

The Public

DR. H. J. WOODHOUSE
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1900.

Number 131.

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.

As stump speakers, Hanna and Roosevelt make an elegant combination for an imperialistic campaign. Hanna with his full dinner pail issue, and Roosevelt merely as a spectacle, recall the "bread and circus" politics of imperial Rome.

Mr. Hanna's contract with that "twin relic of barbarism," the Mormon church, to throw the Mormon vote for McKinley, is a fit sequel to the presidential agreement with the proslavery and polygamous sultan of Sulu.

A significant banner was that which the great procession of striking miners carried while parading through Wilkesbarre on the 2d, and which read: "We want our dinner pails filled with substantial food, not coal barons' taffy."

To which political party in this campaign are the trusts contributing campaign funds? Would the trusts contribute to any political party without reasonable assurances of governmental protection in return? The answer to those two questions should determine the vote of every intelligent republican who has felt the deadly pressure of the trust.

It now transpires that Aguinaldo, instead of urging his people to fight until the American elections, in the hope of a Bryan victory, as the administration press has tried to make the public believe, assures them that either event will aid the Filipino cause. Should Bryan be elected, he says, the United States will recognize their independence; should McKin-

ley be reelected, he will become involved with the allies in a war in China, and for troops to use there must weaken the American army in the Philippines. Aguinaldo evidently expects independence in either case. Under McKinley, at the cost of more blood; under Bryan, by an honorable peace.

Judging from British dispatches, the much-talked-of "invasion" of Europe by American capital consists in the purchase of foreign monopolies by American syndicates. This kind of invasion will yet prove more disastrous to our foreign fellow men than an invasion by an army with banners.

We have occasionally expressed an opinion that the Bourbon democracy of the south, which is chiefly responsible for the undemocratic treatment of southern negroes, only awaits a favorable opportunity to go bag and baggage over to the McKinleyized republican party. There have been many signs of late, entirely apart from the logic of the situation, which strengthen this opinion. One of these is the announcement that ex-Senator M. C. Butler, of South Carolina, who led the white terror against the South Carolina blacks in the seventies, and whom Tillman afterward extinguished, has indicated his intention to become in name, as he already appears to be in fact, a McKinley republican. When "democrats" like Butler become republicans, it is high time for a good many "republicans," white and black, to become democrats.

An American court-martial in the Philippines has convicted two commissioned officers of torturing seven Filipino prisoners by hanging them by the neck for ten seconds. So we have one indisputable instance of tor-

ture. The crime is proved. Other instances are charged by newspaper correspondents; but we hear of no court-martials, though one peculiarly brutal species of torture, that of throwing prisoners upon their backs and pouring them full of water, is reported by the correspondents to be common. And when the penalty imposed in the one case of conviction of which the American public has been advised is considered, the torturing of Filipinos by American military officers would appear to be without danger of serious punishment. Though these two officers had been convicted of hanging seven of their prisoners by the neck for ten seconds, a torture that must have been agonizing, they were sentenced to be—reprimanded!

Advocates of postal savings banks may be put to their trumps by the condition of the postal savings bank system of England. While its report for 1898 showed a surplus of assets over liabilities of \$50,000,000, its report for 1899 shows an excess of liabilities over assets of \$2,500,000. From 1876 until 1895, the bank made an annual profit, over and above the expenses of operation and 2½ per cent. interest paid to depositors; but there has been a yearly loss since 1895, culminating in 1899 in what in a private institution would be confessed insolvency. Postal savings banks may be useful institutions, but the British experiment is not as good evidence of it as it used to be.

The British Tories have thrown shame aside and adopted some of the campaign dodges of American McKinleyites. They began the parliamentary campaign now in progress by calling the elections for a date three months in advance of the new registration of voters. The elections are

being held, accordingly, under an old registration, thereby disfranchising voters who have changed their residence since this registration was made. Most persons so disfranchised are presumed to be liberals, the liberal party being recruited chiefly from the poorer classes, who move oftener than the well-to-do. Had the tory minister postponed the elections until after the 1st of January, instead of calling them hurriedly in the fall, the liberal party would have been to that extent strengthened. As it is, the tories get this rather off-color advantage. Such a trick is so peculiarly Yankeeish that it is difficult to believe it was originated by our transatlantic cousins, even those of the tory strain. But another election trick of which the tories are guilty was unquestionably borrowed from this side. It consists in publishing for the first time, in the midst of the campaign, sensational war documents that have been stowed away in the pigeon holes of the war office for months. The tories get these public documents as public officials and ostensibly for public purposes; but as public officials they withhold them from the public until as political campaigners they can publish them to their supposed advantage for campaign purposes. That electioneering trick is borrowed from Mr. McKinley, who invented it for the present presidential campaign and has used it without shame though with indifferent effect.

No better effect in behalf of McKinleyism has been produced by the spectacular trip of Roosevelt as a rough riding spellbinder through the farther west, where it had been assumed that his swashbuckler characteristics had made him peculiarly popular. His trip appears to have been a painful failure. The hardy pioneers did not take him seriously, but looked upon him curiously as a tenderfoot giving an imitation. Then he was put at a disadvantage by orders from headquarters to lay aside his gold standard speeches. This was at the

request of the local leaders, who wired that his speeches on that subject would lose their states. So this strenuous representative of the party, whose principal candidate declares and whose manager insists that the money question is the "immediate" and burning issue, was forced to be silent on the money question in the very states which he had set out to conquer on that issue. So flat a failure did Roosevelt's rough and tumble tour in the west prove to be, that his party has made the most of a Rocky mountain mining town disturbance in which, to his professed delight, he figured vicariously as the object of the miners' wrath. The disturbance had been caused by Senator Wolcott, who is excessively unpopular in the mining districts of Colorado, but who ventured to take Roosevelt in tow. But Roosevelt, though undisturbed in his speech except by a rude question which he answered more rudely than it was asked, assumed the role of a visitor assaulted by a democratic mob and now tries to make political capital out of it.

This disturbance in Colorado calls for reflection upon the different ways in which the republican leaders and democratic leaders deal with disturbances of adversaries' meetings by their respective followers. What a mob may do is not so important as how the party leaders regard its action. It is that that gives responsible color to the event. Now, in 1896, Mr. Bryan's meetings were disturbed more than once. Republican rowdies mobbed him in Chicago, and plutocratic toughs broke up his meeting at Yale college. To these disgraceful acts the republican candidate and the republican leaders, big and little, gave their silent approval. Not one word of condemnation or protest or admonition did any of them utter to prevent repetitions of these outrages. But when the Colorado mob, last week, angered by the presence of Wolcott, had broken out riotously at Roosevelt's meeting, the democratic convention of the county where it happened passed resolutions

condemning "the spirit of intolerance exhibited on that occasion," and disavowing "all responsibility for the disturbance;" while Mr. Bryan himself promptly and publicly condemned the action of the mob. Parties and candidates being responsible for the lawlessness of any of their supporters only in so far as they acquiesce in it, Mr. Bryan is certainly in much better position regarding the Colorado demonstration against Roosevelt than was Mr. McKinley three years ago regarding similar riotous demonstrations against Bryan.

In his anti-trust speech at Nebraska City, Neb., Bryan characteristically and completely demolished the attempt of J. Sterling Morton to raise a local prejudice against him on the basis of legal proceedings instituted by the populist attorney general against the starch trust. A so-called nonpartisan meeting had been called to protest against these lawful proceedings on the ground that they would have the effect of closing the Argo Starch company at Nebraska City and throwing the local employes out of work. Mr. Bryan appeared upon the ground to reply to this demagogic protest. He showed from J. Sterling Morton's own paper, the *Conservative*, that in May, 1899, the Argo company was so prosperous, though a competitor of the National Starch trust, as to afford, in Mr. Morton's language, "irrefutable evidence of the fact that no combine or capital can crush out a well-managed private concern." Yet in September, 1899, the Argo company joined a competing trust, organized under the laws of New Jersey; and in August, 1900, the competing trust joined the original trust, thus destroying competition altogether. Consequently the populist attorney general began the proceedings in question, under a law of the state, to prevent the merging of the Argo company into the all-absorbing trust.

Upon the foregoing facts Mr. Bryan, with characteristic point and

frankness, said to the people of Nebraska City:

If the people of Nebraska City defend the starch trust they must be prepared to defend all the other trusts, for it is impossible for them to destroy a trust located elsewhere and defend a trust located in their own city. Are the people of Nebraska City willing to subject themselves and their countrymen to the extortion practiced by all the trusts in order to maintain one trust which has one factory in their city? As a matter of fact, the people of Nebraska City are more interested in the dissolution of the starch trust than the people of other parts of the state. When the Argo was an independent company it was controlled by the citizens of Nebraska City, and Nebraska City interests could be considered by its management. But if the National Starch company, with headquarters in New York, is allowed to absorb this industry, the control will be removed from Nebraska City to New York, and the wishes and interests of the people of Nebraska City will have little consideration. What is to prevent the Argo company from being closed down by the starch trust? When all the factories belong to one corporation, the closing down of one factory does not bring loss to the corporation, because the work can be carried on somewhere else; but the Argo company as an independent company could not close down without serious loss; therefore, the chances are greater in favor of the local factory being closed down under a trust than under independent management. The attorney general is seeking to enforce a statute of Nebraska. The law is a good law and ought to be enforced, and the people of Nebraska City ought to hold a mass meeting to commend him rather than condemn him.

It is quite in keeping with the spirit of McKinley republicanism that, while professing to be the party of law and order, it should thus condemn public officials for endeavoring to enforce the law against rich and powerful trust magnates, appealing for support to the selfishness of small local interests. And it is entirely in keeping with Bryan's character to meet that sort of thing boldly, upon the basis of general fair dealing, instead of bending his knee to popular clamor. He gave evidence of this quality when a candidate for congress from Nebraska. Asked while on the stump if he would vote for a tariff for the protection of the Nebraska

beet industry, he unhesitatingly replied: "If elected to congress I will not vote to take money out of your pockets to enrich others, nor will I vote to take money out of others' pockets to enrich you."

