

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1901.

Number 172.

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.

President McKinley is culpably negligent, else the western crops would not now be threatened with drought. We incline to attribute this fatality to natural causes. But if good crops have a political origin, which is part of the McKinley philosophy, why not bad ones? If the McKinley administration made western fields rich with harvest, as McKinley newspapers and speakers proclaimed at the time, why may not the administration be held responsible for western harvests blighted?

According to the thirteenth statistical report of the interstate commerce commission, just issued, the American railways were phenomenally prosperous during the year ending June 30, and inferentially, so we are assured, the industrial masses also were prosperous. Gross earnings were \$1,487,044,814, an increase of \$173,434,696 over the previous year. The net earnings were \$525,616,303, or about 35 per cent. of the gross earnings. Wages and salaries were only 39 per cent. The net income available for dividends or surplus was \$227,180,447, or about 15 per cent. of the gross earnings. This is certainly a good showing for the railroad corporations. On the inferential point it will be prudent to reserve a doubt.

An astounding declaration was made at the banquet of the Illinois Bar association at Chicago on the 12th by Judge Cartwright, of the state supreme court. "The supreme court," said he, "is often called on to furnish a decision which shall be the

basis for some security to be floated or some real estate to be disposed of;" and "all the attorneys in the apparently disputed case often represent one side, and take that means of getting a stamp of approval from the court merely for commercial purposes." Is it possible that the judges of the supreme court of Illinois knowingly allow this trick to be played upon them?

Mirabile dictu! A McKinley office holder, high up in the treasury department, has discovered and announced that it is just as important to a commercial people to import as to export. He is Frederick Emory, chief of the bureau of foreign commerce; and as quoted by the Chicago Tribune of the 13th he says:

The solution of what now seems a puzzling and difficult problem will be found in an adjustment of tariff relations which will permit us to sell more goods in Europe and to take more in return. It may well be doubted whether we would benefit, in the end, by a selfishly one-sided policy, and it would certainly not be a gain to humanity, if we succeeded in crushing European industry and the beneficial influences which flow out into the world from the refinement, the culture, the trade activity it supports. On the other hand, we might actually inflict great loss upon ourselves by impairing the power of the European nations to purchase from us.

Well may the Tribune, an administration paper, say by way of comment on that quotation, that "it has not been the habit of men holding responsible positions under republican presidents to give utterance to views like these," and that "it would have been considered heretical once to suggest that the importation of goods from Europe should be encouraged." If this free trade doctrine is to be adopted by the McKinley administration, what becomes of the republican platform boasts about an enormous and

increasing volume of excessive exports? Imports will bring them down. What becomes of Mr. McKinley's inflow of "pure gold?" If Europe pays in goods she will not pay also in gold. What becomes of the whole protective tariff philosophy? It must fall to the ground the moment its supporters conclude that profitable trade consists not in exporting but in exporting and importing.

Among the newspapers that are coming to understand the absurdity of the "balance of trade fallacy," which has led Mr. McKinley to suppose that the more wealth a country loses and the less it gains—the more it exports and the less it imports—the richer it becomes, is the Rochester Herald. Presenting the matter to its readers in a concrete illustration, it says:

For the purpose of our illustration we may regard the United States as an individual, say Uncle Sam. Suppose him to buy a cargo of wheat for \$100,000, load it on his own ship, and send it to England. He pays himself \$25,000 freight, and, reaching England, sells his cargo for \$200,000. Then immediately he buys \$175,000 worth of woolen goods and starts home. Arriving in America, he pays himself \$45,000 freight, enters his cargo at the custom house at \$175,000, and puts it on his shelves at a valuation equal to cost, \$175,000, plus freight, \$45,000; plus profit, say \$45,000, or \$260,000. Here we have an interchange of commodities which appears upon the custom house books of Uncle Sam as "exports, \$100,000; imports, \$175,000," and the balance of trade is against him by \$75,000. In England the reverse is true; her customs entry is "imports \$100,000; exports, \$175,000." Consequently, according to some of the would-be authorities on political economy, Uncle Sam is \$75,000 poorer by the transaction, while England is \$75,000 richer. Is that so? It is not. Uncle Sam began the trade with \$100,000, which he put into wheat; he ends it with \$260,000 worth of woollens, which cost him the wheat and the \$65,000 which he had paid for freight, or \$165,000, and

he is exactly \$95,000 ahead of the game.

