

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1900.

Number 136.

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.

"Though the cause of Evil prosper, yet 'tis Truth alone is strong."

Four years more of a "syndicated president." Four years more of trusts, imperialism, speculation, monopoly, plutocracy and a dinner pail "full" with lettering on the outside and scant of food within. Four years more of a prosperity banquet of which the deluded masses only catch the aroma but upon which the syndicates fatten.

The real objection to William J. Bryan is not his so-called "economic vagaries." It is his steady conscience. Men are accustomed to delude themselves with the notion that what they wish in politics is an honest man. It is all a mistake. What too many do wish is a dishonest man whose dishonesty is of the same pattern as their own. Bryan's greatest weakness as a presidential candidate is his honesty of purpose and fidelity to conviction.

Says Robert T. Lincoln, the plutocratic son of the third of America's four great democrats, "the election eliminates in Mr. Bryan a man who has been a danger and a threat to the country." Precisely that spirit was manifested in the fifties by the proslavery men toward Mr. Lincoln's illustrious father, who was the same dangerous and threatening man then that Bryan is now. And for the same reason: Lincoln threatened vested interests in slavery; Bryan threatens vested interests in monopoly. Like Lincoln, Bryan is an enemy of institutional larceny. Hence to men like

Robert T. Lincoln he is as dangerous as Abraham Lincoln was in the estimation of Toombs.

The number of people who voted for McKinley because they feared that if he were defeated a panic might be artificially caused in resentment was doubtless much larger than one accustomed to respecting human nature would guess. It is hard to believe that any man with a spark of civic conscience and even a rabbit's courage would vote to perpetuate the power of a regime which could produce a panic at will. If McKinley's plutocratic friends can do this, it is high time they were shorn of their power; and in that case he must be a pitiful coward who would pass on the fight with them to his children, instead of bearing the burden of it himself. What we need in this country is not so much brute courage of the Roosevelt kind, as manly moral courage of the John Hampden kind.

That peculiar kind of prosperity which, from its extraordinary vagaries, has come to be distinguished as the McKinley brand, responded with startling promptness to the results of the presidential election. Trust stocks went up with a boom, on the day after the vote, and the price of wheat went down. Our flag, as well as the British, has become, in the language of Cecil Rhodes, "a valuable commercial asset"—for the privileged classes by whom the sources and channels of commerce are monopolized.

Republican papers are accusing Aguinaldo of resorting—we quote from the Chicago Tribune of the 8th—to

peculiar means of securing arms for his followers. It is by offering to pay the American soldiers, or the imper-

ialistic soldiers as he terms them, for the delivery of their arms to the Filipinos.

And in a headline the Tribune describes this as offering "bribes to Americans." Inasmuch as the present American administration set the example in that method of warfare, by offering to buy arms from Filipino soldiers, and boasted of it in official reports, there is delicious simplicity in calling it peculiar and denouncing it as bribery. The only thing peculiar about it, however, is the fact that whereas American soldiers sell their arms to Aguinaldo, the Filipino soldiers refused to sell theirs to President McKinley. But this peculiarity adds no luster to the American name. It indicates rather that the American soldier in the Philippines has nothing there worth fighting for, while the Filipino fights for the independence of his native land.

An attempt to reorganize the democratic party under plutocratic influences is announced from Detroit, apparently upon the authority of Don M. Dickinson. The report states that a meeting will be held in a few weeks in New York to outline a plan of reorganization and promulgate a declaration of principles. Some of the names mentioned in connection with this movement are enough to damn it at the start with all declaration of independence democrats. Among them are William C. Whitney and Abram S. Hewitt. Whitney is one of the Standard Oil trust party, who not only draws a vast income from the earnings of an impoverished people, but advocates the perpetuation of every law and institution that makes his unearned fortune possible. Hewitt never was and is not now able to distinguish a democratic principle from a government bond. A proslavery man when his party, under

the dictation of the slave power, defied the declaration of independence, he has never changed, but still clings to the notion that robbery of the poor by the rich, if upon a large scale and by authority of ancient law, is sound democratic doctrine. The meaning of this proposed reorganization of the democratic party is plain. It looks to making of the democratic and the republican parties two office seeking factions of a dominating plutocratic combine.

In response to the Whitney-Dickinson-Hewitt scheme to turn the democratic organization over to plutocracy and the trusts, we gladly commend Gov. Altgeld's pertinent observations:

The second defeat of Bryan will not result in complete reorganization of the democratic party. Bryan is 2,000,000 votes stronger than any other man in the party, and if we cannot elect him we cannot elect anybody. The result simply shows that money can control the American elections. The issues have nothing to do with it. If we had declared for the gold standard the defeat would have been worse, for we would have lost what we had and would not have gained anything, because the corrupt syndicates wanted a tool and not a man in the white house, and they would have corrupted the elections just the same to elect McKinley. We do not want to win if we must sell or mortgage the democratic party to eastern speculators for moneymaking purposes as was done both times when we elected Cleveland. If the government must be run on corrupt Hamiltonian principles, we want the republicans to do it. The democratic party must stand for the toiling masses or else have no mission. To-day the party stands for justice and seven or more millions of men who supported Bryan are satisfied with it. They are not asking for reorganization. The men who are talking about reorganization are the hypocrites and the corporation creatures who supported McKinley when they found that they would not be permitted to prostitute the democratic party. Their proper place is the republican party. Justice must triumph in the end, and the democracy will win if it is only true to great principles, and it will be spat on if it again allies itself with the corruptionists who run the syndicates.

We were told before the election that the Filipinos would stop fighting if McKinley were elected. The

notion was that they would see the hopelessness of the effort—as if a people fighting for liberty are ever hopeless. But now that the election is over, and McKinley has—most unfortunately for the real prosperity and true honor of the country—been reelected, we are told that his election instead of bringing peace in the Philippine islands, will only strengthen our subjugating arms. Upon being officially advised by the war department that McKinley had won, Gen. MacArthur replied that this decision of the American people to hold the Philippines would materially aid the military in overcoming the native resistance. That does not sound like voluntary submission. But there is worse to come. The same dispatch from Washington in which this information about MacArthur was given tells of preparations to increase the army. Secretary Root has based his estimates upon a force of 100,000 men, 65,000 of them to be in the regular service. He and the president are to urge upon congress, so the Washington dispatch continues, the necessity of this increase, and as soon as authority is obtained they will adopt measures to recruit and transport enough troops to the Philippines to take the place of those whose terms expire. So the Filipinos must be crushed, and the beginnings of a giant military establishment must be continued. Here, then, we have the outcroppings of that bolder policy which is to be adopted in consequence of the *carte blanche* Mr. McKinley received at the polls last Tuesday—a more pronounced imperialism and a less timid militarism. And who that voted for McKinley has the right to complain?

The British tories celebrate Mr. McKinley's political victory with nearly as much enthusiasm as they celebrated their own. The *St. James Gazette* regards the result as a popular approval of the American colonial policy in imitation of the British; and the *Pall Mall Gazette* proclaims that "in McKinley and Roose-

velt Great Britain has just the sort of friends" she wants. Evidently the British tories understand what was involved in our election, even if so many of our own people did not. To them the result is a favorable response to Chamberlain's wish that while other nations may be friendly to British imperialism, the United States may be more than friendly. And they are right. Mr. McKinley's reelection, under the circumstances, seals a friendly alliance, not with the people of England, which we should welcome, but with the tory party of the British empire. It confirms that "understanding between statesmen," and makes the dominant parties of both countries one—one for empire abroad and militarism at home.

The tipping system in restaurants has reached such a point of perfection in London that proprietors sell to waiters the privilege of working. The waiters not only live upon tips, getting no wages, but pay premiums for the opportunity. A better illustration could hardly be desired of the truth that gratuities to the working class, when general, go not into the pockets of that class, but into the tills of somebody who exploits them.

Waldorf Astor is making more trouble in London. He is now trying to close a footpath which runs through his grounds, and the people are up in arms about it. But why should they be? If the grounds are Astor's own, he ought not to incur anyone's displeasure by closing them against other people. If, on the other hand, the grounds are not his, why make a fuss about a footpath?

The president of the National Live Stock association, in his opening speech at the recent annual meeting in Chicago, declared that "the cities are filled to overflowing and cannot provide labor for all who come." He, therefore, advised that "social rest and peace and the prosperity of our nation" demand that workers go from the cities to the country. But he

made no suggestions for country workers—where they may go.

What a curious superstition is this that the cities are full of men. What does it mean to have a city full to overflowing with men? The allusion is surely not to lack of space. The very power of city industry consists in minimizing space, working close together. Moreover, there is no lack of space in any city. In no city in all this country is the space half utilized. Vacant lots and lots but poorly built upon are the rule, not the exception. It is not space that the cities lack. Is it then deficient demand for workers? Why, the more people there are at any point the greater is the need for workers, not only absolutely, but proportionately. Besides this, it is evident that but few people in any city are served as fully as they wish to be. If our cities really are overflowing, then, it must be for some other reason than deficient space or over-supply of service. It must be for the same reason that the whole country is overflowing with people. And that the whole country is overflowing is as true as that the cities are. Opportunities for employment are no more abundant in the country than in the cities. Nor is the country overpopulated. The cause of "crowding" lies deeper. It is not overpopulation either in city or country that makes work scarce; it is over-monopoly and consequent under-use of working opportunities.

A surprising discovery has been made by the Chicago Inter Ocean. It has learned that there is no disinherited class. But the Inter Ocean is exceedingly short-sighted. By far the larger proportion of the people of Chicago have no legal right to remain in Chicago. To acquire that right they must bargain with men whose natural or God-given inheritance is no better than their own, for permission to occupy space in this western city. Thousands of these people were born here. Their natural inheritance is the right to live and work here. But of that right

they are disinherited by laws creating special privileges. The owners of the site of Chicago may at will allow them to remain or drive them out. And this is true of the whole country, only in lesser degree and with the exception of diminishing spaces far removed from the advantages of social life. It is in even greater degree true of the world. In the centralized area a comparatively few landlords control all the space. Others, to gain access to it, must labor for it—labor for what is their own by inheritance, labor as the slave labors for his natural freedom. These are the disinherited. The editor of the Inter Ocean sees droves of them every day. But his sense of justice is so blunted that he fails to recognize them for what they are.

