

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1900.

Number 128.

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.

When that awfully destructive storm broke last Saturday over the doomed city of Galveston, carrying destruction and death everywhere without respect for persons, the tides of universal brotherhood rose with the fury of the tempest. White families succored negroes with all the manifestations of brotherly and sisterly affection that they displayed toward their own race. Negroes succored whites with even more than their traditional fidelity. Distinctions of color were ignored, and in the face of that terrifying calamity there was no race question.

In his letter of acceptance Mr. McKinley expresses the opinion that "there is a stain of ill-concealed hypocrisy in the anxiety to extend the constitutional guarantees to the Philippines, while their nullification is openly advocated at home." When the native courtesy of Mr. Bryan toward his opponents, which characterizes all his public utterances, is considered, this oblique remark by Mr. McKinley cannot but reflect upon the good manners of its author. But Mr. McKinley's controversial manners are only of minor concern. A more important consideration is the fact that in attempting in his letter to discredit Bryan's good faith he discredits his own. He does so, in the very sentence in which he describes Bryan's anxiety for the constitution as hypocritical. For his reference to the nullification of constitutional guarantees at home is clearly an allusion to the disfranchisement of negroes in the south. It implies that this is approved by Mr.

Bryan. Yet Mr. McKinley must be aware of the fact that Bryan stands for a different kind of democracy from the aristocratic "democracy" of the pro-slavery era in the south, of which such men as Gen. Joe Wheeler is a type, and which is really impatient to throw off its thin democratic mask and join Mr. McKinley's imperialized republican party. In a still graver manner, however, Mr. McKinley exposes himself to the suspicion he so ungraciously attempts to direct toward Bryan. His whole letter is a pretense. Not only is it distinguished for its misleading suppressions and distortions of details, but its very framework is a sham. While putting forward the money question as the principal issue of the campaign, it elaborates the imperialist question at such length and with so much circumstantiality of statement and refinement of argument as to reveal Mr. McKinley's consciousness of the fact that, notwithstanding his pretense to the contrary, the question of imperialism and not that of money standards, is in truth the paramount issue.

Conformably to his assumption that the money issue and not imperialism is paramount, Mr. McKinley begins his letter with a plea to gold standard men. Describing his party as having in 1896 upheld the gold standard and as now indorsing the legislation of the present congress, "by which that standard has been strengthened," he invites the sound money forces to reelect him, so that his honest financial system may achieve a "permanent triumph." But he does not explain why his party, instead of merely strengthening the gold standard, did not establish it, and thereby make its triumph of 1896 permanent, if a permanent triumph is possible. And although he

knows that his party could have made that triumph permanent during its past four years of power, if it could possibly do so with another four years—that, indeed, it could do so during the coming winter, through which its power will extend, though Bryan be elected—he has the temerity to urge Bryan's defeat because the financial issue is "immediate" and "will admit of no delay." There would appear to be in that declaration not only what Mr. McKinley calls "a stain of ill-concealed hypocrisy," but something besides. It is singularly suggestive of a conviction on Mr. McKinley's part that this is one of the times when gold standard men are easily gulled.

Passing from the financial to the tariff issue, Mr. McKinley naively advocates a system of protection for the exclusion of foreign manufactures from our markets, and of reciprocity for the admission of farm products into foreign markets. But he wisely refrains from explaining how the American farm products sent out are to be paid for, if foreign manufactures are not let in. Were he asked, he might say as he did two years ago in Wisconsin, that they are paid for in "pure gold." But he cuts off that explanation a little farther on in his letter, where he boasts of merchandise export balances during his administration to the amount of \$1,689,779,190, and of gold import balances to the amount of only \$436,000,000. Since these gold imports leave \$1,253,779,190 worth of exports still unpaid for, Mr. McKinley ought to have explained where the profit of excessive exporting comes in. He does say that we have been paying off old commercial debts and bringing home American securities, and that we are now establishing credits abroad. But according to the treas-

ury statistics we have made no debts abroad since 1873, and such as we made before must have been paid off long ago, if excessive export balances since 1873 (of which protectionists have always been exceedingly proud) had really gone to the liquidation of excessive imports in the past. Mr. McKinley must be mistaken about the liquidation of our indebtedness. He is also mistaken about our having by means of our excessive exports established credits abroad. When we bought a few British bonds last month—only \$25,000,000 worth—we did not pay for them with drafts against a foreign credit. We had to ship gold. Mr. McKinley further explains in connection with a statement that our exports for 1900 are “about \$500,000 for every day of the year,” that “these sums have gone into the homes and enterprises of the people.” But we think it would puzzle even himself, astute statistician as he is, to show how the sending out from this country of \$500,000 worth of goods a day, for which little or nothing comes back, not even gold, can put anything into the homes and enterprises of our people.

Like his confusion over export balances is Mr. McKinley's idea that the reduction of interest on government bonds is proof of general prosperity. Low interest on government bonds is not evidence of prosperity. It is evidence, on the contrary, that opportunities for profitable and safe investments in productive enterprises are scarce. This is the reason that low interest on gilt-edge securities is always an accompaniment of low wages or precarious employment. When opportunities for employment are abundant and profitable, so are opportunities for business investment. They go together. The very conditions that induce people with money to buy government bonds bearing low rates of interest because they are safer than business investments, are the conditions that diminish opportunities for employment. Mr. McKinley is oblivious to the fact that in

boasting of low interest rates on government bonds he is calling attention to the precariousness of employment. But it is so. Steady employment at good wages never exists when safe opportunities for profitable investment are few.

Sympathizers with the Boers will hardly respond to Mr. McKinley's assurances of friendship for the dying republics of South Africa. His empty offer to Great Britain of “good offices” counts for little against his unfriendly attitude. He says he maintained neutrality in accordance with our “well-known traditional policy,” but all the world knows that in also withholding every possible expression and indication of sympathy from the two republics fighting for independence, he did not follow our traditional policy. Neither will the victims of trusts find anything to console them in his weak and watery and altogether perfunctory condemnation of monopoly combines. And if working men are satisfied with his assurance that they are prosperous it will be because they find his talk about prosperity more filling than the prosperity he talks about. Along with the others whom he tries to cajole are the civil service reformers. There is something sublime in the assurance with which he discusses one of the most flagrant violations of civil service reform principles of which any administration has been guilty—his withdrawal of a horde of clerkships from the protection of civil service rules and turning them over to party workers—as if it were an inspired improvement. This assurance is equaled only by that with which he unctuously supports the ship subsidy steal which his friend and patron Hanna has fathered.

After dealing with these minor questions, touching lightly, as he passes, upon the Isthmian canal question, the subject of pensions and the situation in Cuba and Puerto Rico, Mr. McKinley comes at last to the Philippine question; and although he assumes to treat it as a subordinate

and unimportant issue, he nevertheless devotes to it fully five-eighths of his letter. This part of the letter, upon the face of it not only the longest but the most important part, is notable alike for its misleading statements and its unfair omissions. Mr. McKinley says he has used force in the Philippines only against force. But he neglects to say that the force he has encountered was at the beginning of the fight a well-organized *de facto* government, the only government, according to reports of American officers, that prevailed outside of Manila for the better part of a year, and a government which did preserve order, and good order, until it was wantonly assailed and annihilated by American troops. Mr. McKinley says there was no alliance with the Philippine republic nor promise of independence, and attempts to make his assertion good by showing that there was none of a formal and binding character. But it has never been claimed that legally binding obligations were incurred. The point is that a military alliance was made, that the Filipino leader and people were knowingly and intentionally allowed to infer that independence would follow the defeat of the Spanish, and that out of this relationship obligations of honor arose. Our navy cooperated with their army, and, as Gen. Otis reported (official report for 1899, page 13), “for three and one-half months Admiral Dewey with his squadron and the insurgents on land had kept Manila tightly bottled.” Did we owe them no debt of honor for that?

Mr. McKinley says that the Filipinos “opened fire upon our army.” Here refers to the beginning of the fighting, February 4, 1899, when, as he says, “the insurgents attacked the American army, after being previously advised that the American forces were under orders not to fire upon them except in defense.” But Gen. Otis (report of 1899, page 96) explains the beginning of the fighting by say-

ing that the first shot was fired by an American picket upon a Filipino who approached him and refused to halt or answer when challenged. This shot, which began the engagement, was replied to, says Otis, by the Filipino troops; and he adds that "the engagement was one strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents, and of vigorous attack by our forces."

Even if the first shot had been fired by the Filipinos instead of by an American picket, Mr. McKinley's statement that they assumed the offensive could not hold good. For the offensive was assumed by Mr. McKinley himself as early at least as one month before the first engagement. It was then that he declared war against the only government that existed in the Philippines outside of Manila—the government of the Filipino republic. Spain had once governed the archipelago, but the new republic had driven Spain into Manila, where, in cooperation with Dewey, it kept her "tightly bottled," as Gen. Otis says, and whence she was finally expelled. After being driven out, after her possession was no longer even nominal, after the people of the islands had acknowledged their allegiance to the new government, then it was and not before that she assumed to sell the archipelago to the United States. She was assuming to sell and we to buy what she did not possess. Yet upon the basis of this sham sale of Spain's moribund title, a sale not yet complete, for the senate had not acted, Mr. McKinley issued a proclamation (Otis's report for 1899, pages 68 and 69) in which he asserted American sovereignty over the Philippines, announced his intention of making them an American "province," and commanded the republic to submit to the "strong arm" of American authority. This proclamation, published a month before the fighting, marks the real beginning of the war, if, indeed, previous American encroachments did not begin it earlier. It was an attack by our government upon the life of

the Filipino government. When Mr. McKinley charges the Filipinos with having assumed the offensive, he places his accusation in direct conflict with the testimony of American official reports which he himself has promulgated.

