

The Public

Dr. H. J. Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1900.

Number 127.

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.

"Some men," wittily observes the Rev. Thomas E. Cox, of Chicago, "would rather pay taxes to the assessor than to the collector." If no one else understood the allusion, these men and the assessors would.

All persons who oppose the McKinley policy in the Philippines are guilty of giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and are therefore traitors. No traitor should be allowed to vote. Consequently the right to vote should be limited to persons who intend to vote for Mr. McKinley.

Upon reporting last week at Washington, preliminary to taking charge of the department of the lakes, with headquarters at Chicago, Gen. Otis predicted early peace in the Philippines. Gen. Otis has been making this prediction at frequent intervals for 18 months. If he keeps on predicting and the Philippine war does not last forever, he may yet prove to be a true prophet.

One of the magazines of the current month tells of the development of submarine navigation. The success of this nautical departure seems now to be assured; and the consequent disappearance from the ocean of great men-of-war to be almost certain. No nation can be mistress of the seas after whole fleets are at the mercy of a few submarine boats, costing little to build and but a trifle to man. Even the weakest nation can then defend her coast and shipping against the attacks of the most powerful, and navigation of the ocean, like riding safely upon rails on land, will depend not

upon the good will of nations with immense navies, but upon common consent.

A gambling-house magnate of Colorado proposes to contribute his mite to the Christianization and civilization of the Philippines by setting up in Manila one of the finest gambling houses in the world. Having observed with pain the barbaric character of the gambling now prevalent in those benighted islands, he offers to relieve the situation. Faro and roulette are therefore to supplement Bibles, hymn books and bullets in the work of redeeming our heathen subjects of the orient. Why not grant him an imperial subsidy?

Tyndall's ridiculous "prayer gauge" is outdone. Two sets of pious people are proposing to organize an endless chain, one to pray for McKinley's defeat and the other for his election. Is a more degrading conception of prayer possible? Apart from pulpit prayers for military success and imperial power, probably not. These performances are not prayer. They lack every characteristic of communion with a being of infinite wisdom and love. At the best they are nothing but pagan invocations.

In his Labor day speech at Chicago Gov. Roosevelt made one generalization which can be unstintingly commended. "Let us strive," he said, "to make the conditions of life such that as nearly as possible each man shall receive the share to which he is honestly entitled and no more." If Roosevelt would make that sentiment the ideal of his life, he would be a better man and a safer leader. It is as much nobler than his "strenuous life" ideal as the aspirations of a devoted physician are superior to the ambitions

of a human gamecock. But Mr. Roosevelt has given no earnest of his own belief in this exalted and exalting sentiment. He is himself a beneficiary of life conditions that give him annually a much larger share of the world's annual earnings than he is honestly entitled to, in consequence of which others have less than they are honestly entitled to. No blame attaches to him for that. But what does he propose by way of changing these conditions? Nothing. How, then, do we know that he believes in the sentiment he phrases?

Carl Schurz, who contributed so efficiently to the election of Mr. McKinley on the gold standard issue four years ago, has driven Secretary Gage into a controversial corner from which Mr. Gage does not find it easy to escape. It will be remembered that Mr. Gage recently published an interview in which he said that—

Mr. Bryan, if elected president, could 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 as well, which amount to \$1,500,000 or \$1,750,000 per day, and that he would give such an order, too, is very certain, if he is in the same mind that he was in 1896.

Mr. Gage added that this would practically put the government on a silver basis, ruin its credit, and bring incalculable disaster upon the business interests of the country. Replying in an open letter to that interview, Mr. Schurz severely rebukes Secretary Gage for using a possible flaw in the gold standard law of last spring for the questionable but "evident purpose of alarming the business community and the possessing classes generally" for political effect, and he denies that the danger set forth in the Gage interview really exists. In support of his denial he directs Mr. Gage's attention to the fact that the

supposed flaw in the gold standard law can yet be remedied by the republicans themselves. On this point Mr. Schurz says:

I call your prediction of the probability specified by you and of the disasters sure to follow, a false alarm for a very simple reason. Whoever may be elected president on November 6, there will be another session of congress before he will take office on March 4, 1901. The republicans will have strong majorities in both houses of that congress. The executive, too, will be in their hands. They will, therefore, be able to make such laws as they please. They will then have full power and ample opportunity to pass any legislation required to make it utterly impossible to any president to break down the gold standard in the way you, Mr. Secretary, describe in your interview.

The reply of Secretary Gage to Mr. Schurz's letter, given out on the 5th, would have been a disappointment had it been supposed that the point Mr. Schurz raised could be answered. The secretary attempts to answer it in two ways. He says (1) that in the event of Bryan's election any attempt of congress to perfect the gold standard law next winter would be "new legislation by a party whose policy would have been rejected by the people through their last expression at the polls," and (2) that "the free silver minority would be justified by their constituents in using all the resources of dilatory procedure to prevent such legislation, and against such tactics affirmative legislation such as you suggest would probably be impossible." This is the sum and substance of Mr. Gage's reply. He says other things, but nothing else to the point.

Now consider these two pleas in reply to Mr. Schurz. When did Mr. McKinley's party acquire so much respect for public opinion as to be sensitive to its expressions when they are not mandatory? And why should the party shrink from perfecting the gold standard law it confesses having botched in the making—why should it shrink because of Bryan's election upon another than the money issue as paramount? Surely Mr. Gage is hold-

ing the Hanna party to political standards of unwonted delicacy. And then as to the practical possibilities of perfecting the botched gold standard law between the first Monday in December and the fourth day of March. There could be no serious difficulty in the senate, where the republicans outnumber the democrats two to one. Some delay there might be, but none which it would not be within the power of the republicans to avoid before the 4th of March. If they could force through the kind of gold standard law they wanted last winter, and, without any effort to rush it, could do so as early as the 6th of March, they can certainly correct their botch work next winter in a senate in which they have a stronger majority. Since the free silver minority in the senate could not stop gold standard legislation last winter, it cannot stop gold standard tinkering next winter. Then as to the house, the republicans there have absolute power. A free silver minority could not delay their action by so much as a day. They could pass a bill within a week after its introduction. Of this power of the republican majority in the house and of its disposition to use the power even to the cutting off of fair debate in the most important matters, it has given us more than one illustrative instance since Mr. McKinley's inauguration.

The effect of Mr. Schurz's letter, an effect which Secretary Gage fails to destroy, is to place all responsibility for any departure from the gold standard upon the republican party. Not alone because that party, either astutely for questionable partisan purposes or because its leaders are incapable of making an effective gold standard statute, has enacted a law which upon Secretary Gage's interpretation Mr. Bryan could legally disregard, but because it still has the power to cure the defect which Secretary Gage thinks he has discovered. If the republican gold standard law is not defective, then Mr. Bryan as president could not put the country upon a silver basis.

If, on the other hand, it is defective, then the republicans can amend it before President McKinley goes out of office next winter. It follows, that if Mr. Bryan should in the event of his election place the country upon a silver basis, the primary responsibility will rest upon the republican party, which, with full power up to the 4th of next March to tie his hands, neglects to do so.

In addition to this consideration put forth by Mr. Schurz, it should be observed that Mr. Bryan—though his opportunities for proving it are only those of a private citizen, albeit a great party leader—is a statesman and not a pettifogger. He believes in bimetallism and he would establish it in this country if he could. But he believes in it as a policy of wise and honest statesmanship and not as a trick in a conjuring politician's repertoire. It is safe to predict, therefore, that he would not demean himself nor discredit his cause by a "turn" in executive legerdemain. Under existing law we are either on a gold basis or we are not. If we are not, it would be the part of honest statesmanship for Bryan as president to pursue a bimetallic executive policy. But in that case the responsibility would rest upon the republicans who, after four years of complete power, had not only neglected but refused to put us on a gold basis. If, however, we are upon a gold basis, it is certain that such a straightforward man as Bryan has amply proved himself to be would not try to put us on a bimetallic basis by a treasury department trick. His boldly declared and ably defended policy is to establish bimetallism honorably and honestly and constitutionally through the law making power. It is not the Bryans but the McKinleys who have pettifogged with the money question.

The futility of the efforts of the Hanna-McKinley combination to minimize the paramount issue of imperialism by stirring up a "sound money" scare, is impressively indicated not only by the consistent posi-

tion which men like Schurz have maintained ever since President McKinley set out upon his imperial policy, but also by the declarations of other great gold standard leaders. One of these leaders is William L. Wilson, Cleveland's postmaster general, who opposed Bryan vigorously in 1896, but who supports him now upon the principle that the issue of imperialism casts all other issues into the background. Another is Richard Olney, Cleveland's secretary of state. He also opposed the election of Bryan in 1896, and through his great influence in business circles contributed materially to McKinley's election. But now, in a letter published on the 6th, he declares that in the defeat of the republican party in the coming election lies the only hope of the reversal of dangerous policies and a return to more wholesome conditions. He believes that the election of McKinley would "sanction a syndicated presidency—a presidency got for the republican party by the money of a combination of capitalists intent upon securing national legislation in aid of their particular interests;" that it would confirm the plundering tariff legislation; that it would encourage land grabbing schemes in contempt of the rights of alien peoples, and approve the brutal Philippine policy of the past two years; that it would be an endorsement of militarism, a condemnation of civil service reform, an invitation to tumble into international complications, and a cringing submission to the power of money in politics. Though Mr. Olney finds many reasons for denouncing McKinleyism and coming to the support of Bryan, the impelling one is evidently the same that has moved Schurz and Wellington and Wilson and Boutwell, and all the other gold standard men who nevertheless do put the man above the dollar. They would, in the language of one of their number, "rather live in a silver basis republic than in a gold standard empire."

