

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 26, 1900.

Number 112.

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.

Instances of brutal treatment of private soldiers by their officers in the Philippines are increasing in number and severity. That is as it must be. Under a regime of militarism private soldiers and mules would be on an equality, with some advantage to the mule in matters of cruelty.

A political revelation has been made by the Boston Globe. Having polled 36 of the 40 delegates to the democratic national convention at Kansas City from Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, it finds that 24 favor free coinage of gold and silver at sixteen to one, and that every delegate is for Bryan. These figures indicate a very different state of affairs in the east from that which the plutocratic press of the east has heretofore assumed as existing there.

We have the assurances of the genial and optimistic Stewart L. Woodford, formerly American minister to Spain, that "the loss of her colonies means Spain's national rejuvenation." It might follow, not illogically, that the gain of Spanish colonies means the national degradation and decay of the United States. If colonies "hoodooed" Spain, why may they not "hoodoo" us? This is something in which the experience of history lends support to the deductions of reason. From Rome down to Spain, not excepting England, colonies have proved a curse to the nation that held them.

The Anglo-Saxon example in civilizing inferior peoples up to our standards is having its effect in encouraging the Turks to civilize inferior peoples

up to their standards. According to a recent press dispatch they are forcing Armenians by the hundreds to embrace Mohammedanism. And what right have American Christians to complain? As matter of essential principle it would be extremely difficult to distinguish between Islamizing Armenian Christians and Methodistizing Philippine Catholics by the military mode of benevolent assimilation.

Chauncey Depew, senator from New York by the grace of Vanderbilt and the fiat of Platt, has a euphonious phrase for these hard times. He describes them as an "indigestion of prosperity." The phrase is not had. But none of Mr. McKinley's supporters have heretofore been willing to admit that the prosperity for which Mr. McKinley became the advance agent four years ago was indigestible prosperity.

A prominent real estate dealer of Chicago assures the people here that if the strike in the building trades were settled "Chicago would see a boom in the real estate market such as it has not seen for a long time." But why should the people regard that assurance as inviting? A boom in building they might welcome, but a boom in the real estate market! Why, a boom in the real estate market means higher rents; and why should the people of Chicago, the great mass of whom are tenants—why should they wish for higher rents?

Cuban newspapers are reported to be urging an investigation of all the departments of American administration in Cuba. The exposure of postal corruption encourages them to believe that other departments also are Yankee rotten. What ingrates these "inferior peoples" are,

to be sure! Utterly forgetful of the war for humanity which Mr. McKinley (assisted by the ever strenuous Roosevelt) waged in their behalf, the ungrateful Cubans would bring his benevolent administration into further disrepute at home and abroad, in the very hour when it is instructing them most diligently in the mysteries of self-government. How can such a people ever be expected to govern themselves?

A federal judge in Arkansas has gravely admonished some street car strikers at Little Rock that the use of the term "scab," as applied to non-union employes of a receiver, is perilously near to contempt of court and must be stopped. What next, in the growth of this fungus called "government by injunction"? If it progresses much further in this direction, we shall not improbably read in the future of injunctions prohibiting the use of such epithets as "goldbug" and "plutocrat." These disrespectful terms are exceedingly offensive to those advocates of government by injunction and other plutocratic pleasantries who see no impropriety in calling their adversaries "popocrats," "populists," "mobocrats," "repudiators," "cranks," "demagogues," "anarchists" and so on, and whose pictorial prints picture farmers as fools and organized workingmen as plug uglies.

The Boer envoys have been distinctly informed by President McKinley himself that they must expect no act of friendliness for their country from his administration. Of the manner in which the information was conveyed there can be no criticism. It was politely done. In that respect it differed altogether from the manner in which the republican convention of Illinois treated a resolu-

tion of sympathy. They hooted it down. But there was no difference in spirit. Whether expressed in the derisive yells of a state convention of Mr. McKinley's thick and thin supporters at Peoria, or in his own studied phrases at the white house, the hostile spirit of administration republicans with reference to the South African war is unmistakable. What they call neutrality is British partisanship.

To say that the administration has done all for the Boer republics that it can do, short of going to war with Great Britain, is not true. It could diplomatically indicate to Great Britain in many ways that this country would not regard the destruction of the independence of those republics as a righteous thing. There would be no difficulty, for instance, in conveying to the British ministry, with entire friendliness, an intimation of the indisputable truth that such an act would tend to strengthen American prejudices against England. To be sure, our own bloody experiment of subjugation in the Philippines might cause some sentimental embarrassment, but Mr. McKinley could overcome that. The administration could go further, without giving Great Britain the slightest ground for complaint. There would be no breach of neutrality in officially receiving diplomatic representatives from the republics as from sovereign states. Of the complete sovereignty of the Orange Free State there is no dispute, and a representative from President Steyn could be received with the same unquestioned propriety as one from the queen of England. And though the sovereignty of the South African republic is disputed, it exists clearly enough to warrant the president in officially receiving its representatives without incurring any serious charge of violating neutrality. For the South African republic was a sovereign nation from 1852 until 1877. Great Britain made a conquest in 1877, but she afterward relinquished it. And though it is

true that she then made a treaty which forbade the little republic's entering into treaties without her consent, and thereby forced it technically into the class of states that are not sovereign, yet with the outbreak of the war that treaty lapsed and the republic resumed its full sovereignty. In these circumstances President McKinley could rightfully, even if not without criticism, receive representatives from the South African republic. Neither in the case of that republic nor of the Orange Free State would this be recognizing a new and rebellious government; it would be the recognition of old established independent governments. And if President McKinley so recognized them, or in any other delicate way indicated to the British ministry that the United States is out of sympathy with its declared purpose of destroying the independence of the two South African republics and, in Salisbury's language, "reducing to obedience to the queen the territories which ought never to have been released from it," that aggressive purpose would be abandoned and the war would end.

But the president has from the beginning of the war refused to recognize representatives from the South African republics in any official way. He refused to receive their envoys this very week, except as distinguished private visitors. To justify this refusal as an act of neutrality is transparently evasive. Upon principles of neutrality, representatives of the South African republic and of the Orange Free State are entitled to equal consideration with representatives from Great Britain. This they have not received. The administration has discriminated against them. It has acted in harmony with Chamberlain's theory that Great Britain has suzerainty over the Transvaal. In spirit it echoes the declaration of Lord Salisbury that the British army is "engaged in reducing to obedience to the queen the territories which ought never to have been re-

leased from it." And it thereby exhibits an animus which for domestic political reasons it would fain conceal.

Those administration republicans who complain that the Boer envoys are being entertained exclusively by critics of the administration, have the remedy in their own hands. There has been no exclusive disposition about the matter. People of all races, creeds and parties have been invited to join in welcoming these guests from South Africa, and if administration republicans choose to hold aloof, as they do, critics of the administration must go ahead with the welcome. If they did not, there would be none.

If anything in the way of absurd hysterics could outdo the hypnotic orgies of the London mob over the relief of Mafeking, the poet laureate has accomplished it. His verses on the subject would scandalize English literature if they were taken seriously. Hear what the dispatches characterize as the best stanza:

Long as the waves shall roll,
Long as fame guards her scroll,
And men through heart and soul
Thrill to true glory
Their tale from age to age
Shall voice and verse engage,
Swelling the splendid page
Of England's story.

Poets might take that for a good stump speech, and spellbinders might take it for good poetry. But neither would like to accept it as an example of their own particular art, though it has some of the qualities of an inferior stump speech. The senseless jingle would pass muster, of course, in a music hall or variety show. Poor England! To think that her poet laureate should sink her so low as to point to anything in the jingo war in South Africa as swelling the page of her splendid story! That really splendid story is tarnished by all that belongs to this Rhodes-Chamberlain war. She can point to nothing in it to be proud of except her brute might. But it is something more glorious than might that gives

to England's story its majestic splendor.

A big fight against certain extortions of the ice trust has been going on in New York, in which the Journal has vigorously taken a leading part. The excitement has, of course, stimulated all sorts of suggestions for relief, and as usual most of them are frivolous propositions intended to regulate the trust by restricting it superficially. It is noticeable, however, that sentiment in favor of public ownership and operation of trusts has been expanded by the agitation. But public ownership and operation would be as undesirable and unscientific—to correctly use a very much abused term—as regulation would be futile. There is a radical difference between supplying ice and supplying water, gas or electricity, etc., to the inhabitants of a city. Water, for instance, can be supplied only through a species of highway, which makes the supplying of water of necessity a monopoly. In that case, no choice remains to the people between monopoly and competition. Their only choice being between monopolists, the common agents of the city government are preferable. These may be bad, but no city government was ever yet as bad in its indifference to public wants as private monopolists. Regarding the delivery of ice, however, the choice is not between monopolists; it is between monopoly and competition. For this business is not a monopoly necessarily. It may be as well controlled automatically by competition as the tailor's trade. What makes it a monopoly now is not the necessity of the case, as with city water supplies, but special privilege. In the case of the New York ice trust, the peculiar special privilege which makes it possible is monopoly of the docks. But for that privilege, there would be no ice trust in New York, and competition or the possibility of competition would secure the best possible and most economical service.

It is evidently intended by the administration republicans to make the

trust issue turn upon the question of a constitutional amendment giving congress full power over trusts. With that object in view the republican majority of the judiciary committee in the lower house of congress has caused the committee to adopt a proposed amendment for submission to congress and the states. Their amendment would give congress—

power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

If there could be any doubt as to the purpose of this move the Chicago Tribune would dispel it when it comments in this wise:

The report of the judiciary committee deserves consideration from a political rather than a legislative point of view. If the republican national convention inserts in its platform an anti-trust plank which indorses the recommendations of that committee it will be impossible for the democrats when they hold their convention two weeks later to adopt a more radical programme regarding combines. If they are willing to go so far as to amend the constitution to give congress more power their plank will be a mere echo of that of the republicans. If they are not, then their plank will be the weaker one.

