

# The Public

Dr. H.J. Woodhouse  
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1900.

Number 126.

**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.

It has been suggested that meetings in support of Bryan and Stevenson be opened with the reading of the second paragraph of the declaration of independence, and that they close with the singing of "My Country 'Tis of Thee." The suggestion is a good one. Since Mark Hanna has assumed to appropriate the flag for partisan purposes, the democrats might neatly retaliate by emphasizing whenever possible the fact of their adoption of the declaration of principles that the flag stands for. They can afford to let Hanna exploit the symbol if they exploit the ideals symbolized. Let democratic meetings ring, then, with the reading of America's liberty charter and the singing of her liberty hymn.

The 'Commercial and Financial Chronicle, that famous Wall street organ of plutocracy, exhibits its sense of the eternal fitness of things when it precedes a laudatory article on the late C. P. Huntington with an expression of the hope for "such a defeat of Bryan as will bury him and his ideas so deep in votes against them that they can never experience a resurrection." The destruction of the Bryans of this country is indeed the hope of its piratical Huntingtons.

There is matter for reflection for superstitious historical students in the fact that the three great political epochs in the history of this country were signalized by the triumph of the new political forces at the presidential election immediately following one at which they were defeated. The first of these

epochs was in the closing year of the last century, when Jefferson swept the federalists out of power after having been defeated four years before. Then came the Jacksonian era. Andrew Jackson failed of election in 1824, but was victorious with an enormous electoral majority in 1828. It was not until 1860 that the third political era began. Lincoln was elected then; and, although he had not suffered defeat personally in 1856, the first leader of his party had. In other words the republican party was beaten once before it succeeded, just as the Jeffersonian democrats had been three score years earlier and the Jacksonian democrats in the twenties. And now we are at the beginning of a fourth political epoch. Will history repeat itself? Was Bryan's defeat in 1896, like Jefferson's in 1798 and Jackson's in 1824 and Fremont's in 1856, prophetic of triumph four years later?

McKinley newspapers have a good deal to say about the part that moving pictures are to play in the campaign in behalf of McKinley. Among other things, they are to exhibit factories in operation by way of illustrating McKinley prosperity. Why not exhibit some of the factories which this prosperity has closed? It would lend variety to the exhibition, and there need be no difficulty in finding such factories. For example, "the fine new plant," says the Cleveland Press, "erected less than a year ago by the Coshocton Rolling Mill company and recently sold to the American Sheet Steel company, is a thing of the past"; it was operated spasmodically for a few weeks after the trust bought it, and was then shut down. Other instances of like character are given by the Youngstown

Vindicator. In all probability more pictures could be obtained of factories that have been closed by trusts since McKinley's inauguration than of new factories that are working.

Secretary Gage is credited with a remarkable newspaper interview, first published on the 25th in the Washington Star, in which he predicts that in the event of Bryan's election the country will be placed upon a silver basis. This is Mr. Gage's explanation of his dire prediction:

There is no doubt Mr. Bryan could order his secretary of the treasury to make payment in silver of all of the public debt payable in coin, and for all current disbursements of the government as well, which amount to \$1,500,000 to \$1,750,000 per day. That he would give such an order, too, is very certain, if he is in the same mind that he was in 1896.

We commend Mr. Gage's interview to the thoughtful consideration of Senator Stewart, of Nevada, and of such other silver republicans as may have concluded to support McKinley on the ground that the silver cause has nothing to hope for from Mr. Bryan. If Mr. Bryan is of the same mind regarding the silver question as he was in 1896, something which nobody doubts, and if as president he could put the country upon a silver basis, as Mr. Gage says he could, what more could silver republicans desire than his election? McKinley gives them no such hope. Mr. Gage's interview, if of any effect in "shoo"-ing eastern gold democrats away from Bryan, ought in the name of all that is consistent to be quite as effective in "shoo"-ing western silver republicans back to him.

The fact that Mr. Gage puts forth such an interview and that the McKinley papers take pains to exploit it, shows how badly the Hanna-McKinley party is demoralized. Can it be

possible that they realize its true significance? It is, indeed, the severest commentary that has yet been passed upon the good faith of the republican party with reference to the money question. For at the last session of congress the republicans forced through a measure the very first section of which declared—

that the dollar, consisting of 23 8-10 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, as established by section 3511 of the revised statutes of the United States, shall be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury to maintain such parity.

That measure professed, as this first section shows, to establish the gold standard so firmly that nothing short of a new act of congress could disturb it. And this is what the republicans claimed for it at the time, and again in their national platform. Alluding to the measure from which we have quoted, their platform described it as an act by which—

the parity of all our money and the stability of our currency on a gold basis have been secured.

But now Secretary Gage declares that Mr. Bryan could if elected "order his secretary of the treasury to make payment in silver of all the public debt payable in coin, and for all current disbursements of the government," thereby putting the government upon a silver basis. What does all this mean? It can point to only one of four things: unless (1) Mr. Gage is merely manufacturing demagogic campaign material to influence the weak-minded, or (2) is honestly mistaken in supposing that Bryan could depart from the gold standard, either (3) the republicans have proved themselves incompetent to make an effective gold standard law, or (4) they were guilty of a false pretense in the gold standard law they did make.

Who can have forgotten how the McKinley press told us last spring that the money question was settled for years to come. The new gold standard law had settled it, and

Bryan's free silver thunder was gone. But now, when imperialism comes to the front as the dominant issue of the campaign, the same press trots out the money question not merely as the dominant issue, but as the only issue! The issue of imperialism, it tells us, is a bug-a-boo, having no existence outside the democratic imagination. What do these apologists, with all their backing and filling, mean by imperialism? Is it the name they are quarreling with? There is nothing in names. The vital point is that McKinley proposes to hold and fortify and fight for what are called our "new possessions," but to deny forever to the people of those possessions the right to participate in the government that governs them. Now that is government without the consent of the governed. It is non-republican. It is imperial. But by any other name it would be as offensive to American ideals. Dare Mr. McKinley deny that this is his policy? He has not yet denied it. But he has said and done much to make it his policy. Whether it be called imperialism, or paternalism, or benevolent assimilation, or what not, the detestable fact remains that President McKinley and all the other Hanna republicans have committed themselves to the un-American policy of permanently establishing subject colonies, to be governed arbitrarily, regardless of their own wishes, from Washington.

Some McKinleyites are more candid than others in their acknowledgment of this imperial policy. One of these is Edward A. Belcher, a judge of the superior court of San Francisco, and a man of recognized light and leading in his party throughout California. In the Los Angeles Herald of July 29, Judge Belcher closed a review of the question of the American citizenship of natives of Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippines with this concise but complete statement of the McKinley policy:

While it is freely admitted, indeed, the writer has many times strongly urged, that mercantile and strategic

considerations make it imperatively necessary that we should hold and fortify these island possessions, and fight to retain them, it is nevertheless urged that they should be kept perpetually as territories. Nothing should make against that save the remote possibility that the native races may be supplanted by the Caucasian race. Upon none, in the writer's estimation, save the intelligent people of the Caucasian race, should the inestimable privilege of United States citizenship be conferred.

If that is not imperialism, will some benevolent assimilationist kindly give it an appropriate name?

The growing desperation of the McKinley press over election prospects is well illustrated by the action of the Chicago Tribune in devoting half a page of its valuable space to a list of what it describes as "some of the prominent men in various states who voted for Bryan in 1896, but cannot find it in their hearts to repeat the act this time." It then spreads out its imposing list, which consists of 63 names, gathered from all sources as with a fine tooth comb. But the prominent names in the list are as scarce as hen's teeth in an aquarium. In all the list, the only names that are prominent enough to even approximate a national reputation are these:

Senator Stewart, of Nevada; E. Ellery Anderson, of New York; ex-Senator Mantle, of Montana; ex-Gov. Hoadley, formerly of Ohio but now of New York; Senator Marion Butler, of North Carolina; ex-Senator Peffer, of Kansas.

Let us pass them in review. Stewart was a republican silver mine owner who voted for Bryan because he hoped free silver would increase the value of mining stock. For this statement we have the authority of the McKinley papers of 1896. E. Ellery Anderson is a Cleveland democrat, who did not vote for Bryan, but energetically opposed him. How Senator Mantle voted in 1896 nobody knows, unless probably Mantle himself. The same is true of Peffer. Hoadley, the law partner of a republican machine leader, did not vote for Bryan in 1896. Senator Butler, who did, has given no intimation of his intention of doing otherwise in 1900.

If the Tribune so recklessly falsifies the facts about the six men in its list who are prominent, what falsifications may it not have made about the 57 whose reputations are local or non-existent?

If lists of this sort were important, even if honestly compiled, what a deadly parallel might be drawn. Think of Senator Stewart, the only anti-Bryan man in the Tribune's list who certainly did vote for Bryan four years ago—and add if you please the doubtful cases of Mantle and Peffer—think of the defection of these three Bryan voters of national reputation in comparison with that of the men of national reputation whose change is from McKinley to Bryan! Carl Schurz alone would outweigh a whole senate full of Stewarts, Mantles and Peffers. And besides Schurz there are such men as Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Gen. John Beatty, John J. Valentine (the president of Wells-Fargo), Henry Watterson, John DeWitt Warner, Webster Davis, Louis R. Ehrich, William Lloyd Garrison, Edwin Burritt Smith, Bourke Cockran, ex-Gov. Boutwell, Senator Wellington, and so on until the list of really prominent and influential supporters of McKinley in 1896 who now support Bryan would for length alone make the Tribune's list of nobodies who have gone from Bryan to McKinley turn sickly pale.