If the demonstration of workmen at Chicago on Labor day was at

all indicative of general opinion, Bryan will score a sweeping victory in November. The discrimination in his favor and against Roosevelt, both by the marchers in the parade of organized labor and by the audience at the labor mass meeting, was so marked as to be painful. The republican candidate for governor of Illinois, Mr. Yates, and the democratic mayor of Chicago, Mr. Harrison, were cheered vastly more than Roosevelt, while the cheering for Bryan was a marvel of enthusiasm. So pronounced a preference had not been looked for. It had been supposed that Roosevelt's reputation as a cowboy and rough rider would guarantee him a warm reception even from men who did not share his political sentiments. But that was a mistaken notion. He hardly attracted notice. Though he sat almost at Bryan's side during the parade, and Bryan's name was shouted in a continuous cheer by the procession of labor unions as it passed, Roosevelt's was seldom heard, and all attempts to evoke cheering for him were humiliating failures. The same spirit was manifest at the mass meeting. Bryan could hardly get through the crowd to the platform, so great was the pressure to grasp him by the hand; but Roosevelt passed through without difficulty and without much observation. When they spoke, there were only a few unseemly interruptions. But while Roosevelt was listened to with attention and was occasionally politely applauded, Bryan's points were applauded vigorously and heartily again and again. And when they left Roosevelt passed through the crowd as he had come; but Bryan, to the music of continuous cheering, was lifted above the swaying and cheering crowd and carried to his buggy. One peculiarly remarkable thing was the fact that many men who wore McKinley buttons covered their buttons with their hands while they shouted and cheered for Bryan.

Roosevelt's speech, in comparison with Bryan's, was a poor performance. Though Bryan's speech was

political, it was not partisan. It did not trespass upon the proprieties of the occasion, but was a statesman's speech, with the Declaration of Independence as its ideal—one which discussed public questions freely and vigorously, but only in so far as they affect labor interests. Government by injunction, for example, was a subject upon which Mr. Bryan enlarged. Gov. Roosevelt, however, in an effort to be nonpartisan became insipid and patronizing. He seemed not to know how to be at once nonpartisan and public-spirited. His speech was an excellent specimen of the style which mission school superintendents adopt when they tell ragged little street boys how important it is to be good.

The unexpected and unprecedented demonstration for Bryan in the very presence of Mr. McKinley's strenuous and spectacular running mate will doubtless result in an attempt on the part of Mr. Hanna to get up a McKinley labor parade in Chicago during the campaign. It has already been proposed. The idea suggested is that it be called a "prosperity procession," and that it be made up of the working forces of the different Chicago factories. There should be no difficulty in surmising what this means. The men are to be ordered out, as they were five years ago; and that none may dare stay away, the hint is to go around that this is a case of "no parade, no job." Prosperity for working men is about as scarce in Chicago as it well could be, and as scarce as anywhere unless in Mr. Hanna's own city of Cleveland. But the power of the employer is none the less on that account. It is greater. To control a job in times like these is very close to owning a man.

The condition of affairs in China is as enigmatical now as when the allied troops were marching upon Peking and the correspondents of London papers were setting the pagan Chinese an example in Christian lying. The only difference is that whereas then the safety of the foreign

ministers was the problem, now it is the intentions of the allied powers.

To the astonishment of the world, Russia has proposed withdrawing from China. So ostentatiously gracious a proposition from such a source naturally excites suspicion; and the fact that Russia has been waging a successful little war all by herself in the Manchurian provinces of China seems to account for her willingness to join the other powers in withdrawing from the more southerly regions of the empire. With Manchuria secured, Russia might find it to her advantage to delay further encroachments until she could do so without confederates. Yet the fact must not be ignored that there are two Russias, just as there are two Englands, two Germanys, two Americas, and so on; that is, that in Russia as in other countries the imperialists do not have it all their own way. Though Russia is not so far advanced in democracy as other countries, democratic influences are at work there as well as elsewhere, and they reach far up. They have certainly affected the royal family in some respects more than once, and the present tsar most assuredly has no love for war. His instincts are for peace. It may be, then, that the proffer of Russia to withdraw from China is a genuine expression of democratic influences in that imperial country. And there is some indication of this in the assurances she makes of her willingness to withdraw not only from all China, but also from Manchuria.

Russia's proposition has been approved by the United States, under the influence doubtless of the anti-imperial sentiment which is manifesting itself so strongly as the presidential election approaches. In harmony with the Philippine policy, American arms should stay in China, whether Russia wishes to withdraw or not, until a stable government is established there with no more autonomy than we think the Chinese capable of appreciating. But the election approaches, and that operates as a check upon new ventures in imperialism.

There is, however, no indication of an actual movement to withdraw from China. The ministers are safe. It is now known that they need never have been in danger. But the flags have gone up, and some of the allies have no hesitation in asserting the imperial principle that when their flag goes up it must not be hauled down. No one can predict the outcome. The most probable guess would be a world war. Meanwhile, reports of the most atrocious acts of barbaric cruelty perpetrated upon Chinese peasants by the civilizing forces that have invaded the empire, begin to leak through the censor's sieve.

In reporting, at page 314, the action of the International Typographical union upon the resolution offered by Robert Bandlow, of Cleveland, and described in the report as a socialist resolution, we copied so much of the resolution as we used from the news report in the Chicago Record. We are now authoritatively advised that the one actually presented and acted upon was entirely different from that which we fell into the error of using. It was in these words:

Resolved, That the International Typographical union emphasizes that it is distinctly a class organization, embracing in its membership all workers following the kindred crafts in the printing industry, who upon the industrial field are antagonized by their employes on every occasion, which fact should impress the members of this organization that to subserve their interests as wage-workers it is essential that they act as a unit upon the political field from whence capitalism derives its power to oppress, and we declare it consistent with the ethics of unionism and the sacred duty of every honorable member of this union to sever his or her affiliation with all political parties of the exploiting class which are constantly encroaching upon the liberties of the working people.

The Record reporter, instead of forwarding to his paper a true copy of the resolution offered at the convention in Milwaukee, had forwarded one which had been offered by Mr. Bandlow last year at the convention in Detroit. The essential difference is that the resolution of last year called upon

the members of the union to ally themselves with the socialist labor party, whereas the one this year called upon them to sever their connection with parties of the "exploiting class." Both resolutions were designed to strengthen socialism in American politics.

Clarence S. Darrow, the well-known Chicago lawyer, increased his fame more than he could have guessed, when, at the celebration in Chicago of Henry George's sixty-first birthday, he expressed his preference for prize fighters to college professors and college graduates for "genuine sympathy and warm heartedness." "Dead right, and that's no dream of a burlesque star," was the verdict of the prize fighters whom one of the local papers interviewed. But the professors whom it also interviewed were evidently annoyed at the comparison. It may be conceded that Mr. Darrow's view of the matter was expressed in extreme terms. But that is frequently excused and sometimes required by the necessity for emphasis in a world in which vital truths stated in commonplace form pass without notice. The thought which Mr. Darrow doubtless had was that the college education has a tendency to harden the heart as it hardens the mind. This is true. It is especially true in those departments of college study that have to do with economic problems. The professor or student who, for instance, allows his mind to become saturated with the merciless principles of Malthusianism, certainly is in a fair way to lose all "genuine sympathy and warm-heartedness." Though his affections may be strong for parent and child, wife and friend, they will be like the love of the beast for its mate and brood. Love for the race cannot long abide in the heart after belief in the social necessity of war, pestilence and famine as checks upon population takes possession of the mind.

A writer in a recent number of the Westminster Review has very opportunely been discussing the logical position of those superior jingoes who

seek to justify national greed and rapacity by claiming for it the scientific sanction of evolution. "Evolution" is a much abused word, and the climax of its absurdity is reached when its authority is invoked in the case of such international calamities as the overthrow of the two South African republics by Great Britain. The writer in the Westminster has no difficulty in showing that acts of war on the part of civilized nations derive no support from the teachings of evolutionist philosophers, and he quotes largely from the writings of Herbert Spencer in support of his position. Although Mr. Spencer has not been on all questions a perfect model of consistency, it is satisfactory to find that his teachings as contained in his works dealing with social evolution, touching the question of wars in general, and his latest specific utterances on the question of the Boer war in particular, are in complete accord. Yet there are many fireside philosophers and pothouse jingoes in Great Britain and America, of the retail order, who pervert the elastic phraseology of Spencer and Darwin so as to cover all sorts of moral failings, individual and national. For example: A big nation makes war upon two little nations, all professing the same religion and on nearly the same plane of civilization. The big one, with an army and resources ten times as great as the small ones, ultimately destroys them after a gallant struggle and a great deal of slaughter. The verdict of these self-approving philosophers is something like this: "All very well, you know, this national independence idea, but it must go; it can't be helped; nature's law must take its course—survival of the fittest." Or again: A thief robs a safe. A policeman attempts to arrest him. The thief shoots the policeman and escapes. Verdict: Survival of the fittest. The astonished philosopher may well exclaim: "To what vile uses may we not return" on seeing how his doctrine has come to be applied.