So badly off for converts is the McKinley party that its papers joyfully exploit the letter of William M. Ivins, of New York, as that of a democrat who intends to vote for McKinley. Having for years been a business confederate of the republican boss, Tom Platt, Mr. Ivins would not be likely to have enough democracy about his political conscience to interfere with his plans for personal emolument. With his associations and ambitions he is precisely the kind of democrat who would support McKinley in a campaign like this. He could not be expected to place confidence in Bryan, whom he describes as a "man without practical experience, either in business or in government." But that is to Bryan's credit. If his practical experience either in business or government were down to the Ivins standard, he would be the worst possible man for president. It is a favorable sign when titular democrats like Ivins and Carlisle and Stetson take refuge in McKinleyism. There is a millennial suggestion about it. It implies that the goats are beginning to separate themselves from the sheep.

At a labor meeting in New York, Oscar F. Williams, formerly American consul general at Manila, made a bitter attack upon Bryan in a speech in behalf of McKinley. There is no mistaking Mr. Williams's motives. He wants a full dinner pail for himself, and looks to McKinley to furnish it. This much he has written down himself. While consul at Manila, but on board an American man-of-war in the bay, he took time by the forelock, and in a letter to Mr. Day, then secretary of state, applied as early as August 5, 1898, for a lucrative job in our Asiatic crown colony. His letter may be found at

page 332 of the famous senate "document 62." We quote:

Presumably when Manila falls and the Philippine islands become by conquest a part of our national domain, my duties will end. In view of such probabilities I seek your appointive favor, and with pride recall to your mind the report of the then Commodore Dewey, made to Secretary Long and by him transmitted to you—this under date of April 18—says of me: "His assistance has been invaluable." This report was made before I ever saw the admiral, and made without my knowledge, and I know that my services to our navy, army, citizens and nation have since been much greater than before. Your commendations of my service have been most gratifying to me, and because of narrow resources I hope to have honorable and profitable station here or elsewhere in the United States public service. Could I be appointed general commissioner of customs of the Philippine islands, lighthouse inspector or general commissioner of agriculture, I should be honored and pleased.

Mr. Wililams's application for a job throws a more brilliant light upon the objects of McKinley "expansion" than do any of his campaign arguments for what he did not then hesitate to call "conquest." It also explains his attack upon Bryan. With McKinley reelected he would have hopes of one of those Philippine commissionerships or inspectorships, which Bryan's election would shatter.

While the McKinley organs are explaining that the shutting down of mills, the reductions of wages and the general tendency to depression in trade which it has been impossible to conceal during the past six or eight months, are due to fears of McKinley's defeat, they might enlighten a bewildered public by explaining how it happens that fears of McKinley's defeat produce the same effects in Europe. "The wave of industrial prosperity in Europe," says a cable dispatch, "has taken a turn and begun to recede; all signs at present point to a crisis in industrial and financial lines, which may occur before two years have passed." Is Bryan responsible for that? Would his election promote that tendency? Would McKinley's stop it? The plain truth is, as we have in these columns re-

peatedly said, that there has in reality been no wholesome recovery from the business depression that spread over the world in the early nineties, and for which our extraordinarily stupid or else phenomenally disingenuous republican friends have held President Cleveland accountable. There have been spurts of better times here and there and now and then; and during the past two years great monopoly interests have flourished. But neither in this country nor abroad has competitive business been profitable except as good crops in some places and famine in others have slightly stimulated it. And now the speculative wave is receding. That is all there was to the recent good times, and all there is to the coming hard times. The masses of the people everywhere, those who do not benefit by monopolies, are reaching a condition in which there are hard times all the time.

Judge Dunne, of Chicago, has made a decision in an injunction case, which, though open to criticism from the case-lawyer's point of view, is upon principle without a flaw. A manufacturing company had made a two-years' contract with a foreman who refused to continue in the company's service to the end of his contract and obtained employment elsewhere. An injunction having issued to restrain him from working for others while his contract with the company lasted, Judge Dunne dissolved it. In doing so he departed from a line of decisions, beginning with a well-known English case. In that case an actor under contract with one manager was prevented by injunction from playing for a rival manager. That decision conceded, however, that the employe could not be compelled by injunction to perform his contract. It held merely that he could be prevented from working outside of it. The distinction has a musty flavor, and Judge Dunne refused to recognize it in the case he has just decided. He argued that there is no difference in effect between "enjoining a man from working for others and compelling him to

work for one man in particular." On grounds of public policy, therefore, he dissolved the injunction. It is to be hoped that his example will be followed generally by the courts. Every lawyer would recognize the absurdity of issuing an injunction to prevent a merchant from buying goods of one man while under contract to buy of another, or to compel an employer to refuse to give work to one man while under contract to give it to another. In these cases the complaining party would be told to sue for damages for breach of contract. The principle is essentially the same in cases like that which Judge Dunne has just passed upon. Nor would any other practice ever have been adopted or followed but for a latent principle of English law which has always distinguished quite fundamentally between "master" and "servant."

Indictments have been found by the Cook county grand jury of Illinois against two subordinate employes of a Chicago packing company for stealing city water through "blind" pipes. None have been found against the real managers of the corporation. We have here an example of the unwisdom at least of granting charters of incorporation. They can be used as covers behind which the real culprits in cases like this can hide. Though crimes be committed by the corporation and to the profit of the stockholders, many or even all of whom may have a guilty knowledge, yet only underlings can be punished criminally. If these indicted employes of the packing house in question should be imprisoned, while the thrifty and cautious heads of the establishment escape, the time will be ripe to consider what good purpose, if any, charters of incorporation serve, which may offset the purpose they so effectively serve, of shielding moneyed criminals.

Mayor Taggart of Indianapolis deserves universal recognition for his courageous veto of an appropriation

by the city council of \$1,000 for the relief of the Galveston sufferers. His act is all the more courageous and commendable because the need for relief is so great and the temptation therefore so pressing. Doubtless Mayor Taggart will be taken severely to task for having thus done his plain duty; it is only fair, therefore, that he should be applauded by all who can see the difference between private philanthropy and public theft. It was not because he objected to giving relief that he vetoed the appropriation. On the contrary, he urged the people of Indianapolis as individuals to contribute. But he held, and held correctly, that the city council had no lawful right to make an appropriation and that he had no right to approve it. It is this distinction of Mayor Taggart's, so seldom made by public officials, yet so vital in its effects upon public morals, that commends his act to general approval. The principle should be clearly understood that legislative contributions of public funds for private purposes are none the less larcenous because the beneficiaries happen to need relief.

That prolific and irresponsible newspaper romancer, William E. Curtis, whose work on the Chicago Record, while it contributes to the interest of that newspaper detracts proportionately from its reputation for nonpartisanship and veracity, has tried his hand at statistically illustrating the prosperity of the striking coal miners in the anthracite district. He puts their average wages at \$600. Pitiably small as such an income would be, the average miner there might well look with envy upon any of their number who got so much. But Curtis's average was probably made upon the principle to which Tennyson alludes when he says that "a lie which is half the truth is ever the worst of lies." The strikers themselves put the average at \$240 a year; and George A. Schilling, formerly secretary of the Illinois labor bureau, writing to the Record to correct Mr.

Curtis's absurdly romantic figures, gives in detail the earnings in the better paid soft coal regions of Illinois. Mr. Schilling quotes from the coal report issued by the Illinois bureau of labor under the present republican administration, which shows that the average number of days worked in the fiscal year 1898-99 was 186, at an average wage of \$2.20, making a total annual average of \$409.20. Even this result was produced by the republican labor statisticians of Illinois by taking the average number of days the mines were in operation and not the average number worked by the men. Neither did it allow for powder, fuse, tool sharpening, and so on, which expenses the miners are required to bear. Allowance being made for these omissions, Mr. Schilling concludes that the soft coal miners of Illinois do not average more than their union reports—\$332 a year, or less than \$6.40 a week. Even this low average has been raised from \$240 or less, as Mr. Schilling declares, by the power of the Illinois miners' organization, which within the past three years has forced wages up from that point.

THOMAS G. SHEARMAN.

When Henry George first published his theories regarding property in land, the omniscient American press predicted that these theories would make no headway in public opinion because they would not attract influential support. Since they threatened the fortunes of the rich, it was supposed that none but the poor would turn toward them. Since they were at variance with accepted principles of private property, it was asserted that conservatives would scorn them. Since they challenged the right of private ownership of land, it was argued that only the landless would adopt them. But time has dealt as harshly with these predictions as with more worthy objections that Mr. George's theories encountered when he first put them forth. It has overwhelmed them with the logic of events.

The first wealthy American to defy the false prophets of the press

was Thomas G. Shearman, who died last week and in whose memory this tribute is written. It had been predicted that none but the poor would be disposed to embrace the George philosophy, but Thomas G. Shearman was a millionaire. It had been said that conservatives would turn away, but he was a conservative of conservatives. It had been surmised that only the landless would become converts, but he was a great landed proprietor whose fortune would have shrunk enormously under the application of George's remedy for poverty.

An explanation is due, however, both to Mr. Shearman and to the truth regarding his adoption of the theories of George. Through independent investigation and study of facts and their relations he had already reached many of the conclusions that Mr. George had arrived at from an application of fundamental principles; and his ultimate acceptance of George's philosophy in its completeness was the result of statistical tests of his own. George reasoned for the most part from broad principles, whereas Shearman reasoned inductively from masses of facts.

