

The Public

Complete

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1901.

Number 158.

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.

Sure enough, the new federal attorney general (Philander C. Knox) is an unknown statesman who has found favor with the plutocracy as a trust attorney. President McKinley does keep Mr. Hanna's "promises with great fidelity—and nerve."

When the Americans began their regime in Manila, they virtuously put a stop to the native amusement of cockfighting. Now they generously grant to the widow of a military officer (we quote from the Chicago Tribune of the 10th, an administration organ) "the exclusive cockpit privilege." Making virtuous pretenses and granting monopoly privileges come as easy to this administration, in all its ramifications, as—well, as easy, let us say, as patriotism.

When William J. Bryan visited Philadelphia last month, he was taken to the top of a tall building, says the Philadelphia North American, to give him a bird's eye view of the fraternal city. While surveying the house tops, his attention was directed to a whited structure toward the west, with the explanation that "there is the place where McKinley was nominated." For half a second Bryan looked in that direction, and then swinging around and leveling a finger at Independence hall, he remarked: "I would rather see the hall where the declaration of independence was signed, than the hall where it was repealed." Bryan's faculty of repartee never sleeps, and what is better its piercing shafts are always directed at those who would

throw away the liberties that America has thus far gained.

The New Jersey anti-trust decision appears to have put a serious obstruction in the way of so watering stock as to defraud stockholders and stock purchasers. It declares fraudulent such proportion of stock as is issued in excess of the actual value of the property for which it is paid. But the decision does not, and no court decision could, protect the general public against the effects of water represented by public franchises. So long as the law continues to make franchises private property, they will have a legitimate market value, furnishing a lawful basis of stock issues. But this market value is the measure of public plunder. It is the value of the privilege of picking pockets legally.

In a referendum vote of the public school teachers of Chicago, announced on the 9th, 2,286 favored a compulsory pension law for teachers, requiring the payment into the pension fund of one per cent. of salaries, and 2,248 opposed it. This slight majority in favor of the law is rightly accepted as insufficient to justify further pressure for its enactment. But it is not encouraging to find so large a number of teachers willing to support a statute which differs from highway robbery only in the fact that it is a statute.

An unpleasant half hour must that have been which Gen. Young, just returned from Manila, gave to the Autocrat of the Philippines when calling at the white house this week. Gen. Young afterwards told the newspaper correspondents what he had told Mr. McKinley. With significant emphasis, so the correspondents put it, he said it would be a blunder to cut down the army of occupation from

60,000. This is rather shocking news to follow the inglorious capture of Aguinaldo, which was so assuredly to end the war. Gen. Young explains that the Filipino leaders, Alejandro and Santos, "who are superior to Aguinaldo in intelligence and education," will never submit until they are captured; and that Alejandro, "the ablest of all the Filipino leaders," has a large following, which, though now scattered, could be quickly mobilized and made formidable as an instrument of opposition to the American autocracy. When the imperialists were tempted to throw the declaration of independence to the winds, and by treachery to an ally turn grateful friends into bitter enemies, they should have pondered Josh Billings's advice to an anxious inquirer contemplating a career of crime. The philosophical Josh replied: "Before you decide to become a scoundrel, examine yourself closely to see if you are not better adapted for a fool."

We trust that the inferior races will not judge all Americans by the standards of those whose letters of advice to the administration about Aguinaldo the administration has given out for publication. One man offers \$50,000 for Aguinaldo's custody for 100 nights, the prisoner to be required to lecture every night. Another offers \$250,000 for him as a curiosity for a show. Another proposes that the government exhibit him for 25 cents a head, so as to get back its war expenses. (That letter may be sarcastic.) Another proposes that he be sent to the Ohio penitentiary for life. Still another—evidently a republican Abou Ben Adhem—would have him speared to death by 12 cavalymen armed with lances, in the presence of thousands of people.

When the manner in which Aguinaldo was captured, and the glittering prize his ignoble captor received as a reward, are considered in connection with those letters (except the sarcastic one, if it is sarcastic), a serious question of comparative civilization arises, and one wonders whether all the virtues really are monopolized by the white man.

This wonder grows when we turn to the horrifying official report from China, partially divulged on the 6th by the state department, which tells, so reads the Washington news dispatch:

1. Of the Chinese married women who announce to their families that on a given day they will depart this life.
2. Of Chinese women who submit passively to death at the hands of their relatives as an honorable method of suicide.
3. Of Chinese girls who drown themselves in water hardly up to their waists to escape brutality at the hands of soldiers from European nations.
4. Of Chinese husbands who bid their wives kill themselves after suffering indignities.
5. Of Chinese towns where it is difficult to find a female between the ages of ten and 50.
6. Of Chinese families murdered—fathers, uncles, brothers and mothers—that the young women might fall into the hands of the European soldiers.

The official report charges the atrocities here hinted at to the French and the Russians, exonerating the British, the Germans and the Americans. This exoneration may be just; but what of it in the minds of the outraged Chinese? How can they be expected to distinguish the different bearers of the white man's burden? If "all Chinamen look alike to us," may not an American, virtuous and mild mannered butcher though he be, look like a barbarous Russian to them?

Not long ago local self-government was conferred upon San Francisco by the adoption of a charter of an unusually advanced type. San Francisco was to be allowed to work out her own municipal salvation, and

the state was to keep hands off. Nothing has yet happened to disappoint the expectations of the friends of this truly democratic charter. But the republican politicians have begun to tinker it. Gov. Gage, who was elected over that unwavering democratic democrat, James G. Maguire, has signed a bill to nullify the merit system of the municipal civil service which the charter established. This act of his is fitly characterized by the San Francisco Star when it says:

In signing the bill intended to destroy the civil service system in San Francisco, Gov. Gage has disgraced himself and his party. In this the Star not only speaks as an advocate of genuine civil service reform, but also as a champion of a far more important principle—that of local self-government. The charter was adopted by the people of this city, and was solemnly ratified by the legislature. In that charter are provisions for its amendment by the people of this city, by direct vote, on their own petition, in any manner that they may desire. Under such circumstances, it is an insult to the voters of the city for the governor and legislature to attempt to change one of the most important sections in the charter, either for better or worse. More than that, it is a denial of the right of the people of this city to manage their local affairs. Once the right to so interfere in the local government is established, all hope of decent city government, of municipal ownership, or of anything except high taxes and no return, will go glimmering. The people of San Francisco are competent to run the government of the city, and the politicians who think otherwise will find themselves beaten by the very trick intended to destroy their enemies.

Tom L. Johnson's entry into office as mayor of Cleveland was as meteoric as his election. During the incumbency of his predecessor, Mr. Farley, an arrangement had been made to turn over the lake front to a railroad corporation, and the ordinance for its consummation had passed the council. But before Mayor Farley could approve this ordinance, as he intended to do, Johnson went into the courts and procured an injunction. This injunction remained in force until 11 o'clock on the morning of the 4th. Whether it

would have been longer lived, depended upon the action of the court at that time and was problematical. So Johnson solved the problem for himself. Though it has been usual for newly elected mayors to go into office a week or more after the election, there is no legal limitation of that kind. The new mayor becomes mayor by law as soon as he qualifies, a fact of which Johnson took advantage. Soon after ten o'clock on the morning of the 4th he demanded and received his certificate of election, took the oath of office, filed his official bond, and half an hour before the expiration of the injunction order had taken the place of Mr. Farley as mayor. It is needless to add that the lake front grab will not be consummated for at least two years to come.

It is not generally known that Johnson has tied up the Columbus street car monopoly by legal proceedings. He had offered, in conjunction with ex-Attorney General Monett, to take the system and operate it for 3-cent fares (see vol. iii., page 692), with a privilege to the city to buy at any time at a fair valuation; but the council by a small majority undertook to grant a long term franchise on the basis of 5-cent fares, with seven tickets for a quarter until gross receipts should reach \$1,750,000, and thereafter with eight tickets for a quarter. Johnson advised an appeal to the courts, and Thomas Ross, a resident of Columbus, brought suit accordingly. Now the Columbus street car monopoly offers to compromise on the basis of eight tickets for a quarter, but Mr. Johnson advises against acceptance. It is his idea that street car monopolies can be forced to reduce fares to three cents each, without the wholesale humbug; that in connection with this reduction arrangements for municipal ownership can be made which will culminate at an early day; and that the consequent rise in land values, giving to landlords the money value of these municipal benefits, will popularize Henry George's single tax reform, as

AP
3
p87

similar improvements have so notably done in Glasgow.

Cleveland is not the only city of the United States that got a single tax mayor out of the municipal elections this month. The city of Solomon, Kan., though a much smaller and less famous city than Cleveland, can also boast a mayor who believes as Johnson does. His name is E. Z. Butcher.

It is not always wise to applaud even the good acts of autocrats, for it is the occasional goodness of the autocrat that makes autocracy tolerable. If there were no good autocrats there could be no bad ones. We are therefore, not enthusiastic over the decree of the Autocrat of the Philippines, addressed to his managing commission, which, in directing the commission to inquire into the tax laws of the islands and improve them where they need it, warns that body that it is to "bear in mind that taxes which tend to penalize or repress industry and enterprise are to be avoided." This is sound doctrine, even if an autocrat did formulate it. And if the Philippine commission were to carry it out literally—remove all taxes that repress industry and enterprise, which would include almost every tax except ad valorem land taxes—the American autocracy in the islands would mark the beginning among the Filipinos of an era of greater liberty and prosperity than the masses of any people in history have ever known.