It is refreshing, among the monotonous succession of imperialistic campaign harangues at the G. A. R. encampment at Chicago, to let the mind rest upon the sentiments of Gov. Scofield's speech at the banquet of the iron brigade. Gov. Scofield also is a republican. He is the republican governor of Wisconsin. But his love for the republic outran his loyalty to the imperialist leaders of his party; and instead of taking advantage, as did so many other republican speakers, of the opportunity to make a stump speech, he made a speech which was thrilling in its patriotism. In these jingo times, when glory

through conquest is so often the theme of republican orations, a quotation from this republican governor would be worth preserving if for nothing more than a pleasing contrast. Said he;

Our path to glory in an honorable future does not lie through bloody seas. The most highly trained army, all the authorities to the contrary notwithstanding, can never subdue wholly an army of intelligent men fighting for their homes. This fact becomes more true every year and our nation will do well to heed it. We have had a taste of war recently, which unquestionably has awakened a military spirit, and what we have now to guard ourselves against is a too great and dangerous growth of this spirit. We prefer peace, and we are a nation whose glory is that when it does engage in war it is not for conquest, but for righteousness' sake.

Another republican governor is outraged by the tendency of his party towards imperialism. This is Pingree of Michigan. He regards his party as having fallen into the hands of Mark Hanna, and he doesn't like it. In a letter to Hearst's Chicago American he writes:

I voted the republican ticket first when Abraham Lincoln was a candidate for president and I've voted it ever since. I'm free to confess that I've never been a Mark Hanna republican and could not be if I tried. Hanna, however, is not the principles of the republican party and some day the party will shake him off. In my opinion, it is the patriotic duty of every man who is in the habit of voting the republican ticket to keep up his allegiance in the hope of finally rescuing republicanism from the clutches of Hannaism. Such being the case, I shall probably hold my nose, vote for McKinley and hope for the best.

There is a good deal of deplorable fatalism in the latter part of Gov. Pingree's letter. Good citizens are under a higher obligation than that of "finally rescuing republicanism from the clutches of Hannaism." It is their duty to rescue the nation, and that cannot be done by voting for any party that Hanna controls. While it is true, as Gov. Pingree says, that Hanna is "not the principles of the republican party," he is nevertheless in a position to substitute for its principles any policy he wishes. And he has done this to such an extent that the

party is now completely divorced from the democratic principles it received from Abraham Lincoln and his compeers.

Towne's brilliant speech, opening the campaign for Bryan and Stevenson at Duluth on the 27th, contained a summing up of Roosevelt's wobbly character which is the work of an artist. It was delivered in connection with an allusion to Roosevelt's notorious speech at Minneapolis. In respect of argument, said Mr. Towne of that rhetorical display of Mr. McKinley's swashbuckler partner in the presidential race,—

the speech is, with rare exception, an alternation of evasion and assertion. In spirit it is a compound of scold and scullion. As to its facts, it abounds in inaccuracies which, if accidental, are inexplicable as coming from a man who has performed creditably work in history and biography. But the world is accustomed to inconsistencies from Mr. Roosevelt. It has long looked upon him as a predestined and incorrigible eccentric. It has given up attempting to explain him or to reconcile him with himself. It is quite impossible, whether it would be worth while otherwise or not, to make an entirely satisfactory diagnosis of a civil-service reformer in partnership with Thomas C. Platt; a citizen soldier who ridicules the volunteers; a leader in battle who finds glory in being rescued from an ambush; a hero who boasts of shooting a fleeing foe in the back; a candidate who plays and poses to delegates and galleries to obtain a nomination that he does not want; a gentleman who charges six and one half millions of his fellow countrymen with lawlessness, dishonesty and cowardice; a statesman who, mounted on a hobby, rides roughly at grave questions in economics and politics, swinging his partisan lariat and yelling like an intellectual Comanche.

A better description of Roosevelt it would not be possible to make; a truer characterization of his Minneapolis speech could not be condensed into so few words.

Henry C. Payne, the great republican monopolist of Wisconsin—the Mark Hanna of the old Northwest—is another republican witness to the fact that the republican party has abandoned the negro and that the bourbon "nigger"-haters of the south are at heart republicans. In an

interview in the Milwaukee Sentinel of the 26th he says:

With a division of the colored vote in the north, a large portion of it going to the democratic party, there would be an instant change in the political conditions of the south, as it would make the democratic party equally responsible for the political association of the colored race in both the north and the south; and the whites of the south, a large majority of whom are firm believers in the doctrines of protection and expansion, would then feel free to act with the republican party and work for its success.

Mr. Payne grasps the situation. His party has made a complete 'bout face since the days of Lincoln. It stands to-day where the bourbon democracy stood in the sixties; and the bourbon democrats of the south are ready to jump into its band wagon as soon as they realize that the negro is no longer under its protection. But Mr. Payne may find himself mistaken about the political effect of this revolution in the south. Not all white southerners are bourbons. When the issue of bourbonism is clearly drawn there, we may find that they lack the majority which Mr. Payne expects.

Many of our readers will recall the fine German translation of Markham's "Man with the Hoe," which we published in No. 93 under the title of "Der Mann mit der Hacke." Its author was Dr. Ernst Schmidt, to whom a sympathetic tribute was paid in the same number by George A. Schilling. Dr. Schmidt was at that time supposed to be at the point of death. He survived, however, until last week, dying on the 26th. For 40 years he had been a well-known physician of Chicago. Born in Bavaria in 1830, Dr. Schmidt participated as a youth in the republican movement of Germany, in which Sigel and Schurz figured so conspicuously; and in 1856 he came to this country. As an American citizen he made common cause with Schurz and Heinzen and Hecker and Hasereck and Louis Prang in their support of the movement for the abolition of slavery. The same human sympathy that made him a German revolution-

ist in the forties, and an American abolitionist in the fifties and sixties, drew him to socialism in his later years. He was the socialist candidate for mayor of Chicago in 1879, polling 12,000 votes out of 50,000; and he braved local prejudice in 1886-87 by acting as chairman of the "anarchist" defense committee when August Spies and his associates were on trial for murder in connection with the Haymarket affair. Dr. Schmidt was a man of magnificent physique, of fine mind, of excellent education, of sturdy convictions, and of splendid courage. He was universally respected in Chicago both as a physician and as a man. His was one of those lives that go to prove that courageous fidelity to conviction in unpopular causes is not always a bar to public respect.

To get a clear idea of what world power imperialism means, one must listen to its advocates abroad, where there is no fear of offending democratic sensibilities. An opportunity for Americans to do this is afforded by the Literary Digest of the 11th, which summarizes from the Chronik, of Leipsic, a discussion of the subject in the Evangelical Social congress at Carlsruh. This conference, the Digest explains, is a representative body of 300 of the most progressive religious thinkers in Germany. Several phases of the discussion are presented in the Digest's summary. To begin with, it assumes that in "the development of new world powers, Germany, too, is called upon to take its part in the spread of its commercial, moral and spiritual powers." Then it urges that "Germany must become a world power, not only in the interests of its economic independence, but especially because it has the duty of contributing toward the civilizing and developing of peoples that have hitherto not done their duty toward mankind." For, "in general, to base a colonial policy only on the benefit that the mother country may derive is unjustifiable." Then follows a vindication of "the duty and the right

of a Christian nation to become a world power," because of the "abundance of national strength and vitality which enable it to make others the recipients of its nobler qualities," and because it is "the general duty of mankind to master the earth and to make it serviceable to the purposes for which it was created."

All that is familiar to the American reader. Precisely such appeals are put forward here to induce the United States to go into the "world power" business of which Mr. McKinley has given us a foretaste. Almost to the letter the German reasons are duplicated by Outlook editorials and militant sermons and strenuous harangues. But what follows in the discussion, from which we have quoted, and what must follow in inevitable order, is not so freely expressed by our own imperial philanthropists as by their German brethren. Referring to their declaration that it is the duty of superior peoples to master the earth and make it serviceable, these German apologists for Christian land grabbing go on to declare that—

this neither the negro tribes nor the states under Islam nor the South American republics can do; this can be done only by European powers, as is seen by the example of Japan, Tunis, etc. That this cannot be done without the application of force lies in the very nature of the case; but conquest of such inferior people is only to be the preliminary step toward their salvation, education, and civilization in accordance with Christian principles.

There you have a glimpse into the imperialism which these professional Christians of Germany describe as a "call," and toward which the same imperial spirit is driving our own aforetime republican nation. Even the South American republics are not to be spared. They, too, are to be Christianized under martial law. And toward all mankind, except the European powers (including the United States in grace of its power), there is to be "an application of force" with a view to conquest. But one suggestion remains to complete this picture of the bloody reign of the

Prince of Peace. The power necessary to conquer "inferior" peoples in South America and Asia, will be available to subdue "inferior" citizens and subjects at home, and for that purpose it will assuredly be used. If you would forecast the further history of this Christian crusade, read the story of Rome.

In criticism of our approving comment, on page 260, upon a New York court's decision in a labor case, we are in receipt of the following protest from William J. Strong, the eminent Chicago lawyer, who has for the past five or six years been waging a relentless legal fight against the "black listing" of workmen:

I desire to challenge the pernicious doctrine laid down by the court in the case of the National Steamfitters vs. Enterprise Steamfitters and approved by you in an editorial on page 260 of *The Public* of August 4, 1900, wherein you assert that "That which all men have a right to do individually, all, or any number less than all, have a right to do together." This doctrine is pernicious because it fails to take note of the fact that there are many acts which can be done individually and not work an injury to others, but which when done in combination with others become oppressive. In other words, there is a power for oppression residing in numbers, when acting in concert, that does not exist in individuals when acting alone. No two men are likely to act in the same manner when acting as individuals; hence the evils which may arise from concert of action are not likely to happen. For instance, I have a right acting as an individual to deny a man employment, from whim or caprice, because, for instance, I do not like the color of his hair; but I have no right to combine with others for the malicious purpose of preventing that man from getting work at his trade. The reason is that as an individual I could not work him an injury. I might deny him work, and he might get work elsewhere; but if every employer in his trade combined to keep him out of work, then an injury could be inflicted. The public is interested in having men work at their trades, and when men cannot find work at their trades they become either paupers or criminals, and a charge on the community, and the public is injured as well as the individual; and as it is one of the highest duties of the state to protect the weakest of its members from oppression, those combinations which are oppressive to the individual are treat-

ed as misdemeanors and are punishable as such, as well as giving a right of action for civil damages to the individual who has been deprived of a legal right. The boycott, for instance, has always been held to be unlawful. On the same principle the blacklist also is illegal.

