

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1900.

Number 132.

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.

Unusual industrial activity is reported from Mexico, yet neither McKinley nor Hanna is president of the Mexicans.

The utter collapse of the Chicago laundry trust, with its inflated capitalization of \$2,000,000, coming upon the heels of the dissolution of the national wall paper trust, furnishes additional proof of the impossibility of making permanent any trust which is not founded in or supported by some kind of legalized monopoly.

There was a time, not long ago, when anything which the London Times might say in favor of the American democratic party, would have been quoted far and wide by the republican press, and shouted from every stump by republican spellbinders, as evidence that the democrats had been "bought with British gold." But now McKinley and Roosevelt are supported by this great tory organ of Great Britain. Have McKinley and Roosevelt been bought with British gold?

Another comicality of the republican campaign is the widely circulated story that in the event of Bryan's election Croker will control the federal patronage in New York. The only voucher for this story is Senator Hanna. But upon much better authority, upon the authority indeed of actual experience during the past four years, it is known that in the event of McKinley's election Hanna will control all the federal patronage of the United States. Which were better, even if the Croker story were

true, to turn over to Croker a few New York appointments, or to Hanna the whole civil service system.

Roosevelt's attempt to make political capital out of a hoodlum demonstration by a few newsboys in Chicago, upon his return from an ostentatious attendance at church last Sunday, is of a piece with his outcry over the disorder at his meeting in a Rocky mountain mining town two weeks ago. No well behaved people countenance these disorderly demonstrations. But what right has Roosevelt to complain? They belong essentially to the "strenuous" order of life which he so highly commends.

"The greatest prosperity barometers in the world are coal and pig iron," says one of the campaign documents of the republican national committee. It bears the title, "Coal a Barometer of Prosperity and of Activity to Labor," and proceeds to explain that "coal, perhaps, is the greater of the two." In the light of that document the strike in the anthracite coal regions assumes marked political importance. Through that strike the public learns that wages in the anthracite region average \$240 a year—about \$4.60 a week. If coal is the barometer of prosperity, and miners' wages average \$4.60 a week, how much prosperity is there—for workmen?

The British elections, though not over as we write (October 11), have gone far enough to show that the tories have regained their former majority in the house of commons and probably added somewhat to it. To mere liberals this must be a sad though not unexpected defeat. But to the radicals, who have been unexpectedly successful, it is full of hope and promise. With this second over-

whelming defeat of the liberal party, coming as it does at a time when there is no traditional leader to hold the party in conservative leading strings, its radical elements have a most inviting opportunity to detoryize it and win. Should a leader spring up among them—such a leader, for instance, as the radical democrats on this side have found in Bryan—the next general election in Great Britain would make British landlords quake.

A confidential circular from the executive committee of the "Indianapolis monetary convention of the boards of trade, chambers of commerce, commercial clubs, and other similar commercial bodies of the United States," which bears date at Indianapolis the 1st of September and is signed by H. H. Hanna as chairman, purporting though it does to be a nonpartisan appeal in behalf of gold standard congressional candidates, is in fact a brazen partisan plea for McKinley's republican party, including its protection features. The names of H. H. Kohlsaat and Henry C. Payne appear properly enough upon this circular. They are pronounced republican partisans and protectionists. But those of such free traders as J. B. Henderson and George Foster Peabody look strangely out of place.

Republican papers announce in their Washington dispatches that the secretary of war is preparing to recommend to congress the increase of the regular army to 100,000 men—four times its size three years ago. Why? If we are about to leave Cuba, as the president promises, no troops will be needed there. Puerto Rico gives no evidence of any necessity for an increase of force there. In China we are to maintain only a legation guard—so our veracious commander

in chief announces. Should Bryan be elected, no more troops will be needed in the Philippines, for he has given a peace pledge. Should McKinley be elected, the necessity will be no greater, unless somebody is lying; for, from the Philippine commission up to the president himself, come positive assertions that nothing but Bryan's candidacy encourages the Filipinos to fight and that the war will end with Filipino submission upon Bryan's defeat. Why, then, does the secretary of war wish to raise the standing army to 100,000 men? Every truly patriotic voter will ask himself that question and answer it honestly before he votes.

Bad purposes never lack plausible arguments to justify them. As some one has crisply said, "every falsity has its fallacy." So the enlargement of the standing army is held in some quarters to be justified by the increase of our population. But that reason is what a southern plantation hand would call "powerful weak." Our population was 60,000,000 in 1890, when a standing army of 25,000 was found experimentally to be quite large enough. Yet, though the population is now no more than 80,000,000, an increase of only 33 1-3 per cent., Mr. McKinley's imperialistic administration wants to raise the army to 100,000 men—an increase of 300 per cent. What is the necessity, even upon the theory of a relation between population and army, for this great disparity between the increase in our population and the proposed increase in our army?

Going deeper, what relation is there between the standing army of a country and the country's population? If a country's enemies increase, that is indeed a reason for increasing its army. We might add to the strength of our standing army if Canada needed to be more efficiently guarded against, or Mexico were to threaten to cross the Rio Grande. We might then point to the increase of Canadian or Mexican population as a reason for increasing our stand-

ing army. But why does an increase in our own population demand that our army be correspondingly increased? What point of relationship is there between the two—between domestic population and standing army? There is and can be but one. No reason whatever can exist for increasing the standing army in proportion to increase in home population, other than a purpose of using the army against the people.

To this there comes but one reply. It is said that an army of 100,000 men could not overthrow the liberties of 80,000,000 people. The possibility of an attempt is described as absurd. But that is the chatter of fools, to whom the history of imperialism is a closed book. Given an issue on which 80,000,000 people are divided, and an army of 100,000 men, shrewdly directed, could turn popular elections into a farce. It is not the magnitude of standing armies that makes them dangerous. It is the fact that they are military machines. Some magnitude is necessary, of course; but that point once reached, all else depends upon the discipline of the men and the boldness of the military master. It was with the aid not of an enormous standing army, but of obedient detachments of troops and a submissive faction in the legislature that Louis Napoleon, the president of the republic of France, transformed himself in the early '50's into Napoleon III., emperor of the French.

A republican spellbinder of the name of Boutelle, having, in pursuit of notoriety, challenged the democratic presidential candidate to go with him into the old slave states and "urge the repeal of all constitutions and laws designed to disfranchise the colored population or restrict their suffrage," the Topeka Capital—notorious for having for a week tried to be such a newspaper "as Jesus would publish"—observes that Mr. Bryan will not accept the challenge "because he does not believe in the 'consent of the governed' as much as he pre-

tends." Evidently the Capital got very little moral benefit out of its brief attempt at imitating Jesus. There is one quite sufficient reason for Mr. Bryan's ignoring Boutelle's challenge, and that is that Boutelle is not in Bryan's class. If the republicans wished in good faith to challenge Bryan to debate, in the south or elsewhere, the challenge would come from their candidate—from the man whose relations of responsibility to their party are the same as are Bryan's to his. Boutelle's challenge is a fake, and the Capital's comments are a fraud. And as to the subject of the challenge, the republican party should make its own pots clean upon the negro question before criticising democratic kettles. In Oregon, for instance, there is a clause in the constitution which, if it were not for the federal constitution, would reduce negroes to the level of brutes; but as late as last June, at an election at which the republicans carried the state, an amendment repealing that clause was voted down.

In his campaign speech at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia, Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, one of the candid republican leaders who, like Senator Beveridge, knows that we are in the Philippines for what we can get out of them and frankly says so, attempted to modify the nonsense about never hauling down the American flag by saying that where it "has been raised rightfully over territory belonging to it by the law of nations and by its own laws, it never has been hauled down—and certainly it never has been hauled down when it was being fired upon." This characteristic prevarication receives a scorching rebuke from City and State, a Philadelphia paper which, though republican, is not imperialist. Says City and State:

Yes, senator, but that does not fit the Philippine case; for in it our flag—as you will discover if you consult the record—was not raised on those islands according to our own laws or traditions, much less according to the laws of God, or of any respectable code of morality. As to the flag not

having been hauled down before, when under fire—when was it under such a fire before? When did the flag ever before shoot men down for believing in the American declaration of independence? Dear senator, ought not we for very shame's sake to haul it down from such a devil's staff as it floats from now? And ought not your cheeks and your master's to grow red as its red stripes with confusion at having hauled it up on such a business?

At the Rock River Methodist conference, now in session in Chicago, the missionary bishop, J. H. Thornburn, who has spent 40 years as a missionary in the orient, has delivered a series of lectures in which he appropriately likens American protectionists to the Chinese. There is something so eminently sensible, not to say extraordinarily Christian, about the bishop's lecture on this point that we take pleasure in quoting:

Our fathers never intended to build a Chinese wall around this nation by putting a duty upon things, and keeping the foreigner from bringing in his goods. We are doing what the Chinese have done for centuries. We must get broader notions about these matters. The Chinese built a stone wall that they thought would keep out the foreigners. Our stone wall is the custom houses that we set on our borders. Before I became a missionary I believed in the republican policy of protection. I have learned that if a nation wants to survive it must open wide its doors and trade with the world. Let our revenues be raised from direct taxation. The true policy to be adopted in dealing with the people of the east is to abandon the old principles. Let us give up being a semi-Chinese nation and excluding other people.

