

# The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1900.

Number 134.

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.

Complaints of coercion in connection with the McKinley parade in Chicago on the 27th are many. Mercantile houses are forcing their employes to join the procession, on pain of dismissal. One house of which we hear, an exceptionally considerate one, left the question to a vote of its employes, but with the admonition that if a majority voted to parade all must join. And this enforced parade of business house employes is to be exploited through the republican press of the country as a demonstration for McKinley!

The associated banks of Chicago have voted, against vigorous protests from some of their number, to close their doors on the 27th, the day of the McKinley parade. Evidently the object of the majority was to promote McKinley's election. But they gave a different reason. They argued that the day, being Saturday, would be a short one anyhow, and that, as the streets would be congested, no banking business could be done. We shall have a test of their sincerity on the 3d. That day, too, will be Saturday, and a short day. Then, too, the streets will be congested, for it is the day of the Bryan parade. If on that day also the associated banks of Chicago close their doors, they may be credited with sincerity with reference to the McKinley parade. If not, then not.

"If Mr. Bryan were elected president, would he pay the obligations of the nation in gold or silver?" That is a question which Roosevelt asks and the McKinley papers repeat. And

there are people who think it important. Mr. Bryan's character is an all sufficient answer. No one doubts that, if elected president, Mr. Bryan would enforce the law. The question resolves itself, then, into another: What does the law require? If it requires payment in gold, Bryan would pay in gold. If it does not, he would not. And if it does not require payment in gold, who is responsible? Who else but the republican party, which, with four years' absolute control of both houses of congress and the presidency, have left us on a silver basis?

Senator Hanna's audience at South Omaha was assured by him that—the coal strike is virtually settled, and I had more to do with the settlement of it than any other man in this country.

One might fairly ask why the Ohio senator, if he has such great influence over the mining magnates, did not oblige them to settle the strike before it had run on a month. One might wonder, moreover, what kind of country this is we are living in, when one little man like Senator Hanna can thus control the livelihood of 150,000 miners.

When Mr. Hanna's party papers and leaders feel disposed again to nag Bryan for not discussing the silver question in New York, they should remember that in a speech at Norfolk, Neb., Mr. Hanna himself said: "I don't want to talk about free silver; that is a dead issue." If free silver is a dead issue in Nebraska, what makes it a live issue in New York?

Bryan is subjected to a flood of criticism from Roosevelt because he accepts the support of Croker in New York. Whose support in New York should he accept? The only alternative is Croker or Platt, and Roosevelt

has accepted Platt's support. Furthermore, in all respects in which Croker is bad, Platt is worse. Next to Hanna, Platt is probably the worst public man in the United States. Croker is only a poor third.

Chairman Jones, of the national democratic committee, charges President McKinley with misusing secret public documents. His charges are based upon the fact that Mr. McKinley, in his letter of acceptance as a presidential candidate, quoted from his instructions, as president, to the Paris peace commissioners. Since those instructions had never before been divulged, although repeatedly called for by senators, the charges are exceptionally grave. Nor are these charges to be evaded by the state department contention that "the president is at liberty to make public executive documents as he sees fit." That the president, as president, is at liberty to do that, no one for a moment questions. But it was not as president that Mr. McKinley published the quotation from his instructions to the Paris peace commissioners. He did it as a political candidate. And he did it not in a state document, but in an unofficial political document—his letter of acceptance. To make the matter worse, he has published only so much of the instructions as suit his purpose as a candidate. The remainder are still under the seal of executive secrecy. If this act be not a grave official offense, then we have come to a point in our history where our presidents, like kings, "can do no wrong."

In a carefully prepared interview published in the Chicago Tribune of the 24th, Archbishop Ireland says that a reversal of President McKinley's policy at the next election—will be interpreted by foreign nations as an indication of unsettled condi-

tions in our own country and of changeableness of political and commercial opinions and methods, and would result in lowering us immensely in the estimation in which we are now held by foreign countries.

Whence did Archbishop Ireland learn that the people of this republican country wish so to formulate American policies and so to cast their votes in presidential elections as to win the esteem of the monarchical countries of Europe? If the distinguished archbishop's impression is correct, the sooner President McKinley is voted out of office the better for American institutions. It is as our institutions differ from the established institutions of Europe, and are condemned by European powers, not as they conform to European standards and are praised by the supporters of European thrones, that they are worthy the devotion of American democrats and republicans. If the European powers want McKinley reelected, that is in itself no bad reason for defeating him.

In that same Tribune interview, Archbishop Ireland made another ominous remark. It cannot but shock every sincere Catholic whose vote for McKinley his interview was intended to solicit. Referring to Cuba and the Philippines and to Catholic interests in those places, he said:

In Rome, where Catholic interests in those countries are well understood, there is entire satisfaction as to the attitude of the American government towards those interests. If the authorities in Rome are satisfied, why should not Catholics in America be satisfied?

Why not? For the same reason that Irish patriots were never satisfied with the meddling of Rome in Irish politics in behalf of British aggression. One of the greatest of Irishmen, a faithful Catholic withal, was Daniel O'Connell, who publicly resented the attempts of Rome to fasten British power upon the Irish people. O'Connell's memorable words were: "All the religion you please from Rome, but no politics!" So say all American patriots, Catholic

and Protestant alike. "All the religion you please from Rome," Archbishop Ireland; "but no politics." When you attempt to influence American elections by an appeal to the opinions of Rome, you overstep the bounds which American Catholics, no less than American Protestants, have unalterably fixed in this country between church and state,

A Filipino of the name of Reyes, resident in Omaha, claims the right to vote at the election. He had applied for naturalization, but was told by the clerk of the court that he was a "subject" of the United States. That made it impossible, of course, for him to renounce allegiance. He could not forswear allegiance to the United States as a subject in order to swear allegiance to the United States as a citizen. Consequently he attempts to vote without naturalization. But there is no provision yet in our voting laws for subjects. Three years ago, this Filipino, had he lived here long enough, might have been naturalized and have become thereby a citizen. But now, this right is cut off. He is in worse plight with reference to American liberties in America than when he was a subject of Spain.

It amuses some republicans who have forgotten the democratic origin of their party to sneer at the new democracy as a party of "antis." But the republican party, before its moral fall, was founded exclusively upon two "antis." It was then anti-polygamy and anti-slavery. Under the Sulu treaty it is now pro-polygamy and pro-slavery. It has dropped both "antis."

A shrewd old colored woman of Evanston summed up the political situation acutely as well as picturesquely when she said, one day last week—

I yeah dis yeh man Hanna he gwine out talkin'. He talkin' coz he skaired. Fiah behine McKinley! An' mighty well he know it, too.

To be assured of the accuracy of that woman's observation one need only

read the speeches of Hanna and Roosevelt. Those two men are McKinley's leading speakers. They take his place personally before the country. And neither of them does him or his cause any credit. Hanna, for example, when speaking at Wymore, Neb., asked what Bryan had done for the workingman and answering his own question said:

Confidentially, not a damned thing. Meanwhile, Roosevelt is indulging at his meetings in the east in vituperation that would have made him the envy of an old-time London fish wife. At West Nyack, New York, he shouted to an interrupter:

Now go back to your fellow hoboes. You stand against the flag; you haven't got a particle of patriotism in you. I am glad you are going away. I think you have learned enough hereafter not to monkey with the buzz saw.

This kind of talk these worthies are flinging not only at their audiences, but also, at longer range, at Bryan. Wholly apart from the bad taste which Hanna and Roosevelt are thereby displaying, their conduct is evidence of their demoralization. They have lost their heads. There is, as the colored woman said, a fire behind McKinley, and right well they know it, too.

The contrast between these representative McKinley men and Bryan is great. Bryan has throughout been respectful toward his adversaries and gentlemanly in dealing even with the worst hoodlums who have tried to disturb his meetings. Yet his temptations to speak with bitterness have been far more numerous and irritating than any which Hanna and Roosevelt have experienced. People who have heard both these men and Bryan, and even those who have only read their speeches, cannot but be impressed with the superiority of Bryan not only as an orator, in which respect the difference is enormous, but also as a man, a statesman and a gentleman.

Because the registration of women as voters in Chicago falls off from 6,264 in 1896 to 1,500 this year, it is

argued that Chicago women take no interest in voting. But the real and very obvious reason for the falling off is that women are not allowed to vote in Illinois except once in two years, when a woman is to be elected as university trustee, and then only for one of the women candidates. If the suffrage right of men were similarly restricted there would hardly be enough male voters registered for any election to cover the face of a visiting card.

The lot of the "prosperity" editor is in these days not a happy one, as that functionary on the New York Times has discovered. He received a communication recently from Thomas W. Organ, a master builder of New York, in which Mr. Organ asserted that since McKinley's inauguration 19 out of every 20 New York builders who had made attempts to carry on their business had been forced into bankruptcy. That state of things was accounted for by Mr. Organ with the further assertion that under the McKinley regime buildings cannot be sold except at a price 20 per cent. below the cost of production. This communication was returned by the "prosperity" editor, with the explanation that the Times had taken pains to ascertain the truth and had found that Organ's statement was absolutely false. Thus challenged, Organ came again to the breach, asserting that in these "prosperous" times the mortgagees, in nine cases out of ten, have to bid in foreclosed property, and that when resold it goes at a loss. To this challenge the "prosperity" editor of the Times replied: "We have no means of knowing where you get your misinformation, but there is no doubt of the fact." That was Organ's opportunity and the Times man's undoing. "If this be misinformation," wrote Mr. Organ, "it will interest you to know that it comes from the columns of the New York Times." And then he referred to a recent issue of that paper in which there were reports of seven foreclosure sales at each of which the property was bought in by the mortgagee. He went

further, showing that one of these seven properties, worth \$16,000 four years ago, was bought in by the mortgagee for \$11,700 and that it could not be resold for more than \$11,000. Mr. Organ clearly had the best of the Times' "prosperity" editor. Nor would any other "prosperity" editor have fared better. Except among trust beneficiaries and their lawyers, and in Wrightalized statistics, there is no prosperity.

The peculiar kind of "prosperity" that prevails in these days was admirably symbolized at the Marquette club banquet in Chicago on the 24th. It was a McKinley banquet, and, in the language of the Chicago Tribune, food was "provided in abundance to typify the full 'dinner pail.'" At this banquet there sat the favored ones, typifying special privilege; while in the galleries were gathered the common herd whose share in the banquet was a smell of its fumes and the echoes of "prosperity" oratory.