Neither do these injuries, in my judgment, arise from monopoly, as you seem to think. Take the packers who have blacklisted girls who struck because Libby, McNeil & Libby cut their wages — girls who were able to earn \$16 a week as expert labelers, and who solely by reason of the combination between the packers, are unable to find work at their trade, and are compelled to go to the department stores and work for four and five dollars a week. It cannot be because these packers have any "legal monopoly" that they are able to perpetrate this wrong. Neither is it because their packing establishments are located on the railroad terminals (which are monopolies), that they are enabled to do it. They could combine and do the same thing if all their business were done by wagons on the public highways.

It cannot be that the monopoly in land is the cause, for under the single tax they could rent the ground, unless it be that the single tax would prevent men from engaging in the packing business.

Even if we had an ideal state where there were no monopolies, and the demand for labor exceeded the supply, they could still do it if the employers in any trade took it into their heads to impoverish a man by keeping him from working at his trade. They might have work for him, and still for the malicious purpose of injuring him they might combine and keep him from getting work. The question of whether they would be likely to do it if monopolies were established is not the question. But could they do it? And if so, what is it that enables them to work the injury? Is it the power of combination, or the fact of monopoly. These illustrations are made to show that there are many evils which may be accomplished by the power of combination and by concert of action, that could not be done by individuals acting as individuals. Hence it is not true as a matter of morals or law, that what a man may do alone he always has the right to do in combination with others, as there are many things which are made wrong solely by reason of the power of oppression which resides in the concert of action of numbers.

I will not refer to the many adjudicated cases which sustain my contention, as you may say that the judges who rendered these decisions were "striving to serve one class by interfering with the rights of another."

The decision you refer to is not, in my judgment, good law, nor is it founded on justice or the rights of man. And

if taken to the higher courts it will be reversed.

The blacklist is an issue in the coming campaign, and I cannot believe that *The Public* will justify the iniquitous practice of the railroads and other corporations who are attempting to terrorize their employes and make them slaves by means of the blacklist, by using the argument they use, viz.: that whatever a man has a right to do individually, he has in all instances a right to combine with others in doing. If a combination has the justification of competition it may be lawful; but combinations which have only the purpose of injuring others, cannot be held to be just or legal.

We assure Mr. Strong that *The Public* does not justify the railroad "blacklisting," which he, as a lawyer and citizen, is fighting so valiantly. But we dissent from his view that "blacklisting" can be accomplished by mere combination. No combination of competitive establishments can make it effective. What makes it effective with railroads is the fact that railroads are not in any true sense competitive. Railroad combinations are combinations of monopolists. Nor is it an answer to speculate upon what might happen even in competitive conditions if all competitors in a given branch of trade combined in a "blacklist." That is an impossible hypothesis. In conditions truly competitive all employers could not combine in a blacklist. They could no more do that than an engineer could build a dam that would prevent the waters of the Hudson from finding their way to the sea. Competition is a force which nothing but legalized monopoly can resist. And when instances are cited, like that of the packers, to show that competitors actually do combine, they prove nothing; they are not instances of competitive conditions. In the first place the packers are lessees of monopolized terminal privileges, whereby they strangle competition; and in the next place, the monopolization of land in general has so far lessened opportunity for self-employment as to have completely killed off that most natural of all competition, which consists in employers bidding against each other for help. It is

monopoly, not combination, that makes blacklisting effective. We would, therefore, destroy blacklisting by abolishing monopoly. It can be done in no other way.

With all possible respect for Mr. Strong's judgment, we deny that anything that would be innocent if accomplished by one person, becomes wrongful when done by a combination of several persons. The essence of wrong is the concurrence of an evil act with a corresponding evil purpose. Whether this be the individual purpose and act of one or the joint purpose and act of many, makes no difference in principle. A purpose and act which would not be wrongful in an individual cannot be wrongful in a combination of individuals. Mere numbers do not in the nature of things change what is innocent into what is criminal. In other words, we believe the law of conspiracy—ancient though it undoubtedly is—to be an unprincipled innovation. And while in exceptional cases, like those of the railroad "blacklisting," it may be invoked as a labor palliative, its main use will continue to be a club for the judicial pounding of workingmen.

As an organ of McKinleyism, the New York Times feels, of course, in duty bound to discredit the doctrine of the declaration of independence that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. But it has the sense to refrain from candid denunciations. The hour for that has not precisely arrived. It would be as yet highly impolitic openly to attack the mass of "prejudice" which holds the heads and hearts of the American people true to the declaration of independence. So the tactics of the Times are for the present those of the sapper and miner. The doctrine of the fathers is assailed with masked satire, which it is hoped may by an imperceptible process make the doctrine ridiculous. The Times accordingly sets itself the task of demonstrating in an underhand way

that government by consent of the governed is impracticable and absurd.

Divested of the smartness that characterizes its editorial writing, and put into blunt English, an argument which the Times in one of its recent issues makes against the declaration of independence is as follows: The McKinley policy of criminal aggression in the Philippines, the imperialism which proposes to rule distant peoples as crown colonies, is right; because the principle of "the consent of the governed" is not acted on in domestic affairs. For example: (1) The Indians are governed without regard for the letter and spirit of the declaration of independence. (2) The District of Columbia is administered without the advice and consent of its inhabitants. (3) The entire woman population is so governed. (4) The army and navy are administered without reference to the opinions of the soldiers and sailors. (5) The committee on rules in congress is a governing body which "derives its powers" from a party caucus and not from the consent of the governed. This, apparently, is the best that the ablest administration organ can do by way of apology for imperialism. We may safely leave its effort to the consideration of our readers, with the bare suggestion that proved deviations furnish no reason for abandoning an ideal. Because men stray from the path of rectitude, that is no reason for closing it. Because a pledged teetotaler has fallen from grace to the extent of drinking now a glass of beer and now a glass of wine, or even to the extent of getting "jolly drunk" at times, that is no good reason for his deliberately becoming a sot.

Apropos of the death of the duke of Argyll, an American magazine, Scribner's, recently discussed the uses of a leisure class. It began with the proposition that "a priori, a man who inherits money enough to be all his life, as the French say, 'at his ease,' is the man from whom we should expect the things that make the world

better, and for which there does not seem to be any immediate market in money." But that is just what ought not to be expected a priori. A leisure class is of necessity a parasitical class. It is supported arbitrarily by the labor of others. And by no rational inference can we expect from a parasitical class devotion to the world's betterment. As well expect grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. It is of the nature of parasites to be always too intent upon their own selfish enjoyment and the perpetuation of their parasitical privileges to know or care about anything else. In self-satisfaction and the effort at holding on, their energies are exhausted. And this is what the magazine in question discovers a posteriori with reference to the British leisure class. It finds that Argyll "was the only duke in Great Britain who within living memory has amounted to anything;" and that the marquis of Salisbury, when he was Lord Robert Cecil, was, upon the authority of Bagehot, "the only member of the British aristocracy who had shown the capacity of earning his own living." To these two, Scribner's adds Lord Rosebery, and, speaking of them as "three out of 500 members of the house of lords" who are worth their salt as workers, adds:

Perhaps an ordinarily well-informed observer might manage to pick out half a dozen more lords who might fairly be called distinguished for something else than being lords, barring the achievements. But that is a sorry showing for so many holders of what may be called perpetually endowed new men, who owe their titles to their fellowships.

From a consideration of these and similar facts Scribner's finally comes to the sensible conclusion that the necessity of earning one's own living is the necessary condition of all worthy achievements, and "that the desire to have been born a duke, which often assails lazy people as a delightful dream, is really a desire to have foregone a much better birthright." Yes, indeed. If it were not for the parasites who suck away the earnings of the workers, there could be no richer birthright than the so-called "curse of Adam."

## AN ATHEISTIC HYPOTHESIS.

"Republic or empire" is the paramount issue in American politics, according to the democratic platform and speakers. Timid republicans, on the other hand, affect to sneer at this epigrammatic phrasing of the issue, and protest that the McKinley policy is not imperial. But there are republicans who possess the full courage of their convictions, and who, having no purpose to serve in trying to befog the issue, speak out boldly. One of these is Franklin H. Giddings. He is professor of sociology in Columbia college, New York, and he speaks through a book which the Macmillans publish. Prof. Giddings makes no wry faces over the alternative of "republic or empire," but comes out flatly for republic and empire. His book contains an undisguised plea for American imperialism.

In this book, entitled "Democracy and Empire," Prof. Giddings argues that these two antagonistic forms of government are quite compatible. There is no fear on his part that we cannot exist half republic and half empire. Had he written in Lincoln's day it is altogether probable, judging the probabilities by the spirit of his book, that he would have foreseen no dangers to a nation half free and half slave. In fact he regards imperialism for America as inevitable, and opposition to it as "probably as futile as opposition to the trade wind or the storm." It is not with concern that he says this. He puts it forward as a reason for falling into line. His philosophy, in other words, is simply an elaboration of President McKinley's fatalistic epigram. He teaches that destiny determines duty, and he believes that it is our destiny to be an imperial republic.

Prof. Giddings's hypothesis is distinctively atheistic. We do not mean by that that Prof. Giddings is an atheist. For all we know to the contrary he attends church services with the regularity of a deacon, and adores pietistic fetiches with the devotion of a pagan. He may even be profoundly religious in his personal life. But his social philosophy is the philosophy of atheism. The hypothesis we have mentioned assumes that precisely such blind forces

as wind and storm hold sovereign sway in social life. It entirely ignores the moral forces which are as capable of checking or diverting evil tendencies in society as intellectual forces are of avoiding the dangers of the storm and making the wind an agency of service instead of destruction.