With one more "if," the Tribune's comment would be faultless. If, besides the other "ifs," the democrats should decide to follow Mr. Bryan's lead on the trust question, the republicans would, indeed, have a clear advantage. But they would have no advantage, on the contrary they would be put at a great disadvantage, should the democrats decide to fight trusts by attacking their causes.

There are two ways of meeting the trust issue. One is the way to which the republicans are now about to commit themselves. It is to put all power in the hands of congress, and then induce congress to adopt repressive legislation. This policy would yield no beneficial results. It would leave the trust evil worse than it found it. And instead of a benefit such an amendment as that proposed would be an everlasting curse. All the private business of the country

would be at the mercy of congress and under the control of the federal politician. We can think of only two classes of people to whom such an amendment would appeal. One is the republican politician who, without caring whether it passed or not, would find it a ready means of allaying trust agitation. The other is the socialist, who would rightly see in such an amendment the possibilities of an early nationalization of all industries. It is an amendment upon which national socialism as an evolution from trusts, could be established. Should the republicans completely commit themselves to that policy it is quite true that the democrats, if they favored the same policy, would merely echo the republicans. But it is not true that they need take a weaker position. They could adopt the second way of meeting the trust issue, which is to oppose this centralization of power utterly, to oppose all tinkering with trusts, and to demand that the monopolistic laws which make trusts possible be repealed. Let the democrats offer that kind of fight, in terms that leave no room to doubt their sincerity, and they will win the election.

Take the tin trust for an illustration of the fact that trusts rest upon monopoly. According to the staid old Journal of Commerce it controls 35 establishments in this country. There are but five independent manufacturers and 16 independent dippers, and they have to go to the trust to get their untinned plates. For the federal steel trust, the national steel trust and the tin plate trust control the billets from which untinned plates are made. This control is secured by means of the tariff on foreign plates. Precisely in that way—by a tariff to prevent foreign competition,—or by special railroad rates, or by control of natural resources, the trusts maintain their power. To leave them these advantages while trying to curb them by restrictive legislation, is like trying to prevent

a tree from growing by tying it with kite strings. Cut the roots if you want to kill the tree. The roots in the case of trusts are legal monopolies.

Our consul at Birmingham, England, reports the formation of a wall paper trust over there, and later of a bleaching trust, calling attention to the fact that these trusts excite no alarm in England. His report appears at pages 92 and 93 of the consular reports for May. The reason that English trusts excite no alarm is evident from the consul's report. They are not trusts at all in the American understanding of the term. They are combinations or associations of producers, made for the purpose and with the effect of securing the economies that come from more perfect organization. There is no indication that they are in any wise helped by tariff regulation or railway discrimination. Trusts of that kind no one need fear. If they attempt to dictate arbitrarily they will collapse. And knowing this they do not attempt it. Another consul, reporting in the same consular report at page 94, says of the wall paper organization that "prices have not been materially advanced (perhaps five to fifteen per cent.) except on low grade goods, which were sold so cheaply that there was loss on every roll."

Though there be no existing law under which Neeley, the Cuban postal defaulter, may be extradited to Cuba for trial, it is a mistake to suppose that none may be passed to reach his case. Extradition to foreign countries is usually made pursuant to treaties. There is of course no treaty covering this case. But a sovereign power may extradite without treaty. It may deliver up a fugitive as pure matter of international comity. The president would have no right to do this, for he alone does not represent the sovereignty of the nation. Nor does any other one person or department of the federal government. It could be done only under a law passed by congress and signed by the

president. As there is no such law now in force, however, the question arises whether one could be enacted and made retroactive. On that question there can hardly be any doubt. Retroactive treaties of extradition are known to be valid and effective. Such treaties have been made by this country, and under them fugitives have been extradited for trial in foreign countries upon charges of crime committed before the treaty. If a retroactive treaty may be made, a retroactive statute authorizing surrender as matter of comity would doubtless be valid. The same principle applies in this respect to both treaties and acts. It is, moreover, a very simple principle of general application, and one quite familiar to lawyers, namely, that a retroactive statute is valid if it affects only remedies and proceedings and not essential rights. While congress, therefore, cannot pass a statute creating a new crime or changing the elements of a crime so as to apply to an act already done, for that would be an *ex post facto* law, it can pass a statute altering the mode or conditions of trials upon charge of crime already committed. If Neeley be not sent back to Cuba for trial it will not be for lack of constitutional power to send him.

Judging from the dissenting opinion of Judge Harlan in the Goebel case, just decided by the federal supreme court, that decision would have been dangerously revolutionary had he been supported by a majority of the judges. According to his view, not only is the right to a state office a property right, but it is such a property right as comes within the protection of the fourteenth amendment. In other words, Judge Harlan believes that the federal courts have, by virtue of the fourteenth amendment, acquired jurisdiction over titles to state offices. Happily the court has decided otherwise. But with a dissenting opinion from so able a member as Judge Harlan, it is not safe to regard that decision as final. With the marked disposition toward federal

centralization, it is not at all unlikely that in some future case a majority of the judges may come around to Harlan's view. The fourteenth amendment seems capable of accomplishing almost anything except the one thing its authors intended it to accomplish—obliteration of race distinction under the law.

At last Gen. Otis officially denies that Aguinaldo applied for a cessation of hostilities after the outbreak at Manila in February, 1899. This is in reply to a demand by congress for information. In consequence of that demand, the adjutant general at Washington telegraphed on April 30, 1900, as follows to Gen. Otis:

Cable whether Gen. Torres came to you under flag of truce February 5, 1899, and stated Aguinaldo declared fighting had begun accidentally and not authorized by him; that Aguinaldo wished it stopped, and to end hostilities proposed establishment of neutral zone between the two armies, of width agreeable to you, so during peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict. Whether you replied fighting having begun must go on to grim end.

To this Gen. Otis replied May 1, 1900:

Judge Torres, citizen resident of Manila, who had served as member insurgent commission, reported evening February 5 asking if something could not be done to stop the fighting, as establishment of neutral zone. I replied Aguinaldo had commenced the fighting and must apply for cessation; I had nothing to request from insurgent government. He asked permission to send Col. Arguellez to Malolos, and Arguellez was passed through lines near Caloocan next morning. He went direct to Malolos, told Gen. Aguinaldo and Mabini that Gen. Otis would permit suspension of hostilities upon their request. They replied declaration of war had been made, a copy of which they furnished him. They said they had no objection to suspension of hostilities, but beyond this general remark made no response, but directed him to return with that message. Arguellez reported that he conveyed my statement; that they had commenced the war and it must go on, since they had chosen that course of action, but did not attempt to induce them to make any proposition, as he feared accusation of cowardice.

Under the circumstances Gen. Otis's reply is not satisfactory. Congress

should subject him to cross-examination, and make further inquiry in other quarters. For it should be remembered that in this denial Otis is contradicting both Gen. Reeves and himself. Gen. Reeves reported nearly a year ago that Aguinaldo did apply for a cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a neutral zone, and that Otis replied that as the fighting had begun it must go on to the grim end. That report by Gen. Reeves has been widely published and never before denied. It was confirmed by an official dispatch which Otis himself had sent to Washington on the 8th of February, 1899, in which he said:

Night of 4th Aguinaldo issued flying proclamation charging Americans with initiative and declared war. Sunday issued another calling all to resist foreign invasion. His influence throughout this section destroyed. Now applies for cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined answer.

This report of Otis is so directly at variance with the explanation he now gives that it cannot be brushed aside by his remark that it was so hastily written as to be "misleading." No degree of haste, if the facts are as he now relates them, could have led him to say that Aguinaldo had applied to him for a cessation of hostilities and that he had declined to answer. We do not say that there is prevarication or falsehood here; but we do say, as every unbiased reader must, that there is flat self-contradiction. That being so, the matter ought to be investigated by congress, at least to the extent of a cross-examination of Otis.

Whether the Philadelphia North American is controlled by John Wanamaker or his son, it is earning a right to the gratitude of a ring be-deviled city. And John Wanamaker himself, quite on his own account, has proved his right to share in that gratitude. The North American was purchased about a year ago by Wanamaker's son Thomas, who put at the head of its editorial staff that sterling journalist, Arthur McEwen, who long before had made his name a household word on the Pacific slope and whose work contributed so notably to the

editorial power of the New York Journal four years ago. The paper at once started upon a straight-forward career in the interest of civic righteousness. This brought it in conflict with the corrupt politicians of Philadelphia, who not unnaturally held John Wanamaker accountable; and a few days ago two of them waited upon him at his store and tried to intimidate him by threats of personal exposures. But they had mistaken their man. Telling his visitors that his son owned the North American and that he himself would not interfere, Mr. Wanamaker defied them to do their worst by ordering them out of his office. There could be no more convincing testimony to the excellent work the North American is doing than this effort to intimidate its proprietor by threatening his father; and Mr. Wanamaker has won a host of new friends by his behavior in the matter.

THE SUFFRAGE A NATURAL RIGHT.

Fundamentally, government is of two kinds—government by all the governed, and government by superior force.

Government by all the governed, which is commonly designated self-government, can be administered only by universal suffrage. All the people do not govern unless all have a potential voice in the government. Universal suffrage may indeed fail to secure government by all, but there is no such thing as government by all without it. The question, then, of whether or not suffrage is a natural right is determined by the question of whether government by all or government by superior force is the natural kind of government.