Such a kindergarten illustration ought not to be necessary to convince anyone that a country, like an individual, is enriched by the wealth it takes in and not by what it sends out; but the protectionists have stood on their heads so long that kindergarten exercises seem to be necessary to get them to seeing things right side up. The service that exporting performs for an individual or a people is not in the exporting itself, but in the importing that it induces. It is the imports and not the exports that enrich.

David B. Hill's friends are allowing it to leak out that Mr. Hill intends to make a fight for the democratic nomination for president three years hence. This announcement, though doubtless serious, is made early enough to give it the flavor of summer politics. Mr. Hill has no chance of getting the nomination. Democrats don't want this man, who gives no other evidence of his democracy than the label he wears; and though the plutocrats of the party would prefer him even to Gorman, indeed to anybody but Cleveland, they are not likely to be so foolish as to nominate him if they get control of the convention. Their candidate will be a dark horse—somebody like the McKinley democrat now mayor of St. Louis, whom the financial combines know and can trust but of whom the people have heard little or nothing. Hill is one of those men whom a democrat might properly vote against, not because he knows the opposing candidate but because he knows Hill.

In an article in Collier's Weekly, recently reproduced in the Commoner, Mr. Bryan discusses the trust question carefully and forcibly. Following his usual analytical method, he divides the subject into three parts. First, he considers the existing "condition;" secondly, the probable result of "present tendencies;" and thirdly, "the remedy." In very much of what Mr. Bryan says we heartily

concur. When, for instance, he argues that the trust issue involves a conflict between competition on one hand and private monopoly or socialism on the other, he generalizes accurately. That, indeed, is the essence of the trust issue. He phrases it with characteristic brevity and force. "If the people decide," he says, "that competition should be suppressed, they must choose between private monopoly and socialism." And in mentioning the alternative, he does not halt at socialism as it is now most generally understood. He refers to the extreme of socialism to which a socialistic tide would inevitably sweep us. By socialism, that is, he does not mean merely "that system of socialism, now called extreme, which would place the government in control of all the forces of production and distribution, but a still more complete system, which would make the state the beneficiary of all service rendered and the distributor of all compensation." This startlingly exact presentation of the trust issue should arrest general attention and command the most serious consideration of the conscientious men of all parties. Even more impressive is his challenge to public opinion to decide between competition and its opposite. "If competition is desirable," he argues, "a private monopoly is indefensible; if, on the other hand, the suppression of competition is a thing to be desired, some plan must be devised to make the suppression complete." By way of moral suggestion, he adds: "It would be obviously unfair for one portion of the community to be protected from competition while another portion was subjected to it." In other words, the alternative which the trust question presents to the American people is competition or socialism—full and free competition or its absolute and complete suppression. In all this and much more we find ourselves in full accord with Mr. Bryan's view; and we should be in accord with him throughout, if all he says were in harmony with these fundamental conceptions.

But Mr. Bryan's remedy seems to us to be at variance not only with his evident preference for competition, but also with the principles of democracy as recognized in this country. He proposes "the extinction of private monopoly" by state statutes regulating the business of outside corporations within their limits, and by acts of congress supplementary to the state laws. "These acts of congress would forbid monopolies from engaging in interstate commerce, and from using the mails, interstate telegraphs and railroads. They would prohibit the watering of stock by corporations engaged in interstate commerce. They would forbid corporations doing more than a prescribed proportion of interstate business. They would require all corporations to sell to all customers at the same price and on the same terms, and would remove the tariff from trust-made articles. And to this end, they would provide a congressional license for corporations engaged in interstate commerce. These propositions, coming from a democrat to the democracy—though Mr. Bryan has proposed them before, and thereby smoothed the way for them—must be at least disturbing to men who shrink from the republican tendency, already alarmingly strong, to centralize all power in the national government; while those who dread the advances of socialism, must be aghast at this democratic proposition to strengthen enormously the foundations already laid for making of the American government a great socialistic state. All these proposals for federal action are centralizing, federalistic, and in an objectionable sense socialistic, save only one—that with reference to the abolition of protection for trust made goods. Judged only by his remedy, Mr. Bryan might fairly be supposed to have decided the issue of competition versus socialism against competition. Yet that is not what he intends to do. He believes that this complex machinery in restraint of free trade would extinguish private monopoly.