Now, evolution is either a physical

law, like gravitation, or it is nothing. If it is a physical law it cannot be, at the same time, a criterion of ethics. Evolution teaches that there is a constant struggle for life going on throughout all nature, mankind included. It does not say by what means the struggle shall be carried on; all it stipulates is that there shall be a struggle. Evolution, when it comes to deal with man, finds barriers which limit its severity and determine its course. These barriers are supplied by the moral law. Every "thou shalt not" of the decalogue is an interference with the severity of the evolutionary struggle; it is not a stoppage of the stream, but merely an alteration of its direction. Evolution under moral law takes the shape of competition in right-doing. Under the physical law it takes the shape of brute force. The extent to which a nation obeys the moral law in preference to the physical law is the measure of its civilization. What then is a war between two civilized nations? It is an appeal from the moral law to brute force; it is a temporary retracement of the steps by which it ascended the ladder of civilization. In the one case as in the other it is the fittest that survives, but the meaning of the word "fittest" undergoes an alteration. Under the moral law it means the most righteous, but under the physical law it means the strongest. The meaning of the word alters with the conditions under which the struggle is carried on. To attach a fixed meaning to the word so as to make it conformable to one's policy is to bring bad logic to the rescue of bad morality.

The weekly country newspaper has not as a rule much improved in its editorial department upon the country newspaper of half a century ago. In wealth of personal gossip, known as local news, there has been a notable advance. Few things happen now within the field of a country weekly's circulation, from the mirroring of a farmer's heifer in a slough to the marriage of his daughter and

the birth of his grandchild, without being reported by the indefatigable village correspondent. But most country editors are hopelessly weak when it comes to editorials. This is not because they cannot write. It is because they dare not think. We recall an exception in a country paper recently published at Waukegan by James H. Malcolm. Mr. Malcolm's disposition to think was equal to his ability to write, and he made a paper worth reading. As the paper did not last, however, country editors might reason that thinking does not pay in country journalism. Possibly they are right. But it is also true that thinking, if it happen to be unpopular, does not pay anywhere. What must be borne in mind is that vigorous thinking, even if unpopular, does pay in the long run. It is to be hoped that this idea will be cherished by the editor of the Sumner Herald, of Pierce county, Washington. For with the single exception of Mr. Malcolm's paper, it has never been our fortune to come across a country paper so strong in its editorial department. There is everywhere a field for local papers of the high order of the Sumner Herald. Though their merits may not be at once recognized, country weeklies that treat their subscribers as thoughtful men and women, instead of mere gossips, are certain in time to make themselves genuine organs of local opinion.

An Oregon reader asks "what relation the national bank circulation bears to the government in its bond security; and whether the bonds are secured by a pledge of money held, or are dependent upon the government's credit." He further asks "in what way this security of the bonds is superior to that which could be placed behind greenbacks of full legal tender," and "why such greenbacks cannot be made to take the place of bank notes and save the people bond interest?" The first of these questions may be answered by reference to the

gold standard law enacted by congress last winter. The government guarantees the payment of national bank notes. Its security for this guarantee consists of government bonds deposited by the banks to the value upon their face of the amount of the guarantee. That is, a bank depositing in the government treasury government bonds of the face value of, say, \$100,000 is entitled to issue \$100,000 in circulating notes guaranteed by the government. These bonds are not secured by any pledge or deposit of money. Their value depends entirely upon government credit. So far, therefore, as the guarantee by government is concerned, national bank notes are not one whit more secure than the same amount in greenbacks would be. But as the banks are themselves primarily responsible for their notes, bank note circulation is more secure than greenbacks, other things being equal, to the extent of the financial responsibility of the banks. Inasmuch, however, as the financial responsibility of national banks for their notes would be more nominal than real under circumstances which destroyed the credit of the government, national bank notes are practically no more secure than a greenback circulation would be if of equal amount. In our judgment, therefore, the redemption with non-interest bearing greenbacks of interest bearing bonds to the amount deposited by banks as security for their circulation, and the replacement of national bank notes with these greenbacks, would provide as safe a currency as the bank notes do, while saving to the people the difference in interest and cutting off the power the banks now have of arbitrarily diminishing or increasing the money volume. Of course the government would lose the trifling tax on circulation, but that would doubtless be offset by lost greenbacks. The objection urged against this policy is that the greenback system is inflexible—the volume being fixed regardless of demands for currency. That objection is sound only against abuses of the

system, and not against the system itself. If greenbacks were made easily interchangeable for bonds and bonds for greenbacks, the volume of paper currency would adjust itself automatically to demand.

There is pending before congress a bill for the regulation of patents, the principle of which ought to have the support of every anti-monopoly congressman in either house. It is known as bill 2941 of the lower house, and is pending before the committee on patents. It is to come up in the house for consideration next winter. The object of this bill is to alter the patent laws so that any person may manufacture patented articles upon paying a limited royalty for the privilege. Whether the specific provisions of the bill are the best possible for the accomplishment of its purpose we do not pretend to judge. But of the principle there can be no doubt. Under the patent law as it exists, the owner of a patent can wholly prevent its use by the public. In many instances this is actually done. To do so would at first blush appear to be contrary to the self-interest of the owner; but what if the owner, wishing to prevent competition, buys up patents on competing machines and then refuses either to use the improved machines or to allow anyone else to use them? Here is a suggestion of one of the many motives for the well-known practice of suppressing inventions by abuse of the patent privilege. The purpose of the patent law is to promote invention and the use of inventions. It offers inventors protection on condition that they give the public the benefit of their discoveries. If it in fact operates to obstruct that purpose, if it enables inventors to violate their part of the contract by keeping their discoveries from the public, then it needs readjustment. To that end the bill in question seems to be well adapted at least in principle and as an initial step. While it protects the inventor, so as to secure him compensation for the labor and expense involved in inventing, it withholds

from him power to make an oppressive monopoly of his improvement. He is guaranteed a fair royalty, but subject only to that compensation he must allow the public the full and unrestrained use of his discovery. This modification of the patent laws might fall short of making them ideal, but it would be in harmony with the principle of patent laws and would go far toward putting an end to the monopolies that rest upon patents.

A tax bill which went by the board for the present year upon the adjournment of the legislature of New York, but which will certainly claim the attention of the next legislature of that state, commends itself to the friendly consideration of students of taxation everywhere. We refer to the bill introduced in the New York senate last winter by Senator Nathaniel A. Elsberg. This bill would secure in methods of taxation a fundamental reform of great importance by means of a few simple amendments of existing laws. In the first place it has a local option feature. It would authorize county legislatures to prescribe by uniform rule the class or classes of property which alone should be subject to taxation. But in the next place, and this is what makes the bill unique, it contains a provision for apportioning state taxes among the counties upon the basis of their own taxes respectively laid for local uses. For that purpose the bill would empower an appropriate board to—

apportion the taxes on the assessed value of the property, for the general purposes of the state in the ratio of the gross amount of taxes for all purposes (except state and school purposes) laid in each county in proportion to all the counties, on assessed values of property, during the tax year immediately preceding the imposing of such taxes.

This measure if adopted would completely do away with the inequalities that are now caused by equalization boards. The state board's duties would be only clerical. It would have to ascertain merely the gross

amount of taxes laid in the several counties by themselves the preceding year for local purposes; and having done that to work out a simple sum in proportion. Fraud and favoritism by the state would be out of the question, for the basis of taxation would be completely within local control. By increasing its local expenses, a county would automatically increase, while by reducing its local expenses it would automatically reduce, its state taxation. This would be a most desirable extension of the principle of local self-government. And when coupled with the provision empowering each county to select its own subjects of taxation, it would make the principle of almost perfect application. Such a law as this Elsberg bill would very quickly solve irritating problems of taxation in the only way in which they can be solved, namely, by referring them to the people who are to be taxed. It is a gratifying and encouraging fact that the Elsberg bill has the hearty support of the real estate associations of New York.

THE NEW NOBILITY.

The constitution of the United States provides, in article 1, section 9, that—

no title of nobility shall be granted by the United States.

Why not?

The "Federalist" does not tell us, and there is little said of it in the constitutional debates. Some of the members, indeed, spoke of creating a peerage, but said that such a thing could not be thought of, because of the deep-seated prejudice prevailing against a hereditary nobility. According to Yates's Minutes, Charles Pinckney said:

There is more equality of rank and fortune in America than in any other country under the sun; and this is likely to continue as long as the unappropriated western lands remain unsettled.

This statesman must have believed as Thomas Carlyle did, when in "Past and Present," book III., chapter 8, that great Englishman wrote:

It is well said, "Land is the right basis of an Aristocracy;" whoever possesses the Land, he, more emphatically than

any other, is Governor, Vice-King of the people.

Conversely stated, Mr. Pinckney's proposition is that with the valuable free lands of the west all taken, there would be danger of a constantly increasing tenant class, keeping pace with the growth of land monopoly and resulting finally in a landed aristocracy on the one hand and complete serfdom on the other; for population must increase, while the area of land cannot. But in view of the vast area of unoccupied land in the west at that time, its complete settlement seemed so remote a contingency that it was scarcely dreamed of by the members of the convention, and had no weight in their deliberations.