That there is a tendency to evil in the social world is true. Consequently there may be the tendency to imperialism that Prof. Giddings points out. But that these evil tendencies in society cannot be resisted or diverted by moral agencies and influences is not true. All evil tendencies in society are results of the influence upon it of evil choices made by individuals; and they may be diverted or subdued by the counteracting influence of righteous choices by individuals. It is thus within the power of every one to affect in some degree the trend of social development. According as he decides for or against the right, whenever his community comes to judgment upon a moral issue, so does he help to make its future. These decisions are the determining factors of history.

It is not a "good God, bad devil" world, this in which we live. There is no duality of person or force—good and bad—in eternal conflict. Neither is there a solitary beneficent person or force that instigates evil in order to produce good. This great conflict between good and evil in which we are floundering, is an unavoidable product of the individual faculty of choosing between good and evil—the moral affirmative and the moral negative, moral harmony and moral discord—with which man is endowed, and without which he could not be man. Out of that struggle so produced comes the great social force or tendency in social life which we recognize as evil and personify as the devil. Its development may be readily observed by following in thought the story of a human life.

Men at birth are wholly selfish. They care for nothing but self-gratification. With advancing maturity, this absorbing self-love gives way in greater or less degree to what in appearance if not in fact is love for others. The grown man, unlike the sucking babe or the toddling child, considers in some measure the com-

fort of his fellows even at the cost of discomfort to himself. He may do so merely because experience has taught him the wisdom, as matter of pure selfishness, of taking others into account; or he may do it because the inspiration of love has touched his heart and opened his understanding to a realization of the beneficent law of moral righteousness, which is so superbly phrased in the golden rule. But whichever may be his motive, selfishness will not be wholly expelled from his nature. In the one case it won't be even modified. Whoever is altruistic merely because experience or observation has taught him that it pays, is essentially as selfish as an Ishmaelite. In the other case, selfishness remains in degree. No man ever becomes so completely at one with justice, so perfectly in harmony with moral law, as to escape a daily battle between his righteous purposes and his selfish inclinations. There are, therefore, innumerable individual decisions against righteousness.

In consequence of these individual decisions against righteousness in social concerns, there is an evil force in the social world. It consists in the spontaneous cooperation of individual selfishnesses. This is the force that makes for imperialism in all its forms. It is the force that supports aristocracy, plutocracy, oligarchies and boss-ships. It is the force that maintains militarism and monopolies, and every other mode of selfish mastery by man over man. It is the force that once degraded Rome from republic to empire and brought on the dark ages, and that threatens now to make history repeat itself with the American republic in the place of the Roman. And this is the force which Prof. Giddings regards as inevitable and irresistible.

It is, indeed, inevitable. But it is not irresistible. In so far as individual men, in their social or public relations, choose the right for its own sake, evil social forces are resisted. When those forces prevail, it is because the social conscience is weak. Slavery cannot live a minute in a community where the dominant sentiment is truly vitalized by the spirit of human liberty. Imperialism could not raise its head if public opinion were inspired by the golden rule.

Militarism would be an abhorrent spectre if the common conscience held human life sacred. Against devotion to the right because it is right, evil tendencies in society are important. And so tremendous is the expansive power of this righteous force that even a little of it accomplishes mighty things. The righteousness of only ten righteous men would have saved Gomorrah from destruction.

**NEWS**

The situation in China, which at our last report was described as somewhat chaotic, remains virtually unchanged. Military operations have apparently subsided, and there has been an entire absence of any trustworthy news since the 21st or 22d, when Mr. Conger sent the message quoted in the next paragraph.

Preceding Mr. Conger's message various news reports were received confirmatory of our account of last week which described the relief of the legations, the flight of the imperial family, and the subsequent attack of the allies upon the forbidden city in Peking. Mr. Conger's message, although not dated at Peking, left there probably as late as the 22d, but was not received at Washington until the 27th. It is as follows:

No important movements since last dispatch. Military is trying to restore order. No representative of the Chinese government encountered yet. Several ministers of the tsung-li-yamen reported in the city, and are expected to appear soon. Generals decide not to enter into imperial palace, believing it practically vacant. Two thousand Germans arrived to-day.

The proposals for peace, made by Li Hung Chang in behalf of China, immediately after the relief of the Peking legations and reported in last week's issue on page 313, were replied to by the American state department in the following note, published on the 23d:

Memorandum in response to the Chinese minister's communication of cablegrams from Viceroy Earl Li Hung Chang, dated August 19 and 21, proposing the immediate cessation of hostilities and the appointment of an envoy to conduct negotiations, received at the department of state August 20 and 21, 1900. While the condition set forth in the memorandum delivered to the Chinese minister August

12 has not been fulfilled and the powers have been compelled to rescue their ministers by force of arms unaided by the Chinese government, still this government is ready to welcome any overtures for a truce, and invites the other powers to join when security is established in the Chinese capital and the Chinese government shows its ability and willingness to make on its part an effective suspension of hostilities there and elsewhere in China. When this is done, and we hope it will be done promptly, the United States will be prepared to appoint a representative to join with the representatives of other similarly interested powers and of the authoritative and responsible government of the Chinese empire to attain the ends declared in our circular to the powers of July 3, 1900.

The circular referred to in the foregoing communication as having been issued July 3, 1900, was reported in these columns at the time on page 199. Since the publication of the above reply no word has been received from Li Hung Chang.

Of the other powers, Japan has replied to Li Hung Chang in the same vein as the United States, but Germany has refused to recognize his authority to represent China in peace negotiations. Russia, on the other hand, strange as it must appear in the face of previous reports, seems to have taken a stand for immediate peace. She has sent a note to all the powers urging them to withdraw their troops from Peking and to accept Li Hung Chang as the representative of China in peace negotiations. This note was considered at a cabinet meeting at Washington on the 29th. The meeting was secret and its proceedings have not been authoritatively divulged, but the press reports aver that a favorable reply to Russia's note was formulated.

The subsidence of fighting in China has been followed by greater military activity in the Transvaal. By our last week's report (page 313) it will be seen that the Boers then had two armies—one, under DeWet, operating to the west of Pretoria, and the other, under Botha, established in the region of Barberton near the eastern frontier. From DeWet's force there is but little news beyond a dubious rumor that it has dispersed. He seems, however, to have attempted to cross the railroad north of Pretoria with a view to joining Botha, and to have been driven back by Baden-Powell after a day's fighting on the 23d near Pienaar's station. The heavy fight-

ing occurred in the east, where Botha commands the Boers. This is under the immediate direction of Lord Roberts himself, who has established headquarters at Wonderfontein, on the railroad between Pretoria and Lourenso Marques. On the 21st the British general, Buller, had fought his way as far north as Belfast, which is on the railroad a short distance east of Wonderfontein. Two of his companies, drawn into ambush on the 23d, suffered severely. The British advance had extended on the 24th as far as Belfast, in the neighborhood of which it engaged the Boers on the 24th, the 25th, the 26th and the 27th. Lord Roberts reported on the 27th that his movements were "slow on account of the extent and nature of the country." Dalmanutha, the next station east of Belfast, was taken by the British on the 27th, and on the 28th, after heavy fighting at Machadodorp, the next most easterly station, the Boer lines were broken and they fell farther back. Buller entered Machadodorp in the afternoon of the 28th.

It now appears that the Orange Free State has not been freed of Boer forces. A body under Gen. Olivier made an attack on the 26th from three sides upon Winburg, the terminal station of the branch line running east from the main line of railroad at Smal-deel, which is about midway between Bloemfontein and Kronstad. The attack was beaten back by the British, and Gen. Olivier and three of his sons fell into their hands. It was Gen. Olivier who conducted the retreat from Wepener (page 41) along the eastern border of the Orange Free State.

From the Philippines we have nothing to report this week but American casualties. Since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to August 30, 1900, these casualties are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91 .....	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900.	48
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900 .....	366
Total deaths since July 1, 1898.....	2,261
Wounded .....	2,220
Captured .....	10
Total casualties since July 1, 1898..	4,491
Total casualties reported last week .....	4,458
Total deaths reported last week..	2,228

American politics are distinguished for the week by Mr. Bryan's speech accepting the populist nomination, and by the substitution as populist vice-presidential candidate of Mr. Stevenson for Mr. Towne.

Mr. Bryan received the formal notification of the populist nomination at Topeka on the 23d. Preliminary speeches were made by Chief Justice Doster and ex-Congressman Simpson, and the notification was delivered by T. M. Patterson. Before Mr. Bryan responded, A. W. Rucker, of Colorado, notified him of the indorsement of the Monetary league. By way of preface to his acceptance speech, Mr. Bryan acknowledged his nonpartisan welcome to the state of Kansas and the city of Topeka, by representatives of both—the representative of the city being a republican—in terms that deserve remembrance and suggest imitation. On this point he said:

I desire in the beginning to thank the authorities of this state and city for the nonpartisan welcome which has been delivered through Mr. Troutman. I appreciate that liberty of thought, that generosity, too infrequent in politics, that enables political opponents to thus tender the freedom of the city to one with whom they do not agree on political questions. I am grateful for the kind words which were spoken and appreciate the admiration mentioned, even though that admiration does not count as much on election day as a simple ballot. I hope that as the years go by we shall be able to lift politics to a higher and brighter plane, so that we can fight out these great questions as citizens equally earnest and equally honest, each one respecting the other's rights.

His acceptance speech dealt first with the money question; then with the income tax; after that with labor arbitration, the blacklist, government by injunction and Chinese labor; next with railroad discrimination, and the question of a labor cabinet officer; after that with the trust question; and finally, after a further elaboration of the money question in its present relation to national politics, to the paramount issue of imperialism.