Savings bank statistics are again brought forward to prove prosperity. The misleading character of this proof has been pointed out over and over again. How misleading it is may be inferred from the following quotation from a circular of the Northern Trust company of Chicago, which refers to its savings accounts:

Interest is paid on savings deposits at the rate of three per cent., and is compounded semi-annually. Persons having incomes, a part of which they wish to reserve regularly, and allow to accumulate with interest, will find savings accounts in this bank desirable.

These are the kind of deposits that swell savings bank statistics. Savings bank accounts, so far from representing the savings of the poor, represent the uninvested surplus of the rich and well to do. Many persons of the latter class keep accounts in several different savings banks, thereby having cash funds as available in normal times as an ordinary bank account, yet yielding compound interest at a good rate if not disturbed. Into these accounts go the uninvested dividends,

the uninvested rents, the uninvested interest receipts of the classes that live, in greater or less degree, upon the labor of others. And it is because these classes have within a few years past discovered the convenience and profit of savings bank deposits as receptacles for their extra cash, that the statistics of savings bank deposits show an increase.

Rule of thumb financiers are frequently heard congratulating the country upon its having as they suppose become a creditor nation. How a nation which is constantly exporting more gold, silver and merchandise than it imports can be regarded as having become a creditor nation, it would puzzle almost any financier to explain. The thing doesn't work in that way. Great Britain, the great creditor nation of the world, is and has for long years been an importing, not an exporting, nation. But what if the United States were to become a creditor nation? She would import, in payment of her claims, more than she exported. And what would happen then? Why, according to the protection theory she would go to the dogs. For that theory holds that it is exports, not imports, that enrich a nation. Consequently it is the debtor nation, always exporting to meet its obligations, and not the creditor nation, always importing its collections, that flourishes. What fools these protectionists be!

Judge Rombauer, of St. Louis, who has always been a republican, and supports Bryan this year because, as he truly says, Bryan "is a far better exponent than William McKinley of every cardinal principle which has called the republican party into being," makes a fine condensation, in the St. Louis Republic of the 18th, of the true American doctrine of the flag. He says:

The flag is an emblem for what it stands. When it is the emblem of liberty, justice and equal rights before the law, it should when once hoisted never be lowered. When it stands for injustice, oppression and cruelty, the sooner it is lowered the better. It takes but a

brute in the latter instance to hoist it, but it takes a moral hero to lower it.

In what splendid contrast is that sentiment with the bunting-worshipping sentiment which it is intended to rebuke.

As Mr. Bryan has made his views regarding wealth perfectly clear, by declaring that he would conserve earned wealth and put an end to unearned wealth, Don M. Dickinson puts himself in an anomalous position by objecting to Bryan on account of his views regarding wealth. It is easy to understand why men like Dickinson wish to conserve unearned wealth, but why they expose their love for that particular kind, as Dickinson has done, is not so obvious.

It is instructive to observe, also, that in justifying his decision to vote for McKinley, Mr. Dickinson declares himself to be "a democrat on all the fundamental issues on which" the party has "joined battle in the past with the republicans." He thereby proves beyond question that he belongs with McKinley; for the great fundamental issue on which the democratic party originally joined battle with the republicans was the issue of the principles of the declaration of independence. The democratic party was opposed to those principles then; the republican party is opposed to them now. It is exquisitely appropriate, therefore, that Mr. Dickinson, since he is proud to have been a democrat in the middle of the century, should be a McKinley republican at its close.

This is the time of year when the Illinois secretary of state goes a-gunning for corporations and partnerships, and the song he sings them has this argentiferous chorus:

A dollar from you! and you! and you!  
One dollar apiece I claim.  
A dollar from you! and you! and you!  
Next year I'll call again.

This dollar is the secretary's fee for filing affidavits in which corporation officers and business men swear that their concerns are not trusts. To forget to file an affidavit and pay the dol-

lar is to incur a penalty of \$50 a day for every day's neglect. That is the law. It is an anti-trust law. But it has no more effect upon trusts, and cannot have, than the pope's bull had upon the comet. All it accomplishes is to fatten the fees of the secretary of state at the expense of corporations and partnerships that are not in trusts. A trust can easily evade the law, but a partnership or corporation not in the trust cannot evade payment of the dollar.

#### THE TREND OF WAGES.

Under the title "Trend of Wages from 1891 to 1900," the September Bulletin of the department of labor, which is over a month late in its appearance, presents a table of relative wage statistics which is an analysis or summary of data given in the July Bulletin (pages 766 to 812) as "Table I—Rates of Wages in Various Occupations." It is intended to show that wages have increased since 1891.

Thus in the heat of the presidential campaign, and when too late to expose him adequately, Col. Wright springs upon the public another batch of misleading wage statistics. His summary follows:

"Relative wages from 1891 to 1900 inclusive."	
Year.	Relative Wages.
1891 .....	100.00
1892 .....	100.30
1893 .....	99.30
1894 .....	98.06
1895 .....	97.88
1896 .....	97.93
1897 .....	98.96
1898 .....	98.79
1899 .....	101.54
1900 .....	103.45

It is remarked in the article in the September Bulletin that "all the data included, except those for mining, relate to the manufacturing industries, the data relative to steam railroads and street railways having been excluded from the summary." There is also this further observation:

While the data from which the table is drawn do not afford the basis for a strictly scientific calculation of relative wages, a careful examination of the figures given in table I leads to the belief that they are fairly representative, and that the results here given, showing the trend of wages from 1891 to 1900, are entirely fair and undoubtedly approximate very

closely the actual conditions for the whole country.

That the data presented by Col. Wright in table I of the July Bulletin, of which the foregoing table of relative wages is a summary, are not "fairly representative" may be discovered by a comparison of the data of that table relating to steam railroads (pages 803-809) with the figures of the Interstate Commerce commission, showing the "average daily compensation of all railway employes in the United States, 1892 to 1899 inclusive," which may be found on page 692 of the July Bulletin. An extended comparison would exceed my space, but any one can discover the facts by comparing these differing statistics, to be found in the same number of the Bulletin.

We may note, for instance, that carpenters' wages in railroad establishment 1 (page 803) increased from \$1.71 in 1892 to \$1.98 in 1899, and that in establishment 2 they increased from \$1.80 in 1892 to \$1.96 in 1899. Yet, according to the interstate commerce table, carpenters' wages paid by railroads fell from \$2.08 in 1892 to \$2.03 in 1899.

Machinists' wages, according to Col. Wright's data, increased from \$1.93½ in 1892 to \$2.18½ in 1899 in establishment 1, and in establishment 2 from \$2.14 in 1892 to \$2.22 in 1899. Yet, according to the interstate commerce figures, there was no increase in machinists' wages.

According to Col. Wright's data the section foremen got a raise in each establishment quoted; but according to the interstate commerce figures their wages fell from \$1.76 to \$1.68.

According to Col. Wright's figures, flag men and watchmen got a slight raise; but according to the interstate commerce figures they had a slight fall.

The foregoing table, which, as stated, is principally of manufacturing wages, shows an increase of nearly six per cent. since 1896. Yet the most complete and reliable statistics of manufactures, those of Massachusetts, show that average earnings have fallen since that date, and that average wages have fallen still more. Even in Pennsylvania, where there has been a boom in the leading manufacturing industries, according to

the report of the Pennsylvania commissioner of internal affairs, the average wages were three cents less per day in 1899 than in 1896.

It is further remarked by Col. Wright in his September Bulletin, that "the figures for 1899 to 1900 show a gratifying average increase over the conditions of 1891 and 1892, when wages in gold were higher than at any period in the history of the country prior to the present year." This last statement, as Col. Wright must be well aware, is not true. Fairly summarized, the data of the Aldrich report show wages (gold values) 20 per cent. lower in 1891 than in 1873. In a full and fair analysis of the data of the Aldrich report, made in "Present Concentration of Wealth in the United States," by Charles B. Spahr, Mr. Spahr proves that result. Only by the most palpable juggling of figures can the Aldrich report be made to show even a slight increase in wages in 1891 over 1872 or 1873.

H. L. BLISS.

Chicago.

#### THE PARTY OF PROGRESS.

In a country which believes in progress it is natural that every party should claim that it is the party of progress. It is manifest, however, that this claim cannot in all cases be substantiated. Two parties diametrically opposed to each other on vital issues cannot both be parties of true progress. As a matter of fact, in every great contest in the political world, like our present national campaign, one of the two great parties represents and embodies the principle of real and true advance, genuine growth and progress, while the other represents and embodies the principle of retrogression and decay, perhaps even the principle of revolution and ruin. Which is which in the present conflict?

It will not do to judge in such a matter by professions or declaimings. The body that mouths the most about the forward march, expansion and the like, may really be the retrogressive or revolutionary party, claiming everything but cloaking its real designs, intentions and tendencies under fine phrases and loud boasts.

Nor will it do to judge entirely by the past, without taking into consideration new factors that may arise.

Men change. Parties change. Issues change. Nothing is more frequent in human experience than to see a party which has gained one great victory for reform or human progress pitch its tent upon the once won field, become demoralized through giving itself over to the enjoyment of captured spoils upon its Capuan plain, or fight to the death those who desire to win another victory and make another advance.

The republican party of to-day loudly claims to be the party of progress. It ardently and noisily proclaims itself as the advocate of expansion. Its claim, however, will not bear analysis.