It is stated by the Wilmington (Del.) Justice that a church site (including the church building) in Philadelphia which John Wanamaker bought four years ago for \$600,000 has been recently sold by him for \$1,000,000. As Mr. Wanamaker made no improvements upon the property during his four years' ownership, and paid no taxes, this sale netted him a clear profit of \$400,000, every cent of which is attributable to the growth of Philadelphia. We call attention to this not for the purpose of criticising Mr. Wanamaker. There is nothing to criticise in his connection with the matter. Our purpose in mentioning it is to direct attention to the enormous sums which communities everywhere must turn over of their own communal wealth to landowners, when in this one instance a single church site in Philadelphia yields to its owner a profit of \$100,000 a year. The question is whether such profits ought to go to site owners. Ought they not in justice and good horse sense to go to the community whose growth as a community produces them?

About the most candid business circular it has ever been our fortune to receive is the handsome pros-

pectus of a new industrial city of Pennsylvania called South Sharon. The circular has been issued for the purpose of stimulating investments in South Sharon building lots, and it holds out at least one delicious morsel to whet the appetite of buyers. Under the quaintly absurd subhead of "the land owners' earnings," as if land owners could "earn" anything, it says:

Statistics show that 95 per cent. of the people within this 100-mile radius who are worth \$100,000 to millions of dollars have accumulated their wealth by the purchase or inheritance of real estate enhanced in value by the increase of population resulting solely from the growth and expansion of its great manufacturing industries. Think of it for a minute! Every industrial corporation in this grand manufacturing district has helped to earn for the landowners 95 per cent. of the actual wealth as against 5 per cent. for the money invested in said corporations.

One of the questions that force themselves upon the attention of readers of that tempting prospectus is probably not a question that its author intended to invite. But why should landlords be allowed to appropriate that 95 per cent.?

Dean Farrar is at much pains in a magazine article to prove that "a war waged in the cause of truth and right, though it may be a very terrible necessity, yet in human history still continues to be at times a necessary duty, even for the most Christian nation, and is in no way at conflict with the obligation by which every true Christian is eternally bound." But the dean's conclusion is stated ambiguously. What does he mean by truth and right? In his estimation Christianity is surely "truth and right;" his own particular church organization must be "truth and right" to him; and all his personal convictions, are not they also "truth and right"? But still we cannot suppose that he would justify an aggressive war for Christianity, or his church organization, or his personal convictions. Everybody except nonresistants agrees with Dean Farrar about wars waged for "truth and right," provided the

wars be waged in their defense. But there is one objection even to wars for defense which writers like the distinguished dean seldom consider. It is to their being glorified. At the best, war is, indeed, a "terrible necessity;" yet this terrible necessity is exploited by strenuous jingoes as a divine jollification, and men like Farrar often indirectly give countenance to these human brutes. Let preachers stop apologizing for glorifiers of war, and the "terrible necessity" for waging it will seldom arise.

One of the most startling plans in furtherance of paternalism originates in New York city in the shape of a proposition to charter a private corporation for the maintenance of morality, the corporation to be invested with police powers. It is to be a corporation which, according to one of its advocates, "can instruct and plead while it punishes at the same time." The alarming fact about this proposition is that it really expresses a tendency which, should it persist, would make the people of our country subject in all particulars to corporation government. Some corporations, like the one in question, would have police powers. Others would assume grand jury functions. Others would administer the courts. Others would be invested with legislative authority. Others would collect taxes. (Some corporations do that already.) And so on, and on, until government had become a complex arrangement of private corporate interests.

The campaign preliminary to the first parliamentary elections for the new Commonwealth of Australia is opening with good prospects for the free traders. Among the leading candidates on their side is Max Hirsch, the best, as well as best-known, statistician of the Australian colonies. Journalistically, the movement is supported not only by the general free trade press, but also, and with inspiring fervor and good political sense, by the Arena, a new threepenny illus-

trated weekly which has been started in Melbourne to take the place of the monthly Beacon. The Beacon was for many years a beacon indeed in Australia. To it the present strength and radicalism of the free trade movement there is in large measure due. But as a monthly its appearance was too infrequent for the needs of a great parliamentary struggle, and the 'Arena has been substituted for it. Through the columns of this excellent Australian periodical, Americans may keep themselves well posted on the affairs of the new commonwealth — the United States of the austral seas.

Some indication of the corrupt influences that were brought to bear by plutocratic elements in the recent campaign to force men to vote against their convictions is offered by the following letter:

Cable address: "Spitzer." Spitzer & Co., bankers. Established 1871. Ceilan M. Spitzer, New York, 20 Nassau street. Albert L. Spitzer, Toledo, Spitzer Building.

Toledo, O., Aug. 22, 1900.—C. M. Hayden, Agent, Wells-Fargo Express Co., City—Dear Sir: We are somewhat surprised to read in the prominent papers of this country that J. J. Valentine, president of the Wells-Fargo Express company, who was a strong supporter of McKinley four years ago, has declared in an open letter for Bryan. If this is the case, it is not necessary for us to state to you that we shall only use your company when we are obliged to, and shall use every effort to throw business to other companies. We cannot afford to do business with a company that has at the head of it a man who is doing everything he can to destroy our business. We know of many more large customers of yours who are talking on the same lines, but do not feel like letting your people know this. You will find there will be a big crusade against your company from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We think your president is deserving of the same fate that St. John received, who was a prosperous man and at the head of one of the largest banks in New York. The pressure brought to bear on the bank was so heavy that the directors were obliged to ask St. John to resign. Mr. J. J. Valentine is not the proper person to be at the head of any financial institution. Any man who believes in free silver and Bryanism should not be at the head of one of the largest financial institutions of this country; he is

simply a traitor to the cause and is bound to ruin the business of the company by his open letters to the public, and if Bryan should be elected and this country go on a free silver basis your banking business would be ruined as well as your express business.

We think the directors should immediately ask this man Valentine to resign, for he surely has not the best interests of the stockholders and officers at heart, but, on the other hand, is seeking to destroy the company's business instead of helping it. The belief of the chief executive of any financial institution should be on the line of building up the business of the company instead of destroying it. Yours truly.

(Signed) Ceilan M. Spitzer.

In Valentine's case the person sought to be intimidated was able to rise superior to such influences. But how many of the hundreds of thousands who were approached in similar fashion were strong enough or brave enough to maintain their rights of citizenship? It was a common thing in the course of the campaign, on the part of republican speakers—Mr. Hanna was one of them—to argue that employes ought to vote as their employers wished. From argument on such a point there is but a step to a demand. And in Valentine's case we have the proof of such a demand. If this is not plutocracy—government by the rich—what shall we call it?

The members of the Henry George Bryan and Stevenson campaign club of Chicago have good reason to be satisfied with the work of their organization. For considerably more than a month it maintained in the center of the business district a series of public meetings which were almost continuous. Beginning at noon, they were carried on daily, except Sundays, until nearly midnight; and except at supper time the store room in which they were held was almost always crowded to the door. Some of the leading speakers of the country were heard at this place, and excellent work in the direction of fundamental democratic principles was done. So many contributed in various ways to the success of

the meetings—some with money and some in collecting money, some as speakers and some as committee workers and distributors of literature—that it is almost invidious to mention any. But the continuous service of F. H. Monroe as chairman of the executive committee and of L. S. Dickey as manager, call for special recognition. The club turned out over 1,000 marchers in the Bryan parade.

✓ OVER THE BRINK.

With an enormous electoral majority the voters of this country have decided to approve President McKinley's imperial policy. Regardless of what any or all of them may have intended to do by voting for McKinley, this is what they have done. That imperial policy is now, and it will continue to be until reversed at a future election, no longer the McKinley policy alone, but the American policy.

The vote of Tuesday will be construed in no other way. Imperialism as applied especially to the Philippines was the paramount issue. The money question only served the republicans as a red herring to draw across the trail. And most dexterously did they use it so as to make the silver issue appear to be a live one in the east, where free silver is feared, and a dead one in the west, where it is popular. The inconsistency mattered not to them. They relied upon Lincoln's aphorism that "you can fool all of the people some of the time." What they wanted was a popular indorsement of the policy of imperialism, and they have got it.

There was but one concrete issue in the recent election. That issue was imperialism as expressed in the Philippine policy. And everybody who voted for McKinley voted in effect to approve imperialism to the extent to which it has gone—the criminal aggression of forcibly annexing the Philippines. As to that question, this country has voted itself over the brink, and the deepest and darkest chasms of imperialism yawn beneath it.

REASON FOR HOPE.

While obliged to concede that the reelection of McKinley is a formal

indorsement of his policy, we have no notion that the voters deliberately indorsed it. We do not believe that the people of this country are imperialistic at heart. If we did we should give up hope. We do believe, however, that they are not yet awake in great masses to the imminence of imperialism. They have forgotten the revolutionary caution that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and are easily lulled into a false sense of security. We agree with the Philadelphia Times when it says that "the people have not approved—they have been overawed;" only we should say "deluded and overawed." To quote approvingly the text of this most excellent comment of the Times:

The reelection of President McKinley in the face of the general condemnation of his policy is the fullest justification of the battle the democracy has made in defense of popular rights—a battle that begins anew today and will continue until it is won. The enormous concentration of capital under corporate control has become the dominant power in this country. It controls our legislatures; it controls the national government; it controls our elections. Through its countless channels of influence, by corruption, intimidation and misrepresentation of every kind, it has compelled the election of its chosen candidate against the deliberate judgment of the American people. Imperialism in government goes hand in hand with this tyranny of money that finds expression in the trusts. The people have not approved—they have been overawed. The false cry of danger to "business interests" has terrified and coerced men against their judgment.