The New York Staats Zeitung abandons Bryan and comes out for McKinley because, to quote its own explanation, "the democrats have not succeeded in the attempt undertaken by their convention to make imperialism the paramount issue and to place the silver question in the rear." That explanation calls to mind the experience of the colonial lay judge who made a good reputation by his decisions until he began to give reasons for them, whereupon he was removed for incompetency. No ex-

planation at all would have been less suspicious than that one. Imperialism not the paramount issue, when McKinley devotes two-thirds of his letter of acceptance to apologies for it! The money question not sent to the rear, when Roosevelt abandons its discussion throughout his cowboy campaign in the west! Where does the Staats Zeitung find the money question at the front except in Hanna's subsidized Wall street papers? Where does it find imperialism ignored? We make no charges, but suspicions are unavoidable. When it is recalled that early in the campaign there were indications of a purpose on Hanna's part to buy up German newspapers in behalf of McKinley, and that fact is considered in connection with the Staats Zeitung's absurdly inadequate explanation of its sudden "flop," a prima facie case is made out which calls for some sort of assurance at least from the Staats Zeitung that it has not changed editorial masters. More especially is this so in view of an admission in the "flopping" editorial itself. It expresses its convictions.

beyond all doubt that a continuation of the policy of conquest must hopelessly corrupt our public life and either destroy our free institutions entirely or at least compel us to engage in a severe struggle for their preservation.

Nevertheless, it considers Mr. Bryan "the greater immediate danger" because he still believes in the free coinage of gold and silver at 16 to 1. If that is not putting the dollar above both the man and the nation, no such inversion is possible. Why not have said plainly: "Mr. Hanna wanted us, and we are his"?

Mr. McKinley's campaign document, prepared under the direction of the secretary of war, by the Philippine commissioners, nominally for state reasons but really for election purposes, and which states that the Philippine islands are virtually pacified, is refuted not only by the reports of hard fighting and severe American losses, but also by Capt. David F. Allen, of the Thirty-eighth

volunteer infantry, who, in accepting the democratic nomination for congress from his district in Indiana, though declining to come home to participate in the campaign, writes—to correct any statement that may have been made in the district, to the effect that the island of Luzon is pacified, or that the backbone of the war is broken. The president's amnesty proclamation was published throughout the municipality of Bala-yan. It was read at high mass by the priest at least a month ago, thus giving it the widest possible circulation throughout the city, and yet, out of a population of fully 50,000, not one person has thus far taken advantage of it. The military authorities, by general orders published throughout the island, offered to pay 30 pesos (thirty Spanish silver dollars) for any kind of an old gun that could be fired. This order was published months ago, and yet in all the province of Batangas, composed of more than 200,000 people, not one rifle or gun has been offered for sale. The war is not over. The people have not become reconciled. These are the exact facts.

When three such historic names in connection with the abolition movement as those of George S. Boutwell, Thomas Wentworth Higginson and William Lloyd Garrison, are affixed to an appeal to American negroes to vote against imperialism at the coming election, it is high time for negroes who prize the security of human rights for their race more than republican patronage for themselves, to take anew their political bearings. This appeal, which was published on the 4th, takes high ground upon the race question. Here is an extract that thoughtful Americans of all races may profitably consider:

Every day in the Philippines is already training our young American soldiers to the habit of thinking that the white man, as such, is the rightful ruler of all other men. This is seen, for instance, in the fact that these very soldiers in writing home letters from the seat of war describe the inhabitants of the Philippines more and more constantly as "niggers," thus giving a new lease of life to a word which was previously dying out among us. Every defender of the war in congress sustains the contest on the assumed ground that the Filipinos are unfit for freedom, although Admiral Dewey at first described them as more fit for it than

the Cubans; and Senator Hoar describes them to be probably better fitted than any race on the two American continents south of ourselves. In other words, freedom is to become, for the new republican party, a matter of complexion. If this doctrine is to prevail, what hope is there for the colored race in the United States? The answer is easy; there is in that case no hope at all. In the name of the old anti-slavery sentiment, we call on you to resist this great danger, even if you have, for that purpose, to turn your backs on the party you once had reason to love.

The undersigned, trained from youth in the strictest school of anti-slavery conviction, are following up the same early training when they now write to you. We wish to warn you that the imperialistic republican party of to-day is not the liberty-loving party of that name which set the American negro free 40 years ago. The time is past when you can safely give to it your implicit support. We warn you that the American negro must henceforth think for himself and must cut adrift from every organization which wars on darker races, as such, and begins to talk again of "the natural supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon."

Congressman Hull, of Iowa, an ardent imperialist and chairman of the military committee in the lower house of congress, when talking to a Chicago Record representative on the 4th, denied, as reported in the Record of the 5th, that he is advocating the retention of the Philippines for the protection of business interests of his own in the archipelago, but admitted—

being at the head of a company organized for the purpose of developing Philippine timber lands. . . . he declared that there was absolutely no connection between his position as chairman of the military committee and his private business.

Think of the impudence of it! This man, as chairman of the military committee of congress, is pushing with all his might a policy of militarism which has for its immediate purpose the conquest of distant lands in which he has acquired speculative private interests; yet he says there is no connection between those interests and his official position. He may be angelic enough to draw fine distinctions between his public duty

and his private speculations, when they conflict, but who believes it? Time was when the discovery of a double relationship like this would have driven the best trusted man in the country out of public life. That time passed, however, when McKinleyism came. Hull is not the only man in responsible public position whose private speculations depend for a profitable outcome upon his official actions.

Hanna's assertion in a Chicago speech that there are no trusts has been taken much more literally by the public than he intended. He is supposed to have stated as a fact what he knew to be false; whereas he only intended to deceive with a play upon words. Originally, trusts were combinations of corporations which had placed their stock in the hands of trustees so as to concentrate the control of their business and destroy competition between them. That kind of trust does in fact no longer exist. But trusts exist, nevertheless. They are formed now not by the intervention of a body of trustees managing many corporations, but by the merging of many corporations into one. The same effect is produced. Control is concentrated, and competition is destroyed. And properly enough the name which the intervention of trustees gave to the original trusts has in popular usage attached to these unified corporations that have taken their place. Mr. Hanna understood this. He knew that the essence of the trust evil is not trustees, but combination for the destruction of competition. Yet he said there were no trusts, because he knew that trustees are no longer a factor in corporate combination. It is by such indirect, misleading and fraudulent statements that public men of the Hanna type expect to make fools of the people. In this instance he overreached himself. The great gullible public is not quite so unsophisticated as to believe that there are no trusts. It knows that business is concentrated and competition strangled, and whether that is done through trusts

or through charters of incorporations it doesn't care.

It is discouraging to thoughtful men to find in the New York Nation a sneer at Bryan's assertion that if Americans are glad to lend money abroad at four per cent. it shows that profitable investments at home are few. The reason this is discouraging is not political. It is economic. A mere political organ might be expected to assume that low interest rates imply prosperity. On this point even populist organs go astray. So also a Wall street trade paper, bloated with pretentious assumptions of financial wisdom, might be expected to regard the matter. To the denizen of Wall street, to whom interest stands for nothing but money premiums, and whose financial horizon is limited by its gambling operations, low interest means plenty of chips, or easy money, and high interest means scarcity of chips, or tight money. But the Nation has a well deserved reputation for economic intelligence. It may make mistakes. It often does. Yet it is exceptionally intelligent when dealing with economic questions. Nevertheless, in one of its editorials of the 27th, while with more or less reason excoriating Bryan for his money theories, it assumes that low interest is one of the surest signs of prosperity.

"If money for long-time investment goes begging at four per cent.," argues the Nation, "the western farmer will not have to pay more than six or seven on his mortgages (instead of ten or twelve some years ago); the business man can borrow at the bank on commercial paper for five; new manufacturing industries can be launched on more favorable terms than ever before; rents will be lower; capital will be in search of the thrifty user of it." All this assumes that interest cuts no figure in economics except between borrower and lender. But the truth is that when capital searches for the thrifty user of it, offering itself at low rates of interest, it searches almost in vain. The

thrifty user of capital knows that when interest rates are low, profits in productive enterprises are low also. Or if he does not know it in advance, he discovers it when the sheriff sells him out. He may get his capital cheaply, but he cannot use it profitably. So far from being "one of the surest signs of national wealth and well being," as the Nation declares, low interest rates are one of the surest signs of industrial depression. Low interest has always been an accompaniment of hard times, and high interest of good times. What our low interest rates mean essentially is this, that capitalized speculative values have risen to such a high point—are so loaded with "water," to use a term that may be better understood—that the margin for interest is crowded almost to zero. The prevailing low rates of interest testify, more positively than anything else, to the completeness of the monopolization of natural opportunities for production. So complete and comprehensive is this monopoly, and so high are monopoly-buttressed capitalizations, that the profitableness of production has declined and interest has declined accordingly.

Among the McKinley campaign speakers is James H. Eckels, whom Cleveland made comptroller of the currency and who is now a Chicago banker. One night last week he spoke for McKinley at the Chicago Auditorium, putting the dollar above the man—the flag, the constitution and the declaration of independence below the banking trust. Mr. Eckels took occasion to say that he submitted—without fear of successful contradiction, that a bank, whether it be a national, state or private one, properly conducted and honestly managed, instead of being a cause of detriment to any community or harmful to any interest, is a source of strength and benefit.

And who has ever denied that? He might with equal ingenuousness have submitted, "without fear of successful contradiction," that a reservoir, "properly" secured and "safely" man-

aged, instead of being a menace to any community is a convenient source of water supply. The sticking point is at the adverbs. There is no issue regarding banks "properly" conducted and "honestly" managed. The objection is to banks that are not properly conducted nor honestly managed. It is urged that banks which are invested by statute with money issuing privileges are not and cannot be properly conducted or honestly managed. The privileges themselves are improper and dishonest. That is the point for Mr. Eckels to meet. Statutory privileges are public crimes, and their beneficiaries are to that extent public parasites. Let Mr. Eckels defend banking all he pleases, but let him fairly meet the real issue, which is not the usefulness of banks, but the burdens of statutory privileges conferred upon banks and the viciousness of a banking ring which corrupts congress to secure, to buttress, to extend and to perpetuate those privileges.