The forcible annexation of conquered territory and unwilling people is no more expansion, in any true sense of the word, than the dropsy is healthy growth. The dropsy adds to a person's weight. The imperialistic annexation of purchased or subjugated peoples adds, likewise, to the nation's extent. But in each case there is the addition of disease, there is gross and perilous deterioration, there is the surrender of health—in the one case individual, in the other national. How can we extend our institutions to the Philippines when, in order to reach and seize them, we drop our institutions on the way? How can we extend our government over the Filipinos when, to govern them at all, we must abandon the fundamental principles upon which our government is based and degenerate until we become low and base enough to join the barbaric parade of nations whose only right is might and whose only god is greed? How can we even expand our trade when we either kill those with whom we are talking of trading or treat them in such fashion as to invite their everlasting enmity? Is it not easier to trade with live men than with dead men? Is it not easier to trade with friends than with foes? We might have had—we might still have—the friendship of the Filipinos, by the simple expedient of treating them justly, a road "as plain as way to parish church." The contention that imperialistic subjugation is essential or even advantageous to trade expansion is an argument too hollow and too canting to deserve aught but contempt. Trade follows

the flag! How comes it then that the trade of the United States is larger with Great Britain than with any other country in the world? How comes it that Great Britain's trade is greater with the United States than with any other country in the world? Alleyne Ireland shows, in his recently issued work on "Tropical Colonization," that while the annual purchases of English goods average only \$1.02 for each colonial subject, such purchases average \$1.50 for each citizen of the United States. Furthermore, Mr. Ireland shows that the United Kingdom's tropical colonies consume annually only 71 cents' worth of English goods per head of population. Trade follows the flag? Bosh! It follows the converging lines of demand and supply.

In flat contradiction of the contention that the conquest of distant and alien peoples is genuine or truly profitable national expansion, history speaks. James Anthony Froude unanswerably says, in his life of Julius Caesar, modestly called by him "A Sketch"—"If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this, that free nations cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties." Prof. Thorold Rogers, in his admirable "Story of Holland," bears like testimony. He says: "If one searches through history, one can never find a single case in which public opulence can be traced to foreign conquest, in which the cost to the public of occupying and maintaining such conquests has not been greatly in excess of all the profit which private interests have secured from them." No standard or reliable historian says other than this. This is the verdict of universal history. Is it "progress" to disdain the universal lesson of all trustworthy history?

The simple fact of the case is that the present republican administration's course in regard to both Puerto Rico and the Philippines is the most marked retrogression. It is reversion to the barbaric type of government, the type our revolutionary forefathers had outgrown—government resting on no better basis than military

force. The republican party's policy is grossly and greatly revolutionary. It involves the subversion of all the principles which justified our separation from Great Britain, of all the fundamental principles of national righteousness and a people's liberty.

On the other hand, no clear, unprejudiced eyes can fail to discern that, whatever the democratic party may or may not have been under Polk, Buchanan or Cleveland, the democracy of to-day is the true party of progress. It advocates the expanded application of the principles of free government—the application of them to the orient and to South Africa as well as to America. It has pronounced in favor of direct legislation, which means the bringing of governmental functions into more direct and complete touch with the people. It declares in favor of the abolition of private monopoly and special privilege, which means the abolishment of governmental favoritism for the classes and the guaranteeing of governmental justice to the masses. The republican idea of prosperity is this: Make the few prosperous by favoring tariffs, by granting franchises, by the bestowal of various and sundry special privileges; then some drops of prosperity will trickle down until they reach the very least and lowest. The democratic idea of prosperity is this: Every special privilege helps one or a few but injures the many; the only law for establishing and maintaining prosperity for the common people is the law of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Along all these lines, as well as others we have not named, the democracy of to-day is the party of genuine progress, notwithstanding the fact that unlike its adversary it does not perpetually mouth the word.

But the most important thing to-day is not even true progress. It is important to distinguish the true from the false, and to make note of the fact that the republican party of to-day is headed towards the centralization of wealth and power in the hands of the few, and is rapidly moving in that direction, while the living democracy of to-day is faced towards equality of rights, equity in

governmental administration, the uplifting of the pyramid of humanity by lifting its lowermost stratum. More important even than progress, however, is conservation; and the democracy of to-day is the party of conservatism, in the true and good sense of that much-abused word.

What step of progress in the realm of material invention or discovery could compensate us for the loss of the printing press? Or of written language? Or of articulate speech? None whatever. Could aerial navigation? Could liquid air as a motor? Could the discovery of some new fuel? Certainly not. No step of advancement we can conceive would or could compensate us for the loss of any of the great acquisitions of the past which we have named. More important, then, by far, than any new advance in art or science is the holding fast that which humanity has, through ages past, already won.

The same is true in the political world. No step of progress, however great, no advancement, either apparent or real, could possibly compensate us for the loss of the ground already gained. Out of the past there reach the hands of generations gone before—the tear-wet, toil-scarred, blood-stained hands of struggling humanity—entrusting to our use and trusteeship the infinitely rich and precious heritage of the past. The founders and saviors of this republic have handed down to us the unspeakably sacred heritage of free government, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. Shall we barter this away for whatever somebody calls "prosperity" or "expansion" or "progress," but which certainly is the abandonment of all that Thomas Jefferson lived for and Abraham Lincoln died for?

Remember that not all motion is progress. A ship is said to "make distance" whenever it traverses the water as measured by the log. But it may be "making distance" towards a peaceful harbor, or towards a maelstrom, or the rocks upon which it will be dashed asunder.

Remember that reversion, deterioration, degeneration, is, for the nation, as well as for the individual organism, always possible. The ship's barnacle begins life as a member of the verte-

brate sub-kingdom, the highest of the five sub-kingdoms into which the animal kingdom is divided; but it soon attaches itself to some ship's hulk, or some old piece of wood, adopts a retrogressive life, and loses the myelonic or cerebral eye, the perforated gill-slits, the spinal cord; the backbone, the interior articulated skeleton—loses all the five characteristics of the vertebræ, and becomes like unto a man standing on his head and kicking his food into his mouth.

Social or national organisms may also degenerate and at length perish. Rome declined. Israel fell. Athens perished. Shall America follow in their footsteps? The policy of the republican party of to-day is making distance toward the rocks on which popular government goes to pieces. Imperialism, disguise it how they will, is but reversion towards the barbaric type of government; it is degeneracy worse than that of the ship's barnacle.

The paramount issue of the present national campaign, then, is not, Shall we achieve this or that step of further progress? but this: Shall we preserve the infinitely rich heritage bequeathed to us by the builders and makers of free government, or shall we surrender this heritage at the bidding of selfish ambition or commercial greed? Shall we hold fast what the past has won and handed down to us as our sacred inheritance, or shall we barter this away for the sake of a little gold and glory?

An Irish land-lubber went on board ship, and, help being scarce, was one night given the helm and told to steer straight by the north star. Presently Patrick went to sleep, and by the time he awoke the ship had veered and drifted 'round until the north star hung over the ship's stern. Patrick carefully kept the vessel in that position the rest of the night, and when, at daybreak, the captain came on deck and found the vessel far out of her true course he soundly berated Patrick for failing to follow his instructions to steer straight by the north star. Patrick replied: "Faith, and we sailed past that star long ago!"

The republican party would have us believe that we sailed past the star of liberty long ago; that the Declara-

tion of Independence was only a "nursery rhyme sung round the cradle of our nation's childhood;" that government by consent of the governed has been outgrown. It behooves all, without regard to race, color or previous condition of party servitude or affiliation, who would call a halt to this declension into the mire of absolutism, who would render any and all real governmental progress possible by preserving the very foundation of all just government, who would conserve the greatest and most sacred political achievements of the past, to support William Jennings Bryan and the democracy of to-day, the party of true conservatism and therefore of true progress.

We have not sailed past the north star of free government. The pilot who is now at the helm has gone to sleep, under the influence of the soporifics which the trusts have rained down upon him; and our ship of state has veered and drifted round until that changeless star hangs over our ship's stern. But by our faith in the American people, there will be a new hand at the helm the 4th of next March, and our ship of state will be swung around and headed for the pole star again. We shall thenceforth sail securely, keeping ever in plain sight, right in front of us, that eternal and immutable star of liberty.

Minneapolis.

S. W. SAMPLE.

## NEWS

The coal miners' strike in the Pennsylvania anthracite region, which was supposed last week to have been settled, still drags along in full force. The first hitch was in connection with the price of powder. It has long been the custom for the employers to charge their men \$2.75 a keg for powder which costs in the open market \$1.50. This extortion was one of the complaints of the strikers. The settlement was delayed, therefore, when the employers, after accepting the terms of compromise proposed by the Scranton labor convention and reported in these columns last week—namely, a ten per cent. advance in wages to be continued until next April—notified the strikers that the advance in wages would be given partly through a reduction in the price of powder from the old rates to

the market rate. The net result of this modification would have been hardly an advance in wages at all. Or, more accurately, it would have amounted to a reduction of the exorbitant price for powder without increase of wages, or to an increase of wages without reduction in the exorbitant price of powder, according to which form of statement might be preferred. President Mitchell refused to call off the strike upon those terms. It would now appear, however, from the very imperfect press reports, that the powder question has been satisfactorily adjusted, and that the strike continues only because all the employers have not yet accepted the terms of the Scranton convention. On the 24th the owners of mines producing about 75 per cent. of the total output had accepted; the others had not then been heard from.

Last week's political news closed with the departure of Mr. Bryan from New York city, after he had excited most enthusiastic demonstrations there, upon a campaign tour through New York state. After meeting with extraordinary receptions at every point, he jumped over into West Virginia and thence into Maryland whence he will return to New York through Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and will devote the latter part of next week to Chicago.

Gov. Roosevelt has been following in Bryan's wake, making vituperative attacks upon him, charging him, among other things with hypocrisy. Gov. Roosevelt's methods were adopted also by Senator Hanna in his speech-making campaign. At Lincoln, Neb., on the 19th, he said, as reported on the 20th by the Chicago Times-Herald, a McKinley organ:

I am here in Mr. Bryan's own town to hurl back in his teeth the slanders he has uttered against me and to tell him they are false as hell. I am here to tell his neighbors that a man who circulates such slanders against another man as he has circulated against me shows no conception of the dignity of the office to which he aspires. Such a man is not fit to be a constable.

What the slanders were to which Mr. Hanna alluded did not transpire, and the reports of Bryan's speeches fail to reveal any.

President McKinley arrived at Canton on the 23d, where he intends to remain until he votes on the 6th. He has decided to decline invitations

to political demonstrations at New York and Chicago, but it is expected that he will send letters embodying political sentiments.

On the 27th there is to be a monster McKinley parade in Chicago. The democrats of Chicago will parade on the 3d, with Bryan to review them. Chairman Jones, of the democratic national committee, has proclaimed the 27th as Flag day, when supporters of Bryan and Stevenson throughout the country are to display portraits of the candidates and the American flag, and to hold meetings in their honor.

