents. Legislative bodies, from the lowest to the highest everywhere, are in the habit of making similar appropriations of public money to private use. But the principle is invariable. In doing so, every responsible participant is morally guilty of stealing.

There are indications that Japan does not contemplate with satisfaction the prospect of a partition of China. She may well manifest concern. When China shall have been carved up and the pieces been distributed among the European nations, the spoliation of Japan will be only a matter of a little time. The current of events is running so fast that the history of the future can almost be read even by the politically blind. That long impending conflict between the Saxon and the Slav, now well-nigh at hand, seems to be taking the form of a life and death struggle for the mastery of the world, in which Great Britain, seconded by the United States, is to be one contestant and Russia the other.

An exciting local election in British Columbia has resulted in the defeat of the progressive element whose immediate demand was government ownership of railroads. But this defeat, which is only temporary, has not been without its bright side. For

the radicalism of the party in British Columbia that corresponds to the democratic party in the United States has been held in check by the influence of tricksters and compromisers; and the hot campaign through which the province has now passed has driven most of them out of the party. Though the party has consequently lost for the time in numbers, it has gained immensely by the purifying process.

Rumors are current in Chicago that Hearst, the proprietor of the New York Journal, is about to launch a new paper here, to be published in the afternoon during the week and in the morning on Sundays. This is welcome news. The daily papers of Chicago now are all controlled by financial cliques. As a rule they are conducted without journalistic purpose, but in aid of business operations and interests; and are responsive to all manner of plutocratic pulls. In consequence, with an abundance of journalistic talent that equals if it does not surpass that of any other American city in brilliancy and liberality of opinion, the Chicago papers are inferior. The newspaper men are hampered and suppressed. It is only now and then, when a "Mr. Dooley" or a George Ade springs into notice through articles personally signed, in which he gains unusual freedom of expression, that the general public realizes that there are any able journalists in Chicago—so completely do speculative interests, wholly foreign to the Chicago newspaper, hold Chicago newspaper-makers in subjection.

Before the next issue of The Public can appear this nation will have celebrated another birthday of one of the noblest documents in history—the American declaration of independence, a copy of which will be found

on another page. It is a document which every truly patriotic man should read, at least once a year, with intelligent affection. For the declaration of independence is the real chart of the American ship of state.

That place has been assigned to the constitution; but the constitution is subject to amendment for the good of the republic, whereas the declaration of independence cannot be amended without destroying the republic in all but form. It gave birth to a nation which, conceived in liberty, was dedicated to those immutable truths that all men are endowed with equal rights and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Since that sacred dedication the nation has steadily advanced toward the goal of its high purpose. One by one it has been casting off the evils that in spite of its dedication have clung to it from the past. And never until now has it been forced to face the issue of repudiating its dedication.

But that issue the nation does now face. The truths of the declaration of independence are denied by powerful interests and from high places; no longer timidly in extenuation of old inequalities not yet swept away, but boldly, as obstacles to the establishment of new inequalities necessary to a splendid career of imperialism. In this emergency, universal reading and reflection upon the declaration of independence should be encouraged. It should be read next Wednesday in every household, and at every public gathering. Especially should it be read at the democratic convention at Kansas City. If the clergyman who is to pronounce the invocation at the opening of that convention should, in place of improvising a prayer of his own, simply, but with true religious fervor, repeat the Lord's prayer, and be immediately followed by an impressive reading of the declaration of independence—both democratic to their heart's core—a new inspiration would thrill the public mind and

elevate political thought. There could be no more appropriate and hopeful beginning for the elemental fight against imperialism. When democracy is assailed at the source, let democrats go to the source for inspiration and courage.

One plank in the democratic platform to be adopted at Kansas City next week will doubtless express the sympathy of the party for the struggling Boers. The republican platform sympathizes with both the Boers and Great Britain, merely expressing a—

hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to terminate the strife between them—

and unless the democrats say more they had better say nothing. They should at least express their—

hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to secure a permanent peace with independence to the two republics.

The difference between hoping for the end of the strife, as the republicans do, and hoping for peace with Boer independence, as the democrats should, would be worth something to the democrats in the campaign, and if the contest were close it would be worth a great deal to the Boers. For only recently Joseph Chamberlain said, at the meeting of the Woman's Liberal Unionist association, that "even a note of disapproval" from the United States "would be a matter of serious concern." But the democrats can and ought to say more than that. They ought not only to express sympathy, but also to register a promise.

But there is a notion prevalent that this country can do nothing to preserve independence for the Boers without involving itself in war with Great Britain, and therefore that no promise can be made. That is a mistake. Great Britain would not destroy the independence of the Boer republics if her ministry were authoritatively advised that such an act would be regarded with concern by the people

of the United States. The ministry now labors under the delusion, confirmed by the behavior of the republican administration and the expressions of the Philadelphia platform, that the great majority of the people of this country sympathize with the purpose the British have declared of divesting the South African republics of their independence. Mr. Chamberlain has publicly said as much. An opportunity to dispel that delusion is now open to the democrats, and all they need do to accomplish it is to insert a plank in the Kansas City platform something like this:

We cannot contemplate without serious concern the declared purpose of the present ministry of Great Britain to divest the South African republic and the Orange Free State of their independence, the more especially as that purpose has thus far been encouraged by the friendly acquiescence of our own government. If without protest from the greatest republic in the world this act of subjugation were accomplished, it would thereafter be cited as a precedent justifying the destruction by military conquerors of the independence of the nations they defeat in battle. Even the United States, with all their reserve of military strength, might, through the ill fortune of some unavoidable war, fall a victim to this most dangerous usage. It is a usage, therefore, which should be promptly discountenanced by all self-governing peoples. And that it may be discountenanced in behalf of the people of the United States, we hereby instruct our candidate for president that in the event of his election the democratic party will expect him to advise the British ministry, with friendliness and firmness, that the people of the United States would regard the destruction of the independence of the South African republic and the Orange Free State as a precedent fraught with grave danger to all republican government.

Another part of the Kansas City platform calls for boldness of purpose and directness of expression. This is true, of course, of the anti-imperial planks, but there is little danger of timidity there; the plank we have in mind is that on trusts. Upon this issue more than upon any other there is danger of timid and frivolous declarations. The principal danger, probably, will be due to a failure to

recognize a fundamental difference. It is often supposed that trust combinations make monopolies. That is the notion of the republican platform. But the truth is just the reverse. Monopolies make trust combinations. The way to abolish the trust, therefore, is to abolish monopolies. Every oppressive trust has its seat in some legalized monopoly. If, then, the democratic party would be true to democratic principles, let it—

demand, as the sovereign cure for trusts, the abolition of all legalized monopolies, by the repeal, or by other legislation neutralizing the effect, of all laws that interfere with free competition.

And that this demand may not appear to be a harmless generalization, let it be supplemented with a specific demand to the effect that—

as a first step in this direction we demand the repeal of all tariffs on trust goods.

Though such declarations would drive friends of the trusts away from the party, they would draw to it every intelligent adversary of trusts who was not absolutely party-bound. And what is of more importance intrinsically, they would help pull the democratic party out of a quagmire and put it on firm foundations. But if a mere rhetorical denunciation or some centralized scheme for regulation be adopted, it can make little difference to anybody, so far as the trust issue goes, which party he votes for. Either way he will be voting to perpetuate the evil of trusts.

Roosevelt's nomination by the Philadelphia convention, to run as vice presidential candidate with McKinley, which was a defeat for himself as well as for Boss Hanna, was a victory—the only victory for anyone in that cut-and-dried convention—for Boss Platt, of New York. Boss Platt wanted Roosevelt out of the way at home, where he was an aspirant for reelection as governor. Not that Roosevelt refuses absolutely to obey the boss. He is obedient enough, and in magazine articles he makes a virtue of being so. But he assumes such

an air of independence as to give Boss Platt the fidgets whenever a delicate combination is being worked out, even though he knows that Roosevelt will finally take the place assigned him. It is annoying also to have to humor those whims of Roosevelt's by which he tries to save his face as an independent. His refusal to appoint Boss Platt's man Payn to the New York insurance department was an example. Payn he would not and did not appoint. But he did appoint Hendricks, another of Boss Platt's men, thereby leaving the powerful insurance department under Platt's control. This suited Boss Platt's purposes well enough; but then it was irritating to Platt to have to go through a bit of gallery play like that merely to keep Roosevelt's useless reputation as a reformer furnished up. So Boss Platt set out to unload Roosevelt upon the national ticket, that the ways of the machine in New York might be smooth; and with the aid of Boss Quay he succeeded in landing his man despite Boss Hanna's opposition. Hanna pretends, now, that he was in favor of Roosevelt all along, and opposed him only far enough to get Platt and Quay committed. But that is a mental attitude which the great fable writers have portrayed much better than we can, if in this instance it needs portrayal. So Roosevelt finds himself in a position where Boss Hanna does not want him and where he did not want to be himself, but where he will be out of Boss Platt's way in New York. Should he get in Boss Hanna's way in Washington, that will not unpleasantly concern Platt. This bird's-eye view of the affair is not vouched for as accurate; but it is the way the thing looks to a man up a tree.