A volume could not more vividly and accurately describe the circumstances which have made this republic indorse with an overwhelming vote a monarchical policy against which the people in their hearts protest.

THE FUTURE.

Though imperialism, as exemplified by what may be called the American policy in the Philippines, has been approved by the American people, the revolt against the principle of imperialism is not yet put down.

This principle goes deep. It involves not only the right of the American republic to organize crown colonies and govern a subject people, but also its right to subject its citizens at home to the dominion of a privileged class.

Over that principle the politics of this country have been more or less deeply agitated for nearly two decades. It gained expression first in the tariff question; then, more superficially and less appropriately, in the silver coinage question; and in the recent campaign more fundamentally than ever in the Philippine question. What form of expression it may next adopt cannot be foretold, nor is it important. The vital thing is that the conflict between elementary natural rights and mere legal privileges has begun at the American ballot box.

The election of Tuesday did not determine this conflict. That was only a battle. The war is still on. It has had its Bunker hill. It has had its Long Island. It may have its retreat across the Jerseys. Even a Valley Forge experience may await it. But the sun will yet rise upon a Saratoga and a Yorktown in this war of ballots between the impoverished and their despoilers as it did in the war of bullets which Washington's half-starved ragamuffins waged against the well-fed troops of King George.

On our side, notwithstanding one defeat in the early stages, one victory followed by unexampled treachery, and two dispiriting defeats in the more recent stages of the conflict, we have made a great advance. We have for one thing identified one of the great parties of the country with the principle of imperialism, and the other with that of democracy. The republican party now stands in this country, like the tory party of England, for privilege and paternalism; whereas the democratic party, no longer the tool of the slave power, has at least reached the place of opposition. We refer, of course, not to what these parties say they stand for, nor to what some of their managers are trying to make them stand for, but to the now evident trend of each. The issue of restriction, regulation, governmentalism on the one hand, and of individual liberty on the other, has been raised between them. The rest is only a matter of keeping on. Be the results of elections what they may, every contest like the last one will emphasize that issue, provided these

parties continue to hold the same relations toward each other.

That the republican party will remain what it is and advance in the direction in which it is now going, there is no room for doubt. The plutocratic interests of the country have its machinery and its influential members completely at their mercy. But there is not the same certainty that the democratic party will do so. A supreme effort will be made between now and the next presidential election to turn it back in its course. The republican press is already urging that this be done, giving as a reason for it that the democratic party has been so badly defeated that it can never win with the principles it now represents. Why the republican press should be anxious to have the democratic party in a winning position must be inferred, for it is not explained. But the republicans are not alone in their anxiety to reverse the policy of the democratic party. So-called democrats are preparing to make a crusade within the party for that purpose.

It is known that some of these voted for Bryan with no other motive than to give them again a place in the party organization where they might obstruct its present movement. There are others who voted for McKinley for the declared purpose of helping to produce a defeat for Bryan that might force his party to turn in its tracks. Such men, aided by others who care nothing for political principle but everything for political spoils, intend to reverse the direction of the democratic party so that instead of fighting republican corruption it may share in it. And the preliminary steps to this end consist in discrediting Bryan as a leader.

That is the first danger to be guarded against. The democratic party must be held upon its present general course, and the only truly democratic leader it has had since Jackson should be assured of the confidence of all democratic democrats. Not that Bryan is the only person for democratic leader. There may be others, and it may be wise to accept another before the next election. Of that no one can judge now. But Bryan is the one leader of whom anything is yet known. He is the only demo-

crat of this generation of democrats who has proved both his ability as a popular national leader and the depth and genuineness of his democracy.

To Bryan, then, in the immediate future, at any rate, will true democrats turn for advice and support in maintaining the integrity of the new democracy; and to him will they look for that reasonable advance along democratic lines which his defeat of last Tuesday necessitates. The democracy, like revolutions, can neither stand still nor go backward. It must press on, come victory or defeat, toward the ultimate contest of our era—the contest which shall be to plutocracy and democracy what the fateful battle of Tours was to Saracen and Christian.

NEWS

Details of the voting at the presidential election on the 6th are as we write (November 8) not yet available. No report of the popular vote, therefore, can be given. But President McKinley has been reelected by a larger electoral vote than he received in 1896.

Mr. Bryan began his final speaking campaign in Chicago on the 1st, immediately upon his arrival, which was reported last week, and from then until the 3d, when he reviewed a night parade of about 40,000, he addressed audiences in different parts of the city every day from early in the forenoon until late at night. Most of the meetings were out of doors. Among the few indoor meetings at which he appeared was that of the Henry George Bryan and Stevenson Campaign club at Handel Hall, where his speech dealt impressively with fundamental moral principles. It is reported verbatim in the department of Miscellany. Leaving Chicago on the 3d, Mr. Bryan made a rapid tour of Nebraska on the 5th, returning to Lincoln in time to vote on the 6th. President McKinley went to his home in Canton a few days before election day and voted there. At the close of the campaign on the 5th the managers of both parties issued manifestoes claiming the election by large majorities of their respective candidates.

The electoral vote, as the newspaper reports now estimate it, is as follows:

FOR M'KINLEY.		FOR BRYAN.	
California	9	Alabama	11
Connecticut	6	Arkansas	8
Delaware	3	Colorado	4
Illinois	24	Florida	4
Indiana	16	Georgia	13
Iowa	13	Idaho	3
Kansas	10	Kentucky	13
Maine	6	Louisiana	8
Maryland	8	Mississippi	9
Massachusetts	15	Missouri	17
Michigan	14	Montana	3
Minnesota	9	Nebraska	8
New Hampshire	4	Nevada	3
New Jersey	10	North Carolina	11
New York	36	South Carolina	9
North Dakota	3	Tennessee	12
Ohio	23	Texas	15
Oregon	4	Virginia	12
Pennsylvania	32		
Rhode Island	4	Total	163
South Dakota	4		
Utah	3		
Vermont	4		
Washington	4		
West Virginia	6		
Wisconsin	12		
Wyoming	3		
Total for McKinley		284	
Total for Bryan		163	
Majority for McKinley		121	

Though the returns of the popular vote are exceedingly defective, we give the pluralities as reported, along with the pluralities in 1896, for purposes of comparison:

	1900.		1896.	
	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.	Dem.
Alabama	45000	76489
Arkansas	60000	72591
California	40000	1922
Colorado	35000	134792
Connecticut	28415	53545
Delaware	2000	3360
Florida	22000	21448
Georgia	40000	34141
Idaho	3000	16968
Illinois	100000	141517
Indiana	30000	18001
Iowa	80000	65452
Kansas	25000	13509
Kentucky	8000	281
Louisiana	30000	55138
Maine	28500	45777
Maryland	15000	32224
Massachusetts	82888	173265
Michigan	90883	56868
Minnesota	50000	53875
Mississippi	45000	58750
Missouri	50000	58725
Montana	17000	32043
Nebraska	4000	12935
Nevada	1000	6439
New Hampshire	18000	35794
New Jersey	52900	87692
New York	147000	268469
North Carolina	28000	19266
North Dakota	10000	9465
Ohio	79000	48494
Oregon	15000	2117
Pennsylvania	300000	295072
Rhode Island	15000	22998
South Carolina	30000	49517
South Dakota	16000	183
Tennessee	25000	19403
Texas	175000	202914
Utah	5000	33116
Vermont	30000	40490
Virginia	30000	19341
Washington	15000	12493
West Virginia	13000	10888
Wisconsin	106000	102612
Wyoming	3000	583
Totals	1391686	648000	1571378	961675

Chicago newspaper returns give the popular vote in that city. The figures are inexact but will probably

prove to vary but little from the official returns. They sum up as follows:

McKinley (republican).....	182,485
Bryan (democrat).....	174,178
McKinley's plurality.....	8,307
Woolley (prohibitionist).....	2,330
Debs (social-democrat).....	5,073
Barker (populist, m. of r.).....	188

McKinley's majority..... 716

Since 1896 the city of Chicago has been territorially enlarged, but as the effect of that enlargement upon its voting population is slight the following comparison with the above returns may be fairly made:

McKinley's Chicago vote in 1896..	203,121
Bryan's Chicago vote in 1896...	145,329

McKinley's plurality 57,792

Alschuler, the democratic candidate for governor of Illinois, though defeated in the state, has a plurality in Chicago of 13,549 and in Cook county of 5,064. Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, the democratic candidate for university trustee, an office for which women as well as men vote, has a plurality in Chicago of 10,126, and in Cook county of 1,664.

Unless the newspaper reports so far received turn out to be misleading, the next congress will be more strongly republican in both houses than the present one.

While the people of the United States were choosing their president for the next term, the people of Cuba, represented in the constitutional convention elected in September (see page 377), were beginning the work of forming an independent Cuban government. The convention assembled at Havana on the 5th, all the 31 delegates being present. Gen. Wood, American commander of the department of Cuba, had appointed a commission to arrange the initial ceremonies, and at two o'clock on the 5th he attended in person, with his staff, and as the representative of the president of the United States called the convention to order. In his speech Gen. Wood advised the convention that it would be its duty—"first of all to frame and adopt a constitution for Cuba," and, when that had been done, to formulate what "ought to be the relations between Cuba and the United States." He went on to direct that "the constitution must be adequate to secure stable, orderly and free government," and to give assurances that when the relations which the conven-

tion thought ought to exist between Cuba and the United States had been formulated by it, the government of the United States would "doubtless take such action on its part as shall lead to a final and authoritative agreement between the people of the two countries to the promotion of their common interests." In conclusion, Gen. Wood admonished the convention that it has "no authority to take part in the present government of the island." He appointed Senor Figueroa as temporary chairman, and the chief justice administered to the delegates an oath of office containing this concluding cause:

We publicly and solemnly renounce allegiance to or compact made with any state or nation, whether made directly or indirectly, swearing to the sovereignty of the free and independent people of Cuba, and swearing to respect the solution this convention may adopt, as well as the government established by the constitution.