He was a statistician. But he was a statistician in the best sense. Some statisticians, while good collectors and reporters of figures, lack the logical faculty of drawing legitimate conclusions from the figures they collect. Others have such disorderly minds that they are not even good collectors. But Mr. Shearman's mind was acutely logical, and his statistical conclusions have never been successfully nor even plausibly assailed. It was his proved ability as a statistician that made his work so efficiently supplement that of George when it had finally led him to George's conclusions. He was pre-eminently the statistical leader of the George movement.

Thomas Gaskell Shearman died on the 29th at his home in Brooklyn, from the effects of a surgical operation.

He was a native of Great Britain, having been born in Birmingham, England, on the 25th of November, 1834, nearly 66 years ago. Coming in 1844 with his parents to the United

States he settled in 1857 in Brooklyn, where he was admitted to the bar in 1859.

During the late sixties and early seventies he was a partner of Dudley Field, son of the famous David Dudley Field, under the firm name of Field & Shearman, with David Dudley Field as senior partner or counsel. In this period the noted Erie railroad litigations in which Gould and Fisk figured were managed by his firm.

Upon dissolving his connection with the Fields, Mr. Shearman formed a partnership in 1874 with John W. Sterling, a junior associate in the Field firm, which lasted until his death. It was after this business connection had been formed that he gave his professional services as managing counsel to Henry Ward Beecher, his pastor and friend, throughout the vexatious Tilton-Beecher litigations.

In the midst of an extremely busy life as a practicing lawyer Mr. Shearman took the time to write two legal text books, one on practice and pleadings, in collaboration with a Mr. Tillinghast, and the other on negligence, in collaboration with Amasa A. Redfield. Both books were recognized authorities in their day. "Shearman and Redfield on Negligence" was at one time to be found in every fairly well equipped lawyer's library the country over.

Mr. Shearman's time, always occupied with work, seemed never to be exhausted. He exemplified in the most striking manner his own often-expressed theory that "if you want your work done and done well, get a busy man to do it." His faculty for filling in every hour of the day with work accounts, no doubt, for the great amount of good work he turned out as a statistical economist, while engaged actively in the laborious and multifarious employments of a leading member of a metropolitan bar. An admirer used to say of him that "when his work in his law office had tired him out, he would go home and rest himself poring over tables of statistics.

In economics Mr. Shearman was a free trader, which made him in his later years a democrat in politics,

though from early life he had been a republican. A member of Henry Ward Beecher's church, and naturally a democrat of the Jefferson type, he came into the republican party through the gateway of abolitionism. This association made him at first a protectionist, as it had done with David A. Wells, between whom and himself close intimacy existed, originating in their similarity of views on economic subjects, Mr. Wells being in his opinion more radical than he expressed himself or was generally understood to be; but, like Mr. Wells, he was led by personal observation and the study of statistics to abandon the protection superstition. Going further than Mr. Wells, however, he became an advocate, first of direct taxation as opposed to indirect; then of land value taxation, the single tax, as the only scientific system of direct taxation; and, finally, of the complete George theory of solving the social problem by restoring the land to the people by means of the single tax.

Notwithstanding this unreserved acceptance of George's doctrines—perhaps "confirmation" would be the better word—Mr. Shearman was known as a single tax man "limited" in contradistinction to George, the single tax leader "unlimited." The distinction was made by George himself at a public meeting in the eighties at Cooper Union. It was supposed to mean that whereas George would take for public use in taxation every penny of the annual value of land, his friend Shearman would take only as much as might from time to time be needed. There may have been point in the distinction originally, but it came to have but little significance. Shearman did not, indeed, favor the levying of taxes regardless of the needs of government. Neither, for that matter, did George. But he believed that when taxes were levied upon land values exclusively, all industry being exempt, every community would insist upon increasing taxation for the maintenance and extension of public improvements so long as a penny of land value remained in private hands untaxed. The difference, therefore, between him and George was only one of statement. While George would have increased land value taxation to the limit

for the purpose of making public improvements, Shearman would have made public improvements to the limit of land value taxation. Both contemplated the abolition of private profit in land monopoly.

Mr. Shearman's "Natural Taxation," published by Doubleday, McClure & Co., is his principal literary contribution to the economic subjects to which most of his leisure was devoted. He had no toleration for the atheistic notion of the university cult in economics that taxation must of necessity be haphazard—that there is, in other words, no science of taxation, no natural method. He believed that government is natural and that its sustenance is provided naturally. And this book on natural taxation was written to illustrate his views in that respect and by statistical methods to prove his position. Wholly apart from the theory it advocates it is without exception the best American text book yet published on the statistics of American taxation. Other books there are that contain more statistics, but as compared with Shearman's they fail utterly in a logical and common sense marshaling and massing of the statistics they contain. It is in this work that Shearman happily characterizes direct taxation as "straight taxation" and indirect as "crooked taxation," a characterization that is destined to live as long in fiscal history as that of the witty French economist who described indirect taxation as a method of "plucking geese so as to get the most feathers with the least squawking."

Since Mr. Shearman was a large landed proprietor, his consistency in advocating a method of destroying the profits of land owning has in some quarters been regarded as open to question. Exactly why this should make him inconsistent is not quite obvious. One might suppose that a rich man who advocates a public policy because he believes it to be right, though he knows it would destroy the framework of his fortune, could be regarded as eminently consistent, not to say also self-sacrificing. The essence of the criticism probably lies, however, in the fact that while Mr. Shearman was a land monopolist and

profited by it, he regarded land monopoly as wrong.

Those who make that criticism, wholly ignore the insuperable difficulties in the way of individual land monopolists, who, having come to realize the wrong involved in land monopoly would wash their hands of the sin. It cannot be done. The land monopolist who would cease to be one, may do so; but he cannot thereby abolish land monopoly. All he can do is to make others land monopolists in place of himself. Neither can he put an end to land monopoly by refraining from increasing his holdings. He may thereby limit his own powers as a land monopolist, but in so doing he will enhance the powers of other land monopolists. There is no individual escape from responsibility for land monopoly by individual renunciation of land titles. All that any man can do is to use his talents, his fortune and his influence to abolish the system. And this much Thomas G. Shearman did.

The ill-considered criticism not infrequently elicited from him his own response. It was something like this: "I am making money out of land monopoly. I am, therefore, making it at your expense. I will do all I can to help you put an end to the system. If you won't join me in that, it is you and not I who perpetuate it."

To the public objects in which he was interested Mr. Shearman was a systematic contributor; and in emergencies his contributions were equal to the need. He had the rare faculty, too, of being able to say No; he could refuse to contribute even modestly to enterprises which his judgment did not commend. And there was no exploiting of his gifts. It was almost literally true in his case that his left hand seldom knew what his right hand had done. Though his money was often in the contribution pool, his name seldom appeared upon the contribution list. Managing committees in movements he sympathized with came to understand the meaning of his quiet request to let him "know the deficit."

An exacting professional career had bred in him habits which in other relations were sometimes misconstrued; a native sensitiveness to the

pride of others put him as a rich man at a disadvantage when associating with the poorer men into whose society his economic convictions often brought him; while his firmness in refusing to support what he could not commend, tended to excite suspicions of his generosity. For these reasons Mr. Shearman was not infrequently misunderstood. But those who understood him knew him to be a man of generous impulses and democratic instincts.

He was one of the few rich men of our time who have linked their names with something better than wealth-getting, and whose memory will be green long after his riches have been dissipated.

AN EXHAUSTIVE REPORT.

Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks, of Cornell, has investigated the Sugar, Lead and Standard Oil trusts, and 38 other combinations, and has given as a result about 60,000 figures in a report of the Department of Arithmetical Labor.

He adopted a simple plan which he describes as "the statistical method." It consists in asking the various corporations whether they have advanced prices or not. It is gratifying to learn from their own secretaries that not one of them has done either.

Why did no one ever think of this "statistical method" before?

Great credit is due to the diligence and accuracy of Prof Jenks's clerks, as the figures given, if placed in line, would stretch to 191 yards.

The value of the report would have been greater if the figures had covered the full 200 yards, or if some attempt had been made to separate combinations like the Standard Oil and street railways, which depend upon natural monopolies, from printing, cigar and awning combines, which are open to the competition of any discharged mechanic. Tables of the "average" destructiveness of wolves, lambs and other mammals are interesting, to composers, but a little exhausting to the taxpayer's pockets.

But Prof. Jenks is a dear old man; you can't help loving him—if you have a monopoly.

BOLTON HALL.

New York.

NEWS

The great anthracite coal strike is still in progress, having begun its third week on the 1st stronger than ever. Less than 5 per cent. of all the miners in the anthracite region were then at work, and during the next two days more went out. Yet it had been widely published on the 27th that the strike had been settled, the employers having conceded their men's demands. This news proved, however, to be only a political canard originating with a campaign literary bureau in New York. Senator Hanna was credited by these reports with having personally, after frequent conferences with the great coal operators in Wall street, induced them to bring the strike to an immediate end. The only basis for this unique exploitation of Mr. Hanna as a "friend of labor" was the fact that on the 27th the anthracite coal operators, at a meeting held in New York, had decided to offer the workmen in their respective mines, as individuals, an advance in wages of 10 per cent. provided they would withdraw from the strike at once. The miners' union was to be ignored.

Having heard reports of this decision, President Mitchell, after a conference with the other executive officers of the general union, instructed each local president in the anthracite region to advise all miners in his district that—

no attention should be given to these reports and that they will be officially notified should any offer of settlement be made. Under no consideration whatever should work be resumed unless authorized by a convention representing all mine workers in the anthracite fields. It is vitally important that all miners stand firm and determined, and not be deceived by those whose interest it is to defeat the purpose for which the strike was inaugurated.