Mr. Bryan's error, a most serious error as we cannot but regard it, and one fraught with great danger when his far-reaching influence is considered, is traceable to his assumption that private monopoly consists in some power peculiar to corporations. He supposes, that is to say, that corporations make trust monopolies, instead of seeing, what is the fact, that monopolies make trust corporations. This fundamental misconception appears early in the article we are considering. After describing the development of trusts, from combinations of separate corporations by agreements in restraint of trade to the present system of one consolidated corporation owning many plants, he distinguishes corporations, however large, from monopolies. That makes a promising beginning. But the promise does not hold out. Mr. Bryan's distinction soon evaporates and ceases to be distinguishable. For he describes the monopoly feature as appearing "whenever a corporation is sufficiently powerful to control the market."

We should be glad to believe that what Mr. Bryan means by that is that this power to control the market rests not upon consolidation of mere competitive interests, but upon privileges existing anterior to the consolidation. Evidently, however, that is not his meaning. He clearly supposes that the monopoly feature is a manifestation of consolidation. There is no indication that he attributes monopoly to legal privileges which might belong to an individual quite as well as to a corporation, and which would give to that individual as great a power. On the contrary, he assumes that corporations can throttle competition in manufacture by merely acquiring all the plants, even though there were nothing monopolistic in the plants themselves. Thus, he says, that—

if all the woolen mills now in existence should be gathered under the control of one corporation with a capital of half a billion, who could compete with it successfully? If a person

amply supplied with capital to conduct under ordinary conditions a successful mill were to compete with a monopoly, such monopoly would be able, at a very small expense to itself, to undersell him in his particular field, while maintaining prices in other parts of the country. If an organization of equal capital attempted rivalry, it would first have to overcome the advantage which the established industry had secured by the advertisement of its wares, and then, if it were successful, the country would have more woolen plants than necessary to supply the demand, and more skilled laborers than would be required for the work.

The assumption in that illustration is that the woolen mills have no legal privileges—no tariff advantages, no transportation rebates from privileged railways, no patents, no superior water power, no advantages of location, no facilities whatever that are not subject to competition on even terms. Yet there is nothing in experience to show that a woolen mill trust or any other kind of trust, without those advantages, could dispose of rivals in the way Mr. Bryan describes. And every consideration of economic principle gives assurance that potential competition would hold it in complete subjection to the public good. "The advantage," so called, "which the established industry had secured by the advertisement of its wares," could not, under circumstances of free competition, survive a depreciation in the quality of its goods or an arbitrary increase of their price. When opportunities are equal—that is, when competition is not shackled by law—no business combination can control the market after it ceases to satisfy the market. The trick of underselling at the point of competitive attack and recouping in higher prices afterwards or elsewhere, would no longer work. If natural opportunities were not monopolized, competition, actual or possible, would, like air pressure, be effective everywhere and at all times.