The Puerto Rican elections were held on the 7th, the object being the election of the lower house of the legislature, to be organized under the act of congress of last spring. The election was carried overwhelmingly by the republicans, who are opposed to the American colonial policy. The opposing party, the federals, cast only 200 votes, whereas the republicans cast 75,000. The election passed off without the slightest disturbance. Gov. Allen reports it as evidence of the capacity of the people for self-government.

Canadian parliamentary elections followed close upon the presidential election in the United States. The Canadians voted on the 7th. There were 213 seats to fill, and nearly all were contested by the two leading parties—the conservative, under the leadership of Sir Charles Tupper, and the liberal, under the leadership of the present premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The issues were commercial, but both parties stood against free trade and for protection. As Goldwin Smith says, they were trying to crowd each other off the same platform. Reports so far received show a liberal plurality in the next house of commons of 47, as follows:

Province.	Lib.	Con.	Ind.
Ontario	35	50	3
Quebec	53	7	1
New Brunswick.....	9	5	..
Nova Scotia.....	15	5	..
Prince Edward's Island.....	4	1	..
Manitoba.....	2	2	2
North West Territories.....	1	1	..
British Columbia	1	2	..
Totals	120	73	6

British politics are quiet, nothing of general importance having come to public attention during the week except the approval by the queen of part of the new tory cabinet—

Lord Salisbury as premier and lord of the privy seal; the marquis of Lansdowne as secretary of state for foreign affairs; Mr. William St. John Broderick, as secretary of state for war; the earl of Selborne, as first lord of the admiralty; and Mr. C. T. Ritchie, as secretary of state for home affairs.

The London borough elections have been badly affected by the jingoism of the parliamentary elections that preceded them. These borough elections were the first held under the new system of London government. The city of London had been governed by vestries, a survival of the old parish system. When the London county council was formed, the vestries were restricted in their powers; but the council, with its single tax and kindred agitation, was much disliked by the tories, and to narrow its authority parliament divided London into boroughs with a separate mayor and council for each. The first election under this new arrangement came off last week, and the tories made the contest an imperial or "patriotic" one, appealing to the jingo sentiment in national politics and thereby defeating the progressive candidates with a sweep.

Although the tories promised the people of Great Britain that the war in the Transvaal would end as soon as the tory party had won the parliamentary elections, they have not yet been able to make their promise good. Another British disaster this week is to be added to those of last week. On the 28th a Boer force captured a British outpost of 90 men in the vicinity of Geneva; and on the 26th another force had captured a force of 30 British at Reddersfield. The Boers have suffered a defeat, however, near Parys, losing some of their guns. According to London reports, through the Associated Press, the British loss during the month of October was as follows:

Killed in action—men.....	152
Killed in action—officers.....	15
Died of wounds.....	71
Died of disease.....	367
Died of accidents.....	22
Captured	97

Total British casualties for Oct...724

The American war in the Philip-

piners drags on like that of the British in the Transvaal. Near Dagupan, in Luzon, one day last week, a Filipino attack resulted in the killing of two Americans and the wounding of three. No other fighting is reported. It is to be remembered, however, that the press censorship at Manila is still in force. An indication of the extent to which unreported fighting has gone on during the summer, appears in a dispatch from the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record to the effect that the secretary of war has issued special instructions to Gen. MacArthur, expressing the dissatisfaction of the department with what the report describes as "the successful operations of the Filipinos against the American forces," and ordering new measures for military defense.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to November 7, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900.	103
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900	495
Total deaths since July 1, 1898....	2,445
Wounded	2,321
Captured	10
Total casualties since July 1, 1898.	4,776
Total casualties reported last week	4,746
Total deaths reported last week.	2,415

Of the Chinese question there is only one thing to report. The Anglo-German agreement quoted on page 456 and acquiesced in by the American government, as stated on page 472, has been accepted by all the other powers. France and Russia make similar reservations regarding the third clause to that made by the United States.

NEWS NOTES.

—Russia has completed plans for a great ship canal between the Baltic and White seas with a minimum depth of 20 feet.

—Iceland by her recent elections has practically demanded of Denmark an autonomous government by placing in power the party pledged to accomplish this reform.

—William L. Strong, the last mayor of "Smaller New York," died at his New

York home on the 2d. Mr. Strong was in office from 1895-98 as a leader of the reform movement which brought about the Lexow investigation. He was 74 years old.

—A rich strike of Cinnabar ore has been made in Brewster county, south-western Texas, near the Rio Grande river. The ore is of such a nature that the quicksilver can be extracted economically. The district is rapidly filling up with prospectors.

—A gigantic customs fraud in sugar duties has been unearthed by the Philadelphia Times, which, backed by the affidavits of ex-employees, charges the Spreckels Sugar Refining company, of that city, a part of the sugar trust, with having defrauded the government of \$8,000,000 during the past three years.

—The constitutionality of the Puerto Rican tariff law will be tested by a case which comes before the United States supreme court January 7. The case in question is a suit brought by E. S. De Lima, a Porto Rican, against G. S. Bidwell, collector of customs of the port of New York for the recovery of duties paid under the existing law.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for October shows on hand October 31:

Reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash balance....	137,005,032.12
Total	\$287,005,032.12
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1900	305,705,654.78

Decrease

\$18,700,622.66
The treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the federal government for October, shows the following:

Receipts for October:	
Tariff	\$20,552,938.64
Int. Rev.	27,691,143.80
Misc	3,381,984.61
	\$51,626,067.05
Expenses for October:	
Civil and Misc.....	\$11,754,840.72
War	15,169,228.67
Navy	4,598,258.57
Indians	849,938.03
Pensions	10,648,500.19
Interest	4,972,871.42
	\$47,983,637.60
Surplus	\$3,632,429.45

Receipts July 1 to October 31:	
Tariff	\$81,440,221.16
Int. Rev.	104,234,007.69
Misc	10,900,060.90
	\$196,574,309.75

Expenses July 1 to Oct. 31:	
Civil and Misc....	\$43,943,681.78
War	63,371,324.69
Navy	20,107,771.58
Indians	3,799,258.32
Pensions	47,206,857.50
Interest	13,214,553.63
	\$191,643,457.50
Surplus	\$4,930,852.25

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.
—Lowell.

MISCELLANY

A LAMENT OVER ENGLAND.
"How are the mighty fallen!"

This ode, which is said to be creating great excitement in London, was written by Miss Alice Buckton, of Sesame house, London, and is published in The Public by Miss Buckton's personal permission. Copies of it may be obtained from the Women's Printing Society, Limited, 66 Whitcombe, St., W. C. London.

Woe is my country, woe!
For the worst is fall'n
That e'er befel
The greatest of the great!
She hath left her high,
Her fair estate,
For a garbled cry,
And a thirst for gold;
And darkness—darkness manifold—
Hath led her to the gate,
The Gate of Shame!

Who could foretell
The hour and place
Where she should come
To look upon
The tolls of her disgrace?
'Neath burning skies amazed she stands,
Her mighty hands
Struggling with death,
Wrath in her heart,
And fearful doubt
Choking her breath—
Woe is my country, woe!

Shall we steep her brow
In poppy juice
Lest she should know,
And drug her ear
Lest she should hear
The scorn of nations gathering
To mock her woe?
Or, dim the mirror of the skies,
Lest she should see
How low the lust of sovereignty
Hath bowed into idolatry
The head that once was free?

Land of the Sacred Home!
O land of April skies!
Of lovely maids and fair-limbed lads,
And many minstrelsies!
Your veterans, of peace and war,
Amazed as never yet before,
Are strangely grim to-day;
Your bells are sad at Sabbath-morn;
Your toiling cities, gray and worn,
Stoop with a fate to mortal eyes
That nothing can withstand—
The doom of Her that did forget,
Of all the Earth,
To rule a little perfectly
Is greatest power and worth!

Woe is that country, woe!
Where half her citizens that meet
By thronging ways, and echoing street,
Must turn aside to shun the name
Of Victories that darken fame
More foully than defeat!
And what of those that give their life,
Pouring it as a sacrifice,
To pluck from out the smoke of strife
The quenching brand of Fame?
Bright with the blood of those that lead
And follow without name?

Of all her sons, none will she mourn
More tenderly and long,
Than those, unquestioning of ill,
That followed her with desperate will,

And followed her to wrong,
Lying upon the battlefield,
In bitter death, contented still
Her name upon their tongue!
Ah, who shall give us back again
The true, the brave, the strong?

Land of Freedom! once how free
Men only know
That, missing low
Thy light among the stars,
Ffnd Heaven dark, knowing thee now
For what thou wert and art.

The Pattern once of all things great,
Now, Pattern of a world's disgrace,
Be greater pattern in thy Penitence!
Majestic still, unvell again
That fair discrowned Face!
Thy beauty is not wholly hence,
Thy glory wholly slain,

While thou canst stand
To every land
A matchless monument,
Of all the mighty, one alone
Mighty, with outstretched hands, to own
"Yea, I have sinned, and would atone—
Meteme my punishment!"

NOT FOR SUCCESS, BUT FOR RIGHT- EUSNESS.

For the man who, seeing the want and misery, the ignorance and brutishness caused by unjust social institutions, sets himself, in so far as he has strength, to right them, there is disappointment and bitterness. So it has been of old time. So it is even now. But the bitterest thought—and it sometimes comes to the best and bravest—is that of the hopelessness of the effort, the futility of the sacrifice. To how few of those who sow the seed is it given to see it grow, or even with certainty to know that it will grow.

Let us not disguise it. Over and over again has the standard of Truth and Justice been raised in this world. Over and over again has it been trampled down—oftentimes in blood. If they are weak forces that are opposed to Truth, how should Error so long prevail? If Justice has but to raise her head to have Injustice flee before her, how should the wail of the oppressed so long go up?

But for those who see Truth and would follow her; for those who recognize Justice and would stand for her, success is not the only thing. Success! Why, Falsehood has often that to give; and Injustice often has that to give. Must not Truth and Justice have something to give that is their own by proper right—theirs by right and not by accident?

That they have, and that here and now, everyone who has felt their exaltation knows.—Henry George, in "Progress and Poverty."