As a term in social philosophy, "natural" does not mean either brutal or primitive, though professors of social science have used it in both senses. While some have gone, with ludicrous complacency, to the brute instincts of the lower animals for examples of what is natural in the social life of man, others have in an equally absurd way assumed that primitive social life and natural social life are the same. Francis A. Walker, the

famous university economist and author, is on record for the latter blunder. With astounding composure he confessed his inability to understand what is natural to man because he had never seen man in the natural state! These are inexcusable confusions. Whether a form of government be natural or not, is not to be solved by reference to the habits of the lower animals or the customs of primitive man. It is to be solved by reference to natural moral laws.

Many learned men deny that there is any natural moral law. It is fashionable in some quarters to do so. They contend that questions of righteousness are questions of expediency; and that in nature, including human nature, there is no such thing as a right to be claimed or a duty to be performed. They profess to recognize no absolute moral standards, holding only that to be right which from experience appears to them to be wise. Such men are atheists. Though they preach from pulpits or teach in the class rooms of pious universities, they are atheists nevertheless. To deny the eternal sway of invariable moral law is to deny God.

It is impossible, consistently with sincere recognition of a supreme ruler of the moral as well as material universe, to regard problems of right and wrong as mere questions of experience. Though moral laws may be discovered by experience, it is not out of experience that they take their rise, nor do they vary with its variations. Just as the physical laws of gravitation existed and operated with unvarying constancy during all the time before Newton's experiments, so the moral law must be coeval with that personification of infinite justice whom men call God, and be as immutable. It was as truly a violation of moral law to steal before Moses promulgated the eighth commandment as after some social experimenter had discovered that honesty is the best policy.

But it is not to atheists, either of the pious or the impious sort, that we address these considerations regarding universal suffrage. Since they do not believe in natural rights at all, they are in no mental condition to reflect upon any argument for suffrage as a natural right. That universal

suffrage could be defended in their atheistic forum we have no doubt. Simply as a matter of wise expediency, having reference to the general good, its superiority over no suffrage and limited suffrage could doubtless be shown. But we now address readers who, believing in a God of infinite justice, believe therefore in the immutability of moral law, with its natural equilibrium of rights and duties.

Let us revert, then, to the main point. Which kind of government is natural—government by the governed or government by superior force? For, as we have already indicated, the solution of that question determines whether or not the suffrage is a natural right.

The question really answers itself. Without hopelessly confusing power with righteousness, it is impossible to conceive of a moral commission which any man or set of men may hold to govern other men against their will. The superficial plausibility of the theory that power to govern implies right to govern, we concede. But the theory is really without validity, even in experimental philosophy; and in morals it is not so much as plausible. Nothing could be more repugnant to moral principle than this idea that might makes right. Though might and right may often coincide, yet might is no more right than weakness is. Might never coincides with right except by accident. Mere force cannot possibly give a moral right to govern. We must, therefore, either exclude government from the domain of morals, as philosophical anarchists do, or conclude that fundamentally it rests not upon force but upon the consent and participation of the governed.

This conclusion is in accord with the natural law of morals. For harmonious moral adjustment in the social sphere implies equilibrium of rights and duties. The duty of every one not to steal or murder, springs from and is balanced by the right of everyone else not to be murdered or stolen from. In these respects the rights of each correlate with corresponding duties of the others. And so with all other rights and their correlative duties. Among these is the

right of each to be free within the limitations of like freedom to all—limitations which are defined by the corresponding duty of all to respect the freedom of each. As to rights and duties, therefore, all persons are naturally equal. And where all are naturally equal, none can coerce by force as matter of natural right.

In this view of the moral law, government by superior force has no warrant. Such government as may exist at all by natural right, must be a government in which the governed participate. It follows that universal suffrage, even though it might not secure government by all, yet, because there can be no government by all without it, is a natural right.

The same conclusion follows the more definite premise that rights to life and liberty are natural. No moral philosophy worthy the name would deny the natural quality of these rights. Nor does any political philosophy which defends government at all deny that its primary function is to protect them. Yet government by all, which implies suffrage by all, is the only kind of government that essentially recognizes the right of all to life and liberty.

Under an absolute monarchy, when life or liberty is at stake, the only appeal is to the individual generosity of the monarch. His beneficent acts are not dictated by any recognition of another's right; they are prompted solely by his own grace. If he recognizes rights and duties at all, it is only as rights and duties between master and slave are recognized—the monarch has rights and the subject owes duties. The great fundamental natural rights to life and liberty are not guaranteed, either in fact or theory, by absolute monarchy. The conception is wholly foreign to that system. Absolute monarchies, therefore, are not natural.

Of oligarchies the same thing is true. Though oligarchies, like monarchies, might give security to life and liberty, it would be as matter of grace and not in recognition of a natural right.

No less comprehensive a system than government by all can secure those rights as natural rights. That is the only system which essentially recognizes them as natural, and un-

der which every person is armed with the best weapon of peace yet known for protecting them. Where all are accorded an equal voice in government as matter of right, none is likely in practice to be denied equal consideration with reference to his life or his liberty; and none can be denied it consistently with the principles of the government.

It may well be objected that a majority under universal suffrage is in no wise different from an oligarchy under restricted suffrage. For it is true that majorities are often autocratic. But this is chargeable to defective methods.

In essential principle, and to a very high degree in actual practice, majorities are radically different from oligarchies. Majorities proceed upon the principle that rights to life and liberty are natural and equal; oligarchies proceed upon the theory that these rights are neither equal nor natural, but are gifts from superiors. In actual practice an oligarchy, which is a stable class placed over other classes, is unresponsive to their demands; whereas a majority, a shifting quantity in one class, is affected by all.

Objections to universal suffrage as a right, which rest upon the absurdity of extending the suffrage to minors, to convicted criminals and to the insane, assuming that universal suffrage logically demands that extension, are the veriest pettifogging.

There is a period in every one's life when he is concededly incompetent to participate in government. This is indubitably true of an infant in arms. Later there comes a period when, if of sane mind, he is competent. This is certainly true of the man or woman of 30. But as no general rule can be formulated for determining as to each person when he crosses the line between the incompetency of childhood and the competency of manhood, it is customary to fix an age period of general application arbitrarily. If the period fixed be reasonable, it involves in no rational sense a denial of the suffrage.

A similar principle applies to the insane. Men who are adjudged incompetent from insanity to manage their own affairs, may be denied the

suffrage without the slightest prejudice to the principle of suffrage as a natural right. And as to convicts, the same principle that justifies the denial to them of life or liberty consistently with the theory of natural rights to life and liberty, may deny them the suffrage without raising any question of inconsistency with reference to the suffrage as a natural right.

In other words, to withhold the suffrage from persons incapable of performing ordinary obligations is not inconsistent with the principle that suffrage is a natural right. Liberty is a natural right. But consistently with that right children are held under tutelage. Consistently with that right also the "non compos" are restrained. Consistently with that right again convicts are imprisoned. To argue that the suffrage is not a natural right because it is properly withheld from immature individuals, from individuals adjudged "non compos," and from criminal convicts, is to argue that liberty itself is not a natural right. And if liberty be not a natural right, then the only basis of natural right is superior force, which is a moral absurdity.

These questions of government and suffrage would be very much simplified, if a clear distinction were drawn with reference to the legitimate functions of government. No form of government has any right to coerce an individual in regard to his individual concerns. Coercion of individuals in individual concerns is an invasion, an aggression; and it does not cease to be such because the invader and aggressor is a government instead of another individual or a mob. This is as true of government by all under universal suffrage, as of government by one under absolute monarchy.

The sole moral justification for government is the fact that social life is not limited to individual concerns. There are also common concerns. It is for the regulation of these, and only for that purpose, that government of any kind possesses just powers. Its solitary function is to protect common rights and administer common property. When government attempts to coerce

individual action except for the protection of such common rights as life and liberty, and the administration of such common property as highways and site values, it becomes a marauder.

With this distinction clear all rational objections to government by majority are removed. When government is conceived of as possessing power to regulate private concerns, government by majority is as intolerable as any other species of tyranny. But when it is conceived of merely as the agent for protecting common rights and administering common property, government by majority commends itself as fair and natural. It is the only method of securing common action in accordance with common agreement.

The same distinction also makes the naturalness of the right of suffrage self-evident. To have a voice in the management of the organization which is charged with the protection of every one's life and liberty and the administration of every one's interest in common property is a natural right if anything can be.

NEWS

In the British war in South Africa the advance from Kroonstad to Pretoria has begun. At our last report Lord Roberts was at Kroonstad, which he made the center of his line, with the right wing, under Rundle, somewhat to the north of Thaba N'Chu, and the left, under Hunter, on the Vaal river not far east of the Bechuanaland border. On the 22d the center of the line, under Roberts, began its advance. At this writing it had reached the Rhenoster river, about half way between Kroonstad and the Vaal. The Boers in large force retreated before it, carrying all their supplies and munitions with them. There was but little fighting, the reports indicating that the Boers were outflanked by Roberts's long lines.

Buller's forces in Natal have made no decisive movement beyond Glen-coe, where they were last week; but over on the western border of the Transvaal the British have at last succeeded in relieving Mafeking.

Of the relief of Mafeking the first report came from Pretoria on the 18th, when the Boers announced that after one more severe bombardment of Mafeking, they abandoned the siege, which they had maintained since October 9, and that a British force from the south took possession of the place. There was no confirmation of this news until the 21st. Lord Roberts then reported that the flying column under Col. Mahon (reported last week as having passed through Vryburg) had entered Mafeking at four o'clock on the morning of the 18th, at the cost of five hours' fighting the day before.

Without waiting for this confirmation London crowds went into a frenzy upon receiving the first report. To quote from the cable dispatches:

By midnight the thoroughfares of the metropolis were overrun with jostling, howling crowds, and drum and fife corps paraded the streets, followed by vast, straggling processions of men, women and children, madly waving flags and yelling without intermission. The reminders of most conservative persons that the report might possibly be untrustworthy had no effect on the celebrators, who noisily rejoined: "Bobs said he'd relieve Mafeking today, and he's done it." And so the outpouring of popular ecstasy continued and grew in volume until all London was little else than a maelstrom of unreasoning revelers.