They thought it advisable, nevertheless, to put in a clause against the granting of titles of nobility. That clause was a part of the Virginia resolutions. By inserting it, the framers of our constitution showed their aversion to privilege, and their determination that whether privilege existed or not the government should confer upon its possessors no honorary distinction. But by the use of that phrase they no more rendered their country exempt from the evils of a hereditary aristocracy than they would have made innocuous the serpent's venom by enacting that all snakes shall be called humming-birds. A title is but a name—the rank is but the guinea's stamp.

Privilege does not depend for its existence upon honorary distinctions. Mere titles do not create privilege, although privilege does ultimately create titles. Titles of nobility are but the emblems of the power behind them. They are dangerous only because of the "nobility" which they imply. It is not the duke who is dangerous, but the dukedom—the social condition of which the duke is but a symptom. The real value of such a title is in the power which it represents.

Such power is always based upon privilege—upon rights accruing solely to the holder of the title, to the exclusion of others not so favored; in short, it is based upon monopoly. From time immemorial the granting of noble titles has, with few exceptions, been either in recognition of power already in possession, or else

has been accompanied by a grant of power—usually a grant of lands—commensurate with the supposed dignity of the title.

So long as individuals and private corporations have the power to monopolize natural resources or public utilities they will be the masters of all who do not share in the monopoly. The coal barons, the railway kings, the steel magnates and the whole piratical fraternity of multi-millionaires all subsist, like the regal plunderers of Europe, upon the fruits of privilege. They are an untitled nobility. The sunshine scintillates upon their gilded palaces in every great city of our land; but in the same cities there are dens of squalid misery and want, where sunbeams never penetrate, and where no kindly ray dispels the darkness of despair that lurks within.

According to Charles B. Spahr, Ph. D., author of a treatise on Distribution of Wealth, one per cent. of our families own more wealth than do the whole of the remaining 99 per cent! Now, who are the favored one per cent? Men like John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie; men who own more than any individual could produce in a dozen centuries.

And are they not princes, lords, kings? They have no titles, to be sure. But what could a paltry title add to the man who controls, for instance, the oil-producing lands of the United States? They have no coronets, but they possess that without which the coronet is but a barbaric bauble. The man who bows to the throne really makes his obeisance to the power behind the throne. The king's word, the king's name, is but "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal;" the king's power is everything. Crowns, scepters, robes of ermine and cloth of gold—all these are nothing; nothing but hated symbols. If the kingly power remain, what boots it though we lack the kingly name? A king by any other name is just as bad. The powerful Earl Warwick, known to history as "the king-maker," was no more a king-maker than one Marcus A. Hanna, of Ohio; and if Hanna really wore the crown which he sometimes wears in the newspaper caricatures he would be no more dangerous than he is to-day. And what

makes him dangerous? The privileges which he and his kind possess.

The real groundwork of an aristocracy is not in the unequal distribution of wealth. It lies farther back than that. We must seek it in the causes which lead to unequal distribution. It is in the inequality of opportunity to produce wealth. Equality of opportunity begets equality of condition. Whether you restrict the opportunities of one class, or grant special privileges to another, it matters not; the result is the same, and that result is seen in the class distinctions which inevitably follow in the wake of privilege.

As there may be serfs without shackles, so may there be nobles without titles. We have both in America to-day. The thing which our fathers greatly feared has come upon us. We are face to face with as great a crisis as ever threatened any republic since Rome first trembled at the glance of Caesar. The final struggle may not come this year, nor next, but it will come; and when it does, the American people will exclaim, in the words of the immortal Frenchman, "Tyrant, step from thy throne and give place to thy master!"

The ballot is the bloodless guillotine of the new revolution. It is a weapon mightier than the bayonet if used in time. Let us use it while it is still at our disposal. Put a true man in the white house, and the work of reform will be more easily accomplished. Inasmuch as the barons of the United States to-day, unlike those at Runnymede 800 years ago, are seeking special privileges for themselves instead of magna chartas for the people, it should be our first duty to remove from the presidency of this nation one whose instability of character and inordinate love of power—equaled only by his incapacity to exert it—mark him with peculiar distinctness in these respects as the American ectype of King John.

SPEED MOSBY.

Jefferson City, Mo.

NEWS

Since our last report upon the Chinese situation, the full text of the

Russian note to the powers, mentioned last week, has been officially published, as has the reply of the United States, which was understood last week to be favorable to the Russian proposition. The notes are too long for verbal reproduction here. In substance that of Russia was stated orally by the Russian charge d'affaires at Washington to the acting secretary of state on the 28th. It declared that Russia has no intention of acquiring territory in China; that she has cooperated with the allied powers to secure the safety of the legations and to aid the Chinese government in repressing insurrection; that the objects of the cooperation have been accomplished; that in the interval, incidentally to defensive measures on her own frontier, she has occupied Niewchwang, in Manchuria, for military purposes, but as soon as order is restored there she will withdraw if the other powers do not put obstacles in her way; that as the Chinese government has left Peking she has withdrawn her minister from China, and intends to withdraw her troops; that when the government of China shall have been restored to power and expressed a desire to negotiate, she will name her representatives; and that she hopes the United States shares her view of the matter. The reply of the United States was communicated on the 29th by written memorandum. It expresses satisfaction with the assurance that Russia has no designs upon Chinese territory, and averring that the purpose of the United States was to secure the safety of their legation and to help the Chinese government to repress insurrection, declares that the Russian declarations in this regard are in accord with those made to the United States by the other powers. The memorandum then proceeds at considerable length to review the situation. Observing that all the powers have now disclaimed any purpose of acquiring Chinese territory, it suggests that an amicable settlement ought not to be difficult. The safety of the ministers having been secured, it continues, the original purposes of the powers not yet accomplished are to protect foreign life and property in China, to guard all legitimate foreign interests, to aid in preventing the spread of disorders, and—to seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China, preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity, protect all rights guaranteed by treaty and international law to friendly powers, and safeguard for the world the prin-

ciple of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese empire.

For the attainment of these purposes the memorandum recommends the— joint occupation of Peking under a definite understanding between the powers until the Chinese government shall have been reestablished and shall be in a position to enter into new treaties with adequate provisions for reparation and guarantees of future protection. With the establishment and recognition of such authority, the United States would wish to withdraw its military forces from Peking and remit to the processes of peaceful negotiation our just demands.

This American memorandum concludes with an assurance that the United States will interpose no obstacle to the withdrawal of Russia from Niewchwang, and an indication that—

unless there is such a general expression by the powers in favor of continued occupation as to modify the views expressed by the government of Russia and lead to a general agreement for continued occupation, we shall give instructions to the commander of the American forces in China to withdraw our troops from Peking after due conference with the other commanders as to the time and manner of withdrawal.

Here the matter hangs. Russia wants to quit at once. The United States, also, would like to get out immediately, and promises to do so unless all the other powers unite with her for the pacification of China. But other powers distrust Russia's motives, and question America's good sense in falling in so readily and so fully with Russia's proposition. No change has occurred in the situation since the giving out by the United States of the memorandum abstracted above; but it is understood that Germany, England, Italy and France are averse to withdrawing their ministers and military forces.

In South Africa the British have finally annexed the South African republic to the British empire. This was done on the 1st by Lord Roberts. He issued proclamations, under the queen's warrant of July 4, announcing that thenceforth the Transvaal would form part of the queen's dominions. The "South African republic" is thereby blotted off the maps, and the "Transvaal" province takes its place. When this was announced in the Cape Colony assembly, in session at Cape Town, the ministerialists welcomed the announcement

with prolonged cheering, but the opposition received it in silence.

There appears to have been no better military reason for annexing the Transvaal on the 1st than before. For Lord Roberts has not been able to report any material advance of his army since our account of last week. He had then got as far east as Machadorp, on the railroad between Pretoria and Lourenzo Marques. That was on the 28th. On the 29th he had extended his line to the north of the railroad track as far as Helvetia; but at the date of this writing he has made no further advance eastward worth mentioning. Such slight advances as he has made were made without opposition, from which it is inferrable that the Boers have turned aside from his line of advance. This inference is confirmed by the fact that a British reconnoitering expedition into the mountains north of the railroad track, where they overlook Lydenburg, has discovered a large Boer force holding the pass.

The renewed activity of the Boers in the Orange Free State, reported last week, has since gone to the extent of investing the British garrison at Ladybrand, which lies near the border of Basutoland. A British expedition, however, started on the 3d to the garrison's relief, and upon its appearance the siege was raised. The Boer force was estimated at 2,000. It demanded the surrender of Ladybrand on the 2d, and from that time until the approach of the relieving force it subjected the garrison to a continuous cannon and rifle fire.

The American war in the Philippines goes on, with occasional reports of engagements in which two or three Americans and two or three score or as many hundred Filipinos are killed, while the American casualty list grows weekly. In southern Luzon, where there are 18,000 American troops, there is daily fighting and life is not safe outside the garrisoned towns. The latest specific report of an engagement comes from Bohol, an island in the southern part of the archipelago, where the Americans lost in killed one and in wounded six. The Filipino loss was 120. Fresh American troops arrived in Manila from the United States on the 4th and more have sailed from San Francisco.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official

reports given out in detail at Washington to September 5, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900. 52	
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900.....	375
<hr/>	
Total deaths since July 1, 1898....	2,274
Wounded	2,255
Captured	10
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July 1, 1898.	4,539
Total casualties reported last week	4,491
Total deaths reported last week..	2,261

The political event of the week, though in itself of small importance, is the state election in Vermont, which in presidential years is looked forward to with some interest as a straw indicating the popular drift in national politics. The election took place on the 4th and resulted in the success, of course, of the republican ticket. The only significance, if there is any at all, is in the plurality. For purposes of comparison we append the vote at state elections for four gubernatorial years:

Year.	Rep.	Dem.	Republican Plurality.
1900.....			32,000
1898.....	38,565	14,686	23,879
1896.....	53,246	14,855	38,391
1894.....	42,663	14,142	28,521

With the beginning of the month the presidential campaign on the democratic side opened in earnest. Mr. Bryan set out from Chicago upon his first speaking tour, which is to include the states of Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia and Missouri.