It would be a waste of space to follow Mr. McKinley's disingenuous letter further in its details. The documentary history of his administration condemns his letter as an unfair presentation of the subjects with which it deals. It is, moreover, a model of weakness. How petty, for instance, to speak of the Filipinos as a "tribe," when they have notoriously reached a point of civilization which removes them from everything that the word "tribe" suggests to the American understanding. How absurd to speak of the native supporters of the Filipino republic as a small minority of the Philippine population which terrorizes the peaceable majority who yearn to be American subjects, when this peaceable majority is defended by 60,000 American troops. How wretchedly ridiculous the revamping for American consumption of the wild stories of Filipino conspiracies to loot and burn Manila which were invented originally for Spanish consumption when Spain was engaged in the same work of suppressing liberty in the Philippines that we have taken up. How puerile the argument that if we cannot establish our government in the Philippines without the consent of the inhabitants, we could not adopt Bryan's plan of protecting them while they establish a government of their own—how puerile in view of the fact that the government they did establish we demolished. How inconsistent the contention that "a military support of authority not our own" in the Philippines, for the purpose of giving that country its independence, would be "the very essence of militarism," when Mr. McKinley is professing to do precisely that thing in Cuba. How ignoble the attempt to hold Bryan responsible for the

Philippine policy, because Bryan, to bring the Spanish war to an end, advocated the ratification of the peace treaty with a resolution virtually nullifying the imperial clause in it, when Mr. McKinley himself caused that clause to be inserted in the treaty, and used all his influence to secure its ratification and to defeat the modifying resolution. And withal what folly to assert that our title to the Philippines "is practically identical with that by which we hold our territory acquired since the beginning of the government and under which we have exercised full sovereignty and established government for the inhabitants." The falsity of this assertion will be apparent upon reference to "Our Historic Expansion," an article in another column, wherein the history of American expansion is told and the title documents are quoted. In addition to its weakness in detail, Mr. McKinley's letter of acceptance, taken as a whole, puts him helplessly upon the defensive. Instead of advancing a just and winning principle, he is forced and consciously resorts to the defense of a hateful and losing cause. Nor does he in doing that put forward any policy, with a pledge to recommend and support it. He drifts aimlessly. There is no pledge with reference even to what he tries to treat as the paramount issue—the money question. The letter does nothing but defend imperialism, and it outlines no policy but the policy of drift.

If the Maine election held this week be regarded as foreshadowing the result of the presidential election in November, the supporters of Mr. McKinley can draw no encouragement from it. On the contrary, in so far as it is prophetic at all, it gives satisfactorily strong assurances of Bryan's election. The republican loss in Maine is estimated at 11 per cent. as compared with the election of 1896, whereas the democratic gain is 18 per cent. Since Maine is a hard-shell republican state, the loss to McKinley and the gain for Bryan are

likely to be even greater in the other eastern and middle western states. But even at that rate of change, Bryan would carry Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Maryland, West Virginia and Delaware. Adding these to Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia, which are conceded to him, and we have a Bryan electoral vote of 222. If, then, we add the other states that he carried in 1896, namely, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, we have 45 more votes, making a total of 267—43 more than a majority. And this takes no account of Kentucky, which Bryan lost in 1896 but is quite as likely to carry this year, notwithstanding local complications, as he is to lose any of the states he carried four years ago. Upon the basis of the Maine election, therefore, Bryan might lose all the states he carried before, except those that are conceded to him—or, at any rate, all but any one—and yet be elected. If the McKinleyites wish to estimate presidential election probabilities, the Maine election does not offer promising figures for that diversion.

We are assured upon authority second only to the best that our statement on page 339, that Secretary Olney "opposed the election of Bryan in 1896, and through his great influence in business circles contributed materially to McKinley's election," is erroneous; that, on the contrary, he refused to support McKinley either indirectly by countenancing the Palmer-Buckner movement, or directly by favoring McKinley himself. Our statement was based upon the general understanding, never authoritatively denied, as to the attitude of the McKinley cabinet, and we gladly correct it. We also gladly notice the assurances of our informant, which are certainly confirmed by Mr. Olney's recent Bryan letter that Olney is a good deal more of a declara-

tion of independence democrat than he gets credit for being.

With a simple but impressive memorial number in memory of the late A. J. Auchterlonie, one of its former editors, "The New Earth," of New York, after a most useful career of 11 years, suspends publication. The paper was started and maintained as a labor of love, by a small group of Swedenborgians who were followers also of Henry George. Though the number of its readers was not large, it has circulated all over the English speaking world, carrying its philosophic message of a new heaven resting upon a new earth. Its publication is discontinued on account of the loss of Mr. Auchterlonie's efficient editorial assistance, and the last number has been made a beautiful tribute by his coeditors to their departed associate.

Mr. Charles C. Jackson, of Boston, representing the uppercrust bankers and brokers of State street, and a leading spirit in the gold conventions of recent years, remarks of Mr. Olney's letter that it "seems to be addressed to the lower classes, and not to the educated thinking man." Well, whom do the McKinley orators address when they emblemize their party's attractions for votes with a "full dinner-pail." Little pictures of the full dinner-pail are profusely scattered through the page margins of the bought-up comic papers and other illustrated journals of civilization acquired of late by trust millionaires to be worked in the interest of "the syndicate President." The highly educated Senator Hanna, in his speech at the opening Ohio rally, declared that "the whole paramount issue boiled down is in that dinner pail." Mr. Hanna's ideal of the American republic, no doubt, is a nation of millions of men with dinner pails working at an average wage of less than a dollar apiece a day, with a half-hour for lunch out of dinner pails, to enable a few score of Hanna's Fricks, Rockafellers and other representatives of the upper classes to

lunch at the buffets of their private cars and steam yachts. Is it not time that somebody addressed to the "lower classes" something better than the poor bribe of fodder enough to fill a tin dinner-pail?

Roosevelt is not gentle with Dewey when he says in his campaign speeches that—

not one competent witness who has actually known the facts believes the Filipinos capable of self-government, for Dewey is on record at page 383 of "senate document 62" in an official dispatch, dated Manila, August 29, 1898, as saying:

In a telegram sent to the department on June 23, I expressed the opinion that "these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races." Further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion.

As Mr. Roosevelt's party is making a little capital just now out of the president's plans for giving self-government to the Cubans, it is to be presumed that they are in Mr. Roosevelt's opinion capable of self-government. It would be interesting to know, therefore, whether Roosevelt regards Dewey as an incompetent witness or as ignorant of the facts.

A republican member of the Hamilton club, a republican club of Chicago, has appealed to its president to call a special meeting of the club for the purpose of changing its name. This remarkable proceeding was prompted by the fears of the protesting member that in retaining for its own name the cognomen of Alexander Hamilton, the club gives unpleasant color to the democratic contention in the present campaign that the republican party is no longer a party of the people, but has become an aristocratic party with a tendency to centralize power, and that it is forcing the country out of its career as a republic and into the career of an empire. That this protest is not groundless the club member in question shows by reference to the life of Hamilton, written by his warm admirer, Senator Lodge,

who presided over the republican convention at Philadelphia. Senator Lodge's life of Hamilton states that "the republic of Hamilton was to be aristocratic as distinguished from a democratic republic," and shows that he opposed popular suffrage, favored government by the wealthy, and was a firm believer in the use of military force for the suppression of domestic discontent. Mr. Kickham Scanlan, the author of this protest, who by the way is a Chicago lawyer of high standing, goes at great length into the subject matter of his protest, and makes a clear case against Hamilton out of the mouth of Lodge. Unless republicans are prepared to embrace plutocracy, imperialism and militarism, and admit that these are the principles of their party, they will do well either to avoid the further identification of Alexander Hamilton's name with their organizations, or to get Senator Lodge to suppress or edit his life of Hamilton.

OUR HISTORIC EXPANSION.

Precedents are not principles. Neither can they be substituted for principles. At the best they only illustrate principles; at the worst, they stultify them. The best use of precedents in a republic is as landmarks to show how far, at any given period of history, it has progressed toward its ideals or drifted away. For instance, the legalized slave trade period of American history may be compared with that later period when the slave trade was treated as piracy, as a means of judging whether, between the two periods, we were approaching or receding from the American ideal of the rights of man. But justification is another matter. A policy of to-day cannot be justified by the precedents of yesterday and the day before. For justification everything must stand the test not of precedents but of ideals—not of wrongful practice but of righteous conviction. The justice of Lincoln's emancipation proclamation and the thirteenth amendment is to be determined neither by the slave codes of the south nor the fugitive slave law of congress, but by the principles of the declaration of independence. And as with the

new precedents that Lincoln and his compeers made, so with those that we of this generation are called upon to make. History will test our work by ideals of justice, not by the blunders or worse than blunders of our predecessors.