This hysterical excitement spread all over England. Says one of the dispatches: "Bells were rung and whistles blown and bonfires built all over the island, and at one o'clock in the morning the demonstrations were reported as still in full swing." The London Times described these demonstrations as having "had no parallel in recent times." They were kept up through the next day, when all business was suspended, say the reports, "except flag, button and drink selling." To continue quoting from the London dispatches:

Every conveyance save that of society, in the streets, is decked with union jacks. Cab drivers fly flags on their whips and horses' heads and tails. Some wear paper caps of red, white and blue. It is an exception to find anyone not wearing a favor. The vast majority have flags of various sizes. All the younger and a good many of the elder section of the population carry tin trumpets which they blow incessantly when not cheering vociferously, and aimlessly display on the whole an utterly childish, effusive unrestraint, absurd in its disproportion to the occasion. In the city yesterday shops were closed, while groups of stovepipe-

hatted, frock-coated, middle-aged and ordinarily staid citizens paraded the streets, arm in arm, waving flags, blowing trumpets and whistles, singing patriotic songs, and acting altogether as if they were mad or drunk. They were neither. They were only unduly elated and unable to give their enthusiasm any more dignified expression.

Public opinion regarding the war is being aroused in the United States by the appearance here of the peace convoys from South Africa—Messrs. Wessels, Fischer and Wolmarans. They were given an official and popular reception at New York on the 17th at the city hall. In welcoming them Mayor Van Wyck said:

I am delighted to welcome you to the city of New York and to be able to assure you that wherever you go in free America you will receive a cordial welcome from the liberty-loving people of this country. I desire to inform you that the representatives of the city of New York have asked me to extend to you a welcome, and that the municipal assembly has adopted resolutions tendering you the freedom of the city. Never since I have been in the mayor's office has a more pleasant duty devolved upon me than to welcome you in behalf of this free people and to assure you that you have their full sympathy.

Mr. Fischer responded:

We believe that no people can understand what it is to struggle for freedom except a people which has gained its liberty by such a struggle. We have been told to avoid intemperance, the pitfalls of party cliques and political entanglements, and we can say that to-day we are as ignorant of all party cliques as on the day of our arrival. Our appeal is to no faction, to no party, but to the whole American people, and we prefer to believe that the splendid welcome that has been given us voices the feeling of all classes alike. We cannot think that our mission to seek for our country peace with honor will be unsuccessful.

From New York the Boer envoys went to Washington, where they were received upon their arrival on the 18th by a committee of congressmen, senators and leading citizens. A mass meeting was held in their honor on the 20th. The audience, large and enthusiastic, was presided over by Congressman Sulzer, of New York, a democrat. It was addressed by Bourke Cockran, one of the leading McKinley orators of the campaign of 1896; by Senator Teller, of Colorado, a silver republican; and by Senator

Mason, of Illinois, and Senator Wellington, of Maryland, both republicans. The envoys spoke in response. Meetings of a similar character are being arranged throughout the country.

On the 21st the Boer envoys were accorded an informal and entirely unofficial interview with the secretary of state. According to the latter's subsequent account of the interview, they expressed a desire that the United States should intervene in the interest of peace. To this the secretary replied that while the president regretted the suffering and sacrifices of both combatants, he could do nothing but preserve strict neutrality. By way of showing that the president had exhausted his powers of inoffensive intervention the secretary recalled the request for intervention some weeks ago, made by the two South African republics, and said:

The president at once directed me to convey the substance of this telegram to the British government, and in communicating this request I was directed by him to express his earnest hope that a way to bring about peace might be found, and to say that he would be glad to aid in any friendly manner to promote so happy a result. The Transvaal government was at the same time informed of the president's action in the matter. Our representative in London promptly communicated the president's instruction to Lord Salisbury. In answer he was requested to thank the president for the friendly interest shown by him, and Lord Salisbury added that her majesty's government could not accept the intervention of any power. This communication also was immediately transmitted to our consul at Pretoria to be communicated to the president of the South African Republic. So far as we are informed the United States was the only government in the world of all those approached by the South African republics which tendered its good offices to either of the combatants in the interest of a cessation of hostilities.

An interview with President McKinley was obtained on the following day. This also was an informal, personal visit, the object of the coming of the envoys to this country being only briefly referred to. The president prevented any discussion by informing his visitors that the response made to them by Secretary Hay on the previous day must be regarded as final.

Meanwhile, some members of the senate had endeavored to secure for the

Boer envoys informal recognition by that body. A resolution was offered on the 21st by Senator Allen extending to them the privileges of the floor. It was antagonized by Senator Davis, and lost by a vote of 36 to 21. Mason and Wellington alone among the republicans voted for it. Morgan was the only democrat to vote against it.

From the Philipines the news is still of fighting. On the Island of Samar; at Catarma, May 1, there was a skirmish in which three Americans are said to have been wounded and 209 Filipinos killed. Six days later, at Pambugan, on the same island, the Americans report that they killed 75 Filipinos without any loss to themselves. On the Island of Mindanao a fight has occurred in the hills near Aquasan in which two Americans and 51 natives were killed. This conflict was not with Filipinos. It was with Mohammedan subjects of the sultan of Sulu. Another occurred near Cotobatto, also on the Island of Mindanao, where an American detachment had been sent to preserve the peace at a conference between two hostile chiefs. At last reports reinforcements were on the way to support this detachment. In the southern provinces of Luzon the Americans are unable to maintain order. They occupy a few coast towns there, but are surrounded by Filipinos, who constantly assail the garrisons, which are too small to operate in the surrounding country. Gen. Bell, in command of the hemp provinces in that region, has consequently been obliged to suspend Gen. Otis's order to organize municipal governments there. Referring to this embarrassing situation, dispatches from Manila state that several regiments are needed to control each southern province of Luzon, but that there are none to spare from their present stations.

Aguinaldo has been heard from in what purports to be a proclamation issued by him on the 4th of May from Pilillo island, which is adjacent to the eastern coast of Luzon. It is being circulated in Manila. This proclamation declares that the American commission, of which Judge Taft is chairman, has been appointed by President McKinley without authority from congress, and that it is therefore without lawful power to bind the American government in its dealings with the Filipinos. They are accordingly warned not to surrender their arms upon any promises of the

commission, for congress may refuse to ratify the promises. But the proclamation urges them to welcome the commission enthusiastically in the various towns and provinces, and to ask boldly for the form of government they most desire. It closes with an appeal to the people to still strive for liberty and independence.

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

Deaths to May 16, 1900, (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900	2
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900,	23
<hr/>	
Total deaths since July 1, 1898.....	1,872
Wounded	2,129
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July 1, 1898.....	4,001
Total casualties reported last week	3,973
Total deaths reported last week.....	1,847

In the Cuban postal defalcation, of which an introductory account was given last week, there are no very important developments except of details. Neely has been arrested on a criminal charge pending extradition proceedings and admitted to bail in \$20,000. He has been arrested also in a civil action brought by the United States to recover \$45,300.25 of public monies which he is charged with appropriating. In this proceeding he has been committed to Ludlow Street jail, New York city, in default of \$50,000 bail. To clear the way for his removal to Cuba for trial on the criminal charge, the judiciary committee of the lower house of congress agreed upon an extradition measure, which the house passed on the 23d. It adds to the existing law a provision that—

whenever any foreign country or territory or any part thereof is occupied by the United States, any person who shall violate or who has violated any of the criminal laws in force therein and who shall depart or flee or who has departed or fled from justice therein to the United States, shall, when found therein, be liable to arrest and detention by the authorities of the United States, and on written request or requisition of the authorities in control of such foreign country or territory shall be returned and surrendered as hereinafter provided to the authorities in control of such foreign country or

territory for trial under the laws in force in the place where such offense was committed.

There is no political news of general interest in the United States, but in France it now appears that the triumph of the nationalists or military party in Paris, reported on pages 71 and 92, was purely local and its effect upon national politics of no importance. Though the nationalists secured a majority in the Paris council they were defeated overwhelmingly in the provinces. Out of 33,942 communes thus far heard from (the total number being 36,170), they won only 153. Other reactionaries won 8,519, while the result in 438 has not been definitely reported in this country. The supporters of the republic won 24,832.

Closely following these elections the French parliament reassembled on the 22d, after a six weeks' recess, and the ministry submitted to an interpellation on its general policy. Conceding that the Paris elections were a rebuff to the republican idea, the prime minister, Waldeck-Rousseau, pointed to the elections in the provinces as a triumph for the republic, and outlined the following ministerial programme: A law for the protection of the president from calumniators; a law to prevent the accumulation of property by religious associations; laws for promoting education; direct taxation; pensions for workingmen. He closed with the declaration that if this programme did not secure a majority the ministry would resign. By a vote of 439 to 56 it was then ordered that "the chamber is resolved to energetically pursue a policy of reforms and the defense of the republic and laity;" and by 271 to 226 that the chamber "approves of the declaration of the government."

In English politics the Australian question, explained on page 92, appears to have been amicably settled. Mr. Chamberlain, as noted on page 92, introduced the Australian commonwealth in parliament on the 17th with an amendment preserving rights of appeal to an appellate court of the empire; and the bill, so amended, passed its first reading. It came up for second reading on the 21st, when Mr. Chamberlain announced an agreement with the Australian representatives. The agreement was to the effect that an appeal from the highest court of the Australian common-

wealth may be taken to the queen's privy council in every case in which both parties to the litigation consent, and also where other than Australian interests are concerned; but in all other cases the Australian legislature is to be free to adopt any course it pleases. This modification, while it holds Australia in subordination to the empire by a slender legal thread, thereby satisfying Mr. Chamberlain's requirement, is a substantial victory for the Australian delegates.