Natural opportunities being no longer monopolized, actual competition would not be necessary to prevent trade combinations from becoming

monopolies. The ever present possibility of competition would be enough. For this reason, an overproduction of plants and an oversupply of special operatives could not occur. No one would compete unless the market called for competition; and if the market called for competition, the combination could not destroy its rival. Every instance to the contrary will prove upon investigation to be a case in which the destructive combination possessed some legal advantage—transportation, tariff, location, patents, sources of natural supply, or all together. Even in his article, Mr. Bryan does not mention a single trust which has not back of it some or all of these legal privileges or advantages. The Standard Oil trust owns exclusive pipe lines and dockage rights and controls the best natural sources of oil supply. It is the legal monopolies it has consolidated, and not its perfect organization, that makes it an oppressive trust. The steel trust depends for its power not upon its organization of the steel industry, but upon its indirect control of transportation terminals and its direct control of more than 80 per cent. of the natural sources of steel supply. As to the steam pump trust, what would it be without its patents and the privileges it derives from other privileged trusts? Let Mr. Bryan test the rubber trust and the envelope trust by the principles here suggested, and he will find that they, too, are powerful by reason of their consolidation not of competitive interests but of monopoly interests. Take away their underlying privileges of transportation, patents, and land, and competition, actual or possible, would make quick work of their oppressive power.

That is the key to the trust question. The remedy is not more restrictive laws, as Mr. Bryan proposes, but free competition. We concede that competition completely free cannot be quickly secured. But every step in that direction, every shackle removed from competition, will tell.

Let Mr. Bryan come back to the fundamental principle he himself declares. Let him realize the full force of his postulate: "If competition is desirable, a private monopoly is indefensible." Realizing that postulate in its fullness, and desiring competition, he must advocate the abolition of all private monopoly. When he does this, he will strike a blow at the vitals of the trust. Whatever else he does will help and not hurt it. His plan for interference by the federal government, if adopted, would only strengthen and adorn the commercial monster he seeks to destroy.

In discussing the Ohio democratic convention last week we concluded with the remark that Kilbourne may win "if Johnson's support and the popularity of Johnson's tax agitation prove sufficient to hold in line the Bryan men whom McLean's convention insultingly dismissed," and added that this "appears now to be the only hope for Kilbourne." Quoting those observations, the Dubuque Telegraph—which is by odds the most aggressive and able democratic daily of Iowa, and second to none in the party anywhere for ability, sincerity and sound democracy—makes them its text for the following comment:

If this is the only hope, Kilbourne may as well abandon hope. The state ticket, which was nominated by the McLean reactionaries, is against Mayor Johnson's reforms; and as these would not be ushered in by its success, the Bryan men will not fall in line. They would cheerfully render a service to Tom Johnson, whom they admire and honor for his sterling democracy, but as they can render him no service by supporting the ticket, and are unwilling to hand the democratic party over to plutocratic control, instead of voting the ticket they will vote against it. In Ohio nor anywhere are the men who upheld democratic principles and the democratic candidate in 1896 and 1900 to be deceived by the trickery of putting forth a platform declaring democratic principles and nominating a ticket and secretly negotiating for the support of privileged interests antagonistic to the principles. What the welfare of democracy now imperatively demands is the success of the regular republican ticket in Ohio

by a majority larger than has ever before been given to any ticket in the state. The reelection of Gov. Nash by a majority of 200,000 will end the reorganization movement everywhere, and force the reactionaries into the republican ranks, where they have been training for five years and should remain.

The Dubuque Telegraph evidently makes the mistake of supposing that the fidelity of an Ohio governor to the declarations of his party platform is of considerable moment. But it is not at all important. In Ohio the governor has little legislative influence and no legislative power. If a tax reform legislature, bound by the tax planks of the democratic platform, were elected, it would make no difference who might be governor nor what he might like, or have secretly agreed, to do. Having but little patronage, he could do but little to influence the legislature against its pledges to its constituents. Having no veto power, he could not obstruct it. The Telegraph would be wiser, therefore, it seems to us, if it advised the Bryan democrats of Ohio to see to it that legislative candidates are nominated and elected who can be depended upon to make the tax pledges of the platform good in spite of the secret negotiations which the Telegraph suspects the state organization to have made with the privileged interests. To defeat those interests in the legislature, which has power, rather than to rebuke at the polls the candidate for governor who would have none, is the most effectual way of stamping out the reactionary movement in the democratic party in Ohio.