It makes no moral difference, therefore, whether President McKinley's imperial policy is warranted by American precedent or not. Even if Jefferson and Jackson and other traditional democrats had been the imperialists that republican speakers and papers say they were, even if the acquisition of the Louisiana territory and the Floridas and the Mexican concession were precedents for the forcible annexation of the Philippine archipelago and the benevolent assimilation of its inhabitants—nevertheless this forcible annexation and benevolent assimilation would still be criminal aggression. The conduct of our predecessors would only show what they were indifferent to national righteousness. It would not show that they were right, nor justify us in imitating them. And by conforming to their ephemeral precedents instead of aspiring to the realization of eternal principles, we should prove that we had made no advance, but were still as far off as they from the realization of American ideals.

In fact, however, Mr. McKinley's imperialism is a distinct departure. His attempted acquisition of the Philippines is absolutely without precedents in American history.

We have expanded, that is true. But we have never before assumed to acquire subjects instead of citizens. We have never before attempted to erect subordinate colonies in perpetuity like those of Rome. Not once in all our history before McKinley's time have we acquired sovereign jurisdiction over new territory without a definite purpose and distinct promise with reference to citizenship or statehood or both.

In support of this assertion let appeal be made from the clamor of irresponsible partisans to the records of the government.

The territorial system under which the United States have expanded had its inception in what is known as the

ordinance of 1787. This was an act of the congress that sat under the articles of confederation, which preceded the constitution. It was enacted July 17, 1787, for the government of the territory northwest of the Ohio river, which had been ceded to the general government by the states of New York, Virginia, Massachusetts and Connecticut, pursuant to a request of congress, for the purpose of laying it out into separate and independent states, from time to time as the numbers and circumstances of the inhabitants might require. The ordinance may be found in almost any lawyer's library.

The ninth section of this ordinance provided that as soon as there should be 5,000 free male inhabitants of full age in the district comprising the northwest territory, they should proceed to form a territorial government with power to make laws for the district and the right to be represented in congress by a delegate; and the thirteenth and fourteenth sections introduced a definite compact between the original states and the people of the northwest territory in these terms:

And for extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, which form the basis whereon these republics, their laws and constitution are erected; to fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions and governments, which forever hereafter shall be formed in the said territory; to provide, also, for the establishment of states and permanent government therein, and for their admission to a share in the federal councils on an equal footing with the original states, at as early periods as may be consistent with the general interest, it is hereby ordained and declared by the authority aforesaid, that the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original states and the people and states in the said territory, and forever remain unalterable unless by common consent.

Following this preamble came a series of articles guaranteeing religious freedom, the writ of habeas corpus, trial by jury, proportionate representation, and due course of law; encouraging public schools; demanding good faith toward the Indians, with assurances of their liberty and property rights; guaranteeing that states formed in the district should forever remain part of the United

States; and providing that not less than three nor more than five states should be formed in the territory. With reference to forming states, the ordinance required that—

whenever any of the said states shall have 60,000 free inhabitants therein, such state shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the congress of the United States, on an equal footing with the original states, in all respects whatever; and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and state government: provided the constitution and government, so to be formed, shall be republican, and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles, and so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the state than 60,000.

That was the origin of our territorial policy. The trail of the pro-slavery serpent was indeed upon it. Only free inhabitants were considered as fellow citizens; and while the final article did foreshadow the eradication of slavery by prohibiting that institution in the territory, it nevertheless required fugitive slaves to be given up. But the pro-slavery blemish has long since been wiped off, and the territorial policy of this original precedent stands forth now in substantial conformity to the national ideal. Local self-government was to be established when the population had reached 5,000, and statehood acknowledged when it had risen to 60,000. The dominant idea was the creation of states, and the recognition of the inhabitants as citizens and not as subjects.

This dominant idea of the ordinance of 1787 distinctly colored every subsequent act of territorial expansion. It appears in bold relief in the treaty with France, whereby we acquired the Louisiana territory; in the treaty with Spain, whereby we acquired the Floridas; in the treaty with Mexico, whereby we acquired the Mexican cessions; and in the treaty with Russia, whereby we acquired Alaska. It was recognized, of course, in the acquisition of Texas, for that state came into the union as a sovereign nation; and it had already been recognized in respect of the Oregon country, which was confirmed to us by treaty with Great Britain, for the British treaty only settled a disputed

boundary line. Not until the cession of the Philippines in 1898 did any American treaty for territorial expansion depart from the foundation principle of our territorial policy as outlined by the ordinance of 1787.

The first of our expansion treaties was that with France for the cession of the Louisiana country. It was made April 30, 1803, and ratified and proclaimed October 21, 1803. This is one of the treaties to which apologists for the present administration refer as a precedent for its imperial policy with reference to the Philippines. Without much trouble any intelligent person can satisfy himself of the uselessness of that treaty as a precedent for that policy. The treaty may be examined at any reference library. We quote from it as it appears at page 331 in the compilation of treaties published by the government in 1889. In the third article it provides that—

the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and the religion which they profess.

Our next expansion treaty was with Spain. It was made February 22, 1819, ratified and proclaimed February 22, 1821, and may be found at page 1016 of the compilation of treaties already referred to. After ceding all the Spanish territory east of the Mississippi—known then as East and West Florida—together with the adjacent islands, etc., this treaty provided in Article VI. that—

the inhabitants of the territory which his Catholic majesty cedes to the United States by this treaty, shall be incorporated in the union of the United States, as soon as may be consistent with the principles of the federal constitution, and admitted to the enjoyment of all the privileges, rights and immunities of the citizens of the United States.

It was at the expense of Mexico that we next expanded. There were two treaties, that of 1848, which terminated the Mexican war, and that of 1853, which completed the Gadsden purchase. The first was made at

Guadalupe Hidalgo, February, 2, 1848, and proclaimed July 4, 1848. It appears in the compilation described above at page 681. Having provided in the eighth article that Mexicans in the ceded territories might remain or remove at their option, this treaty proceeded:

Those who shall prefer to remain in the said territories may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens, or acquire those of citizens of the United States. But they shall be under the obligation to make their election within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and those who shall remain in the said territories after the expiration of that year, without having declared their intention to retain the character of Mexicans, shall be considered to have elected to become citizens of the United States.

And then in Article IX. it stipulated that—

the Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican republic, conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the union of the United States, and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.

These clauses were by the second treaty made applicable also to the Gadsden purchase. The second clause (the ninth article of the Guadalupe Hidalgo treaty), however, was suppressed by the United States before ratification, the third article of the French treaty ceding Louisiana, which we quote above, being substituted; but with the understanding, as stated in a protocol (see pages 692-93 of the compilation of treaties of 1889) that the American government—

did not intend to diminish in any way what was agreed upon by article 9 in favor of the inhabitants of the territories ceded by Mexico. Its understanding is that all of that agreement is contained in the third article of the treaty of Louisiana. In consequence, all the privileges and guarantees, civil, political and religious, which would have been possessed by the inhabitants of the ceded territories if the ninth article of the treaty had been retained, will be enjoyed by them

without any difference under the article which has been substituted.

For the interpretation, then, of the Mexican treaty, in so far as it is to be cited as an American precedent with reference to expansion, we must go back to the third article of the Louisiana treaty, which for that reason is here quoted again:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and the religion which they profess.

Our only other treaty of expansion prior to the McKinley administration was that with Russia ceding Alaska. It was made March 30, 1867, and proclaimed June 20, 1867, and it may be found at page 939 of the 1889 compilation of treaties. In the third article this treaty follows in principle the example set by the ordinance of 1787 and adopted by all preceding treaties. It provides that—

The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

Here we have, then, a consistent line of expansion precedents which are pronounced against imperialism. Our whole expansion policy, from the foundation of the government, thus appears to have been in the direction of recognizing citizenship and conferring statehood. It was reserved for President McKinley to reverse that policy. His administration is the first to turn away from the American ideal of statehood and citizenship toward the imperial Roman system of colonies and subjects.

This will be perfectly clear upon contrasting the treaty provisions we have quoted, with the corresponding provision in the Paris treaty with

reference to the Philippines—a provision which President McKinley himself caused to be inserted in the treaty, and upon which his imperial policy of making colonies and subjects is founded.

The Paris treaty, along with much other matter of great collateral interest and importance, is published officially in senate document No. 62 of the third session of the Fifty-fifth congress, which may be bought of the government printing office at Washington for 35 cents. The treaty occupies the first nine pages of that most luminous document. By article three, to be found on page four of the document—

Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine islands,

and by article nine (page nine of the document), it is stipulated that—

the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the congress.

Beyond this, and a clause securing freedom of religious worship, there is no provision whatever in the treaty for the protection of the native inhabitants of the Philippines. So far as the treaty is concerned, congress may do as it pleases with them. Their country belongs to ours, but may not be of it. They may be subject to our laws, but not citizens of our republic.

Both the Louisiana territory and the Floridas came to us under treaty pledges that their inhabitants should be incorporated into the union and admitted to all the rights of citizenship; and the Mexican cessions were made upon the same terms. But we are under no such pledge as to the inhabitants of the Philippines. With reference, then, to every treaty of expansion prior to Alaska—and it is these that the imperialists cite as precedents—there isn't so much as the shadow of a basis for the contention that they are precedents for the Philippine treaty. Pledges of statehood and citizenship cannot be precedents for the denial of both. Yet statehood and citizenship for the Filipinos are precisely what the president's policy denies, and precisely what the Philippine treaty makes it possible to deny. Nor does the Alaska treaty substantially alter the orig-

inal policy. While it does not in terms provide for statehood, it does in terms provide for the American citizenship of all the civilized inhabitants who remain in the territory. There is no such provision in the Philippine treaty. Though the Filipinos are a Christian people and were vouched for by Admiral Dewey before the making of the treaty (document 62, page 383) as so far civilized that they "are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba," yet no distinction is drawn in the treaty between them and the uncivilized tribes that inhabit remote regions of the archipelago. The Philippine treaty, then, lacks the support as a precedent of even the Alaska treaty, which turned over to us an almost uninhabited territory.