Our attention has been called to an article from the pen of Herbert N. Casson in the Bellamy Review, which asks us a question about the single tax. The article refers to the late George Francis Gilman, the tea millionaire, who operated 285 tea-stores, from which he made \$20,000,000 besides all he spent. To remedy this concentration of commercial power and congestion of wealth, Mr. Casson says that "the socialist suggests the public ownership of the tea business,"

and he asks us how the single tax would "solve this social problem." As The Public is not a single tax organ it does not undertake to answer socialist riddles in behalf of the single tax belief. It thinks, moreover, that in the present stage of social agitation no good can come from sectarian debate between different schools of social agitators. For those reasons we decline the discussion to which the Bellamy Review courteously invites us, simply referring all who may be interested in Mr. Casson's question to Henry George's discussion of the principle it involves. That discussion will be found in chapter xxviii. of "Protection or Free Trade"—the chapter on "Free Trade and Socialism." We might properly observe, however, that Mr. Casson has not very carefully analyzed the Gilman problem if he thinks it nothing but a question of store-keeping. Tariffs and other taxes, tea gardens and other kinds of land, and disinherited labor, all entered in to give to Gilman, on the one hand, abnormal commercial power and to make his employes, on the other, abnormal commercial power, and to The Gilman problem is much less a question of competitive store-keeping than of legal monopoly.

The Australian land tax reform meets much the same reception in this country as did the Australian ballot reform. Political machines oppose it, regardless of party. The measure was adopted by the democrats in the Colorado legislature, the republicans opposing it in the interest of the great corporations. But in the Maryland legislature the republicans introduced and supported it and the democratic machine turned it down.

It is not strange that even a thoroughly democratic democrat, so far away as the Pacific coast, should get but a dim view of the outlines of so small a figure as the mayor of Chicago. The San Francisco Star is accordingly excused for supposing that Mr. Harrison has "in former years

made a record against granting long franchises." It is quite true that Harrison opposes franchises of more than 20 years' duration, but as the state law forbids longer terms that is a narrow basis for a record.

PERMANENT SIDE PARTIES IN POLITICS.

Circumstances connected with the recent municipal election in Chicago, make a discussion in these columns of the question of side parties in politics appropriate at this time. In that campaign the leading candidates of both leading parties were in our view objectionable, and, for reasons which we stated then, we advised radical democrats to vote for the republican candidate. Without repeating those reasons now, we shall merely note our conviction that when the democratic party nominates undemocratic candidates, the cause of radical democracy is often best served by voting outright for the republican. But because in this instance we advised radical democrats to support the republican candidate against Harrison for mayor of Chicago, we have been more or less severely rebuked by some friends of the paper—not for advising opposition to Harrison, but for declining to urge support of some one or other of the several reform side parties that were in the field.

The particular reform party which our critics admonished us we were conscience-bound to support was in each instance, of course, the one with which the critic himself had affiliated. There, would, indeed, have been no lack of variety for a choice, not less than five of these parties being represented on the official ballot. Their importance as political factors may be inferred from the vote they commanded. The socialist party polled 4,713, less than 1 2-3 per cent. of the total. The prohibition party polled 2,804, less than 1 per cent. The social-democratic party polled 1,844, less than 2-3 of 1 per cent. The single tax party polled 950, less than 1-3 of 1 per cent. The socialist-labor party polled 638, less than 1-4 of 1 per cent. We are inclined to think that men who take politics seriously will

see in these figures sufficient justification in the event for our decision not to support any of the third parties.

But it is easy to confound seriousness in politics with zeal in political activities, though the latter may be nothing but exciting play whereas the former is rational concern for the public good. We shall, therefore, present in extenso our reasons for opposing such side parties in politics as those we have mentioned; not for the purpose of explaining the past, but to make our policy understood in the future.

Our reference, let us say, is to side parties that are permanent. Parties that organize for the purpose of influencing a particular election, or of disciplining the old party organization from which its supporters mainly come, may or may not serve a useful purpose. They depend for justification upon special circumstances and are not properly subject to general criticism. And let us emphasize the fact that we mean side parties as such, side parties which live and move and have their being as side parties, without any reasonably grounded hope of ever being anything else. We do not criticise new parties that start out with the intention and reasonable expectation of becoming factors in politics. The only question in such cases is whether the expectation has a reasonable basis. Our criticism is leveled at parties that are formed and maintained regardless of reasonable probabilities of success—at side parties in perpetuity.

In again stating our position on this subject* we have no hope of curing chronic cases of side-party disease. But these are few. Most people find little enjoyment in everlastingly playing at politics. We may hope, however, to stimulate the thought of earnest men, who have been or may be tempted into side parties by impatience for political activity in the direction of reforms that appeal to them. At any rate, it is to such men that we address these considerations on the subject of permanent side parties in politics.

*We discussed the same subject quite fully more than two years ago, under the title of "Third Party Politics." See Public, No. 21, page 6, November 5, 1896.

I.

It should be observed, in the first place, that party politics, like every other field of human effort, has limitations. It may be that objects highly desirable in themselves and appropriate to other fields, are not to be served in this field. A political party, therefore, unless it have an object appropriate to political partisanship, has no reason for existence.

What objects, then, are appropriate?

Primarily, party politics is the field for choosing public officials. But as legislation is enacted by officials, it is also a field for influencing legislation. Obviously, then, a political party may appropriately have either or both of two objects. It may exist solely for the purpose of influencing the election of public officials; or solely for the purpose of influencing legislation; or for both purposes, as has always been the case in actual experience.

And inasmuch as popular agitation in behalf of new reforms, and popular education with reference to them, are necessary precursors of reform legislation, it is also appropriate for political parties to exist for the sole purpose of agitating and educating for or against a reform.

Besides these four—electing officials, influencing legislation, agitating and educating—we can think of no reason for being that any political party can appropriately have. Nor do we suppose that even the most inveterate side-party devotee would ask for further concessions. He would probably agree that if a side party cannot justify its existence upon this broad basis, it cannot do so at all.

We have, then, four possible legitimate objects of a party—popular agitation, popular education, public legislation and public administration.

With reference to permanent side parties, the latter function must be ignored. Since they do not elect public officials, they have no share in public administration. The side party that does elect public officials, or has reasonable expectations of doing so, is not a permanent side party. It is a political factor, and must be reckoned with as such. The same thing is true

with reference to the function of legislation. A party that influences legislation, or has a reasonable expectation of doing it, is not a permanent side party but a political factor. On these two points, therefore, the question raised by the organization or maintenance of a permanent third party is not whether its expectation of influencing elections justifies its existence, but whether the expectation itself is justified.

That is a question which we shall consider farther on. For the present let us turn our attention to the remaining functions of partisanship with reference to permanent side parties, namely, agitation and education.

II.

To argue that permanent side parties are useless for purposes of agitation in the political field, where agitation consists in arousing the public in mass, would seem to be a work of supererogation. It borders upon the absurd to dignify as instruments of political agitation, party organizations so small in size and so light in impressive qualities that the public is hardly aware of their existence and professional gamblers only notice them to offer bettors their pick at \$30,000 to \$1. The kind of agitation of which such instruments are capable is positively hurtful to the causes they profess to represent. It tends to bring the causes into the same popular contempt in which the lilliputian parties themselves are held.

Side parties do sometimes agitate with impressive effect. An instance was given by the united labor party of New York city in 1886, which drew to Henry George 68,000 votes for mayor, enabling him to outstrip Theodore Roosevelt, the republican candidate, and placing him second in the contest. Lee Meriwether's fight in St. Louis affords another instance. Still another is furnished by Mayor Jones, of Toledo, both in his three successful contests for mayor, and in his unsuccessful but brilliant campaign for governor of Ohio.

But none of these instances illustrates the permanent side-party idea. In each the side party sprang into being without nursing or coaxing. It was also a factor in politics, the people having been aroused in mass

by it. The latter is the essential quality. To agitate beneficially and effectively, in politics, a party must be a political factor. It must challenge the respectful attention of the electorate. Parties toward which the electorate is contemptuously indifferent are powerless for beneficial agitation.

If the possibilities are few of popular agitation in the political field, along lines not at issue in the public mind, the possibilities of education along those lines are less. A party so contemptibly weak as to be unable to challenge public attention, cannot possibly educate the public through party methods as well as its adherents might by other methods. This is a common sense proposition. It is proved, moreover, by experience. Most converts that permanent side parties in politics can claim have been attracted to and educated in the party's cause not by the party but by other agencies.

In the case of one of the socialist parties that fact is somewhat obscured by the duplex character of its organization. As the party is engaged perennially in what are essentially non-political methods of agitation and education, the converts made in fact by non-political methods of work go nominally to the credit of the political methods, all work being done in the name of the party. But it would be no rash assertion to say that the socialists have done nothing in the United States in the way of socialistic agitation and education that could not have been done more effectively and extensively without the aid of the socialist side parties.

That is true also of the prohibitionists. It is true of all permanent side parties. Not by independent political action without political possibilities, but by political action with political possibilities and by non-political modes—modes, that is, which could be utilized as well or better without a side party in politics than with one—are popular attention to and consideration of a cause secured and converts made.

For these reasons, which might be amplified had we the space to spare, but which we have stated with sufficient fullness to furnish intelligent

readers with a substantial basis for rationally considering the matter themselves, we discover no place in the political field for permanent side parties as agitating and educational agencies. A party that is doomed to remain a side party in perpetuity if it stays in the political field, cannot justify its existence by the plea that it agitates and educates. The agitational and educational possibilities of a political party being dependent upon its political possibilities, the whole question regarding third parties reverts to the primary consideration in each case of whether the party is or may reasonably be expected to become a factor in politics.