On the 4th the republican convention of New York state met at Saratoga and nominated Benjamin B. Odell, Jr., for governor and Lieut. Gov. Woodruff for lieutenant governor.

Two other presidential tickets are added to our list of last week. The National Union Reform party, which puts forward for the present the single issue of direct legislation, has by a referendum vote nominated Seth H. Ellis, of Ohio, for president and Samuel L. Nicholson, of Pennsylvania, for vice president; and the third party anti-imperialists, whose movements have been heretofore reported (pages 299, 314), met at New York on the 5th and nominated Donaldson Caffery, of Louisiana, for president, and

Archibald Murray Howe, of Massachusetts, for vice president. The complete list is now 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.

Union Reform—For president, Seth H. Ellis; for vice president, Samuel L. Nicholson.

National (third party anti-imperialist)—For president, Donaldson Caffery; vice president, Archibald Murray Howe.

The strong political flavor given to the celebration of labor day by the labor unions of Chicago in consequence of the appearance there, as the principal speakers, of Theodore Roosevelt, the republican candidate for vice president, and William J. Bryan, the democratic candidate for president, makes that the most important celebration of the day. During the great labor parade of the morning, when Bryan and Roosevelt stood almost shoulder to shoulder on the reviewing stand, the cheers and preference of the marchers were overwhelmingly for Mr. Bryan. Even more marked was the contrast in the receptions accorded the two men at the labor picnic in the afternoon, where they were the principal speakers. Mr. Roosevelt, the first speaker on the programme, was greeted with but scanty applause and at no time did he arouse any semblance of enthusiasm. His speech, frequently interrupted with cheers for Bryan, was received on the whole with stolid indifference. In direct contrast to all this was the enthusiasm for Mr. Bryan. Beginning with his appearance on the stage and at intervals punctuating his speech, it cul-

minated in a perfect storm of cheers at the close. Caught up as he left the stand by a surging crowd, which brushed aside the hurriedly formed police guard, he was finally lifted into his carriage and escorted out of the grounds after what, considering that the meeting was nonpartisan, was probably the greatest popular tribute of his career.

NEWS NOTES.

—The sultan of Turkey celebrated on the 31st the twenty-fifth anniversary of his sultanate.

—Arthur Sewall, of Maine, the democratic candidate for vice president in 1896, died at his summer home in Bath on the 5th.

—Gen. Otis is to succeed Gen. Wheeler in command of the department of the lakes, with headquarters at Chicago. The change goes into effect on the 10th.

—The National Paper Hangers' Protective and Beneficial association, in session last week at Chicago, elected James P. Archibald, of New York, as president.

—The G. A. R. at its national encampment at Chicago last week elected Leo. Rassieur, of St. Louis, commander in chief. The annual meeting next year is to be in Denver.

—Great suffering is reported from the gold fields at Cape Nome; and it is predicted that unless the government speedily sends out transports to bring them home, thousands will die of starvation.

—Caleb Powers, secretary of state of Kentucky during Taylor's regime as governor, and who was convicted of being accessory to the assassination of Goebel (page 314), was sentenced on the 5th to imprisonment for life.

—At the convention of the Afro-American council at Indianapolis on the 30th, Bishop Walters, of New Jersey, was elected president; Cyrus Field Adams, of Illinois, secretary, and Ida Wells Barnett, of Illinois, national organizer.

—Lorenzo D. Lewelling, the eleventh governor of Kansas, died of heart failure at Arkansas City, Kan., on the 3d. He was governor from 1893 to 1895, having been the populist-democratic candidate. In 1897 he was defeated for reelection. Mr. Lewelling died at the age of 54.

—The thirty-third annual congress of British trade unionists opened on the 3d at Huddersfield. The delegates in attendance represented 140 organizations, with a membership of 1,250,000. Two honorary representatives from the United States were present—John M. Hunter, of Illinois, from the United Mine Workers, and S. J. Kent, of Ne-

braska, from the Carpenters and Joiners' union.

—The Henry George association of Chicago was organized on the 1st, with F. H. Monroe, 356 Dearborn street, as president. A loose form of organization was adopted. Neither fees nor dues are required, but any applicant approved by the executive committee becomes a member, and members may financially support the work of the organization in their own discretion. The president is elected annually, and all responsibility is placed upon him, he having the right to appoint the other officers. President Monroe has appointed Hiram B. Loomis as secretary-treasurer, and F. D. Butler, Louis F. Post and John Z. White as the executive committee.

—Preliminary steps were taken on the 3d at Indianapolis for the consolidation of two of the largest religious denominations of Afro-Americans—the "African Methodist Episcopal Zion," with a membership of 519,681, and the "Colored Methodist Episcopal," with a membership of 199,206. The only other African Methodist churches are the "African Methodist Episcopal," with 750,354 communicants; the "African Union Methodist Episcopal," with 7,000, and the "Congregational Methodists," with 319. At the consolidation conference mentioned, Bishop Walters was the principal representative of the Zion church and Bishop Holsey, of the Colored Methodists. The name of the new organization is to be the "A. M. E. Colored Zion church."

MISCELLANY

THE RIDERS.

For The Public.

The sound of a shot—then a hullabaloo!
Steady!—you! Steady!—you!

My hand is as steady as plummet at rest,
And as slow as a sob is the heart in my breast!

Then ho for the riders! and hell for the ridden!

And die, you brown rebels! or cringe as you're bidden!

For war is the game of the man in the saddle!—

Let pipers of peace call it frenzy astraddle;
But horsemen will gallop, and galloping perish,

To gather the trophies that conquerors cherish!

The riders! The riders! Beware of the riders!—

The strength of the proud, and the pride of the strong!

The riders! The riders! Beware of the riders!

The bugle is singing their marshaling song!

The sound of a shriek in the hullabaloo!
Steady!—you! Steady!—you!

My blood is as chill as the drippings of ice!
And my steel has sunk deep in an enemy thrice!

Come, little one, die! Don't you know I'm your neighbor,

As reeling you clutch at the stroke of my saber!

My saber is crimson, and crimson my vision;

The stripes in the flag wave a crimson derision!

The cannon are growling like bellowing cattle!

I'm mad with the moan and the lust of the battle!

The riders! The riders! Beware of the riders!

The scourge of the earth, and the squadron of death!

The riders! The riders! Beware of the riders!

Inferno is open—they reek of its breath!

A prayer at the end of the hullabaloo!

Listen!—you! Listen!—you!

I lie in the dust at the little one's side!

And no more with the galloping troops shall I ride!

For wounded he whispers, and wounded I hearken,

And softly he prays, while the night-shadows darken.

A dim cavalcade through the twilight is fitting—

On phantom-like steeds, phantom horsemen are sitting;

But sweeter the prayer of the little one's speaking

Than glories of war the phantoms are seeking!

The riders! The riders! Beware of the riders!

Like furies they come, and like phantoms they go!

The riders! The riders! Beware of the riders!

They trample a path for the treading of woe!

Then halt! for the riders, and help! for the ridden,

And peace! for the land of the freedom-forbidden!

This war is the game of a man in the saddle—

Well called of the pipers, a frenzy astraddle!

No horseman must gallop, no rider must perish,

To gather the trophies that conquerors cherish!

E. J. SALISBURY.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ON NON-COMBATANTS.

The following comment on the Quakers, Mennonites and Dunkards of Pennsylvania, Ohio and other of the northeastern states of the United States, is taken from the Hon. Theodore Roosevelt's biography of Thomas H. Benton. In speaking of the early and turbulent history of Missouri, in which Benton was a central figure, he says:

But after all the ruffianism was really not a whit worse in its effect on the national character than was the case with the nonresisting elements in the northeasterly states; in fact, it was more healthy.

A class of professional noncombatants is as hurtful to the real healthy growth of a nation as is a class of fire-eaters, for a weakness or folly is nationally as bad a vice as a duelist. No man who is unwilling to bear arms

and fight for his rights can give a good reason why he should be entitled to the privileges of living in a free country.

A LESSON AS TO COLONIES.

Perhaps there is a lesson for a good many Americans in the fact that Spain seems to have been much benefited by the loss of her colonies. For a number of years the nation was drained of her young men in order to keep up the warfare on Cubans and Filipinos, the money cost of which was about \$100,000,000 annually. Now, according to a Spanish financial journal, Spain is progressing more rapidly than it has at any time within the last century. The government loan of \$200,000,000 was oversubscribed three times. Industries which have been dormant for years are being revived and electric traction is making its way into Spanish cities. Spain is still receiving a large share of the products of what were once her colonies and is buying heavily of machinery from the United States.—Chicago Chronicle.

A SURE THING.