It has no precedent whatever in the whole history of our territorial expansion down to McKinley's time. But, in flat defiance of our national ideals, it is a radical departure also from the policy and practice of a century of national life.

NEWS

The most important home event of the week is President McKinley's formal letter of acceptance of the republican nomination as the candidate of that party for reelection. Dated at the executive mansion on the 8th, it appeared in the newspapers on the 10th. Mr. McKinley leads off with congratulations of his party upon the victory it won for the gold standard in 1896; and, while deploring the fact that its antagonist reopens the financial question, he accepts the issue and invites "the sound money forces to join in winning another," and, as he hopes, "a permanent triumph for a sound financial system which will continue inviolable the public faith." Following this at length with quotations from all the opposing platforms, for the purpose of showing that in the event of Mr. Bryan's election a victory for the coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 of gold will have been won, he proceeds briefly to discuss protection and reciprocity, prosperity, trade balances, pensions, loans to Europe, the Boer war, ship subsidies, the Isthmian canal, trusts, civil service reform, the Cuban situation and the Puerto Rican

question, after which he takes up the Philippine question and devotes to it considerably more than half his letter. Here he gives in great detail so much of the history of the Philippine acquisition as he considers pertinent, from which he infers that there has been no time since the destruction of the Spanish fleet in Manila bay when we could or should have left the Philippine archipelago. To the criticism that there would have been no fighting in the Philippines "if congress had declared its purpose to give independence to the Tagal insurgents" he replies that—

the insurgents did not wait for the action of congress. They assumed the offensive, they opened fire on our army. Those who assert our responsibility for the beginning of the conflict have forgotten that before the treaty was ratified in the senate and while it was being debated in that body, and while the Bacon resolution was under discussion, on February 4, 1899, the insurgents attacked the American army, after being previously advised that the American forces were under orders not to fire upon them except in defense.

He also refers to papers since found in the Filipino archives as showing that "this attack had been planned for weeks," and concludes that—

their unprovoked assault upon our soldiers at a time when the senate was deliberating upon the treaty shows that no action on our part except surrender and abandonment would have prevented the fighting, and leaves no doubt in any fair mind of where the responsibility rests for the shedding of American blood.

The letter ends with a brief reference to the Chinese affair, preceded by an argument against the Philippine policy announced by Mr. Bryan in his Indianapolis acceptance speech, and in support of a continuance of the present policy.

Next in importance probably to Mr. McKinley's letter of acceptance is the state election in Maine. This event is of general interest, because the September elections in Maine, in presidential years, are regarded by politicians as indicative of the results to be expected throughout the country in November; not according to the way Maine goes, for the state always goes republican, but according to the size of the majority. When the campaign closed, on the 8th, the chairman of the republican state committee, J. H. Manley, issued a signed statement, in which, as published by

the Chicago Tribune, he predicted that—

the republicans will carry Maine on Monday next by a majority greater than they ever did in years since the party came into existence in 1856. The republicans will poll their full strength, and the vote will show no falling off on their part. The democratic vote will increase somewhat over the vote four years ago, when the party was paralyzed in this state, but it will not reach the average democratic vote for the last quarter of a century.

This prediction failed of verification. Though the full vote is not yet reported, it is evident that the democrats made large gains, while the republicans have suffered loss. The republican loss, as compared with the election of 1896, is estimated, upon the basis of the vote reported, at 11 per cent., and the democratic gain at 18.

Complete returns from the Vermont state election, held on the 4th and reported last week at page 345, are now available. They give the republican candidate for governor a plurality of 31,468, and a majority of 30,192. Following is a comparison of the vote with that of the three preceding gubernatorial elections:

Year.	Rep.	Dem.	Republican Plurality.
1900	48,466	16,998	31,468
1898	38,555	14,686	23,869
1896	53,246	14,855	38,391
1894	42,663	14,142	22,521

Thus the increase of the democratic vote as compared with that of the corresponding election four years ago is over 14 per cent., while the republican loss is nearly nine per cent.

Other political items relate to state conventions. Gov. Lind has been nominated by the democratic and the people's parties of Minnesota for reelection. The democratic, the silver republican and the people's party conventions of Colorado have made a fusion ticket. In New York the democratic convention met at New York city on the 11th, and on the 12th it nominated John B. Stanchfield for governor. This was a victory for Croker over Hill. The latter had pressed the nomination of Bird S. Coler, who got 154 votes to 294 for Stanchfield. The platform denounces trusts, and in the denunciation it includes specifically the Platt-republican ice trust of New York city, in which Tammany-democratic office holders became partners and were exposed by the New York Journal early in the summer.

Turning now from American politics to the news from China, it should be explained at the beginning, with reference to the Russian note abstracted in our last issue at page 344, that the publication by Russia of the full text of the note shows that Russia's proposal was to withdraw her minister and troops, not from China, as reported last week, but from Peking. Since then Russia has received replies from all the interested powers, other than the United States, whose reply was reported last week. France accepts the proposal without modification. This makes three nations that are willing to evacuate Peking immediately—France, Russia and the United States. The other five—Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan and Austria—indicate their intention of remaining. Great Britain declares her purpose of doing so as long as may be necessary properly to protect British interests.

On the part of the old government of China there is manifest an earnest disposition to reestablish its sovereignty. To this end it has issued an imperial edict, dated August 24, which Li Hung Chang forwarded September 7 to the Chinese minister at Petersburg, who transmitted it through the various Chinese ministers to the powers on the 9th. It is as follows:

Li Hung Chang, envoy plenipotentiary, is hereby vested with full discretionary powers, and he shall promptly deal with whatever questions may require attention. From this distance we will not control his actions.

The purpose of Chang's appointment as envoy had already been disclosed by the following edict of August 19:

The Iho-chuan outlaws (Boxers) in their hatred of foreigners and Christians have attacked them at Taku and Tientsin. The allied forces have therefore taken Tientsin and Taku, and on the morning of August 15 attacked the imperial capital from the east and the Tung-chi and Chao-yang gates of the city were blown up by the Japanese. We therefore prepared the departure of the empress dowager for the west. We have repeatedly telegraphed to the foreign powers, remonstrating against the invasion of our kingdom. They have replied that they fight only against the Iho-chuan (Boxers) and their leaders are not in conflict with our government, showing that they are not unwilling to make peace. But, as all the ministers are safe in Peking, we hereby com-

mand Yang Lu Hsu Lung and Ching Yu to stay in Peking and arrange terms of peace. We also command Li Hung Chang, viceroy of Chi-li, who is our faithful and trusted officer and has the confidence of foreigners, to devise measures to bring about negotiations and telegraph to the secretaries of state of the various countries or consult the consuls general at Shanghai. We trust that Li Hung Chang will forward the cause of peace, thereby earning our thanks.

Notwithstanding these edicts, the powers distrust Chang's authority to negotiate peace on behalf of the empire. The views of the American government on that point were officially given on the 11th by the acting secretary of state, Mr. Hill, who in acknowledgment of the delivery by the Chinese minister at Washington of the notification of Chang's appointment returned this note:

The United States does not feel called upon to express any opinion at this time as to the sufficiency of Li Hung Chang's authority, but hopes it will transpire that his credentials are full and authoritative not only for negotiation, but to enable him without further delay to give assurance that the life and property of Americans will henceforth be respected throughout the Chinese empire.

The situation in South Africa is not substantially altered, although President Kruger is reported to have left the Transvaal and gone to Lorenzo Marques, and British dispatches again announce the war as in its last stages. The Boer force reported last week as holding the pass to Lydenburg has withdrawn farther north and east, and the British occupied Lydenburg on the 6th. Most of the stores of the retreating Boers were carried farther into the mountains to Krugerspost. But a stand was made at Spitzkop, east of Lydenburg, which the British captured after a sharp engagement on the 8th. The Boers retreated. Another force of Boers is still operating southwest of Pretoria. These two forces are evidently the same as those mentioned at page 313—Dewet's in the southwest and Botha's in the northeast. The report of Kruger's arrival at Lorenzo Marques, which is in Portuguese territory, came on the 13th by way of London. He is said to have been accompanied by part of his official staff and to have the Transvaal archives with him. The same dispatch, however, explains that he is on his way to Europe, upon a six

months' leave of absence, and that Shalk-Burger is to be acting president of the republic meanwhile.

From the Philippines there come through American sources no reports this week of fighting, except an official account of the engagement in Bohol, which was mentioned last week. Gen. MacArthur says that 1 American was killed and six wounded, and that a force of 120 Filipino bolomen were nearly annihilated, over 100 being killed. He adds that an American movement into the interior of the island is now in progress. From Filipino sources, however—through a letter from Agoncillo, the Philippine envoy, now in Paris—there comes a statement that—

The Philippines are not conquered as yet. The Americans capture a town to-day, and if they leave it its recapture becomes necessary within a week. Aginaldo is as safe in his palace on the Island of Luzon as McKinley is in the white house.

