

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1900.

Number 137.

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.

Mr. Roosevelt is credited with describing Mr. McKinley as "too much like a banana—sweet but soft."

What could Mr. Hanna have meant when he told the newspaper men on his special car during his Dakota trip that they could have anything they wanted but liquor, explaining that he did not intend to make the mistake Roosevelt made in his trip through that country?

My name is Don M. Dickinson. I live in Detroit. I was Grover Cleveland's postmaster general. At the recent presidential election I voted the republican ticket. I did it to defeat the democratic candidate. The democratic candidate is defeated, and I am now ready to reorganize the democratic party, so that no matter which party wins the trusts, the monopolies, and the money power generally will hold the reins of government. "Me, too," says Abram S. Hewitt.

Some overzealous Cleveland friends of Mr. Hanna have started a boom for him as the republican presidential candidate in 1904. When that year comes, Mr. Hanna's party may have grown so indifferent to appearances as to nominate him openly; but as yet it seems disposed to "pander to the moral sentiment of the community" so far as to nominate Mr. Hanna's man instead of Mr. Hanna himself.

We trust it will not disturb the equanimity of our "patriotic" fellow citizens who voted for McKinley upon the assurance that the Filipinos would stop fighting immediately

after his election, to call their attention to the fact that the Filipinos are fighting as hard as ever, and that the administration is preparing to urge congress to authorize a permanent increase of the standing army for the purpose of carrying on the Philippine war.

Opponents of woman suffrage, who made so much of the fact that only a few women cared to register in Illinois, where women are allowed to vote only for university trustees, and that the number is declining, will find food for thought in the women's vote in states where they have the same voting rights as men. In Colorado, for instance, the woman vote is reported to have increased in four years from 46,720 to 86,943. It makes a vast difference in their interest in elections whether women are accorded the full rights of their citizenship or allowed as a mark of masculine favor to vote for school officers only.

When one man killed the king of Italy, the civilized world shuddered. But now that Italian soldiers are arresting honest peasants and farmers by wholesale, recklessly charging them with being accomplices of a brigand, and are shooting them at sight when they resist even to the extent of making a verbal protest, the civilized world is quite complacent. It is not human life, after all, that civilization holds so sacred, but that glamor of divinity which doth hedge a king.

The city of Cleveland has decided by popular vote to adopt the use of voting machines. This is by no means the least of the good work that Cleveland did on election day. It also reduced a McKinley majority of 3,000 or more to a bare plurality of less than 200. But by adopting the machine

method of voting, which has proved so satisfactory in Rochester, it has hastened the day when all the benefits of the Australian system, and more, will be adopted generally, without the defects by means of which politicians have to a degree discredited that system. Voting by machinery is the method of the early future. As it comes in, all kinds of corruption at the polls will be forced out, and whatever else our elections may be they will at least register public opinion honestly.

Advocates of public ownership and operation of municipal monopolies will be interested to learn from the fifth annual report of the Detroit public lighting commission, made by its president, Frederick F. Ingram, that the expense of public lighting since the public lighting plant of that city has been established has now been reduced 13 per cent. This has been accomplished without lowering wages or lessening the quality of the light. Wages have been increased and Detroit is the best lighted city in the United States. Added to these advantages the political morals of the city have, as Mr. Ingram observes in his report, "been improved by placing one branch of the public service beyond the reach of franchise-seeking corporations." Whenever and wherever public ownership of monopolies is afforded a fair trial, as in Detroit, it proves its superiority over the private monopoly system.

William J. Bryan struck the keynote of the next presidential campaign, already begun, when he said that "the contest between plutocracy and democracy cannot end until one or the other is completely triumphant." In these words he at once recognizes the nature of the conflict in which he has been thus far a magnifi-

cent leader, and indicates the patience and endurance which it demands of those who enlist upon the democratic side.

Plutocracy against democracy! That is what it means, and it is a war to the death. By plutocracy is not meant rich men, but the ideal of government by and for the rich. By democracy is not meant poor men, but the ideal of government by and for all. It is an old, old fight, and it has had many and varied manifestations. The American revolution did not begin it. That birth pain of our republic was but an incident in this conflict of the centuries. The anti-slavery struggle did not complete it. That was only another victory for democracy added to the victories that had gone before. What distinguishes the struggle now is the more general and more perfect recognition of its true character. And what gives greater hope than anything else is the fact that Mr. Bryan, who is preeminently the leader of American democracy now, so clearly perceives and so courageously describes the issue.

All sorts of reasons are advanced for voting against Bryan by men who are ashamed, now that it is too late, of having voted for McKinley and thus approved his policy of turning this liberty-loving republic into a man-eating empire. One reason is that Bryan lowered himself by making a stumping tour. But is it more degrading to go directly to the people, when the opposition controls the press of both parties, than to pull wires in secret as Mr. McKinley did. Another reason is that he affiliated with Croker. But what right had he to affiliate with anyone else in New York? Since the democrats there have placed themselves bodily under Mr. Croker, there was no alternative for Mr. Bryan, as the candidate of their party, but to affiliate with Croker or stay away from New York, leaving that city to the immaculate Roosevelt and his delectable side partner, Platt. It was

the business of New York democrats, not of Mr. Bryan, to put Croker aside. Still another reason is that Mr. Bryan clung to his free silver principles. What should he have done? Blown hot and cold, according to circumstances, as McKinley did? But the most extraordinary reason is that he opposed imperialism. Beyond that there is no climax that would not be an anti-climax. The truth is that if Bryan had done the things which pretended democrats who voted against him say he ought to have done, he wouldn't have deserved the support of any man. He did deserve support because he never once lost the courage of his convictions nor departed from the straight line of principle as he saw it. Among the democrats of to-day Bryan towers like Saul among his brethren.

It is highly encouraging that the republican press feels constrained to prompt and promote the effort of McKinley democrats to de-Bryanize the democratic party. Why the republicans should wish to do that is clear enough. With Bryan and Bryanism out of the party there would be nothing left in it but a parcel of office seekers. The party itself would be only a faction in the republican party. Bryan and Bryanism have made the democratic party a party of democratic principle. Why should it abandon that principle? There is but one answer. It is the same answer from William C. Whitney, who carries a democratic label in his pocket for use when it pays, and from the republican press; and the answer is: So that the party can win. Win what? Without political principle there is nothing to win but office for parasitical leaders. What democratic democrats want to win is democratic principle, and unless the triumph of the party can win that for them they would prefer to see it beaten.

These democrats are not disheartened by the result of the election. They realize that defeat will tend

to make the democratic movement more radically democratic than before, whereas victory at this time, even under Bryan, might tend to check its progressive impulse. They know moreover that democracy was defeated not by an intelligent anti-democratic vote, but by unawakened democrats. The republican party is full of them. At heart the people of this country, the people who make republican majorities, believe in equal rights and government by consent of the governed. They believe in the man as against the dollar. They believe in democracy as opposed to plutocracy. They believe in the republic and not in the empire. But they have not yet awakened to the drift of events. They do not yet realize that plutocracy is sapping the democratic blood out of the republican party and trampling upon the standards of the republic. They do not understand that the trusts are an expression of plutocratic power which has got a legal leverage under our social system. They do not realize that the Philippine question raises the whole issue of colonial imperialism. They do not know that a great plutocratic revolution of worldwide scope is engulfing our republic. They know the facts as well as anyone, but they are not yet awake to the significance of the facts. They will awake, however, and it is our business to arouse them. When they are aroused the work for democracy in this generation will have been accomplished.

While the British tory press is jubilant over McKinley's reelection, it is gratifying to find that the liberal papers, especially those that maintain the democratic spirit in England, sympathize with "Bryanism." We quote from the London Speaker, which is to British democracy what the Spectator is to British toryism:

The thing which is uppermost is that man is the slave of the dollar. That seems to be the chief impression conveyed by the victory of Mr. McKinley. The veriest tyro must

know that the party Mr. Croker leads in New York must be far from an ideal party. But what is rather absurdly called Bryanism, and what might better be called the new democracy, does vaguely represent an effort to raise the American republic to a better standard of life, to remind the people of the idealism from which the republic was born, to curb the dangerous power of organized capital and to make republican institutions square with the principles of liberty and equality, and what is good in the politics of Mr. Bryan will remain. It is Mr. Bryan's personality as a candidate for president which disappears, for the simple reason that the aggression of the monopolies is certain to become more tyrannical and more insolent every day. Materialism is riding mankind in the United States, as in Europe.

The Speaker is mistaken in supposing that Mr. Bryan's personality has been eliminated from democratic politics. It is too closely and permanently identified with the new democracy for that. But the Speaker clearly sees what Bryan bluntly declares, that the issue is plutocracy against democracy—the dollar or the man.

Those plutocratic democrats who wish to reorganize the party, and, dropping "Bryanism," as they call it, go back to traditional democracy, should be warned that the less they say about traditional democracy the better for them. Traditional democracy is pro-slavery democracy. Abraham Lincoln killed it, and William J. Bryan has come forward to bury the corpse. Whitney, Hewitt, Dickinson, and the other McKinleyites, are at perfect liberty to weep over the grave; but in these times of a revived Jeffersonian democracy they will find it no easy job to galvanize the old pro-slavery cadaver. Traditional democracy has given place to democratic democracy.

To Senator Hoar and Senator Mason, who spoke against the president's Philippine policy but voted for it in the innocent belief that they were only voting for McKinley, who might be depended upon to reverse himself, we commend this editorial extract

from the Chicago Tribune, with reference to the same Philippine policy:

On Tuesday last the people of the United States by an unprecedented majority indorsed that policy and practically instructed the president to expedite operations for the suppression of the Tagal rebellion and the organization of a stable government in the islands.