III.

A third party that is a factor in politics, is not a side party; and a third party that may reasonably be expected to become a factor in politics, is not a permanent side party. To such third parties, then, if any there be in this country, this criticism does not apply. But it does apply to the prohibition party, to the Chicago single tax party, and to all the socialist parties. It applies to others also, which the circumstances do not require us to specify.

That none of these third parties is a political factor is too patent to need more than a bald statement. In no way does any of them affect legislation or administration.

The only facts at variance with this statement, and they are but apparently so, is the election in small scattered places of side-party local officials. The prohibitionists have probably had this measure of success at times, and the socialists certainly have. But these elections were in no instance side-party victories. They were due not to the influence of the winning party, but to local and temporary causes, such as ordinarily find expression through local and temporary organizations. The statement still holds that the parties named are not factors in politics. Whether or not they are to remain side parties permanently, they are side parties now.

Our subject is, therefore, reduced to the question of whether these par-

ties may reasonably be expected to become factors in politics in the future.

IV.

The idiosyncrasies of human nature and the history of politics, alike testify that third parties cannot be built up slowly from small beginnings to great accomplishments. A political party that does not come to maturity almost at a bound, is not likely to come to maturity at all—except as a dwarf. In other words, there is no reasonable probability that a party which starts as a side party, or falls to the low estate of a side party, can ever become a factor in politics.

Against this view the history of the socialist party in Germany is often urged. But the experience of that party confirms rather than refutes the principle. It was not a party of slow growth. At its first parliamentary contest, 1877, it polled nearly half a million votes. A party that can do that is a political factor to be reckoned with. And the German socialists were reckoned with. They were proscribed for 12 years. This persecution naturally augmented their voting strength. Persecution might lift even a side party into political importance. It pushed the German socialist party forward so fast that a large proportion of its members are socialist only in party name. So strong has this element become that the socialistic programme element, backed by the machinery of the party and strengthened by party loyalty and tradition, has for a considerable time been but barely able to prevent the relegation of the economic programme of the socialists to second place, and the formal adoption by the party as its prime purpose of a general policy of political opposition. This is suggestive of the probable culmination of reform parties when they do come to political maturity. But that by the way, our reference to the German socialists being intended only to show that the history of their party fails to refute our idea that political parties are not like the tall oaks which from little acorns grow. It did not begin small; it began large.

American history is replete with illustrations, every one of which

testifies to the soundness of the principle we have stated.

Prior to the forties, American third parties were only factions of old parties. But in 1840, the abolitionists made a presidential nomination under the title of the liberty party, and their candidate polled 7,609 votes.

They nominated again in 1844, but wisely withdrew their candidate and abandoned their party to support the free soilers, a faction of the democratic party. The free soilers had bolted the democratic convention because they failed to secure satisfactory representation; but as they came out against the extension of slavery in the territories the abolitionists were content to join them. This marks no growth, let it be observed, of the liberty party as a party. It lasted four years as a side party and then dissolved. Nor did the free soil party originate in the liberty party. It was a "bolt" from the democratic party. In 1848 it polled its largest vote, 291,263; and in 1852 it also dropped out of politics and into history, with a vote diminished to 156,149.

Then the republican party was founded—not by the liberty party, not by the free soil party, nor as a product of either in any party sense. It was organized by democrats and whigs who resented the treachery of the democratic party and the poltroonery of the whig party in connection with the repeal of the Missouri compromise and the opening of Kansas to the possibilities of a slave system.

There is nothing in our history prior to the civil war to warrant the supposition that side parties may reasonably expect to become political factors. It all indicates that parties which do not become political factors at once can never hope to.

Since the civil war all third party experience has pointed in the same direction.

The liberal republicans and the straight democrats of 1872 are not to be considered as parties. They were only factions of old parties, and died with the election that had caused their organization, making no effort to perpetuate themselves. But the

greenback party, like the liberty party of the forties, was a true type of third party organization. At its first appearance, 1876, it polled 81,740 votes. Its vote rose in 1880 to 307,206, but fell in 1884 to 133,825, when the party died. Meantime it had elected members of congress, members of legislatures, and local officials, sometimes as the result of local and temporary causes, but usually because the party was really a factor in politics over a large part of the country. In those places it was locally not a side party. But as a national party, it cannot be said, except in its congressional successes, to have been a political factor. If it ever was a political factor, however, the time came when it ceased to be, and then it died.

Instead of maintaining it as a permanent side party, greenbackers organized the union-labor party, which polled 148,105 votes in 1888.

That party was then abandoned, and the greenback sentiment went to the support of the populist party which in 1890 became a factor in politics locally to an extent sufficient to make it a factor in politics nationally. In 1892 it polled 1,041,028 votes. And it had so influenced the politics of the country by 1896 as to color the platform and in some degree to dictate the nominations of the democratic party.

None of these movements can be classed as permanent side-party movements. The parties were either political factors while they lasted, or were abandoned as soon as it was discovered that they could not become such. In the whole history of the country the only distinctively third party to become a permanent factor in politics is the republican party; and that party, organized in 1854, became a factor in national politics in 1856, and the leading party of the country in 1860.

Of the permanent side parties, the oldest is the prohibition. It was organized nationally in the early seventies, and without having yet become a factor in politics has been maintained in the vain hope that some time, somehow, it will rise to political prominence and ultimate victory. It has probably done as much to ob-

struct restrictive liquor legislation as any other single influence outside the liquor interest. Had it organized within the republican party, it might have forced that party to accede in degree to its demands. For politicians are very deferential to the demands of voters whose numbers are unknown and whose support they may possibly gain. But the support of a side party cannot be gained by any concession short of absolute surrender to it, and upon the face of the returns side parties don't amount to much anyhow. That is the way politicians look at such matters. And for that reason the prohibition party has lessened the hold of temperance sentiment upon the republican party by organizing outside instead of inside. Not that it could have hoped to make the republican party a prohibition party complete. That could not have been done unless a very large proportion of the sentiment of the country had demanded prohibition. But it could have made it prohibition in places where prohibition sentiment was strong, and so secured its professed objects in far greater degree than it has. It could also have promoted prohibition sentiment and prohibition tendencies within the republican party. As it is the prohibition party has secured nothing. The notion that prohibition in states where it prevails is the work of the prohibition party is not well founded. That party has secured no temperance legislation. It is not a political factor. As to the possibility of its gradually becoming one, let the following figures of its vote for president be considered:

1872	5,607
1876	9,737
1880	9,678
1884	150,626
1888	249,945
1892	264,133
1896	145,976
1900	208,555

As the single tax party of Chicago is a local affair of recent origin, it calls for only a word or two in this connection. It has been through two elections, that of the fall of 1900 and that of the spring of 1901. At the former, the head of the county ticket polled in the city 465 votes; at the latter

the head of the ticket polled 950. Measured in percentages this increase is phenomenal. It is over 100 per cent. If we had had no experience with political matters until day before yesterday, we might calculate the date of assured success for the party in the future at the rate of 100 per cent. increase per election. But the statistics of side parties are not lacking in instances of gains of 100 per cent. and more, which have quickly turned to losses never recovered. The prohibition party's experience is an instance in point. Nothing is more deceptive in economics and politics than percentages. It was Cory O'Lanus, of the old Brooklyn Eagle, who fell back upon percentages to measure the growth of his popularity. As a candidate for constable he had increased his vote over that of his previous candidacy by 100 per cent., whereas his adversary's vote had grown only three per cent.; from which Mr. O'Lanus argued that at the same rate of relative increase his ultimate triumph was assured. This seemed plausible until he explained that his vote had increased from 1 to 2, whereas his adversary's had increased from 100 to 103.

The other side party—or group, rather, of such parties—is the socialist. A justification of permanent side party organization in the socialist movement might be based upon the socialistic doctrine of class consciousness. That is, a segregated movement might, with consistency at least, adopt a segregated system of political activity. But that point is quite apart from the question of whether a side party tends to grow into a real party, and on this point the history of the socialist party in this country throws light.

The party began its independent political career in New York, in 1887, as the socialist-labor party. Its vote in the city of New York in 1887 was about 6,000, and at one election subsequently it polled something like 25,000.

At the presidential election of 1896 its vote was 21,164. Four years later it was 36,274. At the next presidential election, 1900, the social-democratic party, with Debs for presidential candidate was organized na-

tionally, and part of the socialist-labor party joined it. But as the rest remained outside, there were two socialist tickets. Together they polled 123,540 votes—84,003 for the fusion and 39,537 for the old socialist labor party. A comparison of these three presidential votes, 1892, 1896 and 1900, shows a continuing increase.

Standing by itself that would indicate the possibility of side-party growth. But upon further investigation it will be seen that the increase is attributable to the extension of the party to new places and not to growth in places where it has long existed. In New York city, for instance, the total vote of both socialist parties in 1900 was only 1,000 more than in 1896. Debs's personal popularity would more than account for that. Here, then, in the place where the socialist party has had a ticket in the field regularly since 1887, there is no increase. A similar condition is observable in Chicago. We make no comparison with the large socialist vote of some years ago, which was not a socialist vote, but only a temporary outburst. Our comparison is of last fall's vote with that of this spring. The total socialist vote of last fall was 6,009. This spring there were three socialist tickets, and a large body of the general voters were opposed to both the republican and the democratic candidates for mayor, two conditions that must have had a tendency to increase the vote for the socialists. Yet the total socialist vote for mayor this spring was only 7,195. Similar results will follow a comparison of the regular socialist vote of the present with its regular vote of the past, wherever it has been long enough in the political field to have reached its maximum. If its vote as a national party is still increasing, that does not prove that it will keep on increasing, but only that its third party maximum, from which it will decline, is not yet reached. That maximum the prohibition party seems to have reached.