The chorus of a new campaign lyric, sung at the initial republican ratification meeting in Carnegie hall, New York, on the 26th, is deemed sufficiently important to telegraph over the country. Here are the lines:

Hail the name of Bill McKinley, in trouble always calm!

Hail! Rough Rider, Teddy Roosevelt, the hero of San Juan!  
Up in Maine or down in Dixie forever and for aye,  
Honors due to Bill and Teddy from the Blue and the Gray.

Since Roosevelt has leaped—he always leaps—to the first place in point of picturesqueness upon the ticket where his official place is second, and as he is a thorough believer, as his outpourings of magazine articles go to show, in the maxim that "in the hands of one entirely great the pen is mightier than the sword" even as an instrument of deadly warfare, a better chorus (with apologies, of course, to the author of Pinafore) would run like this:

For he himself hath said it,  
And it's greatly to his credit:  
He's the Hero of San Juan.  
For he might have done the fightin',  
And let others do the writin'  
As becomes a modest man.  
But, spite of all temptations,  
He has published to the nations:  
He's the Hero of San Juan.

#### THE MCKINLEY-ROOSEVELT PLATFORM.

##### I.

In a delicious political satire by Stewart Chaplin, published in the June Century, the subtle art of constructing party platforms is exquisitely and humorously worked out. It is there explained that they must, for example, "please civil service people and not scare the beelers, please the gold people and not scare the silverites; please the people generally that want economy and not scare the cross-roads folks that want a marble post office and a granite bridge over their creek; please the anti-trust element and not scare the capitalists, and please the free traders without scaring the protectionists;" and that they must "be written with lots of nerve, sliding over all the things the people are hot about and going in strong for what nobody disputes."

The most important element in the construction of these platforms is what the satirist calls "weasel words." They are the "words that suck all the life out of the words next to them, just as a weasel sucks an egg and leaves the shell;" so that "if you left the egg afterward, it's as light as a feather and not very filling when

you are hungry, but a basketful of them would make quite a show and would bamboozle the unwary." Examples of weasel words are "wise exceptions," "justly" "undue," "duly," etc., and their synonyms and variables.

When duly drafted in accordance with these principles of the art, a political platform is, in the estimation of the satirist we are quoting, a sort of stained glass window; "you look through one pane and see a purple dog, and you look through another and he's green, but what his real color is you can't tell till you throw open the window."

In some respects this ingenious satire of Mr. Chaplin's quite snugly fits the McKinley-Roosevelt platform adopted last week at Philadelphia.

A happy use of the weasel word "practicable" will be found in the civil service plank of the Philadelphia document, where it is declared that employment in the public service in our outlying dependences should be confined to their inhabitants—"as far as practicable." Happier still, in view of the Cuban postal corruption, is the weasel phraseology in which the administration is complimented, in the same plank, for having acted "wisely in its effort to secure for public service in Cuba," and our other colonies, "only those whose fitness has been determined by training and experience."

There is another weasel word example in the demand for the extension of the rural free delivery postal service, the demand being limited with neat vagueness by the phrase, "wherever its extension may be justified."

And without using any words of the weasel sort at all, several planks beautifully exemplify the weasel word principle. The demand for good roads, for instance, is cordially approved, but with a weaselly reference of the subject "to the earnest consideration of the people and of the legislatures of the several states;" while, for another instance, such monetary legislation is favored, with a view to reducing interest rates, "as will enable the varying needs of the season and of all sections to be promptly met in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed and commerce enlarged"—which is about

as definite as the size of a piece of chalk.

In one respect it is almost impossible to distinguish Mr. Chaplin's satire from the McKinley-Roosevelt reality. A plank in Mr. Chaplin's satirical platform deals with the trust question; so does one of the planks in the McKinley-Roosevelt platform; and they are so much alike that we quote them both for comparison. Here is one of them:

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade, but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectually restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition, and secure the rights of producers, laborers and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

And here is the other:

Dangerous trusts should be vigorously suppressed. Octopus-like, they threaten the very existence of our institutions. But large business enterprises, honestly administered, whatever their nominal form, which effect prudent economies, while paying more for their raw material, buying more of it, employing more labor, paying higher wages and reducing prices of the finished product, without injury to the interests of the public or of independent competitors, should be encouraged.

In one of these planks, it will be observed, the anti-trust sentiment is catered to in the opening clauses while the capitalists are reassured at the close, whereas in the other this arrangement is reversed. But that is the only difference, and it would require a shrewd guess to decide which plank was intended to be satirical and which serious. Nor is that difficulty a reflection upon the wit of the satirist, for both planks are satires. But the one that was intended to befuddle rather than amuse, and so was inserted in the McKinley-Roosevelt platform as a serious declaration, is, let us save the guessing energies of our readers by explaining, the former of the two.

Little if anything more, however, can be said of the weasel characteristics of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform. It is singularly short of

evasive planks. Well, indeed, will it be for the country if the Kansas City platform shall prove to be as free. On the vital issues of the campaign, with the single exception of the trust question, the McKinley-Roosevelt republicans have declared themselves in unmistakable terms. The charge against them, for the most part, is not that they have evaded issues, but that they have taken ground on the wrong side of them.

That they have done this, and not this alone, but also that in doing it they have stultified their earlier record and become essentially a different party from that which Abraham Lincoln led to initial victory, it is our purpose to show.

## II.

But before taking up the weightier questions pursuant to that purpose, we may advantageously run over some of the minor points which the McKinley-Roosevelt platform presents.

It is not exactly candid in this platform—to begin with a very minor matter indeed—to imply as it does that in defeating Bryan in 1896 McKinley defeated Cleveland. For at that time Cleveland and all who sympathized with him were doing their utmost to defeat Bryan and elect McKinley, while of all Cleveland's critics the Bryan party was the most severe. This is matter of common knowledge. Yet the McKinley-Roosevelt platform has the unblushing effrontery, in its opening declaration, to say that—

the expectation in which the American people, turning from the democratic party, intrusted power four years ago to a republican chief magistrate and a republican congress, has been met and satisfied—

as if Bryan's defeat had been Cleveland's defeat, or Cleveland's supersession had been Bryan's condemnation. That clause embodies a clumsy misrepresentation.

There is a more subtle misrepresentation in that part of the platform which assumes credit for bringing on prosperity. The fact of prosperity might be very effectively disputed. It is certainly very sincerely doubted. But even if the false statement of the platform that "capital is fully employed and everywhere labor is prof-

itably occupied," be conceded, it is not honest to claim this as a result of the election of McKinley and the defeat of Bryan. The best argument for that claim is that whereas the democrats were in power during the hard times, the republicans are in power in the good times; and that would be bad logic even if it were a fact. The democrats in power during the hard times were not Bryan democrats, and if they had been, the argument that would make them responsible for the hard times of the 90's would make the republicans themselves responsible for the hard times of the 70's, for they were in power all through that terrible period which introduced the tramp to American civilization. And they had been in power for years before.

The platform under review drops from misrepresentation into something worse when it calls for—

legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

For these mild-mannered words mean much more than they express. What they mean was revealed last winter in congress when the ship subsidy bill, supported by Senator Hanna until the stench of it compelled even him to let it go, proposed to open the public treasury to the tune of millions of dollars annually to an eastern shipping ring.

After our examination, which is thus far so uncomplimentary to the good faith of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform, one might be justified in discounting the platform's promise to reduce the war taxes. But the language of that promise itself, in the light of very recent history, discredits it. The platform reads on this subject:

The country is now justified in expecting, and it will be the policy of the republican party to bring about, a reduction of the war taxes.