Mr. Mitchell's appeal to the strikers had full effect. The overtures of the operators were ignored by the men as completely as the miners' organization had been ignored by the operators. Pursuant to the operators' agreement the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron company announced on the 30th a 10 per cent. increase in wages, to begin on the 1st; but on the 1st only 7 of its 39 mines started, and they are small affairs and were working short-handed. Similar offers were made by the other

operators in the region, but no attention was paid to them. President Mitchell declared, however, that the officials of the general organization would not require a recognition of that body as a condition of ending the strike; but he insisted that the individual unions must be recognized. An immense mass meeting of strikers was held on the 2d at Wilkesbarre, at which from 25,000 to 30,000 were in attendance. In speaking to this gathering Mitchell promised in behalf of the general organization that the strike would not be called off until a convention of the anthracite miners, at which every colliery in the region should be represented, had so decided.

Some of the state troops, whose appearance upon the scene of the strike was chronicled last week, have been withdrawn. This movement followed a conference between Gen. Gobin, the sheriff and representatives of the mine operators, called at the solicitation of Gen. Gobin. The strikers were not consulted. At the conference the operators were undecided as to the advisability of withdrawing the troops and referred the question to the sheriff, who, unwilling to assume the responsibility of deciding, referred it to Gen. Gobin. Convinced, as he said, that the presence of troops was unnecessary, since there was absolutely no indication of violence on the part of the strikers, Gen. Gobin decided to send away one regiment on the 1st. The Twelfth regiment accordingly left Shenandoah on that day for home.

Other labor troubles are brewing. On the 1st the Logan iron and steel works at Burnham, Pa., reduced wages 25 per cent. and the 3,000 employes threatened to strike. As a measurable offset to this news, however, the steel trust had resumed operations under the new scale of wages. It shut down on the 1st of July (see page 201), throwing 100,000 men out of work, and assigning as a reason the necessity for repairs, readjustment of the wage scale and declining business. It was not until the 22d of September that the scale of wages was readjusted. The men to the number of 60,000 were then allowed to go to work at a reduction. This unsatisfactory resumption was followed by the closing down on the 29th of some of the mills of the Illinois Steel company's plant at Joliet, which threw 1,200 men out of work, the reason

given being lack of orders—the same that had been given (page 24) for the Joliet shut-down of last April.

In American politics one notable event of the week was the publication of the letter of acceptance of Adlai E. Stevenson as the people's party candidate for vice president. He acknowledges the generosity of Mr. Towne in withdrawing so as to secure unity of action between the populists and the democrats, and pays a tribute to the party for its subordination of partisanship to political principle. While indicating his sympathy with the populists on questions of finance, domestic administration and taxation, he discusses at large the overshadowing issue of imperialism.

The presidential campaign is now of course in full swing. Mr. Bryan is speaking to large crowds over the country, making long railroad jumps from point to point. Mr. McKinley is represented upon the stump principally by his associate on the ticket, Gov. Roosevelt, and his manager, Senator Hanna. Among the important men opposed to Bryan four years ago who have taken the stump for him this year are Carl Schurz, whose opening speech was made at Cooper Union, and Bourke Cockran, whose first address was delivered to the largest audience ever assembled at a political meeting in Chicago. David B. Hill, who was lukewarm in 1896, is making a Bryan campaign now. The Philadelphia Times, a republican daily which supported McKinley four years ago, came out for Bryan on the 1st. Of the minor parties, the social democrats have held a large meeting at Chicago, addressed by Prof. Herron and by their candidate, Mr. Debs; and Mr. Woolley, the presidential candidate of the prohibitionists, is touring the country with a coterie of speakers in a special railroad train. One of the important gatherings of the campaign was the convention of democratic clubs, which opened at Indianapolis on the 3d with 5,000 delegates present. Mayor Taggart, of Indianapolis, was elected temporary chairman, and the principal speakers of the first day were Adlai E. Stevenson, Mayor Jones of Toledo, James Hamilton Lewis of Washington state, Capt. O'Farrell of Washington city, and Sigmund Zeisler of Chicago. The convention is in session as we write.

On the 2d the democrats of Massa-

chusetts nominated Robert Treat Paine, Jr., for governor, and on the 3d the democrats of Georgia carried the state election against a fusion of republicans and populists by 45,000 majority. At the town elections held in Connecticut on the 1st, where the issues were purely local, the net republican loss was 6 towns.

Voting at the English parliamentary elections began, as announced last week (page 398), on the 1st. The elections continue until the 15th, voting taking place in some constituencies on one day and in others on another. As far as heard from the tories have made gains. But the liberals have done better than they were expected to, either by themselves or their adversaries. Winston Churchill—the "khaki" Roosevelt and pet of the tories—is elected, but with only 227 votes to spare. His associate is defeated by a liberal. Labouchere, whom the tories expected to defeat as a "traitor," has been reelected. The same is true of Burdette Coutts, who, though not a liberal, had made himself obnoxious to the jingo imperialists. Another "pro-Boer" against whom the tories made a dead-set was John Burns, the labor leader, who contested Battersea. He made his campaign a protest against the forcible annexation of the two South African republics, and though opposed by a rich tory brewer who was supported by the best tory campaigners, was reelected by a majority of 254, being 10 votes more than his majority of 1895. At this writing (October 4) the polling is complete for 287 out of the 670 seats to be filled. The results are as follows:

Ministerialists	212
Opposition	75

In the parliamentary campaign it has been assumed by all parties that the war in South Africa had virtually terminated with the overwhelming defeat of the Boers. That is doubtless the fact. Yet the Boers have not wholly ceased their activity. A dispatch of the 2d told of the capture by Boers of a convoy of Natal volunteers between De Jager's drift and Blood river which has caused the indefinite postponement of the intended discharge of the Natal volunteers. A few days prior to this event another force of Boers attacked a portion of Paget's force at Pienaars river station and was driven off only after three hours' fighting.

Relative to Kruger's departure from Lorenzo Marquez to Holland on board a Dutch war vessel tendered him by the Holland government (see page 377), Great Britain has notified the Dutch government that if he is allowed to carry bullion or Transvaal archives such permission will be regarded as a breach of neutrality by Holland.

Baden-Powell, the British general, has assumed command at Pretoria of what the dispatches call "the police in the Transvaal and Orange river colony," to consist of 12,000 men; and the appointment of Lord Roberts as commander in chief has been officially announced in London.

The American attempt in the Philippines to imitate the British colonial system has met with further sanguinary resistance, Capt. Shields with 51 men of company F, Twenty-ninth volunteer infantry, having been captured and some of the men killed. This disaster, the worst of the whole Philippine war, occurred on the 11th of September on the island of Marinduque, one of the small islands south of and near to Luzon, but was not reported until the 28th, when Gen. MacArthur cabled officially that there was "scarcely a doubt that the entire party was captured, with many killed and wounded, Shields among the latter." Orders were immediately given by MacArthur to send reinforcements and "commence operations immediately and move relentlessly until Shields and party were rescued."

Filipino activity continues throughout Luzon, in which it is now fully believed in army circles that the "friendlies" participate.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to October 3, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900. 83	
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900	409
Total deaths since July 1, 1898....	2,339
Wounded	2,284
Captured	10

Total casualties since July 1, 1898..	4,633
Total casualties reported last week	4,619
Total deaths reported last week..	2,335

In the Chinese complications there is no definite change. Great Britain is said to have replied to Germany after the manner of the reply of the United States (page 397), to the effect that while demanding the punishment of the Boxer leaders, she will not join in the demand that they be delivered up to the powers for punishment as a condition precedent to negotiations for peace. And the United States, pursuant to its policy as thus far outlined, cabled instructions to Minister Conger on the 29th to the following effect:

Prince Tuan [regarded as the leader of the revolt] must be removed from office, and some one acceptable to the allies be appointed in his place. Minister Conger has no general authority to act in connection with mediation. But he may accept any reasonable programme of a majority of the powers which stipulates for measures less severe than Germany demands. If the disagreement of the allies continues, Minister Conger is to proceed to negotiate with Li Hung Chang and Prince Ching solely with regard to American interests and future American action. He is to inform the powers plainly that the United States intends to guard Amoy and New Chwang with a large naval force, solely in the interest of trade rights, and that aside from the legation guard in Peking no American troops will be permitted to remain in China.

Whether as a result of these instructions or not, it appears to be the fact that Prince Tuan has been degraded and ordered to be tried by the supreme judicial tribunal of China.

The Russian troops and the Russian legation have been withdrawn from Peking to Tientsin. This is in accordance with Russia's proposal to the powers noted on page 360.

Germany has reiterated her demand for the punishment of the Boxer leaders, doing so, however, in an imperial letter which inferentially recedes from her demand (page 378) that those leaders be delivered up to the powers as a condition precedent to peace negotiations. The Chinese emperor having addressed a message to the German emperor regarding the murder of the German minister at Peking—Baron von Ketteler—pleading the inability of the Chinese officials to prevent the murder, and stating that by decree a sacrifice had been ordered by him to "be made on an altar for the deceased" and that the chief secretary had "been instructed to pour libations on the al-

tar," the German emperor replied on the 30th, saying:

I have observed with satisfaction that your majesty is anxious to expiate according to the custom and precept of your religion the shameful murder of my minister, which set at naught all civilization, yet, as the German emperor and a Christian, I cannot regard that abominable crime as atoned for by a libation. Besides my murdered minister, there have gone before the throne of God a large number of our brethren of Christian faith, bishops and missionaries, women and children, who, for the sake of their faith, which is also mine, have died the violent death of martyrs and are accusers of your majesty. Do the libations commanded by your majesty suffice for all these innocent ones?