From the history of third parties, then, it appears that side-partyism in politics is not a road leading to political influence. And this is in harmony with what might be inferred

in the first instance from a consideration of human nature.

Though some men may "stay by" a hopeless fight, men in masses will not. What general would expect to win a war if he gave his army to understand that every battle until the last, to be fought in the distant future, would end in overwhelming defeat? No possible prospect of the ultimate victory could keep the spirits of his men alive. It is so in politics. Men in masses will not act with a party that hasn't a fighting chance. Since politics has to do with men in masses, this factor must be considered. To ignore it is to exhibit incompetency for promoting causes which depend for success upon popular support. Politically speaking, the permanent side party is "neither fish, flesh, fowl nor good red herring."

One of the best theoretical politicians of our time, a man who more than once successfully put his political theories to practical test, on two occasions in connection with temporary third parties—we refer to Henry George—lays down these sound doctrines for political action in support of causes:

The advocates of a great principle should know no thought of compromise. They should proclaim it in its fullness, and point to its complete attainment as their goal. But the zeal of the propagandist needs to be supplemented by the skill of the politician. While the one need not fear to arouse opposition, the other should seek to minimize resistance. The political art, like the military art, consists in massing the greatest force against the point of least resistance; and, to bring a principle most quickly and effectively into practical politics, the measure which presents it should be so moderate as (while involving the principle) to secure the largest support and excite the least resistance. For whether the first step be long or short, is of little consequence. When a start is once made in a right direction, progress is mere matter of keeping on. It is in this way that great questions always enter the phase of political action. Important political battles begin with affairs at outposts, in themselves of little moment, and are generally decided upon issue joined, not on the main question, but on some minor or collateral question. . . . To bring an issue into politics it is not necessary to form a party. Parties are not to be manufactured; they grow out of existing parties by the

bringing forward of issues upon which men will divide.—Protection or Free Trade, chapter 29, "Practical Politics."

V.

We should not do justice to our subject if we stopped with showing that permanent side parties are futile. Like most futile things, they are in our opinion also positively harmful—harmful to the causes for which they nominally stand. We therefore believe that it is prejudicial to a cause to support or otherwise encourage its permanent side party. And it makes no difference whether there is anything else worth supporting or not. If we believed a permanent side party representing a cause which to us was the cause of causes, was a good thing for that cause, we should support it under all circumstances. Believing such parties to be not only useless but harmful to their causes, we support them under no circumstances. Nor are we unmindful that a righteous cause cannot be ruined by anything. That is true. But it may be embarrassed and obstructed and its progress delayed. There are many ways of doing this, and all do not originate in the malice of enemies.

—"evil is wrought by want of Thought
As well as want of Heart."

And of all friendly ways of obstructing the progress of a cause, few seem to us so rich in possibilities of harm as permanent side parties in politics.

One of the harmful possibilities of such parties is associated with the chances they afford for corrupt deals in close elections to the prejudice of the cause they profess. That objection, however, we shall pass by, since it is not the corrupt acts of side-party managers that we are considering, but the evils that belong of necessity to the parties themselves.

In our reference to the prohibition party we have indicated how that party has obstructed its cause by segregating itself from the party to whose politicians it could to a great extent dictate had it remained within their party. But that is a very minor kind of the harm that these futile parties do to the cause they proclaim.

A greater harm is the false idea of

the strength of a cause that side-parties propagate. Unable to draw their own vote, they do not represent the strength of the cause at all. But its strength is estimated by their vote, and in a world where success breeds success and failure failure this is an injury not to be lightly invited.

Such a party is almost certain, too, to oppose what influence it has to the opportunities that constantly arise for promoting its cause. Debs's nomination last year illustrates that evil. Loyalty to the socialist-labor party name stood in the way of united socialist action in his support. In that case it made no practical difference, for he fell far short of election and the votes of both parties are counted together in estimating socialist strength. But if Debs's nomination had involved a fighting chance to win, that "bolt" might have insured his defeat. The bolters would have been coddled by the enemy, and their attacks upon Debs, under the trade-mark of "the only simon-pure" party of the cause, would have been used with effect by the opposition press. As an example of the possibilities in this direction, nothing more illuminative could be desired than the history of the middle-of-the-road populists. Or, as an illustration which single taxers will appreciate, suppose there had been a well-seasoned permanent side-party of single taxers in Cleveland when Tom L. Johnson was nominated for mayor by the democrats, upon a three-cent fare platform. Isn't it almost a dead certainty that a little handfull of the loyal members of that party would have denounced him as not coming up to single tax standards, and have furnished "hot stuff" about Johnson to the republican papers?

Under evils of that sort, which are inseparable from permanent side parties, there lies the natural tendency of mankind to set up fetiches and worship them. To third party devotees their little party becomes a fetich, which dethrones the cause it nominally represents. This evil is not a peculiarity of third party men. It is characteristic of human nature. But it is more virulent, and, within third party possibilities, more injurious, with third party men than with others; because third party men

transfer all the zealous energy of their original devotion to the cause, over to the fetich which in their conscience they substitute for the cause. Hearty loyalty to the cause gives way to intense loyalty to the side-party of their love and hopes, and all things and all persons are tested by the demands which they suppose this fetich to make.

It is matter of conscience with them, therefore, not only to vote with their side-party, but to insist that every other believer in their cause ought to vote with it too—also as matter of conscience.

These fetich worshipers become dead, apparently, to the ethics of voting. It is not the way in which a man votes that is within the forum of conscience. That is matter of judgment. The jurisdiction of conscience is over his motive. If after the question of motive had been adjusted in the forum of conscience, the act of judgment in deciding how to vote in order best to give effect to that motive—if this act also were matter of conscience, it would hardly be possible to have parties enough to meet the demands of conscientious men. For if we cannot in conscience vote with the republican party because it does not come up to high standards, nor with the democratic party for like reason, then we cannot in conscience vote with any party that falls short of our ideals. This is not far from the ground taken by conscience voters who support side-parties, which partially accounts for the ease with which side-parties split up. But imagine everyone acting upon that principle! Since the old man was about right who said to his wife: "Betsey, all the world's queer but me and thee, and I think thee's just a little queer," there would have to be a side party for nearly every voter with a conscience. One truth that conscience voters of all parties need to take to heart, was expressed by Jefferson in his first inaugural. "Every difference of opinion," said he, "is not a difference of principle."

If our suggestions of the evil that permanent side-parties bring to the cause they profess do not impress the zealous reformer, if he still regards side-party activity as the "practical"

side of reform work, the best advice we can give him is to join one of these parties, and after looking up its antecedents to follow its fortunes for awhile. The chance is one in 30,000, or thereabouts, that he may become a chronic side-party man. But if he misses that lonesome chance, he will have had his demon of impatience exercised and be in good condition thereafter to work intelligently for his cause instead of blindly for a fetich.

NEWS

A sensational report upon Chinese news was sent out from Washington on the 6th. It came in the form of a dispatch purporting to be from the American charge d'affaires at Peking, Mr. Squiers. The terms of the dispatch were: "Peking, April 6, 11 a. m., Secretary of State, Washington.—The Russian minister refuses to receive official communications from the Chinese peace commissioners. (Signed) Squiers, charge d'affaires American Legation." The dispatch had earmarks of forgery, but it was commented upon as indicating Russia's intention of making war upon China for rejecting the proposed Manchurian treaty. On the 7th, however, Secretary Hay authorized a denial of the report that such a dispatch had been received.

Both that dispatch and the denial were preceded by a circumstantial official statement from the Russian government regarding the Manchurian treaty question. The statement explained that, pending the settlement of the Chinese questions affecting all the powers, Russia considered it necessary to establish permanent order along the Russian-Manchurian frontier. To that end provisional terms were agreed upon between Russia and the Chinese governors of three Manchurian provinces, with reference to local civil administration. Subsequently Russia drafted a special agreement with China for the gradual evacuation of Manchuria by Russia and the adoption of measures to insure peace in the province. This agreement was intended as a basis "for the restoration to China, as contemplated by the Russian government, of the province of Manchuria, which, in consequence of the alarming events of last year, was occupied

by Russian troops;" but false texts of the proposed agreement were published by a hostile foreign press, importing an intention on Russia's part to establish a protectorate over Manchuria, in consequence of which hindrances were placed in the way, and the acceptance of the agreement by China, "which was indispensable for the gradual evacuation of the province, proved to be impossible." Referring to the possibility of an eventual restoration of Manchuria to China, this official explanation declares it to be—

manifest that such intention can only be carried out when the normal situation is completely restored to the empire, and the central government established at the capital independent and strong enough to guarantee Russia against a recurrence of the events of last year.

The explanation concludes with this diplomatic intimation as to Russia's Manchurian policy:

While the Russian government maintains its present organization in Manchuria, to preserve order in the vicinity of the broad frontiers of Russia, and remains faithful to its original and oft-repeated political programme, it will quietly await the further course of events.

Upon the publication of this explanation, Russia was officially advised by the American minister, pursuant to instructions from Washington, of the gratification it afforded the president.