Why is the public justified in expecting this relief now? Why was it not justified in expecting it while congress was in session? What has happened meanwhile? Nothing. Yet the republican congress, completely under the influence of the republican administration, positively refused to lessen the war taxes. Moreover,

why promise merely to reduce? Why not abolish the war tax if it is true, as the platform asserts, that the Dingley bill has so well performed its work as to make it possible to reduce the war debt in the sum of \$40,000,000? With a tariff bill producing such a surplus, there should be no necessity for any war taxes.

It is to be feared that the promise to reduce war taxes is conceived in the same deceptive spirit as that which dictated the misrepresentations already considered and the mendacious plank about the gold standard pledge to be quoted in the next paragraph.

The gold standard plank of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform is contradicted not only by well-known facts, but also by the express terms of the preceding platform. This plank, referring to the platform of four years before, that of 1896, says that the party then—

promised to restore prosperity by means of two legislative measures—a protective tariff and a law making gold the standard of value.

But the well-known fact is that the party did not promise a law making gold the standard of value. What it did promise was to preserve, not create, the gold standard until bimetallism could be established by international agreement, which it pledged itself to promote. In testimony of this, reference may be had to the republican platform of 1896, in which the party then declared itself—opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved.

That pledge is so far short of a promise to enact a law making gold the standard of value, and so radically different from such a promise, that by no possibility could the declaration quoted above from the McKinley-Roosevelt platform have been adopted in good faith.

### III.

It is, however, to the great issues of which the McKinley-Roosevelt platform takes cognizance that we wish especially to draw attention; and foremost among these, of course, is the issue of protection. Not only is this so historically; it is so in a sense

the most broad and profound. The protection issue raises something more than a question of dollars and cents. It touches the question of human rights and of the world's civilization. For out of the protection seed has grown the upas tree of imperialism.

Yet it is as a question of dollars and cents that the issue of protection at first presents itself to the mind; and in the McKinley-Roosevelt platform, as in preceding republican platforms, it is considered in no other way. But in this platform the absurdity of the protection idea is exposed with unusual clearness in a charmingly ingenuous reference to the balance of trade fallacy, which is at the core of the protection theory as an economic doctrine.

Asserting that prosperity is more general and abundant than ever before, and claiming for the republican party the sole credit for this, the platform proceeds:

No single fact can more strikingly tell the story of what republican government means to the country than this—that while during the whole period of 107 years, from 1790 to 1897, there was an excess of exports over imports of only \$383,028,497, there has been in the short three years of the present republican administration an excess of exports over imports in the enormous sum of \$1,483,537,094.

That is to say, while this country from 1790 to 1897 sent away wealth, in excess of the wealth it got back, to the amount of \$383,028,497—impoverishing itself to that extent—the McKinley administration has in three years raised the excess, and thereby increased the impoverishment, to \$1,483,537,094.

An assumption is implied, of course, that an equivalent has either been or is to be received back. But that assumption has no basis. There can be no equivalent in credits to be drawn against. For Europe is not in debt to us. Despite this vast excess of exports we are notoriously in debt to Europe. Neither has the excess of exports been paid in gold or silver. Our exports of gold and silver exceed our imports of those metals. So far as the statistics go, this enormous excess of exports is a dead loss to our country. Yet the McKinley-Roosevelt platform brags about it

as the one single fact that more strikingly than any other tells "the story of what republican government means to the country"! What it does mean in fact is that the extortions of non-resident bondholders, trust owners and landlords have been increased.

In the British statistics a similar story is told as to what British government means to India. According to the Statesman's Year Book for 1899, the excess of exports from India over imports to India averages \$130,000,000 a year; and like our excess of exports it is continuous year by year. There is never a counter-balancing excess of imports. The British government tells about this in its statistics. It has to. But it doesn't brag about it as if such a drain of wealth from India were evidence of prosperity in India.

There is where the McKinley-Roosevelt platform differs from the British government. It actually brags of an enormous drain of wealth from the country, as if that were proof of greater wealth in the country. Its absurd theory is that the more goods an individual or a nation gets rid of, without ever getting anything back—either money, other goods, or an account to draw against—the richer it is! And that is the extraordinary notion upon which protection as an economic theory rests.

This theory found timid expression for the first time in a republican platform in 1872, in this demand for a tariff for revenue with incidental production:

That revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote the industries, prosperity and growth of the whole country.

No advances beyond this had been made by protection in 1876, nor yet in 1880, when the platform in that respect did not materially differ from the plank just quoted; but in 1884 a distinct though still cautious advance may be noted. In that year the platform demanded that—

the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made not "for revenue only," but that in raising the requisite revenues for the government such duties shall be so levied as to af-

ford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor as well as capital may have its just award and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

More boldness was exhibited in 1888, when the platform declared the party to be "uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection," and to meet the demand for a reduction of revenues proposed the repeal of certain internal revenue taxes, and—

such a revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which cannot be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is required for the wants of the government, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system, etc.

By this time the party had fully accepted the protection doctrine, and in 1892 it reaffirmed "the American doctrine of protection," "calling attention to its growth abroad," and unreservedly declaring that—

all articles which cannot be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty; and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be duties levied equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

Until now the notion that the country is enriched by what it exports and not by what it imports and that continuous prosperity therefore requires a continuous excess of exports, had figured only as a stump speech argument, like the kindred notion that the foreigner pays the tax. In this platform of 1892, however, the excessive export notion was formally adopted as a party doctrine in a plank which pointed to the "success of the republican policy of reciprocity," because under it our—

export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops.

This declaration was an advance in unconscionable preparation for the policy of imperialism, so soon to supplement the protection policy. For the business element in the policy of im-

perialism is the belief that trade consists in exporting more than you import, and consequently that the business of the country needs new and enlarged markets for its exports. That may be seen by reference to the McKinley-Roosevelt platform where it advocates an isthmian canal because "every effort should be made to open and obtain new markets, especially in the orient," and to the business arguments that are put forth in support of imperialism. Imperialism is relied upon to afford an outlet for American goods. The idea of enlarging markets for exports was finally clinched in the platform of 1896 with the declaration that—

Protection builds up domestic industry and trade and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.

This advancing policy of protection, put forward by American plutocratic interests in the name of American labor, and out of which has developed the most gigantic aggregation of monopolies the world ever saw, is at bottom a denial of human rights. For it contemplates and has caused the enactment of laws forbidding men to trade their labor and the products of their labor in freedom. That invasion of personal liberty once secured, the total destruction of liberty is only a matter of keeping on. It is not strange, therefore, that the republican party, founded in liberty and dedicated to its establishment, should have drifted with the current of protectionism out upon the unbounded and boundless sea of imperialism. That it has done this is now assured. The McKinley-Roosevelt platform, though it retains some of the phrases, repudiates the great principles of human freedom for which the republican party once stood.

#### IV.

The event in our country's history which opened the way to that repudiation was the Spanish-American war of 1898. It was a war, says the platform, "for liberty and human rights," and "no thought of national aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards were unfurled." All that is true.

But the republican administration did not allow the war to continue as

such a war, nor its high purpose to remain untarnished; and now the platform of the party indorses the recalcant acts of that administration.

When the question of the Spanish war came before congress in April, 1898, the joint resolution demanding that Spain withdraw her forces from Cuba and Cuban waters contained this clause:

Resolved, first, that the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent.

That resolution was adopted with great difficulty, a long contest occurring over the words "are and." The point involved in the contest was the question of the existence of the provisional government of the republic of Cuba. To have cut out the words "are and" would have left the resolution as declaring merely that the people of Cuba ought to be free and independent. But to leave those words in the resolution was to decide that they were then free and independent in their organized capacity as the republic of Cuba. To contest over those two little words was between congressmen and senators who believed that we should assist the republic of Cuba to throw off the Spanish yoke, and others who believed that we should ignore the republic of Cuba altogether; and the question was determined in favor of intervening in behalf of the republic. It was so understood at the time and there was no room to understand it otherwise.

But when the war had got under way the significance of those two words, "and are," was totally disregarded by the administration; and from that time on the resolution, though a law of the land in the form quoted above, was lawlessly treated as if it had read:

Resolved, first, that the people of the island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent.

The republic of Cuba, that is, was ignored in spite of the law, and that was the beginning of the policy of imperialism.