A new epoch in polar exploration has been made by the Duke d' Abruzzi, a nephew of the late King Humbert of Italy, who is better known in Rome as Prince Louis of Italy. He sailed for the arctic regions June 12, 1899, on the "Stella Polare," and was first heard from, on his return, at Tromsø, Norway, September 6 of the present year. His party suffered severely, being driven to the extremity of killing their sledge dogs for food; and by the pressure of ice packs their vessel was badly damaged. But they got nearer to the north pole by 20 miles than any previous expedition. The nearest approach to the pole ever made before was by Nansen, who returned in 1896, after having left his vessel, the "Fram," at a point in 84 degrees, and traversed the sea to 86 degrees and 14 minutes—within 261 miles of the pole. The Duke d' Abruzzi navigated his vessel to 86 degrees and 33 minutes—within 241 miles of the pole.

The ordinary news of the time is varied this week by reports of a storm which for destructiveness to human life is more terrible than any other natural catastrophe in the history of the country. It reduced the city of Galveston to ruins, and killed thousands of the inhabitants. A hurricane struck the city about noon on the 8th, producing a flood which is described as having turned the city into a raging sea. At the same time

the wind, which had reached a velocity of 84 miles an hour when the measuring instrument blew away, played havoc with the stanchest buildings. The storm came from opposite directions—a fierce wind from the north blowing the waters of the bay into the streets where they met an enormously high tide blown up by a raging storm from the gulf. The waters of the bay and those of the gulf met about mid-afternoon, and flooding the lighting plants, left the city in darkness throughout the hours of the night during which the storm continued. The flood rose steadily until after midnight. The highest parts of the city were from four to five feet under water. Most of the streets were submerged to a depth of ten feet. When the waters had subsided hardly a habitable dry house was left, and dead bodies were found everywhere. The mayor announces his belief that 5,000 lives were lost. Later estimates put it as high as 8,000. On the 11th 2,300 bodies had been located and buried. Some of the dead had been drowned and others had been killed by crashing buildings. Ocean steamers had been torn from their moorings in the bay and stranded. At least 15,000 persons are believed to be homeless, and not less than 5,000 destitute. There is extreme suffering from lack of food, though the entire stock of food owned by local merchants has been "commandeered" by the committee of public safety. The suffering for want of drinking water is more severe, for the waterworks are ruined and the tank cisterns are either blown away or filled with sea water. The situation is growing worse hourly. Frenzied by their sufferings, scores have died, and many have gone insane. With all the rest, robbers have looted houses and mutilated bodies for plunder, for which 90 or more have been shot; and dead bodies in process of decomposition are necessarily buried in trenches or burned without identification. The probabilities are that the site of Galveston will not be occupied by a city again. An appeal for relief has been telegraphed over the country, and favorable responses are coming in. The federal government has forwarded 50,000 rations and 1,000 tents.

A catastrophe of another kind has been precipitated by the arrogant refusal of the great coal magnates of the anthracite regions of Pennsyl-

vania to confer amicably with their organized employes upon questions of wages and grievances. About the middle of August last the anthracite mine workers's convention, in session at Hazleton, adopted a series of resolutions in which, after setting forth the bad condition of the miners in the anthracite regions, and declaring their deprecation of strikes except as a last resort and their desire to settle differences by arbitration and amicable discussion in joint conferences of men and employers, they respectfully invited the anthracite coal operators to meet with them in joint conference. This invitation was supplemented with assurances to the operators and the public at large that the miners would, when in such conference, gladly withdraw from any position which they might have taken as soon as it had been demonstrated that the position was wrong. To make the invitation definite, the resolutions fixed August 27 as the date and Hazleton as the place for the meeting. At the time and place appointed the miners were represented, but no operators nor any representative from them appeared. They had ignored the amicable overture. Consequently the miners formulated demands and passed a resolution asking the general organization—the United Mine Workers of America—to authorize a strike unless the demands were complied with within ten days. Since then efforts have been made by the general officers to bring about an agreement, and in the hope that a friendly adjustment might possibly be effected, authority to strike has been delayed. But the operators refused to give any attention to the matter. They would not go so far in recognition of the organization of their employes as to confer with its representatives. So at last, on the 12th, the strike was formally authorized by the general officers. It is to begin without further notice on the 17th.

John Mitchell, the president, and W. B. Wilson, the secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America, sign the strike call. It recites the meeting of August 27 at Hazleton and the application there made for leave to strike. It then explains the delay in granting leave by describing promising possibilities of settlement, which, however, proved to be misleading, and concludes by instructing—

all the miners and mine workers of the anthracite coal region, whether members of the United Mine Workers or not to cease work on and after Monday, September 17, 1900, and remain away from the various collieries, strippings and breakers until the demands of the Hazleton convention have been acceded to by the coal companies.

The following admonition to the men accompanies the strike call:

Be law-abiding, self-respecting and quiet; do not allow any person, whose interest it may be, to provoke you into quarrels and violations of the peace. That is one of the most common methods used by large employers to destroy the public sympathy and defeat our cause.

The grievances that form the basis of this strike, which threatens to be one of gigantic proportions, need explanation. At the head of the list is a demand for the abolition of the company store system. This is the familiar system whereby employers compel their men to spend their wages at stores owned by the employers where the prices are excessive. Next comes a demand for the reduction of powder to \$1.50 a keg. Workmen are furnished their blasting powder by the employers, who deduct the price from the workmen's wages—a custom which affords further opportunities for robbing the men. Third in order comes a demand for "the abolition of the company's dictation as to who shall be our doctors." The men are regularly assessed for the salaries of mine doctors, but are not allowed to select the doctor thus paid for. Some of the other demands are either obvious or too technical to admit of brief explanation. They call for the abolition of the "sliding scale" in use in the Lehigh and Schuylkill regions, for the substitution of a 2,240-pound ton for the 3,360-pound ton, and for a rule that "no miner shall have at any time more than one breast, gang or other class of work, and shall only get his legal share of cars." There is also a demand that the employers comply with the state law requiring fortnightly pay days instead of paying monthly, and that wages be paid in cash instead of store orders. Then there is the demand for an increase of wages. It calls for a 20 per cent. increase on wages of less than \$1.50 a day, 15 per cent. on wages not less than \$1.50 nor more than \$1.75, and 10 per cent. on all wages now in excess of \$1.75.

NEWS NOTES.

—The annual convention of the International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen met at Peoria on the 10th.

—British capitalists are reported to have acquired options on more than 1,000,000 acres of oil fields in north-eastern Wyoming.

—The National Association of Letter Carriers, in session at Detroit on the 7th, elected John N. Parsons, of New York, as its president.

—Brig. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, in command until the 10th of the department of the lakes, was then relieved by Brig. Gen. James F. Wade, and placed upon the retired list.

—President McKinley having appointed ex-Presidents Harrison and Cleveland as members of the permanent board of international arbitration provided for by the treaty of The Hague, Mr. Harrison has accepted but Mr. Cleveland declines.

—Rev. Dr. Frank Gunsaulus has resigned as president of the Armour Institute of Technology at Chicago for the purpose of devoting himself wholly to the Central church, an institutional church in the heart of the business district, which is to be open day and night to compete with the theaters for the patronage of people of all classes, ages and conditions.

—In Cleveland on the 31st the "Northern Ohio Democratic Club of Women" was formed. Its motto is "Save the Republic." It has a membership of 83 and its officers are Louisa A. Southworth, president; Sara von Ehrenberg, vice president; Lucinda B. Chandler, secretary, and Orpha O. Jones, treasurer. The club is enrolled in the membership of the National Association of Democratic Clubs.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for August shows on hand August 31—

Reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash balance..	135,419,696.09

Total	\$285,419,696.09
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30,	
1900.....	305,705,654.78

Decrease	\$20,285,958.69
----------------	-----------------

—Members of the Henry George association, of Chicago, have formed a "Henry George Bryan and Stevenson Campaign club," with Edward Os-good Brown as president, Thomas G. McElligott as vice president, Theodore J. Amberg as treasurer, Charles A. Butler as secretary and Frederick H. Monroe as chairman of the executive committee. Similar clubs are forming elsewhere. The movement began in New York with the organization of the "Single Tax Bryan and

Stevenson Campaign committee," of which Henry George, Jr., is chairman.

—An expedition of four Americans, six Mexicans and two Yaqui Indians which set out in June to explore the island of Tortugas, in the Gulf of California, is reported to have been attacked by savages and all its members to have been killed but three—an American and two Mexicans. This island has had the reputation for 200 years of being the home of a fierce cannibal race. More than a dozen expeditions for its exploration have been destroyed by savages.

MISCELLANY

A PRAYER OF THE HILL-COUNTRY.
"And the strength of the hills is His also."

Lift me, O Lord, above the level plain,
Beyond the cities where life throbs and thrills,
And in the cool airs let my spirit gain
The stable strength and courage of thy hills.

They are thy secret dwelling places, Lord!
Like thy majestic prophets, old and hoar,
They stand assembled in divine accord,
Thy sign of established power forevermore.

Here peace finds refuge from ignoble wars,
And faith, triumphant, builds in snow and rime,
Near the broad highways of the greater stars,
Above the tide-line of the seas of time.

Lead me yet farther, Lord, to peaks more clear,
Until the clouds like shining meadows lie,
Where through the deeps of silence I may hear

The thunder of thy legions marching by.
—Meredith Nicholson, in the Century.

"BRYANISM."

An extract from the address of William Lloyd Garrison before the Manhattan Single Tax club, at its meeting held in New York, September 3, to celebrate the birthday of Henry George, as reported in the Springfield Republican of September 4.