In speaking at Stourbridge, England, on the 9th, Joe Chamberlain summed up Great Britain's policy in these words:

To remain on friendly terms with every great country in Europe, and on something more than friendly terms with the United States.

When one nation is on "something more than friendly terms" with another, they have either an open alliance or a secret understanding. Does either relationship exist between Great Britain and the United States? There is certainly no open alliance. Is it true, then, that what Chamberlain, referring to the same subject, described some time ago as "an understanding between statesmen," really subsists between the McKinley administration and the tory ministry? If it is true, the American people ought to know it. We of this country would like to hold friendly relations with the English people. We tried to once, in the truest way—through free trade. But McKinley would have none of that. As a protectionist he preached enmity to England. But

now that there is an opportunity to form an alliance, not openly for free trade and peace with the people of England, but secretly for war and conquest with the tory ministry, it would appear from what Mr. Chamberlain says and from all the circumstances that Mr. McKinley has jumped at the chance.

The Chicago Federation of Labor, in responding to a request for an opinion on the subject, made by the Chicago street railway commission, takes strong ground in favor of municipal ownership of street railway franchises and against compensation to the city for granting franchises. On the latter point it truly says:

Compensation is merely a form of robbery. It is using the street railway company as a tax collector to extort from those who must ride on the cars a charge over and above the value of their ride, to be paid into the treasury to relieve the property-owners from paying just that amount of taxes. It is robbery pure and simple under the form of law and an abuse of the power of taxation that should not be tolerated for a moment. The cry for compensation, under the surface, is merely the cry of the downtown landlords for a share in the amount extorted from the people by a franchise holder.

The acting secretary of war, G. D. Meikeljohn, is another aspirant for notoriety who tries to hitch his donkey cart to Mr. Bryan's chariot. Mr. Bryan having spoken of the Sulu treaty as recognizing slavery, Mr. Meikeljohn writes an open letter to remind him that in October, 1899, President McKinley "confirmed and approved, subject to the action of congress," the Sulu treaty, with the reservation "that this agreement is not to be deemed in any way to authorize or give the consent of the United States to the existence of slavery." And Mr. Meikeljohn appears really to suppose that that quotation from McKinley refutes Bryan's charge. He seems totally oblivious to the fact that McKinley can be quoted on both sides of nearly every public question with which he has been officially connected, and that when he cannot be quoted on both

sides, he can be quoted on one side and be shown to have acted on the other. The question Mr. Bryan raises is not whether McKinley made anti-slavery reservations outside the treaty, but whether he in fact protects slavery in the name and by the authority of the United States as the suzerain power in Sulu. And that question is easily and incontrovertibly answered. Slavery does exist in Sulu; it exists there under the protection of the American flag; it exists there by the permission and in virtue of the authority of the American army, which McKinley commands. Mr. McKinley's reservation, which Meikeljohn quotes, is ignored by the Sulu sultan, by the Sulu slaveowners, by the American army, by the secretary of war and by McKinley himself.

INFLATED AND FALSE PROSPERITY.

The true character of McKinley prosperity is innocently exposed by one of the McKinley side shows in this presidential campaign, a "faked up" labor organization which calls itself the "Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political League" and has national headquarters in room 802 Grand Northern building, Chicago. From its literature there is no difficulty in discovering that the officers of this Hannaistic organization are much closer to the railway trust than they are to railway workmen.

One specimen of its pretentious labor literature is intended to demonstrate by figures the great prosperity which railway workmen are now enjoying as compared with the depression under which they suffered before Mr. McKinley waived his wand and brought forth good times. The whole first page of the document is accordingly devoted to sad pictures of the railway workmen's life in 1896, side by side with glowing pictures of his active and prosperous life in 1900. The other pages are devoted to a great display of comparative figures, which make it appear to careless readers that railway wages have risen wonderfully since 1895.

One is really impressed when he sees thus displayed a "gain of 143,899

in employes, "of \$77,459,635 in wages," and so on.

But let us examine these boastful figures somewhat in detail.

According to this veracious republican document there has been a great increase in the number of employes.

Here are the figures:

Number in 1895.....	785,034
Number in 1899.....	928,924
Increase	143,890

So far, then, so good. There has been, let us say, an increase in the number of railway employes.

Likewise with the amount of freight carried:

Tons of freight carried in 1895.....	696,761,171
Tons of freight carried in 1899.....	959,763,583
.....	263,002,412

Upon the faith of these republican figures, therefore, the roads carried much more freight in 1899 than in 1895.

Now let us see what these lump figures imply as to the individual work of the men. Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when 696,761,171 tons of freight were carried, the average per employe was 887 tons; and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when 959,763,583 tons were carried, the average per employe was then 1,033. So the increase of work in carrying freight averages 146 tons.

It follows that the railway employes were more prosperous in 1899 than in 1895—if heavier work is the same to them as prosperity. They had to handle 146 tons more per employe, which is nearly three tons more per week, in 1899 than in 1895.

Not only did they do more work; they made more money for the roads.

This same republican document claims an increase of net earnings of the railroads, over and above operating expenses, as follows:

Net earnings in 1895.....	\$349,651,047
Net earnings in 1899.....	456,641,119
Increase	\$106,990,072

Now what proportion do these net earnings of the road bear to the number of men whose labor helped earn them? Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when the net earnings of the roads were \$349,651,047, the average per man employed was \$445.39; and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when the net earnings had risen to \$456,641,119, the

average per man was then \$491.58. So the increase of net earnings for the roads averages \$46.19 to each employe.

It follows that the railway employes were more prosperous in 1899 than in 1895—if larger net earnings for the roads are the same thing to the men as prosperity. They turned over to the railway treasuries, over and above operating expenses, \$46.19 more per employe, which is nearly \$1.00 more per week, in 1899 than in 1895.

But that is not all. They increased the dividends of stockholders.

It is claimed by this same republican document that there has been an increase of dividends to the amount now shown:

Dividends in 1895.....	\$ 85,287,542
Dividends in 1899.....	111,009,822
Increase	\$25,722,280

What proportion do those dividends bear to the number of employes? Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when dividends were \$85,287,542, the average per man employed was \$108.64; and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when dividends had mounted up to \$111,009,822, the average per man employed was then \$119.50. So the increase of dividends for railroad stockholders averages \$10.86 to each employe.

It follows that the railway employes were more prosperous in 1899 than in 1895—if larger dividends for stockholders are the same thing to the employes as prosperity. They turned over to railway stockholders \$10.86 more per employe, which is over 20 cents a week, in 1899 than in 1895.

We venture to question, however, whether larger dividends for stockholders, greater net earnings for the roads, and heavier work, constitute in themselves what may be called prosperity for railway employes. Such prosperity may be satisfactory to the "Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political league," who possibly regard work as a greater boon than wages, and it may be a complete fulfillment of the McKinley prosperity promises; but to the traditional "man up a tree" wages would appear to be the most important considera-

tion to men who live by wages. Let us see, then, what this same most interesting McKinley campaign document discloses on the subject of railway wages. Here are its figures:

Approximate amount of wages and salaries in 1895.....	\$445,508,261
Approximate amount of wages and salaries in 1899.....	522,967,896
Increase	\$77,459,635

So wages do appear to have increased in the aggregate.

But, according to the same document, so also has the number of employes. Let us ascertain, then, from these McKinley statistics what has been the effect upon per capita wages, for each employe lives upon his own wages and not upon wages in the aggregate.

Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when wages were \$445,508,261, the average wages per employe was \$567.50, and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when wages had risen in the aggregate to \$522,967,896, the average per employe was then \$562.98.

So the average of wages per employe, instead of having increased at all, had decreased. It was \$4.52 less in 1899, under McKinley, than in 1895, before McKinley.

How, then, do the figures of this McKinley campaign document indicate prosperity for railway workingmen? We confess our inability to figure it out.

The workmen handled more freight on the average per man in 1899 than in 1895 by 146 tons. They earned a larger net income on the average per man for the road in 1899 than in 1895 by \$46.19. They turned over fatter dividends on the average per man to stockholders in 1899 than in 1895 by \$10.86. But they got less pay on the average per man in 1899 than in 1895 by \$4.52.

It is easy to see that this means prosperity for the railway trusts, but where do the railway employes come in? How does this McKinley prosperity benefit them?

Not the least important thing about this railway workmen's "prosperity" document is the fact that it fairly exemplifies the kind of prosperity that Mr. McKinley has blessed all American workingmen with. In

every other line of employment, as well as in railroading, hired men are working harder, producing more, and getting less.

That they are working harder is a painfully familiar fact to most hired men of every class—mechanics, unskilled workmen, clerks and all. We cannot prove it by statistics proffered by Mr. McKinley's supporters, because these statisticians are as a rule more astute than the managers of the "Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political league," whose statistics we have analyzed above. They do not give us in general employments the statistics of both wages and work. But it happens that in the republican campaign book for 1900, published by the republican national committee, they do give, on page 293, a table of statistics from which the average of wages per employe, though not the average of work, can be ascertained. And from that table it appears that the average of general wages, instead of having risen since 1895, has, like the average of railway wages, actually fallen. It has fallen from \$478.04 down to \$451.40.

The republican table in question is introduced by the national committee with this explanation:

The following table shows the returns received from 200 manufacturers in the United States of the number of employes engaged and wages paid by those firms from 1890 to 1899 inclusive.