Mr. Stevenson's nomination by the populists, necessitated by the withdrawal of Mr. Towne (page 281), was made at Chicago on the 27th by the national committee. The test vote, which was taken upon a motion to nominate a populist, stood 71 against to 24 for the motion; but Stevenson's nomination was afterward made with

practical unanimity. The leader of the Stevenson movement in the committee was Gen. James B. Weaver, who has been twice a candidate for president—once as the nominee of the greenback party, and again as the nominee of the populists. Senator Butler, the member from North Carolina, opposed any vice-presidential nomination at all.

The presidential nominations now before the country are as follows:

Democratic—For president, William J. Bryan; vice president, Adlai E. Stevenson.

Republican—For president, William McKinley; vice president, Theodore Roosevelt.

Silver Republican—For president, William J. Bryan; vice president, Adlai E. Stevenson.

People's Party (regular)—For president, William J. Bryan; vice president, Adlai E. Stevenson.

People's Party (middle-of-the-road)—For president, Wharton Barker; vice president, Ignatius Donnelly.

Social Democrats (including fusion wing of socialist labor party)—For president, Eugene V. Debs; vice president, Job Harriman.

Socialist Labor Party (De Leon wing)—For president, Joseph T. Malloney; vice president, Valentine Rimmel.

Prohibition—For president, John G. Woolley; vice president, Henry B. Metcalfe.

United Christian—For president, S. C. Swallow; vice president, John G. Woolley.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The American Bar association began its thirty-third annual convention at Saratoga on the 29th.

—The thirty-first annual convention of Beekeepers of the United States met at Chicago on the 28th.

—The thirty-fourth annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic convened at Chicago on the 28th.

—The fifth annual convention of the National Association of Local Fire Insurance Agents opened at Milwaukee on the 29th.

—Henry George's birthday will be celebrated at Elgin, Ill., in the opera house, at 7:45 on the 2d. The speakers will be Louis F. Post and Father Cox, of Chicago.

—At the democratic primaries in New York state on the 28th the supporters of Richard Croker, in a contest with those of David B. Hill, secured the control of the forthcoming state convention.

—The negro whose assault upon a little girl caused the riot at Akron, O., reported last week (page 314), pleaded guilty on the 24th to the charge against him and was immediately sentenced to life imprisonment.

—The birthday of Henry George will be observed in New York city on

the 3d, at the Manhattan Single Tax club, with William Lloyd Garrison, Samuel Seabury, George L. Rusby, John De Witt Warner and James A. Herne as the speakers.

—John J. McCann, of St. Louis, whose imprisonment in the St. Louis workhouse for nonpayment of a fine imposed for his refusal to pay the city for permission to work for his living was explained at large and commented upon editorially in these columns last summer (page 244), was released on the 25th, the mayor having remitted his fine.

—The trial of Bresci, the assassin of King Humbert of Italy, began at Milan on the 29th. It ended on the same day with a plea of guilty of murder and life imprisonment. He said he had killed the king to avenge the misery of the people which had forced them into bread riots, and insisted that he acted without advice or accomplices.

—The Henry George association, of Chicago, Frederick H. Monroe, provisional chairman, will celebrate the sixty-first anniversary of the birth of Henry George, at Handel hall, 40 Randolph street, Chicago, at three o'clock in the afternoon, Sunday, September 2. Willis J. Abbot will preside, and speeches will be made by Father Cox, Clarence S. Darrow and John Z. White. Similar celebrations will be made at all important centers throughout the world.

—Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, arrived at New York on the 28th from Europe, on board the "Oceanic," which made the voyage from Queenstown in 5 days, 16 hours and 45 minutes. Mr. Johnson says:

I was having a good, quiet time in Europe, taking in the exposition and all that sort of thing, but Mr. Bryan asked me to come home and assist in the campaign work, and here I am. I expected to take a hand in it anyhow, but the request of Mr. Bryan brings me home a little sooner than I expected. Where shall I canvass for Mr. Bryan? Why, anywhere that he wants me to. I am in his hands as to that. Personally, I should much prefer to work in Ohio, which is my own state and is also Mr. McKinley's state. I could probably do my best work there.

—On the 28th the Afro-American council met in annual session at Indianapolis, and was welcomed to the city by Mayor Taggart and several representative colored men of Indianapolis. Bishop Walters, the president of the council, delivered his address on the 27th, when a committee on "address to the country" was appointed, with T. Thomas Fortune, editor of the New York "Age," as chairman. The committee reported an address on the 29th, from which an indorsement of the McKinley administration had been excluded after a contest in committee.

—Robert Fitzsimmons, the pugilist and ex-champion heavy weight, won a prize fight against Thomas Sharkey,

under the expiring New York law, at the Coney Island Athletic club on the 24th, knocking him out in the second round. Fitzsimmons afterward challenged James J. Jeffries, the present heavy weight champion of the world, for a fight in New York on the 31st of August, the last day of the law; and upon Jeffries refusing to meet him so soon, proposing instead a meeting in California some months hence, Fitzsimmons publicly announced his withdrawal from the prize fighting ring forever.

## MISCELLANY

### AN EXILE'S MESSAGE.

For The Public.

The roses in my garden bloom  
Above the violets' faint perfume.  
Close by, the fountain's singing spray  
Leaps up a-sparkle in its play;  
And 'gainst the deep-toned southern sky  
The feathery palm fronds wave on high.  
Land of the olive and the vine!  
Land of the orange and the pine!  
I look beyond thy golden glow  
And see the land I used to know.

I see the bloom-wreathed orchard trees  
Soft stirring in the western breeze;  
Their scented petals floating down,  
Above a gold head and a brown,  
And—sloping upward to our feet  
The red-topped clover, billowy sweet.  
Land of my childhood, loved of old!  
Amid the tropic's blue and gold  
I hear the ripple of thy streams  
And catch the woodland wild flowers' gleams.

Land of mine own immortal dead!  
Land of the Race, to Freedom wed!  
The storm clouds gather 'round thy head.  
Rise up! Thou hast not failed before;  
For Justice's sake, one battle more!  
Land that the black man's fetters smote,  
Thy God is with thee! Smite again!  
Thy star-lit banner yet shall float  
Above the Rounded Rights of Men!

Land of the just! Land of the brave!  
Whose naked sword hath freed the slave!  
For thine own children's freedom now  
Blind thou the helmet on thy brow!  
For thine own children's right in thee  
Stand forth in glorious majesty.  
And once again, for mankind's right  
To tread the path that seeks the height,  
Thou Conqueror of a Tyrant's will,  
Rise up! Thou art Columbia still!

Above the fountain's silvery plash,  
And thro' the sun-birds' rainbow flash  
I see the palm tree's feathery crown  
Against the blue sky arching down,  
And past the mountains' shadowy band—  
The vision of a regnant land.

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

Cullacan, Estrado de Sinaloa, Mexico.

### THE SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN ON MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH.

There is little dissent among the papers capable of any degree of fairness to Mr. Bryan that his Indianapolis speech was a truly great rhetorical achievement. Putting aside the principles it supports and ignor-

ing the force of its argument, the address possesses a literary strength, even in the types, that is unusual. As all Frenchmen could take pride in the oratory of Mirabeau, and as all Englishmen could admire the forensic powers of Gladstone, it seems also that Americans of all parties can be proud of so highly developed a rhetorician and public speaker as Mr. Bryan. It is not necessary to say that he rivals Lincoln in the simplicity and clearness of his style; yet hardly any other American political leader since the rise of Lincoln has surpassed Mr. Bryan in the dignity, poise, simplicity and clearness which now characterize his best efforts. He has also a gift for epigram and strong condensation of ideas, which few other public men possess. There is no one in English politics who compares with him in all these respects, unless it be John Morley, and in America Carl Schurz almost alone is his equal. Mr. Bryan's oratory gains force from the utter lack of personality and personal abuse which characterizes it. The Indianapolis speech is particularly notable in that respect. From the beginning to the peroration it is an appeal to the understanding and the sense of justice of every American voter. No presidential candidate could lift political discussion to a higher plane, and to Mr. Bryan credit should be given for this much, however obnoxious his principles and his party may be to his critics.—The Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

### A LONELY LITTLE MONKEY.

All that Borax, the little pink-eyed monkey, wanted of his fellows in the Lincoln park zoo was kind treatment, and when they turned their backs on him and ignored the inoffensive creature altogether he got sick and sulked in the darkest corner of the cage. The keepers had never witnessed such a strange manifestation of feeling akin to human among the animals and did not worry about Borax. The ostracism imposed on him by his erstwhile companions made Borax sick and he refused nourishment. Yesterday morning the little animal died and his long-tailed playmates of two weeks ago, unforgiving even in the face of death, refused to show the slightest sign of sorrow when he was carried away and buried.

The circumstances of Borax's death were not known to the thousands who visited the animal reservation. They found the monkeys in new cages, and when something was said about a demise in the colony they attributed it

to an accident attendant upon moving. There was one less simian to be bribed into a clever acrobatic feat with a handful of peanuts, but the demand was not lessened through the absence of the dead animal.

Borax was the cleverest performer of all the monkeys and his skill led to his fate. He handicapped his fellows by previous training, for he came from a circus where he got a bun if he rode a spirited greyhound around the track without losing his seat and a whipping if his performance did not suit the trainer. Borax's life at the Lincoln park zoo had promise of happy days. The first Sunday he performed he got as many peanuts as all the rest of the monkeys combined, but Borax was not selfish and attempted to divide his spoils. The simian's generosity was regarded as an attempt to lord it over the rest and he was not thanked.

After a month's stay at Lincoln park Borax apparently wished he had never left the circus, though the bun was frequently stale and the beating a severe one. There he was on good terms with the greyhound and the savage bull-terrier that wouldn't treat any other member of the outfit with the least show of civility. Borax did his best to furnish amusement to the crowd, but would not accept the rewards. After dark his cage companions would appropriate their despised comrade's emoluments, though they make unkind remarks about him.