The delight with which such "democratic" papers as the Chicago Chronicle exploit what they regard as the repudiation of Bryan and Bryanism by the Ohio democratic convention, shows where their hearts were in the presidential campaign. While pretending to champion democracy, they were really playing into the hands of plutocracy. Betrayed by these enemies within, assailed by a combination of powerful interests without, it

is not remarkable that the democratic candidate went down to defeat last fall. The really remarkable thing is that with an open enemy appealing viciously but effectively to the patriotic fury which the smell of blood always engenders in a mob; with that enemy commanding fabulous wealth and dictating the livelihood of millions of workmen; with the terror which power like this inspires; with a reckless use of this terror unparalleled except by the same enemy at the previous election; with nearly every secular and religious paper in the land subservient to its interests; with an effrontery in the misrepresentation of issues and facts which only this vast press conspiracy could save from exposure; and all this supplemented with the aid of papers like the Chronicle, which encouraged the candidate it professed to oppose and betrayed the party it pretended to serve—with this accumulation of political power to contend against, the remarkable thing is that Mr. Bryan polled so large a vote. In a total of 13,969,770, he fell only 849,455 behind Mr. McKinley. When the Chronicle sneers at Bryan, for whom 6,358,789 American citizens voted last fall, and jauntily rules him out of the party which it renounced in 1896 and betrayed in 1900, it affects to despise a political force that cannot be despised with impunity. It was Bryan's magnificent leadership and devoted following alone that made possible even an approximation to what was, against such prodigious odds, his phenomenally large vote. No other democratic leader could have commanded the confidence or done the work necessary, under the circumstances, to accomplish so great a result. Cleveland polled only 4,911,017 when elected in 1884, only 5,538,233 when defeated in 1888, and only 5,556,918 when elected again in 1892. These circumstances considered, the Chronicle's sneers at Bryan now only accentuate the purse-born motives that impelled its desertion in 1896 and its treachery in 1900. Its right to sneer at Bryan and to describe con-

temptuously those who believe in the principles that Bryan stood for, no one questions. If its owner chooses to make the Chronicle a vehicle for placing his monopolistic business interests above public considerations, that is his affair. But democrats have the right to protest against his doing this in the name of democracy.

Mayor Johnson's local equalization board in Cleveland, which has been for the past month or more trying to value taxable property fairly as between owner and owner, has stirred up the wrath of the "Little Consolidated street car company, of which Senator Hanna is president, by increasing its tax valuation from \$595,000, to \$6,000,000. This increase is on the basis of 60 per cent. of true value, which is the basis on which the property of Cleveland home owners is customarily valued for taxation. Can Mr. Hanna tell why his street railroad company should be taxed on only \$595,000, which is hardly seven per cent. of its true value, as shown by the financial reports, while home owners are taxed on valuations of 60 per cent.? That is one of the questions that Mayor Johnson's equalization board will raise when Mr. Hanna's street car company takes this case into court, as it threatens to do.

This increased valuation was imposed by the Cleveland city equalization board after a hearing on the 15th, at which Prof. Bemis, in behalf of the mayor, and two or three officials of the road were examined. Prof. Bemis testified, as reported by the Plain Dealer, that—

This road has outstanding \$2,000,000 of first mortgage five per cent. gold bonds, which have been quoted in the market for many months quite steadily at 103½, or \$2,070,000. In the street railway supplement of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of February 23 the stock of this road was given as \$7,600,000, and the statement was made that in January the authorized stock was increased to \$9,000,000 to "reimburse the company for expenditures already made," for

improvements, etc. If this stock has already been issued, about which there is no information at hand, the value of the road will be increased \$1,414,000 beyond the figure that will be assumed in this discussion. The minimum stock issue of \$7,600,000 at 101, its quotation the first week of April, and approximately its quotation since January 1, is worth \$7,676,000. The addition of this to the market value of the bonds, ignoring any outstanding indebtedness that there may be, will give \$9,746,000 as the minimum of value of the Little Consolidated; \$600,000 of floating indebtedness or a total of \$10,346,000. The assessment of real estate and the return made by the company of its other property, or about \$600,000, is less than seven per cent. of this market value.