Quite as important in some respects was the action of the London county council on the 22d. That body then demanded the surrender of their franchises by the street car companies of three parishes, embracing about 20 miles of track, and announced its intention of hereafter requiring possession of street car properties as fast as their franchises expire. The council intends to place all the lines in the county under public ownership. No new franchises will be given, and the only question that agitates the council now is whether to lease the lines or subject them to public operation.

England is undergoing the troubles of a great lockout at Staffordshire which threatens the pottery supply. Some 20,000 operatives, representing every department of pottery work, are idle. Production is consequently at a complete standstill. The cause of the lockout was a small strike in one establishment for the restoration of the wages that were reduced a penny in the shilling 20 years ago. To defeat this strike the employers combined and declared a lockout. They refuse even to consider the workmen's demand before autumn, and thus far every attempt at arbitration has been without result.

A street car strike in Berlin, which was ended in two days, was violent enough while it lasted. It broke out on the 19th. For two days the 6,000 strikers tied up the lines. Their weapons were stones, and the blank cartridges of the armed police failed to disperse them. But on the 21st the chief burgomaster of Berlin intervened. His mediation was accepted by both sides, and through his influence most of the demands of the strikers, though they had been stubbornly rejected for weeks, were granted.

The St. Louis street car strikers, of whose strike we have told on pages

72 and 93, have not been so fortunate. Yet they give no signs of weakening, although a sweeping injunction has been issued by Judge Adams, of the United States district court, based upon allegations that the strike is interfering with the operation of mail cars. Rioting continues, and several additional persons have been shot. At a meeting of labor union leaders on the 19th, in which over 100 unions were represented, it was decided to recommend a sympathetic strike, and the question has been referred to the unions individually. No result has yet been reported.

NEWS NOTES.

—The national convention of mothers began its third annual session in Des Moines, Ia., on the 21st.

—The Presbyterian general assembly, which began its sessions in St. Louis on the 18th, has taken up the question of a revision of the creed.

—The German Reichstag on the 23d passed by a vote of 163 to 123 the meat exclusion bill, which, with a few unimportant exceptions, practically prohibits the importation of foreign meats.

—A bill enabling women to be elected as aldermen and councilors in borough councils passed its second reading in the English house of commons on the 23d by a vote of 248 to 129.

—The national conference of charities and corrections held a five-days' session in Topeka, Kan., beginning on the 18th. More than 300 delegates from all sections of the country were in attendance.

—Count Leo Tolstoi, the celebrated Russian philanthropist and author, was on the 23d declared a heretic by an edict of the orthodox Greek church. This edict is in effect a complete excommunication.

—Jane Addams, the well known social reformer and head of Hull house, Chicago, sailed for Paris on the 23rd to serve on the jury of awards at the Paris exposition for exhibits in social economics.

—Francis B. Carpenter, the celebrated portrait painter, whose historical picture of Lincoln reading the emancipation proclamation gave him his greatest fame, died in New York on the 23d from a paralytic stroke. He was 70 years old.

—The Methodist general conference in session in Chicago decided on the 23d, by a vote of 542 to 94, to grant women the right of membership in the general conference. This has been a mooted question in the general conference for over ten years.

—A system of compulsory insurance for workmen was overwhelmingly rejected in Switzerland last week by referendum vote. The scheme contemplated payment of insurance premiums in part by employers, in part by workmen and in part by the government.

—The United States supreme court handed down a decision on the 21st in the Kentucky governorship case by dismissing Taylor's plea for want of jurisdiction. This decision leaves Beckham in complete control. W. S. Taylor left Kentucky for Indianapolis on the 21st on receiving word of the supreme court's decision.

—Gov. Smith of Montana on the 18th sent a telegram to the United States senate revoking the recent appointment of W. A. Clark as senator, which had been made by the lieutenant governor during his absence from Montana, and at the same time announcing the appointment of Maj. Martin Maginnis as senator in Clark's stead.

—Chicago platform democrats of New York state met in New York city on the 21st, and, after reaffirming the sixteen to one plank of the Chicago platform of '96, adjourned until June 6, with the understanding that, should the regular democratic state convention not instruct for Bryan, a contesting delegation will be sent to Kansas City.

—Bubonic plague continues to find new fields in which to flourish. Rio Janeiro reports seven deaths on the 21st, and Sydney, New South Wales, has had a total of 235 deaths since the inception of the plague in that city. Nine deaths from this cause have occurred in Chinatown, San Francisco, during the past week. The board of health there ordered that all persons in the infected district should be inoculated, but Chinese opposition grew so menacing that the board rescinded the order and has contented itself with maintaining a strict quarantine.

IN CONGRESS.

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

May 14-19, 1900.

Senate.

The naval appropriation bill was passed on the 14th. After a long debate the committee in charge of the bill succeeded in having their armor plate amendment, printed on page 5914, incorporated in the bill. This bill also authorized the construction of five submarine boats of the Holland type. On the 15th W. A. Clark, after a speech in which he protested against the findings against him of the committee on privileges and elections, announced his resignation as senator from Montana. On the 16th Senator Bacon spoke at length on the Cuban postal defalcation. The speech

is printed at page 6153. Consideration of the post office appropriation bill was begun on the 17th and continued on the 18th. On the latter day McCumber spoke on the joint resolution declaring the Philippine Islands part of United States territory. It is S. R. 53, and is printed on page 6133. Senator Frye on the 19th laid before the senate a telegram from Gov. Smith, of Montana, revoking the appointment of W. A. Clark as senator by the lieutenant governor of that state, and announcing the appointment of Martin Maginnis. Consideration of the post office bill was resumed on this day, and the amendment appropriating \$725,000 for pneumatic tube service was rejected by a vote of 32 to 16. The rest of the session was devoted to the delivery of speeches in acceptance of a statue of Gen. U. S. Grant, to be placed in the rotunda of the capitol.

House.

The general deficiency bill was passed on the 14th, and the military academy bill on the 15th. A senate amendment to the Alaska civil government bill, printed on page 6038, regarding the purchase of lands in Alaska, was agreed to, and a bill to incorporate the National Red Cross society was passed. The river and harbor works bill was passed on the 17th, and the Alaska civil code bill was discussed. Nothing of importance was done on the 18th, and the whole morning of the 19th was devoted to the ceremonies of acceptance of the Grant statue, to be placed in the rotunda of the capitol.

MISCELLANY

"THE FEET OF THE YOUNG MEN."

"Behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out. Then fell she down straightway at his feet, and yielded up the ghost; and the young men came in, and found her dead, and, carrying her forth, buried her by her husband."—Acts 5:9,10.

Where the nations sat in council, scarlet robe and purple hem,
From the four-went ways of travel came the poor of God to them;
Came the blind of right and reason, came the halt of rule and law,
Came the feeble, feckless peoples, crying dole of all they saw.

"Lo, to you God giveth bread,
Break a crust to us," they said,
"We have eaten fruit of bondage to the core;"
"Take and eat," the nations cried,
"Here is freedom;" but they lied,
And the young men's feet were at the door.

"All we know of truth to God-ward, all we can of love beside,
All our good sword arm hath won us," quoth the nations, but they lied,
Bid them wait upon the scarlet, puppet to the purple hem—
As they dealt with hungry peoples, so the Lord hath dealt with them.

They have felt the threshing flail,
They have passed beyond the pale,
To the limbo of lost empires, gone before,
They are stricken in their pride,

They are dead, because they lied—
And the young men's feet are at the door.

Though your word shall run with power,
and your arm reach overseas,
Yet the questing bolt shall find you if you
keep not faith with these;
Lest you be at one with Egypt, lest you
lie as Rome lies now
In the potter's field of empires, mint and
cumin, keep the vow.

Keep the truth your fathers made,
Lest your children grow afraid,
Lest you hear the captives' mothers
weeping sore—

There is little worth beside—
They are dead because they lied,
And the young men's feet are at the
door.

—Mary Austin, in Land of Sunshine for
February.

A FABLE.

Once upon a time some Reformers,
looking very ferocious, came upon
some Ordinary Persons. All this in a
certain large and populous town.

"Can you show us any tiger's
tracks?" asked the Reformers.

"We can show you a tiger," replied
the Ordinary Persons.

"All we want is tracks!" protest-
ed the Reformers, and went their way
with much noise and were all present-
ly elected to fat offices, it being poss-
ible always to fool enough of the
people enough of the time.—Puck.

1776 AND 1900.

The people who believe that "Eng-
land is fighting in South Africa to-day
for what our forefathers fought for in
the revolution"—well, they would be-
lieve anything. England is fighting
to-day for what she fought for in 1776
—to force her good government on
those who do not wish it; to crush in-
dependence; to maintain her sover-
eignty. She says so now, herself; and
makes her apologists look even more
foolish than nature made them to look.
And as her defeat in America was by
far the best thing that ever happened
to England, her real friends hope she
will be beaten in Africa.—Charles F.
Lummis, in the Land of Sunshine.

BAD BUSINESS.

It costs the government eight cents
a pound, on an average, to carry sec-
ond-class mail matter, and it only
charges one cent a pound, therefore it
loses seven cents a pound. So say the
defenders of the Loud bill (which has
deservedly been defeated by the
house) who wanted to curtail the sec-
ond-class privilege.

"Justice" has no desire to receive
government help, and would willing-
ly pay eight cents a pound, if that
was the real cost. But that makes

\$179.20 a ton. The average haul is no
longer than from Chicago to New
York, and the railroads haul "trust"
freight that distance for \$5.60 a ton.
Therefore any loss to the government
comes from the overpayment to the
railroads, not from undercharge to
the shipper. As an example, the gov-
ernment pays rent for the mail cars,
pays the railroads so much a ton for
mail matter carried, and then pays a
bill for the hauling of the car!—Wil-
mington (Del.) Justice.