Then comes the table, from which we take the figures beginning with 1895. They are as follows:

Year.	Number of Employes.	Wages Paid.
1895	110,556	\$52,851,317
1896	112,551	53,209,420
1897	109,600	54,412,774
1898	131,428	62,247,940
1899	174,645	78,835,069

If, now, the reader will take the pains to divide the aggregate of wages each year by the number of employes for the same year, he will find that the average wages per employe in 1895 were \$478.04; that in 1896 they fell to \$472.75; that in 1897 they rose to \$496.46; that in 1898 they fell to \$473.64; and that in 1899 they fell still further, to \$451.40, which is \$26.64 lower than they were in 1895.

On republican statistical authority, then, we find, when we analyze

the figures, that hired men are not only doing more work per man than they did before McKinley's election, but that they are getting less pay per man.

And the condition of employers who have no monopoly privileges is not much different from that of their men. They, too, are doing more work, but making less profit than before. McKinley prosperity is what for two years we have insisted that it is, and what so respectable an authority as the Philadelphia Times now bluntly calls it—"inflated and false."

THE STUNTED CHILDREN OF THE COAL FIELDS.

"For, oh," say the children, "we are weary,
And we cannot run or leap—
If we cared for any meadows, it were merely
To drop down in them and sleep.
Our knees tremble sorely in the stooping—
We fall upon our faces, trying to go;
And underneath our heavy eyelids drooping.
The reddest flower would look as white as snow.
For, all day long, we drag our burden tiring.
Through the coal-dark underground;
Or, all day we drive the wheels of iron
In the factories, round and round."
—Mrs. Browning.

When the big hearted Fred Dilcher, of the executive board of the mine workers, conceived and organized that procession of half clad, half starved children in the anthracite coal fields last week, he swayed the hearts and stirred the souls of his countrymen to greater depths than could have been done by the greatest orator in the world.

Here was a procession of young little old men, from eight to sixteen years of age. Stunted and blunted, robbed of the playground and the school-room, they knew of nothing but work! work! work! The day that witnessed that demonstration was a glad day to those children. Somehow they felt that their deliverance was nigh, and a thrill of joy and hope quickened their steps as they marched through the town.

In a conversation with the writer, Thomas I. Kidd, who witnessed the procession, said: "I never saw such unbridled joy as was manifested by those boys. Two of the kids were so intoxicated with the excitement of the occasion, with the liberty which it gave them to do something inde-

pendent and in spite of their task-masters, that they danced the 'cakewalk' all along the line of march." Oh! how sad this comedy! What a spectacle for the citizens of this republic to behold!

They look up with their pale and sunken faces,
And their look is dread to see,
For they mind you of their angels in high places,
With eyes turned on Delty.
"How long," they say, "How long, Oh cruel nation,
Will you stand, to move the world on a child's heart—
Stifle down with a malled heel its palpitation,
And tread onward to your throne amid the mart?"

Why are these little lives dwarfed in body and mind?

Is it that labor is so much in demand that the older boys and men cannot supply it? No, for we are informed that 175 days is all the time the mines were operated during the year. Is it because the labor of these children is necessary for our common good? No, every consideration for the public weal points the other way. Their blood and bones are converted into gold so that more millions may be added to the colossal fortunes of the coal barons and a few railroad kings who own and dominate the anthracite fields, the richest coal bed in the world, placed there by God for the use and benefit of all. No true American can read of this procession of children without feeling ashamed that the conditions which it exposed should exist in this republic.

Is it any wonder that the illiteracy of Pennsylvania is 40 per cent. greater than that of Kansas?

When the procession was over, Dilcher, in company with some of his juvenile friends, approached Mr. Kidd and said: "Tom, these are all my boys."

Kidd laid his hand on a little fellow's head and asked: "How old are you?"

"Sixteen," was the reply.

"And you?" to the next.

"I am 15."

"And you?" to the third.

"Fifteen."

"Well, well, how small you all are! Why, I have a boy at home in Chicago who is only 12, and he is bigger than either of you," said Kidd.

"Do he work in the mine?" asked one.

"No."

"What do he work?"

"Why, he doesn't work at all; he goes to school," said Kidd.

"Oh!" they all chimed in, as if that solved the mystery. "We'd be bigger, too," said one, "if we'd go to school."

No one can read of this without being reminded of similar conditions that prevailed in Great Britain in the early part of the century, when women were harnessed in chains, and on all fours hauled coal cars in English mines, and when little boys and girls were working in mines and factories 14 and 16 hours a day. But to the credit of England be it said that no such spectacle as that witnessed in the Pennsylvania coal fields disgraces her any longer.

I am told that during a parliamentary investigation, brought about through the efforts of Robert Owen, a little boy employed in one of the mines was placed on the witness stand, and among other questions was asked whether he knew anything about God. The little fellow reflected awhile, and then shook his head and said: "No, I don't know God. He doesn't work in our mine; maybe he works in one of the others."

That disclosure of the positive ignorance of the child about God startled the English people and contributed much toward the overthrow of the conditions that fostered it.

But what must we think of Pennsylvania, originally settled by William Penn and his Quaker friends, one of the 13 colonies that contributed so much towards the triumph of the American revolution? Upon its sacred soil was signed the solemn declaration of American independence, and its "liberty bell" chimed forth the glad tidings to the world "that all men are created equal" and entitled to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Benjamin Franklin, writing of early colonial days, said: "Childhood was sure of its joys, industrious men and women of their reward, and old age of its comforts." What a change! To-day she is dominated by a heartless clique of

millionaires upon the one hand, and on the other populated by a horde of imported foreigners, whose ignorance and poverty have made them an easy prey, but who, unable to endure the oppression any longer, are now in revolt against their task-masters. Is the commonwealth of Pennsylvania an irreclaimable degenerate? Is the conscience of her people dead? Is there no power within her border to rise and redeem her name? Has privilege so thoroughly entrenched itself that no one dare contest its power?

Chicago. GEORGE A SCHILLING.

NEWS

The fourth week of the anthracite coal strike in Pennsylvania began on the 8th with more men out than ever. Less than 4,000 miners are reported as at work in the whole anthracite region, where the number usually employed exceeds 140,000. And shipments of coal to tide water have almost ceased. On the 4th only 20 coal cars passed down the Philadelphia & Reading railway, over which the daily average before the strike was 1,400. Some disorder has occurred, but in only one instance of a serious kind. This was at Oneida, about 12 miles from Hazleton, where a mob of Hungarians came into collision with a body of mine guards and coal and iron police, who were escorting a party of non-strikers. One guard was killed and one guard and one of the mob were seriously injured. Of the non-strikers, 13 were injured slightly. The leaders of the strike have succeeded, as a rule, in preventing rioting, whether from outbursts on the part of strikers or assaults by the police, by appealing to the strikers not to march in bodies in the neighborhood of the mines, an appeal that has generally met with favorable responses. The riot at Oneida was a result of the neglect of this appeal by the Hungarian strikers there.

From time to time, as noted last week, the operators, who refused to deal with the strikers as an organized body, have posted notices offering to their respective employes individually terms of settlement. These offers are vague. Apparently they amount to an increase in wages of ten per cent., and a reduction in the price of powder from \$2.75 to the market

rate of \$1.50; but upon examination they appear to involve a deduction from the proposed ten per cent. increase by the amount of the proposed reduction in the price of powder. To ascertain the sentiment of the strikers regarding these offers, and also to enable them to decide for themselves, the officers of the United Mine Workers of America, under whose authority the strike was begun, have called a delegate convention of the strikers to meet at Scranton on the 12th, with one delegate to each 100 strikers as the basis of representation. This is a new departure in strike methods. As President Mitchell said in a speech to an immense mass meeting of strikers on the 9th at Shamokin—

Every other strike that has taken place in the anthracite region has been declared off by your officers. Heretofore when men went on strike they remained out for a time and then the chief executive or the executive board declared the strike off without consulting the wishes of the strikers. I want to say, as I have said before, that this strike will never end until the miners, through delegates in convention, end it for themselves. We have called a convention, and you men are invited to send delegates there. You are invited to pass judgment on the operators' proposition. If you believe that they act in good faith; if you believe ten per cent. to be enough; if you believe that they will pay the ten per cent. for a year, then you must decide whether to return to work. On the other hand, if you reject the offer and continue on strike, John Mitchell will be there to help you do it. I do not expect that this one strike will eradicate all the wrongs from which you suffer. I do not believe that the accumulation of 40 years of injustice can be wiped out at once, but I do believe that you have established an organization here that, with each succeeding year, will give you improved conditions of employment.

Another feature of the labor situation is the continued resumption (see page 407) of work by steel and metal mills, after periods of idleness; at a general reduction of wages. The wage reduction in most mills averages 20 per cent. Among the plants so to resume during the current week were the American Tin Plate company, of Pittsburgh, which employs 35,000 men; also the Susquehanna Iron and Steel company, and some of the mills of the Illinois Steel company's plant at Joliet. In the iron plants owned by the Reading company,

which controls the Philadelphia & Reading Railway company, and the Reading Coal and Iron company, the wages of puddlers has been reduced from four dollars per ton to three dollars. Yet the annual report of this company, just published, makes the most profitable showing of recent years. After paying all expenses and demands there remains an undivided surplus of \$1,938,000. The revenue from coal alone is 12 per cent. larger than that of the previous year.

Except as these evidences of depression in connection with the labor interests of the country have their bearing, nothing of importance is to be noted in American politics for the week, beyond the concluding proceedings of the convention of democratic clubs at Indianapolis, the opening of which was reported last week. The great day of the convention was the 4th, when Mr. Bryan spoke. He was followed by Bourke Cockran, Mr. Stevenson, and Bishop Turner, the colored minister to Liberia under Grant. Gov. McMillin, of Tennessee, presided, and the following permanent officers were elected: President, W. R. Hearst; secretary, Max T. Ihmsen; treasurer, Marcus Daly.