This declaration has peculiar significance because it is made by a paper which, prior to the election, insisted that the only issue before the people was the money question. Thus the campaign of deceit begins to expose itself.

More than once we have had occasion to notice the inevitable drift of the wealthy classes of the south toward the republican party. Nothing has kept them in the democratic party but their political traditions and the fear of negro domination, and this hold is weakening now. On the one hand the democratic party is becoming too democratic to continue its old fight against the rights of negro citizens, and on the other the republican party is becoming too plutocratic to champion those rights any longer. And as the southern whites have settled the race question in their respective states by disfranchising negroes, those among them who are plutocratic in spirit see no further necessity for remaining outside of the party which really represents their plutocratic aspirations. In this view of the relation of the two parties to the southern vote we now find ourselves confirmed with unexpected candor from the white house itself.

Our authority for this statement is a special correspondent of the Chicago Record, whose dispatch of November 9 appeared in the Record of the 10th. He said:

Several distinguished republicans met at the white house yesterday, and while discussing the outcome of the recent campaign the suggestion was made by a prominent southerner, who holds a high position under the present administration, that the time is ripe for some valuable missionary work in behalf of the republican party in the south. The proposition was

advanced that President McKinley now has a golden opportunity to build up a white man's republican party in the south if he will go about it in the right way. It was asserted that in many of the southern states there are men who have become interested in commercial and business enterprises who are progressive as well as ambitious to keep up with the industrial procession. For the last four years the anti-Bryan democrats of the south have been in close communication with members of the republican party, and they have discovered that the lines of demarcation between them are not insurmountable, nor is the association uncongenial. In Maryland, West Virginia and Kentucky there are several thousand influential business men who were forced to oppose Bryanism four years ago who may never return to the democratic party. In North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee and Florida there are many successful business men who at heart sympathize with republican ideas and principles, and it is said would cheerfully affiliate with that party if the race question could be made less prominent.

That item is rich in political substance. It explains why the republicans pigeon-holed Crumpacker's bill to reduce the representation of states that disfranchise negroes. It indicates with extraordinary definiteness the plutocratic purpose of the Hannaized republican party. It furnishes further convincing evidence of the general recognition of the radical issue upon which the nation is dividing—plutocracy against democracy. And it accounts most unmistakably for the attitude of "anti-Bryan democrats" everywhere. There is indeed no insurmountable line of demarcation between such democrats and Hanna republicans. Neither is there anything uncongenial in their association. A more subtle system of slavery than that of ante-bellum days has come among us; it has forced to the front the old anti-slavery issue in a new guise; the republican party is the champion of this system; and every man with the instincts of a slave driver naturally seeks in that party his political companionship. But there is another and hopeful side to the picture. Just as plutocrats of all past party affiliations, south as

well as north, are now drawn toward the republican party, so democrats of all past party affiliations are repelled by its pro-slavery trend. The process of again separating the goats from the sheep in the politics of this country is advancing with gratifying speed.

In deciding to begin the campaign of 1904 now, and to keep up the work throughout the coming four years, the democratic national committee has done much to inspire public confidence. There is hard work and delicate work to be done. Not only are the McKinley elements of the republican party to be fought and the democratic elements of that party to be awakened, but the plutocratic and Bourbon elements of the democratic party, encouraged by Bryan's second defeat, are to be headed off in their efforts to recapture the organization. In this work the committee will get many rebuffs and but cold comfort at the most from the democratic press of cities. It must make sentiment through the country by means of a literary bureau; and to make that efficient every energy should be devoted to its maintenance. Important as local organization is, this is even more important if a choice must be made.

Having consented, under the pressure of a tremendous strike, to make an increase of ten per cent. in wages in the anthracite coal fields, the monopolists of that region are recouping by adding 50 cents a ton to the wholesale price of coal. According to the estimate of the Philadelphia Record, this will more than cover the advance in wages. So it is not the coal field monopolists, but the already overburdened coal consumer, whom the anthracite strikers overcame. What they have gained, and more than they have gained, the consumer loses. The monopolist alone comes out ahead. All of which goes to show that so long as monopoly is maintained by law, labor conflicts are in

effect not between laborers and monopolists, but between some laborers and other laborers.

It cannot be disputed that one of the marked effects of the election has been a further boom in McKinley prosperity. Standard Oil trust certificates have gone up with a leap. Railway shares have passed the highest point since 1885. The ice trust has secured control of 90 per cent. of the ice business on the Atlantic seaboard. A steel billet pool has been formed which conspires to raise prices to \$20 a ton. A rice trust has been incorporated. The salt trust has marked up the price of common salt from \$1.10 to \$2.50 per hundred pounds. The meat trust has put a cent a pound upon the commodity it controls, which raises the price to consumers from two to three cents or more. John D. Rockefeller is forming a trust to master the Texas cattle business. And the New York stock exchange has been in hysterics over the largest aggregate of gambling transactions in its history. But business in general, the legitimate trading of the country as distinguished from stock exchange gambling and the arbitrary decrees of trusts, has remained quiet; while wages have not gone up, though the steel trust at its plant at Mingo Junction, O., and a plow factory at Racine, Wis., are reported to have made a reduction. Of such is the prosperity of McKinley.

It is probable that the extraordinary trading on the stock exchanges consists in the unloading by trust magnates of their trust holdings upon innocent lambs. This probability is confirmed by reports that the public is greedily buying "industrials." Having raised a general expectation that McKinley's election would boom business, the manipulators of trust stocks are letting go of them at high prices to a gullible public, with the intention of buying them back later on at lower prices. Much piteous bleating may be expected in due time.

John J. Lentz, the eloquent Ohio congressman who fought the imperial administration so hard in the house as to draw its especial attention to his district when he came up for reelection last week, appears upon the face of the returns to have been defeated by eight votes. Mr. Lentz claims that this result was procured by corrupt means, in which Hanna, Dick and McKinley participated; and he announces his purpose of subjecting all three to a rigid cross-examination in the contest he intends to make. Though refusing at this stage to discuss the matter, he declares that while he has no personal desire to retain his seat in congress he does feel that the people of the United States should learn something of the wholesale bribery that was carried on in his district. A contested election case from Lentz's district, in which Hanna, Dick and McKinley were compelled to tell what they know about the distribution of campaign funds, would certainly lack none of the elements of general interest.

The proceedings of the Cuban constitutional convention will bear close watching. The convention is composed of 31 delegates. A majority, therefore, would be only 16; and 16 men are not a large number to influence. Should this majority lend itself to the schemes of the American syndicates that direct the policies of the administration at Washington, the people of Cuba could be sold, assigned, transferred and delivered, bound hand and foot, by a constitution not of their own adoption. True, they have elected the delegates. But the delegates may decide not to submit the constitution they frame to approval by the people. And this is the decision they are in danger of making. It is not for his health that the secretary of war, Mr. Root, has gone to Cuba. Neither is it exclusively to fish for fish, although he has taken fishing tackle with him. He may have man tackle also in his baggage. If the Cuban people understand the situation they will demand

that any constitution which the Cuban convention frames shall be submitted for approval to popular vote. Every move against that course may be safely regarded as a move against Cuban independence.

In the federal court at New York Judge Brown has decided that as Puerto Rico "is subject solely to the sovereignty and dominion of this country" it is "not a foreign port." This decision was made in a pilotage case, which depended, with reference to pilots' fees, upon whether Puerto Rican ports are American or foreign. Though the decision is not reported in full, there is no probability that it vitally touches the great question of the application of the American constitution, by its own force, to Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico might be American territory, and yet, from the imperialist point of view, not be subject to the American constitution. But two cases are now before the supreme court, to be argued December 17, which do involve the main question. They turn upon the right of the United States to collect tariff duties on goods imported into the United States from the Philippines and Puerto Rico after the Spanish cession. Should these cases be decided against the government, the whole protective system would receive a shock, which could hardly fail to prove fatal either to that system or to imperial colonization. In the event of a contrary decision, the question of the application of the liberty clauses of the constitution to "our colonies" will still be an open one.

An important decision relative to federal authority in the states has been made by the federal court of appeals at San Francisco upon an appeal from the conviction of ten Idaho strikers for obstructing the mails by stopping a mail train. These men had been fined and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment by the lower federal court, but the court of appeals has released them on the ground that

the indictment did not allege that they knew the train they obstructed carried mails. This court held that it is not a federal crime to hinder and delay the passage of a railroad mail train unless the train is actually carrying mails and the obstructors know it. Should the decision be generally recognized as sound, it will serve to protect the country from one of its most menacing dangers—the usurpation of power by the federal government. For the undoubted right of the federal government to protect the mails and to punish their obstruction has been used at the solicitation of great private corporations as a subterfuge to excuse the unwarranted exercise of federal authority, both judicial and military, for the suppression of local disturbances. If the federal authority cannot interfere with strikes, on pretense that they obstruct the mails, unless the strikers intend such obstruction, railway corporations will be obliged to look for protection to the local authorities, where alone it is safe to lodge police powers, and the dangers of concentrated imperial power, directed from Washington, will be to that degree removed.