LUCKY FILIPINOS.

It appears that the Filipinos have
lost confidence in Americans.

Do those benighted wretches fail to
realize what we have accomplished in
their islands?

We may have burnt certain villages,
destroyed considerable property and
incidentally slaughtered a few thou-
sand of their sons and brothers, hus-
bands and fathers, etc., but what did
they expect?

Were we to transport an army more
than half way around the earth mere-
ly to listen to peace propositions?

Not much.

And look at Manila.

Two years ago the main street of
Manila did not possess a single sal-
oon. Now there are 13 on this one
street!

And they complain that drunken
American soldiers insult the native
women.

What do they expect from a drunk-
en soldier, anyway?

Progress is now in those islands.

She may be red-handed, and at
times drunk, but she is there for
business.—Life.

IMPERIALISM ANCIENT AND MOD-
ERN.

It is pretty hard to find anything
absolutely brand-new under the sun.
A correspondent who is evidently a
wide reader has resurrected in the
Spectator some fifth century Latin
verse of one Rutilius Claudius Nu-
matianus. He is not a well-known
bard, and the lines, as his new patron
admits, are not especially noteworthy
as poetry; but they are in reference
to the empire of Rome, and they cer-
tainly do show a remarkable resem-
blance in sentiment to the British im-
perial spirit so widespread to-day. A
very good translation is the follow-
ing:

Wide as the ambient ocean is thy sway,
And broad thy empire as the realms of day;
Still on thy bounds the sun's great march
attends,
With thee his course begins, with thee it
ends.
Thy strong advance nor Afric's burning
sand

Nor frozen horrors of the Pole withstand;
Thy valor, far as kindly Nature's bound
is fixed for man, its dauntless way has
found.

All nations own in thee their common land,
And e'en the guilty bless thy conquering
hand;

One right for weak, for strong, thy laws
create,

And bind the wide world in a world-wide
state.

—Toronto Globe.

AN OPEN LETTER FROM THE
LATE P. J. JOUBERT.

To the Worthy and Honored Dear
Friends, the Widows, Mothers and Sis-
ters of the Burghers Who Fell at Dun-
dee, Elaandslaagte, Ladysmith, Bel-
mont, Mafeking, Stormberg, Rooi-
laagte, Modder River, Colenso and All
Places of Battle: I ask you to accept
the assurance of my innermost regard
and sympathy because of the painful
burden laid upon you of mourning for
your own.

Let it be your consolation that they
were striving for their God-given, in-
alienable rights. A noble strife for a
holy cause, because our independence
as a people is to the interest of all
the people of South Africa and their
descendants and successors. They
have completed their duty and aspira-
tion. May they rest in peace and may
their deeds be remembered. May they
be precious in the sight of Him who
died for all.

And now may the God of our fathers
pour out His consolation in overflowing
and give you grace and strength to
bear this cross and be near unto you
and soothe and give you peace. This is
the prayer and heartfelt wish of your
earnest and true friend—the command-
ant,

GEN. P. J. JOUBERT.

Volksrust, Dec. 16, 1899.

SLAVERY IN SOUTH AFRICA.

I have never seen but one case of
slavery during my whole residence in
South Africa, and that one case was in
British territory. . . . I saw in various
directions (in the Transvaal) gardens,
fruitful orchards, and small square
houses in the possession of blacks, who
were living in a condition of ordinary
propriety, having abandoned poly-
gamy. . . . They were the so-called
slaves of the Dutch. . . . They had
come voluntarily, or been placed in
their care by their parents when suf-
fering from war or famine, or brought
up from childhood amongst the fam-
ilies they now willingly served. . . .
I have gone into the huts of hundreds
of these "tame" people, and have rare-
ly seen one where there was not a gun
and ammunition ready to be used will-

ingly and faithfully for the defense of the flocks and herds of the much-maligned Boer. These folk were perfectly free to come and go; yet I have never known an instance in which an Englishman could keep his or her house full of servants in the same way as the Boer could.—“Transvaal of To-Day” (pp. 197—202) by Alfred Aylward.

Of course the Boers, like ourselves, have been engaged in frequent native wars. Doubtless these wars were often unnecessary and barbarous, like our own iniquitous Zulu war, or our constant Kaffir wars before 1854, our Basuto wars, and Mr. Rhodes's Matabele campaigns. In these wars the Boers took prisoners whom they indentured as farm laborers. That no doubt is an approach to slavery, but our hands are certainly not clean. Hardly more than a year ago we virtually sold a number of Bechuana prisoners of war into slavery. — London Morning Leader.

ARRAIGNED.

Those who make private property of the gifts of God pretend in vain to be innocent; for in thus retaining the subsistence of the poor, they are the murderers of those who die every day for want of it.
—Gregory the Great.

Turn your eyes to these faces. Ah, see what they tell!

All marred with the misery of want!
Have beasts in the forests no homes where to dwell?

Are they always hungry and gaunt?—
Is there plenty for creatures that live midst the trees,

And but little for children of men?—
Are the homeless poor beings that God never sees?

Are hungry ones outside his ken?—
Is earth made too small—without room for all?

Will God's soil furnish food for but few?
Does he guard with a wall the green fields where fall

His life-giving rain and his dew?—
Is not earth, by its plan, the great storehouse for man—

Ever full of the bounties of Love?—
Then, who shuts the poor, by an impious ban,

From the gifts of the Father above?—
From the places for homes and the earning of bread,

Who, who turns them hopeless away—
To the deserts, the streets, and the dens full of dread—

In want to exist how they may?—
With a price for each use of the All-Father's lands.

Ah, who takes their birth-right to live—
While to earn daily bread they have skill and their hands,

And the means, the Creator does give?—
Shall not woe betide him who joins field unto field,

Until there's no room in the land—
And faces grow wan—and work does not yield

To starved bodies the bread they demand—
And toiling and struggling, 'tis useless to try

To replace Heaven's gifts that he takes—
And oh! every day little children must die
With the hunger his robbery makes?—

Shall not woe betide him whose riches increase
By the killing of joy and of hope—
By the breaking of hearts—the destruction of peace—

By the strangling of virtue and love?—
By this turning God's earth into poverty's hell—

The where 'tis unaltering fate,
Side by side with oppressed, oppressors must dwell

Midst the shadows of crime and of hate?

Ah, what is your right to these bounties of God?
Have you bought them from babes yet unborn?

Can you tell of a day when to all you gave pay,
For these gifts that from all you have torn?

Does community's treasure from you have its measure,
For these stores whence all must be fed?
Or do you, to gain gold, Heaven's free table hold,

And crowd children away from their bread?

ASHER GEORGE BEECHER.

WHY IS INDIA STARVING?

The New York Times is astonished at the frankness of some of the missionaries from India who are attending the ecumenical conference in this city. In discussing the Indian famine they stated that what the people of India need is not grain, but money. “There is plenty of grain in our storehouses,” say the missionaries, “and the natives only lack the money to buy it at the prices at which it is held.” Then the virtuous Times proceeds to haul the grain speculators over the coals, and to recommend that the English government take steps to have the grain distributed, and pay the speculators for the grain.

It seems to me I have read something like this before. Henry George states that Ireland exports foodstuffs regularly to England, famine or no famine. He says the same thing of India. It is likewise, according to George, true of Egypt. Strange, isn't it? It is worth looking into.

Who raised that grain in the India storehouses?

The Indians.

Who are starving?

The Indians.

Why don't they eat the grain?

Because it isn't theirs to eat.

Why don't they buy it with the money they received when they sold it?

Because they virtually received no money for it. It took all the money

they got to pay their taxes, rents and blood money generally.

But hasn't India a favorable balance of trade?

Oh, yes; very favorable indeed. India exports pretty much all she produces, and when the “home charges” are all settled she has little or nothing coming back to her.

What is the matter with India, anyway?

Why, you see, it is impossible to keep her people in a proper state of subjection except by the display of vast pomp, power and circumstance. These things cost money. It costs Lord Curzon nearly half a million a year to keep a proper establishment, and there are hundreds of others who have to keep up establishments, too. Then the army has to be supported, or the first thing you know the Indians would be running their country themselves and lose all the benefits of the Christian civilization which England is piously cramming into them. Who knows but they might try to stop the opium traffic itself?

The people of India don't appreciate their blessings. Just as the English have got the rewards of industry down to the lowest notch, so that India has every advantage of low wages and could cut the industrial heart out of any country on the footstool, the people begin to sicken and die of starvation and their generous patrons and masters have to dig up their wallets and help them tide over the difficulty. It is very unpleasant and diminishes English capital, thereby diminishing wages still further.

It is a hard nut to crack. Between the fact that the Indians cannot govern themselves and the corresponding fact that it takes all the people can raise to pay the English for governing them, the outlook for India is not a happy one.—Stephen Bell, in Justice, of Wilmington, Del.

THE GODDESS' REPRIMAND.

For The Public.

(A Dialogue Between the Goddess of Liberty and Her Daughter, Columbia.)

Goddess—My dear Columbia, what is this. I hear about your new pranks, such as going in for annexation, imperialism, and other naughty games, and keeping suspicious company? I'm surprised at you, indeed I am. You, my favorite child, ought to know better.

Columbia (with her hands over her eyes)—Please, mother, I didn't think I was doing wrong. I only felt that I was getting too big for the mantle you gave me, and I wanted to stretch myself. Besides, mother, am I not old

enough now to take my place amongst the nations of the earth?

G.—The nations of the earth! Why, you must be crazy to think of associating with such a dirty, low lot. Do you know their character? Have you looked up their antecedents? It would pay you to go to some respectable inquiry agent. It grieves me to think that a child of mine should so far forget herself as to want to play with them and learn their bad manners. Why, they are nothing but a pack of cut-throats and thieves, and they have been so for thousands of years. You know the old saying: "Tell me your company, and I'll tell you what you are."