This policy soon developed the Philippine question. As the invasion of the Philippine islands had not been foreseen by congress, which had had no other country than Cuba under consideration, the resolution quoted

above was not in terms applied to those islands. But in spirit it applied to them as well as to Cuba. For there, as in Cuba, the people had risen in rebellion against the Spanish yoke. Yet, because the congressional resolution as to independence had not been expressly applied to the Philippines, the administration, pursuing the policy of imperialism, secured a bare technical title to the islands and proceeded to treat its people literally as "subjects" of the American republic. And now that imperial policy is adopted as the established policy of the republican party in these words:

In accepting by the treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish war, the president and the senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the western Indies and in the Philippine islands. That course created our responsibility before the world and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain, to provide for the maintenance of law and order, and for the establishment of good government, and for the performance of international obligations. Our authority could not be less than our responsibility, and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the government to maintain its authority, to put down armed insurrection, and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples. The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

In fact the people of the Philippines were not an "unorganized population." American official reports show that they had a government of their own which governed the country in liberty and peace. In fact, too, the so-called sovereign rights of the United States did not extend, even technically, beyond Manila, when the administration assumed sovereignty over the whole archipelago and thereby declared war against the native government. But these matters were fully set forth, with extracts from official documents in substantiation, in No. 111 of *The Public*, at page 83. The important part of the platform as quoted above, for consideration at this time, is the last sentence, which promises the Filipinos—the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties.

Compare that imperialist prom-

ise of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform with the truly democratic sentiments of the earlier republican platforms.

In the first platform of the party, that of 1856, we find this:

The maintenance of the principles promulgated in the declaration of independence and embodied in the federal constitution is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.

And in that same platform the doctrine that might makes right was denounced as a highwayman's plea.

Still more explicit on the question of self-government was the republican platform of 1860, the one on which Lincoln was elected. Quoting that clause of the declaration of independence which declares that all men are created equal and endowed with rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," it reasserted that the maintenance of those principles is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions. In 1868 it recognized—

the great principles laid down in the immortal declaration of independence as the true foundation of democratic government.

And in 1876, again quoting the same principles from the declaration of independence, the platform declared:

Until the truths are cheerfully obeyed, or, if need be, vigorously enforced, the work of the republican party is unfinished.

Allegiance to these same principles was reaffirmed in 1884.

But in 1900, after such a record of devotion to the great elementary doctrine of liberty, this party of Lincoln, which discreetly refrains from mentioning his name on this fortieth anniversary of his first election, and dare not quote his immortal words, sinks to that level of autocratic complacency where it dare proclaim its purpose to confer upon 10,000,000 people such measure of self-government as it thinks consistent with their welfare and its duties! The imperial Caesars of declining Rome were not less generous nor more presumptuous.

V.

Having reached this stage of imperialism, the republican party as it

now exists, represented by a McKinley and a Roosevelt and bossed by a Hanna, a Platt and a Quay, could have expressed no greater sympathy than it did for the struggling Boers.

It made this declaration in its platform of 1868:

This convention declares itself in sympathy with all oppressed peoples who are struggling for their rights.

In 1872 it declared that the American government should maintain honorable peace with all nations while—sympathizing with all peoples who strive for greater liberty.

In 1888 it earnestly hoped—that we may soon congratulate our fellow citizens of Irish birth upon the peaceful recovery of home rule for Ireland.

And in 1892 it declared—

The republican party has always been the champion of the oppressed, and recognizes the dignity of manhood irrespective of faith, color or nationality. It sympathizes with the cause of home rule in Ireland, and protests against the persecution of the Jews in Russia.

But now that the national life of the two South African republics hangs in the balance, with an enormous imperial army from Britain invading their country against the resistance of one barely a tenth, as large and asserting an intention to destroy every shred of their independence, all that the McKinley-Roosevelt remnant of the grand old champion of the oppressed can say is this:

While the American government must continue the policy prescribed by Washington, affirmed by every succeeding president, and imposed upon us by The Hague treaty, of non-intervention in European controversies, the American people earnestly hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to determine the strife between them.

Non-intervention in European affairs cuts no figure when these American imperialists talk grandly of abandoning the "little Americanism" of Washington and blooming out as "a world power" in copartnership with the empires of Europe. But when two little republics are in a fight for existence with one of those European empires, the American imperialists cannot even hope for their independence. They can hope only for honorable peace! That is what Great Britain offers—honorable peace without independence.

The whole democratic life appears to have gone out of the republican party. Nothing but the old shell is left and that is vitalized by an all-absorbing imperial ambition.

## VI.

The form which this ambition takes is indicated by the clause of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform already quoted with reference to the Philippines. It is the form of colonial empire, under which such measure of self-government is to be given as this government may think consistent with the welfare of its subjects and its duties regarding them. That is not national growth; it is colonial acquisition. It is not expansion, but imperialism.

This policy rests upon the theory that the colonies or territories are not within the protection of the constitution and have no right to become states in the union.

But that was not always the doctrine of the republican party. While it is true that the platform of 1856 declared that—

the constitution confers upon congress sovereign power over the territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the imperative duty of congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery—

that declaration did not mean and was never understood by the party to mean that constitutional guarantees do not extend over territories.

This is evident from the same platform, which charged the then federal administration with a "high crime against the constitution," for acts done in a territory. It is further evident from a plank in the republican platform of 1860, which insisted, though that was long prior to the anti-slavery amendment, that slavery cannot constitutionally exist in a territory.

Neither did the declaration quoted above imply that the admission of territories into the union as states is mere matter of congressional grace and not an inherent right. In the platform of 1888 the declaration quoted above from the platform of 1856 was supplemented by this entirely harmonious and genuinely democratic explanation:

The government by congress of the territories is based upon necessity, only to the end that they may become states in the Union. Therefore, whenever the conditions of population, material resources, public intelligence and morality are such as to insure a stable local government therein, the people of such territories should be permitted as a right inherent in them to form for themselves constitutions and state governments and be admitted into the Union.

By no ingenuity can these declarations of inherent right in the territories be harmonized with the doctrine of absolute federal power over territories, to which the McKinley-Roosevelt party is now formally committed. That doctrine is not a development from those declarations; it is in absolute hostility to them.

The republican party has reversed itself. From a democratic party in the true sense of that much-abused term, it has become, like the tory party of England, an imperialist party. Having abandoned the declaration of independence and turned its back upon Lincoln's ideal of a government not only of and for the people but by the people, it is now no more the party of Lincoln than the slavery-ridden democratic party of Buchanan was the party of Jackson or of Jefferson.

## NEWS

Though the newspapers have been vocal this week with sensational rumors about the situation in China, they have not been able to publish much trustworthy news. The only authenticated fact of importance is the taking of Tientsin by the allied foreign forces.

Tientsin is the port of Peking. It lies up the Peiho river 30 miles above Taku, which, as explained last week, is a fortified place at the mouth of this river on the Gulf of Pechili. There were reports on the 22d that the American consulate at Tientsin had been destroyed and other foreign property badly damaged on the 18th, after a bombardment of the foreign quarter by Boxers and Chinese troops lasting 36 hours, the assailants being resisted by a foreign garrison of some 3,000 troops, mostly Russians. A large foreign force was then massing at Taku for their relief. The next day

the American admiral, Kempff, telegraphed from his station at Chefoo, near the mouth of the Gulf of Pechili, that a small force of Russians and Americans, on their way to Tientsin had had an engagement with the Chinese army and been unable to break through the line. This relieving force appears to have been repulsed and to have returned to Taku. The fighting in Tientsin was believed to be still in progress on the 21st; but on the 23d, the second relieving force entered the city, having first silenced the Chinese arsenal and broken through the Chinese lines. As its loss was small and no accounts of injuries sustained by the foreign residents of Tientsin have yet been made, the preceding rumors of a terrible life and death struggle and a destructive bombardment were not improbably grossly exaggerated.

Peking is still cut off, and a mystery hangs about the allied relieving expedition under the British Admiral Seymour, who was reported last week as having been obliged to return. But he had not returned. Dispatches of the 22d told of his entering Peking simultaneously with the large Russian force which was mentioned last week as marching upon Peking; and these were quickly followed by others which told of his being surrounded half way between Tientsin and Peking. There was one, also, to the effect that he had been killed. On the 24th a dispatch reported that no word had been received from him for 12 days. Japanese reports of the 26th had him captured, and an American report of the 27th told of his having heliographed news that he is besieged in Peking. As we write there comes a report of June 28, from Chefoo, saying that he has been relieved, but had failed to reach Peking. On the 25th Admiral Kempff reported to Washington that since communication with Peking was interrupted on the 10th he had received from there but one communication, which was dated June 12th. In the same report he verified the news given in these columns at pages 122 and 150, of the departure of an allied relieving force sent from Taku to Peking. He said of this that—

a force of 100 Americans, uniting with a total force of 2,500 men of all nationalities represented here, went June 10 to open the road and to relieve Peking. This movement was by permission of the Chinese govern-

ment. The last news from the expedition was dated June 12, when the expedition was at Lang Fang. The railroad had been destroyed behind it since.