When George A. Schilling made the speech in English at the thirteenth annual Chicago meeting in commemoration of the execution in 1887 of the so-called Chicago anarchists, he said that if he were ever tried as those men were he hoped it would be by a jury of millionaires. His reason was that if one of the millionaires were a man of convictions he would hang out for acquittal without fear of losing his job. "Of all the things I should dread," Schilling added, "it would be to be tried by a jury of the hired men of millionaires." This is not an irrational dread. Hired men have come to be so hopelessly dependent for opportunities to earn a living that the most potent fear in the great majority of homes to-day is the fear of losing employment. It is not confined to the poorer classes. The same specter of possible poverty that grins at the struggling me-

chanic invades the parlors of the well to do, glares through the windows of counting-rooms, and even stalks along the corridors of the rich. It does make of the hireling an abject creature, as Schilling says, so abject that even as a juror, with the life and death of a fellow-man hanging in the balance, he swaps his conscience for his employer's favor. For that reason, a jury of millionaires would be safer for an innocent prisoner against whom the prejudice of the rich had been aroused. But millionaires themselves must be men of courage in such circumstances, or they, too, will surrender their convictions. So complex are the ramifications of business that not many millionaires could stand up against the vengeance of their fellows. Among all the millionaires of Chicago there are few who could not be ruined by the others. This is not because such power resides with any one naturally. It is due to the vast system of legal monopolies we have been creating and fostering. In a state of free competition no one could coerce anyone else. By checking competition, until now its regulative power is all but destroyed, we have corrupted our business, our newspaper press, our politics, and even our jury system. We have cultivated a race of cowards by inspiring men with fear of poverty.

Another university professor loses his chair for holding opinions adverse to parasitical pecuniary interests. Prof. Ross, of Leland Stanford university, has learned that if one will not labor for plutocratic privileges he shall not eat of plutocratic crumbs. And so the good work of exposing the claws beneath the velvet of plutocracy goes on, thanks to our friend the enemy.

RECOMPENSE.

I have loved justice and hated iniquity; and therefore I die in exile.—Pope Gregory VII.

When Bryan was in Jefferson City in 1897 he stated, in a private conversation, that he did not expect his reward at the hands of the people

whom he sought to serve, and gave it as his opinion that those workers in the cause of truth who expect their reward of men, are usually disappointed in the end.

The same idea was long ago expressed by Lowell when he wrote:

Count me o'er earth's chosen heroes,
—they were souls that stood alone,
While the men they agonized for
hurled the contumelious stone;
Stood serene, and down the future
saw the golden beam incline
To the side of perfect justice, mastered
by their faith divine,
By one man's plain truth to manhood
and to God's supreme design.

It is, indeed, most natural for man to indulge in the hope of reward. The difference between the true man and the false, is best told by their ideas of recompense. There are those who serve others but to help themselves. They seek wealth, ease and luxury. This they also receive; it is their reward, and sufficeth for them. The world is glad to pay them in the coin of their own mintage, and God is willing that their recompense shall be apportioned out of the base substance upon which their hearts are fed. Wherever there is pampered fraud or consecrated vice, waxing fat upon the heart-blood of innocence and virtue, there will be those who fawn and cringe and vomit forth the perjured flatteries of their putrifying souls. Wherever the weak is gasping in the clutch of power, there will be those who curl the lying lip of scorn to taunt the helpless and applaud the strong; men who will kiss the jeweled hand of Oppression, although it be red.

But the greatness of a man is measured not by conquest, but sacrifice; by what he gives, not what he gains—if he gain his own soul, it is enough. He who aspires to be, in the highest sense, the true servant of humanity, must do for the world that which the world will not do for him. Whoever would make the world morally better must attack the errors and prejudices of mankind. But the world loves its faults and fondles them. You may not shatter the idol without provoking the wrath of its votaries. Who plucks the serpent's fangs, must also hear its hiss.

As Heine so beautifully says:

"Wherever a great soul gives utterance to his thoughts, there is also Golgotha." For the man who combats the folly and injustice of his fellow-men, the Cross of Calvary is still looming in the distance. Socrates dared to be the critic of his age, and he paid the critic's penalty. But shall we therefore say that the hemlock was his only reward? Was Calvary the only reward of Jesus? The noble-minded Greek might have had his life for the asking. Christ could have escaped the Cross, and he knew it. "All These Things Will I Give Thee, If Thou Wilt Fall Down and Worship Me!" Where is the great soul who has not heard that offer, and refused it? Savonarola heard it in his prison cell. They heard it who died at Valley Forge. But those men had their reward. It came to Spinoza, when in the hard gripe of poverty—but he refused it. He heard it who said: "Philosophy has been my worldly ruin, and my soul's prosperity;" but Anaxagoras, too, though exiled from home and country, had his reward.

Robert Morris, one of the signers of the declaration of independence, the man who gave arms to Washington and sustained the national credit in time of need, died among felons, the occupant of an insolvent debtor's cell! But Morris could not have been a tory, even if he had foreseen his end. It is not likely that Warren, the martyr of Bunker Hill, would have changed his principles, even if he could have foreseen what history was afterwards compelled to record—the fact that his children, after his glorious death, were the objects of private charity, and that Benedict Arnold was one of their most liberal benefactors. Yet Morris and Warren had their rewards.

What was it, and what is it, then—this nameless recompense? What is it that leads men to brave the scorn, the hate, the persecution of mankind? They best knew who gave their bodies to be racked and burned, to be the victims of flames, poison, torture or the sword. They best know who are to-day carrying their crosses along the well-worn path. This much we know: It is something more than life, or food, or raiment. Bread is

not the reward of virtue. Perhaps it is enough for them, that they have lived and labored in the cause they loved. The servants of Truth are paid by the knowledge of Truth, for to them alone is it given to know the good from the bad, the right way from the wrong. Surely, as Bacon says: "No pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage ground of Truth." Those who love Truth will know it; and to know it is to work for it. When a man loves the right and knows it (and he must know it if he truly loves it), his soul is married to an eternal principle, and you cannot by wealth or worldly power dissever them; as well may you attempt to sully the sunbeam, or rob the stars of their brightness.

Great souls are nurtured by the love of Truth. Victory and defeat, life and death, are matters of indifference to them when principles are involved. It is as natural for them to teach their doctrines as it is for the diamond to shed its luster. They are the great leaders of human thought, the makers of opinion. Bribes cannot tempt them, nor threats of a halter intimidate. They live, labor and die, under the supreme fascination of a conviction that they must so do and die. "They rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." This, then, is their recompense. "Their works do follow them." Is it not sublime? Lives there a man whose heart was ever touched with yearning for the good, the beautiful and the true, who would not be even as one of these?

The man who loves justice for its own sake, whose soul is wedded to the right—his love will repay him for the work he does. He alone can experience the soul-filling heart-throbs of joy which blessed martyrs feel, when earthly hopes are withered, when life's work is done, and the spirit leaves its home on earth to walk in peace with God. He alone may know the happiness they reached, who lived and loved and wrought for Truth; his character will be clothed with the imperishable grandeur of the principles he loves; he is his own reward; his own name is the noblest title that the world can give.

SPEED MOSBY.

Jefferson City, Mo.

IN DEFENSE OF THE HALF EDUCATED.

Conspicuous among the self-anointed prophets of the day are a few curious exponents of tory doctrines who inveigh against what they call half-education. This they tell us is the bane of our age. The smattering of knowledge and the superficial accomplishments so easily acquired are unfitting our young men and young women for practical workaday occupations. They are breeding ideas and ambitions impossible of realization. They are turning first-class ditch-diggers and bricklayers into third-rate lawyers and physicians, and transforming good kitchenmaids and dressmakers into bad painters and musicians. To this is due the seething discontent of the times, and unless something be done to separate the fit from the unfit and to close to the latter all save the elementary avenues of learning social disaster must result.

This doctrine, which numbers among its adherents Dr. Goldwin Smith and Prof. Harry Thurston Peck, strikes upon American ears with the force of a startling novelty. And yet it contains no element of originality. On the contrary, it is as old as education itself, as old as conservatism, as old as human selfishness. It is but one attempt among many from apologists for privilege to lend speciousness to the monstrous doctrine of aristocracy—that might makes right. For its advocates recognize and admit that to deny equal rights to education is to deny equal rights to political power—to stultify democracy and abandon republicanism. In the world-old conflict, not yet half fought out, between the ideas of aristocracy and the ideals of democracy, between those who can conceive of no well-ordered society where the few do not dominate the many and those who believe in government of, by and for the people, between a greedy and self-serving pessimism and a humane and generous optimism, they take the reactionist side. They are the legitimate successors of those Englishmen who a generation or two ago declaimed against teaching the masses to read and write. Their deliverances

breathe a recrudescence of the spirit that would make learning the handmaid of tyranny, the spirit that dominated the oligarchies of Greece and Rome, whose examples they cite; the spirit that made sycophants of Dryden and Addison, the spirit that rendered possible first the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Louis of France and then the Marats and Carriers who succeeded them, the spirit that today dominates Russia and China and India.

"Odi profanum vulgus et arceo," exclaim our modern Horaces. "Let it not invade the hallowed precincts of our colleges. Let it not enjoy in degree however small the blessings and compensations of knowledge. For education means ambition, and ambition means discontent, and discontent means danger to the privileges and immunities of the 'small and highly-trained patriciate' born to drive in harness 'the hewers of wood and drawers of water who constitute the vast majority of the human race.'" Without discontent, Prof. Peck, whose virtual argument I quote, admits, the individual would make no progress. National progress, on the other hand, he seems illogically to hold, can safely be left to the operation of contentment—the philosophical contentment of the educated few and the apathetic contentment of the ignorant many.

It is not necessary to ask whether the Columbia professor and his sympathizers are right. If they are right, then the ecclesiastics and the land monopolizers and the slave holders who have so often and so persistently at different stages of the world's progress tried to stop the spread of popular education and of popular government were also right. If they are right, then Robert Lowe was a wiser patriot than John Bright, Calhoun a truer friend to the blacks than Garrison. If they are right, then not only has the American republic been founded in vain, but all the upward strivings of the human race have been in vain. A beneficent oligarchy would be poor humanity's only hope—and where in history's pages is there record of one?