The new territory of Hawaii is having its first experience in American politics. The registration of territorial voters, which closed on the 9th, was reported at San Francisco on the 18th. For the district of Oahu the number registered was 5,891. Returns had not been received from the other districts, but it was estimated that the registration for the district of Hawaii would amount to 3,000; for Maui, 2,000, and for Kauai, 1,000. Both the democratic and the republican parties have done active electioneering to secure the native vote; but the natives are suspicious, and have nominated a ticket of their own.

The question of the constitution and the flag has twice come up in this territory before the supreme court, and in each case a diametrically different decision has been made. In one case the court held that immediately upon the cession of the islands to the United States, the constitution of the United States, with all its guarantees for the protection of life, liberty and property was in force. In the other case the court held that the constitution did not apply to the territory until extended by act of congress. Both cases were upon indictments for criminal libel. The indictments had not been found by a grand jury, and convictions were obtained by a verdict of ten jurors out of twelve. This contravenes the provisions of the constitution. In one case the conviction was sustained, the constitution being held to apply. In the other the conviction was reversed, the constitution being disregarded. The chief justice held in both cases that the constitution follows the flag. But whereas in one case one of his two associates agreed with him while the other opposed, in the other case

his approving associate had been displaced by another judge.

From the Philippines no news is published this week.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to October 24th, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91) .....	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900	88
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900 .....	468
<hr/>	
Total deaths since July 1, 1898.....	2,403
Wounded .....	2,296
Captured .....	10
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July 1, 1898.....	4,709
Total casualties reported last week .....	4,709
Total deaths reported last week.....	2,403

In South Africa the guerrilla warfare against Great Britain continues. Almost daily railroad lines are torn up and telegraph and telephone wires cut; and workmen cannot leave the garrisoned points to make repairs without large escorts. A fight occurred at Jagersfontein on the 17th in which the Boer loss was 20 and the British 11 in killed. Other fighting has occurred, but no details are reported. It has spread chiefly in the south of the Orange Free State. According to London dispatches the British hold all the key positions, but are not active enough to prevent the Boers from gathering and swooping down upon weak garrisons.

President Kruger sailed on the 19th from Lourenzo Marques for Holland, on board the Dutch cruiser Gelderland.

A new and startling turn has been given to the Chinese question by the announcement on the 20th, from London, of an agreement between Great Britain and Germany, to which the other powers are invited to become parties, but in the making of which they were not consulted. The agreement was made on the 16th, at London, by the British prime minister and the German ambassador. It is in these terms:

1. It is a matter of joint permanent international interest that the portions of the rivers and littoral of China should remain free and open to trade and to every other legitimate form of economic

activity for the peoples of all countries without distinction, and the two governments agree on their part to uphold the same for all Chinese territory as far as they can exercise influence.

2. Both governments agree that they will not on their part make use of the present complication to obtain for themselves any territorial advantage in Chinese dominion and will direct their policy toward maintaining undiminished the territorial condition of the Chinese empire.

3. In case of another power making use of the complications in China in order to obtain under any form whatever such territorial advantages the two contracting parties reserve to themselves the right to come to a preliminary understanding regarding the eventual step to be taken for the protection of their own interests in China.

4. The two governments will communicate this agreement to the other powers interested, especially Austria-Hungary, France, Italy, Japan, Russia and the United States, and invite them to accept the principles recorded in it.

The third clause of this agreement is interpreted as a warning to Russia, which is advancing her interests in Manchuria without regard to the other powers.

From Berlin, on the 23d, it was reported that Austria-Hungary and Italy had formally adopted the agreement, and that France, the United States and Russia had not yet defined their positions.

France and the United States have interchanged notes relative to the American note on the Chinese question, which appeared in these columns last week; but these notes relate to details, and have no important bearing upon the development of the question.

Meanwhile the Chinese government is trying to bring about a complete adjustment. Prince Ching and Li Hung Chang, representing the Chinese empire, propose to the powers the following preliminary convention:

Article 1. Laying siege to the legations of foreign ministers is a high offense against one of the important principles of international law. No country can possibly tolerate such a thing. China acknowledges her great fault in this respect and promises that it will never occur again.

Article 2. China admits her liability to pay an indemnity for the various losses sustained on this occasion, and the powers will each appoint officials

to examine and present all claims for a final consultation and settlement.

Article 3. As to the future trade and general international relations, each power should designate how these matters are to be dealt with, whether the old treaties should continue or new conventions should be made, slightly adding to the old treaties or canceling the old treaties and negotiating new ones. Any of these plans may be adopted, and when China has approved them further special regulations can be made in each case as required.

Article 4. This convention will be made by China with the combined powers to cover the general principles which apply alike to all. This settled, the foreign ministers will remove the seals they caused to be placed in various parts of the tsung-li-yamen, and then the yamen ministers may go to the yamen and attend to business as usual. And, further, each power should arrange its own special affairs with China so that separate treaties may be settled in due order. When the various items of indemnity are all arranged properly, or an understanding has been come to about them, the powers will successively withdraw their troops.

Article 5. The troops sent to China by the powers are for the protection of ministers and no other purpose, so, when the negotiations begin for treaties of peace, each power should first declare an armistice.

NEWS NOTES.

—Hon. W. P. Schreiner, ex-premier of Cape Colony on the 14th resigned his seat in the cape parliament.

—England has doubled the home squadron of her navy, thus making it the strongest fleet in the world.

—The Vermont legislature on the 18th elected ex-Gov. W. P. Dillingham as United States senator to succeed Senator Ross.

—Charles Dudley Warner, the distinguished author, editor and essayist, died of heart failure at his home in Hartford, Conn., on the 20th.

—Gov. Beckham of Kentucky on the 22d signed the new nonpartisan election law (see page 409) which supersedes the present unfair Goebellaw.

—Public telephone service in Chicago was cheapened on the 24th by the introduction of five-cent slot machines. The Chicago Telephone company intends to supply 60,000 of the new machines.

—Typographical union No. 6, of New York city, has voiced an eloquent appeal to all organized labor of whatever previous political belief to unite this November in defeating the republican party.

—John Sherman, ex-senator from Ohio, a member of two cabinets and for 50 years one of the most promi-

ment and influential men in American public life, died in Washington on the 25th at the age of 77 years.

—The Laughlin shovel works of Wheeling, W. Va., the largest shovel factory outside of the ax and tool trust, closed down on the 24th prior to joining the trust, thus leaving several hundred men in idleness.

—Lord Curzon, viceroy of India, in an interview on the 19th stated that 500,000 deaths had occurred as a result of the famine; that 2,000,000 sufferers were still receiving aid from the government, and that the loss due to the long continued drought exceeded \$275,000,000.

—Henry E. Youtsey, after one of the most dramatic trials in recent years, was convicted on the 20th of complicity in the Goebel murder in Kentucky (see page 398). The jury fixed his punishment at life imprisonment, but sentence was not formally passed by the court, owing to the critical illness of Youtsey.

—Count Von Buelow German minister of foreign affairs, was on the 17th appointed by the kaiser as imperial chancellor to succeed the aged Prince Hohenlohe, for whose resignation various conflicting reasons have been assigned. Baron Von Richt-hofen was on the 23d appointed foreign minister to succeed Von Buelow.

—Gen. Azcarraga, of the Spanish conservative party, succeeded on the 23d in forming a new cabinet to succeed the Sivela ministry, which was disrupted by the recent appointment of Gen. Weyler, of Cuban "reconcentrado" fame, to the post of military commander of Madrid without knowledge of the majority of the ministers.

—Charles Francis Adams, president of the Massachusetts Historical society and the grandson of John Quincy Adams, in an address before the Chicago Historical society on the 24th denounced imperialism and the course of the administration in the Philippines and denied that "any inferior nation had ever been elevated by what we know as benevolent assimilation."

—The Women's Anti-Imperialist league, at its meeting held in Chicago September 9, authorized the issuance of an open letter to the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Colonial Dames of America, asking them why they sit idle while the principles for which their ancestors fought are violated, the constitution is declared obsolete, and the sacred declaration of independence is spurned with contempt by those in power.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, to and including September 30, 1900, as given by the treasury reports, were as fol-

lows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold, and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M.....	\$319,810,190	\$184,725,164	\$134,585,026 exp
G.....	22,130,493	12,021,980	10,108,513 exp
S.....	17,124,365	11,686,381	5,437,984 exp
	\$358,565,048	\$208,413,525	\$150,151,523 exp

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States since the foundation of the government (gold, silver and merchandise), as shown by the treasury reports to September 30, 1900, were as follows:

[The upper row of figures represents merchandise to date, inclusive of gold and silver down to 1821; the second row represents gold and silver from 1821 to date.]

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
	\$37,492,166,074	\$33,849,395,943	\$3,642,770,131 exp
	3,638,697,984	2,161,534,394	1,477,163,590 exp
	\$41,130,864,058	\$36,010,930,337	\$5,119,933,721 exp

—The treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the federal government for September, shows the following:

Receipts for September:	
Tariff .....	\$19,700,516.13
Int. Rev.....	22,927,439.00
Misc.....	2,676,371.09
	\$45,304,326.22

Expenses for September:	
Civil and Misc.....	\$8,115,549.68
War .....	14,125,284.44
Navy .....	4,734,285.33
Indians .....	1,001,593.59
Pensions .....	10,861,213.96
Interest .....	332,044.49
	\$39,169,971.39

Surplus .....	
	\$5,134,354.83
Receipts July 1 to September 30:	
Tariff .....	\$60,887,282.52
Int. Rev.....	76,542,863.89
Misc.....	7,518,096.29
	\$144,948,242.70

Expenses July 1 to September 30:	
Civil and Misc.....	\$32,188,841.06
War .....	48,202,109.02
Navy .....	15,509,513.01
Indians .....	2,949,320.29
Pensions .....	36,558,357.31
Interest .....	8,241,682.21
	\$143,649,722.90

Surplus .....	
	\$1,298,519.80

—The Henry George Bryan and Stevenson club of Chicago is holding continuous meetings from noon till midnight at its headquarters on the ground floor of 83 Randolph street. A succession of speakers, secured by L. S. Dickie, who manages the meetings, is on the platform every day; and the audience, shifting from hour to hour, keeps the auditorium constantly full. The peculiarity of these meetings is that spell-binding is at a discount with the audiences, while solid speaking is at a premium.