I do not make your majesty personally responsible for the outrages against the legations, which are held inviolable among all nations, nor for the grievous wrongs done so many nations and faiths and to the subjects of your majesty of my Christian belief. But the advisers of your majesty's throne and the officials on whose heads rest the blood guilt of a crime which fills all Christian nations with horror must expiate their abominable deed. When your majesty brings them to the punishment they have deserved that I will regard as an expiation which will satisfy the nations of Christendom. If your majesty will use your imperial power for this purpose, accepting to that end the support of all the injured nations, I, for my part, declare myself agreed on that point. I should also gladly welcome the return of your majesty to Peking. For this my general, Field Marshal von Walderssee, will be instructed not only to receive your majesty with the honors due your rank, but he will also afford your majesty the military protection you may desire and which you may need against the rebels. I also long for peace which atones for the guilt, which makes good wrongs done and which offers to all foreigners in China security for life and property, and, above all, for the free service of their religion.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Fiji islands are taking steps to federate with New Zealand.

—Railway mail clerks of the United States opened the sessions of their twenty-fifth annual convention in Detroit on the 2d with a large attendance.

—President Charles K. Adams, of the University of Wisconsin, has retired from his official duties for an indefinite period owing to continued ill health.

—Count Yamagata, premier of Japan, resigned with the rest of his cabinet on the 29th. Marquis Ito, of

Japan-Chinese war fame, has been asked by the mikado to form a new cabinet.

The American Bankers' association opened the sessions of its twenty-ninth annual convention at Richmond, Va., on the 2d. More than 700 members of the association were in attendance.

—A company recently incorporated at Grand Rapids, Mich., with H. S. Boyle, of that city, as its organizer, undertakes to insure nations against war. The scheme is based upon a popular stock membership at \$1 a share.

—The Michigan supreme court on the 2d held the beet sugar bounty law of 1897, which called for a bounty of one cent a pound on beet sugar produced in the state, to be unconstitutional, as an appropriation of public money to private uses.

—The Henry George Bryan and Stevenson Campaign club, of Chicago, is holding public meetings at 83 Randolph street, ground floor, every day at noon and at eight o'clock in the evening. It provides a variety of speakers and the attendance is large.

—The British flag was formally raised over the Porcupine, Alaska, mining district on September 17 by Justice Archer Martin, of the British commission, in compliance with the terms of the recent *modus vivendi* between Great Britain and the United States.

—The Kentucky legislature on the 27th passed an election law by a vote of 58 to 40. The bill, which provides for equal party representation on the election boards and in election officers, is a substitute for the unfair Goebel law, described in number 97 of *The Public*, on page 5, which provided for a partisan election board.

—A meeting held in the Central Music hall, Chicago, on the 27th to protest against the extortion of the gas companies of that city adopted resolutions favoring municipal ownership, authorizing the attorney general to bring suit attacking the constitutionality of the present gas consolidation act, and empowering the chairman to appoint a committee of 100 to take up the question of municipal ownership after the November election.

—Walter Vrooman, the founder of Ruskin hall, the labor college at Oxford, England, has finally succeeded in raising the necessary funds to revive the old Avalon college, of Trenton, Mo., as a labor college under the name of Ruskin college, which will work along the lines of its English prototype. Prof. George McK. Miller, late of Avon college, and formerly a lawyer in Chicago, is president of Ruskin college, and Prof. Thomas E. Will, late of the Kansas Agricultural college, is vice president.

MISCELLANY

GIVING WORK.

For The Public.

Was't you who said that giving work
Was such a thing to do?
Say, look-a-here, you funny man,
I want a word with you.

Now, what is there in work itself
That makes it such a treat?
It isn't work we're looking for,
But things to wear and eat!

Man tries to get at what he needs
With just the least of toll,
So what's the use of making work
And locking up the soil?

Old Mother Earth holds all we want,
Just let us get at her!
Just let the word go out she's free,
And see the people stir!

Holy Moses! what a rush!
See them leave the slums!
Kids a-skipping on before,
Then the drunken bums.

Hear the wages climbing up!
Hear the rents come down!
Hear the builders building homes
All around the town!

So you think it's work we want?
And I say it's land.
Even money has no pull
When we've room to stand.

Perhaps you meant it just for fun,
You funny, funny man!
That talk of giving others work
Is such a funny plan!

W. D. McCRACKAN.

RESULTS OF THE TEXAS STORM.

Extract from a private letter from Houston, Tex.

We escaped without loss of life in Houston, though there were several narrow escapes. I suffered no damage beyond fences laid low and shade trees badly demolished. However, I do not care to pass another such four hours (from ten till two was the hardest blow with us). Houston would have had a lot to say about her loss of property had not everything been overwhelmed by the thousand times worse calamity at Galveston. So universal is the woe that I have not seen a tear shed. Men have related as calmly the loss of wife and children as I would mention the blowing down of my fences. The personal sorrow is lost in the universal sorrow, and to weep for your own would seem selfish.

The survivors, and particularly those who worked for days helping the living and burying the dead, when they did get away from there were hardly rational—some have lost their minds, at least temporarily.

No man can make a Fourth of July speech to-day and leave any doubt as to which party he belongs to.—Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan.

WHICH PRESTIGE WILL YOU CHOOSE?

It is said that if we voluntarily give up the subjugation of the Philippines we shall lose our prestige in the world.

Ah, yes! We shall indeed lose our prestige with the land robbers; our prestige with the oppressors of weak peoples; our prestige with the swash-bucklers who are constantly spoiling for a fight; our prestige with the scoffers at democratic institutions; our prestige with the devotees of despotic rule. Yes, with them our prestige will be irretrievably gone.

We shall even be in danger of being regarded the world over as an honest people; as a just, generous, noble and liberty-loving people; as a people of such moral greatness that, in spite of the intoxicating seductiveness of victory, it may be counted on always to listen to its conscience and to overcome all false pride in repairing wrong done and in vindicating its high principles; a people so truthful that its word can always be believed; a people so upright that the powers of the world will feel instinctively inclined to trust it as the safest general arbiter in the peaceful adjustment of their differences.

Here are the two kinds of prestige, one of which we may lose, and the other of which we may win.

Americans, proud of your country, which will be your choice?—Hon. Carl Schurz, in New York, September 28.

TWO PHASES OF "PROSPERITY."

For The Public.

"When you were a slave, Uncle Remus, did the Master share his 'Prosperity' with you?"

"Sure, Boss, I always had a 'full dinner pail.' Master bought me all the clothes I needed and gave me house-rent and fire-wood free. When Master wanted a well dug he let me dig six feet, and they hired a white man to dig the rest, for it wouldn't do to risk my life underground. When any of my family was sick the doctor came without cost to me. Master never laid me off, for want of something to do, until I was too old to work. Then he'd give me and the old woman board and clothes, until the undertaker came around, when his bill was paid, too."

"What share do you get, Pat, when the 'Company' is 'prosperous,' especially when the 'prosperity' is 'unparalleled?'"

"Well, your honor, I've got the 'full dinner pail' with the help of the children at the 'breaker.' I can get clothes at the 'Company store' at good stiff

prosperity prices. I pay rent to the Company for the shanty I live in. Coal at the market rate, I can also get. My work is all underground, blasting rocks with powder, which I buy from the Company at more than twice the price I'd pay at the powder mill. I am paid by the ton. When 4,000 pounds tips the Company's scale, they call it a ton. Whether I'm sick or well the Company's doctor has to be paid out of my wages. I am 'laid off' half the year without work or wages, so that an 'understanding among gentlemen' can put up the price of coal to the consumer. When I am too old to work, there's the almshouse over the hill, and 'the boys' are always good enough to take up a collection to have me put under the sod."

H. V. H.

"BE ASSURED, MY GOOD MAN."

From "The Two Paths," by John Ruskin. Page 231 in edition of 1859, published by Smith, Elder & Co., London.

Nothing appears to me at once more ludicrous and more melancholy than the way the people of the present age usually talk about the morals of laborers. You hardly ever address a laboring man upon his prospects in life, without quietly assuming that he is to possess, at starting, as a small moral capital to begin with, the virtue of Socrates, the philosophy of Plato, and the heroism of Epaminondas. "Be assured, my good man," you say to him, "that if you work steadily for ten hours a day all your life long, and if you drink nothing but water, or the very mildest beer, and live on very plain food, and never lose your temper, and go to church every Sunday, and always remain content in the position in which Providence has placed you, and never grumble, nor swear; and always keep your clothes decent, and rise early, and use every opportunity of improving yourself, you will get on very well, and never come to the parish."

All this is exceedingly true; but before giving the advice so confidently, it would be well if we sometimes tried it practically ourselves, and spent a year or so at some hard manual labor, not of an entertaining kind—plowing or digging, for instance, with a very moderate allowance of beer; nothing but bread and cheese for dinner; no papers nor magazines in the morning; no sofas nor magazines at night; one small room for parlor and kitchen; and a large family of children always in the middle of the floor. If we think we could, under these circumstances, enact Socrates or Epaminondas entirely to our own satisfaction, we shall be

somewhat justified in requiring the same behavior from our poorer neighbors; but if not, we should surely consider a little whether among the various forms of the oppression of the poor, we may not rank as one of the first and likeliest—the oppression of expecting too much from them.

THE COAL STRIKE A PHASE OF THE LAND QUESTION.

A circular now being distributed in New York.

The coal strike is but another phase of the land question. If it were possible for all coal miners to take up as much of the idle coal lands as they could work, it would be impossible for the rapacious mining companies to get them to work for the miserable pittance against which they are now striking. And why should they not be allowed to take up the unused coal lands? Is there any good moral reason why any man should not have at least as much right to stake out a claim on unused coal lands as he now has on a newly discovered goldfield? No! But in answer to this question we are told that somebody owns the coal lands, and has a sign up: "No Trespassing." Somebody has bought the land from someone that bought it before, and the title to it can be tracked back to a grant from a foreign king, or to a grab from an Indian tribe. By the common consent of mankind, based upon the sanction of a system that has long since outgrown its usefulness, this kind of a title to land is respected and defended by the people.