In England the parliamentary voting mentioned last week is still in progress, and the number of votes thus far cast is enormously in excess of the number at the last preceding general election, 1895. On the 6th the Tories had polled 4 per cent. and the liberals 29 per cent. more than their respective votes of that year. Among the great liberals reelected is John Morley, who defeated a "liberal-jingo" adversary in Scotland with a vote of 3,960 to 2,390. Out of the 670 seats to be filled the polling is now (October 10) complete for 562, with the following results:

Ministerialists	357
Opposition	205
Total	562

And still the fighting goes on in the Transvaal. There are skirmishes daily. On the 8th a London dispatch told of the retreat of a body of 4,000 to 5,000 Boers from Pilgrim's Rest, near the Portuguese border; and one from Aliwal North, Cape Colony, reported the Boer general Dewet to be in the Orange Free State about 70 miles north of that place. The lat-

ter dispatch was confirmed by the Associated Press from London on the 10th, which quoted from the London Times a report of a three days' fight, October 5 and 7 both inclusive, with Gen. Dewet and his force of 1,000 men and five guns in the Orange Free State mountains near Vredefort. According to the Times, Dewet was dislodged and his force demoralized and dispersed.

The presbytery of the Dutch Reformed church, in session at Cape Town on the 5th, adopted a resolution, by a vote of 23 to 4, which strongly condemns the British policy in South Africa.

In the Philippines as well as South Africa the war goes on, the Americans finding it even more difficult to subjugate the Filipinos than do the British to subjugate the Boers. Confirmation has been received of the capture reported last week of Capt. Shields's command by the Filipinos on the island of Marinduque, but details are still lacking. Reinforcements consisting of 12 full companies of infantry were sent to Marinduque by Gen. MacArthur on the 4th, under Gen. Hare, with orders, says MacArthur in his official report, "to push operations until insurrection is stamped out absolutely." This was in addition to the two companies sent out under Col. Anderson as reinforcements, with orders, as reported last week, to "move relentlessly until Shields and party were rescued."

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to October 10, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900..	84
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900	441
Total deaths since July 1, 1898....	2,372
Wounded	2,290
Captured	10
Total casualties since July 1, 1898..	4,672
Total casualties reported last week	4,633
Total deaths reported last week..	2,339

Substantial progress appears to have been made with the Chinese question. On the 2d a Chinese edict, issued on the 25th of last month at Tai Yuen, capital of the province of

Shansi, was published at Peking in the name of the emperor. It decrees the stripping of Prince Tuan and Prince Chung of the insignia of their rank, and their consignment with Kang Yi, Chao Shu Chiao and four others to a board of deliberation to decide on their punishment. Prince Tuan is the father of the recently selected heir apparent to the throne, and is said to be the supreme chief of the Boxers. Kang Yi is grand secretary of the empire, and Chao Shu Chiao is president of the board of punishments. The edict concludes with the hope that the punishment of these ministers for betrayal of their trust may be accepted as a proper atonement.

The German government made the foregoing Chinese edict the basis on the 2d of a diplomatic note to the powers, published on the 4th, in which, after referring to the edict as "the first sign toward a practical basis for the reestablishment of an orderly state of things in China," it was proposed—

that the powers come to an agreement to instruct their diplomatic representatives in China to examine and give their opinion on the following points: (1) Whether the list contained in the edict of persons to be punished is sufficient and correct. (2) Whether the punishments proposed meet the case. (3) In what way the powers can control the carrying out of the penalties imposed.

This note is regarded as a substitute for that given out September 18 and published at page 378.

To the German note quoted from above, the United States replied on the 3d in a note given out on the 4th, in which it was explained that the American government is disposed to regard the Chinese edict—

as a proof of the desire of the imperial Chinese government to satisfy the reasonable demands of the foreign powers for the injury and outrage which their legations and their nationals have suffered at the hands of evil-disposed persons in China; although it has been thought well, in view of the vagueness of the edict in regard to the punishment which some of the implicated persons are to receive to signify to the Chinese minister the president's view that it would be most regrettable if Prince Tuan, who appears from the concurring testimony of the legations in Peking to have been one of the foremost in the proceedings complained of, should escape such full measure of exemplary punishment as the facts warrant, or

if Kang-Yi and Chao-Shu-Chiao should receive other than their just deserts. With a view to forming a judgment on these points, the United States minister in Peking has been instructed to report whether the edict completely names the persons deserving chastisement; whether punishments proposed accord with the gravity of the crimes committed, and in what manner the United States and the other powers are to be assured that satisfactory punishment is to be inflicted. It is hoped that Mr. Conger's replies to these interrogatories will confirm the government of the United States in the opinion which it now shares with the imperial German government that the edict in question is an important initial step in the direction of peace and order in China.

Great Britain also is understood to have accepted Germany's latest proposal.

The French programme—not based upon the Chinese edict, however—and in which Russia concurs, is as follows:

(1) The punishment of the principal culprits, who will be designated by the representatives of the powers at Peking. (2) The maintenance of the prohibition of the import of arms. (3) Equitable indemnities to states, societies and individuals. (4) The formation of a permanent guard for Peking legations. (5) The dismantlement of the fortifications. (6) Military occupation of two or three points on the road from Tientsin to Peking, which would thus be always open to the legations wishing to go to the sea or to forces proceeding to Peking from the sea.

Notwithstanding these negotiations, there are fitful reports of actual fighting in China. One dispatch this week tells of an attempt by the Chinese fleet in Formosa strait to engage a Russian armored cruiser, and another describes a battle between a German force and 8,000 Chinese on the 5th a few miles south of Tientsin.

Count von Walderssee, the German field marshal, whom the powers have agreed to accept as commander in chief of the allies in China, has arrived at Peking and assumed command.

NEWS NOTES.

—John P. Crichton-Stuart, marquis of Bute, died at his seat in Ayreshire on the 9th from paralysis. He was 73 years old.

—Telegraphic communication between Alaska and the outside world was opened on the 3d by a line which extends from Seattle to Skaguay.

—Parliamentary elections through-

out Canada will take place on November 7, the dominion parliament having been dissolved by a proclamation of the cabinet on the 9th.

—Four persons were killed during the political riots which took place in Guayama, Porto Rico, on the 8th, between members of the two recently formed federal and republican parties.

—The Chicago Teachers' federation, in the name of Miss Catherine Goggin, on the 8th brought a mandamus suit to enforce the assessment of the capital stock of several great semi-public corporations of the city for taxation. The amount heretofore untaxed exceeds \$200,000,000.

—Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, on the 5th issued a call for a special session of the legislature of that state which convened on the 10th, for the purpose of enacting a new law to regulate taxation and to consider the question of the repeal of special charters to railroad and other corporations.

—Political interest in Hawaii has been aroused by the nominations, on September 26 as delegates in congress of Sam Parker by the republican party, which represents the moneyed interests in the islands, and of Prince David Kawanakoa by the democrats, who represent the native home rule element.

—In his comic play, "A Modern Robinson Crusoe," with which Roland Reed is starring, Sydney Rosenfeld has succeeded in putting upon the stage a genuinely dramatic, yet economically sound, representation of the elementary principles of political economy. His dramatic materials are conventional, while his economic method is new; and the lesson loses no force in the succession of funny incidents which characterize the performance from the start. Though the play is not exactly a Henry George lecture—it is no lecture at all, but teaches by incident and not by precept—it would nevertheless be highly appreciated by George if he were alive.

—The noonday and evening meetings of the Henry George Bryan and Stevenson club of Chicago have proved exceedingly popular. During the past week many prominent speakers from all sections of the country have addressed the club, among them being ex-Gov. Hogg, of Texas; James R. Sovereign, of Arkansas; F. A. Hood, of Chattanooga, Tenn.; W. H. Berry, of Chester, Pa.; Capt. W. P. Black, Clarence Darrow, James R. Todd, Congressman George P. Foster, W. J. Strong, Louis F. Post, John Z. White, Herman Kuehn, Edward Osgood Brown, H. L. Bliss, George A. Schilling, F. H. Wenworth, Charles H. Mitchell, and others, of Chicago. The meetings will be continued until the day preceding the election.

—Arrangements have been completed for a summer school in radical econom-

ies to be located on Gull lake, Yorkville P. O., Michigan, where a "Golden Rule park," comprising 50 acres, is to be laid out under the management of E. D. Wheelock, of Chicago; N. O. Nelson, of St. Louis, and Mayor Jones, of Toledo. Building lots in the park are not to be sold, but are to be leased upon ground rents to be used for common purposes. The summer school will be under the direction of Prof. George D. Herron, aided by Franklin D. Wentworth, of Chicago, as financial agent; and with this school as his educational base of operations, Prof. Herron, under Mr. Wentworth's management, will devote his time when the school is not in session, to lecturing throughout the country. He will begin his lecture work early in the year.

MISCELLANY

HARPER'S FERRY—1900.

For The Public.

Old Loudon stands titanic in repose,
Unbonneted to every passing breeze,
While at his feet the Shenandoah flows
To join her sister stream unto the seas.

Fearless, those rocks looked down when
Brown was here;

No stone more rugged in that lofty pile
Than he, who also never knew a fear;
Steadfast, whom servileness did ne'er de-
file.

Convulsion's riving throes to both gave
birth.

Secure they stand undaunted to the end;
Prophets of Freedom in a slavish earth,
Their mighty rest shall ruthless time not
rend.

JULIAN A. DUBOIS.

WHEN STOCKS FALL, THE REPUB- LICAN HEAVENS FALL.