—John P. Altgeld, ex-governor of Illinois and the foremost democrat of this state, addressed an immense and intensely enthusiastic mass meeting in the Chicago Auditorium on the 23d in a ringing denunciation of the administration's policies. Clarence S. Darrow and Dr. Julia Holmes Smith preceded Altgeld, while Samuel L. Alschuler, the democratic candidate for governor, who arrived late in the evening, made an eloquent closing speech. The audience, which exceeded 7,000, crowded the hall to its full limit, hundreds being forced to stand while hundreds more were turned away for want of room.

## MISCELLANY

### IN FREEDOM'S NAME.

For The Public.

Once more our voice we raise,  
God of the free,  
And as in olden days  
Cry unto Thee;  
E'en as our fathers cried,  
And cried in vain.  
In that for which they died,  
Help us again.

Help for a Nation's wrong,  
Help for its fame;  
Thou in Thy might so strong,  
Guard Freedom's name.  
Let not her emblem proud—  
Flag of the brave—  
Again in shame be bowed  
Over a slave.

Rend Thou the iron bands,  
That greed of gain  
Fastens on Labor's hands.  
Help to maintain  
That which was Thy decree—  
Sealed with Thy sign—  
Manhood and Liberty,  
Birthright divine.

High above Truth and Right  
Gold is enshrined;  
Dazed by its sordid light,  
Man walketh blind;  
Sees not his way is wrong;  
Sees but the gains.  
Teach, though Thy day be long,  
Thy Justice reigns.

Save Thou a Nation's cause;  
Let it not fall.  
Hold high above its laws  
Freedom for all.  
Wake them to Truth and Good,  
Blind man to man  
In bonds of brotherhood—  
Thy primal plan.

AMY DUDLEY.

### THE IMPERIALIST'S PRAYER.

For The Public.

O Lord, bless our sacred missionaries in the Philippines. Endow them with courage, and with maxim guns, and with abundant ammunition. Fill them with grace, and with a blessed thirst for blood, so that, without any foolish, weakling qualms, they may be able to thrust their bayonets through the heathen carcass of those who deny our right to rule them. Enable them to tear the howling heathen infants from their bleeding mothers' breasts, and dash out their brains ere they grow into a life of impious rebellion against us.

O Lord, send death to the Filipinos, and destruction to their possessions. Lay waste their fields, make desolate their homes, and chasten them with all the ghastly horrors of war, until they shall be converted from their evil ways, and shall give unto us their lands, their mines and the fruits of their toil. Hide from them the pernicious, soul-destroying heresies of

the Declaration of Independence, and lead them into the way of all truth and holiness and submission and obedience to us. Fill their hearts with devout thankfulness that they may, for the first time in all their heathen history, have the opportunity—the God-sent opportunity—to toil in our vineyards, and to earn our bread by the sweat of their brows.

JOHN TURNER WHITE.

### THE RESPECT OF FOREIGN NATIONS.

For The Public.

There is a man in this city who a few weeks ago was by everybody considered honest beyond any question—not an honest fool, but a man whose intelligence and abilities were as unquestionable as his honesty. Whenever in conversation sneering expressions were made use of, and slurs cast upon the pretense of perfect integrity, upon the claims of honesty put forth for well-known characters, this man was always excepted—mentally excepted—from suspicion and reproach by every one taking part in the conversation. Everyone unreservedly respected and admired him. Yet everyone felt some little sense of embarrassment and reserve in his presence, although he was uniformly courteous and genial, because he was manifestly a character above and apart from others.

This man has quite recently been convicted by public report and a complete chain of circumstances of sharp practice in business in several instances, though nothing that would render him criminally liable, at least nothing that could certainly be brought within the criminal statutes. He has simply fallen into the ways of business men generally, and shown that on occasion he is ready to take advantage of others if opportunity offers.

It is noticed now that people no longer feel reserved and embarrassed in the presence of this man. He is greeted with an appearance of friendliness and cordiality that was wanting before. People have been observed even to offer familiarities, seeming to intimate:

"Well, well, you are one of us after all."

Some go so far as to make rough jokes.

With all this apparent friendliness, however, and cordiality, there is some reason to question whether this man is actually respected and admired as before. Sometimes as he passes on the street, men may be seen to exchange a

grin, and one is almost certain to hear the remark:

"Another good man gone wrong."

But it may be, all the same, that the cordiality with which America is welcomed into the "concert of nations" is all right, and that the United States stands higher in the respect and admiration of other nations because she has thrown aside all those principles for which she has been heretofore distinguished.

ALDEN S. HULING.

Topeka, Kan., Oct. 15, 1900.

### BRYAN AND ROOSEVELT IN CLEVELAND.

Correspondence of The Public.

If the rest of the country rises up on election night like Cuyahoga county, Bryan's electoral vote will exceed the vote cast for McKinley in the electoral college of '96.

As elsewhere and everywhere, the campaign here is very quiet. The Bryan and Roosevelt meetings of the past week, however, were magnificent in more ways than one.

The attendance at the Bryan meeting in the armory was about 12,000, and four times that many on the outside.

What brought the people out? Surely not the many democratic committees, for they are more concerned as to who shall swing bridges and clean corridors for the next two years than they are in a cessation of hostilities in the Philippines. A mayor is to be elected next spring, and every little democratic smooth-bore imagines he was born to be chief executive of this city. Verily, men who cannot run a coffee mill aspire to run the state.

What then brought out the people?

Bryan, and the cause he represents.

And what an ovation he got! The fish horn man was absent, but the thinker was present.

With a wave of his hand he quieted the multitude, and for an hour he held that jammed audience spellbound. With his irresistible force, his keen wit and biting sarcasm he completely routed the enemy. A second speech he had to make to the thousands on the outside. Then it was that the size of the crowd could be fairly judged. It so frightened the republicans that the county committee of that party, before Bryan left town, met and changed their plans for the Roosevelt meeting, which was to take place two nights after.

Every corporation slave, minus the children, however, was compelled to march. Clubs were brought from all over northern Ohio. But notwithstanding the corporate power, a united

committee, brass bands and red fire and beer, the crowd did not outnumber the outpouring two nights before.

And what a difference in the crowds! What a disparity in the enthusiasm! I have never read of such a difference, to say nothing of witnessing such a contrast.

Roosevelt's first meeting was in the south end. To hold the crowd in the armory until the man with the teeth could arrive, United States Senator Foraker was billed to speak. He was billed—that's all. I sat within 50 feet of the stage, and the words: "I trust," and "I proceed," is all that I heard. It was a sight that beggars description. A United States senator stood before the people. He talked, but the people heard him not. He frantically moved his arms, but they only laughed. He then turned and spoke to those who were seated on the stage. He seemed to strike a responsive chord for about 200 who could hear him. He quit. The band played "America." He arose when their band stopped playing, and again faced the audience. He met with the same success, and then, livid with rage, talked to the reporters, and sat down amid thunderous applause.

I suppose you think it was democratic noise, but it was not. It was a rebuke meted out to him by his thousands of erstwhile supporters. For years they had admired him for his opposition to Hanna. Now they despise him for the partnership he has formed. And no one knows it better than Foraker himself.

After a long and tiresome wait, the man with the teeth arrived. He received a noisy ovation. It was a duplicate of the one tendered Foraker. He spoke about 20 minutes. Less than 2,000 people caught a word the first ten minutes. Absolute quiet did not come until two or three minutes of the close.

I shall remember that meeting as long as I live, and so will Foraker and Roosevelt.

Altgeld was here two weeks ago. We gave him a grand reception. Friends and enemies alike agree that his speech was the greatest political speech ever delivered in this city. He was presented with a bouquet of roses, tied with a white ribbon on which was printed the words:

To Hon. John P. Altgeld, from his many Cleveland admirers, for his many civic duties unflinchingly performed.

The reception, the complexion of the audience, and the speech, whether taken singly or collectively, was the most magnificent rebuke the local plutocrats ever got.

PETER WITT.

AN ADDRESS TO INDEPENDENT VOTERS.

Issued by the American Anti-Imperialist League.

The undersigned citizens of the United States regard with profound apprehension the course of the present administration in Porto Rico and the Philippines. Our prior acquisitions were of adjacent territory for the extension of the area of constitutional government and the creation of new states of the union. We made their few inhabitants citizens; our people settled them; we there established the institutions of freedom. For the first time in our history it is now proposed that the president and congress shall rule vast territories and millions of men outside our constitutional system. Officials sworn to support the constitution and deriving all their power therefrom have acquired colonies and assumed arbitrary authority to govern their inhabitants without consent and to tax them without representation. This policy offers to the people of Porto Rico and the Philippines no hope of independence, no respect of American citizenship, no representation in the congress which taxes them. This is the government of men by arbitrary power; this is imperialism.

We believe that it is the first duty of the American people to stamp with their disapproval doctrines so hostile to liberty and dangerous to constitutional government. If they are to remain free and their government is to continue representative, their servants must not have or exercise any but constitutional powers. Between the claim of freedom that all men are entitled to equal political rights and the dogma of tyranny that might makes right there is no middle ground.

We have not prior to this year supported the candidacy of Mr. Bryan. We do not now concur in certain of his views on minor issues. Yet his position on the supreme issue of the present campaign is so sound and his advocacy of it has been so able and courageous that we now favor his election as the most effective way of showing disapproval of Mr. McKinley's course. Without claiming any special political influence, we unite, for what our example may be worth to our fellow citizens, in this statement of proposed action in the presence of "a greater danger than we have encountered since the pilgrims lauded at Plymouth—the danger that we are to be transformed from a republic, founded on the declaration of independence, guided by the counsels of Washington, into a vulgar, commonplace empire, founded on phy-

sical force." We invite the cooperation of all independent voters to avert this great and impending danger.