But noble souls, through dust and heat
Rise from disaster and defeat
The stronger.
—Longfellow.

HOW "FIT" ARE WE?

One of the most curious, and, on the whole, amusing, theories extant is that people, in their own lands, where they have existed for unknown ages, are not "fit," or not "prepared," for self government, and that the people in and about Philadelphia or New York—for example—can prepare them, or render them, "fit," and will cheerfully do so. This in the face of the known facts as to the manner in which the people of Philadelphia and New York—for example—"govern themselves," is something to wonder over, at the least.—Friends' Intelligencer, Tenth Month, 13, 1900.

THE TWO WORLD CLASSES.

The political world to-day is divided into two classes and only two; there is no middle ground. One believes in the authority of might, in the divine right of kings, in inherited nobility, in titles by conquest, in the legitimacy of invasion, in possible government imposed from without. This is monarchy.

In the dictionary of monarchy there is room for the words "colonies," "dependencies," "subjects," "conquests." Monarchies may indulge in long-armed governments. They may impose upon a remote and alien people their wishes. This is imperialism. But in the dictionary of democracy there is no place for these words.

Democracy must believe that the best government at any given time for any given people is that government to which they themselves can attain; that the poorest government ever achieved by a people among themselves, by themselves and for themselves is better for them than the best government ever invented from without, for tyranny is tyranny, however benignant.—Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, on Sunday, October 14, as reported in the Chicago Chronicle.

"DEFEATED?"

An extract from a private letter.

I am glad to have been one of the Bryan men of 1900. It was a magnificent movement, magnificently led—on a plane a little high, perhaps, for the rank and file, but they responded finely. Look at the mass of them! Look at the old democratic party we used to fight—now on a plane higher than that of the Christian church! Almost half of the people leading their ministers of the Gospel! Is that not a victory to be proud of? Is it not a marvel, and a proper source of heart-warmth and congratulation?

Defeated? If "one with God is a majority," what is almost half a nation! It is invincible reform.

Distinctly lower is the thought that we have done our duty, and are clear as may be of the national blame. We do not need to wash our hands, nor cry, "Out, damned spot!" at succeeding Manila butcheries of white and brown. Our hands are clean of oriental blood.

C. H. R.

Chicago, Nov. 7, 1900.

MUCH LIKE AMERICA.

Mr. Maclean, M. P., in a recent speech in the British house of commons, is reported as saying:

"When in India he was struck with the apathetic and despairing attitude of the native population, who under recent calamities had had taken from them even the last elements of hope. The real cause of their impoverishment was heavy taxation. The salt tax was a most oppressive burden to the poor man. As a matter of fact all the resources of India were mortgaged to this country. All the great businesses, the shipping, railways, banks and great industrial institutions of all kinds were in the hands of Englishmen, who, drawing large salaries, transmitted their savings to England. What were the consequences to the native population? Famine followed famine, cattle died, household goods were pawned, and having no means to replenish their farms, the natives lived mere slaves to the village usurer."

And he might have added that the system of landlordism which the British introduced in place of the common village ownership that formerly prevailed, was also a large factor in the robbery from which the masses suffer.—Justice, of Wilmington, Del.

THE PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION AT BUFFALO IN 1901.

The exposition is now under way, to open on May 1, 1901, with a working capital of \$5,800,000.

The exposition is to be just what its name implies—Pan-American. A site that is all that can be desired, embracing a portion of Delaware park, has been secured, and the plans of the original promoters have been expanded into a scheme that contemplates something bigger than has ever been attempted in this country, with the exception of the World's fair at Chicago in 1903.

To accommodate the exhibits, there will be 20 massive buildings, besides a score of smaller ones. It was early decided by the consulting board of architects that the buildings, instead of being classic and monument-

al, as were the buildings at the World's fair, should be treated in free renaissance, with column and entablature used for decorative and not for architectural effect. Instead of the glaring white of Chicago, there will be color everywhere at Buffalo. The flats will be colored, and color used on color to gain the picturesque detail decided upon.

The principal buildings will be those of manufactures and liberal arts, agriculture, machinery and transportation, electricity, electric tower, stadium, administration, propylaea, horticulture, forestry, graphic arts, temple of music, mines, ethnology, and dairy, beside the New York state building and the three United States buildings.—The Cosmopolitan for September.

CREATING MARKETS.

The appetite of the world-market grew with what it fed on; the countries within the ring of what was called "civilization" (that is, organized misery) were glutted with the abortions of the market, and force and fraud were used unsparingly to "open up" countries outside that pale. This process of opening up is a strange one to those who have read the professions of the men of that period and do not understand their practice; and perhaps shows us at its worst the great vice of the nineteenth century—the use of hypocrisy and cant to evade the responsibility of vicarious ferocity. When the civilized world-market coveted a country not yet in its clutches some transparent pretext was found—the suppression of a slavery different from and not so cruel as that of commerce; the "rescue" of some desperado or homicidal madman whose misdeeds had got him into trouble among the natives of the "barbarous" country—any stick, in short, which would beat the dog at all. Then some bold, unprincipled, ignorant adventurer was found (no difficult task in days of competition), and he was bribed to "create a market" by breaking up whatever traditional society there might be in the doomed country, and by destroying whatever leisure or pleasure he found there. He forced wares on the natives which they did not want, and took their natural products in "exchange," as this form of robbery was called, and thereby he "created new wants," to supply which (that is, to be allowed to live by their new masters) the hapless, helpless people had to sell themselves into the slavery of hopeless toil so that they might have something wherewith to purchase the

nullities of "civilization."—"News from Nowhere," by Wm. Morris, Chapter XV.

MODERN LIFE IS DEMOCRATIC AND HUMAN.

"It was once the best of form for gentlemen to talk like stable boys and to be carried to bed drunk every evening. It was once in shocking taste to say that the Book of Genesis is a fairy tale. It was once the best of form for gentlemen to murder each other on the slightest provocation. It is still in shocking taste to criticise the spoliation of the poor by the rich," says Richard Le Gallienne in his latest volume, "The Sleeping Beauty, and other Prose Fancies." He goes on with some shrewd observations, worthy of reproduction, because England and America seem to be treading the same road as nearly as may be:

"Now, any time since the French Revolution there has been a steady warfare waging between two ethical ideas and two political ideas, between Christian asceticism and modern humanism—the gospel of the joy of life—on the one hand, and between the aristocratic and democratic ideas on the other.

"These ethical and political ideas have mutually interacted beneath the surface, so that what is valuable in Christianity has passed into democracy, and all that was good in aristocracy—those secrets of humanism which it had wealth and leisure to learn—have passed into the humanist gospel; but on the surface Christianity and aristocracy are still ranged together against democracy and humanism, the dead bodies against the life that once animated them.

"Once upon a time Christianity stood for most of the purity and pity that existed in the world, and aristocracy, perhaps, stood for most of the world's refinement and culture; but that time has passed, and at the present moment both goodness and good breeding, to state it gently, are quite as likely to be found elsewhere."

NATIONAL IDEALS.

What really determines a man is his ideal.

It is the same with a country.

Our American republic has in the past 30 years gradually been changing its ideal. The ideal of freedom, fraternity and equality was embodied in the Declaration. Our forefathers did not live up to the ideal; but they had the ideal, and this was much. They did not deride it. They at least acknowl-

edged it in words. Schoolboys declaimed it; orators proclaimed it. If they did not earnestly mean it all, they at least honored it.

The ideal of human freedom was held up throughout the struggle for the abolition of negro slavery. This got to be the embodiment of the ideal. Life-blood was at last poured out in its cause.

When this struggle ended, the nation entered upon an era of unprecedented money-making. We need not here speak of the causes. The fact is known. The world has never before seen such a race for wealth. Some held command of the natural opportunities of the country, and so have had a great start in the race. Others were endowed with the vulpine intellect for outwitting rivals. Thus there has come an ever-widening distinction of classes. We have land lords and monopoly lords wealthier than the lineal lords of the old countries.

These new aristocrats have not the ideal of their forefathers. Their ideal is embodied in an effort at imitation of the old regime of Europe. It savors of exclusion, privilege, and condescending patronage. The words of the Declaration are smiled at as the expression of a silly dream. Men whose fathers fought for the liberation of slaves are not ashamed to show contempt for the real freedom of labor.

These new aristocrats have command of the church, of education, of art, of literature. By their control of these influences they are poisoning the nation. The young men of the country and thousands of the masses are unconsciously affected. They are adopting the false ideal, which is now being presented to them under the guise of imperialism and glory.

Nothing can save the republic but the glow of a new ideal. No, not a new ideal, for the ideal of freedom and brotherhood has ever been the ideal of the prophets of all times and races. But this old ideal needs the fresh glow of a new birth and a new body.

What is to be the new form in which it is to be embodied? It can be none other than the crusade which is to complete the freedom of labor. This freedom can be attained only by the recognition of the fact that one man as much as another is lord of the earth on which he is called to live and work.

Reason and the course of history point to this as the next necessary step in human progress. Without this ideal the republic, which we have in times past been proud to call the hope of the nations, is sure to march on in the road of militarism and imperialism.

The power of monopoly and special privilege will increase. The concentration of wealth will continue. Philosophy, art, and the finer sides of life will be subjected more and more to the ideals of an upper class founded on money and controlling the means of livelihood. More and more the logic of the schools will be employed to discredit the rights of man. More and more our politics and international relations will conform to the commercial greed and the doctrine of the right of might.

There are awful signs of danger in the new issues which have lately come. But it is not too late, if only the heart of the nation can be turned once more to enthusiasm for the great ideal of justice and equal rights. He who first saw our new dangers and their remedy never lost faith in the future.—J. H. Dillard, in *National Single Taxer*.

THE CLASSES AND THE MASSES.

Class hatred was the theme of a sermon delivered Sunday morning at the Vine Street Congregational church by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow. Mr. Bigelow chose for his text a report of a sermon on the same subject by Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis. He said in part:

While it serves the purpose of some demagogues to play the role of reformers it does not follow that all reformers are demagogues. Appeals to class prejudice should be discountenanced, but not in so sweeping and indiscriminate a way as to create on the other hand a prejudice against the progress of true reform.