In these days of tremendous mechanical energy, the values that attach to land in cities or mining districts rapidly overtake the amount of taxes that the community exacts from the owners. Consequently there is an incentive for man to accumulate much more land than he can use with a view of selling out later at a profit. This is why more than ten times the area of coal lands is owned than is operated.

In thus keeping the miners off the unused lands, the owners are driving them into the clutches of the oppressive companies who are now standing behind the military power of the state and saying that they have "nothing to arbitrate." And why should they arbitrate? They have the legal and moral right to go into the labor market and hire workmen at the lowest rates, just the same as they buy their machinery and supplies at the lowest prices.

As long as the people will allow their lands to be held without exacting a fair rental from the holders, they can expect no other conditions than have

been prevailing for many years in the coal fields.

Let the people apply the remedy by levying a tax on land values (irrespective of improvements) and the companies would soon be bidding against each other to get miners to work for them at wages that would be at least as high as what they could earn by forming their own companies and working the idle lands. In other words, let the people enact a law known as the "Single Tax," that would say to the owners: "Yes, you may keep all the land you wish—use it or not—but you must pay into the common treasury that sum per year which would be offered by anybody that wanted to work that land." It would then at once become a question as to whether the companies should work all their lands or give them up to cooperative companies formed of miners out of work. In either case strikes would cease, wages would be high and price of coal would be low.

A PROPHECY AS TO THE FUTURE OF AMERICA.

In the midst of so many college and university addresses at the present time, it is well to read and deeply consider an address that was delivered at the formal opening of the Johns Hopkins university at Baltimore September 12, 1876, by Prof. Thomas H. Huxley, on his first visit to this country. The following are the concluding chapters of it:

I constantly hear Americans speak of the charm which our old mother country has for them, of the delight with which they wander through the streets of ancient towns, or climb the battlements of mediæval strongholds, the names of which are indissolubly associated with the great epochs of that noble literature which is our common inheritance; or with the blood-stained steps of that secular progress, by which the descendants of the savage Britons and of the wild pirates of the North sea have become converted into warriors of order and champions of peaceful freedom, exhausting what still remains of the old Berserker spirit in subduing nature, and turning the wilderness into a garden. But anticipation has no less charm than retrospect, and to an Englishman landing upon our shores for the first time, traveling for hundreds of miles through strings of great and well-ordered cities, seeing your enormous actual and almost infinite potential wealth in all commodities and in the energy and ability which turn wealth to account, there is something sublime in the vista of the future. Do not suppose that I am pandering to what is commonly understood by national pride. I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness, or your natural resources, as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs a true sublimity, and the terror of overhanging fate is what you are going to do with all these things.

What is to be the end to which these are to be the means? You are making a novel experiment in politics on the greatest scale which the world has yet seen. Forty millions at your first centenary, it is reasonably to be expected that, at the second, these states will be occupied by two hundred millions of English-speaking people, spread over an area as large as that of Europe, and with climates and interests as diverse as those of Spain and Scandinavia, England and Russia.

You and your descendants have to ascertain whether this great mass will hold together under the forms of a republic, and the despotic reality of universal suffrage; whether state rights will hold out against centralization, without separation; whether centralization will get the better, without actual or disguised monarchy; whether shifting corruption is better than a permanent bureaucracy; and as population thickens in your great cities, and the pressure of want is felt, the gaunt specter of pauperism will stalk among you, and communism and socialism will claim to be heard. Truly America has a great future before her. Great in toil, in care, and in responsibility; great in true glory if she be guided in wisdom, and righteousness; great in shame if she fail. I cannot understand why other nations should envy you, or be blind to the fact that it is for the highest interests of mankind that you should succeed; but the only one condition of success, your sole safeguard, is the moral worth and intellectual clearness of the individual citizen. Education cannot give these, but it may cherish them and bring them to the front in whatever station of society they are to be found; and the universities ought to be, and may be, the fortresses of the higher life of the nation.

May the university which commences its practical activity to-morrow, abundantly fulfil its high purpose; may its renown as a seat of true learning, a center of free inquiry, a focus of intellectual light, increase year by year, until men wander hither from all parts of the earth, as of old they sought Bologna or Paris or Oxford, and it is pleasant to me to fancy that, among the English students who may be drawn to you at that time, there may linger a dim tradition that a countryman of theirs was permitted to address you as he has done to-day, and to feel as if your hopes were his hopes and your success his joy.—Science and Education Essays, pages 259, 260 and 261.

—Correspondence of Brookline (Mass.) Chronicle.

GIVE JUSTICE RATHER THAN CHARITY.

Less charity would be needed in this world if more justice was dispensed. Fairness, impartiality, absolute honesty in dealing with one's fellows, these are more to be desired than benevolence.

If the employer would pay fair wages there would be no demand for free hospitals and free soup kitchens.

If we sent less rum to dark-skinned savages we need send fewer missionaries.

If we paid wage-earning women a fair recompense for their work we need not have work girls' lunch-

rooms, social settlement classes, nor free fresh air homes.

If we provided a good home for every foundling we need not give the waifs a Thanksgiving dinner.

If we had an equal standard of chastity for men and women we would not need to spend money on refuges for deserted, erring women.

If England had not taxed India to the starving point the whole Christian world would not now need to send their gold to purchase the food in English storehouses to feed the perishing millions.

If women had the ballot they could afford to pick up their own pocket handkerchiefs.

Give justice rather than charity.—Catharine Waugh McCullough, in Chicago Tribune.

THE MENACE OF PLUTOCRACY.

An extract from an address delivered by the late Thomas G. Shearman at Portland, Ore., June 17, 1889. This address, just as it was taken down by the stenographer at the time, was reproduced in the September (1900) number of "Why?", an excellent little periodical published by Frank Vierth at Cedar Rapids, Ia. As the editor of "Why?" says: "The lapse of nearly 12 years gives the speech added interest and significance."

Some cause has been at work during the last 25 or 30 years, which has resulted in a tremendous widening of the social chasm between the rich and poor. Some cause has, within the recollection probably of the majority of those who are present, entirely transformed the face of American society. Our old equality is gone. So far from being the most equal people on the face of the earth, as we once boasted that we were, ours is the most unequal of civilized nations. You talk about wealth of the British aristocracy, and about the poverty of the British poor. There is not in the whole of Great Britain and Ireland so striking a contrast, so wide a chasm between the rich and the poor, as there is in these United States of America. There is no man in the whole of Great Britain and Ireland who is as wealthy as one of some half a dozen gentlemen who could be named in this country; and there are few there who are poorer than some who could be found in this country. It is true, I think, even yet, that there is a larger number of the extremely poor in Great Britain and Ireland than there is in this country. How long that will remain true it is difficult to say; but it is unquestionably not true that there is any greater mass of riches concentrated in a few hands in any country than in this.

Whereas, 40 years ago a man worth

\$100,000 was, even in our great city of New York, an object of remark and envy, such a man is now utterly obscure and unnoticed, and is considered to have laid merely the beginnings of a very moderate part of the capital which would be necessary for him to make a living.

Whereas, 40 years ago, there was but one man in the United States who was supposed to be worth more than \$5,000,000, there are several Astors now, each of whom is generally reputed to be worth at least \$50,000,000. There are probably ten times as many men to-day who are worth \$20,000,000 as there were 40 years ago who were worth \$1,000,000; and there are now several men who are worth over \$100,000,000 each.

This state of things is developing more and more rapidly. In every corner are men and women buried in obscurity, until we learn by some accident that they are worth their \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000. A single member of a banking firm in the city of Philadelphia lately died, leaving more than \$21,000,000. There are at least four surviving partners in that firm having equal shares with the deceased. Two Philadelphians, of no public fame, recently died, having \$22,000,000 each. One lady in my own city of Brooklyn is worth certainly not less than \$30,000,000. We see evidences of this enormous accumulation on every side. And it can be demonstrated with great ease by statistics which are undisputed, that at the present day less than 100,000 persons, constituting as a matter of fact only about one two-hundredth part of our working force, are possessed of incomes which enable them to save about three-fifths of all the wealth that is annually saved in this country. And as wealth is substantially all reproduced within less than 30 years, this means that within 30 years 100,000 persons are destined to own three-fifths of the entire wealth of the United States; land, houses, improvements, goods, chattels, personal property of every kind.

Everybody knows that this state of things is undesirable. This enormous amount of wealth concentrated in a few hands brings to them no particular pleasure, no additional comforts, certainly does not bring to them anything like proportionate happiness.

Those of you who are in tolerably good circumstances, who can see your way to earn your living comfortably and peaceably through life without special anxiety, may well thank God that you are not so rich as these rich men. For, with a somewhat extended

experience among them, I have yet to find the first man who was one particle happier—I make no reference to his being better, but who was one particle happier—for being in possession of more than or even as much as \$1,000,000.

But what is the result of this state of things upon the community at large? You all know that there is widespread discontent among the poor who are deprived of the pleasures which they see the rich enjoy. You all know that, while it is easy to cast reproaches upon those who call attention to these facts, by accusing them of exciting popular discontent, the public discontent is already excited—is already universal. You have seen for 15 years at least a continual seething tide of discontent rise and dash itself against the barriers on every side; sometimes shown by the granger movements; sometimes by the farmers, by the miners, by the manufacturing workmen, by the laboring classes generally. In one form or another this surging roar of discontent is continually heard. I am no such alarmist as are many gentlemen whom I have heard, distinguished in public affairs, whose names I would not venture to use. I have heard in every quarter, and from wealthy men, from men who do not believe in popular government, the gravest expression of alarm, and the gravest fears for the future, expressed in every direction. In all parts of the country rich men are putting their heads together and whispering: "What are we to do about popular suffrage? What will become of our property if we allow universal suffrage to go on? Can this government last under such an arrangement?" And they whisper to each other: "It cannot."