The half and the quarter-educated who constitute so great a proportion

of the population of English-speaking countries know that their critics are wrong. Riches may grow irksome and honors may pall, but the acquisition of knowledge, however meager or unremunerative, never brings regret. Ambitious, even discontented, though the half-educated may often be, they can afford to smile at the opinions of their self-appointed mentors. They know that not in restriction, but in the still more general diffusion of intelligence and education, lies safety for the future. Because it has not fallen to them to drink deeply at the Pierian spring, no label "Danger" will prevent their tasting it. They will not bring up their children in ignorance that they may be unambitious and contented. Because only the few can attain the lofty intellectual heights of a Bentley, a Macaulay or a Peck, the many will not refuse to use the brains with which their Creator has endowed them. Because they cannot read Homer and Virgil in the classic tongues, they will not burn their English poets, nor because the subtleties of Kant and Fichte may weary them, will they reject philosophy and wisdom as they reach them through writers less abstruse. And if the poverty of their attainments brings down upon them collegiate contempt, they will have at least three sources of consolation. First and greatest will be the pleasure and the advantage which even the slenderest store of learning carries with it. Second will be the remembrance that from their ranks and not from those of a patriciate have sprung in large majority both the great geniuses and the great benefactors of the world—Burns, Dickens, Shakespeare himself, Columbus and Livingstone, Cobden and Lincoln. Third will come the reflection that, however great may be the contrast between their acquirements and their critics', into still greater insignificance must shrink the sum of professorial erudition when placed in comparison with all there is to know. The tallow candle and the ocean searchlight are equally futile to explore the noonday sun. And perhaps learned doctors and half-educated laymen alike may with advantage cultivate not the pride of Knowledge "that he has

learned so much," but the humility of Wisdom "that he knows no more."
FRANK C. WELLS.
Brooklyn, New York.

NEWS

The electoral vote for president and vice president will be the same as given last week (page 486), with the exception of one state, Nebraska, which goes from the Bryan to the McKinley column. Mr. McKinley's vote is thereby increased to 292, while Mr. Bryan's is reduced to 155, giving McKinley a majority in the electoral college of 137. Official returns being still incomplete, no trustworthy statement of the popular vote can yet be made.

Immediately upon being convinced of his defeat, Mr. Bryan telegraphed Mr. McKinley, saying:

At the close of another presidential campaign it is my lot to congratulate you upon a second victory.

Mr. McKinley replied:

I acknowledge with cordial thanks your message of congratulation and extend you my good wishes.

Mr. Bryan's letter to the public, issued on the 8th, is as follows:

The result was a surprise to me and the magnitude of the republican victory was a surprise to our opponents, as well as to those who voted our ticket. It is impossible to analyze the returns until they are more complete, but, generally speaking, we seem to have gained in the large cities and to have lost in the smaller cities and in the country. The republicans were able to secure tickets or passes for all of their voters who were away from home, and this gave them a considerable advantage. We have no way of knowing at this time how much money was spent in the purchase of votes and in colonization. But, while these would account for some of the republican gains, they could not account for the widespread increase in the republican vote. The prosperity argument was probably the most potent one used by the republicans. They compared the present conditions with the panic times of 1893 to 1896, and this argument had weight with those who did not stop to consider the reasons for the change. The appeal, "Stand by the president while the war is on," had a great deal of influence among those who did not realize that a war against the doctrine of self-government in the Philippines must react upon us in this country.

We have made an honest fight on

an honest platform, and, having done our duty as we saw it, we have nothing to regret. We are defeated but not discouraged. The fight must go on. I am sure that republican policies will be repudiated by the people when the tendency of those policies is fully understood. The contest between plutocracy and democracy cannot end until one or the other is completely triumphant.

I have come out of the campaign with perfect health and a clear conscience. I did my utmost to bring success to the principles for which I stood. Mr. Stevenson did all that he could. Senator Jones and the members of the democratic, populist, silver republican and anti-imperialist committees did all they could. Mr. Hearst and his associates in the club organization put forth their best efforts. Our newspapers, our campaign speakers and our local organizations all did their part.

I have no fault to find and no reproaches. I shall continue to take an active interest in politics as long as I live. I believe it to be the duty of the citizen to do so, and in addition to my interest as a citizen I feel that it will require a lifetime of work to repay the political friends who have done so much for me.

I shall not be a senatorial candidate before the legislature which has just been elected. Senator Allen deserves the senatorship which goes to the populists. Mr. Hitchcock and Mr. W. H. Thompson are avowed candidates for the democratic senatorship. They both deserve well of the party, and I am too grateful to them for past support to stand in their way even if I desired a seat in the senate.

The last paragraph of this letter was written with reference to a call upon Mr. Bryan to accept an election as senator, upon the supposition which then prevailed that there would be a fusion majority in the Nebraska legislature.

In Nebraska the fusion state and legislative tickets, as well as the presidential, were defeated, though by a closer vote; and in Minnesota Gov. Lind falls short of reelection by a plurality for his republican adversary which is estimated at from 1,000 to 5,000.

The returns from the Canadian elections, of which we were able last week to give only an incomplete report, were fully revised on the 9th, for 209 out of the 213 constituencies, with the following result:

Province.	1900.	
	Lib.	Cons. Ind.
Ontario	33	56 2
Quebec	57	7 ..

Nova Scotia	15	5 ..
New Brunswick	9	5 ..
Prince Edw'd Island...	4	1 ..
Manitoba	2	3 2
Northwest Territory ..	3	1 ..
British Columbia	1	2 1
Totals	124	80 5

For purposes of comparison we give the political complexion of the preceding house of commons, elected in 1896:

Province.	1896.		
	Lib.	Cons.	Ind.
Ontario	47	40	5
Quebec	51	14	..
Nova Scotia	10	10	..
New Brunswick	5	8	1
Prince Edw'd Island...	3	2	..
Manitoba	4	2	1
Northwest Territory...	2	1	1
British Columbia	4	2	..
Total	126	79	8

Newfoundland has just passed through a more exciting and vital political experience, probably, than any of the other countries that have voted this autumn, and with results more satisfactory to democracy. She has defeated the attempt of a pronounced plutocratic leader, who already controls the country economically, to rivet his power upon the people by securing political control. This man is R. G. Reid. A Scotchman by birth, he went to Newfoundland from the United States ten years ago as a contractor to build a government railway. Owing to the financial depression that bankrupted the Newfoundland treasury, the government was unable to furnish funds for the railway construction, and Reid, already a millionaire, advanced them. He also relieved the government of the cost of operating the road for ten years after its completion, under a contract giving him 5,000 acres of land per mile of road operated. These contracts were afterward improvidently renewed, extended, added to and generally manipulated, until now Reid practically owns all the Newfoundland railways, steamer lines, wharves, docks, elevators, coal, copper and other mines, the pulp and lumber mills, the telegraph system, formerly owned by the government, and a good part of the land of the island. He is reported to be the largest landowner in the world, his holdings in Newfoundland alone aggregating 4,000,000 acres of the best land in the island; and he personally controls every large industry. Wishing, however, to incorpo-

rate his property interests into a limited liability company, as the basis for some scheme in Napoleonic finance, of the nature of a trust with watered stock, he came in conflict with the Newfoundland ministry, which, under the premiership of Robert Bond, refused this further concession to his already enormous power. That conflict made the issue at the recent election. Reid brought all his influence to bear to prevent the return of the Bond party, nominating his own lawyers and other hired men for office, and misusing his railway and telegraph service to help them and hinder their opponents. But his party was defeated, and Mr. Bond was reelected by the most pronounced vote of confidence ever cast for a premier in the island. The new legislature is almost a unit against Reid. This disposes of Reid in politics for the present, but it would be remarkable if the owner of a country, should he be allowed to continue to own it, did not in time bring even its politics under his control.

Sufficient time has not yet elapsed to ascertain the effect of the American elections upon the war in the Philippines. The result was reported on the 11th to have been received quietly at Manila however, no noticeable change in Filipino sentiment having been observed. Several minor military engagements had occurred during the preceding week, with an American loss of ten wounded and four killed.

On the 10th the department at Washington gave out Gen. MacArthur's report, evidently received during the presidential campaign but withheld until after election, in which MacArthur predicts that in the Philippines "for many years to come the necessity of a large military and naval force is too apparent to admit of discussion." He attributes this necessity to the fact that in the island there are "several millions of sensitive and credulous people, without allegiance to any existing institutions, but animated by certain inchoate ideas and aspirations, which, by some unfortunate perversion of thought, they conceive to be threatened by America;" and he accounts for their unity of sentiment by reference to the probability that "the adhesive principle comes from ethnological homogeneity which induces men to respond for a time to the appeals of consanguinous leader-

ship, even when such action is opposed to their own interest and convictions of expediency." All which is a pedantically obscure mode of explaining that the Filipinos are bound together by ties of race against an alien invader, and that they subordinate selfish interests to patriotic ideals. Gen. MacArthur makes this clear when he says that "the people seem to be actuated by the idea that in all doubtful matters of politics or war men are never nearer right than when going with their own kith and kin, regardless of consequences."

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to November 14, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900.	105
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900	522

Total deaths since July 1, 1898.	2,474
Wounded	2,332
Captured	10

Total casualties since July 1, 1898.	4,816
Total casualties reported last week	4,776
Total deaths reported last week.	2,445

One of the outcomes of the American policy regarding the Philippines is the Spanish-American congress now in session at Madrid. A preliminary step in the direction of uniting the Spanish republics of America with Spain in an alliance against the imperial encroachments of the English-speaking nations, it was inspired by fears that the ambition of the United States for conquest, as indicated by her Puerto Rican, Philippine and Cuban policies, may reach out to the South American continent. The congress assembled at Madrid on the 10th with 30 representatives from this side of the Atlantic in attendance. All the Spanish republics in America, as well as Spain and Portugal, are to be represented, and hopes of a Latin alliance are indulged. Secret sessions began on the 12th, when the whole six sections into which the congress is divided, held protracted meetings. In the arbitration section a motion for the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration for the settlement of all disputes between Spain and the Spanish republics in America was adopted.