There are heavy headline reports of another uprising in northern China, under the leadership of Tung-Fu-Sian, but it is not regarded in official circles as at all menacing. The only other Chinese news of moment is the decision of the American government, given out from Washington on the 4th, directing Gen. Chaffee to take no part in the destruction of the Chinese forts from the coast to Peking, and the establishment in their place of a chain of fortified foreign posts, which course has been determined upon by the other powers.

The war in South Africa has advanced a stage. Great Britain captured, on the 8th, the town of Pietersburg, which has been the capital of the South African republic since the fall of Pretoria. Pietersburg is a village in a sparsely settled country at the northern terminus of the railway which runs from Cape Town northward through Pretoria and into the

mountains. It is about 170 miles above Pretoria. The capture was made after slight opposition, only 60 Boer prisoners being taken and only two British being killed. The Boer garrison had evacuated the village the night before the British force arrived. Some other skirmishes are reported, none of which are important except the capture by a force of Boers, after several hours' fighting, of 75 out of a British force of 100. This event occurred at a point northward from Aberdeen, Cape Colony, and is reported by Lord Kitchener.

The British casualties in South Africa for the month of March, as reported from London on the 4th, are as follows:

	Officers.	Men.
Killed	9	103
Wounded	26	270
Total	35	373

In an interview at Utrecht on the 4th, President Kruger gave his views on the subject of arbitration. He expressed his entire readiness to submit all questions between the South African republic and the Orange Free State, on one side, and Great Britain on the other, to an impartial tribunal, including even the question of independence. His language was:

Not even excepting the question of independence. We would sacrifice our liberty if the verdict of arbitration decided that one or the other of the chiefs of the republics had done anything to forfeit it.

Mr. Fischer, the delegate from the Orange Free State, was present and assented.

Philippine news consists largely of reports of surrenders here and there in the islands, and of prognostications as to the character of the American civil government, to be inaugurated July 1. Meanwhile a mystery hangs about the prisoner Aguinaldo. While apparently provided for comfortably, he is kept in close confinement. No newspaper correspondent has yet been allowed to see him. It is said that other visitors are freely admitted, but this may be reasonably doubted. If such visitors were admitted freely, the exclusion of newspaper men would be without purpose or effect. Secret influences are evidently being brought to bear upon Aguinaldo in his prison to induce him, as the head of the Filipino government, to proclaim a general sur-

render to the United States. Manila dispatches of the 4th, for instance, reported that Aguinaldo has the assistance of Chief Justice Arellano and Gen. MacArthur's private secretary in preparing a manifesto. A dispatch of the 8th reports that the manifesto had not then been signed, and adds that Aguinaldo was "reluctant to comply with the conditions." Nothing further has been disclosed.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington to February 20, 1901, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	468
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Killed reported since presidential election	36
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	183
Total deaths.....	2,634
Wounded since July 1, 1898.....	2,410
Total casualties since July, '98.....	5,044
Total casualties to last report...5,020	
Total deaths to last report.....2,610	

Since the last reports from Cuba (see vol. iii., page 793) nothing definite has been done by the Cuban constitutional convention until now, and even now its action is not final. At a meeting of the committee on the 28th, each of the five members furnished the draft of a different report; but two of them subsequently joined a third, Senor Gomez, in his draft proposing the rejection of the Platt amendment (see vol. iii., pages 743-44 and 762-63), especially clauses 3, 6, 7 and 8. When the committee report came before the convention, five other propositions were introduced. Pending their consideration a motion to send a committee to Washington to discuss the question with President McKinley was on the 1st defeated by the vote of 12 to 13. But on the 9th this motion was reconsidered by a vote of 20 to 9. On the 10th, however, Havana reports stated that the receipt of an authoritative telegram to the effect that President McKinley had decided that he has no authority to confer with a committee except

upon the basis of the Platt amendment as a sine qua non, had produced the effect of suspending the proposed action to appoint a committee. It was argued that the ultimatum could be answered from Havana as well as Washington. Meanwhile three of the propositions on relations with the United States were voted upon and rejected. One of the rejected propositions was for the acceptance of the Platt amendment. It was rejected almost unanimously.

Gen. Wood has put extra tension upon the situation by arbitrarily suspending a Havana newspaper, the Discussion. A cartoon which it published on Good Friday provoked his action. The cartoon was entitled "The Cuban Calvary." A Cuban soldier typifying the republic was pictured upon a cross, with another crucified figure on either side, one labeled McKinley and the other Wood, while Senator Platt was represented in the foreground as offering to Cuba a vinegar-saturated sponge labeled "Platt amendment." The cartoon was evidently intended to portray the crucifixion of Cuba, and had no personal animus; but Gen. Wood hastily assumed that it was intended to denounce him and the president as thieves. So he arbitrarily suppressed the paper and closed its office. This autocratic act excited deep indignation, and Gen. Wood has removed his ban. The Discussion appeared again on the 8th. With its reappearance it placed a new line under its title head, namely: "Suppressed by Weyler, October 23, 1896; suspended by Wood, April 6, 1901."

NEWS NOTES.

—At the opening session on the 8th of the new Chicago council, a non-partisan organization was effected.

—The report, questioned last week (vol. iii., page 824), that Tolstoy had been banished, is now completely disproved.

—Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, is reported to be taking steps to increase the tax assessments of corporations doing business in that city.

—Prince Kropotkin, who is to lecture at Central Music Hall, Chicago, on the evening of the 14th, arrived in Chicago on the 7th and is stopping at Hull house.

—At the debate on the 5th between the teams of the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago, the Michigan men won. They had the affirmative of the question, "Resolved,

That the United States should subsidize its merchant marine."

—An equestrian statue of Gen. John A. Logan was unveiled at Washington on the 9th in the presence of the president and his cabinet. Senator Depew delivered the oration and President McKinley spoke briefly.

—Both houses of the Minnesota legislature have passed a bill providing for the appointment of physicians in every county, who are to examine all applicants for marriage licenses with a view to preventing the marriage of imbeciles, except imbecile women over 45 years of age.

—In citing the Cleveland Recorder last week as authority for the statement that in the Cleveland council the democrats have a majority of 1 (vol. iii., page 824), we were in error. At the recent municipal election the democrats did elect one more member than the republicans; but of the hold-over members the republicans have enough to give them a majority in the body.

—At the retrial before the circuit court in Milwaukee on the 4th, of Christian science healers convicted in a police court of practicing medicine without a license, the circuit judge ruled out all evidence as to their religious belief, holding that the sole question was whether they did or did not practice medicine by giving drugs or resorting to surgery.

—The British parliamentary committee on appropriations for the king's civil expenses recommends \$3,100,000 annually. Under Queen Victoria these expenditures were put at \$2,765,000. Of the proposed amount, \$550,000 is for the king and queen's private purse, in addition to provisions for household salaries, household expenses and royal almsgiving.

—By a majority of more than 9,000, in a referendum vote, the International Typographical union has ratified an agreement with the American Newspaper Publishers' association, for the creation of a standing board of arbitration. The only branch of organized labor on the great dailies which is not included in the agreement is the pressmen's union, and there are expectations that at its annual national convention in June it will provide for a similar agreement.

—Albert Johnson, brother of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, is about to build a fast trolley line from the heart of New York city to the heart of Philadelphia. The company was incorporated in New Jersey on the 4th as "the Philadelphia, Trenton & New York Railroad company," with a capital of \$500,000, which is to be increased. His cars will have a speed of 50 miles an hour, and he intends to charge 50 cents fare for the full distance, for which the steam roads charge about five times as much.

MISCELLANY

MY BROTHER.

For The Public.

I care not in what land his birth occurred,
Nor in what language his thought finds
its word,

Nor what the color of his skin may be,
Nor what religion wins his fealty—
If against tyranny he wages strife,
Resists oppression at the risk of life,
However poor in purse, unknown to fame,
That man from me a brother's love may
claim.

J. K. RUDYARD.

TOM L. JOHNSON'S STRENGTH.

February 6 Tom L. Johnson publicly
announced:

I believe in the philosophy of Henry
George as the best rule of conduct in gov-
ernmental affairs, whether local, state or
national.

February 19 he was nominated for
mayor of Cleveland at the democratic
primaries without opposition.

April 1 he was elected mayor by a
large majority.

A word to the wise is sufficient.—
Justice, of Wilmington, Del.

"LABOR AND CAPITAL ARE ONE."

"Times are hard," said the Picked
Chicken.

"Why," said the Rat, "this is an
era of prosperity; see how I have
feathered my nest."

"But," said the Picked Chicken,
"you have gotten my feathers."

"You must not think," said the Rat,
"that because I get more comfort
you get poorer."

"But," said the Chicken, "you pro-
duce no feathers, and I keep none—"

"If you would use your teeth—" in-
terrupted the Rat.

"I—" said the Picked Chicken.

"You could lay by as much as I do,"
concluded the Rat.

"If—" said the Picked Chicken.

"Without consumers like me," said
the Rat, "there would be no demand
for the feathers which you produce."

"I will vote for a change," said the
Picked Chicken.

"Only those who have feathers
should have the suffrage," remarked
the Rat.—Life.

THE CHINESE WORSHIP THE
RIGHT.