The American regiment ordered from Manila to China, as reported last week, was detained at Manila by the typhoon until the 27th, when it was dispatched in two transports convoyed by the gunboat Princeton. The armored cruiser Brooklyn had sailed on the 26th from the Philippines for Taku. Brig. Gen. Chaffee is assigned to the command of the American land forces in China, and directed to proceed to Peking by way of Taku. He is to sail from San Francisco on the 1st with the 6th cavalry.

The European powers are rapidly increasing their forces in China. They are massing them at Taku. The British are now expected to send 10,000 men from India. Of this quota one regiment embarked at Calcutta on the 25th. Japan purposes sending 15,000 within a fortnight. It is estimated in London that the foreign powers will soon have not less than 40,000 men upon the ground. The number already massed at Taku on the 24th was 8,000. Jealousies have begun to appear, as is cautiously intimated by a military correspondent at Taku, who says that the operations of the allies are suffering from defective organization and the want of a recognized head.

While the allied powers are thus preparing to march upon the Chinese capital, the viceroy of the southern provinces of Hunan and Hupeh has made an appeal to them, through the Chinese minister, to suspend further military operations until Li Hung Chang, now on his way from the south, can reach Peking and consult with the empress and the emperor with a view to averting war. The appeal lays responsibility for the assaults upon foreigners in China upon the lawlessness of the Boxers, whom it charges also with assaults upon the Chinese as well. Replying to this appeal Secretary Hay has notified the Chinese minister to this country that there can be no delay in the dispatch of American troops to Peking; and it is understood at Washington that a similar reply has been given by the European powers to the Chinese representatives accredited respectively to them.

So completely have Chinese affairs occupied the attention of the press, and so reticent is Lord Roberts, that there is only scant news from the war in South Africa, although the end of that conflict is nowhere yet in sight, and an important British movement is evidently in progress. Lord Roberts appears to have turned his attention from the Transvaal to the eastern part of the Orange Free State, where the Boers have been giving him no end of trouble. Within a few days they have again cut his communications on the railroad a little to the north of Kroonstad, giving him one of the fiercest engagements he has recently fought. For the purpose of crushing the Boers in the Orange Free State he has organized four separate armies to sweep them into a net. One advances from Heidelberg, in the southern part of the Transvaal; one from Heilbron, in the Orange Free State, somewhat east of the main line of the railroad; one from Lindley, about 40 miles further south; and one from Winberg, east of the railroad at Smaldell. These points lie nearly in a straight line from north to south, and the movement is a converging one in an easterly direction. Gen. Buller cooperates by effecting a junction with the Heidelberg force and holding the railroad that runs from Johannesburg to Ladysmith, thus completing the net within which the Boers to the south of the Vaal, supposed to number 8,000 in arms, are to be encircled. He has advanced northward along the railroad as far as Standerton. This encircling movement is regarded in London as destined to be the decisive campaign of the war.

In the Philippines the latest report of fighting bears date the 24th, and tells of an engagement on the 14th in which a detachment of 100 Americans was repulsed and driven back to the coast with a loss of seven killed and 12 wounded. This engagement occurred on the Tagayen river. Troubles in the island of Samar were reported at the same time, together with information that reinforcements had been sent there.

The amnesty proclamation to the Filipinos by President McKinley, announced in our last issue, was officially given out on the 21st over the signature of Gen. MacArthur as military governor. It bears date June 21 at Manila and offers—  
amnesty with complete immunity for

the past and absolute liberty of action for the future to all persons who are now, or at any time since February 4, 1899, have been in insurrection against the United States in either a military or a civil capacity, and who shall within a period of 90 days from the date hereof formally renounce all connection with such insurrection and subscribe to a declaration acknowledging and accepting the sovereignty and authority of the United States in and over the Philippine islands. The privilege herewith published is extended to all concerned without any reservation whatever, excepting that persons who have violated the rules of war during the period of hostilities are not embraced within the scope of this amnesty.

The proclamation concludes with an offer to all who apply: to receive them according to their rank, to provide for their immediate wants, to furnish them passes and free transport to any part of the island, and to assist the destitute by paying 30 pesos (about \$25 gold) to each man who presents a rifle in good condition. Nine imprisoned Filipino leaders at Manila, including Gen. Pio del Pilar, took the oath of allegiance under the proclamation on the 27th, and were thereupon released. Otherwise the proclamation had up to that time been without result.

On the day that this amnesty proclamation was issued about 200 Filipinos met in Manila under the auspices of the American military authorities, to consider the possibilities of an honorable peace, and in the evening of the same day they submitted to Gen. MacArthur the results of their deliberations, which were—

1. Amnesty.
2. The return by the Americans to the Filipinos of confiscated property.
3. Employment for the revolutionary generals in the navy and militia when established.
4. The application of the Filipino revenues to succor needy Filipino soldiers.
5. A guaranty to the Filipinos of the exercise of personal rights accorded to Americans by their constitution.
6. Establishment of civil governments at Manila and in the provinces.
7. Expulsion of the friars.

The meeting was composed exclusively of the patriotic element. Thirty political prisoners were released from jail by Gen. MacArthur to enable them to attend, and Senor Paterno presided. Three days after this meeting, on the 24th, Gen. MacArthur returned his formal reply. He assured

the Filipinos that all personal rights under the United States constitution would be guaranteed their people, excepting the right to bear arms and the right to trial by jury. But he rejected the clause demanding expulsion of the friars, on the ground that that question rests with the Taft commission.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to June 27, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900, (see page 91) .....	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900, .....	22
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900, .....	100
<b>Total deaths since July 1, 1898, .....</b>	<b>1,969</b>
Wounded .....	2,179
<b>Total casualties since July, 1898, .....</b>	<b>4,148</b>
Total casualties reported last week .....	4,099
Total deaths reported last week .....	1,931

As we went to press last week the republican convention at Philadelphia had just nominated William McKinley for president and Theodore Roosevelt for vice president of the United States. Both were unanimously nominated, the only vote against Roosevelt being his own. Before the making of these nominations on the 21st the resolution offered on the 20th by Senator Quay, and reported last week as calculated to reduce southern and increase northern representation in future republican conventions, was laid before the convention. Mr. Quay at once withdrew it. Alabama being then called to name her choice for presidential nominee, she yielded to Ohio, and Senator Foraker, of Ohio, responded with the speech nominating McKinley. Gov. Roosevelt followed, and was succeeded in turn by Senator Thurston, of Nebraska; John W. Yerkes, of Kentucky; George Knight, of California, and Gov. Mount, of Indiana, with seconding speeches. No other nomination was made, and of a total of 930 votes Mr. McKinley received them all. When Alabama was again called, this time to name her choice for vice president, she yielded to Iowa, and Lafe Young, of Iowa, editor of the Des Moines Capital, responded, making the speech nominating Roosevelt. This nomination was seconded in speeches by Butler Murray, of Massachusetts; James M. Ashton, of

Washington, and Senator Depew, of New York. The vote being taken Roosevelt, having no competitor, received 925, the chairman announcing that only 926 delegates were in the hall. The convention, which had opened for the session at 10:30 in the morning, adjourned sine die at 2:14 in the afternoon.

The important event of the week in democratic politics is the Illinois state convention, which concluded its work at Springfield on the 27th. Ex-Gov. Altgeld was received with exceptional enthusiasm when he entered the hall, and not being a delegate he was invited to address the convention, which he did. His influence undoubtedly secured an adherence in the platform to the national platform of 1896, and probably turned the tide from Ortseifen, the gubernatorial favorite of the Chicago faction, to Samuel Alschuler, who was nominated on the second ballot. The platform reaffirms and indorses, "in whole and in all of its parts, in letter and in spirit, the democratic national platform of 1896." Mayor Harrison of Chicago, and Ben T. Cable, are among the delegates at large to the national convention, and ex-Vice President A. E. Stephenson and ex-Congressman George W. Fithian are among the alternates. Owing to the opposition of Mayor Harrison, ex-Gov. Altgeld was not named as a delegate.