- [Signed by]
- George S. Boutwell, Boston (ex-governor and ex-secretary of the treasury).
  - Charles Gordon Ames, Boston.
  - Melville B. Anderson, Leland Stanford university.
  - Francis Fisher Browne, Chicago (editor of the Dial).
  - John Beatty, Ohio (ex-congressman).
  - William Birney, Washington, D. C.
  - D. F. Bremner, Chicago.
  - Albert S. Cook, Yale university.
  - D. H. Chamberlain, Massachusetts (ex-governor of South Carolina).
  - Charles R. Codman, Massachusetts.
  - Henry B. Cabot, Boston.
  - Starr Willard Cutting, University of Chicago.
  - Noah K. Davis, University of Virginia.
  - John Dewey, University of Chicago.
  - Dana Estes, Boston.
  - Louis R. Ehrlich, Colorado.
  - Joseph S. Fowler, Washington, D. C. (ex-United States senator).
  - Edwin L. Godkin, New York (former editor the Nation and New York Evening Post).
  - William Lloyd Garrison, Boston.
  - Judson Harmon, Cincinnati (ex-attorney general United States).
  - F. D. Huntington, Syracuse (bishop of Protestant Episcopal church).
  - Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Boston.
  - William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago.
  - George Lincoln Hendrickson, University of Chicago.
  - Henry U. Johnson (ex-congressman, Indiana).
  - Edward Holton James, Seattle, Wash.
  - William R. Lord, Portland, Ore.
  - Louis R. Larson, Minneapolis (ex-judge).
  - John V. LeMoyne, Baltimore (ex-congressman).
  - Charles F. Lummis, Los Angeles (editor Land of Sunshine).
  - Joseph Lee, Boston.
  - George Gluyas Mercer, Pennsylvania.
  - Thomas A. Moran, Chicago (ex-judge).
  - Edwin D. Mead, Boston (editor New England Magazine).
  - Charles Elliot Norton, Harvard university.
  - Henry Loomis Nelson, New York.
  - Warren Olney, San Francisco.
  - William Morton Payne, Chicago.
  - Franklin Pierce, New York city.
  - Arthur Latham Perry, Williams college.
  - H. A. Rattermann, Cincinnati.
  - U. M. Rose, Little Rock.
  - Rufus B. Smith, Cincinnati (Judge superior court).
  - Edward M. Shepard, New York city.
  - Moorfield Storey, Boston (ex-president American Bar association).
  - Edwin Burritt Smith, Chicago.
  - Albert H. Tolman, University of Chicago.
  - Edwin F. Uhl, Grand Rapids (ex-ambassador to Germany).
  - John J. Valentine (president Wells-Fargo Express company).
  - William Vocke, Chicago.
  - C. E. S. Wood, Portland, Ore.
  - Lew Wallace, Jr., Indianapolis.
  - Charles B. Wilby, Cincinnati.
  - George L. Wellington (United States senator, Maryland).
  - Herbert Welsh, Philadelphia (editor City and State).
  - John DeWitt Warner, New York city (ex-congressman).
  - Sigmund Zeisler, Chicago.
  - Charles Zueblin, University of Chicago.

IMPERIALISM AND LABOR.

The effect upon wages of annexing new countries overrunning with the cheapest kind of labor is evident enough to anyone who will consider the question dispassionately, but perhaps a brief account of what I have seen with my own eyes in Egypt may serve to illustrate it. We hear a great deal of the political benefits conferred by the British government upon the Egyptians, but little or nothing is said of the industrial results of expansion, and yet these results are the most important.

Some years ago while I was living in Egypt I visited one of the cotton mills at Mansourah, the commercial center of the cotton region. These mills are owned by English, French and German capitalists and operated by native labor. In the main room of the factory the air is so thick with cotton dust that I found it difficult to breathe. A row of Arab girls of 12 or 13 years of age were standing there before a series of tubs manipulating the raw cotton.

"What are the hours of labor of these girls?" I asked the European foreman, who was acting as my guide.

"From four o'clock in the morning to six o'clock at night, with an intermission for dinner," he answered.

"And what is the pay?"

"Twelve and a half cents a day."

I could hardly believe this, and the next time I met the English manager of one of these mills I cross-questioned him on the subject.

"Is it true," I asked, "that you work your girls from four until six for 12½ cents a day?"

"Yes," he said, rather reluctantly. "I didn't quite like it when I first went to Mansourah, but the girls don't seem to mind it."

"Don't mind 14 hours' work a day?" I cried.

"Oh, that is not all," he replied. "When we are very busy they stay overtime from six till ten o'clock in the evening and we pay them an extra piastre (2½ or five cents) and sometimes young mothers come with their babes at the breast and put them down on the floor in the corner and go to work with the rest."

And all this, mind you, in an atmosphere which you can almost cut with a knife, so thick is it with cotton.

One thing has saved Egypt, and that is the absence of coal. It costs too much to bring it there for it to pay to introduce factories on a large scale. But there is plenty of coal

in the Philippines. Coal can be had at the entrance of the mines in Japan for 13 cents a ton, I am informed, and it will be as cheap in the Philippines. With coal at this price, with girls and boys ready to work for 12½ cents a day, what is to prevent the immediate flow of our capital to these islands and the inauguration of a competition such as we have never known before? Either wages will fall here to the 12½-cent level or our factories will be moved bodily to our new possessions and our own workmen left to starve.

Bishop Potter, of New York, has just been in the Philippines, and he tells us that the Filipinos take kindly to our factory system. Poor Filipinos! So do mice take kindly to cheese in a trap! The system will prove a curse to them as it has already proved to the girls of Mansourah, and at the same time it will impoverish our American wage-earners at home. It may be said that the natives are not forced to work. But this is not true. When their cupidity is not sufficient to make them toil, means are found to compel them. This has already been done in the mines of South Africa, and the British government imposes taxes upon the natives there with the avowed object of forcing them to seek employment in the mines for the purpose of raising money to pay the tax, that being the only way open for them to earn money. The same plan will doubtless be adopted by our capitalists in the Philippines if it turns out that Bishop Potter is mistaken and that the Filipinos do not take kindly to factory work.

We are told that we ought to establish a stable government in the Philippines. That is precisely what we ought not to do. It is the lack of stable government which prevents capital from going to countries where people are willing to work on starvation wages. It is an automatic arrangement of nature that in uncivilized or partly civilized countries franchises and monopolies are not well enough protected for capital to risk itself. If this were not so, all manufacturing industries would seek at once the country of cheapest wages, other things being equal, and the starvation of the home populations would follow. It is best for the world that the government of such countries should not be too stable, and by insisting upon a stable government in the Philippines we are doing our best to throttle our own industries.

It is clearly the interest of all wage-earners to oppose imperialism root and

branch, and if they have any doubt on the subject, let them consider the cotton operatives of Egypt.—Hon. Ernest H. Crosby, in American Federationist.

#### "INDEPENDENCE OR DEATH."

Hong-Kong special correspondence of the Montreal Daily Star, dated September 2, and published in the Star of September 2.

The strictness of the censorship notwithstanding (at Manila), I am happy to be in a position to communicate the following most recent and interesting authentic official document from the revolutionary battlefield. It will serve to show how the imperialists prevaricate when they assure the world in general, and the citizens of the United States in particular, that the Filipinos desire the American sovereignty, and that by resisting it the revolutionists work against the wishes of the inhabitants in the Philippine archipelago. It is the letter with which Gen. Juan Cailles, a Filipino, answered the letter received by him from one of the agents of President McKinley at Manila, inviting the said general to surrender his arms. The letter of Gen. Cailles is accompanied by an act containing the manifesto of the most authoritative persons in the province in which the general is operating. These persons are the genuine representatives of the most peaceful elements, of those whom President McKinley mentions in his letter as desiring the American sovereignty, and the act is signed by Capt. Pedro Guevara, A. D. C.

General Encampment, La Laguna Province, July 12, 1900.

To Mr. Vincent Reyes, Santa Cruz.

Dear Sir: As I have promised you, this morning I convoked to a great assembly in this general encampment the local presidents of the province and the military officers of the brigade under my command, in order to inform both parties of the proposals of the enemy which have been sent to me for consideration through your courtesy, and in order that the said proposals may be discussed, and that, at the same time, a copy of the act which shall be extended and distributed upon the decision of the grand assembly be sent to you.

By the annexed act of reference you and the enemy will understand that the purposes of "freedom" which the military and local officers have sworn to stand by before the sacred banner of the Philippine republic, remain firm in the heart of everybody, with tendencies to grow warmer still but never to grow cold.

You had already my private answer—now I send you the answer of the whole province and of my brigade. In both answers you will recognize the bond which unites the subordinates with their leader in the demand for the independence of the mother country. For that very union you must not be surprised that order prevails in this province, although in a relative way in spite of the efforts of our enemy to disturb it with assaults, with fire, with mur-

ders, and worse, apart from what people of evil living would do in these circumstances, in which the local police are often compelled to hide themselves, in view of their limited number, at the appearance of the forces of the enemy. The order is maintained not by the Americans, but by my forces who blindly obey my orders.

The Americans must not forget the protestations that I ordered to be posted at the door of the building in which I had my residence in that city. In those protestations, in view of the help of the towns and the decision of my subordinate officers, I expressed the sublime thought: "Independence or death."

By my resignation to suffer all the consequences and hardships of an unequal and almost suicidal war and by the fact that no one of my military and local officers has presented himself to the American authorities, you must be convinced, and yourselves likewise, that that sublime thought beats lively in the heart of everyone, because the anxieties for "freedom" and "independence" tempered the will and being of the true sons of the Philippines.

I will go no further for fear that, launched on this field, you should judge me passionate should I express my real sentiments. Good-by, and do not forget this motto of the authorities and inhabitants of La Laguna—"Independence or Death."

I remain, yours affectionately,  
(Signed) JUAN CAILLES, General,  
Military Governor.