E. L. Godkin, in a letter to the New York Evening Post of Oct. 3.

There is no denying that McKinley has committed a class of faults unknown to former presidents. He has disregarded the constitution by annexing foreign provinces without the authority of law. He has employed 65,000 Americans to massacre foreigners who had done him no injury and to destroy their homes. He has declared war, without notice, upon a friendly people, to whom he had first promised peace and cooperation. He has allowed his subordinate officers to denounce the organic law which created them as worn-out and of no effect. He has, in fact, done all the things which usually precede a coup d'etat, whether under Julius Caesar or Louis Napoleon, and, what is unheard of in history, he has secured a congress in connivance with him.

To tell me that such a man as McKinley is fit for the presidency because his nonelection will cause a fall of stocks strikes me as ludicrous. This might be

considered a sufficient answer for a broker. Among free and self-governing people it ought to excite a smile. It is the old argument by which Napoleon III. justified his coup d'etat. What he said was that he must be emperor, must kill those who opposed him and must put an end to the republic or stocks would fall heavily.

This is exactly the McKinley argument. There is not one unconstitutional act committed by McKinley the omission of which would have imperiled the happiness of a single American citizen. If he had court-martialed Otis and Merritt, who have been abusing the constitution and justifying his own violation of it, it would have secured us the respect of foreign nations and continued the stability of our power, without the loss of a single life. The permission accorded to his military officers to decry the form of government to which they owe their existence strikes me as one of the silliest things in his career. The proposal to give a man who is elected to the highest office in the state once in four years authority to decide when he will obey the constitution and when he will not; to annex provinces when he pleases by simple proclamation, and to make treaties of peace through his creatures seems to me one of the craziest propositions in history. To decide upon the propriety of this one does not need to prefer either McKinley or Bryan. Great nations do not compose their state papers while hanging over a stock exchange ticker.

WHY ITALY IS RESTLESS.

What are the particular grounds of complaint in Italy? It is a country with 30,000,000 of people in which only 2,000,000 have the right to vote and where the most outrageous liberties are taken with the ballot. The senate is strong for the interest of the crown, which is its own interest, and the chamber of deputies is for the most part dominated by the crown, so that there is nothing like free government under the so-called constitutional monarchy. The socialist and republican parties elect members regularly and their number is steadily increasing, but they are too much in the minority as yet to produce any real results. Mazzini was elected to the chamber of deputies, but he would never take a seat; and just a few weeks ago, Dr. Nicola Gigliotti, one of the triumvirs of the Federazione Pensiero ed Azione, of this country, was elected, but he declined to return and serve under the monarchy. Such things occur in spite of the corrupt electoral system.

On the surface of things there is a brave show. All things governmental have the appearance of affluence and stability. The king and his family get 28,000,000 francs a year—more than \$5,000,000. Then there is a vast army and navy establishment, and a great higher educational organization to support, and they are supported at monstrous cost, and to the glory and benefit of the privileged class.

As for the fiscal reports of the Italian government, they are a masterly array of confused matters. They are as comprehensible to the masses as is Herbert Spencer's definition of evolution: "An integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." For many years successive governments (what we should call cabinets) have brought into parliament budgets, which have juggled with the word "equilibrium," making it appear to have some potency to raise revenue and meet wild extravagance. But the word was like so much sand thrown into the people's eyes; it blinded them, so that they could not see what was really going on. But the day of reckoning is at hand. H. R. Whitehouse, at one time secretary of the American legation at Rome, in the current number of the Forum Magazine explains this situation:

The reasons for this are obvious. Economies alone, however sweeping, could not accomplish this much-heralded equilibrium; it was necessary to devise fresh taxes or to increase the burden of those in force. Italians now enjoy the unenviable distinction of being the most heavily taxed nation in Europe. The interest on the perpetual debts alone amounts to 490,000,000 lire. Sig. Fortinato, the deputy, estimates the budget at 1,600,000,000 lire, out of which 800,000,000 lire are devoured by the interest on the public debt in its various forms, including pensions. Deduct another 160,000,000 reserved for the payment of redemptions, and but 600,000,000 remain for the expenses of the government, including the army, navy, public works, prisons, public security, etc. This is not only meager, but absolutely insufficient.

Rotten with debt, the Italian monarchy seems ready to topple. And if this is the condition of the head-piece of the state, what of the people—the body and limbs of the state? Three words sum up that condition: 1, taxes; 2, taxes; 3, taxes. These taxes fall not in proportion to privileges enjoyed, nor even in proportion to wealth possessed. In the first place they fall with exceeding weight upon the common necessities of life,

such as grain, salt and petroleum, of which the poor man consumes as much as, if not more than, the rich man; and then they are supposed to fall upon revenue, the rich, however, as is usual with such a tax, managing to get exemptions that relieve them of a very large proportion of what they would bear under this tax if it were justly administered. The truth is that in Italy the poor pay 50 per cent. of the taxes—taxes for a revenue spent by the monarchy in wasteful pride; among other things to keep up a great standing army to repress the people at home and subjugate peoples abroad, and to keep up a large, useless navy, or, if useful, then only to do the devil's work.

The Italians are naturally a happy, joyous people. We who have so many of them among us can see that. In Italy no Roman is too mean, no mountain cottage too poor to have its banjo or guitar or mandolin. The fascination of the people for music in the years not so long ago, when Rossini and the group of great composers made all Italy a land of song and sunshine, is illustrated in the story of a conversation between two Milanese gentlemen who chanced to meet in the street. "Where are you going?" "To the Scala, to be sure!" "How! Your father lies at the point of death." "Yes! yes! I know, but Velluti sings to-night."

"Dolce far niente" ("doing nothing; sweet idleness") expresses what a large part of these poetical, music-loving people might find it most easy to give themselves up to in their picturesque country, with its seas and mountains and lakes; its mild, golden sunshine, and its transparent blue sky. A monarchy that would not be oppressive, and that outwardly would show a care for the people, even if only a superficial care, might float along for years and years until some outside political and social convulsion would arouse this quick, sensitive, high-natured nation to throw off dreaming, become self-assertive and advance as a nation to active things. But ever since the House of Savoy at the palace of the Quirinal assumed the crown of Italy there has been nothing but oppression of the people. What must follow when a good carpenter can be had in Italy for 30 cents a day? When that same carpenter out of his scant wages must pay heavy taxes to be squandered by men who call themselves God-ordained rulers of the people? Through many years

we have seen the consequence. The youth of Italy has to great extent emigrated to other parts of the world—to Africa, to South America, but mostly to the United States. Here they have been absorbed into our nationality and become industrious, sturdy American citizens.

But with the finding of better social and political conditions in other countries Italians have yearned for the establishment of better things in the mother—their native—country. And the principles of free American political institutions have asserted themselves in the steady effort of the Italian American citizen to bring about the establishment of a republic in Italy, where the people shall by their votes govern and tax themselves. In such movements there have been in the past, and must be in the future, individuals with distinct ideas and acting alone or practically alone, and such a person we may call this man Angelo Bresci, who, filled with the wrongs of the Italian people, and seeing no recourse but to destroy the headpiece of the governmental despotism, took his own life in his hands and killed King Humbert.

I do not for a moment justify this murder, nor do I believe that good can come to Italy from such an act. I am merely endeavoring to show the forces at work in that country, which, if not relieved in some way, must soon break into a vast political and social eruption.

That anarchism, teaching the abolition of government of man by man and the constitution of society without government, involves the abolition of monarchy is as true as that the principle of a democratic republic gives monarchy no place; but the recognized teachers of the doctrine of anarchy—such men as the celebrated scientist Prince Krapotkin and the famous French geographer, Jacques Elisee Reclus—do not for a moment recognize that their principles are to be advanced by the murder of anyone. So that the great amount of talk about a vast Italian conspiracy of assassination and bloody revolution has no foundation. It is precisely the kind of statement that the Italian despotism might give out to the world in order to hide its own acts of oppression and to bind its chains tighter upon the people.—Henry George, Jr., in *Philadelphia North American* of Aug. 13.

Give me neither poverty nor riches, lest I be poor and steal, or lest I be rich and say "there is nothing to arbitrate."—Wilmington (Del.) Justice.

AN OPEN LETTER FROM RABBI SALE.

Rabbi Samuel Sale, of St. Louis, has written an open letter to George A. Schilling, of this city, in which he rebukes the statement recently made by an eminent Jewish ecclesiastic, that the Jews should hang together and vote as one man at the coming election. Dr. Sale's position is the Jews cannot and should not be led to the polls like sheep, to cast their vote for William McKinley. Rabbi Sale has always been an earnest republican, and in 1896 was chaplain of the republican national convention at St. Louis. He disclaims any intention of making his letter an encyclical to the Jews, but simply writes as an American citizen. He says in part:

You know as well as I do, that a Jewish minister has no other influence over his coreligionists than that of reason and moral suasion, and that they are not a flock of sheep, to be led by a bell-wether. So far as any political capital to be gained thereby is concerned, such letters might just as well remain unwritten, but the injury which may be done to the Jews is incalculable.

The very fact that a rabbi writes to a Jew, giving him information and advice on the political situation, carries with it to an outsider the inference that his fellow believers are politically a separate and distinct class, a foreign body in the state, and this inference is to-day the very life of all so-called anti-semitism, the world over. Let Mr. Blumenthal or any other Jew, who cannot advise himself in the present political crisis, get his information at the same sources to which all Americans, Jew and Christian alike, are wont to go; but let him not turn to the rabbi, who is not his father confessor. I am not an alarmist, and I can prove that my reasoning is based on a solid foundation by pointing to the fact that the national republican committee are now actually circulating Hirsch's letter as a campaign document intended especially for the Jews.

If, as I am inclined to believe, Dr. Hirsch's letter was written at the suggestion of some political fire worker in the national republican committee, and Dr. Hirsch is now aware of its perversion, then he should recall it at once.