Here is a preacher who says that the increase of property means the increase of happiness of all classes.

That depends. The property which a man produces cannot add to his happiness if it is stolen from him. The labor of the slave may increase the property of the master, but the slave must be content with his bed of straw and slave's rations.

The preacher says:

Much of the wealth of field and factory has been produced, not by land, not by labor, not by capital applied to both, but by ability.

He says:

Anarchism and socialism propose to run a mowing machine over the tops of men's heads until all are equal.

Yet there is hardly an anarchist or socialist in New York who could not have told the preacher that when the political economist says that labor produces all wealth, he means the labor of brain as well as brawn. In political economy the term "labor" includes the ability of the brain worker with the skill of the hand worker.

The preacher says:

Among many men the impression

prevails that labor alone has produced the wealth, that the large fortunes of the rich have been created by and belong to the poor. The logical result of this idea is class hatred and class warfare.

That is only half the truth. A large part of many fortunes do belong to the poor. There are two ways of getting wealth. Either you must earn it or steal it. He who accumulates a fortune by performing for society some valuable service must enrich others as well as himself. Such a fortune is the measure of a man's worth to the world, and can harm no one. But if a man gets a fortune without performing any useful labor either of brain or brawn he grows rich, not by enriching others, but by impoverishing others. Such a fortune is the measure of a man's legal power of robbing his fellow men. The poor ought not to covet what the rich have earned by any form of useful labor. But they are miserable slaves if they do not covet their own. They ought to be jealous of that wealth which is not earned, but which becomes concentrated in the hands of the few, not by virtue of service rendered, but by virtue of unjust laws which make hard times for the many and unearned prosperity for the few. Every great fortune is composite in its character, but there are millions which represent little else but the legal power of their possessors to grow rich by increasing the poverty and the misery of their fellow beings. Millions are diverted from the pockets of producers for the support of idleness and the encouragement of snobbery.

If I said this with the purpose of inciting some enraged mob to raid the palaces of these commercial conspirators I would be guilty of appealing to class hatred. But if I stand in my pulpit and condemn as demagogues those who point to existing evils, am I not guilty of treason to humanity?

Grant that class hatred is a menace. Who is to blame for it? Is it the man who calls himself a socialist, or something else, and who stands on the street corner and makes indiscriminate attacks upon all those who have more of this world's goods than he? Is it the anarchist who throws a bomb or assassinates a king? These men are merely the symptoms of a social disease.

Read Mr. Riis' book, "A Ten Years' War," if you would know why men imagine they have a grievance. Consider how the other half of New York lives. One man in ten ends his life in a pauper's grave. While we are

worrying about the savagery of remote islands, 47 in every 100 of the denizens of our slums can neither read nor write. Infant death rate in these sections of the metropolis is over 80 per cent. The homes of these people have been called "infant slaughter houses," where children are "damned" not born into the world. Men and women crowded together sometimes at the rate of 1,500 and more to the acre! This crowding is steadily increasing. In 1880 there were 16 persons to a dwelling. In 1890 there were 18. In 1895 there were over 21. Three thousand people packed into a single block! God's sunshine sold at auction! From one-fourth to one-third of the income of these people required to pay for hovels where the elders of Plymouth church would not keep their dogs. In 1894 5,000 of them slept in rooms without windows. Think of it—tenants paying a dollar a week for the privilege of herding with the rats in rooms made of odd boards and roof tin! In the Astor tenements Mr. Riis found women finishing pants at 30 cents a day.

I tell you it was these people who equipped the Astor battery that was sent to Cuba. It is the wealth of these people that is represented in the private yachts that go lolling about the summer resorts with their idle crew. It is the wealth of these people that is paraded on Fifth avenue, where ladies give dinner parties to their lap dogs. The wine that flows at their banquet halls is crimson with the blood of these oppressed people who pay the rich man's taxes, build his palace, make its furnishings, supply his table, nurse his children, dig his grave, and for what? For the privilege of living upon land which before God is theirs no less than his. The baby that is born in a windowless room has a right to feel outraged. Society has no right to expect good citizens of boys that can never know the song of the meadowlark or the smell of fresh-blown clover.

The preacher says there is no occasion for social discontent here where the loftiest positions of the nation are open to the boys of the workshop and the factory. I think it is a reckless kind of optimism that indulges in that sort of rhetoric. Mr. Riis is nearer the truth when he says for half the population of New York the struggle for existence has been "growing ever harder and the issue more doubtful." Tennyson was nearer the truth when he said:

"Every door is barred with gold, and opens but to golden keys."

ON NATIONAL DEBTS.

One day Peter and Paul—I knew them both, the dear fellows. Peter perhaps a trifle wild, Paul a little priggish, but that is no matter—one day, I say, Peter and Paul (who lived together in rooms off Southampton row, Bloomsbury, a very delightful spot) were talking over their mutual affairs.

"My dear Paul," said Peter, "I wish I could persuade you to this expenditure. It will be to our mutual advantage. Come now, you have ten thousand a year of your own and I with great difficulty earn a hundred; it is surprising that you should make the fuss you do. Besides which you well know that this feeding off packing cases is irksome; we really need a table and it will but cost ten pounds."

To all this Paul listened doubtfully, pursing up his lips, joining the tips of his fingers, crossing his legs and playing the solemn fool generally.

"Peter," said he, "I dislike this scheme of yours. It is a heavy outlay for a single moment. It would disturb our credit, and yours especially, for your share would come to five pounds and you would have to put off paying the press-cutting agency to which you foolishly subscribe. No; there is an infinitely better way than this crude idea of paying cash down in common. I will lend the whole sum of ten pounds to our common stock and we will each pay one pound a year as interest to myself for the loan. I for my part will not shirk my duty in the matter of this interest and I sincerely trust you will not shirk yours."

Peter was so delighted with this arrangement that his gratitude knew no bounds. He would frequently compliment himself in private on the advantage of living with Paul, and when he went out to see his friends it was with the jovial air of the Man with the Bottomless Purse, for he did not feel the pound a year he had to pay, and Paul always seemed willing to undertake similar expenses on similar terms. He purchased a bronze over-mantel, he fitted the rooms with electric light, he bought (for the common use) a large prize dog for £56, and he was forever bringing in made dishes, bottles of wine and what not, all paid for by this lending of his. The interest increased to £20 and then to £30 a year, but Paul was so rigorously honest, prompt and exact in paying himself the interest that Peter could not bear to be be-

hindhand or to seem less punctual and upright than his friend. But so high a proportion of his small income going in interest left poor Peter, but a meager margin for himself and he had to dine at Lockhart's and get his clothes ready made, which (to a refined and sensitive soul such as his) was a grievous trial.

Some little time after a fishmonger who had attained to cabinet rank was married to the daughter of a large usurer and London was in consequence illuminated. Paul said to Peter in his jovial way: "It is imperative that we should show no meanness upon this occasion. We are known for the most flourishing and well-to-do pair of bachelors in the neighborhood, and I have not hesitated (for I know I had your consent beforehand) to go to Messrs. Brock and order an immense quantity of fireworks for the balcony on this auspicious occasion. Not a word. The loan is mine and very freely do I make it to our mutual position."

So that night there was an illumination at their flat, and the center-piece was a vast combination of roses, thistles, shamrocks, leeks, kangaroos, beavers, schamboks and other national emblems, and beneath it the motto: "United we stand, divided we fall; Peter and Paul," in flaming letters two feet high.

Peter was after this permanently reduced to living upon rice and to mending his own clothes; but he could easily see how fair the arrangement was, and he was not the man to grumble at a free contract. Moreover he was expecting a rise in salary from the editor of the Hoot, in which paper he wrote "Woman's World," and signed it "Emily."

At the close of the year Peter had some difficulty in meeting the interest, though Paul had, with true business probity, paid his in on the very day it fell due. Peter therefore approached Paul with some little diffidence and hesitation, saying:

"Paul, I trust you will excuse me, but I beg you will be so very good as to see your way, if possible, to granting me an extension of time in the matter of paying my interest."

Paul, who was above everything regular and methodical, replied:

"Hum, chrn, chrn, chrn. Well, my dear Peter, it would not be generous to press you, but I trust you will remember that this money has not been spent upon my private enjoyment. It has gone for the glory of our mutual position; pray do not

forget that, Peter; and remember also that if you have to pay interest, so have I, so have I. We are all in the same boat, Peter, sink or swim; sink or swim. . . ." Then his face brightened, he patted Peter genially on the shoulder and added: "Do not think me harsh, Peter. It is necessary that I should keep to a strict business-like way of doing things, for I have a large property to manage; but you may be certain my friendship for you is of more value to me than a few paltry sovereigns. I will lend you the sum you owe to the interest on the common debt, and though in strict right you alone should pay the interest on this new loan I will call half of it my own and you shall pay but one pound a year on it for ever."

Peter's eyes swam with tears at Paul's generosity, and he thanked his stars that his lot had been cast with such a man. But when Paul came again with a grave face and said to him: "Peter, my boy, we must insure at once against burglars; the underwriters demand a hundred pounds," his heart broke, and he could not endure the thought of further payments. Paul, however, with the quiet good sense that characterized him, pointed out the necessity of the payment and, eying Peter with compassion for a moment, told him that he had long been feeling that he (Peter) had been unfairly taxed. "It is a principle" (said Paul) "that taxation should fall upon men in proportion to their ability to pay it. I am determined that, whatever happens, you shall in future pay but a third of the interest that may accrue upon further loans." It was in vain that Peter pointed out that, in his case, even a thirtieth would mean starvation; Paul was firm and carried his point.