In the Transvaal there has been excessive guerrilla fighting between the Boers and the British at several points for several days. The British are always victorious, according to the reports, but they evidently feel the effects of the harassing tactics of the Boers. Gen. De Wet, the Boer commandant, is reported as having been wounded. While the Transvaal Boers keep up their desultory warfare, their president, Kruger, is on his way to Europe in the hope, even at this late hour, of securing European intervention in behalf of the independence of the republics. The Gelderland, which carries him, reached Port Said, on the Suez canal, on the 12th, and he is expected to land at Marseilles by the 17th or 18th.

Turning now to China, we are advised that a joint note has been agreed upon by the representatives at Peking of the allied powers, for submission to China as the basis for a preliminary treaty. This note demands—

- (1) the erection of a monument to the murdered German ambassador, Von Ketteler, on the site of his assassination, and an apology through an imperial prince personally to the German emperor;
- (2) the infliction by China of the death penalty upon 11 enumerated Chinese princes and officials;
- (3) the dismissal and punishment of all Chinese officials who fail in future to prevent anti-foreign outrages;
- (4) the payment of indemnities to states, corporations and individuals for losses in the recent uprising;
- (5) the abolition of the *tsu-li-yamen*, or foreign commission, and the substitution of a foreign minister;
- (6) the removal of the forts at Taku, as well as other forts on the coast of Pichili; the prohibition of the importation of arms, and the establishment of a permanent system of foreign guards at the legations and between Peking and the sea;
- (7) the posting for two years of an imperial proclamation throughout the empire for the suppression of Boxers.

Pending these negotiations the allied powers, under the command of the German field marshal, Count von Waldersee, have set up a military tribunal for the trial of Chinese officials charged with responsibility for Boxer assaults upon foreigners. Pursuant to the sentence of this tribunal, four leading officials of Pao-ting-fu were shot on the 5th. One of the four was Ting Yang, acting viceroy of Pichili. Another was Gen. Kusi Hing. After execution they were decapitated and their heads were exposed on poles as a warning to the

populace. We are glad to be able to add that the Americans took no part in these international lynchings. Apprehensions on the part of the Chinese government have been justly excited by them, and it has officially expressed surprise and regret at this action of the allies during peace negotiations, and fears of its disturbing effect at a critical time upon the Chinese people.

NEWS NOTES.

—The German reichstag reassembled on the 14th.

—R. G. Dun, head of the great mercantile agency of R. G. Dun & Co., died in New York on the 10th. He was 74 years old.

—The thirty-fourth annual session of the national grange, Patrons of Husbandry, was opened at Washington on the 14th.

—The National Civic Federation has called a conference of employers and labor leaders to meet at Chicago, December 17 and 18, to discuss plans for conciliation and arbitration.

—The American Steel and Wire company has obtained control of the American Steamship company, which operates a fleet of the largest ore freighters on the great lakes. Ten of its ships have a capacity of more than 5,000 tons each.

—The military department of Puerto Rico was abolished by a war department order of the 9th. One native regiment of 850 men and three battalions of United States regulars will remain in the island, attached to the department of the east.

—Henry Villard, the well-known railroad financier, died suddenly at his home at Dobbs Ferry, N. Y., on the 13th, from an attack of apoplexy. Mr. Villard, who was formerly a newspaper man, owned a controlling interest in the Nation at the time of his death. He was 66 years old.

—A new contrivance in the automobile line is a slot machine, now on exhibition at the New York automobile show, which automatically charges the storage batteries of automobiles, the open sesame, however, being a quarter instead of the customary penny.

—Several English lacemakers whose transportation from Europe to America was paid by Dr. John A. Dowie, of Zion fame, have been detained at Philadelphia by immigration officials for violation of the alien contract labor law. Dowie claims exemption for them on the ground that they came to establish a new industry.

—Two Atlantic steamship companies and one Pacific have been merged into a single company. The combining companies are the Red Star, which operates a fleet of

steamers between New York, Philadelphia and Antwerp; the Pacific Mail, which runs a fleet between San Francisco and Yokohama, Japan; and the Atlantic Transportation company.

—Marcus Daly, of Montana, commonly known as the "copper king," died in New York on the 12th from heart disease, aged 58 years. Daly was president of the Amalgamated Copper company, "the copper trust," and was reported to be worth \$30,000,000. With his death is ended the famous Daly-Clark feud, which has kept Montana politics in a turmoil for the past ten years.

—Prof. Edward A. Ross, head of the department of economics at Leland Stanford university, has been compelled to resign, by order of Mrs. Stanford, because of his views in opposition to coolie immigration and in favor of municipal ownership of public utilities. Mrs. Stanford, who is the widow of the university's founder, is a large employer of Chinese and Japanese labor and is deeply interested in street car lines.

—Paris closed the gates of her immense exposition at midnight on the 12th in a blaze of glory. Though not the success its projectors intended, and while outdone architecturally by the Columbian exposition of 1893, the fair brought together the largest and most diversified collection of exhibits ever made. The attendance, which was prejudicially affected by a British boycott, was nevertheless in excess of 50,000,000, or nearly twice that of the fair of 1889. Among foreign nations, the Germans and Americans took the most prominent part.

MISCELLANY

THE FULL DINNER PAIL.

For The Public.

Here's to the nation! Here's to its people!

Here's to its Ruler! May IT never fail.

This is its motto—this is its mission—

Its highest ambition: A full dinner pail.

Preach not of human rights; prate not of honor;

Justice and virtue no longer prevail.

Sink to oblivion all that is noblest;

Take them—but leave us a full dinner pail.

Speak not of liberty won by the fathers.

Nor of the future wrongs we entail;

If but the present lend an existence—

If it but offer a full dinner pail.

Greed of a nation! Greed of a people!

Weighed in the balance with Right, they shall fall.

Selfish of heart, and selfish of purpose—

Selling themselves for a full dinner pail.

Leave it unwritten; never record it;

Bury forever the sorrowful tale—

Of a great people that took for its idol,

Bowed down and worshiped, a full dinner pail.

Lost to all honor, betraying a brother,

Lowering themselves in humanity's scale!

God, who last judges, will not take for answer:

"This thing we did for a full dinner pail!"

AMY DUDLEY.

THE SINGLE TAX.

An Essay on the Single Tax in 50 Words.

All men have equal right to life.
Life depends absolutely upon land.
Therefore all have equal right to land.

Some must occupy more valuable land than others.

Equal right demands that landholders pay the yearly value of land into a common fund for common purposes.

This is the single tax.

SAMUEL BRAZIER.

AN OBITUARY.

For The Public.

Notices Under This Head Two Dollars Per Line.

DIED.—Uncle Sam, of the United States, died November 6, 1900. Uncle Sam was born July 4, 1776, and was therefore 124 years, 4 months and 2 days old. Uncle's most intimate friends have noted his failing health ever since 1873, but no one expected the end to come so sudden. Charges are made, and apparently on good evidence, that his doctors have been administering poison continually for the last three years. Uncle will be missed by all who ever made his acquaintance.

In the United States about 35,000,000 people mourn his death, while about the same number rejoice that he is gone; the other 7,000,000 don't appear to care one way or the other.

Two of Uncle's sons were unjustly executed in South Africa lately, but the old gentleman was too weak to render any assistance. The dastardly attempt to assassinate the youngest son, Filipino, was a terrible blow to the old gentleman, and probably hastened the end more than anything else. N.

THE RELATION OF THE CONSTITUTION TO THE REPUBLIC.

The imperialists have been so put to it for defenses that they have caught at every departure from our fundamental principles, every failure to live up to our political creed, as expressed in the amendments to the constitution, and in the constitutions of the various states, into which the principles of the declaration of independence have been incorporated; and these departures and failures have been cited as authority for the acquisition of transmarine territories, and the government of their inhabitants outside of the constitution, and without any purpose or expectation that

they should become citizens of the United States.

Some imperialists seem to regard the constitution as a suit of clothes, which can be put off and exchanged for the imperial purple by that moral person, known as the United States in the family of nations, whenever it makes a raid and acquires new territory beyond its existing boundaries. But the constitution is not the nation's apparel—it is its charter, its rule of conduct, its life, its soul—and it can no more part with it than it can with itself; for it is the principles of the constitution that make the United States what it is among the nations of the world.

If imperialism means the government of colonies or subjects outside the constitution, then imperialism for the United States means revolution; for we shall be another kind of nation if we undertake the government of foreign or colonial populations with or without their consent. We have stood as a nation for self-government—for the principle that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed—that the people are the only source of governmental authority, and that government should be of the people, by the people, and for the people. We have not attempted to force this civil religion of ours upon mankind; for we hold that men are free to choose a king; but we have said: "As for us and our house, we will govern ourselves, and let other peoples do likewise." There is no need to go into qualifications or explanations of this principle. It is either this or the divine right. And when the divine right to rule over other peoples in distant lands is asserted by a democracy, it becomes a tyranny, and there is no such tyrant as a tyrannical democracy. It is a traitor and an apostate, as well as a tyrant—a traitor to liberty and an apostate from the rights of man.