"You can't tell me that the pink-eyed fellow didn't die of grief," said one of the keepers the other day. "It was a plain case of getting shut out in the cold. He wanted to be the 'good fellow' with the crowd, but they would not stand for it. It is just like men anyhow. If they see a chap succeeding they begin talking bad about him. Borax wasn't accustomed to that sort of a thing and it broke him all up. I could see he could not live through it. He didn't see any chance of getting back to the circus or another job, so he went back in the cage and starved himself to death. That monkey was more sentimental than many a human being." — Chicago Chronicle of Aug. 6.

### THE AMERICAN DECLARATION OF IMPERIALISM.

For The Public.

When in the fateful course of blind Destiny, it becomes necessary for the people of a great democratic republic to subjugate inferior peoples, and by destroying infant republics to assume among the nations of the earth the exalted and profitable station of a

world power, a decent respect to the opinions of the better elements of mankind require that they should declare the causes which impel them to depart from their democratic ideals.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that the God of infinite love is a judicious respecter of persons, who in his infinite wisdom hath created some men in superior station and with superior rights; that they are charged by their creator with certain corresponding duties; that among these is the divine obligation of regulating the lives and liberties and ministering to the happiness of their inferiors, through the strenuous processes of benevolent assimilation. That to perform these duties governments are instituted over inferiors, deriving arbitrary powers from standing armies and crooked taxation, and conserving the privileges of the governing class by thereunto subordinating the rights of the governed. That whenever government becomes republican in spirit and thereby destructive of these despotic ends, it is the duty of the better elements to alter or abolish it, provided they do so in the name of patriotism, and to institute imperial government in its place, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect the safety and happiness of inferiors and to contribute most effectively to their own respectability, comfort and profit.

Prudence, indeed, will dictate that republican government shall not be suddenly changed in form; for all experience hath shown that the lower classes and inferior peoples are more disposed to suffer the evils of independence than to relieve themselves by formally renouncing it. But when the fortunes of foreign war, pursuing invariably the same victorious course, evince the design of the God of Battles to augment the paternal obligations of a superior people whose benevolent rapacity is hampered by republican government, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government and to provide new guards for the security of their divine privileges and the advancement of their manifest destiny.

Such have been the unmistakable indications of providence, and such is now the necessity which constrains the superior classes of the United States of America to alter their antiquated system of government.

We, therefore, the representatives of the better classes of the United States

of America, in imperial convention assembled, appealing to Plutus the blind for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name and by the authority of the superior people of these states, including the editor of the Outlook, solemnly publish and declare that these United States are and of right ought to be a mighty empire, that they are as such absolved from all constitutional restraints, and that all relation between them and the glittering generalities of the declaration of independence is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as an empire marked by Destiny to hold despotic sway over the inferior children of our common Father, they have full power henceforth to levy war for purposes of conquest, to conclude peace with honor and spoils to purchase powers of sovereignty over unwilling peoples, to govern the conquered and the purchased without their consent and as dependent subjects, to contract alliances with other world-power empires, to maintain a standing army commensurate in magnitude with our imperial dignity and the necessities of military operations in distant parts of the globe and for that purpose to draft conscripts from the inferior classes, and to do all other acts and things which world-power empires may of might do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the Almighty dollar, we pledge the lives and earnings of the American working classes and our own sacred honor.

#### AN UNCROWNED KING.

The career of one of earth's powerful kings, albeit uncrowned, is suddenly closed. His remains are conveyed in royal state from his princely summer home in the Adirondacks to his palatial residence in the metropolis. His private train, with a cortege of friends and attendants, is given the right of way over a highway crowded with the traffic of a nation.

This uncrowned king, commanding revenues approximating in volume those of the general government, was not an executive officer of the nation; he did not sit in the halls of legislation, he had not been clothed with judicial ermine, he never presided at the marts of commerce, he had engineered no great manufacturing enterprise, yet public officials and mercantile combines yielded to his will, and all industrial interests paid enforced tribute to his exchequer.

This uncrowned king was not vested with the scepter of authority by royal inheritance, by popular election, or by military conquest. He did not acquire

his vast power over his fellow-men by employing the magic gifts of oratory, by the arts of the skillful advocate, by masterly thought in the editorial arena, nor by any of the agencies which have hitherto held sway over men's minds, and exercised control over their actions.

It was by using his undelegated and almost unlimited and irresponsible power as master of transportation that this uncrowned king became also a master of finance, a master of industry, and thus a master of the people. It was by acquiring the exclusive control of a vast machinery for the distribution of products that he was enabled to levy tolls for his own emolument, and virtually to fix the prices of the fruits of industry.

In no obtrusive or ostentatious fashion did this uncrowned king enforce his authority over the farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, the banker, the miner, the contractor and the innumerable employes in every vocation, yet that authority was felt in all the avenues of industrial, commercial and professional life.

As a master of transportation, by a compact with less than half a dozen other master spirits in the country, he fixed and levied the tax which each of the 75,000,000 people in these United States must pay for the conveyance of persons from one point to another, and for the transit of every pound of food, every article of clothing, and every other object that ministers to their necessities or pleasures.

Here was a man whose business consisted in building and operating national highways, for all railways are virtually such to-day, and yet he was invested with the sovereign prerogative of levying a compulsory tax. This plain citizen, undelegated by a political constituency, was empowered to formulate revenue laws in his private interest, subject to no revision or veto. This private individual, not clothed with judicial functions by the people, was permitted to pass upon the rights of those who were compelled to make use of these public railways. This professional railroad man, who could do no better service in building and operating railroads than 10,000 of his fellow-citizens who are following that calling, was accorded a personal revenue greater than the combined incomes enjoyed by the monarch of Great Britain and the czar of Russia.

There is one other fact that should not fail to be noted in regard to the career of this most remarkable man, a fact that detracts equally from the fair fame of the uncrowned king, and

from the good name of the people who suffered the wrong and disgrace. He openly dispensed fabulous sums in political campaigns to secure the election of judges, legislators and executive officers favorable to himself, and secretly expended enormous sums in the halls of the national and state legislatures to secure the enactment of laws in the interest of his vast railway system.

These undeniable facts, which ought to be as startling as they are true, are not enumerated at this time to criticize the acts or to assail the memory of the uncrowned king who was deprived of his scepter by the hand of death. He was merely the product of a system in which such things were possible. His successor assumes the authority he abdicated, and the power he usurped from the people will be wielded as relentlessly as before, for the system in which that power was entrenched continues undisturbed. The facts are recalled not to condemn the dead magnate, but to awaken the thoughtful consideration of the American people.

Is it wise to permit one human being, or a small cabal of railway financiers, to exercise such unlimited and irresponsible control over a system reaching down to the minutest details of every person's material welfare? Is it sound policy for the state to leave in the hands of private individuals the control and princely revenues of a tax-gathering system which embraces the entire country, and is in its very nature an absolute monopoly?

The governments of other countries are gradually absorbing those functions and enterprises which are recognized as public utilities, and is it not time for our own people who have felt the evil effects of private and corporate ownership of railway transportation to mature some plan for the transfer of that ownership and its emoluments to the collective control of the people at large?—William H. Knight, in *Los Angeles Times* of Aug. 17.

#### AN ESTIMATE OF THE FILIPINOS.

The conclusion of a letter written by John T. McCutcheon to the *Chicago Record*, dated Manila, April 23.

From my personal experiences with the Filipinos—experiences covering the greater part of two years and the larger part of the Philippines and the Sulus—I have reached several deductions which at present I think are tolerably well founded. Perhaps if I had time I would change or remodel them.

The first is that I like the Filipinos. From the very first I have met with hospitality and kindness from them in every part of the islands. On nearly all of these occasions the people have had no other reason to be courteous and friendly except the impulse of inherent hospitality. About the only Filipinos I have had cause to disapprove of were the cab drivers in Manila, together with various house boys who at one time or another transferred my watch, money and other valuables from my home in Manila to some unknown place either in Manila or out of Manila. These I dislike.

But in most of my experiences with Filipinos in Manila and nearly all the provinces I have met a uniform degree of courtesy, which, whether assumed or natural, has prepossessed me in their favor. There has never been a house, however small, or a family, however poor, which has not hospitably placed itself at my service when conditions rendered such service most opportune and grateful. I have heard of scores of cases of treachery, but as a general thing I've found this treachery to have been directed at officials or people whom the Filipinos distrusted or had reason to dislike. This treachery has had its inception in conditions for which we cannot wholly blame the people, and the methods of exercising it may be partly excused when we reflect that the Filipinos have not reached an advanced state of enlightenment—that is, that the way to avenge a wrong is to carry the matter through several years of litigation instead of going out with a bolo and ending it all in one night.

Treachery, also, may vary with the point of view. When a native with a Remington shoots a soldier from his hiding place in the bamboos it is murderous treachery, but when the soldier goes out and shoots a Filipino it is merely another bandit killed and is called a praiseworthy stroke of enterprise. And when a local president whom we have appointed betrays to the Filipinos some prospective military expedition it is rank treachery from one point of view, but the Filipinos simply regard it as an evidence that the race is standing together in its fight against an outside invading race. It all depends upon whether we look upon the matter from the standpoint of people who have been getting the worst of it for several centuries or from the standpoint of a people who have had their

independence for a century or more of stupendous progress and enlightenment.

Another conclusion I've reached is that a higher state of education exists in the Philippines, excepting, of course, the Igorrotes, Negritos and Moros, than one can find in any other oriental country. From Albay province to Aparri you will find the greater part of the people uniformly able to read and write; you will find substantial stone buildings and imposing churches and schools in the most remote sections. A trip up the Ilocos coast is a revelation to the traveler, for he will find the valleys highly cultivated, the cities large and imposing and the people normally peaceful and fairly industrious.

The same conditions will be found existing in all sections of Luzon. You will find pianos where you have been led to expect breechcloths and savagery. You will find well-dressed people reading the native newspapers, and men who will discuss with you intelligently the problems of the islands. Only in the remote mountain districts will you find the half-naked savage who is used in the American comic weeklies to represent the typical Filipino. For this state of comparative enlightenment the church is responsible, for whatever we may say of the methods of the friars we must acknowledge that they have done a great work in educating the people—leaving the price out of the question.