The Chinese are a proud—some say,
a conceited—people, but they have
good reasons for their pride, and
their conceit has its excuses. Far
away from the rest of the world they
have been living their own life and
developing their own civilization;
while others have been displaying
what humanity may attain to with a
revealed religion for its highest law

and a Christ for its pattern, they have
been exhibiting what a life a race
may rise to, and live, without either.
The central idea of their cult is filial
piety; reverence for seniority, in-
tensifying with every generation that
transmitted it, settles all the details
of family, social and national life.
They are a preeminently reasonable
people and when disputes occur it is
the appeal to right that solves them;
for 30 centuries or more this recog-
nized and inherited worship of right
has gone on strengthening, and so
strong is the feeling that to hint to
them right must be supported by
might excites something more than
amazement. The relations of sov-
ereign to subject and of man to man
have so long been authoritatively de-
fined and acknowledged that the life
of the people has been poured into
and shaped by a mold of duty, while
the natural division of the empire
into provinces has been so harmoni-
ously supplemented by provincial and
interprovincial arrangements under
the metropolitan administration that
law reigns everywhere and disorder
is the exception. The arts of peace
have ever held the first place in the
estimation of all, and, just as might
should quail before right, so does in-
tellectual prowess win honor every-
where and the leaders of the people
are those whom the grand national
competitive examinations have proved
to be more gifted than their fellows.
In no other country is education so
prized, so honored, so utilized and so
rewarded.—Sir Robert Hart, Bart, G.
C. M. G., in the March Cosmopolitan.

THE GREAT GULF.

An extract from an article entitled
"The Root of the Evil," by Leo Tolstoy,
published in the April North American.

The system exists not only in that
little corner of the government of
Tula, which I picture clearly to my-
self because I see it so often, but
everywhere—not only in Russia, from
St. Petersburg to Batum, but in
France, from Paris to Auvergne; in
Italy, from Rome to Palermo; in Ger-
many, in Spain, in America, in Aus-
tralia, even in India and China.
Everywhere, two or three men in a
thousand live so, that, doing nothing
for themselves, they eat and drink in
one week what would have fed hun-
dreds for a year; they wear garments
costing thousands of dollars; they live
in palaces, where thousands of work-
men could have been housed; and they
spend upon their caprices the fruits
of thousands and tens of thousands of

working days. The others, sleepless
and unfed, labor beyond their
strength, ruining their physical and
moral health for the benefit of these
few chosen ones.

For some men, when they are about
to be born, a midwife, a doctor (some-
times two) are summoned; a trous-
seau is prepared, with a hundred lit-
tle shirts and swaddling clothes with
silk ribbons; and spring rocking-cra-
dles are purchased. Others, the enor-
mous majority, are given birth to any-
where and anyhow, without help; they
are rolled up in dirty rags, laid on
straw in wooden cradles—and the
parents are glad when they die. The
first are cared for by the midwife,
nurse and wet nurse, while the moth-
ers lie in bed for days; the second are
not cared for at all, because there is
no one to care for them, and the
mothers leave their beds directly after
child-birth, light the fire, milk the
cow, and sometimes wash their own,
their husbands' and their children's
clothes. Some children grow up
among toys, amusements and study.
Others begin by crawling on their
naked stomachs across the threshold,
are crippled and devoured by swine,
and at five years old begin to labor
for masters.

Some are taught all the scien-
tific wisdom adapted to children's
minds; others are taught the coarsest
abuse and the most outrageous super-
stitions. Some fall in love, have ro-
mantic histories, and marry when
they have already tasted all the pleas-
ures of love; others are married at
16 or 20 years of age, as best suits the
interests of their parents.

Some eat and drink the very best
and most expensive things in the
world, feeding their dogs with white
bread and meat. Others eat only
bread and kvass, and even that not
to their fill; while their food is often
stale, to put them off eating much.
Some, who do not work, change their
fine linen every day; others, working
continually at other men's tasks,
change their coarse, torn, lousy linen
once in two weeks, or else do not
change it at all, but wear it till it falls
to pieces. Some sleep in clean sheets
on feather beds; others on the earth,
covering themselves with ragged
coats.

Some drive about with strong, well-
fed horses, for recreation; others la-
bor miserably with half-starved
beasts, and for business walk on foot.
Some devise things they may do to
occupy their idle time; others have
not the time to clean themselves, to

wash, to rest, to converse, or to see their families.

Some can read four languages, and daily amuse themselves with the most varied pastimes; others do not even know their letters and have no pleasure but drink. Some know all and believe nothing; others know nothing and believe all the absurdities they are told. Some, when they fall ill, besides all manner of watering places, all possible care, cleanliness and medicines, go about from place to place seeking for the most healing climate; others lie down on the stove in a chimneyless hut, and with unwashed wounds, without any food except dry bread, or any air besides an atmosphere tainted by the members of the family, by calves and sheep, rot alive and die before their time.

Is this as it should be?

If there exists a Supreme Wisdom and Love guiding the world, if there is a God, he cannot sanction such a division among men: that some should not know what to do with their superfluous wealth, and should squander aimlessly the fruits of other men's toil; and that others should sicken and die prematurely, or live a miserable life of exhausting labor.

If there is a God, this cannot and must not be. If there is no God, then even from the simplest human standpoint, a system by which the majority of men are forced to ruin their lives in order that a small minority may possess superfluous wealth—a wealth which only hinders and perverts them—such a system of life is absurd, because it is detrimental to all men.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

On the second day of April, 1743, Thomas Jefferson was born, and his life of 83 years spanned an important epoch in the nation's history.

At the age of 31 he drafted the address to the king, setting forth the rights of the colonists. Two years later, at the age of 33, he wrote the Declaration of Independence, and for 50 years thereafter, until his death on July 4, 1825, he was the greatest champion of human rights in all the world.

His service as a representative in state and federal legislatures, as governor of Virginia, ambassador to France, secretary of state under Washington, vice president under Adams, and president, together with his service in minor offices, covered more than 40 years of his eventful career. But the work which he did for mankind was so far reaching in its effect and so enduring in its character that he is remembered for his ideas,

rather than for the positions which he held.

He was the greatest constructive statesman known to history. His birth and surroundings were such as might naturally have made him an aristocrat, but he became the greatest democrat; his wealth, considerable for that day, might naturally have made him partial to the rich, but he cast his lot with the common people. Many with less education have from a feeling of superiority held aloof from their fellows, but he employed his knowledge of history, of law, of science and of art for the defense and protection of the masses.

He believed in the right of the people to govern themselves, and in their capacity for self-government. When near the end of life, fortified by an experience and observation such as few men have had, he wrote:

I am not among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are our dependence for continued freedom.

Only four years before his death he said:

Independence can be trusted nowhere but with the people in mass. They are inherently independent of all but moral law.

At another time he said:

No other depositaries of power than the people themselves have ever been found, which did not end in converting to their own profit the earnings of those committed to their charge.

And, to add still another extract from his writings:

The people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty.

He not only believed in the people, but he understood the people and recognized the distinctions which everywhere exist, however much concealed or denied. Read the analysis which he gave of parties and see how completely it has been borne out by the history of the last hundred years:

Men, by their constitutions, are naturally divided into two parties: 1. Those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. 2. Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish them and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depositary of the public interest. In every country these two parties exist, and in every one where they are free to think, speak and write, they will declare themselves. Call them, therefore, liberals and serviles, Jacobins and ultras, whigs and Tories, republicans and federalists, aristocrats and democrats, or by whatever name you please, they are the same parties still, and pursue the same object. The last appellation of aristocrats and democrats is the true one expressing the essence of all.

Jefferson not only announced great fundamental principles, but he ap-

plied them to so many different questions that he can be read as an authority on all questions of to-day. He was opposed to imperialism, and believed in self-government; he was for a republic composed of equal and self-governing states and entirely opposed to the colonial idea.

He was opposed to a large army, and believed that a government was stronger when resting upon the love of the people than when tolerated only because of fear.

He was so opposed to the principle of monopoly that he only excepted copyrights and patents. Here is the amendment which he suggested to the constitution:

Monopolies may be allowed to persons for their own productions in literature, and their own inventions in the arts, for a term not exceeding — years, for no longer term, and for no other purpose.

At another time he suggested 14 years as the limit for patents.

His hostility to monopoly was exemplified in 1787, in a communication to John Jay, in which he said:

A company had silently and by unfair means obtained a monopoly for the making and selling of spermaceti candles (in France). As soon as we (Lafayette assisted him) discovered it we solicited its suppression which is effected by a clause in the *Arret*.

He denounced as a fatal fallacy the doctrine that a national debt is a blessing.

He was the relentless enemy of banks of issue. At one time he declared that banks of issue were more dangerous than standing armies. At another time he said:

I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength, and bid defiance to the laws of our country.

In 1819 he said:

Interdict forever to both the state and national government the power of establishing any paper bank; for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium, and the same revolution of property to go through every 20 or 30 years.

He was a believer in bimetallism, and no one who understands his principles can for a moment conceive of him as yielding to the financial influences which controlled Mr. Cleveland's administration and the republican administrations which preceded and followed it.

He warned his countrymen against the dangers of an appointive judiciary holding office for life.

Of the freedom of speech he said:

The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties.

Of the freedom of the press he wrote:

Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press and that cannot be limited without being lost.

He was the author of the statute of Virginia guaranteeing religious liberty and was also the father of the University of Virginia. He favored a free school system which would bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education.

He was an advocate of the jury system; and he argued in favor of freeing the slaves three-quarters of a century before Lincoln issued his emancipation proclamation.

His writings fill many volumes and cover almost every conceivable subject, but through all that he said there runs the evidence of a great heart as well as a great intellect.

There is need to-day of a revival of Jeffersonian principles. He was not an enemy of honestly acquired wealth, but he believed that the government had no right to exaggerate by favoritism the differences between individuals. He believed that all should stand equal before the law and that every department of government, executive, legislative and judicial, should recognize and protect the rights of the humblest citizen as carefully as it would the rights of the greatest and most influential.