The Consumer—Ow! Ow! Ouch!
 The Trust—Ha, ha, ha!
 "Let up. Ouch! Stop it. Oh! Ow! Please stop."
 "Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha!"
 "Oh! Ow! Ouch! Confound you, you're squeezing the life out of me. Ow! Stop, darn it, stop."
 "Ha, ha, ha! By Griggs, you are amusing. Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha!"
 "Funny, is it? Oh! Ow! Ouch! It won't be so funny when I get my hands on you."
 "Get your hands on me? That's a good one! Ha, ha, ha! By Hanna, that is a good one. You get your hands on me. Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha!"
 "Well, why not? Ow! Oh, ouch! Oh, ow! Wow! And I will, too, this fall."
 "Oh, no, you won't. Ha, ha, ha! Your excess of unreasoning enthusiasm won't let you. Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha!"
 "Ouch! Oh, ouch! Ow-w-w! You see if I don't blast you for this."
 "Phew! Why, if you intend anything like that, I'll just holler patriotism and glorious destiny and duty to humanity and never-pull-down-the-flag in your ear, and you'll take off your coat to help elect my party of patriotism, prosperity and pelf. You get your hands on me? By Mac, that is a good one. Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha!"—Alex Ricketts, in *Life*, of New York.

WHAT OUR FATHERS FOUGHT FOR.

Opening of address made by the Hon. M. L. Lockwood, of Zellenople, Pa., in accepting the democratic nomination for congress in his district, as published in the Butler (Pa.) Times of August 27.

Our revolutionary fathers bought and paid for in sacrifice and in blood the right of self-government; the right for themselves and their children to have an equal show in the contest for bread and the good things of this life; the right to be relieved from the wrong and oppression of an aristocracy of special privileges.

They declared in that declaration that made them free, that great self-evident truth, that "all men are created equal;" not equal in height, or breadth, or strength; not equal in brain, in intellect or ability, but equal before the law, entitled to equal rights and equal opportunities in the combat of life.

They declared that man was "endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights;" that among these were "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" that to secure these rights, governments were instituted among men, "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"

It was the thoughts contained in these declarations that gave courage to the revolutionary army and gave them something high and holy and righteous to fight for. These thoughts strengthened the arm of Washington and Jefferson and Adams. The inspiring thoughts of the rights of humanity as against the oppression of the plutocracy gave heart and hope through the long dark night of the revolution; gave heart and hope to Washington and his patriotic army at Camden and the Delaware and Valley Forge. It was these thoughts that fired the hearts of patriots everywhere. Aye, it was the declaration of these principles that kindled the slumbering fires of patriotism throughout the world, and brought men to our shores to fight for liberty and the equal rights of man; to fight for the right of self-government; to fight for the doctrine that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Aye, it was the desire to engraft these principles in government that brought to our shores Lafayette and Kosciusko and thousands of patriots from every clime under the sun, ready to die that these principles might live; ready to die that the shackles of plutocracy might

be stricken from the limbs of humanity; ready to die that man might be free and equal.

These declarations of our revolutionary fathers broke the black darkness of tyranny and oppression everywhere and let the sunlight of a new era in. It came to all humanity like an electric shock, and carried hope and cheer to the oppressed of every land.

THE CURSE OF PUERTO RICO.

Editorial in the San Juan (Puerto Rico) News of August 9.

We are told that we will become sadly unpopular if we succeed in unearthing the real industrial ills of this island, and conclude that a few have a corner in our natural resources. But we believe in publicity, publicity and publicity. When a man is enabled to demand \$50 a month rent for a flat in San Juan, which would be refused at ten in the heart of New York city, we must admit we are confronted with an industrial disease no less than alarming. There is something inherently wrong.

The lessons of history proclaim that there is danger ahead. That the many won't always consent to want while others waste, lest our laws, our liberties and our civilization shall decay.

Our ailment antedates the change of the money, the mortgage law, the prohibitive tariff and—the landing of Gen. Miles. Juggling with the tariff or currency is like the beating of the Chinese tom toms to save an imperial soldier from the bullets of the allies.

Landlordism is the curse of this country. The enormous wealth of the few and the pitiable poverty of the many are chiefly due to a monopoly of the soil, maintained by its exemption from taxation, especially in our cities and particularly in the capital.

Henry George, the ablest economist of recent years and his thousands of intelligent followers to-day, stand for a single tax on land alone, as the remedy for all economic problems. In the more prosperous nations of the Anglo-Saxon race, land has always been taxed, while in less fortunate sections, among them Puerto Rico, the revenue has been raised by imposing a tax upon production.

Not only should a tax be imposed upon all land on the island, but it should be more burdensome in the cities, and our tax commissioners should seriously consider this suggestion.

There are no more building sites in the city, although hundreds of persons stand ready to pay handsome rentals

for the first new apartment to be provided, and the highest bidder will get the prize.

Something must be done to relieve the situation at once. The land between the city and Puerta de Tierra, owned by the municipality and the insular government, must be released for private occupation. It matters not whether the ground is reserved for military purposes or for the storage of relief supplies. Dump the relief supplies in the deep ocean and send the cannons to the Philippines or China, for both will have outlived their usefulness here.

We hope that this presentation of our deplorable condition will be a basis of discussion by those in position to act. We offer what we insist is a radical and sufficient remedy for our industrial ills, and we sincerely hope that the remedy offered will be equal to the emergency. Our plan is not idle gossip; this editorial is not a space filler, and we will press our reform to a successful conclusion. Details of our scheme can and will be supplied, but first the correct diagnosis must be established.

AN AMUSING AND INTERESTING PARALLEL.

Various parallels between the conduct and language of the contending parties in the American revolution and those of the people of the United States and the Filipinos in the present conflict have been found by the curious in such matters. I have just found one unexpectedly, which, to one who views the whole subject as I do, is amusing. We are constantly meeting from the advocates of the administration, in the press and elsewhere, the absurd proposition that the expressed sympathy with the Filipinos on the part of the anti-imperialists, and the opposition of these latter to the administration measures, are responsible for the stubborn resistance of the liberty-loving patriots in the Philippines and for the want of success of our arms in subduing them. I recently saw this sort of stuff quoted from the letter of a soldier in the Philippines, double-leaded, in a Chicago paper which is supposed to be the particular organ of the president. But I have had a curious proof that even in a thing so monstrously ridiculous as this "there is nothing new under the sun."

I have been reading some letters from an army surgeon with the British army in America at the time of the revolution to his family at home. His name was Mervin North. Listen to him as he alludes to a speech

of his namesake, Lord North, on the 17th of February, 1778, in which Lord North counseled the abandonment of certain pretenses previously made by parliament:

Philadelphia, 22 May, 1778.—* * * What in the name of wonder can Lord North mean by his late dastardly speech given in the house of commons? The cowardly despondent conduct of his lordship has done more mischief than our armies can retrieve in a campaign. The rebel rascals, before the arrival of this speech, had almost persuaded themselves that any further opposition would be in vain, and, of course, their aversion to any service under Mr. Washington rendered it impossible to recruit the army, but convinced from Lord North's speech that one effort more would secure their independence they have once more entered the lists and Mr. Washington again finds himself at the head of a very considerable army in our neighborhood.

The good surgeon also seems to have been as much misled by his patriotic zeal about the character of the Americans as some of the soldier correspondents whose letters appear in republican papers seem to be about the Filipinos. Hear him again:

New York, 19 July, 1778.—* * * Had our government been really bent on conquest, one-half of the forces which have been sent to America would certainly have effected it, but we fought with the olive branch in one hand and the sword in the other, which, by the by, was never the method of reclaiming a race which is proof against every liberal sentiment, and are the most artful, intriguing and infamous part of humanity instead of those artless, simple, innocent creatures which the Americans are represented to be by the patriots at home and the espousers of this rebellion. We find them all worthy of the character of Catiline, and, I am sorry to say, we have hitherto been, and still seem to be, the dupes of their cunning and deceit.

Despite the fact, however, that the Americans had no hope for success except that which they derived from the speeches of their sympathizers in Great Britain, and were in the eyes of the soldiers sent out to conquer them a despicable people, they managed to secure the independence for which they fought so devotedly and suffered so much. I am heartily of the hope that the Filipinos may do the same.—Edward Osgood Brown, in Chicago Chronicle.

ECONOMY AND PATIENCE.

The late C. P. Huntington is quoted as having attributed the accumulation of his fortune of some eighty odd millions to "economy and patience." Of course we know that when a rich man is asked by a space writer to tell him for publication the secret of his success he is likely to tell him almost anything to get rid of him, and then, too, it has been made apparent on various occasions that not all rich

men really know the secret of their own success, simply because the gift of seeing themselves as others see them has not been given them. But, whether Huntington said that or not, it is nonsense and tommyrot. If economy and patience were all that were needed to accumulate millions and if the millions could be accumulated in proportion to the exercise of these commendable qualities, then we know a lot of men working in machine shops as employes and proprietors that ought to be much richer than Huntington was, but that somehow are not, and are not at all likely to be.

The people of California, who have been for years in the vise-like grip of Huntington's system of railroads and transportation lines, would attribute his wealth to other things besides economy and patience, and the history of the Credit Mobilier, in which Huntington was the leading spirit, sustains their view.