Liberty ever manifests itself as a foe to society. And truly it is to a society founded on oppression. Its manifestations are not always wise, its methods are often open to question, for how can oppressed peoples and classes be expected to possess high intelligence and wisdom? They know surely that they are wronged, and if they strike blindly at justice the blame rests upon the wrong-doer. There are enough crudities in every insurrection of thought and action against tyranny to afford tyrants plausible excuses for denouncing the dangerous tendencies manifested. What more effective method than to brand the new manifestation by a sweeping and inclusive name? Now "Bryanism" is the bogey word expected to frighten Americans into acquiescence of the subversion of popu-

lar government. It is represented as a cover for all the dangerous elements of the republic and the enemies of society. Instead, it is the refuge of those who would save republican institutions and of the enemies of plutocracy. It is a warning to the men who have legalized robbery in the name of protection, and given murder an imperial title.

And Bryanism is the expression of discontent. It reveals the pain of the body politic. Hopeful and cheering sign, for without the warning of pain disease means death. The soothsayers assure the masses that they are in the enjoyment of unexampled prosperity and that the "full dinner pail" is the benevolent gift of William McKinley. Bryanism denies that an increase of national wealth which is chiefly gathered by the speculators and trusts is prosperity for the people. Congestion is the sure sign of ill-health. Syndicates increase dividends while they close mills and discharge workers to maintain prices by reduced production. Bryanism refuses to credit the lord of the white house with the bounteous harvests that are due the Lord of the universe and which white house lords divert from hungry mouths to plethoric coffers. Bryanism is the notification of the suffering and ill-paid that patience is well-nigh exhausted. The legitimate parent, McKinleyism, trembles at the threat of its offspring which naturally holds no filial feeling.

INTIMIDATION AS AN ISSUE.

For The Public.

The Public for August 25 (page 306) reports the case of a lawyer who was warned not to use his influence in support of the democratic party. In his reply the lawyer, Mr. Edward M. Shepard, says:

These threats come measurably near to raising another issue not to be evaded.

For years the American mechanic has been practically disfranchised—or what is worse—he has been induced to vote contrary to his convictions through fear of losing his place in the shop. Very little has been said about it, however, and no one has seemed to think that this kind of persecution raises an issue "not to be evaded." What constitutes an issue, anyway? And if the mechanic can be intimidated, how long will it be before the farmer and professional man will be also? These are questions in which we should all be interested, for wrongs done to one class of people will eventually extend to all others. Thomas Jefferson said:

Persecution makes hypocrites, not converts.

The hypocrisy which must be the

product of each presidential campaign, with its system of republican persecution, is not a pleasant thing to contemplate, and should, it seems, afford the basis of a most important political issue.

It seems strange that so little has been said upon such an important subject. Who ever heard of a clergyman preaching against the "subjugation" of employes by employers? With few exceptions the statesman, the editor and the poet have been equally silent concerning this phase of growing imperialism. No one seemed to care, or to fear its ultimate results. It was only when the same class of people of which I complain (the plutocrats) began to extend their system of subjugation upon people living upon the opposite side of the globe that the voice and pen of the statesman, the editor and the poet were lifted in protest, in argument and words of warning, vying with each other in eloquence such as is developed only in time of a nation's peril.

Much has been said by "our friends the enemy" about "Providence" and "Destiny" in connection with Mr. McKinley's war with the Philippine islands. But it is quite possible that Providence or Destiny is leading us in a very different direction than that proposed by the plutocrats, or from what appears upon the surface at present. For if the Philippine war results in arousing the American people to a sense of the republic's danger, it must logically lead to such a reformation of our industrial system as will enable each ballot cast to represent the wish of the voter. And if this is to be the indirect result of the Philippine war, then the blood of our fellow countrymen, the Filipinos, will not have been shed in vain, for a gain for liberty's cause is a gain for the world of humanity, in which they also will share.

I have spoken of the Filipinos as "our fellow countrymen" not because our government has bought or stolen them, but that I would paraphrase the words of the great Charles Sumner in some such way as this: Where the love of liberty is, there are our fellow countrymen. And those of them who have "fought and bled in Freedom's cause" have fought for a cause for which we are now contending in a different way. And it may be that "Destiny" has decreed that the America of the future will honor them as those whose blood is the blood of martyrs, which in all ages has been the seed of the church of liberty.

MECHANIC.

HENRY GEORGE.

A poem read at the recent celebration of Henry George's birthday, at Des Moines, Iowa.

Though he went from our midst too soon,
Though the task of his fervid noon,
His message with world-wide boon,
Too suddenly fell from his fingers,
He had wrought it in heedful haste
As though life had no time to waste,
With no tool at his hand misplaced,
Nor a stroke that haltingly lingers.

It stands a symmetrical whole
That sophistry cannot annul,
Nor precedent—curse of the dull—
Forever resist its appealing;
And many who scoffed at his scheme
As a theorist's idle dream,
At the touch of his sunrise gleam
Feel the eyes of their faith unsealing.

For those who have followed his trend,
Have been to him brother and friend,
Who faithfully met at the end
The trust he had left to their keeping.
Not on one may his mantle fall,
But solemnly consecrate all,
As watchman at midnight they call
To a land still sodden and sleeping.

Though they stand not first in the fray
Now blinding and blotting our day,
Their rear guard alert on its way
The plibroch of justice is sounding.
With the sword of the spirit they fight,
With the fervor of inborn might
Stand fast for a God-given right,
The land-tyrant's network confounding.

The voice of the leader is still,
But his bountiful word and will
Through speech of his followers thrill
With the life of a grand ambition.
So the sound of his name shall stand
For a blessing, in every land,
And the gracious work of his hand
Clasp the world in final fruition.

D. H. INGHAM.

THAT FULL DINNER PAIL.

The closing portion of an address delivered by R. T. Snediker at the celebration of the birthday of Henry George, held in Kansas City, Mo., September 3.

Look! In this great producing land of ours hundreds of thousands of workmen receive but nine dollars per week. Mark you well, \$36 per month, if they work every day. Is that high wages?

God save the mark! Is that a just distribution of wealth? If so, we have no right to complain. It is the law. Yea, the law of nature, the law of God! Thirty-six dollars per month for the free American workman, from which he is to support himself and those dependent upon him. Thirty-six dollars per month sounds big to those who roll it under their tongues and prate of high wages!

Let us examine it; let us take it apart, for nothing is greater than the sum of its parts. Let us itemize that \$36, I say, so we may see the justice enjoyed by our own free citizens.

The first item of expense to our workman is housing, to protect his loved ones from the storms. And

nine dollars per month in the cities does not secure very superb appointments. Environments are not the best at nine dollars per month. Then three dollars per month is not high for fuel to keep them warm; no coal will be carelessly burned with three dollars per month.

Three dollars per month for car fare is what the Metropolitan exacts. With this the good wife may go to town once each week and the children can walk.

Have I been extravagant? If so, I shall proceed to economize.

Thirty dollars for clothing per year for the man—too much, did I hear you say? But that only allows him one \$12 suit of clothes, two pairs of shoes and half soles. Four pair of overalls, half a dozen shirts, one hat, six collars, one necktie, some cotton underclothing and socks in cold weather.

Is that too expensive for a producer of wealth, who must put in 13 long hours in order to get in ten of hard work?

And the good wife, is she entitled to any clothing? Is \$20 per year too high? Are there any objections to her having one dress, a couple pair of shoes, one hat and a few undergarments?

Here we find the little ones; three or four strong of limb, bright faces, bright eyes. The workman and his wife love their children like all human kind. Shall we put clothing on them? How much? Twenty-five dollars, you say? Twenty-five dollars a year to clothe three or four children is not extravagant—do you think so? Twenty-five dollars be it. Seventy-five dollars per year to clothe a free American workman and his loved ones! Let us call it \$72, or six dollars per month. That is right, for I see the rich man nod. How it pleases the rich to see what comforts—luxuries—the honest workingman enjoys during these progressive times.

But, here, we find we have money left; money—some \$15 a month. What shall we do with it? Why, the family must eat, of course. Should not the man who makes wealth have something to eat? How much, ye gods, how much? They say \$15 worth is a just distribution in these prosperous times. Yea, \$15 per month!

From this large sum the horny-handed son of toil must furnish the carbon, the energy that makes it possible for us to live. He must furnish the good wife with wholesome sustenance; he must furnish nutritious food to make those boys and girls

strong, healthful, honest and virtuous men and women. From what must all this come? From the \$15 per month. Ah! I understand, \$15 for every 30 days!

Mr. Liveryman, stand up! "How much do you charge per month for keeping mules and asses?"

"Fifteen dollars."

"Fifteen dollars, did I hear you say?"

"Yes, \$15 per month for keeping one ass."

Fifteen dollars per month is a most generous amount from which to nourish a workingman's family, build a home and provide for old age! Fifteen dollars—50 cents per day—to keep a workingman's family, or—an ass!

ARE WE APPROACHING THE ROMAN CATASTROPHE?

Take the little summer and winter villa city of Lakewood, in New Jersey, lying between New York and Philadelphia. I talked with a journeyman paperhanger and painter last night, who told me that he had been down there during the last fortnight on some very important work. He had charge of five men, who were 1½ days in fastening a piece of canvas on a ceiling in a house there. The house belongs to Mr. George J. Gould, of New York, and the canvas was covered with a costly painting, which had been measured to extreme exactness and had to be attached to the ceiling with white lead.