Jefferson's principles, applied to the problems of the twentieth century, would restore the republic to its old foundations and make it the supreme moral factor in the world's progress. The application of his principles to-day would restore industrial independence and annihilate trusts. The application of his principles to-day would drive the money changers out of the temple, insure to the people a stable currency and harmonize labor and capital by compelling justice to both.

Society to-day has its aristocratic and its democratic elements; whether Jefferson's principles are applied depends upon which element controls the government.—The Commoner of Apr. 5.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF THE REPUBLIC.

Speech of George Gluyas Mercer, president of the American League, of Philadelphia, at the liberty meeting, Faneuil hall, Boston, Saturday evening, March 30, 1901.

"When liberty is in danger, Faneuil hall has the right, it is her duty, to strike the keynote for these United States." These, citizens of Boston, were the words uttered in this hall by your son, Wendell Phillips, some three and sixty years ago, in the first speech he ever made here

—a speech to be followed by many others made by the same champion of human freedom in this same sacred place. Two generations before that these walls had answered to the appeals of revolutionary patriots, and in those days Philadelphia and Boston stood side by side in the struggle for independent self-government, and I deem it a high honor to-night to have the privilege of standing here to bring you greeting from Independence hall.

It is my conviction that the fathers of our republic proclaimed to the world, not only a profound principle of political philosophy, but also a fundamental principle of social evolution, when they declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All political and social progress since that time has been in accordance with that principle, and we are here to-night to demand that wherever our flag goes that principle shall go with it, to distinguish our republic from the empires of Europe. Gov. Boutwell has adverted to the criticism sometimes made that we have not been faithful to that principle in the cases of women and negroes and Indians. As for the women, they give submissive assent to the present government. When they unite in demanding rights equal to those of men, which I, for one, believe they ought to have, they will get those rights. As for the negroes, our civil war lifted them to the plane of citizenship and any attempt now made to deprive them of their constitutional rights is wrong. As for the Indians, our treatment of them has properly been called "a century of dishonor," but we have never treated them as badly as we are now treating the Filipinos. We have recognized their nationality and made treaties with them and have behaved toward them far more nobly than toward our former allies in Luzon. But granting that we have not done our duty in these cases, is that any argument for a continuance of the wrong-doing? Because a man breaks one commandment, shall he disregard the entire decalogue? "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." What did Christ mean by that? Not, I take it, that perfection was attainable by all, but rather that perfection was the ideal for which all should strive. When the American fathers declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, they set that up as a standard.

They believed that the nation that did most toward reaching that standard would attain the nearest degree to political perfection. Prior to the Philippine war, America kept ever before her this lofty ideal of the declaration. As the years went by we succeeded in making the ideal more and more nearly real. Did the constitution make an exception to the rule in its provision as to slavery? Are we always faithful to the principle to-day? As applied to the situation in the Philippines, I care not how these questions are answered. They are beside the mark. What we protest against is that the government has deliberately abandoned that ideal in the Philippines and set up another policy. This eighteenth century political philosophy which Jefferson embodied in the declaration of independence—is it true? Is it what Lincoln said its author meant it to be—"a stumbling block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the paths of despotism?" Is it still an ideal for twentieth-century America, freer and more prosperous than in the days of her youth? Or has plutocracy bred tyrants, and must we give up our ancient faith? I see there are some who still believe in the principle. We believe it the highest duty to strive to bring the republic back to the ideals of her youth, and we shall not cease in our endeavor while life lasts.

When the administration first entered upon this imperialist policy, the man who taught me political economy at Yale college, Prof. William G. Sumner, published an article entitled "The Conquest of the United States by Spain." Prof. Sumner had no intention at that time of assuming the role of prophet. He meant merely to indicate that the administration had entered upon the path which had brought Spain to ruin. Subsequent events, however, have shown that no paper ever had a truer title. The Spanish conquest of our country has steadily continued. Beginning with the denial to the Filipinos of their independence, it has gone on step by step until the Filipinos have to-day toward us the same feeling of intense resentment that they formerly felt toward the Spaniards. We protested against the reconcentrado method of a Spanish general, who was called a butcher, in Cuba. We have adopted the same method in the Philippines. "He has transported us beyond the seas to be tried for pretended offenses." That was one of the counts in the indictment against George III., as made in

our declaration of independence at Philadelphia. We have established a penal colony in Guam, and the most noted man to be banished is he whom Admiral Dewey calls the brains of the Philippine insurrection, Mabini, too weak to fight; Mabini, in Manila, which is under the control of the American forces, if there is any place which is; Mabini in prison, where one would think he could do no harm; Mabini paralyzed, but, in spite of all this, banished because he would not renounce his love of liberty and swear allegiance to the United States. Was there any fear that this paralytic could make forcible resistance to American authority? Was he banished lest he might escape from prison? No. He was banished because God's truth was on his lips, and because the administration feared the indignation of the civilized world over the hypocrisy masquerading in the name of American liberty. But this is not all. American soldiers are killing wounded and unresisting Filipino prisoners. Do you doubt it? Read the statistics cited by George Kennan in his papers written for the Outlook. Remember that that religious periodical has been an administration organ, and that the president has had no more able defender than its editor, Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott.

The support which imperialism is receiving from vested interests and so-called Christian pulpits reminds one of a similar support given to the cause of slavery in the days of our fathers. Again I am reminded of Wendell Phillips. As he appealed, after John Brown's raid, "from the American people drunk with cotton and the New York Observer to the American people 50 years hence," so may we appeal from the American people, drunk with the lust of conquest, and the New York Outlook to the American people when the light of history and civilization has at length made clear that militarism and democracy cannot abide together. But the Spanish conquest of our republican administration continues. We are now resorting to Spanish inquisitorial methods to compel silent prisoners to speak or reluctant witnesses to testify. An officer of our regular army, now serving in Luzon, has given in a letter details of the "water torture," which are too horrible to repeat. Gen. Sherman was right when he said that "War is hell," but the war in which he fought was not disgraced by any such atrocities as those just related as taking place in the islands of the

Pacific, until one may well exclaim: "O, liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name."

The culmination of the conquest of the United States by Spain was reached the other day when the Filipino leader was made a prisoner. It has been truly said that war legalizes nearly every practice that is held in abhorrence by civilized men in time of peace. I am not sufficiently familiar with military tactics and military ethics to enable me to say whether forgery, which would land a civilian in the penitentiary, is approved by military regulations, and I shall not waste time in any criticism of the trickery and strategy by which Aguinaldo was deceived. It may be worth while, however, to remember that of the capturing party five only were Americans, three were Tagalogs, and 78 were Macabebes, who, as Col. Codman has said, are now allies of the United States, as they were formerly allies of Spain, and who, as Gov. Boutwell has said, are savage mercenaries in the employ of our government. The report tells us that one of the Filipino traitors had been shot through the lungs in a recent battle in which he was taken prisoner. What threats of torture and punishment and what promises of reward induced these Filipino prisoners to turn traitors we can only guess. Until we know, we cannot justly estimate their guilt. My desire is merely to call attention to the fact that it was not until the Spanish officer, apparently in command of the party, said: "Now, Macabebes, go for them!" that the Judas who betrayed Aguinaldo threw his arms about the leader and said: "You are a prisoner of the Americans." I take this from Funston's story of the capture, as printed in the daily papers. So it was by command of a Spanish officer that Aguinaldo was captured at last. This was the culmination of the conquest of the United States by Spain. What could be more pathetic than the statement in Funston's report that Aguinaldo dispatched supplies to the party and directed kind treatment of the five Americans who were advancing to make him prisoner, and who, he thought, were prisoners in the hands of his own men. We may be able to give points to the Filipinos on forgery and stratagem, but they can give us points on the elementary and fundamental principles of Christianity. For my part, I would rather be the commander-in-chief of the Filipino forces, fighting for home and liberty and independence against great odds, and now at last a prisoner through

stratagem, than be the commander-in-chief of the American forces, sworn to uphold and defend the constitution of the United States, and now directing a war against the fundamental principles of human liberty. "If this be treason, make the most of it." My brethren are men of whatever color and in whatever place, who are fighting for liberty and self-government. My foes are they who betray the sacred principles to which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The chairman of this meeting has alluded to the apathy of the American people on this great question. To my mind this is our greatest danger. If the president of the United States should boldly proclaim the empire, there is no doubt as to the answer of the people. Imperialism is making progress among us, just as it did in ancient Rome, by gradual stages, and without any clear conception on the part of the people of the trend of affairs. Men who love their country as dearly as we do, and who hate tyranny as bitterly, cannot be persuaded that there is danger to our institutions from the forcible imposition upon an alien race of what they regard as a superior civilization. They cannot see that benevolent assimilation is as false in principle as criminal aggression. They think that if there be imperialism there must be an emperor, and, as they read the honeyed words of presidential papers, they can find no Caesar in "the mildest mannered man that ever scuttled ship or cut a throat." But the essence of empire is absolutism. It makes no difference, so far as the existence of the empire is concerned, whether the absolute power is administered benevolently or malignantly, or whether it is wielded by one man or by many. Free government is by consent of the governed. Government without responsibility to the governed is imperial. It is in this sense that Gov. Boutwell finds an empire already in existence in the Philippines, where the people have no voice, and where the president rules 10,000,000 souls by the strong arm of military force, and without any constitutional restraint.

If I had my way, no one would call the McKinley party by the name republican—a name hallowed by its association with the names of the great men who freed the slave and saved the union. "No man is good enough to govern another man with-

out that other's consent—this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor of American republicanism." This is the definition of the word republican as made by Abraham Lincoln, and no man has a right to that party name who is false to that fundamental principle.