A story is told of him, which is supposed to show his good qualities as a business man, as follows:

He once boarded an Oakland ferryboat for San Francisco, and, being hungry, strode at once into the restaurant and ordered a beefsteak. Neither the waiters nor anybody else had an idea who he was, and his steak was sent to him, as it appeared to be to most of the customers, fried, done to a crisp, and very unappetizingly served. Mr. Huntington looked around enough to satisfy himself that that was about the style of the establishment, and then at his watch, which told him that the cook had taken so long to spoil this steak that the boat was almost at the San Francisco dock. The only remark he made as he left the restaurant was "You must be making a pile of money here." Nobody paid any attention to him; but the proprietor began to realize who he was on receiving by the next morning's mail a few lines from Mr. Huntington to this general effect: "The disparity between the food you serve and the price you demand for it is so great that it is plain that your business must be extremely profitable. You can, therefore, probably afford to pay \$3 per day per boat as easily as your present rate, \$4. The rate is raised accordingly."

There is here no indication that he thought for one moment of the right of the traveling public to have decent food for a high price. He thought only of extracting from his concessionaire double the share of the plunder.

Huntington was a man of force and of executive ability. In many ways he rendered an important service to the community, but in considering the life of such a man we are too apt to jump at the conclusion that the work he accomplished would not have been done at all had he not performed it, whereas there is no proof to sus-

tain any such conclusion. We shall probably have numerous homilies from well-meaning persons on the virtues of "economy and patience," but we think impartial history will record that most of C. P. Huntington's wealth was due to other and less admirable qualities, coupled with legislative favors and the granting of monopolies that ought never to have been granted to anyone, but which, supposing them to be granted, he, of course, had as much right to as anyone else.—Editorial in American Machinist of Aug. 23.

PRINCIPLE BEFORE PARTY.

Extracts from a letter written by Gen. John Beatty to the Columbus (O.) Press-Post under date of August 22.

We owe no fealty to a name; names may be changed at will, or they may be adopted by a party and held onto after the party has abandoned everything to which it originally adhered. The citizen's allegiance is due simply to fundamental principles. In these there can be no change; they are the bed rock upon which all political action should be founded. The right of the people to select their own representatives in state and national legislation and to choose their own presidents and governors as well, is the core, the essence, the vital and animating principle of republicanism. Without it the word republican becomes an empty husk.

The liberty party in 1843 declared in favor of the "restoration of the equality of rights among men" and affirmed "that the fundamental truths of the declaration of independence was the fundamental law of our national government." The liberty men of 1843 and 1847 becoming satisfied finally that a half loaf was better than no bread, united in great part with the free soilers of 1848, who in the Buffalo convention affirmed that "our fathers ordained the constitution * * * to establish justice, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty, but expressly denied to the federal government, which they created, all constitutional power to deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due legal process." This party also resolved to inscribe upon its banner—"Free soil, free speech, free labor and free men." In 1852 the free soilers again met in convention and declared "that governments, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, are instituted among men to secure to all those inalienable rights of life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness with which they are endowed by their Creator, and of which none can be deprived by valid legislation, except for crime." The liberty men of 1843-47, and the free soilers of 1848-52, uniting with others of like political predilections, met in Philadelphia in 1856, and formed the republican party. The platform adopted by this old party now again invested with a new name, and somewhat broadened in its purposes, affirmed "that with our republican fathers we hold it to be self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our federal government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction." The liberty men of 1843-47, the free soilers of 1848-52, the republicans of 1856, reinforced by multitudes of independent men from both the whig and democratic parties, met in Chicago in 1860 and nominated Abraham Lincoln for the presidency. After the manner and in their spirit of their predecessors, they declared "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; * * * that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This, I take it, is genuine republicanism and under this banner the political battle of 1860 was fought and won. It was a struggle for the truths of the declaration of independence, for the inalienable rights of men; and the same issue under slightly changed conditions is before the people to-day. For one, I shall look to the essence of the thing uninfluenced by a now empty, but once honored, name, strike for the old cause and stand by the convictions of a lifetime. . . .

I stand now where I stood 50 years ago, squarely on the assumption that the principles of the declaration of independence, and the precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ should be recognized as fully in the Philippines as in the United States. On this paramount issue I am in agreement with Mr. Bryan. How, therefore, as a consistent republican, can I do otherwise than vote for him? He may differ from me on minor questions, just as the democrat with whom I stood shoulder to shoulder on the battlefields of the great civil war differed from me on minor questions; but we

nevertheless fought together to obtain a righteous determination of the paramount issue of that day and then in good time gave attention to matters of lesser importance.

Equal opportunities for all men, irrespective of place, race, color or previous condition, was the paramount issue in 1776, in 1860, and is the paramount issue in 1900. In this struggle I shall neither dodge nor hide between the lines, but go promptly to the front and cast my ballot where it will be counted at its full value.

ROOSEVELT'S STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO THE FILIPINOS CHALLENGED.

From the Chicago Record of August 25 we take the following open letter to Gov. Roosevelt, written by Sixto Lopez, who was formerly secretary to the Filipino commission in Washington.

Dear Sir: I have read your remarkable speech delivered recently at St. Paul, Minn., in which you charge the Filipinos with being the "precise analogues" of the Boxers and Apaches and our government with being a "bloody Aguinaldoan oligarchy." Nothing appeals to the best human emotion so much as the spectacle of a brave man. Permit me to say that I cordially join with the American people in admiration of the chief of the "rough riders," but while admiring your achievements as a soldier and a fearless reformer, my admiration ceases when you strike at what I believe to be the truth. Indeed, I am afraid your brilliant career may receive a check in the unequal contest, for truth has never yet been vanquished.

I cannot believe that a gentleman and a soldier will make serious charges against an opponent without being in possession of absolute proof of his statements. Consequently if your charges are true I must cease to be a champion of the cause of my people. If they are false you ought to cease to be the champion of yours.

Therefore, in the name of my countrymen, for whom you and your colleagues have made such lavish profession of friendship, I challenge you to furnish proof of the truth of your charges or else withdraw them.

Let me draw your attention to the circumstances as we Filipinos view them: You came to our country. You call us "Dear Gen. Aguinaldo." You ask, accept and profit by our aid in the defeat of your enemy. You deliver Spanish prisoners over to our charge. You place a large number of

your own sick and wounded practically in our care.

When your enemy has been defeated you turn upon us, shoot us down by thousands, and when our resistance is greater than you anticipated you declare that we are the precise analogues of Boxers and Apaches, and him who you once styled "dear general" when you required his aid you now refer to as "Bloody Aguinaldo."

Honor bright, do you consider all this as consistent with the conduct of a gentleman and a soldier? There is only one escape. Prove your charges.

Look at it in another light: You are powerful and wealthy. You can bring to your task of extermination the most deadly weapons of so-called civilized warfare. Your soldiers are well armed, well fed, well quartered.

We, on the contrary, are without wealth and without a single field piece. We have very few arms and inferior ammunition. We have only such food as our soldiers can find in forest and mountain, and we have to live in swamps, jungles, exposed to every weather.

The contest is thus fearfully unequal, but of this we have not complained. Our Philippine mothers and sisters have silenced the pang when an imperialist shell or bullet has robbed them of husband, father or brother. We have fought fairly; even your own officers have admitted that we have conducted the war fairly and in accordance with the customs of modern war.

Yet, not content with having all advantages on your side, you would now try to take from us our good name. How pitiable, how infinitesimal!

A brave man will always sympathize with the "smaller dog." A worthy foeman will be generous to his weaker opponent. A gentleman and a soldier will not heap dishonor upon his adversary.

Do you believe these mere truisms? Then there is only one escape—prove your charges.

Indeed, you ought to have proved the charges when making them. Honor, fair play, the generosity you should have shown to a weaker opponent who is absent, all proclaim that you ought to have given proof at the time. But let that pass. It is not too late even now.

It will not, however, suffice to appeal to imagination or assumption, to rumor or unfounded reports. Such rumors and reports cut both ways.

There have been as many evil reports against the American soldier as against the Filipinos. Your own commissioners admit "isolated occurrences are regrettable, indeed, but incident to every war," but they do not "feel called upon to answer idle tales without foundation in fact."

Why do you and they not apply this noble reasoning to the Filipinos? Similar charges have been made against Boer and Briton, against union and federal, against every army in active war since time immemorial.

With the belief that you will either prove your charges or withdraw them and offer the amende honorable, I have the honor to be, etc.

SIXTO LOPEZ.

THE COMING CRISIS.

For The Public.

To the lookers-on it seems as if all the force, the awful, terrific force, of the water above Niagara falls increased at a tremendous rate just before the final plunge down the fall. One hardly dares stand without support near the edge of the bank or on the little islands for fear of being carried to destruction. Such is the power of this surging, rushing mass of water which for miles has been gathering force. Mad, insane would anyone be who even for an instant thought to stay the rush or to attempt to steer a boat in it, however strong. So alive does the water seem that one almost unconsciously feels he ought to warn this torrent that it is rushing on to destruction; that it is carrying with it everything within its reach, and that it cannot for a long time return again to the peaceful, quiet stream it was miles and miles back.

And hundreds of people go every day in the tiny "Maid of the Mist" to see this fatal plunge; go so near that their faces become dripping wet from the spray and only a complete covering of rubber clothing prevents a thorough bath. How many of these people feel awe-stricken at the insignificance of man before such almost infinite power one can never tell; but he who does not feel it must be made of stone.