The national prohibition convention met at Chicago on the 27th, but had not at this writing made any nominations. The platform adopted on the 27th is confined to prohibition principles, characterizing the liquor traffic as the primary evil of civilization. In harmony with this view it denounces President McKinley for using wine, for maintaining the army canteen, and for permitting the introduction of the saloon in the Philippines.

The Union Reform party of Illinois, having the initiative and referendum as its primary demand, met at Chicago on the 27th and nominated a state ticket with Lloyd G. Spencer as the candidate for governor.

On the 25th a conference of leading anti-imperialists was held at the Plaza hotel, New York, in response to a call of the American Anti-Imperialist league. Ex-Gov. Boutwell,

of Massachusetts, presided, and a resolution offered by Carl Schurz was adopted in the following terms:

Resolved, That to the end that we may carry into effect our condemnation of the imperialistic policy of the administration, the executive committee of the American Anti-Imperialistic league be instructed to issue a call for a general conference to meet at such time after the democratic national convention and at such place as may be decided upon by the committee.

In European politics the most important event reported is the compliance by the German government with the demands of the agrarians (agricultural protectionists) for the admission of Russian and Polish farm laborers into Germany in order to reduce the wages of German agricultural laborers, which have been somewhat advanced by the demand for manufacturing labor in cities.

A new ministry has been formed in Italy with Guisepe Saracco as minister of the interior and premier. This was made necessary by the resignation of the Pelloux ministry in consequence of the adverse results of the popular elections, as reported in these columns at page 136. The new ministry is composed of divergent elements, but is believed to be under the control of ex-Premier Crispi.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Tennessee supreme court on the 26th decided that women cannot practice law before any of the courts of that state. Two judges dissented.

—Estes G. Rathbone, the former director general of posts for Cuba, who was under suspension, was officially removed from office on the 25th.

—Sidney Lucas, an eastern horse, won the thirteenth American Derby at Washington park, Chicago, on the 23d. Forty thousand people saw the race.

—Several hundred Cuban teachers sailed from Matanzas on the 26th for Boston, where they will take the free summer course of Harvard university.

—Brigham H. Roberts, ex-congressman from Utah, was convicted of polygamy in Salt Lake City on the 21st. A number of the jurors were Mormons.

—Count Muravieff, Russian minister of foreign affairs, died from a stroke of apoplexy in St. Petersburg on the 21st. He had been foreign minister since 1897, and was 55 years old.

—The World's Woman's Christian Temperance union congress, in session in London, reelected Lady Henry Somerset as president and Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, of Maine, as vice president.

—Miss Jane Addams spoke at the World's Congress of Women at the Paris exposition on the 21st on the subject of "Hull House, Chicago," and was vigorously applauded by the convention.

—Martin J. Russell, editor in chief of the Chicago Chronicle, and one of the most brilliant editorial writers in the west, died at Mackinac on the 25th, from Bright's disease, aged 54 years. Mr. Russell had been prominently identified with Chicago journalism since the close of the civil war. He was collector of the port during Cleveland's second administration.

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

	Exports.	Imports.
Merchandise .....	\$113,503,577	\$71,555,861
Gold .....	12,209,596	3,706,161
Silver .....	6,066,068	\$ 2,461,493
	\$131,779,231	\$77,723,515
Excess of exports..	54,055,716	

—For the 11 months ending May 31st, 1900, American exports and imports, according to the report of the treasury department, were as follows:

	Exports.	Imports.
Merchandise ....	\$1,286,214,534	\$753,792,848
Gold .....	40,173,491	40,867,135
Silver .....	51,524,356	30,357,267
	\$1,377,912,380	\$860,017,250
Excess of exports.	517,895,130	

MISCELLANY

SHALL IT NEVER COME DOWN?

An answer to President McKinley's question: "Who Will Haul It Down?"

For The Public.

Shall it never come down? Shall it never come down

From the heights where we placed it o'er hamlet and town?

Must it float there forever, the sign of our shame;

The flag which we love, whose glory and fame

Have been that it sheltered the wronged and oppressed;

That for Liberty's cause it by all should be blessed?

What matter if Malays or Cubans or others

Are weaker than we? Are they not still our brothers?

Is the birthright of freedom less theirs than 'tis ours?

Because they are weak, shall we crush out the powers

Which God has implanted? Forbid them to rise

To the stature of men 'neath the o'er-arching skies?

Shall it never come down? Shall it never come down?

Must our flag, honored more than e'er scepter or crown,

Now float o'er a land which is peopled with slaves;

Or lies desolate, sown but with patriots' graves?

Have we wandered so far from our principles, then,

That we're willing to traffic in women and men

In the effort to stand with the mighty of earth?

Can we hope to succeed, if the right of our birth

Is thus trampled upon? Can true freedom be ours

If we seek to oppress those of more feeble powers?

Oh, let it come down! Rather let it be furled,

Than flaunt its disgrace 'neath the eyes of the world.

Shall it never come down? Shall it never come down,

No matter what happens to hamlet or town?

Must the red glare of war and the dread din of battle,

The cannon's hoarse roar and the musketries' rattle

Make us false to the cause which for years we have claimed

Was most dear to our hearts, which we oft have proclaimed

Was the source of our hopes—was the cause of our being?

Must we fail of our aims when we thought we were seeing

The dawn of a day of peace on the earth; When the progress of man at last should give birth

To freedom for all; which, bursting all bands,

Should leave none oppressed throughout the known lands?

Shall it never come down? Shall it never come down?

O God, hide Thy face! lest Thy terrible frown

Shall strike us with death! Give us time to repent,

Ere, in Thy just wrath is the thunder-bolt sent!

Oh, give us to see that our own cause is falling;

That unto the gods of the heathen we're calling,

When we say, in our pride: "We are greater than they!"

We've the right to command. They the right to obey."

Oh, bid us awake from our arrogant pride!

Make us strive once again on fair Liberty's side!

Make our flag stand for Freedom o'er hamlet and town,

Lest in shame and disgrace it forever come down.

W. A. HAWLEY.

Bellevue, Pa.

WHO THOUGHT CHINA UNCIVILIZED?

At a chamber of commerce meeting in New York lately, William Barclay Parsons repeated an incident of his recent experience in China, at which his listeners laughed long. He thus describes it:

Sir Thomas Jackson spoke about the need of teaching the Chinese to build railroads. I found that they need no

teaching on this subject. A magistrate who was detailed to go everywhere with me, to see that I had every opportunity to conduct my business, was very anxious to know about railroads. He probably had never seen one in his life. One day he asked me where the station would be located in his capital town. I looked at him awhile, anxious to know if he understood what he was talking about. He would like very much to know. I told him that little matter would not be of the slightest importance. But he said he had an earnest desire to find that out, and he should like to have the knowledge for himself alone. I told him I did not know.

He expressed deep sorrow, and told me that it would help me also. I inquired how. "Why," he said, "I, like the other magistrates, can fix the price of land. I thought that all the business of the town would center about your railroad station, and that property there would become valuable. You and I can buy the land at our own price, and after having the station built in the center of it we could sell it back to the people we bought it from, charging our own prices."

Evidently human nature is not essentially different in China to what it is in the United States.—New Earth.

#### THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

From beginning to end there was not a word of vital discussion of party principle or policy, only a succession of bloated panegyrics. It was not intended that any delegate whose fidelity to boss rule was not assured should have an opportunity to open his mouth in the expression of opinion on dangerous questions. The bosses were afraid of free debate, and they suppressed every possibility of the appearance of a difference of opinion.

The convention was absolutely harmonious and absolutely useless as an indication of public sentiment. No representative of anti-administration sentiment on any subject was given an opportunity even to get himself hissed by the subservient lackeys of power. There was no more independent freedom of speech than in an assembly of Germans, Russians or Turks. Such a national convention was never before known in America. Twelve years ago it would have been the death of any party submitting to it. Perhaps it will be so now. It may be that there are yet some sparks of living independence in the republican party, that it is not a moribund organization composed wholly of dictators and cravens. There is more hope of the nation's purity and safety in the angriest free fight of a party caucus or convention, such as Ben Butler and Fred Williams have given samples of in this vicinity, than in such a convention as has been held this week in Philadelphia, having regard to the unrelieved acquiescence in

the tyranny of its control, and its emptiness of any genuinely popular character.—Boston Herald of June 22.