The "act of reference" is as follows:

In the general encampment of the province of La Laguna, on this 12th day of July, 1900, at a previous calling of the military governor, gathered in solemn assembly, the local presidents of all the towns, as well as the officers of the military columns, under the presidency of the said military governor, Gen. Juan Cailles, in order to deal and discuss the proposals made by the enemy to the above-mentioned military governor, so that the latter may surrender with the brigade under his command through the citizen, Senor Don Vincente Reyes, on the 4th of July. As soon as the secretary of the military government had finished the reading of the proposals, they were unanimously and without any discussion, rejected, inasmuch as everyone in his own name and the name of his respective subordination declared that "they proclaimed before heaven and the world" that they will die rather than recognize, even tacitly, the American sovereignty in the Philippine archipelago, which has never before been under the dominion and sovereignty of the United States government, and, therefore, they consider not only as untimely, but ridiculous, as well as the pretended amnesty with which they like to disguise the granting of pardon and the forgetfulness of crimes which they have never committed nor can they commit, against the government at Washington, inasmuch as the violent incidents and the present American-Filipino war have not been provoked by the government of the Philippine republic, apart from the "sine qua non" condition which involves all pardon or amnesty, which requires the avowal of being vanquished and of being the author of some crime, before it can be extended to anybody. That the conduct of the Philippine people cannot be more consistent with that prescribed in the international law, as well as the proceed-

ings of the war in all other cases, whilst the Americans often swerve from the law, which forbids, although it tolerates in serious cases, incendiarism, devastation and pillage, many of the persons present having been eyewitnesses of the lootings committed by the American forces, in the presence of their officers, in the towns of Lillo, Naykarlang, Pagsanjan, Kalauang, Paete, Rizal, Pila, Bay, Santa Cruz, Lumbang, Eavinte and Luisiana, besides the burning of hamlets in the towns of Santa Cruz, Naykarlang, Majayjay, Pagsanjan, Paete, Eavinte, without counting the entire destruction of the town of San Antonio. That the death of innocent and defenseless people stains with blood the formerly bright pages of the history of the United States of America. That the proposals and conditions under which Gen. Juan Cailles is intimated to surrender with all his forces must be rejected, and not even the honor of being remembered should be given to them, inasmuch as the mere thought of them sullies, because they are proposals of treason to a sacred cause, which all those present have sworn to defend at the cost of all sacrifices, even at the cost of life, for the Philippine people are entirely convinced that their future happiness depends upon the attainment and establishment of self-government in the midst of a free and independent country. Finally, the grand assembly enacted that the military government of La Laguna must not henceforward deal with emissaries from the enemy, as long as the object of their mission be the ending of the war; because, if the American rulers desire in a positive and sincere way the happiness and peace of the Philippines, the Philippine people have a representative in the person of Hon. President Emilio Aguinaldo, in whom they have trusted their faith, and whom they have made the arbiter of their fate. This has been agreed upon by the grand assembly, and this act has been extended for the consequent effects and signed by all present, after the military governor of which, I, Pedro Cueva, the secretary, certify.

To this act are appended 35 names of local presidents and prominent citizens representative of the populace in the province of La Laguna.

#### EDUCATION AS A FACTOR OF NATIONAL GREATNESS.

Extract from the Commencement Address of Judge Presley K. Ewing, at the University of Texas. Published in the University Record.

To you, in part, will be the task of preserving the integrity of the union, the ideals of the republic, the faith of the fathers. In discharging this high trust, no duty will be more imperative than that of infusing perpetual life into that wise provision of the Texas constitution which enjoins the support and maintenance of an efficient public free school system, declaring "a general diffusion of knowledge essential to the preservation of the liberties and rights of the people."

The preservation of the liberties and rights of the people! These are not idle words. Their thought burned

in the impassioned eloquence of Patrick Henry, glittered on the sword of Washington and inspired the pen of the immortal Jefferson. Think you that this thought would have so possessed orator, soldier, statesman, in the founding of our republic, without the influence of education in the highest and most ennobling sense? Who but one standing as "heir of all the ages," moving with majestic power "in the foremost files of time," inspired by knowledge from every fountain of the past, could have bequeathed to posterity the declaration of independence? The truths of that imperishable document were proclaimed as "self-evident," but philosophers of all the ages had groped in darkness for the formulation of its doctrine, hinting, like Locke, but as dreamers; and no nation had ever adopted its creed of the political equality of men, or the derivation of all just powers of government from the consent of the governed, and not a kingdom of the earth then believed that creed. It came as the real dawn of human liberty, the true herald of our country's greatness; and it is, to-day, whatever the recent shocks to its principles, the abiding hope in the throbbing breasts of millions for their country's future glory. The republic's constitution has been somewhere in effect described as the bond of our union, the shield of our defense, the source of our national prosperity, but, indeed, the spirit of its letter is the declaration of independence, which binds both constitution and people to the fundamental and immutable principles of our government.

It is these principles, born of the enlightenment of education, which must be perpetuated by that enlightenment. Never, perhaps, in the history of this nation was the demand so great for intelligent thought and action among the masses of the people; and greater and greater will that need become, if changes in the past few years may shape our prophecy of the future. Open and avowed advocates are now found of the doctrine that the sacred truths of the declaration of independence are but "glittering generalities;" and it is boldly maintained in certain quarters, under the influence of "the dollar above the man," that education ought to be withheld from the masses of the people. An ex-attorney general of the United States, a reputed aspirant for the chief magistracy of this nation, has, in a carefully prepared article

for a leading periodical, plainly sought to justify, for reasons of mere expediency, a violation of the plighted faith of these United States to Cuban independence, a transformation of that proclaimed war of humanity into one of brutal conquest, of mere commercial gain. Men high in place and power, in the brief space of two years, have sought to make criminality a synonym for benevolence, and to divorce from the folds of the flag the constitution of the republic. A principle, broad in its truth as the blue canopy of heaven over the habitations of men, has been sought by some to be so localized that we might, without inconsistency or breach of plighted faith, or assault upon our national ideals, salute Maximo Gomez as hero of liberty in the island of Cuba, while we hunted to the death Aguinaldo, our former ally in war, as a renegade in Luzon!

It might not be germane to the thought of this address, if, abstractly considered, it were only Aguinaldo and the archipelago of the Philippines. But when Aguinaldo shall fall as Kosciusko fell, when the Philippines shall fall as Sarmatia fell, both at the bayonet point of the only republic that ever realized the true blessings of liberty in the political equality of man—well may we recall, in mournful consciousness of their application, the familiar words of immortal thought:

Oh, bloodiest picture in the book of Time,  
Sarmatia fell, unwept, without a crime;  
Found not a generous friend, a pitying foe,  
Strength in her arms, nor mercy in her  
woe!

Dropped from her nerveless grasp the  
shattered spear,  
Closed her bright eye and curbed her high  
career;

Hope for a season bade the world farewell,  
And Freedom shrieked as Kosciusko fell!

It may be suggested that these sentiments sink into political partisanship, but it is denied. Questions like these, touching the tap-root of the republic, rise too high and strike too deep to be merely covered beneath the wings of political councils. Their place is here, everywhere the flag of the union floats, in every bosom where the lamp of liberty is lighted, on every monument dedicated to our heroes of patriotism, around all the shrines of our sainted soldiers, and wherever noble aspirations for the freedom of men may lead our way to deathless deeds.

This hour for you, young men and women, is the narrow isthmus between the two eternities—the miniature world of the alma mater your past, but the greater outer world

your future. In facing the duties of citizenship as patriots and lovers of liberty, temptations will beset your path. False philosophers and teachers are likely to appear at any step, and the seductive influence of money-gain to sing its siren song. It will need the vigilance of your faculties, sustained by educational strength, to withstand the trial and test. Over, beyond and above all, remember that there are different meanings for virtue and valor in individual and national life. Away with those words of misguided zeal: "My country, right or wrong!" Put in their place those other words of patriotic utterance: "My country, right—to be kept right; wrong—to be made right."

There is an eastern allegory that tells of those who attempt to climb an enchanted mountain for the talismen of power, as being assailed at each progressive step by every conceivable calumny and insult. If they falter, they fall as inert matter; but if one is found who presses forward, fearing neither death nor calumny, standing throughout for the eternal right, he transforms the faltering fallen into life, and as they crowd about him he becomes their leader.

May you, young friends, climb to the topmost height of the enchanted mountain, but, having grasped the talisman of power, wield it for the greatness of Texas, the glory of the republic! May you discover in your own educational advantages, that, after bread, education is the first want of the people; and, so imbued, strive to fulfill the public need by general diffusion of knowledge among the masses! May you, ever recalling the rise of the republic, avert its fall by striking, as at a deadly serpent, apostasy to the declaration of independence and the constitution of the union! May the spirit of education, blessing heart and mind, ever teach you that with the nation, as with the man, when honor's dead the life is dead! May you, finally, so shape your lives in the course of citizenship that all the ends at which you aim shall be your country's, your God's, and truth's! Then, indeed, though some supreme ambition may as the fabled apple turn to ashes at your touch; though it may be for you as with Cyrano de Bergerac to stand in the shadows as prompter for others climbing to kisses of Fame; you will yet in the final hour be able "to wrap the drapery of your couch about you, and lie down to pleasant dreams;" while, like him, above you there will wave

the white plume of a life's consecrated and exalted purpose.

#### OUR DUTY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES.

There are two branches to any inquiry into the subject of the duty of the American government toward the Philippines. We must first determine what it ought if possible to do, and then what, under the circumstances, it can do.

No difficulty is presented by the first branch. When congress declared the attitude of the United States toward Cuba it determined in advance what its attitude ought to be toward the Philippines. To that declaration, then, let us refer.

It is the fourth clause of the joint resolution adopted by congress on April 18, 1898, and signed by the president on the 20th—the same resolution that recognized the independence of Cuba and by authorizing armed intervention brought on the Spanish war.

In unequivocal terms that clause disclaimed "any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over" Cuba, "except for the pacification thereof," and asserted the determination of the government, "when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people." Cuba alone was named. But that was because the circumstances at the time happened to have brought Cuba alone into consideration. By naming Cuba, under the circumstances, the declaration did not exclude like cases; on the contrary, it invoked in behalf of Cuba a principle of general application. An analogy may be found in the practice of the law courts. Legal principles which a court applies in one case it is expected to apply in every like case. If, for instance, it decides that under certain circumstances John Doe is entitled to his liberty, it must decide that Richard Roe is under like circumstances entitled to his. That would be a queer lawyer who objected to the applicability of Roe's case of a principle applied in Doe's, merely because Roe had not been mentioned. Legal principles do not depend upon particular instances. Neither do principles of national polity and international morality. The principle governs the instance, not the instance the principle. What instances do is to illustrate. So, when the United States disclaimed all purpose of sovereignty as to Cuba and promised independent self-government to her people, it illustrated a general principle—the principle of duty which American polity imposes upon the American government in its attitude toward alien

peoples whom circumstances happen to place within its power.