Now I have a different opinion; and still, my opinion is not very much more favorable upon the whole to the future, than theirs. I do not believe they will ever abolish popular suffrage; but this I do predict, without fear that the future will falsify it, that if this state of things continues unchanged for 30 years, or at the most, 50 years more, while you will retain the form and shell of popular government, you will in reality be subject to an absolute plutocracy. There will be possibly 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 votes cast; and so long as a plutocracy can manage that of the 25,000,000 votes cast, 12,600,000 shall be cast on their side, they will count the remaining 12,400,000; but the moment there is a change, and the men who control, as they will control at that time, from two-thirds to

three-fourths of all the wealth of the country, find that 12,600,000 are going to vote against them, the last 200,000 somehow or other, will not be counted. You have seen this before your eyes. You make a great ado about that condition in the south, and are devising measures to cure it; and it is proposed to put an act through congress which will put your elections, as well as the elections of South Carolina, under the rule of a dominant central officer. I do not discuss the question upon its merits at all; I only say that, you see this difficulty right there, and you see how the men of wealth, the owners of property, have solved it there. They have solved it by putting the majority under their feet; they have done it openly, and you could not prevent them. You had the whole force of the army and navy on the side of the poor and propertyless; but you could not keep them on top; and you cannot do it. If you intend to maintain the republic you have got to keep the majority of the wealth of the country in the hands of the majority of its people. Now, as things are going on, you are not going to do that, and all admit this. Republicans, democrats, greenbackers, anti-monopolists and monopolists, railroad men and anti-railroad men, capitalists and anti-capitalists, all agree upon this. The fact is indisputable that this country is progressing at a more rapid rate toward the centralization of wealth than any other country under the face of the sun.

HOW WE RUN THE SCHOOLS IN OUR COLONY OF PUERTO RICO.

Extracts from an article on the "Ruin of Puerto Rico," by G. Clinton Hanna, published in the Chicago Chronicle of September 23.

When the American army invaded Puerto Rico the people were unprepared for resistance; its coming was not expected; the sentinel was not on duty; the keeper of the powder magazine was not at his post, and when he was summoned it was found that the key to the magazine was lost. So the stars and stripes floated over Morro castle and San Cristobal practically without resistance. In fact, the whole island passed peacefully into the hands of the United States army with but little opposition.

The people almost universally welcomed the army, saluted the flag and rejoiced at the prospect of becoming citizens of the great republic of the United States. They believed in the American people and when Gens. Brooke and Miles promised Puerto Rico territorial government and citi-

zenship under the constitution, with all the blessings that go with our constitution and flag, the people of Puerto Rico believed and were happy.

To-day the people of Puerto Rico, excepting the few that hold office, would be just as glad to see the American flag come down. To them it is a symbol of broken promises and unkept pledges. They have lost faith in the government of the United States and confidence in her people. Eighteen months of military government and six months of so-called civil government, full of blunders and frauds, have reduced the island and her people to despair.

Under Spanish autonomy Puerto Rico had a representation of three senators and 16 representatives in Spain's legislative body; under the Foraker bill No. 2 she has one silent delegate to congress.

In all her domestic legislation the Spanish autonomy gave to Puerto Rico very liberal powers, while the Foraker bill No. 2 restricts all legislation of the assembly by an executive council, the majority of whom are Americans who are in no way in sympathy with Puerto Rico and her people, and further by several veto powers reaching from the governor to congress and the president of the United States. In legislative power Puerto Rico has lost much of her freedom by an exchange of governments. This loss of confidence in the United States government and its officials has been greatly increased by irregularities in almost every department of insular government.

The most evident irregularity has been in the conduct of the public schools. On February 9, 1899, the public school department of the military government of Puerto Rico was established by the appointment of Gen. Eaton as director general of public instruction. Gen. Eaton immediately proclaimed his educational scheme—a scheme so vast, so ideal, so visionary that even Massachusetts, with her century of public school development, is not yet ready to adopt it—a scheme requiring such an outlay of money that Chicago, with all her wealth, could not adopt it with the consent of the taxpayers. Gen. Eaton's plan involved a complete chain of free kindergartens, free primary, grammar and high schools, free Sloyd departments in all schools, free schools of stenography, typewriting and pharmacy. Why he did not include law, medicine and theology is not known.

As less than one-fourth of the people of Puerto Rico can either read or write, and as all speak the Spanish language, Gen. Eaton must have been preparing for the education of the people of the twenty-fifth century. After ordering 10,000 English reading books for distribution among the Spanish pupils in schools that did not yet exist, Gen. Eaton retired from Puerto Rico.

What those Spanish-speaking children were to do with these 10,000 English readers has never been told, nor is it known what ever was done with them.

Gen. Eaton's successor was a Victor S. Clark, commonly known as Dr. Clark. Nearly all teachers in Puerto Rico assume the title of "doctor" as soon as they land on the island. Mr. Clark, called by the natives "the calamity of Puerto Rico," began his reign by ordering more English textbooks—a safe estimate placing the value at about \$60,000. The strange spectacle now presented itself of a superintendent of public instruction buying and selling books, school supplies, furniture and apparatus. Books and supplies were sold to individuals, private schools and municipalities. Mr. Clark bought his books by wholesale and sold them at retail—also acting as agent for an American school furniture and supply company.

The school buildings owned by the Spanish government were transferred to the United States government and all the schools that had existed were closed and the buildings used for other purposes. This left the island without a schoolhouse, and to-day there is not a public schoolhouse in all Puerto Rico, republican orators to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Instituto with its fine coordinate branches, a splendid preparatory school for boys, which had for many years prepared the young men for the universities of Europe and the United States, was closed, as was also the Madres, a similar institution for girls. The curriculum of the institute and its branches embraced higher mathematics, literature, rhetoric, the sciences, Latin, Greek, German, French and English. It was splendidly equipped with modern apparatus and appliances for the higher teaching. Nothing has as yet been substituted for this school.

In September, 1899, Mr. Clark opened what he called the model training school for English pupils only, in the post office building. This school was transferred to the new model and

training school just outside the city in January. From the day of its opening in September until its close in June, this model training school was the jest of the people of Puerto Rico and a disgrace to the United States government. Knowing that a model training school is an adjunct to a normal school, its title was a misnomer, as there has not been a normal school in Puerto Rico during the American occupancy. It claimed to be for only English-speaking children, and yet many of the pupils could not say "good morning." Its curriculum embraced everything from the kindergarten to the college. Its faculty was a grand international collection from all parts of the world except the United States. Its principal was from India, but he was dismissed in a few months on a charge of having deserted his wife and children in England and being about to marry a young lady of San Juan.

Some teachers were from Mexico, one from Finland, one a Frenchman, another a Spaniard, and not until late in the year was a real live professional American teacher employed.

The United States model training school building was planned by the chief architect of the bureau of public works, was built at a cost to Puerto Rico of \$13,600, and, as it was modeled directly after a Kentucky tobacco barn and was not so substantially built, being a mere frame structure of Georgia pine, it probably should have cost about \$4,000. Mr. Clark and the chief architect shared the glory and responsibility of its construction. School opened in January in this new structure, of which a writer in the *Engineer's Magazine* of April, 1900, said prophetically, "Its only redeeming feature is it is not fireproof," and closed June 22. During this time, from January to June, principals were changed five times, the last one being a local preacher of a Protestant church from Chili.

Early in January the insular board of education removed its offices to this new school building, and, unfortunately, removed all its papers, documents, books, accounts, including valuable papers over 100 years old, from the fireproof buildings of the city to this new fire trap. In February Dr. Saldana, a member of the insular board of education, demanded an account of receipts and disbursements from the treasurer. Failing to receive this statement, he sent a letter to the governor general, preferring charges against Mr. Clark. The governor general claimed that there

was no ground for any of the seven charges. Dr. Saldana then offered proofs, and the governor general ordered an investigation. This investigation lasted three days. Mr. Clark was convicted and the governor general dismissed him on Friday of the same week, and appointed Dr. Groff as president of the insular board of education on Saturday. On the next Tuesday after his dismissal Mr. Clark was appointed assistant superintendent of public instruction at the same salary he had been receiving as director general, an office created solely for the purpose of giving a job to the man who had just been dismissed. Dr. Groff, who had been secretary of the board of health, retaining his old office, was now happy in the possession of two fat places, drawing two fat salaries. And this was done as proclaimed by the governor general for economy's sake. Puerto Rico, poverty stricken as she was, and is, does not want economy in governmental affairs in that way.

In less than two months Mr. Clark was again investigated and again dismissed. This second investigation also dismissed the treasurer and disbursing officer for cause. A liberal coat of whitewash, it is alleged, has kept the true history of that investigation from being known, and it is also talked of in Puerto Rico that the Cuban scandals warned the Puerto Rican officials to keep Puerto Rican like affairs suppressed. It was a presidential year.

In June the civil government ordered a third investigation of the public school affairs. A committee of investigation was appointed, and was ordered to begin work the first Monday in July. On the Saturday night preceding the commencement of this third investigation San Juan was startled at midnight by the unusual cry of "Fire." The model training school, with all its documents, papers, accounts, treasurer's books and the history of the insular board of education, was burned to the ground.

Dead men and ashes tell no tales. The investigation was over forever. Who burned that schoolhouse? A committee appointed to investigate the fire has never made its report public. House, furniture, books, supplies and apparatus burned entailed a loss of \$25,000, with an insurance of only \$10,000.