#### MR. BRYAN ON THE RIGHTS OF THE FILIPINOS.

I believe that the rights of the Filipinos and the rights of the Cubans are identical. The recognition of the rights of the Cubans by resolution did not create those rights. They existed before.

If the Filipinos have a right to their independence, the fact that they fought for it does not justify us in carrying on a war of conquest. It is no more humiliating for a nation to recognize the rights of an opponent than for an individual to do so. We would have had the same trouble in Cuba if we had treated the Cubans the same as we have the Filipinos. We would have had no trouble in the Philippine islands if we had treated the Filipinos as we have treated the Cubans.

If we are going to give the Filipinos their independence we ought to say so at once, and thus avoid further bloodshed. How can we justify the sacrifice of American soldiers and the killing of Filipinos merely to show that we can whip them?

The Bacon resolution received the support of nearly every democratic senator, and was adopted by a democratic caucus in the house. This resolution promised independence. If it had been accepted and acted upon when it was first introduced there would have been no Filipino war. If it had been adopted at the time the vote was taken it would have stopped the war.—William Jennings Bryan, in the Knoxville (Tenn.) Sentinel of June 22.

#### AN ENGLISH PROTEST AGAINST THE ANNEXATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLICS.

An extract from a letter by Silas K. Hocking, published in the London Christian World of May 24.

When the victorious armies of Germany marched to Paris, Germany did not annex France nor attempt to crush its spirit of nationality. She demanded a war indemnity, it is true, which was paid, and also annexed for strategical purposes two small provinces, which, however, have been a source of anxiety and unrest ever since.

If England were at war with a nation her own size there would be no talk of annexation; but because we are fighting a little people whom we can crush by weight of superior num-

bers we must, forsooth, take their country from them and destroy that sentiment of nationality for which they have fought so stubbornly. If it be said that we are compelled to annex, or they will threaten our peace in the future, I answer, Germany might have said the same thing of France; and we might say the same thing of other nations. According to some statesmen, France is a constant menace to us, so also is Russia. Why do not we wipe those countries from the family of nations in the interests of future peace? . . .

The Free State has existed on the best of terms with England, and no one, as far as I know, has said anything against its form of government. The only sin of the Free Staters is that they have been loyal to their own treaty and have fought side by side with the Boers of the Transvaal when the latter believed that their independence was threatened. That for standing side by side with their neighbors and fulfilling their treaty obligations they should lose their political life and their country seems a very harsh and cruel procedure.

#### ST. LOUIS' POSSE COMITATUS.

Developments in the strike of street-car employes in St. Louis place foremost the question whether a posse of citizens is not a greater menace to life and law than the industrial disorders which it is meant to combat. When the so-called rioting began there the police admitted that they were unable to cover the territory menaced. They expected that Gov. Stephens would send the militia to their aid. He refused to do so, for political and personal reasons, and the question of helping the police came up to the sheriff.

In summoning a posse comitatus he selected what he called "the best" men in St. Louis. The deputies were doctors, lawyers, rich business men and sons of millionaires. The newspapers wrote columns about them and laid special stress upon their wealth and attainments. Repeating shotguns loaded with buckshot were placed in their hands, and some of them began to ask: "Which end of the gun do you put the load in?" Most of them had never handled a weapon so modern and so deadly, and none of them knew what he might do if a crowd should become unruly. Of the 2,400 deputies thus far sworn to enforce the law and preserve property 35 per cent. were young men who bought leggings, red neckerchiefs, blue shirts and pistols and went about like the sheriffs in melodrama. "hon-

ing" for a chance to show their "gameness."

The average "good" citizen in that posse had an exaggerated idea of the damage that might be done by, say, the impact of a spoiled egg or an overdue tomato. No policeman will kill a stranger who calls him a "scab" or hits him with an egg. A trained soldier, whether regular or militia, is likely to smile grimly at a volley of mud, or even stones, but the millionaire posse man, very fragrant, very clean and quite undisciplined, smells revolution in the effluvia of putrid missiles, feels anarchy in the smack of a clod of mud and begins to shoot in a frenzy of good citizenship. Furthermore, even the most peace-loving labor man is not pleased to see perfumed and curled sons of millionaires stalking him with shotguns and ordering him to "move on" if he pauses to light his pipe.

The battle between strikers and rioters in Washington avenue was precipitated by the trivial causes here set forth. Five hundred conductors and motormen marched past the barracks of the posse. They had been to a picnic and were marching home. They should have avoided the barracks as a matter of mere prudence. But they did not know what an "itch" for fighting the young deputies had who patrolled the sidewalk. A stranger named Kennedy threw a brick through a passing car just as the strikers came abreast of the barracks. There was a striker named Thomas in line with the missile, and Deputy Webster "thought" it was he who threw the brick. It is worth noting right here that a policeman half a block away chased the real brick-thrower a block and caught him while the deputies were shooting down "rioters." Webster tried to arrest Thomas, who protested; a crowd of strikers gathered to object to the capture of an innocent man. That was another mistake, of course, but it was enough for the deputies. They poured out of their barracks and swept the streets and the adjoining buildings with buckshot. Three harmless strikers fell dying in their tracks. The man who started the trouble by throwing the brick was not a striker. The man who caught him was not a member of the posse comitatus. Left to himself, that policeman would have been enough to handle that especial case in its incipency. "Assisted" by a hundred hot-headed amateur "officers," the affair became a horrible tragedy.

The same afternoon four deputies, sons of prominent citizens, chased a dozen disorderly characters who were stoning cars. When the fugitives ran

through a gateway and closed the gate a deputy promptly put the muzzle of his gun into a knothole in the fence and blew the head off an old citizen who was reading his Bible in his own doorway within. Even when the deputies "fired over the heads of the crowd" they usually contrived to wound the ubiquitous innocent bystander. Nobody in St. Louis except deputies with a thirst for man-hunting now believes that a posse of citizens is a safe or effective means for establishing law and order. The posse has never stopped the sporadic attempts of unorganized mobs of women to denude others of their own sex. Every volley fired by deputies has been "impromptu," without orders, and justified by the general instructions of the sheriff to oppose force with force. A blow from a clod of mud has been answered with a charge of lead big enough to kill a buffalo. What is perhaps a more enduring evil resulting from this form of enforcing law and maintaining order is the enhanced bitterness with which the laboring classes of St. Louis, who are in sympathy with the strikers, regard the men of means and education who are carrying shotguns against what they believe is their cause. They respect a policeman, they would tolerate a militiaman in times of trouble, but a millionaire—"man hunter," they call him—looks all wrong. The posse comitatus is not a success in St. Louis.—Chicago Record of June 25.

#### THE CHINESE MOTES AND THE AMERICAN BEAMS.

An extract from a sermon by Herbert S. Bigelow, delivered in the pulpit of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, June 24. The subject was The Boxers, and the text chosen was: "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

Press reports say that regret was expressed in the navy department at Washington that the American ship did not participate in the action against the Taku forts. Regret did not seem to be that the bombardment should have been necessary, but that American seamen had not the savage satisfaction of taking a hand in the ugly business. Thus it is that while the Christian sentiment may be reluctantly drawn into a war, there is also the savage nature which glories in the occasion for war.

While we deny the Chinaman's right to murder foreigners who are there under treaty guarantees, are we equally ready to concede the right of his government, in a peaceable and legal way, to exclude foreigners? We exercised that right when we passed the

Chinese exclusion act. If the Chinaman does not like us, so much the worse for his taste, of course. But have we any stones to throw on that score? What are the Boxers but an A. P. A. organization, with yellow skins and pig-tails, and with the courage of their convictions?

But, we complain, the Chinaman does not want to trade with us. It is too bad he does not understand the beneficial ethical as well as economic effects of free trade. But are we the ones to instruct him? The difference between a Puerto Rican tariff, a McKinley tariff and a Chinese tariff is after all one of degree. All tariffs are relics of barbarism. Would that the American people were civilized enough to know that. But if England were to send her imperial armies here to teach us that lesson, what American would not rather die in the trenches than be enlightened?