Are not these rapids suggestive of the state of our society at the close of the century? The world, it is true, will not suddenly change either for better or worse at the moment when the last night of this century is tolled out; yet all the forces for good and bad seem to be rapidly gathering, just as the water seems to gather rapidly at the last before making the final plunge, while in reality both are the result of time.

The censored press gives daily indications of a seething, a restlessness and a breaking away from the fetters which

bind the masses, strong as those in power have tried to forge them; and those who look below the surface and see what must inevitably come unless the gathering force is staid, and that quickly, tremble for the future. Let us devoutly hope that we may not have a social Niagara.

At home strikes are becoming more and more frequent; the rights of the masses are each month increasingly trodden upon; great fortunes are piling up for the few, made possible by special privilege laws which a few years ago no one would have even dared to propose; "government by injunction" is hardly a matter of surprise; political dishonesty, blackmailing and open stealing and bribery are too common to provoke more than a passing comment; taxes have increased together with the price of living, so that an occasional increase of money wages is not enough to compensate for the increased price of living; and a chapter of such straws, including the enormous growth of trusts, indicating the direction of the wind, might be written.

But worse than all these, because the cause of them, is the repudiation by so many men in high official places of the principles as laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Men who should—and do—know better deny that we all have an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. When these principles on which our government was founded, belief in which has for over a century been our boast, are denied by our rulers what is there to hope for?

We have boasted not only that we were a free people, but that the bulwark of that freedom is universal suffrage. This has not been strictly true, for nearly one-half of the population has been denied the right of suffrage because of sex limitation, and in many states there is a property or an educational qualification.

William Lloyd Garrison recently said:

A republic means a government of the whole people, not of a part. It includes all within its borders, regardless of sex, subject to its laws. Otherwise it has no right to the name. To make laws and deny the governed a voice is simply despotism. The most dangerous foe of democracy is he who, in its holy name, seeks to make it an oligarchy.

And Wendell Phillips said:

The community that will not protect its humblest, most ignorant, most hated member in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves.

Yet the number of those who would still further limit the ballot is increasing rather than diminishing. Would they have only the "intelligent" people

vote? Who are the "intelligent" people? The Platts, the Quays, the Hannas are all "intelligent" men, while the mechanic who understands more in a day what constitutes true liberty than those men know—or seem to know—in a year would be called ignorant. The real question is: Has every member of a community a right to have a voice in making the laws by which he is to be governed, or has he not? If he has, then let us have universal suffrage, which we have never yet had; if not, then let us burn the Declaration of Independence, repudiate the name republic, and say what would be true, that we are an empire, a nation of governors and governed, emperor and subjects, masters and slaves.

For the ballot lies at the very foundation of our government. The idea of a republic without a free, unrestricted ballot is absurd. Class legislation or the government of the many by the few is dangerous always. Our forefathers said that "taxation without representation is tyranny," which is another way of saying that a country which does not allow every citizen to express his unbiased and free opinion of the policy his government should pursue, is in form, if not in name, an oligarchy. And not only is it true that every member of a community has a right to a part in the government under which he lives, but that the exercise of that right is an educator; it gives everyone a feeling of responsibility which he otherwise could not have. A nonvoting class is always a dangerous class. Indeed, from the standpoint of policy as well as that of justice we should demand universal suffrage.

That the masses of people are ignorant of right principles there is no doubt, but they can be educated only by their own experience; and this ignorance is at least as likely if not more likely to be found among the so-called "better classes"—which usually means those possessing wealth and social standing—as among the so-called ignorant or "common" people. Four years ago the majority voted to put in power a party which in the time of Lincoln was the party of freedom, but which has rapidly degenerated into the party of privilege, of plutocracy, of oppression. Some men doubtless honestly felt that they were voting wisely, while more voted as their fathers had done before them with no thought of what it meant. Now that the republican party has shown its horns and hoofs, not only shown but used them, will the people dare to trust another four years of such misrule? Can they still lick the hand that would take from

them everything which was once dear to an American—a right to earn a living where and how he will so long as he does not aggress on the rights of others, freedom of speech, a free press and a free ballot? Is there not still enough manhood left in them to vote in overwhelming numbers against the policy of imperialism which at the close of the nineteenth century threatens the life of the republic?

The democratic party has come out bravely against this policy in their platform, and has promised to make anti-imperialism its warcry in the coming campaign. Whatever differences of opinion there may be in regard to the financial problems, all who value the future life of this country as a republic should unite and make a strong fight against privilege and monopoly. Bad financial legislation can be altered if the people still possess the power to make or change laws; but once take away that power, once make slaves of American citizens, and their doom is sealed; the people must take what their rulers see fit to give them.

There never was a time in our history when every true patriot who loves the traditions handed down to us from our forefathers should be more alive to his imperative duty. In the early days there were doubts whether or not the baby republic had strength enough to walk alone; but now that it has been shown that a government of the people, for the people and by the people is possible, a greater crisis has arrived—one which calls for all the wisdom and strength that can be found.

In two short years our nation has changed from a nation of peace to one of war; it has broken its promise to peoples fighting for their freedom; it has paid, and will continue to pay, for this in blood and money, and, like Cassio, has "lost its reputation, and what remains is bestial." Can anything be sadder than the sight of a nation which, drunk with power, has fallen into the gutter? where it must remain unless there is still pride and wisdom enough left in its people to again raise it?

Is all this the cry of a pessimist who sees only the dark side and has no hope for the future? No; but the peril is great, and there are so few to sound the warning that there is need for constant vigilance and perseverance on the part of those who do see the danger. As the raging waters rush madly on in the Niagara rapids above the falls, so do the masses of the people seem to rush headlong to

destruction, blindly ignorant of what is in store for them, unless they change it before it is too late; and it is the duty of all who see the impending danger to do their best to ward this off.

The truth in regard to the Philippine war—the censoring of the press, garbled reports and cruelty on the part of our men—have been published in those papers which are not under the rule of those in power, and those who can read between the lines see that the government that will so outrage every tradition of our country with foreigners, will not hesitate—indeed, has not hesitated—to do the same at home. Therefore there need no longer be the excuse of ignorance of the ganger. Surely there is enough of the true American spirit left in the hearts of the masses of the people to insist on still holding the reins in fact as well as in form, and resisting the encroachments on their liberties which have been so stealthily but surely made by the plutocrats.

O, Liberty! can man resign thee,
Once having felt thy generous flame?
Can dungeon bolts or bars confine thee,
Or whips thy noble spirit tame?
Undo the wrongs of days before,
Make free to all the common earth,
Our common heritage by birth,
For man is man, and who is more?
FLORENCE A. BURLLEIGH.

I want to suggest questions for you to use with those who defend the imperialistic policy in the Philippines. Ask them whether the Filipino is to be a citizen or a subject. If he is to be a citizen he must share with us in the destiny of this nation, if he is to be a subject we must change our form of government. I do not want him as a citizen; I do not want him as a subject; I want to give him independence and let him work out his own destiny.—Hon. W. J. Bryan, at La Porte, Ind.

If, in a school, 20 years hence, it shall be asked: "What celebrity lived in Canton?" and a boy answers "McKinley," and another boy, "Li Hung Chang," which of the boys will be marked perfect?

G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

The official report of the National Anti-Trust conference held at Chicago last February (Chicago: Geo. S. Bowen & Son, Unity building; \$1) has just appeared. This conference was an outgrowth of the Trusts conference held in Chicago last autumn under the auspices of the Civic Federation. The anti-trust delegates at that conference came together in caucus and took the steps preliminary to the Anti-Trust conference now reported. The official report contains a report of the proceedings,

Including speeches or papers by M. L. Lockwood, Tom L. Johnson, W. J. Strong, Attorney General Monett, Geo. Fred Williams, John S. Crosby, John P. Altgeld, John J. Lentz, Jerry Simpson and a host of other anti-trust thinkers and speakers. It is illustrated with portraits of the leading participants in the conference.

"The Wolf at the Door" (Boston: The Coming Age, Copley Square), an essay by Leigh H. Irvine, proposes that the federal government relieve the unemployed by organizing a volunteer industrial army, in which anyone may enlist as an honorable workman, giving a few hours of his time each day to service under orders as an industrial soldier in colonies upon the public domain in exchange for guaranteed support for himself and his family and education for his children.

THE HENRY GEORGE BRYAN AND STEVENSON CLUB.

Single taxers in and about Chicago are invited to attend a meeting at 8 p. m., Monday, September 10, in the Le Moyne Building, 40 E. Randolph Street, for the purpose of forming a Henry George Bryan and Stevenson Club, similar to that recently formed in New York City, of which Henry George, Jr., is president.

John Z. White, Thos. G. McElligott,
Frank D. Butler, Clarence S. Darrow,
F. H. Monroe, M. J. Foyer,
Louis F. Post, Chas. A. Butler.
Hiram B. Loomis,

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.

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

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

Program for Sunday, September 9th:

MR. LOUIS F. POST,
Editor of the Public.

Subject: "That Favorable Balance of Trade Theory."

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE.
ALFRED T. JOHNSON.
JOHAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.
LAWYERS,
SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

NELLIE CARLIN.
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
122 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 filling.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

To be "fixed for life" is desirable. Much more so to be "fixed for death." There is no temporal way for the latter better than life insurance. 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 Economy25c
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.

JOIN THOSE WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

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