C.—But, mamma, surely you would not want me to stop in this spot all alone by myself, and the world so full of excitement. I want to be an actress; I want to go upon the stage of the world's history; to deck myself with laurels plucked from the brows of expiring nations, and to fulfill that destiny which I feel prompting me from within.

G.—Alas! This is the result of the evil company you keep, and the naughty books you have been reading. Your head is turned already. As for your destiny, pray don't think it is that which is prompting you to do what you say. No, it is an evil spirit which will one day devour you. Why, your destiny is plainly on your countenance, if you will only view it through the mirror of history. It is to remain at home and enjoy the ample domain you have inherited from your forefathers, to defend yourself if attacked, but never to strike a blow unless somebody strikes you. Lovers of freedom from far and near, will then come to woo you, and will look up to you as an example of what a virtuous nation should be, until even the wicked European powers may be shamed into conversion.

C.—But, mother, is it wrong to strike anybody for beating and ill-treating another?

G.—No, certainly not, if it is to protect the other.

C.—Well, mother, I saw Spain hitting Cuba, and I ran after Spain and gave her a right good whipping, and then I took hold of Cuba and one or two other children that Spain had been treating badly, and I took them and am going to look after them myself.

G.—Do they want you to look after them?

C.—Oh, no, but don't you see, 'tis my destiny, and if I didn't do it—

G.—You mean, if you didn't do wrong, somebody else would. I see it all. Now,

look here, Miss Destiny—I mean, my dear Columbia—you are an exceedingly naughty girl, and are already on the downward path that leads to perdition. If you persist in your present course, I must disown you at once, and then you can sink as low as you wish. There is still time for you to turn back if you choose to do so, but you must not detain those children against their will, nor covet your neighbor's goods in any shape or form. You must give all kidnapers, pirates and slave-owners a wide berth—I thought the Atlantic was wide enough, but it seems not. If you are to be the heiress of Liberty, you must tread in her footsteps, guard her heirlooms, and live up to her traditions.

C.—How, then, mother, should I behave to the other nations of the world?

G.—You must remember what your father, George Washington, said to you with his dying lips, that while you were to buy and sell with them, and be civil in passing them in the street, you were not to hob-nob or keep company with any of them. Oh, to think what poor George would say if he were to know that his favorite daughter was falling into disgrace. (Weeps.)

C.—Mother, don't cry, I will see what can be done.

G.—Will you promise to turn over a new leaf, and to tear that dirty leaf out of your diary?

C.—Give me till next November, and I will see what I can do. I am under contracts which don't expire till that date. I intend to change my servants, whom I blame more than anybody for leading me away from the path of duty.

G.—Very well, my dear child, we shall wait and see. But what are all those bloated-looking pimples on your face?

C.—These are "trusts," mother; I wish I could get rid of them.

G.—Dear me, girl, you should look after your health, instead of playing those wicked games. These trusts will suck your lifeblood unless you get rid of them. You must rub them with taxation ointment until they disappear.

T. SCANLON.

Liverpool, Eng.

If all men were so far tenants to the public that the superfluities of grain and expense were applied to the exigencies thereof, it would put an end to taxes, leave never a beggar and make the greatest bank for national trade in Europe.—William Penn.

What Kentucky needs is a movement to teach the young idea not to shoot.—Puck.

A CHAPTER OF HISTORY.

Being extracts from a chapter in the "History of the Anglo-Saxon Race." Eckstein & Co. 1940. Three dollars.

The successful termination of the Transvaal war, which had been watched with increasing interest by the western branch of the Anglo-Saxon people, had resulted not unnaturally in a federation of the English-speaking world, and one of the most remarkable consequences of the triumph was the adoption by foreign governments of the tactical methods first used with so much success by our generals. The whole art of war had been revolutionized by the daring experiments of the new strategy; and of all those who hastened to learn the lesson none were more eager or more successful than our American cousins. Their own campaign in the Philippines had added not a little to this new aspect of the science of warfare, and the world stood confronted by 100,000,000 sterling men trained in arduous campaigns, and eager for new battles.

A second effect of the victory was the immediate absorption into the tongue and customs of the empire of all the Hindoo, Dutch, French and other native and aboriginal components of our vast dominions. In one of the most romantic scenes of which our history bears record the French Canadians, led by their priests, abjured their quaint customs and obsolete idiom upon the fields of La Rochelle, and within a very few hours the whole language had died out in Lower Canada. In South Africa the process was still more rapid, since it was helped by the munificence and imperial generosity of the great fortunes which had for so long controlled the destinies of those provinces, and before 1925 none but the most out-of-the-way villages continued to use the Dutch language. Queensland also abandoned the use of German, and the Channel islands remained as the single picturesque exponent of what had once been a Babel of tongues within the empire.

Some ten years after the conclusion of the war the Cape to Cairo line was finished, and the pessimists who had so constantly asserted that it was a vain enterprise were confuted by the vast mass of traffic and the great hosts of passengers that rushed at once to take advantage of this new method of communication. In the presence of the strategic advantage given to our forces by the completion of Lord Krugersdorp's railway the Germans were compelled to abandon their colonies to the east of it, a cession which they accomplished the more readily from the

belief now generally felt in Europe that continental nations were unfit to colonize. The west of Africa, including even the Free State of Congo, lapsed naturally to the British crown, and the duke had the pleasure of living to see realized the dream of which he is father and had been, at Highbury and at Birmingham, for so many years the constant exponent.

In February, 1932, the presidential election in the United States began to turn definitely upon what was known as "the unity question;" both parties were in favor of amalgamation with the British empire, but a sharp line of difference existed between the parties. The republicans, having trade interests mainly in view, struggled for a complete absorption into the scheme of federation, were willing to accept a governor from England (if possible a peer), and demanded no more than representatives in the house of commons and the privy council; while the democrats, true to the sectarian and particularist traditions of their party, insisted upon the maintenance of congress at Washington and even clung with old-world idealism to the name of republic. Every one knows how this was decided in the following autumn by an overwhelming majority in favor of Mr. Yallerby, the republican nominee, and from that date the English people presented legally, as they had so long presented morally, a united front to the world.

Events followed quickly upon this foregone conclusion, and it was in the next year that Lord Harmsworth brought in his bill since known as the "foreign shipping bill," though called at the time "an act for preserving the security of trade," which forbade any ship carrying flags other than British to engage in over-sea commerce, and thus restricted the dwindling trade of continental nations to coastwise traffic and internal navigation. Small as was the issue from the practical standpoint, this bill which, from their point of view, was considered to be tyrannical and offensive, was at once challenged by the Europeans; the ambassadors who, by a curious anachronism, were still maintained at the court of St. James's, did all in their power to modify the terms of our demand, but never was a nation more united, and when it was found that the main thesis of the bill would be presented unchanged, especially after Lord Harmsworth's great speech in Upper Clacton, rebellion broke out on the part of the continental peoples against our authority.

The battle was not so easily decided as many of the rasher spirits at first

maintained it would be, and at the beginning of the war not a few minor reverses attended the Anglo-Saxon arms. The fatal policy of landing troops and attempting to fight with soldiers led to more than one minor disaster, and it looked as if the struggle would proceed indefinitely, when the popular voice forced the government to a measure more in consonance with the national tradition. The word went round that England should disdain to fight any battles save at sea, large mobs insisted upon this policy, with a simplicity of diction and a clearness of object hitherto unknown in the collective action of an ill-educated majority. More than one leading spirit arose from the popular ranks of society who was found capable of voicing the national demand, and the phrases, "Remember the Maine," "Do not speak to the man at the helm," "Le pont est interdit aux voyageurs de deuxieme classe," and similar nautical epigrams of pregnant menace were printed in large type across the headlines of the newspapers. The sluggish government was at length overcome, and the arguments so ably maintained a generation before by Capt. Mahan were cheerfully but effectually listened to. A declaration was issued that Great Britain would fight her battles only at sea.

The effect was immediate. The foreigners disbanded their armies, sent out their fleets ill commanded and in many cases under-manned, chose the most impracticable ports for their points of issue, and in more than one instance even deprived their ships of all their heavy guns before sailing. The three fleets which concentrated upon the united foreign squadrons in the neighborhood of Ushant gained a signal and complete victory, and the war was at an end. During its progress there had been found some men exceptionally daring, who maintained that the lurking discontent on the continent could never be effectually relieved until our military forces had achieved a final victory over theirs. These men were rather exceptional, but they had studied history to some purpose, and knew that the firmest friends of an imperial power were those who had been taught by some severe lessons the folly of resistance. Nations beaten at sea are lost upon land. Our soldiers hitherto but ill-successful became invincible, and the issue of a short campaign proved the accuracy of the imperialist motto. It was only by the exercise of a wise and prudent forethought which excluded from the empire the Latin races and included only

the vigorous Teutonic stock that the empire was not overburdened with too willing but useless subjects, a consumption which arrived in time to close the weary eyes of the aged Kipling.

But now that complete unity had been obtained, and when something of the nature of the old Roman empire, though without its paganism and cruelty, (and without its stain of avarice), had been imposed upon civilization a new danger threatened the general peace of the world. The Salvation Army. * * * * * —The London Speaker of April 21.

CAUSES OF TRUSTS.

The very foundation principle of the trust combinations is restriction. Probably on the theory that fire must always be fought with fire, every effort thus far made by legislatures, to destroy the power of the so-called trusts, has been in the form of still further restrictions. One restriction is piled upon another, and still a third upon both; and in this way it is somehow hoped that liberty will be established by multiplying restraints upon liberty. The commerce and trade of the country are tied up with chains by the trust monopolies; and then congress and the legislatures seek to nullify the effect of these chains by chaining the chains. It is seriously proposed to restore free competition by prohibiting trust combinations from entering into competition. Laws have been passed for the avowed purpose of preventing combinations which control two-thirds of the production of any article from selling their goods in competition with the producers of the remaining third. It is no cause for wonder that all the so-called anti-trust laws have resulted in ignominious failure, and that the number of trust combinations never increased so rapidly as since these laws were enacted.