The wretched Peter was now but skin and bone and his earning power, small as it had ever been, was considerably lessened. Paul began to fear very seriously for his invested funds; he therefore kept up Peter's spirits as best he could with such advice as the following:

"Dear Peter, do not repine; your lot is indeed hard, but it has its silver lining. You are the member of a partnership famous among all other bachelor residences for its display of fireworks and its fine furniture. So valuable is the room in which you live that the insurance alone is the wonder and envy of our neighbors. Consider also how firm and stable these loans make our comradeship. They give me a stake in the rooms and

furnish a ready market for the spare capital of our little community. The interest we pay upon the fund is an evidence of our social rank, and all London stares with astonishment at the flat of Peter and Paul, which can without an effort buy such gorgeous furniture at a moment's notice."

But, alas! these well-meant words were of no avail. On a beautiful spring day, when all the world seemed to be holding him to the joys of living, Peter passed quietly away in his little truckle bed, unattended even by a doctor, whose fees would have necessitated a loan the interest of which he could never have paid.

Paul, on the death of Peter, gave way at first to bitter recrimination. "Is this the way," he said, "that you repay years of unstinted generosity? Nay, is this the way you meet your most sacred obligations? You promised upon a thousand occasions to pay your share of the interest forever, and now like a defaulter you abandon your post and destroy half the revenue of our firm by one intemperate and thoughtless act! Had you but possessed a little property which, properly secured, would have continued to meet the claims you had incurred, I had not blamed you. But a man who earns all that he possesses has no right to pledge himself to perpetual payment unless he is prepared to live forever!"

Nobler thoughts, however, succeeded this outburst, and Paul threw himself upon the bed of his departed friend and moaned. "Who now will pay me an income in return for my investments? All my fortune is sunk in this flat, and, though I myself pay the interest never so regularly, it will not increase my fortune by one farthing! I shall as I live consume a fund which will never be replenished, and within a short time I shall be compelled to work for my living!"

Maddened by these last reflections, he dashed into the street, hurried northward through the now rapidly gathering darkness, and drowned himself in the Regent canal, just where it runs by the Zoological gardens, under the bridge that leads to the cages of the larger pachyderms.

Thus miserably perished Peter and Paul, the one in the thirtieth, the other in the forty-seventh year of his age, both victims to their ignorance of Mrs. Fawcett's "Political Economy," the "Nicomachean Ethics," Bastiat's "Economic Harmonies," "The Fourth Council of Lateran on Usury," "Speeches of Sir Michael

Hicks-Beach and Sir Henry Fowler," the sermons of St. Thomas Aquinas, under the head "Usuria," Mr. W. S. Lilly's "First Principles in Politics," and other works too numerous to mention.—London Speaker.

BRYAN TO THE GEORGE MEN.

The following speech was delivered by William Jennings Bryan, democratic candidate for President of the United States, at Handel hall, Chicago, Friday, November 2, 1900, before the Henry George Bryan and Stevenson campaign Club and its guests. This verbatim report was made by Phillips, Lee and McDermut, law reporters and general stenographers, 59 Clark street, Chicago. The speech is published here for the first time absolutely in full.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—I learned of this meeting only this morning, but I was glad to add another meeting to the already crowded programme for to-day, because I appreciate the activity and the zeal which have been manifested by those who belong to your organization throughout the United States. (Applause.) You can always tell a single taxer (applause), and whether you believe with him or not you are bound to admit that the single taxer believes in himself and in the theory that he advocates. (Applause.) He believes in himself because he believes in his theory.

Now, the single tax question is not involved in this campaign; but, my friends, I can understand why a single taxer should be opposed to the republican party, for the republican party asks the people to thank God that things are as they are, and single taxers don't do that. (Laughter and applause.)

The single tax movement has given to the United States a great man, for Henry George was a great man. (Applause.) He was a great man. A great man is one who adds to ability a desire to do what is right. (Applause.) The Lord does not require us to succeed in order to be great, but I believe he does require us to do what we can in the world, with the best light that we have, and then our responsibilities cease. And I believe that Henry George did what he could for humanity; he acted according to the best lights that he had, and he tried to secure the best lights that he could get.

When you compare the life of the man who devotes himself to the uplifting of his fellows, when you compare the life of the man who spends his time trying to find out the best thing for all the people—when you compare the life of such a man with the life of a man who simply tries to see how much mon-

ey he can make in this world, without being very careful about the means of making it—I say when you compare the lives of such men you can see how a great purpose will ennoble, and how a selfish purpose will belittle human effort. (Applause.) When you get down to the hearts of the people I believe that you will find that each one is doing the best he can, but you will find that some are so biased by partisanship, and some are so hindered by environment that their work counts for but little. We cannot tell what the future may be; we can only anticipate what is right and advocate it, and throw our influence on the right side of every public question, as we see that question (applause), and then obtain all the information possible in order that our views may be as nearly correct as human wisdom can make them. (Applause.)

If I were going to take a text this morning I would take it from Isaiah, where he speaks of the time when people will build houses and inhabit them, when they will plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them, when they will not build and another inhabit, when they will not plant vineyards and another eat the fruit thereof. (Applause.) I have not given you the quotation exactly, but I have given you the substance of it; and our complaint against the present conditions so boasted of by republicans, is that the men who build the houses do not inhabit them, the men who plant the vineyards do not eat the fruit thereof. (Applause.) In other words, we complain that the producer of wealth does not enjoy a fair share of the wealth which he produces; while the man who does not produce the wealth obtains too large a part of the wealth that is produced. (Applause.) And when we seek to correct these conditions I believe that we are showing a higher patriotism than those who, profiting by present conditions, insist that they must be retained regardless of the injustice which they work. (Applause.)

I am a conservative man; I have simply sought to apply well settled principles when I have complained of the injustice done. I have not asked that we shall go back and undo what has been done; I simply ask that those who have sinned shall sin no more (applause), and those who have suffered shall suffer no longer. (Applause.) That is a conservative plan.

When our party advocates the election of senators by direct vote of the people (applause) it advocates the policy which means to bring the government nearer to the people, so that

the people can make that government what they want it to be. (Applause.) When we advocate an income tax we simply insist that the men who have much shall give much to support the government, and the men who have little shall contribute little to support the government. (Applause.) When we try to destroy private monopoly we simply ask that the man who has to labor shall labor with hope; that he must have an opportunity; and when we insist that a man shall labor with hope we simply insist that he shall have the only stimulus that ever does make people labor. (Applause.) Take hope out of this world and this world is not worth living in. (Applause.) Just to the extent that you lessen hope, just to that extent do you make this world a bad world; and it is a short-sighted man who makes his neighbors miserable—a short-sighted man. Victor Hugo has said that the mob is the human race in misery. (Applause.) Beware how you make people miserable! The rich man is a short-sighted man, who thinks that he can build a house with walls so thick as to shut out the cry of distress that comes up from the street (applause); and that man is a short-sighted man who believes that he can build permanent prosperity or enduring happiness upon a foundation of human misery or injustice. (Applause.)

We are opposed to the centralizing processes of the republican party, and we believe that the despotism that the republican party now attempts to inflict upon the people of the Philippine islands comes naturally from a party that would inflict despotism upon the people of this country. (Great applause.) If a man will not raise his hand to protect the great mass of the people of this country from the despotism of private monopoly, will you believe him when he says that he is going 7,000 miles away from home to do better for a people that he never saw, than he has done for the people of his own country? (Great applause.) There is a saying that charity begins at home. Justice does also. (Applause.) The Bible says: "By their fruits shall ye know them;" and these men who now want to branch out into the orient have been bearing fruits in this country (laughter and applause), and if we are to judge them by their fruits, then their efforts in the Philippine islands will not bring forth blessings. They will bring forth cursings both from them and from our own people.

We ask that fundamental principles be applied to all these questions. Lincoln said that he had no sentiment that was not drawn from the declaration of independence. I will go further than that: no true American can have a political sentiment that does not arise from the declaration of independence. If all men are not created equal, then is "our faith vain, and we are of all men the most miserable." If all men are created equal then no man has a natural right to injure any other man (applause); and if no man has a natural right to injure another man, and governments are instituted to secure to the individual the enjoyment of his natural rights, then no good government will either enable or permit one man to injure another. (Applause.) The republican party has so administered the government that it not only permits one man to injure another, but enables him to do so. It is guilty of sins of omission and of commission. It is guilty of doing things that it ought not to have done, and of leaving undone the things that it should have done. And whether it does or fails to do, its action is prompted by the desire to give to organized wealth an advantage over the rest of the people. (Applause.)

You may say that this is speaking harshly; but, my friends, truth is often harsh. And I am within the truth when I say it, and I believe that in this campaign which is now about to close we are going to find that the last act of the republican party is going to open the eyes of the American people to the iniquity of the policy that runs through all those acts. When the children of Israel were in bondage it required several plagues to soften the heart of Pharaoh. We have had several plagues in this country, and they have not succeeded in softening the hearts of these Pharaohs who have held the people—the American people—in bondage. But, my friends, the Philippine war has brought us the last plague, the slaying of the first born, and in the light of this last plague I believe the American people will see the vicious principle that runs through republican policies—namely, that a dollar is worth more than a man. (Great applause.) If you will examine republican policies I believe you will agree with me that that principle is manifest all through those policies.

And in the Philippine war we find a doctrine asserted for the first time in this country, and that is that you can purchase trade with human blood.

It is a new doctrine, a doctrine that is repugnant to all that we have been taught either in politics or in religion. And I believe that the American people when they sit in judgment upon this claim that you may justly kill people in order to trade with them—I believe that when the American people sit in judgment upon this question, if they fully appreciate the importance of the question, they will administer such a rebuke to the republican party that it will be a long time before any other party ever attempts to raise the dollar and to depress humanity. (Great applause.)

I am not going to attempt to make an argument on any subject, but I want to show you how absurd the republican argument on the Philippine question is, when you rob it of the beauty of rhetoric and condense it into a plain statement of the principles involved. I am going to make you a republican speech, just a short one, which will contain everything, the substance of everything, that you ever heard in any republican speech on imperialism or will hear in this campaign. I will show you how you can condense a speech of an hour, or of a day, into a few sentences and yet not lose any of the vital principles set forth in the speech. Now, here is the speech: We are sorry that we have the Philippine islands. We did not want them. They were thrown into our lap, and we cannot shirk the responsibility for them. We must keep them; and it looks as if it was God's work. It looks as though God were leading us on some divine purpose. And, besides, there is money in it. (Great laughter and applause.)