In October, 1899, the municipality of Fajardo offered to give \$20,000 if the government would give a like sum for a normal school to be located at Fajardo. The government accepted

the proposal, and agreed to have the building finished by April, 1900. Fajardo immediately deposited her \$20,000 in the American colonial bank. The United States government at Puerto Rico has not yet put up her \$20,000, nor is there any movement afoot to erect this building up to this time, six months after the time limit has expired. The people of Fajardo wonder who is drawing the interest on their \$20,000. A few rooms have been rented in a private house in Fajardo, and a so-called normal school has been opened. The republican press and speakers have said much of the American schools and the normal school and the flags that waved over them. The flags are there, but the schools have not yet materialized.

Puerto Rico has been divided into school districts and a supervisor appointed for each. No greater insult could have been offered to the intelligence and decency of a people than has been offered to the people of Puerto Rico in the appointment of English supervisors for her schools. With but one or two exceptions they are men without experience or education.

One supervisor was a driver of an odorless excavating apparatus company's wagon for a few months and was then made English school supervisor of an important district. Another man came to Puerto Rico as a boiler maker to do some work for the government, and after he had repaired a few steam boilers was appointed English supervisor of schools; another supervisor was a driver of a government wagon and received his appointment soon after his discharge, as a driver on account of drunkenness; another, it is alleged, is a notorious crap shooter from the slums of one of our cities; another is said to have brought to Puerto Rico several hundred of the vilest obscene pictures to sell to the youth; few are respectable, and but one or two have any school experience or education. Puerto Rico very justly resents such carpet-baggery in her public schools.

The American teacher in Puerto Rico is not a credit to that great brainy body of people known as the teachers of the United States. In few cases has there been any care or judgment exercised in their selection. Experience, qualifications and education have not been considered and the result is that the majority of the girls teaching school in Puerto Rico are not only illiterate but uncultured and unrefined. There are exceptions, but the majority have been so

careless of public opinion and indiscreet in behavior, so very loud in their manners, so reckless in their deportment, so ignorant of their own language, both in speech and writing, that the "American teacher" is an object of contempt in Puerto Rico and a disgrace to the profession at home.

In refined society the American teacher is not welcome and in many instances the appearance of the American teacher at a public function has been immediately followed by the withdrawal of the discreet Puerto Rican mother and her daughters.

Under the régime of the military government the youth of Puerto Rico have lost two valuable years of school life; the people have seen hundreds of thousands of dollars squandered on unnecessary books, model schools, etc., and not an atom of good result is visible. They have seen a director general of public instruction accused and convicted of inability and dismissed; they have seen this same man reinstated and again dismissed; they have seen another director general appointed, who during a short reign of four months on account of his complete ignorance of public school affairs plunged the schools into a religious controversy that will injure the education of the island for many years to come; who by exceeding his authority made appointments and contracts for next year, spent large sums of money in so-called teachers' institutes which were conducted by inexperienced persons and were of no educational value, ordered \$10,000 more of books that are not needed and in a general way tied up the whole educational work for another year. He encouraged municipalities to spend their surplus money in summer schools in order that political favor might be bestowed upon a few worthless teachers, and at last when the new commissioner of education arrived he hurriedly took the first transport for the United States, much to the delight of the people of Puerto Rico, who had now witnessed the departure of the last one of the American gang that had so disgracefully run the public schools of Puerto Rico.

"Free silver made many votes for the republican party in '96," sighed the man from Wayne county.

"And I am afraid that it will have a like effect this year," groaned a weak-kneed Jeffersonian, "the G. O. P. has millions in the metal to give away."

G. T. E.

ANOTHER REJECTED POEM.
For The Public.

You have no idea—says I to the boys—
Of the villainies dark and deep
That Bryan lies awake to contrive.
When honest folks are asleep.
This great coal strike that we read of now,
'Twas Bryan brought it about.
And other strikes more, not less than a score,
To help his election out.

Class hatred he has a patent on,
And popular discontent;
Likewise ingratitude to those
Who furnish employment.
In the New York Tribune picture here
The truth of the case I've found;
Bryan stands in luck on the coal strike rock
To escape from being drowned.

And all good Tribune readers know
His traitorous talk is the means
Of benevolent assimilation's
Collapse in the Philippines.
O, sorry the day the trap was set,
The imperialistic snare,
That caught the best loved president
Who has sat in Washington's chair.

And Bryan himself is the guilty man,
As cannot be well denied;
The treaty of peace was a harmless joke
If it hadn't been ratified.
Deliver us, Lord, from the man who contrived
The whole of our trouble with Spain;
For I haven't a doubt, if the truth should come out,
That Bryan blew up the Maine!

J. HAWKINS.

Haskell Flats, N. Y.

People often ask why it is called Fortress Monroe instead of Fort Monroe. The difference between a fort and a fortress lies in the fact that the former is designed to contain solely the garrison and their munitions, while the latter is often a city containing a large number of noncombatants. France has on the German frontier three first-class fortresses—Belfort, Verdun and Briancon; on the Belgian frontier, Lille, Dunkirk, Arras and Donaz; on the Italian, Lyons, Grenoble and Besancon, and on the Atlantic coast, Rochefort, Lorient and Brest.—Chicago Chronicle.

"I shall next show," said the exhibitor of magic lantern pictures at the republican mass meeting, "a view of Aguinaldo clasped in the arms of William J. Bryan."

But the next instant the showman jumped from the third-story window and ran for his life, for he had, inadvertently, shown the picture designed for democratic use, a representation of the sultan of Sulu in the arms of Mr. McKinley.

G. T. E.

It is getting to be so a man cannot praise the Declaration of Independence without being denounced as a democrat.—Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan.

"Now, don't be a McKinleyite," admonished the warden to the recently liberated convict who was going out into the world.

"Oh, I won't, sir," exclaimed the penitent. "I am going to cast my vote for Woolley and Metcalfe."

"Why, I didn't mean that," the warden hastened to explain. "I don't want you to go back on Mack. What I meant was that I didn't want you to try to get a second term."

G. T. E.

"I tell you, Congressman Grabmore is a fierce partisan of the administration's."

"What has he done?"

"Introduced a bill providing that the government publish a colored supplement to the Congressional Record in which to caricature its caricaturers."—Puck.

Remmell—Don't you think that McKinley will be able to carry Nebraska and Kansas?

Demmell—No, I do not. He isn't strong enough to carry them and the Philippines, too.

G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Liberty, Independence and Self-Government" (Chicago: E. G. Ballard, 807 Chamber of Commerce building. Price 25 cents), is a valuable collection of extracts from the speeches and writings of American statesmen bearing upon the paramount political issue of the present campaign. The extracts are accompanied by explanation and comment from the pen of the editor, Everett Guy Ballard.

"The Menace of Plutocracy," by Thomas G. Shearman, monopolizes the pages of the September "Why" (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth. Price 25 cents a year; five cents a copy). This is a revision and republication of Mr. Shearman's famous Portland speech of eight years ago, in which he disclosed the then startling fact that "less than 100,000 persons, constituting as a matter of fact only about one-two hundredth part of our working force, are possessed of incomes which

Ten Cents

To encourage the circulation and extend the influence of

THE PUBLIC

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

Ten Cents

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

enable them to save about three-fifths of all the wealth that is annually saved in this country."

The first issue of the "Quarterly Bulletin of the Bureau of Economic Research" (New York: Bureau of Economic Research, 35 Lafayette place. Price \$1 a year; 35 cents a number), deals with comparative prices, freight rates and stock quotations. This work, which has been done under the supervision of Prof. John R. Commons, is the first result of an attempt by the bureau to reduce the more important industrial and commercial statistics to a basis of percentages or index numbers.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 8,500.

EMANCIPATION

"The author deals with the economic question from a philosophical standpoint involving man's individual responsibility.

"What is most encouraging about the work is that it tells one where the trouble lies and how to remedy it."—Coming Nation.

PRICE IN CLOTH, 75 CENTS.

J. B. Herboldshimer, 348 Unity Bldg., Chicago.

BIOGRAPHY OF HENRY GEORGE

The life of Henry George, by his son, Henry George, Jr., will be ready for delivery in a few days. Orders taken now by

MISS MAUDE DICKEY,

83 East Randolph Street,
CHICAGO, ILL.

Popular Edition, . . . \$1.50
Library Edition, . . . 2.50

THE DOCUMENTARY OUTLINE
OF THE

Philippine Case

which appeared in THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900, has been put into tract form, and will be sent to any address, postage paid, for Three Cents the single copy or \$1.25 per hundred. Address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SEND 25 CENTS in stamps to REV. L. G. LANDENBERGER, 3741 Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo., for his song,

"THE PEOPLE'S PRESIDENT."

Colored title page with fine picture of BRYAN. The music is sound, the words are weighty and the music is melodious.

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, October 7th:

MR. CLARENCE S. DARROW,
A Review of Tolstol's "Resurrection."
ADMISSION FREE!

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

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

LAWYERS,

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

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

Houston.

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

EDUCATIONAL.

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

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



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.

He was overboard struggling for life and shouting for help. Some one threw him a crowbar. The intention was kindly, but the act was inconsiderate. Consider the aid you intend for your family. Consult

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

TIMELY BOOKS

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

The Preparation of Ryerson Embury . . . 75c
Reconciled, A Story of Common Life . . . 25c
Japanese Notions of European Polit'l. Econ . . . 25c
Our Farmers of the Revenue 25c
The Single Tax, Post 25c
The Trusts, Collier, Just Published 50c
atural Taxation, Shearman 80c
Progress and Poverty, George 30c
Our Country, Strong 85c
Prices include postage. Same books in cloth, binding 20 per cent off. For any book on earth, Old or New, address

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

WE DON'T SELL OUR

CIGARS

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE, NO MORE, NO LESS.

J. & B. MOOS,

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