Mark you, I would not have the letter recalled for fear of any good it may do the republican party, for I assure you, it will neither make or unmake a single vote; but I fear the evil consequences that may spring from its spreading, if, which God forefend, at any future time, the dragon seed of Jew-baiting should be sown in the soil of our beloved land. If

that dire contingency should ever arise, then this questionable letter will be cited by the political descendants of the very people who are now using it, as a proof of the political aloofness and separateness of the Jew.

Remembering that Hirsch's letter appeared in the Chicago Tribune, and was made the subject of one of its editorials, and learning now that it is being circulated among the Jews for campaign purposes as a sort of pastoral, I do not hesitate to characterize it as unworthy the notice of respectable American Jews. I feel no reluctance, in the face of this letter, to declare to you and to the whole world, in my individual capacity, not as a rabbi, nor a Jew, but as an American, that I shall not vote for the candidate of the republican party for the office of president. Four years ago, as the chaplain of the national republican convention which nominated Mr. McKinley, I prayed for the success of that party which promised to maintain the honor and credit of the nation. At the coming election in November I shall vote against Mr. McKinley with just as much fervor. Four years ago I believed that the good name and the credit of our people would be endangered by the election of the candidate of the democratic party. To-day I believe the very life of the republic is jeopardized by the policy pursued by the republican administration. Four years ago the people were asked to decide whether our currency should rest upon a sound financial basis, and by their vote they declared that there can be but one standard of values in an honest household. In my opinion that question has been settled once for all, and its insistence in the platform of either party to-day is merely a political trick or by-play. But even if silver were not dead, and there were imminent danger of our going upon a silver basis immediately after the 4th of March next, I should still cast my vote for the democratic candidate, in view of the all-important and overshadowing issue of imperialism, which has come to the fore through the republican policy of criminal aggression. This policy has rudely shaken all our ideals and laid the ax at the very foundation upon which our government was reared. A mistake in our financial system would undoubtedly entail heavy losses, but our country is so rich that they would hardly be felt; moreover, after we had paid for our folly sufficiently, we would be only too glad to correct our

error and return to a sound and sensible currency, just as the Latin league did; but once wrench the foundation from under the free institutions which have been planted here and which have distinguished our country, and they will inevitably totter to ruin. Every act of the republican party, beginning with the treaty of Paris, whereby we bought (!) the right of sovereignty over a foreign, alien, unassimilable, unwilling and oppressed people, has been a step in the direction of high-handed imperialism, unworthy of a free and liberty-loving nation, and subversive of every principle and precedent established by the founders of our republic. The party that prides itself upon having achieved the freedom of the negro slave against his unwilling master, is now engaged in subjugating at the point of the bayonet a people who have never harmed us, and whose only sin is that they would be free and independent according to the bent of their nature, and in the land which God has given them. In taking and forcibly retaining the Philippines, we have torn our constitution in shreds, we have violated every genuinely American principle. The defenders of the administration tell us that if we had not taken the far-off islands, some other nation would; the same reason would justify every theft that ever was committed, for the thief might argue, if he had not appropriated the stolen goods some one else would. Again and again we are reminded that we made no promises to the Philippines of independence or self-government, as if that were a justification of the brutal course which the administration has pursued against these people. The only question to be decided is, How dare we Americans withhold a promise that is inherent in the constitution of the United States? This attempted defense in itself proves clearer than daylight, that we are on the high-road of imperialism. We first declared to the world that Cuba should of right be free and independent, and then we made our boast that our war should not be one of conquest and criminal aggression. I ask in the name of justice and common sense, Were not these declarations to the world not only implied but plain and direct promises made to the inhabitants of the Philippine islands? If not, then indeed we sugar o'er the devil himself with pious words.

Hypocrisy seems to be the order of the day. The republican leaders and platform mouth against trusts

and monopolies, and under the loving caresses and nursing of the republican party, they spring up all over the land like mushrooms. The republican platform, the republican leaders and the republican president give public and private, general and specific promises and pledges, that the civil service shall be maintained and extended, when lo and behold! at one fell swoop 10,000 positions are taken out of the classified service and opened to place hunters and political spoilsmen.

These are only a few of my reasons for supporting the democratic candidate in the coming election for president, the main one being, as we are all well aware, the issue of imperialism, which would dwarf every other consideration in the minds of all true and patriotic Americans.

I have no message as a Jew to the Jews, nor would I at this juncture deliver one if I had; but speaking as one American citizen to another, I recall the famous warning given by the decree of the ancient Roman senate to Lucius Opinius: "Let the consul see to it that the republic does not come to harm." I mean to heed that warning by voting for W. J. Bryan. Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL SALE.

AN ANALYSIS OF M'KINLEY'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

Extracts from an article by Dr. David J. Doherty, published in the Chicago Chronicle of Sept. 23.

THE PRESIDENT'S LOGIC.

Mr. McKinley's letter contains a number of fallacies, which will be easily apparent to any student of logic who will take the trouble to write out his arguments in syllogistic form. He is fond of using the style of argument called the dilemma, which is very perplexing to an adversary and may easily conceal a fallacy. I quote several instances, each of which offends the laws of logic by not being a complete or true dilemma. In his instruction to the peace commission (October 28, 1898), he says: "We must either hold the islands or turn them back to Spain." Here the alternatives are not mutually exclusive, because there is another line of conduct possible, viz., we may treat them as we have treated Cuba, and that is really the question which the American people desire to have answered, but the president does not, at least directly, refer to it.

Again, Mr. McKinley propounds to his adversaries (the anti-imperialists and democrats) a chain of questions which logicians call a sorites. This is

an instance of the fallacy plurimum interrogatorium. It is a multiple dilemma, but not a true one, because all its terms do not cover the entire truth. It was right to send Dewey's fleet to Manila; it was right for the fleet to stay there; it was right to send Merritt "to strengthen Dewey;" it was right to protect the lives and property of those who came within our control by the fortunes of war;" it was right "not to have come away before the conclusion of peace." The president's political adversaries would have done no less than these things, but they would also have done more. It would also have been right explicitly to state to the Filipinos our purpose to aid them in the establishment of an independent government, as we did to the Cubans. To throw the onus on congress by saying that congress "did not see fit" to do certain things does not relieve the republican administration from responsibility, especially as we know how persistently the president uses pressure on members of congress.

A third instance of Mr. McKinley's use of the dilemma is the sentence: "The American question is duty or desertion." This is the fallacy of the ambiguous middle, because one term contains two meanings. The word "duty" includes the democratic plan of an independent Filipino republic as well as the president's plan of a Filipino colony under American sovereignty. Many citizens think it a higher "duty" to recognize the natural rights of a people than paternally to nurse that people.

The president's statement: "When nations make treaties they must keep them," is an example of the fallacy called *ignoratio elenchi*, or irrelevant conclusion. The statement is true as to the principals to a treaty. But we made no treaty with the Filipinos. We even ignored their protests and excluded their representatives from the proceedings preliminary to the treaty. How can a treaty with the Spaniards excuse us from being just to the Filipinos? One might go farther and say that the sanctity of a treaty which involves the rights of a protesting third party is very questionable.

Another form of fallacy in which the president indulges is a misstatement of the question. For example, he says: "The two essential steps upon which all agree were the war with Spain and the ratification of the treaty, and from these flowed all our responsibilities." This is not a fair statement. The ratification of the treaty had a string tied to it, viz., the Bacon resolution. The treaty would not have been ratified

if it could have been known that Mr. Hobart would defeat the Bacon resolution. Public opinion demanded then that the war be ended by ratifying the unsatisfactory treaty. It demanded then and has since demanded that the unsatisfactory portion of the treaty be cured by the Bacon resolution or some similar act giving the Philippines the same status as Cuba. A truthful and complete statement would run: "The essential steps upon which all agree were the war with Spain, the ratification of the treaty and our recognition of the rights of the Filipinos. From these flowed all our responsibilities and our troubles have come from our failure to carry out the third step."

THE PRESIDENT'S FACTS.

Presumably, by virtue of his office, Mr. McKinley should know the facts of the Filipino case better than anyone else. Yet many of them he cannot know of his own personal knowledge, and for these he must depend on other people. Hence it will not be disrespectful to dispute such facts.

His statement of facts includes these. There was no alliance between the Filipinos and the Americans; no promise of independence was made to the former by any official of the United States; the Filipinos began the war; the vast majority of the population welcome our sovereignty and have been loyal to us; the Tagal insurgents are only "a designing minority," "a small fraction of the population, a single tribe out of 80 or more inhabiting the archipelago;" "the insurgents desired to enter Manila that they might loot it and destroy those not in sympathy with their selfish and treacherous designs;" they had secretly planned to assassinate all foreigners on February 22, 1899, and had even "long before their leader reached Manila" resolved that they would later turn upon us, and finally the Filipino people "have no capacity yet to go alone," and are "unable to maintain a stable government at home and absolutely helpless to perform any international obligations."

His authority for these alleged facts is partly reports of the commissions and other officials and partly the archives of Aguinaldo's government, which were captured, forwarded to Washington and are now being doled out in a petty way to the press, whenever any political capital can be made by their publication. Some of these facts have been denied and some have been doubted. I have space to deal only with two or three.

Last spring when in Washington I spoke with several men who occupy

important positions under the administration. I asked them how they could justify the action of the government in forcibly repressing the efforts of an alien people to form an independent republic. Their answer was in almost the identical words of the president, that the Tagals are a mere fraction of the population. I denied their figures, and gave as authority Cavada's "Historia Estadística," published at Manila in 1876. Though dealing with Philippine matters, they had not even heard of the book. They knew Foreman, Worcester, etc., almost by heart, but they did not know Cavada. A messenger was sent to the congressional library and to the bureau of education, but the book was not in the possession of either. The Newberry library and the public library of this city have each a copy of this remarkable work, and any student who knows Spanish may get the facts and figures. Cavada's tables show that the population of the Luzon or Tagal group of islands was in 1870 2,900,000; that of the Visayan group 1,900,000 and that of the Mindanaoan group about 300,000.