The idea that a people who have ordained such a constitution as ours, whose officers and agents have sworn fealty to its provisions, are thereby crippled or deformed, is one of the worst absurdities of this imperial craze. A nation, like a man, can choose principles of action. As a man can abjure unchastity, intemperance, dishonesty, so a nation can abjure "criminal aggression" or government by force, or any interference with the rights of other peoples. Ours is, indeed, a government of limited powers. But when we talk about our nation having been born a cripple if it cannot

constitutionally do what other nations can, it is as if a worshiper of the true God should regard himself as a slave because he had lost his liberty to worship idols. He would but show that at heart he was an idolater.—Crammond Kennedy, in the Washington Post.

LOOKING FORWARD.

An extract from an editorial with the above title, published in the Indianapolis Sentinel of Nov. 8.

It is 80 years since any political party has had an ascendancy approaching that which the republican party possesses to-day.

This is the situation. This is the outcome of a presidential campaign singularly free from popular passion and excitement. The American people have passed their judgment upon issues of the most vital importance, essentially fundamental in character, and they have sustained the republican party at every point. Absolutely nothing is gained by misrepresenting the significance of this verdict by attempting to minimize its importance. That which was but yesterday only the policy of the McKinley administration is to-day the accepted and declared policy of the United States. The American people, with their eyes wide open, have deliberately voted in favor of a policy of aggression and conquest throughout the world. They have voted that this shall be a military republic. They have voted that the constitution does not follow the flag. They have voted to maintain a single gold standard and to confirm the national banks to their control of the circulating medium of the country. They have voted against an income tax and in favor of a high protective tariff and of subsidizing various private enterprises out of the public treasury. They have voted against any attempt by legislation to prohibit or regulate the organization of trusts. They have voted condonation, if not indorsement, of republican maladministration at home and in the territories which we are holding in subjection.

To sum up: The doctrines of Hamilton are clearly predominant. The Jeffersonian tradition is, for the moment at least, in eclipse. The centripetal tendency in our government, which has been steadily increasing for 40 years, except for the temporary checks it received in 1884 and 1892, has been enormously strengthened. The republic of the fathers survives in form and in name, but the spirit of it is gone. The idealism which dominated political thought and shaped po-

litical action in the closing years of the last century and during the first half of the present century has been supplanted by a coarse materialism. Commercialism rules the world.

The full-bellied voter doesn't care to be vexed with questions about human rights and free government. A great majority of our citizens are perfectly willing that we shall shoot our government into distant peoples so long as their own bank accounts and dinner pails are in a satisfactory condition. This is what we must infer from the returns if we go no farther than the face of them.

Right here let us say that recognition of a fact does not imply satisfaction with it. We recognize an existing condition, however distasteful it may be to us. Such recognition does not involve approval of it or sympathy with its causes. A few visionaries to the contrary notwithstanding, physical diseases are not cured by ignoring them. No more are the ills of the body politic.

Let us then frankly admit that the country has adopted, or seems to have adopted, theories of government which we, as democrats, believe to be fundamentally wrong. But let us not hastily assume that this verdict in its largest sense is final. Let us not consider that it may not be reversed, or at least modified, upon another hearing before the great tribunal. On the other hand, let us not deceive ourselves by harboring the notion that the lust for gold and military glory which seems to have taken possession of a majority of the American people can be easily cured. Let us not indulge ourselves in the fond delusion that tendencies which have become so deeply rooted can be easily reversed or even checked. There is no reason for the followers of Thomas Jefferson to despair. If his ideals may never be fully realized in our government it is yet too soon to conclude that they have entirely lost their hold upon the American people. These are dark days for those who have kept these ideals steadily in view, despite the ever-rising tide of Hamiltonism. But let us not lose heart.

For freedom's battle, once begun,
Bequeathed by bleeding sire and son,
Though baffled oft, is ever won.

Much, of course, has been done that cannot be undone. The chapters of history that we have written in characters of blood during the last year cannot be erased. But the American people may yet be induced to turn aside from the pathway upon which they have entered.

OBJECTIONS TO AN ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND.

On the subject of a closer alliance with England, now much talked of, encouraged by her, and advocated by many of our own people, I wish to say a few words. I think we shall do well to remember our early experience with her, and scrutinize somewhat carefully her present motives. We wish to maintain amicable relations with England and to avoid "entangling alliances." It is also far more agreeable to approve and applaud than to criticize and condemn. We acknowledge that no country contains more illustrious statesmen, broader philanthropists or more earnest Christians than England. It is when we consider her as a governing power, when we weigh her methods in the scales of justice and righteousness, that we not only withhold our approval, but emphatically condemn.

History, written and unwritten, records that England long ago became dissatisfied with her place and progress among the nations. She was ambitious. She desired supremacy in the world. How should she obtain it was the problem which she set herself to solve. It could not be by agriculture, for her country was small—she could not raise her bread. It could not be by manufacture, for she was dependent on other nations for much of her material for that. It must, therefore, be by finance. Thereupon she devised and executed plans which, whatever their effect on others, have made her the arbiter of nations, for "whoever controls the money of a nation controls its liberty and its destiny."

How she accomplished this need not here be detailed.

For proof that England absorbs the wealth and vitality of any people so unfortunate as to come within her power, we have only to recall the history and observe the conditions in Ireland, in India and in Egypt, and to consider her recent willingness to stand as guard—to practically hold the hands of a weaker nation—while "the unspeakable Turk" inflicted terrible and unmerited punishment! And this while the cries of the sufferers and the appeals of the humane in her own and in other countries were ringing in her ears.

We need not inquire by what right England obtained her Indian possessions. There are those who remember the Sepoy rebellion, when intelligent, educated, native soldiers, revolting against an oppression no longer endurable, were chained to the mouths of cannon and blown to atoms!

If one is interested in knowing what relentless, merciless, mercenary oppression means, let him read "Spoiling the Egyptians," written by J. Seymour Keay, an Englishman who lived in Egypt and India. Much of the small book is compiled from the English blue books. In its preface the author says: "It must be remembered that nothing is reported here which could be concealed." The American edition was published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, who, in their preface, say:

The author's statement, which is based line upon line on the authority of the official documents, constitutes one of the most damning arraignments that has ever been made of the acts of a Christian nation, and throws light upon some, at least, of the causes of the bitter hatred of Europeans which found such fatal expression in the massacre of Alexandria.

Many years ago I had the pleasure of meeting Hon. Mr. Matson, soon after his return from India, where he had been our American consul general in Calcutta. I had just read "Spoiling the Egyptians," and asked Mr. Matson if he believed it possible that a civilized nation could practice such heartless atrocities. I can never forget the emphasis with which he replied: "Madam, the English language does not contain words that can adequately express the oppression practiced by English officials on helpless natives wherever they have the power."

I will mention one example only of several which Mr. Matson cited as evidence, namely, the obliging of the natives to buy imported salt, while their own hills contain enough to supply the world for centuries. He said: "If a poor native were seen licking the salt (for which he was famishing) out of the earth he would be shot as if he were a dog."

This I regarded as an extreme statement; but recently I have seen an article in the New York Sun, from which I quote, inferring that it may have been literally true:

Among the resolutions discussed at the meeting of the last Indian national congress, held at the end of December in Madras, hardly any were of greater importance than that asking for a reduction of the duty on salt. In India salt is a government monopoly, and, next to the land revenue, is the most productive source of income from taxation, opium being third. * * * There is not another article of general necessity that is more heavily taxed, and for protecting the state monopoly, not one in which a more rigorous set of regulations is enforced even to the extent of being oppressive. According to competent medical authorities the public health and the stamina of the poorer classes of the Indian population are injuriously affected by the restricted use of salt, due to its excessive taxation. The high price of even the coarsest and commonest kinds is alleged to be responsible for the serious epidemics

that have thinned the stocks of cattle in India in recent years.

From good authority I quote:

That the principle of the opium war [waged to force the trade on China] was utterly wrong, and that the leaders of thought in China were absolutely right as to its effect, has been generally admitted, even by Englishmen; yet so great is the power of commercial greed that a royal commission has reported favorably within the present decade on the Indian export of opium. The government revenue that comes from the demoralizing drug is the all-sufficient justification for the traffic.

On the subject of a closer alliance with England, I quote approvingly Judge Tarvin's utterance on what the Jeffersonian democratic American platform for 1900 should declare:

Against Imperialism. * * * Against any alliance with England—that a monarchy and a republic cannot be linked together—human freedom and human slavery cannot march side by side. * * * Colonial dependencies are the life-blood of England, while they would mean the death of free government in the United States. No English soldier ever fought for Liberty, or died for Freedom.

England seems to have verified the truth of what Sophocles said twenty-five centuries ago:

Nothing in use by man for power of ill can equal money. This lays cities low. This drives men forth from quiet dwelling place. This warps and changes minds of worthiest stamp, to turn to deeds of baseness—teaching men all shifts of cunning and to know the guilt of every impious deed.

—Mrs. Susan Look Avery.

SIXTO LOPEZ ON AGUINALDO.

An extract from a letter written by Senor Sixto Lopez, a member of the Filipino diplomatic service, dated 41 Woburn place, London, W. C., June 30, 1900, and addressed to Maj. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, United States army, Washington, D. C. The letter is in answer to a circular of questions addressed by Gen. Wheeler to "Eminentes Filipinos." We reprint from City and State, of Philadelphia.

QUESTION II. OF GEN. WHEELER'S CIRCULAR.

If the Americans had abandoned the islands, would Aguinaldo have been acceptable to all the tribes, or would some have opposed his government, causing revolutions and other conflicts?

ANSWER BY SENOR LOPEZ.