While it is gratifying to find something which I have said so cordially approved, yet there is one drawback to it when you applaud so heartily when I make a republican speech. (Renewed laughter.) Am I to draw the conclusion that I can make a better republican speech than I can a democratic one? Now, since you like a republican speech so well, let me tell you how I would make a democratic speech to answer it. I think instead of arranging the three arguments in the order that I arranged them I would arrange them in this order—First: We are opposed to the purchase of trade with human blood. (Applause.) Second: We deny the credentials—we challenge the credentials of a man who assumes to speak for the Almighty and wages a war of conquest for gain. (Great applause.) And, third: No man is ever put by the Almighty in a position where he has to do wrong in order to get out. God never made a thief out of any man,

and yet God has so arranged this world that any man who wants to be a thief can be one.

I don't believe in killing horses to prevent horse stealing. (Laughter and applause.) I denounce the cowardly doctrine of destiny which would make a chicken thief out of every man who woke up near enough to a hen roost to steal a chicken. (Laughter.) For 50 years there has not been a day when we could not have marched our soldiers to Canada and taken Canada; there has not been a day in 50 years that we could not have marched our soldiers to Mexico and taken Mexico. There has not been a day in 50 years when we could not have built a fleet and started out and captured what they call inferior races and nations, all around us. Why should we do it now when we didn't do it then? There is no reason. The only reason that can be given is that the heart of the republican party has undergone a change. The republican party to-day is not what it was when Abraham Lincoln directed its policy (applause), and republicans who cling to the name without regarding the principles for which the name now stands are like the man who worships the shell of the egg after the contents have undergone a change. (Great laughter and applause.)

I thank you for the invitation that you extended to me. I am glad that at your meetings you have offered republicans a chance to come and defend their cause. And I believe one of the offers you made was to give the platform to any man—any republican—who would come there and attempt to quote anything that Lincoln had ever said which would support an imperial policy. (Applause.) You were perfectly safe in making the offer. Your meetings will never be disturbed by an interruption of that kind. (Laughter and applause.)

Abraham Lincoln believed in the declaration of independence, and the declaration of independence has been good for all the people of all parties until the last two years. When Lincoln was alive he appealed to the people to stand by the declaration of independence. He told them to sacrifice everything else but to keep that. He even said that he would be willing to give up his own life if necessary to preserve that document. I make to you to-day the appeal that he made then—or, rather, I invoke his name and his words for your consideration.

Let us stand by the declaration of independence. It was written by Thomas Jefferson, and to its mainte-

nance he and his compatriots pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. But in a higher and a better sense the declaration of independence was not the work of human hands; it was the bow of promise which the sunlight of truth, shining through tears, cast against the clouds. It was the assurance given to the world that the flood of despotism had reached its height and was receding. God grant the flood may never rise again. (Great applause.)

TO MY HOSTESS IN VIRGINIA.

Written near Luray Oct. 19, 1900.
For The Public.

Bread and water and wine,
Tokens of kindness three,
In a pleasant land with open hand
Virginia gave to me.

Bread—the life of the man,
Body and soul and mind;
Fields of gold, tales of old,
And knowledge of human kind.

Water—to wash the stain,
Bathing the brow and feet;
Mountains blue—from kind hearts true
Ripples of laughter sweet.

Wine—the sprit of God—
Freedom, honor and love;
Vineyards fair, with jealous care,
Guarded the gifts from above.

Bread and water and wine,
Tokens of kindness three;
These shall last till time be past,
Pledges of charity.

W. L. TORRANCE.

Coming in on the train the other day was a family with a little, nervous mother and a flock of children. As we neared Boston the mother began to question if everything was all right.

"Have you got all the umbrellas, Johnny?"

"I should say I had. I had four when I started, and now I've got six!"

—Boston Beacon.

A newspaper correspondent, who has written that the summer colony of Newport "devoted themselves to pleasure regardless of expense," was pertinently corrected by the late Col. Waring himself a Newporter, who explained that what they really did was to devote themselves to expense regardless of pleasure.—The Cosmopolitan.

Hemminghay—But why don't you think it wise to make the steel for our war vessels hard?

Bartham—Don't you think the country has a sufficient number of hardships, as it is? G. T. E.

Alfred has a sweetheart, Caroline. He knows his own shortcomings, and hopes to mend. He says to his friend, a German hairdresser: "I will marry

her and chance it. I don't say I'm worthy of her, mind, but—"

"My boy," protested the hairdresser, "women don't mind that."—Chicago Chronicle's review of "A Breaker of Laws."

Master of the Hounds—At nine o'clock the hunt will begin—do you carry a watch?

Assistant—No, sir.

Master of the Hounds—Well, it doesn't matter. At 9:30 the factory whistle in the village will blow, and half an hour before that you may let the dogs out.—Fliegende Blaetter.

Think you Truth a faltering rushlight, to be pinched out when you will
With your deft official fingers and your politicians' skill?

—Lowell.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Resurrection," by Leo Tolstoy, translated by Mrs. Louise Maude (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company), is the authorized English version of Tolstoy's latest novel. It is a story of Russian life and character, in which the tyrannical indifference of the rich and powerful and their minions, to the commonest human rights of the miscellaneous classes of Russia is graphically illustrated. This novel also gives Tolstoy his place with reference to the philosophy of Henry George. Though it had long been known that Tolstoy sympathized with the views of George as to the injustice of landlordism, there were doubts about his apprehension of the economic method which George advocates for abolishing it. This novel removes those doubts. That Tolstoy is what in the United States would be known as a single tax man, appears with sufficient clearness in chapter six book two of the novel, where some of the thoughts of the hero, a rich convert to George's doctrines, who had once for that reason given away a landed estate in Kousminski to the peasantry, are described in this manner:

Henry George's fundamental position recurred vividly to his mind, and how he had once been carried away by it, and he was surprised that he could have forgotten it. The earth cannot be any one's property; it cannot be bought or sold any more than water, air or sunshine. All have an equal right to the advantages it gives to men. And now he knew why he had felt ashamed to remember the transaction at Kousminski. He had been deceiving himself. He knew that no man could have a right to own land, yet he had accepted this right as his, and had given the peasants some-

THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico.

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS

for

TEN CENTS

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago.

hing which, in the depth of his heart, he knew he had no right to. Now he would not act in this way, and would alter the arrangement in Kousminski also. And he formed a project in his mind to let the land to the peasants, and to acknowledge the rent they paid for it to be their property, to be kept to pay the taxes and for communal uses. This was, of course, not the single tax system, still it was as near an approach to it as could be had under existing circumstances.

"The Religion of a Gentleman" (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Price, \$1), by Charles F. Dole, defines "gentleman" as "a man of generosity, of a social conscience, of disinterestedness, of public spirit, and of cosmopolitan sympathies," and the "religion" of a gentleman as embodying the nobler factors of past beliefs, as offering a wide fellowship, as expressing elemental spiritual facts with simplicity, as reverent—in a word, "a religion of ideals." The book is a tribute to the ideals of democracy.

Another political publication by George H. Shibley is "Momentous Issues" (Chicago: The Schulte Publishing Co. Price, 25 cents), in which Mr. Shibley discusses the issues of the pending presidential election with great minuteness of detail. The book has permanent value for reference.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 20,000.

EMANCIPATION

It is a plea for the establishment of the minimum price of a day's labor as the standard or unit of values. It is an attractive contribution to the discussion of social problems.

THE PUBLIC, Chicago.

PRICE IN CLOTH, 75 CENTS.

J. B. Herboldshimer, Gibson, City Illinois.

LIVE AGENTS WANTED.

IF you have been up against it, by buying cigars indiscriminately,

Try those out of boxes

BEARING OUR NAME, and get your money's worth.

J. & B. MOOS,

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

BIOGRAPHY OF HENRY GEORGE

The life of Henry George, by his son, Henry George, Jr., is now ready for delivery. Orders taken by

MISS MAUDE DICKEY,

83 East Randolph Street, CHICAGO, ILL.

Popular Edition, . . . \$1.50

Library Edition, . . . 2.50

Sent to any address in U. S. or Canada postpaid.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

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.

LEGAL NOTICE.

ESTATE OF CHARLES O'LEARY, DECEASED.
All persons having claims against the estate of Charles O'Leary, deceased, are hereby notified and requested to attend and present such claims to the Probate Court of Cook County, Illinois, for the purpose of having the same adjusted, at a term of said Court, to be held at the Probate Court Room, in the City of Chicago, in said Cook County, on the Third Monday of January, A. D., 1901, being the 21st day thereof.

Dated, Chicago, October 9th, 1900.
WILLIAM J. O'LEARY,
Administrator with the will annexed of the estate of Charles O'Leary, deceased.
4280-37-39

W. W. Mills, Attorney, Ashland Block.



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

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

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

FREE RELIGIOUS LITERATURE Sent on application to Mrs. Carrie F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Ave., Chicago.

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago, Ill.

EDUCATIONAL.

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

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

To be "fixed for life" is desirable. Much more so to be "fixed for death." There is no temporal way for the latter better than life insurance. Consult

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

TIMELY BOOKS Sent to any person, who may return or remit price in 10 days.

Japanese Nations of European Polit'l Econ 25c
Our Farmers of the Revenue 25c
The Single Tax, Post 25c
Natural Taxation, Shearman 30c
Progress and Poverty, George 30c

Prices include postage. For any book on earth, Old or New, address

H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter,
CONNEAUT, OHIO.

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

LECTURES GIVEN AT
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor,
EVERY SUNDAY AFTERNOON
At 3 o'clock sharp.

Program for Sunday, November 11th:
HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION,
BY E. O. BROWN, LOUIS F. POST,
JOHN Z. WHITE,

"The Lessons of the Election."

ADMISSION FREE!