Much more important than Cavada is Prof. Blumentritt, whose pamphlet on the Philippines has recently been published in Germany. He is a recognized authority on ethnology, particularly of the Filipinos, among whom he spent a number of years. His figures are as follows; The Negritos or original inhabitants number about 20,000 souls; the heathen, or mountain Malays (Igorrotes and most of the "80 tribes" scattered throughout 1,200 islands), vary from the lowest estimate of 600,000 to the highest of 1,100,000; the Christian and civilized Malays (the Filipinos proper) number from 6,500,000 to 8,000,000 souls. The Chinese are about 2½ per cent. and the Spanish and Chinese mestizos about 3½ per cent. of the population. Of the Filipinos proper, the Tagals number about one-third or near 3,000,000; the Visayans about one-half, the Ilocoans about three-tenths and the balance is made up by about eight other "tribes." All these Filipinos proper are practically one people, related like the English and the Scotch, or the branches of the Scandinavian race.

It is absurd to speak of them as a conglomeration of 80 or more tribes, as it would be to speak of the inhabitants of this country as being made up of 40 or more tribes, because there are some fifty-odd tribes of red Indians scattered throughout our country.

Let it be noted that we are fighting the civilized Malays, and that our only allies are from the mountain heathen.

As to their capability for independent self-government, Prof. Blumentritt says: "The excuse that the Filipinos are not ripe for self-government is not founded on facts." This he proves by comparisons with peoples of central Europe and Central and South America. It is certain that the ideals and aspirations of the Filipinos are European. Unlike the Chinese, they have no antipathy to foreigners. Their civilization is occidental, not oriental, and in this respect they are superior even to the Japanese. They only need freedom and a stable government to become the Yankees of the orient.

That the Filipinos meant to loot and murder foreigners is not credible. They did not do it at Iloilo, where they had full sway, and had established a well-ordered government before the arrival of Gen. Miller. They did not slay their Spanish prisoners. In his first proclamation issued from Hong-Kong before the departure of Dewey's fleet for Manila Aguinaldo said (I quote from Foreman's book):

Divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach in a manner worthy of a free and liberty-loving people. * * * An American squadron is at this moment preparing to sail for the Philippines. We fear you may be induced to fire on the Americans. No, brothers, never make the mistake. Rather blow out your brains than treat with enmity those who are your liberators. * * * Wherever you see an American flag there flock in numbers. They are our redeemers.

Alas, poor Filipinos! How they have had to change their opinion of their "redeemers." But even in the very proclamation referred to by the president the one, namely, in which Aguinaldo instructed his followers in Manila how to surprise and capture the city, the following sentences occur:

I charge and order that the persons and goods of all foreigners shall be respected and that the American prisoners shall be well treated.

The chiefs are charged to see that the officers and soldiers respect the consulates, the banks and commercial houses and even the Spanish banks and commercial houses, taking care that they be not seduced by the hope of plunder.

I charge that you will not forget the promises made by me to the civilized nations, when I have assured that we Filipinos are not savages or thieves or assassins, nor are we cruel, but, on the contrary, that we are men of culture and patriotism, honorable and humane.

Finally the president proves too much, for if these insurgents are such a small fraction of the population and if the vast majority are loyal to us the American people must wonder why it

took 60,000 soldiers so long a time to conquer them.

THE PRESIDENT ON IMPERIALISM.

Furthermore, Mr. McKinley says: "Imperialism has no place in the creed or conduct of the administration."

That depends on what is meant by imperialism. If with the "Encyclopedia Britannica" we take it to be "an overlordship over other peoples," this administration is certainly imperialistic and the more flagrantly so because the other people are fighting to the death against that overlordship.

AN ABSENT-MINDED NATION.

(With Apologies to Kipling.)

When you've sacrificed to Moloch, drained your nation to the bone;

When you've sniped off every burgher from his hill;

Will you squarely do some thinking of the Lord God on His throne,

And remember his command: "Thou shalt not kill?"

You're an absent-minded nation, and your vision sees but part;

You are brave to face the moment and to meet it;

But in doughty deed heroic, born from out your swelling heart,

You forgot, perchance, how history will repeat it.

Boer's son, your son., Son of the King of Kings!

By your resolve, by your decree, still going forth to slay—

The King will add those figures up (it is well to think on these things);

Fall on your knees for your honor's sake, and pray! pray! pray!

You're a great and mighty nation, noble, brave and very strong;

East and west and north and south your flag's unfurled;

You are waging bitter warfare now, and—be you right or be you wrong—

Your every act becomes a fact to all the watching world.

When the day of fight is finished, you must then make up your book;

And, you'll let a friendly fellow-man remind you,

You must enter on the debit side—however hard to brook—

The blood, the tears, the waste you've left behind you.

Your son, Boer's son, crushed in the crimson sod;

And which commingled dust is yours you'll know not on that day.

War's work is the devil's work (and how will you answer God);

Fall on your knees for your honor's sake, and pray! pray! pray!

There are widows weeping frantic tears, poor little ones who cry,

And mothers shriek whose souls have felt the sword;

From England fair and rugged veldt the cries ascend on high;

They are noted by a just and common Lord.

You're an absent-minded nation, but beware! do not forget!

You must hand your book unto the King to scan it;

In your heart you are too upright to risk piling such a debt,
Just because a reckless minister began it.

God's son, Boer's son, your own son proud and free;

There's a price for blood, O England, and that price you'll have to pay

When the Lord God audits your balance sheet. Oh, what will the profit be?

Fall on your knees for your honor's sake, and pray! pray! pray!

—The Monitor.

"Why do you doubt him, my daughter? You say that his declaration was made with apparent seriousness and sincerity, and—?"

"Oh, yes, mamma, I admit all that; and perhaps it is wrong for me to be suspicious of Mr. Smither. But I really cannot help fearing that he spoke in a McKinleyan sense." G. T. E.

"Alas!" said the Chinese statesman, "it is China against the world!"

"That," said his friend, "is our only hope. Singly, any of the powers could whip us; but it isn't quite certain that they can do it together."—Puck.

Linconer—It is costing us one hundred millions a year to hold the Philippines.

Hannermark—Oh, my friend, you do not look at the situation from a Christian point of view. Can you not understand that we are generously bearing this expense to relieve poor, impoverished Spain?—G. T. E.

The Philadelphian—Isn't the mud on this street a trifle deep?

Chicagoan (proudly)—Deep? It is the deepest mud on any paved street in the world!—Indianapolis Press.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "Our Foes at Home" (New York: Doubleday & McClure Co.), Hugh H. Lusk, formerly a member of the New Zealand parliament, holds up the political and economic experience of New Zealand as an object lesson to the United States. The book is especially valuable for its explanation of the successful reforms for which New Zealand has become famous—an explanation that is enhanced in interest quite as

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.

much by the manner in which these reforms are presented as desirable American possibilities, as by the fluent and direct literary style of the author. Mr. Lusk's rather commonplace criticism of the single tax would probably evoke good-natured smiles from advocates of that doctrine, as would his nervous shrinking from essential principles and clutching at superficial measures; while the timidity of his more or less unconscious socialism would bring him into contempt with strenuous followers of Karl Marx. Nevertheless, both socialists and single taxers, and certainly all politicians of the more advanced sort, will find in his book much to interest and not a little to instruct them. It is worth careful reading if for nothing else than its comparison of our country, which must reform or perish, with New Zealand, which, in a similar emergency, has decided to reform.

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

Liberty, Independence & Self Government

Extracts from expressions of the Founders of the Republic with comment by the editor. Endorsed and used by the Democratic National Committee. Price 25c. Address the EDITOR, E. G. BALLARD 807 Chamber of Commerce, Chicago.

PLUTOCRATIC STATISTICS

AN EXPOSURE of the manner in which official and campaign statistics are juggled and falsified.

A 32-page pamphlet. Sent postpaid for 10 cts. by the author, H. L. BLISS, 7341 Vincennes Road, Chicago. 10 copies 60 cts., 20 copies \$1.00.

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

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

SEND 25 CENTS in stamps to REV. L. G. LANDENBERGER, 8741 Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo., for his song.

"THE PEOPLE'S PRESIDENT."

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

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

Houston.

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

EDUCATIONAL.

THE KATHERINE L. MALTBY

HOME AND SCHOOL.

NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS,
160 Joralemon Street.

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



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

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

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

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

LECTURES GIVEN AT
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor,
EVERY SUNDAY AFTERNOON
At 8 o'clock sharp.

Program for Sunday, October 14th:
MR. LOUIS F. POST,
Editor of The Public,

"That Favorable Balance of Trade Theory."
ADMISSION FREE!

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

The first thousand dollars is hard to get. After that it is easier. No better way of saving exists than through good life insurance. A few years and you have it; if you die, our wife gets it. Consult

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

TIMELY BOOKS

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

- The Preparation of Byerson Embury . . . 75c
- Reconciled, A Story of Common Life . . . 25c
- Japanese Notions of European Polit'l Econ . 25c
- Our Farmers of the Revenne 25c
- The Single Tax, Post 25c
- The Trusts, Collie, Just Published 50c
- atural Taxation, Shearman 30c
- Progress and Poverty, George 30c
- Our Country, Strong 35c

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.

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

Try those out of boxes

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

J. & B. MOOS,

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