Another conclusion I've reached is that with proper training the Filipino may be developed into a good man in any branch of business. He is receptive and imitative. I have seen most excellent maps and draughtings made by Filipinos. In the big banks and business houses high positions are held by them, and on the railway and steamship lines there are dozens of splendid native engineers and mechanics. In music, art, sculpture, medicine, law and literature; in technical vocations, such as architecture, wood carving, weaving, masonry, electricity and mechanical engineering; in sports, such as horse racing, cock fighting, boat racing, fencing, bicycling and various native sports, and in all sorts of clerical work there are many examples showing what may be made of the raw material if properly taught.

The Filipinos are great lovers of fast horses, and, like all eastern peoples, like ostentatious display. They dress their women beautifully, where

they have the means, and they love feasts and parades and balls and music. I am convinced that, naturally, the Filipino is domestic and peace loving, but as a general thing susceptible to the arguments of those of his race more intelligent than he. For this reason the leaders of the revolution have easily obtained thousands of recruits who break their home ties and go out and fight desperately without knowing exactly what they are fighting for.

And, finally, a few general conclusions may be summed up thus: That the Filipinos are inclined to be lazy; that they are pretty generally religious; that the women are virtuous, and that if the people can ever be convinced that the United States is sincere in its desire to benefit them they will make a very good class of citizens.

#### MR. BRYAN AND THE PEACE TREATY.

A letter written by Louis R. Ehrich, of Colorado Springs, Col., to the New York Evening Post, and published in the Post of August 10.

Senator Hoar has charged that Mr. Bryan gave his influence in behalf of ratifying the peace treaty with Spain, doing it in bad faith and with the expectation of making the Philippine question a political issue. Other writers and speakers have repeated the charge, with the added claim that Mr. Bryan's procedure deprives him of the right of justly criticising the unhappy consequences which flowed from an act in which he virtually cooperated.

Let us examine the facts and the accompanying evidence. I am no defender or apologist of Mr. Bryan. I fought his election bitterly in 1896, and I opposed his financial theories long before 1896. I am actuated solely by the spirit of fair play and justice.

On June 14, 1898, three weeks before Cervera's fleet was destroyed and two months before the fall of Manila, Mr. Bryan delivered an address in the Nebraska building of the Omaha exposition. These words, uttered so long before the administration policy had declared itself, assuredly give evidence of the prevision of the statesman and patriot. He said:

History will vindicate the position taken by the United States in the war with Spain. In saying this, I assume that the principles which were invoked in the inauguration of the war will be observed in its prosecution and conclusion. If, however, a contest undertaken for the sake of humanity degenerates into a war of conquest, we shall find it difficult to meet the charge of having added hypocrisy to greed. Is our national character so weak that we cannot withstand the temptation to appropriate the

first piece of land that comes within our reach?

To inflict upon the enemy all possible harm is legitimate warfare, but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the orient merely because our ships won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila? Our guns destroyed a Spanish fleet, but can they destroy that self-evident truth, that governments derive their just powers, not from superior force, but from the consent of the governed?

This was the first public expression on the subject of imperialism, uttered over two years before the electoral campaign of 1900. If Mr. Bryan, with the soul of a petty politician, had been desirous of entrapping the republican party into a dangerous political issue, would he not have kept silent?

The plenipotentiaries of the United States and of Spain affixed their seals to the peace treaty on December 10, 1898. Three days thereafter Mr. Bryan gave out the following interview at Savannah, Ga.:

Our people defended Cuba against foreign arms; now they must defend themselves and their country against a foreign idea—the colonial idea of European nations. Heretofore greed had perverted the government and used its instrumentalities for private gains, but now the very foundation principles of our government are assaulted. Our nation must give up any intention of entering upon a colonial policy, such as is now pursued by foreign countries, or it must abandon the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . . Some think that the fight should be made against ratification of the treaty, but I would prefer another plan. If the treaty is rejected, negotiations must be renewed, . . . with the possibility of international complications. It will be easier, I think, to end the war at once by ratifying the treaty, and then deal with the subject in our own way. The issue can be presented directly by a resolution of congress declaring the policy of the nation upon this subject.

A month thereafter, January 9, 1899, (five days after the president had transmitted the treaty to the senate), Mr. Bryan published an article in the New York Journal, giving, as he says, "a few reasons why the opponents of a colonial policy should make their fight in support of a resolution declaring the nation's purpose rather than against the ratification of the treaty." After pointing out that the rejection of the treaty could be only temporary, because "the new senate will have a considerable republican majority," he gives the following as the weightiest argument:

The rejection of the treaty would be unwise, because the opponents of the treaty would be compelled to assume responsibility for the continuance of war conditions and for the risks which always attend negotiations with a hostile nation. The rejection of the treaty would give the administration an excuse for military expenditures, which could not be justified after the conclusion of peace, and the op-

ponents of the treaty would be charged with making such appropriations necessary. It must be remembered that, in case the treaty is rejected, negotiations must be renewed with an enemy whose ill-will is not concealed. Who is able to guarantee the nation against new dangers and new complications? . . . Our nation owes it to the nations with which we have dealings, as well as to the inhabitants of Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, to announce immediately what it intends to do respecting the territory surrendered by Spain.

Within less than a week after the publication of this article Senators Bacon and Hoar each introduced resolutions in the senate declaring it the nation's policy to give complete independence to the Filipinos. On January 24 Senator Lodge said:

The treaty cedes the Philippines to us. It commits us to no policy, to no course of action whatever in regard to the Philippines. When that treaty is ratified, we have full power and are absolutely free to do with those islands as we please. . . .

Suppose we reject the treaty; what follows? Let us look at it practically. We continue the state of war, and every sensible man in the country, every business interest, desires the establishment of peace in law as well as in fact. . . .

The treaty commits the disposition of the Philippine islands to congress and to the ways and practices of peace. Its rejection leaves them in the sole power of the president, subject to the usages and practices of war alone.

On January 30 Senator Jones, of Arkansas (who certainly stands close to Mr. Bryan), pressed for a vote on the Bacon resolution. He was foiled, as were all further efforts in that direction, by senatorial tactics. The next day, January 31, Senator Platt, of Connecticut, said: "To defeat this treaty relegates us to a state of war legally. What will happen then no human being knows or can foresee."

The very day of the ratification of the treaty (February 6) Senator Allen said in the senate:

Because I shall vote for the treaty it does not follow that I am in favor of annexation. . . . If we open up the subject matter of the treaty we will, in my judgment, especially in the light of very recent events, incur the danger of European interference and European interventions. It is because we will have the power, when the treaty is ratified, of determining the form of government to be set up in the Philippine islands and in the other possessions that have come to us as a result of the war, without incurring any danger from abroad, that I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty.

Within eight days after the treaty ratification, Senator Bacon introduced the following amendment to the McEnery resolution:

Resolved further, That the United States disclaims and disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said islands, and assert their determination, when a stable and independent government shall have been erected therein, entitled in the judgment of the United States to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms

which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

The vote on this resolution, taken February 14, stood 29 to 29. The vice president cast his vote in the negative, and the amendment was defeated. Be it noted that, of the ten democratic senators who voted in favor of the treaty ratification, only two—Senators Morgan and McEnery—voted against the Bacon amendment. This completely exonerates Mr. Bryan, so far as his influence extended, from the charge of selfishly desiring imperialism as an issue in this campaign. Had he fought the ratification of the treaty, he could very justly have been accused of being a narrow minded, rancorous, political obstructionist. He threw his whole influence in the direction of adopting a wise, humane, and noble American policy toward the Filipinos, thus rising above selfish partisan considerations in the plane of patriotic statesmanship.

#### ELEMENTS OF THE CAMPAIGN ISSUES.

For The Public.

Now that we have the declarations of both of the great political parties, some speculation ought not to be amiss as to the relative strength of their positions.

The two principal issues of the campaign, those of trusts and imperialism, are at bottom moral questions, which, in order to be intelligently decided, require an understanding of fundamental principles that are by no means generally understood.

It will, for example, become necessary for the citizen to decide whether it is right for one nation to make subjects of another nation, regardless of present day practices, and with seeming prospects of gain and glories of war to prejudice him in favor of an affirmative answer.

The element of gain will also enter the trust as well as the half dormant tariff issues, inasmuch as both of these are backed by powerful moneyed interests; and, in the case of the tariff, at least—the trust promoters not having had time as yet to confuse the public mind—a great many still regard it with superstitious reverence as a source of national prosperity.

Assuming—for the sake of argument, if it is not unreservedly granted—that the republican party stands sponsor for those issues; the democratic party, it is notorious, is their

avowed opponent. The position of the latter may be summed up as follows: On the expansion question, relinquishing of territory acquired; on the trust question, abolition of trusts; on the tariff question, abolition of its protecting features. These measures, all of them negations of those issues of republican creation, are urged by the democrats on grounds of equity.

So it will be seen that the prospects of material gain are seemingly almost entirely on the republican side, while the democrats have scarcely anything to offer except Righteous Indignation.

On one side we shall therefore, have all the appeals to the passion of gain, and all the forces inseparable therefrom; while on the other hand, we shall simply have appeals to Justice, seemingly irrespective of Material Gain. And the question of the success or failure of either party rests upon the question as to which has the strongest hold upon the majority of Americans, Sense of Justice, or Passion for Gain.

Those who have not already become blinded in the present intense struggle for wealth will have no difficulty in deciding for Justice. But, is there not enough of the "Gentleman of Fortune" in the American citizen for Gain to outweigh Justice with him? Time will tell!

Thus the question arises as to whether it is necessary that a clear separation be made between Justice and Gain; whether it is necessary to weaken the cause of Justice by implying that it must be accompanied by material loss—an implication seemingly involved in the negative answers of the democratic platform to the questions at issue.

So long has Justice been associated with self-sacrifice that it has become difficult to understand how material gain may be made by moral conduct.