For my part I am not disposed to underestimate the strength of the forces against us. We are met just after the army bill has given the president absolute power over the Philippines, after the capture of the leader of the army of liberty, and when the war budget of our own nation is greater in amount than that of any of the military nations of the old world. Under these depressing circumstances there is the one supreme duty for us, and that is to make no compromise of American principles. It has been said here this evening that the power of the United States is so tremendous as to leave no doubt of the ultimate outcome of this struggle, and that the Filipinos must eventually yield to our force. That may be so, and yet the final victory may be with them. The long view gives the clearest vision. To his contemporaries there was never a greater failure than that of the Nazarene on the cross.

I began my remarks with a reference to Wendell Phillips, and it was he who said: "One, on God's side, is a majority." Let me leave with you in the present crisis those inspiring words of your poet, Lowell, which Phillips has quoted more than once within these walls:

Right forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,
But that scaffold sways the future, and,
behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping
watch above his own.
We see dimly in the Present what is small
and what is great,
Slow of faith, how weak an arm may turn
the iron helm of fate,
But the soul is still oracular; amid the
market's din,
List the ominous stern whisper from the
Delphic cave within—
They enslave their children's children who
make compromise with sin.

And is not this slavery, say the people, that though there may be land enough in England to maintain ten times as many people as are in it, yet some must beg of their brethren, or work in hard drudgery for day wages for them, or starve, or steal, and so be hanged out of the way, as men not fit to live on the earth?—Jerrard Winstanley, Epistle Dedicatory to Oliver Cromwell, 1652.

CIVILIZATION?

Your armies pass from land to land,
With scientific murder stored,
That Christ and Mammon, hand in hand,
May leave no region unexplored.

Religion marches (so you boast)
With bayonets fixed and naked blade;
But do you think the Holy Ghost
Is Minister of War and Trade?

Or do you fancy men are led
From barracks and the seething street,
From harlots and from gin, to spread
The Gospel, by the Paraclete?

Your Gospel is the passionless
Half-dead indulgence, which is lust,
The blatant Bible of the Press,
And urban Ethics of the Dust.

Green, pleasant places you despoil
With dirt and drudgery and din,
That, scarcely clothed, your slaves may
toll,
And, scarcely fed, their children spin.

You touch the sensitive wires of trade;
Your feast from others' bread is carved;
And lo! there is a fortune made,
And lo! there is a city starved.

Then with your riches—gathered, mark!
Within the law, by rule and right—
You buy a title and a park,
Endow a church, and dole delight

To village serfs; you hunt and shoot,
You race and bet; give balls, and prate
Of poor-laws; for the destitute
You organize and legislate.

You legislate; but do you think
You help the world along, one whit
Nearer to joy, or rive one chink
Where men may get a glimpse of it?

Are you convinced true joys reside
In clambering on another's head?
For you perchance a merry ride,
But not for steeds discomfited.

For if success be true delight,
How few that true delight may gain!
And none shall gain it, save he smite
Some other with the spurs of pain.

Ambition—not to think and know,
But to indoctrinate and teach—
That this is half our cause of woe
Is half what Jesus came to preach.

—From "The Mystery of Godliness," by
Francis B. Money-Coutts.

The one cloud that hangs over the
Gen. Funston enthusiast is the fact
that history repeats itself, and that
while every kindergarten pupil is familiar with the names of Napoleon and Jefferson Davis, hardly a man of this generation remembers the names of their captors.

G. T. E.

We should not be especially interested in the survival of the fittest. The fittest are well able to look out for themselves. We should be interested to see that the largest number possible are made fit to survive.—Mrs. Susan Look Avery, in Chicago, April 6.

A highly civilized man can sympathize with the men of every country.—Wu Ting Fang.

Branes—Funston's feat is not so monstrous now as it would have been a year ago.

Poynter—No, it isn't to Mr. McKinley. A year ago antedated the last republican convention.

G. T. E.

Hicks—Yes; Wilkins is a mind-reader. You know Hilarum, the crazy man? Well, the other day he was crazier than usual and then got drunk, to boot. And we set Wilkins to work reading his mind.

Wicks—Must have been interesting. Hicks—Interesting? Wilkins said it was just like reading a Sunday paper.—Puck.

MAGAZINES FOR MARCH.

—The Peacemaker (1305 Arch street, Philadelphia).
—The Criterion (41 E. Twenty-first street, New York).
—Washington News Letter (Washington, D. C.) is largely a compilation of Reformed Christian Science sermons.
—The Chautauquan (Cleveland) tells of Russian women, of Crete and the Cretan question, and of our half-forgotten magazines.
—The Open Court (324 Dearborn street, Chicago) opens with a delightful little story of the time of Christ, by Paul Carus, the editor.
—The American Monthly Review of Reviews (13 Astor place, New York) makes the most of its editorial story of the billion dollar steel trust.
—Eliza Stowe Twitchell's contribution to Why (Cedar Rapids, Ia.), is a sound presentation in novel manner and remarkably readable form of several vital points in political economy.
—Sound Currency (52 William St., New York), has for its four topics the currency question in the Philippines, the currency legislation of the Fifty-sixth congress, the deposit and clearing house system in Austria-Hungary and an inquiry into the redemption of national bank notes.

MAGAZINES FOR APRIL.

—Public Libraries (215 Madison street, Chicago), contains the usual varied collection of useful and interesting matter relating to libraries.
—An illustrated description of Hull house and an article on compulsory arbitration are the interesting features of the Locomotive Fireman's Magazine, Peoria, Ill.
—The Social Crusader (609 Ashland block, Chicago), quotes George D. Herron on class-conscious socialism and concludes Mrs. Wentworth's condensation of the Herron course of lectures.
—The International Journal of Ethics (1305 Arch street, Philadelphia) offers a discussion of the moral problems of war and a presentation of the theory of value with reference to its place in the history of ethics.
—McClure's (141-145 E. Twenty-fifth street, New York) offers one of Ida M. Tarbell's historical narratives, "Disbanding of the Confederate Army," and gives place to another of Edwin Lefevre's fine studies of Wall street. This is a trust manipulation story in which there is much instruction.

THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico,

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago.

The Spiritual Man

His Genesis
His Evolution
and His Destiny

Six Lectures by Charles H. Mann,

Tuesday and Friday Evenings at 8 o'clock

AT STEINWAY HALL,

17 E. Van Buren Street, Chicago.

SPECIFIC SUBJECTS :

- April 12. Who the Spiritual Man is
- April 16. His Parentage, Conception and Birth
- April 19. The Developing Stages of his Life
- April 23. His Relation to Life in this World
- April 26. His Religion
- April 30. A Stranger in a Strange Land

These lectures were first given at the Swedenborg Summer School at its sessions at Milton, on the Hudson, in July, 1900. By request of the Faculty of the New-Church Theological School Cambridge, Mass., they were delivered to the students of that institution last November and December, and during these same months were repeated at the rooms of the Metaphysical Club, in Boston. Since then they have been given in Brooklyn, and in Orange, N. J.

Tickets for the course, to be obtained at Room, 800 Steinway Hall, and at the door, \$2.50 Admission to single lectures, .50

From Editorial in Boston Transcript of Dec. 5, 1900.—Mr. Mann lays an unhesitating yet reverential hand upon the soul itself, and discloses its anatomy. A clear and accurate thinker, with an evident scientific quality of mind, illustrating his points by accepted facts of natural science, he seems a metaphysician, who can speak in terse and simple language.

WRITERS, CORRESPONDENTS or REPORTERS

Wanted everywhere. Stories, news, ideas, poems, illustrated articles, advance, news, drawings, photographs, unique articles, etc., etc., purchased. Articles revised and prepared for publication. Books published. Send for particulars and full information before sending articles.

The Bulletin Press Association, New York.

To anyone clipping this advertisement and enclosing 10 cents I will send paper free for six months.—H. G. W.

“LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS.”

The Challenge

A 16-Page Weekly

50 CENTS A YEAR.

H. GAYLORD WILSHIRE,
EDITOR.

Los Angeles.

Wilshire offers Bryan \$5,000 to debate with him. Send for free sample copy.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

WALTER A. LANTZ. T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2254.

LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1253 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

Volume III of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent postpaid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound volumes will be ready for delivery about May 1. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. tf

ALTGELD'S ORATORY

Of which THE PUBLIC said "a remarkable book... will interest and benefit any reader"—is published in cloth binding only and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents. Mention THE PUBLIC and we will add without charge a copy of the *International Socialist Review* (\$1.00 a year or 10 cents a copy). **CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY**, Publishers, 56 Fifth Avenue, CHICAGO.

Rare OLD Books!

CATALOGUE FREE.

THE ANTIQUARIAN BOOK STORE,

43 East Van Buren Street,

CHICAGO.

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.

JOIN THOSE WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

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

GIBSON ART GALLERIES

CHICAGO'S GREATEST PHOTOGRAPHERS .:

N. W. Corner Wabash and Adams.

P. S.—Group pictures of Chicago Single Taxers on sale at our galleries.

For any Book on Earth Old or New

Write to
H. H. TIMBY,
Book Hunter,
Conneaut, Ohio.

CATALOGUES FREE.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC, FOURTH YEAR.

Binders convenient for filing THE PUBLIC, week by week, furnishing during the year and at the end as neat and quite as strong bound a volume as the bookbinder can make, can be had of **WM. O. FOLEY,** Conneautville, Pa. Price, 60 cents postpaid.