Gen. Aguinaldo not only "would have been acceptable" but has been accepted by what you term the "tribes." Practically all the islands sent emissaries declaring their loyal support to Aguinaldo and his government. Even the Igorrotes, and the Moros of Central Mindanao, who never submitted to Spanish rule, have acclaimed our president and government, and the former have sent gold dust to Aguinaldo to assist in the prosecution of the present war. In addition to this, the provinces of the archipelago have elected representatives—in some cases

by a unanimous vote—to our “Asamblea,” or house of representatives. It is true that certain Filipinos, within the sphere and under the domination of the American forces, have professed being favorable to American rule. Though I do not approve it, I can quite understand their attitude. When the British troops entered Bloemfontein many of the Free Staters professed being favorable to British supremacy. But whatever may be the rights or the wrongs of the Anglo-Boer dispute. I am quite sure that those Free Staters would much prefer Boer supremacy. The Filipinos in and around Manila are in precisely the same position as are the Free Staters in and around Bloemfontein. Take your army from the Philippines and you will soon discover whether the Filipinos are in favor of American rule! It is also true that, on payment of certain emoluments by America, the sultan of Sulu has agreed to submit to American rule. I do not wish to say anything unkind about the sultan, but I am of the opinion that he was not entirely a free-will agent in the matter, and that his submission does not necessarily mean the submission of the people over whom he exercises a somewhat doubtful sway. At the time of the American revolution were there no colonists who professed being favorable to English rule? Your great liberty-loving country will hardly be proud of purchased loyalty. Much has been made of the supposed favor with which some Filipinos are said to regard the prospect of American rule in the Philippines. But as a matter of fact there is an overwhelming majority of our people in favor of Filipino rule. If you doubt the truth of this statement; if you still honestly believe that the Filipinos are in favor of American rule, let a plebiscite be taken on the question. Let it be conducted fairly and free from any threat of the sword of either Gen. MacArthur or Gen. Aguinaldo. Let chosen representatives of both parties superintend the voting which should be by ballot. You will find yourselves outvoted by a hundred to one even in the city of Manila. I cannot give you any formal pledge, but I firmly believe that Aguinaldo and all the Filipinos would be prepared to abide by the result of such a plebiscite. If your administration will also agree to abide by the result, the Filipinos will bear half of the incidental expenses. On behalf of the Filipinos I challenge you to put your contentions to this test. One of the first principles of republicanism is that the will of the people, expressed through the ballot, shall be supreme. Are the Filipinos—the

“savages,” as some of your illustrious colleagues have defined us to be—the pleaders for, and you the deniers of, the application of this principle?

To the second part of your question as to whether there will be any opposition to Aguinaldo's government, the reply is that we have never been foolish enough to imagine that any arrangement in this world would be free from opposition. Is there no opposition to President McKinley's government? Do you fondly imagine that, if your administration ever succeeds by force of arms in establishing a government in the Philippines, there will be no opposition to it? Undoubtedly there will be opposition—healthy opposition—to any government established in our country. But the opposition will not be between the so-called “tribes.” Your question implies that if there is opposition to Aguinaldo's government there will also be revolutions and other conflicts. If our government ever became unjust or corrupt; if it refused to admit that its “just powers of government were derived solely from the consent of the governed;” if it sought to thrust its will upon an unwilling people, it would deserve to be, and would no doubt be, subject to revolution. But even just and righteous governments are not always exempt from such dangers. Will any high-minded American declare that the government of President Lincoln was unjust or corrupt? Yet against it was directed the greatest revolution known in the history of the world. Your question also implies that if we ever had a civil war in our country the event would prove that we are incapable of self-government. What, then, did the civil war in America prove? Every country in the civilized world has had its revolutions and its civil wars. Revolution has been the means by which tyrants and dictators have been dethroned. America will never rule the Philippines without becoming a dictator. Give us complete franchise and the power which justly belongs thereto, and we will declare ourselves independent of America. Deny us the franchise and you will become a dictator. Under such dictatorship there will be not only “opposition,” but also an absolute certainty, sooner or later, of “revolutions and other conflicts.” If you sincerely desire the pacification of our country, leave us to ourselves. Protect us, if you will, from foreign aggression, and earn not only the gratitude of our people, but also the grandest title of which a nation can boast—the title of liberator and defender of those who struggle for national life.

Your question further implies that if Aguinaldo were removed from the sphere of operations the Filipinos would be left like sheep without a shepherd. We have every confidence in President Aguinaldo. He is the object of our highest esteem and admiration. We are prepared to follow him as long as he pursues, as he has hitherto pursued, a policy of righteousness and justice. But if, through unforeseen misfortune, he should be removed from our midst, we have other men able and willing to lead our people. Though we gratefully recognize his splendid services to our people; though we believe that he is a bory leader of men, our national existence no more depends upon Aguinaldo than does the existence of the American nation depend upon President McKinley. You have evidently taken the splendid unanimity which our people have shown toward their chosen leader as an evidence that there is only one who is capable of leading. If our people had been divided into factions or “tribes” with a multiplicity of leaders, perhaps we should have been credited with the possession of many capable men! *Verbum sat sapienti.*

THE HISTORY OF THE “CONSENT” DOCTRINE.

It is an intellectual pleasure to examine from the standpoint of history and fact the statements by which Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott's Outlook justifies itself in throwing the political philosophy of the declaration of independence into the lumber room of exploded theories. In the Outlook's recent article on the “Basis of Government” it was stated:

History abundantly . . . disposes of the sentiment borrowed from Rousseau that just governments rest upon the consent of the governed. The rest of the philosophy of Rousseau has long since been abandoned by thoughtful men; the imagined history on which he based it has long since been disproved by scholarly research. This relic of an exploded philosophy is no better worthy of our reverence because it is found inserted in a parenthesis in the Declaration of Independence. . . . Just governments rest on conformity with the laws of God. “The seat of law,” says Hooker, “is in the bosom of Almighty God.”

There are four affirmations, direct or implied, in this short paragraph, which may be considered in this order:

1. That, according to Hooker, the seat of law, or the basis of government, is in God.
2. That Jefferson borrowed the doctrine of the “consent of the governed” from Rousseau, who was the author of it.
3. That Rousseau's philosophy as a

whole has been abandoned by thoughtful men—not some thoughtful men, but all men who can be esteemed thoughtful.

4, That the "consent" doctrine is now without support in reason, science or the authority of thoughtful men.

While regarding Dr. Lyman Abbott and his paper with great respect, the Republican will undertake to show that every one of those affirmations is a piece of misrepresentation, due either to ignorance or to partisan zeal in behalf of the policies of the present administration.

The Outlook only half quotes Hooker. Let us quote that philosopher, who lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, more fully. In his "Ecclesiastical Polity" (book 1, paragraph 4), Hooker wrote:

The lawful power of making laws to command whole political societies of men belongeth so properly unto the same entire societies, that for any prince or potentate of what kind soever upon earth to exercise the same of himself, and not by express commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by authority derived at first from their consent upon whose person they impose laws, it is no other than mere tyranny. Laws they are not, therefore, which public approbation hath not made so.

The Outlook refers to Hooker, who is far more of an "oldtimer," by the way, than Rousseau or Thomas Jefferson, for authority to support its doctrine that governments rest upon the "laws of God." Yet in that passage from the "Ecclesiastical Polity" Hooker not only gave equal weight to the doctrine of "consent," but in the last sentence he leaned clear over to the "consent" doctrine, as, on the whole, the preferable. For in that sentence he says that those are not laws which have not received the approbation, that is, the consent, of the people.

This remarkable passage from Hooker also reveals the falsity of the Outlook's affirmations, or assumptions, that the "consent" class of the declaration of independence was "borrowed from Rousseau," and that Rousseau was the original author of it. Just why all the American assailants of the declaration, in these days, should credit the "consent" doctrine to Rousseau, and to Rousseau alone, is a mystery, unless they think to heap odium upon the doctrine because of Rousseau's influence upon the French revolution, which was stained by some terrible excesses and failures in its early days. The editor of the Outlook, at least, ought to know better, for so learned a person ought

to be included in the very few mentioned by President Hadley, of Yale university, in his article in the August number of the Atlantic Monthly, where he writes:

Everyone knows that Aristotle divided governments into monarchy, aristocracy and democracy; very few know that Aristotle said that there was a more fundamental division of governments into those which were legitimate and those which were not, the former being based on the consent of the governed and acting in the interest of the whole, while the latter were based on the authority of a class and exercised in the interests of that class.

Aristotle lived even before Hooker; in fact, he died 322 years before Christ.

The history of this idea, which has so profoundly influenced human life, and is sure to exercise a prodigious influence in the future of the world, is highly interesting. It did not originate with Jefferson; nor did it originate with Rousseau. In writing of the development of the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which embraces the "consent" doctrine, Prof. William Graham, of the department of jurisprudence at Queen's college, Belfast, in his valuable work on "English Political Philosophy," published this year, declares:

Hooker . . . lays down in clear and express terms the future whig doctrine of Locke, which was subsequently developed by Rousseau into the destructive democracy and direct sovereignty of the people as manifested from 1789 to 1793.

Locke died before Rousseau was born. Read what Locke says about taxation, and you will find the "consent of the governed" doctrine squarely affirmed and vindicated; and taxation was the chief issue underlying the American revolution. According to Locke, they (the people)

could alter the incidence of the (legislative) power, confer more on one estate in parliament than the other, could revive the partial despotism of the Tudors, as under Henry VIII.; of an oligarchy, as during the eighteenth century; or maintain it all in the last resort in the house of commons, as they do at present. (Quoted from Graham.)

It is well known that the Frenchman, Rousseau, was a careful student of the Englishman Locke, and, says Prof. Graham, Locke's "chief conclusions were reproduced and pushed to their extreme logical limit" in Rousseau's "famous 'Contrat Social,' which supplied the groundwork of the French constitution of 1791." And Prof. Graham adds:

Other democratic constitutions have been framed in modern times, particularly in the new-formed American states, on something of the lines of the "Contrat Social," but all after Locke's time, and they may be mostly traced to his suggestions.