Now, is that implication necessary for the reason that there are no positive moral answers to those questions? Or must it be admitted that present-day democrats are not sufficiently enlightened to answer those questions?

The latter seems to be the case. Present day democracy, radical as it is becoming, is not the elemental democracy of the days of Jefferson; nor is it possessed of the knowledge so highly developed in our day, and so much more essential on account of our more complex conditions—the elemental knowledge of man's relation to his environment.

In the light of that knowledge it would be well to inquire into the issues now before the nation.

To come directly to the point: What is the expansion question? In sober truth, laying aside the historical events which led up to the war, what is that public sentiment — for public sentiment it is—which has led up to this desire for territorial expansion, but a manifestation of that universal desire which has been aptly described as "land hunger?" On every hand we hear that "this country is getting too crowded." And, are not these two statements frequently made—contradictory as they are—that "we want new markets for our surplus products," and "new countries for our idle laborers to develop?"

Living in a country that is still in the pioneer stages and one of the most sparsely populated, why should our very laborers themselves express such sentiments, if it were not for the fact, that they do not know that their own country is still large enough to accommodate with comfort many times its present population, and, furthermore, that the use of this, their country, is withheld from them by our present land-tenure laws!

The expansion sentiment being simply a struggle for space on the earth, is but the old question of man's relation to the land of his country. So long as that question remains unanswered we will have expansion of the kind now being urged, the kind of expansion of which imperialism is a necessary complement; since, if we wish to add new territory to our domains by force we must prepare to hold it by force. Friendly relations, without any extension of our governmental authority over other countries, is the only expansion necessary!

Those are facts which ought to be patent to all those who wish to oppose successfully the present expansion movement. To be ignorant of them is to beg the whole question of territorial expansion, and to plead one's inability to cope with it. For it must be admitted that the expansion movement is the expression of a popular desire that is a real desire, a want that is a real want, and not mere fancy or fad of the present moment. It is repeated in history again and again; and the response has always been the same: subjugation of foreign territory and races.

Since the expansion movement is an expression of a want of land, it would

seem like a foregone conclusion that it should be accompanied or preceded by some domestic movement which made land at home difficult of access or artificially scarce. That there has been such a movement is becoming more and more apparent; and, the second important issue of the campaign, the trust issue, is an evidence of that fact. For the trust, instead of being of recent origin, is simply the latest development of the land speculation movement, the name of which is familiar to most people, but the real nature of which is less known—a movement the tendency of which is to arbitrarily diminish the land of the country.

A young country, rich in minerals, fertile in soil and favorable for the carrying on of commerce, it has been settled almost entirely with a view to material gain. In such a country a most superficial observer ought not to find it difficult to conclude that, while land could be had for a low price large portions of it fell into private hands, and these, when the land became more densely populated, rose to an enormous value.

It is this land speculation movement that has so rapidly developed a condition where one corporation owns almost all the iron-bearing land of the country; another, the coal deposits; a third, the oil fields; a fourth, such large portions of the agricultural land that the horizon becomes inadequate for its boundary. It is that condition which enables individuals to own large portions of the most valuable area of our cities, and corporations to hold their populations mercilessly by the throat. These are the real bases of the trusts.

So the concentration of land ownership in a few private hands goes on on one hand, while the cry goes up for more land on the other.

If these things are admitted and deemed wrong, what other right or rational way can there be to stop them but to abolish that system which makes the land at home unavailable to the masses of the people—the system of private land monopoly?

Now, private land monopoly is made possible in one and in only one way, and that is by the private appropriation of that value which attaches to land as a result of population and social advancement, known to political economists as economic rent.

This private appropriation of rent, sustained and protected by our present land-tenure laws, acts as a barrier against the use of land. By means of that barrier it is that by far the greatest part of the land of the United States

is kept vacant. That barrier we must remove if we wish to abolish private land monopoly.

How can it be removed? By stopping private appropriation of rent? Very well, but we cannot do away with rent. If it is prevented from going into private hands we must appropriate it for public use. That is the answer; that is the "simple yet sovereign remedy."

This answer, at the same time that it solves the expansion and the trust problems, also solves the question of public revenue, and as a result the tariff question will cease to exist.

This will be recognized as a rough outline of Henry George's single tax proposition; and further amplification of it may be dispensed with here by a reference to that most admirable of books, "Progress and Poverty."

Democrats ought to be interested to know that this proposition is in perfect alignment with the teachings of Jefferson. In a letter to President Madison, dated Fontainebleau, October 23, 1785, Mr. Jefferson uses these words:

The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on; if, for the encouragement of industry, we allow it to be appropriated, we must take care that other employment be furnished those excluded from the appropriation. If we do not, the fundamental right to labor the earth returns to the unemployed.

In the same letter he makes this suggestion:

Another means of silently lessening the inequality of property is to exempt all from taxation, below a certain point, and to tax the higher portions of property in geometrical progression as they rise.

There are many hopeful signs in the present position of the democratic party. Its protests against the present evil tendency in national affairs embody the principles of true democracy. But let it not be forgotten that those evil tendencies are merely surface manifestations of an evil which lies at the roots of our social institutions, to merely suppress which would be like stopping the rot of a tree whose roots worms were eating out, by cutting off a withered branch. Let it not be forgotten that the popular desire for expansion is not merely an expression of corrupt human nature, but that it is the expression of a deep material need—the necessity of self-preservation. We neither can nor may in justice ascribe to our neighbors who uphold the present administration a purpose that is entirely corrupt. It may be "moral color blindness," as Henry George called it, which afflicts them; but in the last analysis it will be found to be lack of understanding of the true situation, rendered difficult to understand by im-

moral practices of the present day. To them the earth represents a raft, so inadequate to float all of its struggling occupants that some of them must be sacrificed in order that the rest may live. And, deeming themselves more entitled to live, from their superior position in the scale of being, the extermination of those whom they deem inferior seems to them the least sacrifice. This is their argument. What arguments can their opponents advance? Do they silently sanction the premises while they attack the unavoidable conclusions? When will men who call themselves democrats begin to reply to the assertion that "this country is getting too crowded" by declaring this to be false, and by showing that it is the holding out of use of the largest portion of the country that makes it seem "too crowded?" That is the real nature of the challenge which the republican party holds out to the democratic party. Will the democrats accept the challenge, with all that it implies? If they accept it they will simply be placing their party in the positive, aggressive position which it occupied under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, the departure from which caused its downfall. If they accept it they will have taken from their opponents their greatest stronghold, their promises of profit and gain, and adopted for themselves a method for attaining material prosperity which it is easy to demonstrate is both natural and efficient, to which reformers of almost all denominations now subscribe—financial reformers, prohibitionists, populists, trade-unionists and socialists of all descriptions, besides a large and enthusiastic number of out-and-out single tax men—a method which above all other methods has the highest sanctions of morality, to which all must agree who love liberty and desire justice. Let the democratic party go a step further in its denunciations of monopoly, and raise the standard of equal rights to land, and it will be sure to conquer.

P. M. CLEMENS.

Tommy—Papa, if Mr. Roosevelt had been born a Chinaman, do you think he would be a Boxer?

Papa—Hush, my son! Your question is a blow at the administration.

G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

The fifth essay on "Eccentric Official Statistics," by H. L. Bliss, which appears in the July issue of the American Journal of Sociology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), deals especially with the article on wholesale prices from January, 1890, to July, 1899, which appeared in the March number of the United States depart-

ment of labor bulletin. Mr. Bliss shows not only that these price statistics are untrustworthy, but that they have the earmarks of a deceitful purpose.

"Coin as Money. Trusts and Imperialism" (Chicago: Coin Publishing Co., Studio building; price, 25 cents) is the successor of "Coin's Financial School," which played so important a part in shaping the presidential issue of 1896. It follows the same method. "Coin, the young financier and statesman," is supposed to arrive in Chicago in November, 1899, and to give a series of lectures on the subjects named in the title.

"The Review of the Republic" (New York: 150 Nassau St. Price, 25 cents a number, or \$3 a year) appeals to economic and political students with two articles on trusts. One is by C. F. Phillips, "The Workingman and the Trusts." The other, by Lawson Purdy, is on "The Remedy for the Evil of Trusts," with special reference to the tariff.

**IMPORTANT NOTICE TO SINGLE TAXERS.**

Such marked differences have arisen in the Chicago Single Tax Club that a number of us have withdrawn our membership. We took this step only after prolonged debate on the floor at four successive meetings had convinced us that harmony could no longer exist. We now propose to form a new single tax organization. You are, therefore, invited to attend a meeting Saturday evening, Sept. 1, at 8 p. m., in room 608, 40 E. Randolph St., (Handel Hall building), to form a new single tax organization.

- Hiram B. Loomis, M. J. Foyer,
- Frank D. Butler, John Z. White,
- Theodore J. Amberg, F. H. Monroe,
- Louis F. Post, Thos. G. McElligott.
- C. L. Moulton, L. S. Dickey,
- Nancy B. Irving.

**CAMPAIGN OFFER :**

To extend its circulation and influence during the presidential campaign,

**THE PUBLIC**

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

**TWENTY CENTS**

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

**THE DOCUMENTARY OUTLINE OF THE Philippine Case**

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

**ATTORNEYS.**

Chicago.

**CHARLES A. BUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 7711.

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

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

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 2644.

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

Houston.

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

**EDUCATIONAL.**

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

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



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

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

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

**The Public**

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

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.

**Read and Return**

These books sent to any person, on condition they are returned or price remitted in ten days.

- Japanese Notions of European Political Economy ..... 25c
  - Our Farmers of the Revenue, by Wm. S. Rann ..... 25c
  - Natural Taxation, by Shearman ..... 30c
  - Progress and Poverty, Henry George 30c
- PRICES INCLUDE POSTAGE.  
ANY BOOK ON EARTH SUPPLIED.  
**H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter,**  
Catalogues Free. CONNEAUT, OHIO.

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

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