But the Chinaman does not like our religion. Neither do I like the brand that is usually exported for his consumption. The more benighted a man's religion the more anxious he is to bestow it upon others. Missionary zeal seems to bear an inverse ratio to religious enlightenment. The natural method for the religious regeneration of a country would seem to be a reformation of the native faith by natives, not the imposition of a foreign faith by foreigners. To send missionaries to the heathen when we have such an abundance of paganism at home seems as much like impertinence as benevolence. We abominate the Chinese practice of shoe-lacing—a practice which is less injurious than the American way of lacing. We are shocked at the wicked ancestor-worship. We have never thought that some of the effort spent in destroying the ancestor-worship in China might be spent with profit inculcating respect for parents in the American youth. If, instead of exporting our Christianity, we should apply some of it to a solution of the problems of poverty, we would render a greater service to civilization than by converting the Chinese to the medieval elements of our theology. I sympathize with the preacher who said that he had no piety to boast of, and no religion to spare. It seems to me a trifle inconsistent for those who profess to believe in the fatherhood of God to suppose that the people who have not subscribed to their creed must depend for their salvation upon the somewhat uncertain contributions to the missionary box. I wish the Chinamen were enough advanced in civiliza-

tion to realize that the truth in their own religion would only be purified and strengthened by allowing foreigners their utmost freedom in trying to undermine it. But are we that civilized? It is a pity that the trustees of our colleges do not put the same value upon the freedom of thought and discussion. The press informed us that a body of Cincinnati preachers waited on the mayor one day last summer and asked that the police power be used to prevent the preaching of Mormonism on our street corners. It is no doubt to the credit of these preachers that they did not murder the Mormon missionaries. But the use of the police power to suppress freedom, and the use of a mob, are only different ways of doing the same thing.

But it is said the Chinaman is shockingly behind the times. Yet before we are carried away by the Kipling hysteria it would be well to consider the beam in our own eye. I do not believe we should permit the murder of our citizens. Neither do I believe we should begin the war for the protection of the missionary, and end it with a claim for territory. The Boxers were too accommodating. They seem to have proceeded on the plan of Artemus Ward, which was to find out what your enemy wants and then let him have it. In the light of previous aggressions upon Chinese soil we may perhaps be forgiven the suspicion that the powers might consider this opportunity worth the blood of several missionaries. It is certainly the duty of the United States to take no part in this business beyond the protection of American citizens. It is our manifest duty to practice the virtues of a Christian democracy. As Gladstone advised: "Let us recognize, and recognize with frankness, the equality of the weak with the strong, the principle of brotherhood among the nations and of their sacred independence."

#### DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Adopted about midday, July 4, 1776, by a Congress of representatives of the Thirteen Colonies, assembled in the State House, Philadelphia. It was sent forth with the signature of President John Hancock only, but was afterward written on parchment, and on August 2, 1776, the names of all but two of the Signers were affixed. These two were added afterward. Charles Carroll, the last survivor of the Signers, died in 1832.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to

which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established, should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having, in direct object, the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world:

He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature; a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused, for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the danger of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose, obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislature.

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has combined, with others, to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment, for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states:

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing laws on us without our consent:

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury:

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once

an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies:

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering, fundamentally, the powers of our governments:

For suspending our own legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection, and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is, at this time, transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun, with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens, taken captive on the high seas, to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction, of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions, we have petitioned for redress, in the most humble terms; our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attention to our British Brethren.

We have warned them from time to time, of attempts made by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them, by the ties of our common kindred, to disavow these usurpations which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace, friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance, to the British crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

THE MODERN SAINT.

For The Public.

The seed of Christ His church was martyrs' blood,  
Self-sacrifice to bring the world to good;  
But modern saints must keep their own skins whole  
And shed the heathen's blood to save his soul.

WALLACE RICE.

It is not the business of the United States to suppress a Chinese rebellion any more than it is the business of the Chinese to come over here and settle those who thought that the perpetuity of the union should be broken. This should be kept in mind while we are protecting all the rights of our citizens in China.—Detroit Free Press.

Fuddy—Honest, now, what kind of weather do you like best?

Duddy—That is a subject that has bothered me a good deal. On mature reflection I think the weather I like best is the weather we are not having at the time.—Boston Transcript.

Man did not make the earth, and though he had a natural right to occupy it, he had no right to locate as his property in perpetuity any part of it; neither did the Creator of the earth open a land office, from whence title deeds should issue.—"Agrarian Justice," by Thomas Paine.

The magazine called Good Health tells us of a family spoken of by a writer in Trained Motherhood. They were "kept, like Trotty, forever moving on, with never a place to call their own on God's earth. But at last a le-

gacy came to them, a quaint old house into which they settled with unutterable delight. In speaking of it, the mother sweetly said: 'We have always had a home, but never had a house to put it in before.'

"Were you interested at the piano recital?" asked the musician..

"Well," answered Mr. Cumrox, "it was a little slow at first; but after I caught the spirit of it and got to guessing with the others whether it was time to applaud or only a rest, it got to be quite a game."—Washington Star.

Let us devoutly hope that no American soldier man will be so reckless as to raise the old flag over a Chinese village. In that event every man jack of us would have to advocate keeping it flying or be liable to prosecution for treason.—Chicago Journal.

A parish priest of austeritv  
Climbed up in a high church steeple,  
To be nearer God, that he might hand  
His Word down to the people.

And in sermon script he dally wrote  
What he thought was sent from Heaven,  
And dropped it down on the people's heads  
Two times one day in seven.

In his age God said: "Come down, and die!"

And he cried from out the steeple:  
"Where art thou, Lord?" And the Lord  
replied:  
"Down here, among my people!"

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Truth About the Transvaal" (Toronto: William Tyrrell & Co.; Detroit: John Bornham & Son), a pamphlet report of a public address by William Robins, purports to quote fully from the official correspondence of last summer, which led up to the war in South Africa. There is no reason to doubt that Mr. Robins does tell the truth about the matter as far as he goes, and nothing but the truth; but that he does not tell the whole truth is unhappily evident. All reference to the menacing message which Chamberlain sent to the Boers about the middle of September, warning them that he would formulate terms of his own which they would be forced to accept, is discreetly omitted. So is the fact that this message was preceded by pouring British troops into South Africa, and pushing them into strategic positions on the Transvaal border. Nothing is said either of the calling out of the British reserves and the assembling of parliament to authorize it and vote supplies. All these were acts of war on the part of Great Britain, and they all preceded the Boer ultimatum of October 9. Moreover, that ultimatum, when it did issue, was not an ultimatum as to the questions in dispute. It was simply a demand that the military operations should cease. And it was accompanied with an offer to arbitrate. These acts, also, Mr. Robins ig-

nores. It is to be regretted that special pleaders for the British ministry, like Mr. Robins, should so persistently ignore the vital facts in the case.



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

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

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

Copies in cream-tinted plaster of the

**LIFE SIZE  
BUST OF  
HENRY GEORGE**

which was modeled from life by his son RICHARD F. GEORGE and is not only recognized by his friends as EXCEPTIONALLY LIFE-LIKE, but is pronounced by competent judges to be a SUPERIOR WORK OF ART, will be furnished by the editors of THE NEW EARTH, packed in cases ready for shipment for

**TEN DOLLARS**

provided orders are received to the number of two hundred.

Address: Editors, NEW EARTH,  
540 Pearl Street, . . . NEW YORK CITY

**CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB**

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING  
HANDEL HALL,

40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.

Program for Friday, June 29th,

**REV. WILLARD B. THORP,**

Pastor South Congregational Church,  
Drexel Blvd. and Fortieth St.

"A Criticism of the Single Tax Movement."

**ATTORNEYS.**

**Chicago.**

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

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

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

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 2644.

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

**Houston.**

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

**EDUCATIONAL.**

**THE KATHERINE L. MALTBY  
HOME AND SCHOOL.**  
NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS,  
160 Jerome Street.

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

**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.

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

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

**The Public**

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

**Subscription, One Dollar a Year.**

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

**The Public Leaflets.**

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

- Single copies, delivered at office, \$0.02
- Quantities delivered at office, per 100, 1.00
- Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, .03
- Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100, 2.00
- In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100, 1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. **Nero-Taxes**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. **The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust**, by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. **Monopoly and Competition** (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. **Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case** (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900).

**CAMPAIGN OFFER :**

To extend its circulation and influence during the presidential campaign,

**THE PUBLIC**

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

**TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.**

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

**OLD BOOKS!** Any obtainable BOOK, PAMPHLET, or PERIODICAL, supplied.

Libraries, or small lots of Books bought  
Catalog free upon application.  
**H. H. TIMBY, (Book Hunter)**  
P. O. Box 927. 731st Conneaut, Ohio