There is but one remedy for slavery, and that is liberty. There is but one remedy for monopoly, and that is to set free those currents which have been restrained by monopoly. No combination can ever be permanently successful unless it is founded upon some monopoly of natural resources. In very rare cases such a monopoly is founded upon the extraordinary genius of one or two men. For this there is, and ought to be, no remedy. Nature makes it impossible that such a monopoly of genius should last more than a few years; and during that period its benefits will far outweigh all its disadvantages. Genius may have an occasional monopoly; but no one can long have a monopoly

in genius. Nature is sure to produce a rival genius, who does in another way that which the first genius did in his own peculiar way. This was strikingly illustrated in the history of the steel manufacture. Bessemer having invented one immensely valuable and cheap process for making steel, Siemens followed with another method, and Gilchrist and Thomas with still another.

The great monopolies of this country owe their existence to special unjust privileges, conferred upon them by a course of legislation, which the people of the United States adopted of their own free will, and which are still maintained by the votes of the very people who most loudly declaim against monopolies. Foremost among these are the tariff laws, the internal revenue laws and the patent laws. We shall briefly consider these in the order of the least important.

Taking first the patent laws, which avowedly concede a monopoly for the term of 17 years, for good and solid reasons in each case, we have only to say that they afford a striking illustration of the dangers attendant upon any legalized monopoly, however meritorious. This is shown by a comparatively recent scandal with regard to a pretended conflict of claims in the patent office. Two opposing claims were secretly purchased by one corporation, which afterwards employed attorneys on both sides to keep up the sham contest for many years, resulting in a practical monopoly of a single invention for 30 years, instead of 17. By similar manipulations, other valuable inventions are monopolized for a much longer time than the law intends, while many others are simply locked up and kept out of public use entirely. The patent laws need a thorough revision; all in the direction of greater liberty. As we do not propose to discuss the details on this occasion we confine ourselves to saying that these laws should be so amended as to make it impossible for any monopoly to last under it for more than 17 years from the date of the application for a patent, and so as to permit the use by everybody of all patented inventions upon reasonable terms; or, in some other way, patents should be prevented from supporting any monopoly for a longer period than the precise term prescribed upon the face of the statute.

The internal revenue laws, by the restrictions with which they surround the manufacture of liquors and tobacco, afford some great advantages to monopolies. As it is our object in this article not to specify any particular monopoly now existing, we prefer to

illustrate the point by reference to the match manufacture, in the days when there was an internal revenue tax of one cent a box. It is well known that the result of that tax was to destroy immediately all independent manufacturers, and to concentrate the business in the hands of two or three great corporations. When that tax was repealed in 1883, these monopolies fell of their own weight, and it was many years before they could be reconstructed. The present great combinations in the match manufacture are to be found in other laws encouraging monopoly, which are still maintained.

The tariff is the most fertile source of American monopolies. During the last 30 or 40 years hardly an instance has been known in which an American monopoly has been denied any part of the benefits which it has demanded in the enactment of tariff laws. In 1890 and 1897, this rule was without any known exception. In 1894 there were but few exceptions. Tariffs are always made up by the very parties who are interested in preventing foreign competition and securing for themselves a monopoly of the domestic trade.

It is simply absurd to make any effort to prohibit or to regulate trusts and combinations, while their causes are left untouched. If the American people shrink from competition with other nations of the earth, and deem themselves justified in preventing such competition by force, they have no moral right to complain if American capitalists take advantage of the laws which prevent foreign competition, to make of them instruments to prevent domestic competition also. Neither have Americans, who believe in preventing foreign competition by force, any moral right to complain of capitalists who prevent domestic competition by fraud. The one is just as moral, or immoral, as the other.

And thus we come, at last, to the fundamental remedy which is needed. The fundamental cause of American monopolies is to be found in the lack of honesty, justice, business courage and love of fair dealing, which is unfortunately characteristic of a vast majority of the human race, not excepting the people in the United States of America. Whenever a majority of the American people demand simple justice, neither more nor less, for themselves, all these questions will be speedily settled, and trusts will dissolve like snow in summer. For any man who demands and receives exact justice for himself, and no more, necessarily concedes precisely as much to

every one else; and if no man received any more than justice, every man would receive justice. No right can be taken away from any one man, without conferring more than his right upon another. It is as impossible to give more than justice to all men at once as it is to cut off a section of the air and destroy it, leaving a blank.

The inconsistency of any man who demands that competition shall be free, when it works in his favor, but shall be prohibited when it works against him is obvious. But it is not so obvious to the ordinary mind that it is equally absurd to insist upon freedom of competition within the borders of the United States, while excluding competition from without. Nevertheless, the exclusion of competition is quite as unjust and injurious in the one case as in the other: and the demand for freedom of competition at home, while denying freedom of competition from abroad, is absurd and suicidal. The laws of nature cannot be persuaded to work only half-way. No man can take poison and yet enjoy good health. No man can enslave another, yet remain entirely free himself. Neither can any man or nation draw an artificial line and say: "Within these boundaries, competition shall be perfectly free; but outside of these boundaries, there shall be no competition at all."

The remedy, and the only remedy, for the evils of domestic monopolies is the repeal of all laws which pretend to give to any man, rich or poor, American or European, any protection against natural competition, any artificial monopoly of natural resources or any advantage which is not thrown open, on equal terms, to all human beings.

Who would be freemen, must set all men free.

—Thomas G. Shearman, New York, April 5, 1900.

The only "expansion" we need is expansion of access to our own unbounded natural opportunities. That will produce more "commerce" in a single year than would "trade" with the Philippines in a century. — San Francisco Star.

While I was in the wood alone by myself a-gathering of nuts, the forester popped through the bushes upon me, and asking me what I did there, I answered: "Gathering nuts." "Gathering nuts," said he; "how dare you say so?" "Yes," said I. "Why not? Would you question a monkey or a squirrel about such a business?" "I tell you," said he, "this wood is not com-

mon; it belongs to the duke of Portland." "Oh! My service to the duke of Portland," said I; "Nature knows no more of him than of me. Therefore, as Nature's storehouse the rule is, come, first served, so the duke of Portland must look sharp if he wants nuts."—Thomas Spence (1793).

TO THE BOERS AT ST. HELENA.

Hall! steadfast sons of sires whose fearless hands
Kindled in yon dark continent strange fires
Of dauntless independence, flaming high,
Lit in the fatherland at altars old
When Alva thought to quench their blaze
With blood.
Swept by Atlantic surges masterless,
Hymn'd by free winds, under the Southern Cross
Whose emblem stars flash back a martyr's
faith,
Your rock-barred prison, once a despot's
cage,
Beacons the world to-day for liberty
With that proud keep where stood Leonidas
And his three hundred. Still your comrades
hold
In valley and on crest their plighted trust.
Yet brighter glow their watch-fires num-
berless,
Fed of your memories. Forgetting not,
Truer their bullets seek the jailor foe.
Each vacant trench beckons new eager
thongs.
From desolate hearths on veldt and upland
bare,
Yea, from all alien lands beneath the sun,
Redoubled prayers beleaguer pondering
God.
Hall! little host, to freedom's cause not
lost—
"They also serve who only stand and
wait!"

—Charles M. Sturges.

Chicago, April 15, 1900.

BOOK NOTICES.

The March number of "Municipal Affairs" (New York, 52 William street: Reform Club Committee on City Affairs), is one of exceptional value even for that invaluable quarterly. It is devoted to the subject of public utilities, and contains articles on public ownership and the social conscience, on municipalization of public utilities by American cities, and on experiences with municipalization both in Europe and the United States. Among these articles is a comprehensive historical contribution by Gustavus Myers, upon public franchises in New York city. Comptroller Coler has an article on the municipal ownership of New York docks.

Under the picturesque title of "A Country Without Strikes" (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co.), Henry Demarest Lloyd, the well-known author of "Wealth Against Commonwealth," has begun the story of his recent economic explorations in Australasia. It is an account of the origin and practical operation of the compulsory arbitration law of New Zealand. Enumerating the beneficial results of this law, Mr. Lloyd assures his readers that strikes and lockouts have been stopped, that labor and capital are being organized into trade unions and associations instead of mobs and trusts, that the weak and the strong in both classes are equalized, that concentration of wealth and

power are checked and the distribution of wealth is determined along lines of reason and justice and greatest need instead of greatest greed, and that democracy is strengthened by these equalizations. Under this law either party to a labor controversy may summon the other before the arbitration court, presided over by a supreme court judge, and the award is conclusive not only upon the parties to the dispute but upon all employers and employes in the trade who may have been interpleaded in the court proceedings. For refusal to abide by the award, fines are imposed and punishment as for contempt of court may be administered. It has been the policy of the court from the first to discriminate in favor of registered trade unions and registered employers' organizations, other things being equal. The tendency, therefore, as may well be supposed, is toward the organization of industry into employers' guilds and workmen's unions, with a court to promote this tendency and adjust all disputes between the guilds on one hand and the unions on the other. Mr. Lloyd approaches his subject as an extremely friendly critic both of the arbitration law and of its tendency toward a socialistic state.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE.

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

LAWYERS,

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 2644.

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

Houston.

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

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,

40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.

Program for Friday, May 25th,

MR. JAS. E. McGRATH.

"Natural Law and Statute Law."

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

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. Familiarly 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.

Volume 2 of the Public

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

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

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

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

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

JOIN THOSE
WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

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