It seemed to me to be a most expensive matter to have six men work 1½ days in merely hanging a picture, and curiosity led to question after question, drawing out this story, which I relate as closely as I can recall the paperhanger's words:

"In the course of work for one of the large decorating houses in New York I have seen and worked on mansions that certainly will vie with the most famous palaces of Europe for quality of construction, ornamentation and furnishings. Indeed, I thought I had become familiar with all the present ideas of interior furnishings and magnificence, but a surprise was in store when I was sent in charge of several men to Lakewood. We were to hang a picture in the house of Mr. George Gould—a house to which its owner had given the name of 'Georgian Court.'

"We found 'Georgian Court' in a tract of pines, the pathway to the entrance winding about the trunks of fine old trees. About the building proper were polo and tennis grounds,

a skating rink and probably other places laid off for pleasure and recreation. The building itself, if I formed an adequate idea, would perhaps cover the space of two ordinary city squares. You perhaps have heard that this house contains a private theater, replete with the fittings of the largest public theaters; and that it has a gymnasium and swimming pool. Perhaps a most fitting idea of its size may be obtained from the fact that it has 36 separate sleeping suites, and that 80 more are shortly to be added.

"Mr. and Mrs. Gould were away, and the house was supposed to be closed. Nevertheless, an army of servants, high and low, were in the mansion and about the grounds. The whole interior seemed to be enveloped in upholsterers' coverings for protection against light and dust—pictures, walls, statuary, brasses, bronzes and glasses—the very woodwork, as well as the furniture and floor. Little of the real magnificence shone forth. But when some of the coverings were removed, then it seemed as if nothing but the treasures of an oriental monarch of the 'Arabian Nights' tales could possibly pay for them.

"What more impressed me in that house than all else was the woodwork. I believe I have seen much very fine woodwork in interior fittings, and paint that rivaled ebony and ivory. But I never before beheld such gilding of wood. A spacious passageway is there called, if I remember correctly, 'the Golden Corridor.' It is one blaze of gold. I should say that \$500 worth of heavy gold leaf must have been laid on one door alone.

"I stood gazing in amazement at this exhibition of magnificence, and was beginning scarcely to believe my senses, when I was shown the same gilding in various places and was told that it ran throughout the main part of the house. It seemed to me to denote a fortune behind it all of a proportion to exceed the dream of avarice. I was endeavoring to conceive some measure of this, when suddenly some one entered the apartment where we of the working craft were gathered, and said that the proprietor of the mansion had come to the house, and was coming to that apartment, so that we must instantly withdraw. Off we packed without ceremony, until the proprietor had made his progress through that part of the mansion. When he was gone we were told to return to work."

This little story, told me by my paperhanger friend, started a long line of thought after I parted from him

and was left to quiet reflections. I thought of times in Italy 1,800 years ago so much like our own—of the villas of the wealthy, which, if the indications we have are reliable, were puny and cheap as measured by the scale of the wealthy of our time. And then, when I recalled that the Gould fortune is based chiefly upon two forms of privilege—railroads and telegraphs—the parallel grew the more striking.

Another thing. While a vast system of chattel slavery existed in the Roman world, what was the status of the common citizens? To a very large extent it was that of dependents. They were free only in name. The emperor and nobles supplied "bread and the circus," and with them bought the suffrage of the Roman citizens whenever they deigned to take the trouble of going through the form of observing the old usages of the republic which were supposed yet to exist.

Coming to our own day one is led to wonder how soon a similar state of dependence on the part of many of our citizens may come, when the official record shows the masses of the population compelled to live in such circumstances that 700 babies died in the city of Brooklyn alone during last week.—Henry George, Jr., in Philadelphia North American of July 23.

"THOU SHALT NOT STEAL."

A greater portion of the speech delivered by William Jennings Bryan in Kent theater at the University of Chicago, in the afternoon of September 10, as reported in the Chicago American.

I like to talk to students, because students have ideas. I like to talk to students because they build their lives upon great fundamental principles. When a man gets old and absorbed in business and is tempted to make money by illegitimate means he may forget the commandment "Thou shalt not steal," but the student does not. When a man wants to steal on a large scale he may be willing to make an amendment so as to make it read: "Thou shalt not steal on a small scale," but the student does not so amend it.

The student bases his life upon an ideal. And I want to set before the student an ideal that I believe to be an American ideal. If I can succeed in placing before one student a high ideal of American life, that student goes out equipped with his college education to battle for that ideal, and he will make my work easier. It will make it necessary for me to make fewer speeches, if I can have more

going out and fighting the same battle.

I want to take as a text this afternoon the commandment: "Thou shalt not steal." I need not tell you that you must not go out on the highway and steal, for your own caution will tell you that that is not safe. I want to tell you that you can no more afford to steal when stealing is respectable than you can when it is dishonorable. You can no more afford to steal indirectly than you can afford to steal directly. You can no more afford to steal through legislation than you can in spite of legislation.

The moral character of an act is not determined by the number of people engaged in it; the moral character of an act is not determined by the method by which it is done. The moral character of an act is found in the intention of one man to take what belongs to another man. Whether he takes it on the highway or from the house, whether he takes it in the day time or in the night time, whether he takes it in violation of human laws or under the guise of legislation, it makes no difference. If I can leave upon the mind of every student here to-day that ideal I will not have talked in vain. And as I have studied the public question, I have become amazed at the amount of stealing that is done indirectly, and I state it as my solemn conviction that the amount of stealing done by law is infinitely greater in this country than all the stealing done in violation of the law; that the stealing done by those who are not in the penitentiary is infinitely greater than the stealing done by those who are in the penitentiary.

You take the subject of taxation. Is there any just rule for the collecting of taxes? I believe there is. What is the rule? That every citizen should contribute to the support of his government in exact proportion to the benefits he receives from his government. No man should be unwilling to contribute his just share to the expenses of the government. And no man should be willing to contribute more than his just share. And we ought to exercise ourselves to find out what that share is, and to collect that share, as nearly as human wisdom can enable us to do it.

Suppose a man who ought to pay ten dollars to the support of his government only pays five dollars; suppose another man who ought to pay only five dollars pays ten dollars. What is the result of the system which creates this inequality? The

result is simply this: That the government takes five dollars from the man who pays ten dollars when he ought only to pay five dollars, and gives that five dollars to the man who only pays five dollars when he ought to pay ten dollars. That is the result; no one can dispute it. And yet you go through society and see whether these taxes are levied in proportion to the benefits which each man enjoys. I am not to-day going to discuss particular systems of taxation or particular systems of money or particular systems of anything else; only to deal with certain general principles, and I want to leave you to apply those principles. I want you to take up the systems of taxation and ask yourself whether these systems bear equitably upon the people.

A tax upon consumption is a tax upon what men want, not upon what they have. And men's wants are more nearly equal than their possessions. You tax men upon what they need, rather than upon what they possess, and you make the poor man pay more than his share and the rich man less. You ask me what difference that makes to me, provided I am not the one who is overburdened.

I tell you that no citizen can afford to support a bad law because he gets the benefit of it. And if he gets the benefit of it to-day, who knows now but his children may be robbed tomorrow through the same law, by the children of those whom he robs to-day? You cannot tell, and if there were no moral question involved, merely as a question of expediency, no man can afford to support an unjust law of any kind for a temporary advantage he may get out of it.

I want to ask you whether you have considered the various forms of taxation, whether you believe it is wise to collect your taxes all or in large part from consumption? At the time the Spanish war broke out, we collected almost our entire federal revenue from taxes on consumption. We lay a tax on sugar, for instance: Do men use sugar in proportion to their incomes? No. The widow who sews to make enough money to support her family may contribute more to the government through that tax than the millionaire with a small family. Is it just? No. Why is it permitted? Because the men who escape taxation make the laws. That is the reason it is permitted.

People discuss various systems of finance and quarrel over what kind of a dollar we should have. Is there

any rule to govern us in the selection of our dollar? Is there any great principle which will enable us to measure the relative justice of the standards? I say there is, and that rule is this: That that dollar is the best dollar, no matter on what it is based, no matter who supports it—that dollar is the best dollar which more nearly preserves its average purchasing power from generation to generation.

I believe that is a principle that can be applied to the money question. People talk about honest money. Now what would be an honest dollar? It would be a dollar which would buy, from year to year, as nearly as possible, absolutely the same amount of other things. I do not mean that the price of a particular thing would not change; I mean that the average of all things will not change, if you had an absolutely honest dollar. But the trouble is to find such a dollar.

A dollar is the work of human hands. It is the work of human wisdom. And human hands never make perfect things; human wisdom never devises a perfect thing. But we must be contented to take that which makes the nearest possible approach to perfection, and keep it until we can get something that makes a nearer approach than that.

You condemn a dollar which I like; it is not sufficient to say that that dollar is not honest; you have to show me that you have a dollar more nearly honest than that.

It is not sufficient to say that my system is not perfect. You must show me a system which more nearly approaches perfection than mine.

Now, how can you have a dollar absolutely honest? By having enough dollars to keep pace exactly with the demand for money. You say that is impossible. That is true; it has been impossible thus far, and I am not sanguine enough to believe that we shall ever have absolutely an honest dollar. But what provokes me is to hear men talking about their love of an honest dollar, when they are contending for a dollar which they know is not honest and never can be honest.