There is, indeed, no particular reason for thinking that the framers

of the declaration of independence were more influenced by Rousseau than by Locke. Rousseau's "Contrat Social," was not published until 1762, or only 14 years before the issuing of the declaration of independence, while the influence of Locke, the great philosophical support of English whiggism, had had fully three-quarters of a century in which to saturate the minds of the English colonists in America. There is, indeed, some internal evidence in the declaration that Jefferson was not so much under Rousseau's influence, as it is the fashion to assume. The preamble of the declaration does not say that all men are born "free and equal;" it simply says they are born equal, that is, equal before the law. But Rousseau, in the "Social Contrat," laid emphasis on the doctrine that "man is born free." If Jefferson had been largely under Rousseau's influence, why did he omit the word "free?"

The Outlook is now convicted of misrepresenting Hooker, while its affirmation that Jefferson "borrowed" his philosophy from Rousseau, who is presented as the original author of it, is seen to be wide of the truth. Its statement that Rousseau's philosophy as a whole has been "abandoned by thoughtful men" is equally ill-founded. No one can abandon Rousseau's philosophy as a whole without repudiating the fact that sovereignty of the people was Rousseau's cardinal idea, and the governments of Great Britain, France and the United States rest upon it to-day. Rousseau's idea of an original social compact, which he borrowed from Locke, and which Locke borrowed from Hobbes, is now clearly seen to have no historical basis, but there is no justification for throwing overboard the whole of Rousseau's philosophy because his idea of the origins of governments cannot be historically demonstrated, or made to seem reasonable in the light of science. Prof. Graham, who as an Englishman has no sentimental attachment to the French philosopher, and who, of course, rejects the old social compact theory, now sums up Rousseau with evident justice, in writing:

In spite of the first grand failure, the terrible results of its brief triumph (in the excesses of the French revolution), the doctrine of Rousseau and of the sovereignty of the people has largely conquered in the foremost nations; in England, France and the United States, in the English colonies, and partly in those countries where the king or monarch has granted constitutions. Moreover, a great thinker, like Kant, writing in 1796, sees a truth in the doctrine which he tries to detach, in his "Philosophy

of Right." He even declares that government by the collective or general will is the doctrine of the future.

The Outlook's implied claim that the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" is now without support in reason, science or the authority of thoughtful men to-day, is as false as its other assertions on this question. Prof. Graham is a thoughtful man, and so is Prof. W. E. H. Lecky, and both are Englishmen with no sentiment for Thomas Jefferson. Prof. Graham, in his chapter on Locke, expresses his own opinion as follows:

But though there is no proof that governments began in this way, most of them having had their origin in conquest, it is true that unless they finally rest on the unforced and willing consent or agreement of the people or the majority, they are not free governments.

Presumably the Outlook believes in free governments. Prof. Lecky, in his "Democracy and Liberty" (volume 1, page 479), says:

The best, the truest, the most solid basis on which the peace of the civilized world can rest is the free consent of the great masses of its population to the form of government under which they live.

And Prof. Lecky is no particular friend of republics or democracy.

From the standpoint of scientific sociology, furthermore, the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" has a profound significance. As Prof. Lewis G. Janes has well said:

It is a sound political philosophy, justified by scientific sociological principles, which is enunciated in the affirmation of the Declaration of Independence, that "all just government rests on the consent of the governed." This is as true . . . of the older monarchical and aristocratic systems as it is of a democratic-republican form of government. While the evolutionary sociologist recognizes that different forms of government are adapted to varying degrees of culture and social development, he also knows that an autocracy which does not rest upon the actual consent of the governed, which finds no response in the hearts of the people, but is maintained solely by military compulsion, is a tyranny, unstable in its foundations, unadapted to its social environment, and destined to early destruction by peaceful or violent means.

The present British monarchy truly rests on the consent of the governed; if it did not, the monarchy would be destroyed. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which embraces the doctrine of consent, permits the people to set up such governments as they may think are suited to their needs. But whatever the government, popular sovereignty requires that the people shall have ultimate power over it, to modify or change it, or set up another in its place. Without the consent, or, to use Hooker's word, the "approbation" of

the people, no government can endure for any length of time. The most unstable of governments is that to which the people are opposed. Jefferson's immortal declaration is essentially correct as a matter of right and as a matter of fact, and no imperialistic movement of an American political party can throw it into oblivion.—Editorial in Springfield Republican of Oct. 11.

AFTERGLOW.

I pray that Time full many years may bring
And round about us heap his flowers and snow,
That we adown the western slope may go
Clasped hand in hand, as in that joyous spring
When first together we did learn to sing
The songs of youth beside the river's flow;
The songs our hearts unto the end shall know,
If now no more the woodlands with them ring.

And we shall sit on many a golden eve
Beside the fire and dream of other days
When we were young, and laugh a wrinkled laugh.
Nor mourn nor sigh that loud the winds do grieve,
For thou shalt more than multiply the Mays,
And I the long Decembers count by half.
—"A Valley Muse," by Chas. G. Blandin.

"But you will admit that Mr. McKinley has good intentions?" pleaded the apologizer of the administration.

"Oh, certainly; I'll concede that much," said the reformed gold democrat, "but we need more than a 'New Year's man' for our president."

G. T. E.

"A sail!" shouted the lookout.
The admiral knit his brows.
"I hope it's the enemy!" he muttered.
"I have enough powder to fight a battle, but not enough to fire a salute!"

With this he folded his arms and gloomily contemplated the horizon.—Indianapolis Journal.

Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?
For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.
—Sir John Harrington.

Teacher—Who is it that sits idly by, doing nothing, while everybody else is working?

Bobby—The teacher. — Chicago Chronicle.

Pepsey—But, surely, colonel, you did not retreat when you saw the Boers approach?"

Col. Backway—Retreat? Never! I merely retired from business.

G. T. E.

"The world is mine!" asserted the count of Monte Christo. Thus is proved

the fact that not always has this earth been in the grasp of the Standard Oil trust.
G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Eagle's Heart" (New York: D. Appleton and Company) is the latest of Hamlin Garland's characteristically rugged stories of western life. With its main setting in the cowboy country, its motive is to lay bare the heart of a Rocky Mountain outlaw whose badness is mostly external and not altogether of his own making. Garland has done some of his best work in this story. The wild country and rough-and-ready civilization through which it moves from the time the hero leaves his father's quiet parsonage and becomes a tenderfoot, passes like a picture before the reader's eyes; and the characters, of which there are several besides the hero that stand out in full relief, are instinct with life.

In "The Emancipation of the Workers" (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. Price, 50 cents), Raphael Buck essays the solution of both the land question and the interest question, and thereby of the labor question. His proposition is to put all economic rent into the public treasury and lend it out to the people as capital without interest. From his general discussion it would appear that Mr. Buck imagines that private land monopoly injures labor only to the extent of the amount of the rents diverted to landlords. The consequent stimulation of land speculation, the most effective cause of labor exploitation, receives no adequate treatment. In the same connection he falls into the error of regarding economic rent as a tax upon consumers, whereas it is a premium which producers bear for advantage of place. We say that he "falls" into this error, because the error has been so often shown in economic literature to be an error, that the intelligent author who bases any reasoning upon it as if it were true, without showing with great care and clearness that after all it is no error, must be presumed to have fallen into it. And in his principal point, the abolition of interest, Mr. Buck evidently thinks of interest only as a phenomenon of borrowing and lending. If interest flows from the use of capital, and not merely from loans, his plan of abolishing it could not effect its purpose. Mr. Buck disclaims being a socialist; he is certainly not a single taxer; and his individualism is of a peculiar type, though in common with extreme individualists he recognizes society only as a loose aggregation of units in which all phenomena pertain to individuals and none of them to society as an indivisible whole.

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.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 7,000.

**Pingree's
Shoe
Talk**



The two cardinal virtues of any shoe to most of us, consist in the staying new and feeling old. The very best shoes come nearest that mark and if your comfort is of sufficient importance to you, buy

"PINGREE" SHOES

No shoes are more painstakingly made—none wear so well—none keep shape so long.

Ask your dealer for them !!!

These are Pingree Shoes for men, women and children.

They come in all weights for all purposes.

Write for "Pingree Shoe Talk"—it's free.

PINGREE & SMITH, Makers,
DETROIT, MICH.

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 18th:
Mr. Louis F. Post,
Editor Public,
"LAND AND LABOR."

This lecture, the first of a series of lectures on the Single Tax, will be illustrated by colored charts.
ADMISSION FREE!

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

NELLE 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.

EDUCATIONAL.

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

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



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

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

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

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

**To Smoke
or
Not to Smoke
is
Not the Question
if they are
MOOS' CIGARS.**

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

EMANCIPATION

The purpose of this book could not be better, as its object is to offer a simple solution to many of the pressing social problems of the day
—"The New Order." Chicago.

PRICE IN CLOTH, 75 CENTS.

J. B. Herboldshimer, Gibson, City Illinois.

LIVE AGENTS WANTED.

TIMELY BOOKS

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

- Japanese Notions 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 order. Old or New, address

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

AFTER THE BATTLE, resulting in another overwhelming triumph of plutocracy, you perhaps, realize more fully than before, the magnitude of the struggle for reform through political action.

That struggle must be continued—but, did you ever stop to think what immediate benefits might be secured in a local way, under the very laws by and through which the people are oppressed?

Subscribe for the **FAIRHOPE COURIER**, and learn what the "Single Tax Colony," at Fairhope, Alabama, has been and is doing.

Subscription, 50 cents. Sample copy for 2c. stamp.
137-21.