This was the very principle that President McKinley himself, in two preceding messages, had put impressively and almost in epigrammatic phrase. It was the beneficent principle, to quote his words, that "forcible annexation \* \* \* by our code of morality would be criminal aggression."

In the light of that elemental principle there can be no doubt of what the United States ought to do if it can. It ought to proclaim and promise as to the Philippines what it proclaimed and promised as to Cuba. It ought, in other words, to disavow "any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control," except for the temporary purpose of pacification; and to promise that as soon as the country is pacified American authority shall be withdrawn and the independent self-government of the people recognized. Besides this, it ought to redeem the promise promptly, fully and in manifest good faith.

That is what the United States ought to do if possible. The other branch of the inquiry: What can it do under the circumstances? may not be so simple.

In one respect, however, the second branch obviously offers no greater difficulty than the first. Without any embarrassment the United States could at once proclaim its disavowal of sovereignty except for purposes of pacification, and promise to leave the Philippines to their people as soon as pacification is accomplished. There are no existing circumstances, except an indefensible and ignoble desire for forcible annexation, to interfere with that.

If such a disavowal and promise had been made at the beginning and faithfully observed the remainder of this branch of the inquiry would also be simple. Nothing would now stand in the way of fully redeeming the promise. For the Philippine people had already established a pacific government, which, by this time, could have been trusted with the destiny of the islands. This assertion is borne out by Gen. Anderson in his article in the North American Review for February, 1900, and by Leonard R. Sargent, in the Outlook for September 2, 1899. Gen. Armstrong tells us that the Filipino government ruled over nearly all the archipelago in the late summer of 1898. "We held Manila and Cavite," he says; "the rest of the island was held, not by Spaniards, but by the Filipinos. On the other islands the Spaniards were confined to two or three fortified towns." So there was then an effective government. And Mr. Sargent assures us that it was not only effective,

but also pacific. He was an American naval cadet, who, with a naval paymaster, Wilcox, spent two months of the fall of 1898 upon a semi-official investigation of the interior of Luzon. Writing to the Outlook about the trip, he said: "As a tribute to the efficiency of Aguinaldo's government and to the law-abiding character of his subjects, I offer the fact that Mr. Wilcox and I pursued our journey throughout in perfect security, and returned to Manila with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which we found the natives to be leading under the new regime."

Had the United States fostered that regime it would long before this have encountered no legitimate risk in leaving the control of the Philippines to their people. But instead of fostering the government of which Aguinaldo was president, until it had inspired general confidence in the pacification of the archipelago, the United States deliberately set about destroying it.

To begin with, we refused civil treatment to its envoys. We then unceremoniously crowded its military forces off territory they are conceded to have conquered from the Spanish, without complying with its request for assurances that if in our treaty with Spain we should agree to withdraw from the Philippines we would first restore these particular places to the Filipinos. Meanwhile we negotiated with Spain for a treaty discriminating against the Philippines as compared with Cuba. Though we caused Spain to "relinquish" Cuba, we allowed her to "cede" the Philippines. The one she freed, the other she sold. After that, and without waiting for the treaty to become legally effectual by ratification, but while even our bare technical rights were still confined to Manila, we asserted absolute sovereignty over the whole archipelago. At the same time—and this was a month before the fighting began—we virtually declared war against the Philippine government, which until then had been pacific, by proclaiming our intention of putting that government down. Finally, we engaged its army in the opening battle of the war, a battle which, according to Gen. Otis's official report, "was one strictly defensive on the part of the Filipinos and of vigorous attack by our forces."

These circumstances divest the question of what the United States can do with reference to the Philippines as distinguished from what it ought to do if possible of some of its original simplicity. We cannot immediately turn the control of the islands over to the

people, because there is not now a pacific government to represent them. We have crushed the one they had. And in crushing their government and attempting forcibly to annex their country we have shattered their former confidence in the friendliness of our intentions. Whatever we do, therefore, in the direction of what we ought to do, must now be done as the temporary protector of a disappointed and consequently distrustful people.

But these disadvantages can be overcome. By proclaiming our disavowal of permanent sovereignty and our promise to leave the archipelago to a government of the people as soon as a pacific government of that kind is established we shall do much to revive confidence. No such promise has ever yet been made. Our whole behavior, on the contrary, has been that of a conqueror, bent on forcible annexation. We have, indeed, promised "stable government," but that is nothing better than the czar of Russia promises Finland. We have not promised either popular government or independence, both of which are involved in the principle of the Cuban resolution. Let us at once remedy this default. Having done that, our next step should be the rehabilitation of the local government as it existed at its capital of Malolos, when, according to Gen. Anderson, it ruled over nearly the whole archipelago, and according to Cadet Sargent it maintained peace and order. This step should be taken promptly. And afterward, when the local government shall have been thus restored and the general peace of the archipelago is thereby reasonably assured, our military forces should be withdrawn and the Philippine republic formally introduced by the United States into the family of nations. By adopting that course we should in some degree atone for our mistakes of the last two years, and, though it might be humiliating to our pride, it would be wholesome for our patriotism.

As to the wisdom of thus recognizing the independence of the Philippines, let it not be forgotten that we have it upon abundant evidence that the Filipinos, whom we are now engaged in subjugating, are as capable of self-government as the Cubans, to whom we have not only pledged self-government, but are actually beginning to concede it.—Louis F. Post, in Chicago Record of September 24.

Sewall—Is he a man to be trusted?

Crawford—Hardly. He writes campaign literature for six different political parties. G. T. E.

#### FLOOD-TIDE.

For The Public.

We have looked behind the curtain, we have learned the play by heart; For we watched each cunning actor through the triumph of his part When our sons, whose blood was cheapened at the presidential mart, To crime and death marched on.

We have felt the disillusion of the tinsel and the paint That could give us Diavolo in the likeness of a saint— We who read his treacherous fiat, with souls grown sick and faint— His war still marching on.

With our eyes on daily slaughter of his victims, white and brown, Blatant allies bid us hail him as the king our hands shall crown, When our boasted flower of freedom like a weed is trampled down, And greed goes marching on.

We have seen the slighted people leap from lethargy at last, Heard the shout of their awaking everywhere rise fierce and fast; For they know the nearing roll-call might have been their very last, With McKinley marching on.

While the schemers, clearly seeing they have shot beyond the mark, Up and down the land go whistling like a scared boy in the dark, We turn from their bray of conquest, to the tread of justice hark: Bryan goes marching on.

D. H. INGHAM.

Marke—Why are you so sure that he will not vote for Mr. McKinley?

Heeler—He says he won't.

Marke—Have you tried to point out the error of failing to support the administration?

Heeler—Yes; but he won't see.

Marke—Have you offered him ten dollars to buy a pair of spectacles that will enable him to see?

G. T. E.

"The powers are not at war with China—"

"Then the battles at Tientsin, Peit-Sang, Yang-Tsun and Peking illustrate the fact that peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."—Puck.

"I suppose," remarked the seeker after knowledge, "we will pursue the same policy in China as in the Philippines—the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other."

"Not exactly," replied the war department official. "The regulation uniform for Chinese service will have a large pocket for the Bible, leaving the other hand free to operate a machine gun."—Catholic Standard and Times.

#### BOOK NOTICES.

The first systematic history of the events culminating in the Philippine war—not dashed off by the mile on a race against time, after the manner of Murat Halstead, but written with painstaking care and conscientious regard for the verities—is "The Other Man's Country" (Philadelphia: J.

B. Lippincott Co.), by Herbert Welsh, editor of City and State of Philadelphia. Though the story is told in interesting narrative style, its statements are confirmed step by step by citations from documentary and other approved testimony. Free from invective, the book is nevertheless, from the very simplicity of its story, an arraignment of the administration which cannot but bring a blush of shame to the cheek of Americans who love their country and its honor more than their party and its exploiters. Here is the plain truth, fully proved, about our perfidy as a nation to the confiding little brown people of the orient, from the alliance with Commodore Dewey on down to the proclamation of subjugation by President McKinley and the consequent war of conquest.

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

## PLUTOCRACY'S STATISTICS

### STATISTICAL LIES AND LIARS. OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL.

Exposed by H. L. BLISS, Contributor of Statistical Articles to the Journal of Political Economy and American Journal of Sociology.

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.

## LIBERTY, INDEPENDENCE and SELF-GOVERNMENT

Extracts from the speeches, letters and writings of the Fathers and Defenders of the Republic on these themes. Also, all important documents relating to Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippines. Comment by the editor.

Endorsed and used by the Democratic National Committee, personally endorsed by Senator Jas. K. Jones, Willis J. Abbot, Dr. David Starr Jordan, and others of National repute.

"It is the most complete compendium on the subject yet published, and will be invaluable to every political writer and speaker. It ought to be in the hands of every voter."—Ex-Gov. John P. Altgeld.

160 page book. Price, 25 cents. Address the Editor, E. G. BALLARD, 807 Chamber of Commerce, Chicago.

## EMANCIPATION

It is certainly an honest effort toward some feasible plan for the amelioration of existing social mal-adjustments, and I cheerfully recommend its perusal to any one, as a thoroughly original proposition.

FRANKLIN H. WENTWORTH, Atty., Sec. Underwriters' Bureau, Chicago.

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., is now ready for delivery. Orders taken by

MISS MAUDE DICKEY,

83 East Randolph Street, CHICAGO, ILL.

Popular Edition, . . . \$1.50

Library Edition, . . . 2.50

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

### ATTORNEYS.

#### Chicago.

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

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

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

#### Houston.

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

### LEGAL NOTICE.

ESTATE OF CHARLES O'LEARY, DECEASED.

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

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

### EDUCATIONAL.

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

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



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

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

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

## The Public

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.

Credit is often established by the fact of having a life insurance policy. It says a good deal for its holder,—indorses for him. Investigate may what be done. Consult

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

JOIN THOSE WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

## Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

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

### TIMELY BOOKS

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

- The Preparation of Ryerson Embury . . . 75c
  - Reconciled, A Story of Common Life . . . 25c
  - Japanese Notions of European Polit'l Econ . . . 25c
  - Our Farmers of the Revenue . . . 25c
  - The Single Tax, Post . . . 25c
  - The Trusts, Collie, Just Published . . . 50c
  - Natural 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.

## HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

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

Program for Sunday, October 28th:

Prof. H. B. Loomis,

"TRUSTS."

ADMISSION FREE!