Whether a single standard or a double standard will give the closest approach to an honest dollar is a matter for discussion; but that we should accept that system which comes the nearest, on an average, is not a matter of discussion. No man who believes that the people are the source of power, and that governments spring from them and are administered for them, can defend any dol-

lar except upon the theory that it is the best attainable dollar, not for a few people, but for all the people.

Now, I believe that the double standard presents the best dollar. Why? Because with all the gold and silver I do not believe that the world will have too much standard money.

When people tell you that the discovery of gold in the Klondike relieves us of the necessity of using silver, just remind that person that since '96 India has been brought to the gold standard. I say brought—she did not come. She was brought. The Indian people did not ask for it. It was put upon them. And yet in India they have practically as many people as were using gold in all Europe four years ago. Would the increase in the production of gold in America, or anywhere else supply the amount of money needed for this new area and that covered by the people who must have the money?

When a man tells you that we are going to have money enough to furnish the people of India with gold, and the still greater population of China with gold, you ask him where he is going to get the gold. Where is it? It is not in the earth. We are exporting gold now. They say lending gold to Europe.

Europe would not borrow our gold if she had the gold there herself; and we would not lend our gold in Europe if business was not so dull in this country that you cannot find a place to invest the money in this country.

What man would send money abroad unless he could get more for it there than here? I can conceive of only one other reason that might influence a man to send money abroad. There are just two reasons which actuate the man—the looking out for his own business and his own welfare, and there is the unselfish love that he may have.

And if you say that we do not lend money to Europe because Europe will take our money and invest it at a better rate than we in the United States will, take the other: that the men who lend money abroad think more of the people over there than they do of the people here, and send it abroad as a mere matter of affection. There is no supply of gold sufficient to furnish a basis for the world's financial transactions.

During my very brief career in the army and in camp I learned that the mosquito question was the same in principle whether there was one mosquito or whether there were a million; but I learned that the mosquito question grew in importance with the number of mosquitoes. And so the trust

question grows in importance with the number of trusts.

You can stand one trust, you can stand a dozen trusts, but trusts may get so numerous that you cannot stand them.

Put one leech on the body of a man and let it draw all the blood it wants, and the man will still live; but cover the man with leeches from head to foot and let them all draw blood, and he will want to do something for the leech habit.

Now, the trust question must be discussed from the standpoint of the principle involved. Do not say there are good trusts and bad trusts. You might as well say that there are good kings and bad kings, and thus defend a monarchy.

I care not whether a king be good or bad, I hate a king.

I care not whether those who stand at the head of trusts be personally lovable or personally detestable. I hate the system of private monopoly, no matter where I find it.

And if you are going to fight a monopoly you have got to strike at the principle of monopoly. You cannot simply try to keep the bad ones from being worse than they might be. If you are going to stop monopoly you have got to strike at the root of it. You have got to take the stand that any monopoly is intolerable.

Why is our nation the greatest nation in the world? It is because there opens out before the American a greater hope than opens before any other people in the world. It is because the American has a stimulus such as no other citizen has. It is because here we have civil liberty and religious liberty. It is because here the humblest man may aspire to the highest reward in business and in politics; because our men are not born into any class or condition, but more easily than anywhere else in the world can they have what they earn and enjoy what they achieve. That is what makes this nation great.

"Thou shalt not steal" is a command that is directed as much against the trust that plunders by the national highway as against the insignificant robber who plunders by the wayside. "Thou shalt not steal" is a command that is as binding upon those who rob by making the people tributaries and collecting from them such tolls as they, the monopolists, please—that command comes to them as well as to those who are guilty of petty larceny.

But, my friends, there is another question which I want to refer to briefly; a question that has not been considered in this country until recently;

and that is, the size of our standing army. Until recently, people of all parties have rejoiced that in this land we do not need a large army. Until recently, people of all parties have pointed to the burdens borne by the toilers of the old world, and have congratulated our people that these burdens were not imposed here.

Why do we need a large army in this country? Let this nation be what it has been, let this government derive its just powers from the consent of the governed; let our government be servant and not master of the people, and then every citizen will die if need be to preserve that government. But base your government upon force, and you will have to have force present all the time.

Rule men by love and you do not need a large army. Rule them by fear and it will have to grow stronger and more powerful with the years.

Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the gods—that they admired them for their wisdom; feared them because of their power, and loved them for their justice.

What is to be this nation's position? Is this nation to be admired simply for the wisdom of its great men? Is it to be feared merely because of the greatness of its fleet and its army? Oh, young men, there is a higher ideal: Let this nation be loved because of its justice, and you will make it a force that the world cannot prevail against.

It may be that we have run our race; it may be that we have reached a turning point in our career. It may be that destiny—destiny that is never known until it is past—it may be that destiny has determined that this nation, like so many other nations in the past, is to prove again the old truth that the wages of sin is death.

It may be that it is destiny for this nation to show once more that when the dollar becomes greater than the man, the government must decline. It may be that the love of money has so taken possession of the American people that they are willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

That may be destiny. No one has authority to declare what destiny is. That may be destiny; but what is our duty? Lincoln says that it is our duty to do right, what we believe to be right, and then to risk the consequences, and find our consolation in the consciousness that we have done what we believed to be our duty.

It may be destiny for this nation to go down. It may be that we shall speak in vain against the adoption of the doc-

trine of force. It may be, but speaking for myself, if I were the only one to protest, I would a thousand times rather be overwhelmed by this destiny and let history say in ages to come that one man fought against it rather than submit to it—I would rather do that than go and accomplish this destiny, if it is destiny.

As I look at it, destiny is a thing which we accomplish for ourselves. It is not a matter of chance; it is a matter of choice. It is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved, and we can make this nation's destiny what we want it to be, if we are in the majority. The people of this nation can determine this nation's destiny.

A TRIBUTE OF CONFIDENCE.

These trustful and touching lines, written by an honest farmer who doesn't take a newspaper himself, but occasionally borrows one, were rejected by 67 of the most prominent republican papers in the country before their disappointed and discouraged author, in a fit of desperation, added the last three words and offered them to The Public.

Bryan can't deceive us with fine speeches; The man doesn't mean them at all.

Their're only intended to capture The votes of the suckers this fall.

Alas, for the truth-telling statesman,

A hard one to find, east or west; We will stick to brave William McKinley, His metal we've put to the test.

Annexation by force, we remember, 'Twas not to be thought of, said he.

By our morals, an act of aggression Nothing short of a crime, it would be.

Our plain duty to poor Puerto Rico, Who welcomed our army with joy, Was to give her free trade in our markets, Spain's ruinous work to destroy.

And we mind how he stood by those doctrines,

Those sentiments grand that he wrote; O, freemen, indeed 'tis an honor

To give such a hero our vote. And now when we have his assurance

That Columbia no empire shall be, But shall always remain, while she trusts him,

The glorious home of the free;

When he says that above our new islands Our flag but in blessing shall wave, That he'll give to their people good government

Or give them the peace of the grave; Away with all doubt and misgiving!

Boy orators vainly will warn; For we'll stand by brave William McKinley

And trust him again, sure's you're born— In a horn. J. HAWKINS.

Haskell Flats, N. Y.

BOOK NOTICES.

The National Single Taxer (New York: George P. Hampton, 62-64 Trinity place), edited by George P. Hampton and John J. Murphy, as the American organ of the single tax movement, offers an excellent number for September. It is a fine example of what the organ of a movement

should be. Among its principal articles is "National Ideals," by Prof. Dillard, of Tulane university, and one on the constitutionality of the single tax by Lawson Purdy. These leading special articles are supplemented with editorials, minor contributions, gossip of the movement, news of various kinds from different parts of the world having a more or less direct relation to the movement or the cause of which it is an expression, pertinent extracts and quotations from many sources, reviews of economic books, and so on, the whole publication revolving as it were around the central theme, yet avoiding monotony and keeping the reader's interest alive.

The most satisfactory account of the "Boxers" in China which has yet been laid before the American reading public appears in the Open Court (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co.) for September. The article is from the pen of Dr. Candlin, a Chinese missionary, who has long resided in China and is an authority on the Chinese language and literature.

"The Enslavement and Emancipation of the People" (Gibson City, Ill.: J. B. Herboldshimer), by J. B. Herboldshimer, is a plea for the establishment of the minimum price of a day's work as the standard or unit of value. It is an attractive little contribution to the discussion of social problems.

Ten Cents

To encourage the circulation and extend the influence of

THE PUBLIC

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

Ten Cents

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

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 16th:

REV. HERBERT S. BIGELOW,
 OF CINCINNATI.

Subject: "Imperialism and Land Monopoly."

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
 ATTORNEY AT LAW,
 Suite 618, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
 Telephone, Main 711.

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 908 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

NELLIE CARLIN.

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

Houston.

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

EDUCATIONAL.

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

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



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

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

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

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

Certain things are possibilities,—fire, accident, disease. Death is a certainty. He's a poor reasoner who provides against the uncertain and yet neglects to insure his life. It may be done at low cost. Consult

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

Read and Return

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

- Japanese Notions of European Political Economy 25c
- Our Farmers of the Revenue, by Wm. S Rann..... 25c
- Natural Taxation, by Shearman..... 30c
- Progress and Poverty, Henry George.. 30c

PRICES INCLUDE POSTAGE.
 ANY BOOK ON EARTH SUPPLIED.

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

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

Try those out of boxes

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

J. & B. MOOS,

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