The attorney for the road was asked by Mr. Baker, the attorney for the board, what he considered the true value of its property:

"The return we have made is 60 per cent. of the true value," he answered.

"Do you mean that you would sell the road on that basis?" asked Mayor Johnson.

"That is not pertinent," answered Squire.

Squire would admit nothing nor give any additional information. The board decided to send for Senator Hanna, but he was not in the city and Superintendent Mulhern was sent for.

"What do you consider the true value of the road?" was asked.

"I do not know. That is not in my department," was his reply.

A half hour was spent on Mr. Mulhern. Nothing was learned, except that he was not in a position to tell all he might know. Attorney Baker became sarcastic.

"Do you consider the value as returned by the company as the true valuation?" he asked, dropping Mulhern and putting the question to Attorney Squire.

"It is the 60 per cent. required by law."

"Would your company sell at that rate?"

"Certainly not."

"Then it is not the true valuation," replied Baker, "and you are asking us to tax the company on an untrue valuation."

Mr. Squire said nothing.

In the afternoon Mr. J. B. Hanna was present and was the center of fire for an hour. He insisted, as did the attorney, that the return made was all that was asked for by law and said it represented 60 per cent. of the true valuation. Both he and the attorney admitted that the mar-

ket reports of the value of stock were correct, but they insisted that much of the money represented in the stock had been used in repairing, improving, paving, etc.

After comparing that testimony of the officers of the road with the testimony of Prof. Bemis, it must be evident to anyone that the valuation of \$6,000,000 would not be at all excessive as compared with the ordinary 60 per cent. valuations upon Cleveland homes.

Lee Meriwether has withdrawn his contest (see pp. 17,56) of the St. Louis mayoralty election. There was nothing else for him to do, the courts having decided that no recount of the ballots could be allowed—secrecy of the ballot being held to be more important than honesty in the vote. There was no serious dispute as to the fraudulent character of the election. Mr. Meriwether proved that 15,000 fraudulent votes had been cast, and asserted that an examination of the boxes still containing these ballots would show that they had been counted for Wells, and that if they had not been so counted Meriwether and not Wells would have been elected. Instead of denying the fraudulent voting, Wells asserted that the number of fraudulent votes was not 15,000, but 33,000, and that they had been cast for Meriwether. Inasmuch as the election machinery was in the hands of Wells's friends, and Meriwether had no means either of falsifying the vote or even of protecting himself, that claim in behalf of Wells has a somewhat jocular and cynical flavor. If serious about it, Mr. Wells should have seconded Mr. Meriwether's demand for a recount. But instead of doing that he opposed it, and the court helped him out by upholding the sanctity of the secret ballot as against the sanctity of an honest ballot. The circumstances all indicate that Mr. Meriwether and not Mr. Wells was elected mayor of St. Louis last spring, and that the victory of the McKinley-democrats, of which their press throughout the country

has boasted not a little, was achieved by barefaced election frauds.

There was about the convention of the National Educational association, held in Detroit last week, a flavor of plutocracy which is anything but encouraging. Not that these teachers are themselves rich or hope to be; not even that they are inclined towards the plutocratic ideal of government by and for the rich. But they evidently recognize the drift of things toward plutocracy; and, with only a few exceptions, dare not risk their livelihood by turning their faces against it.

One episode in the conference went to show that the disposition to make educational institutions subservient to plutocratic tendencies is reluctant. President Jesse, of the Missouri university, read a paper in which he declared that it was one of the functions of universities to help the people solve their social and economic problems, to understand taxation, to control corporations, etc. He was asked two questions by President George McA. Miller, of Ruskin college, a Missouri institution, situated at Trenton, which undertakes to enable students to support themselves while acquiring a high grade college education, and professes to treat social problems boldly in the public interest. President Miller asked "to what extent universities and colleges are trying to help the people to a solution of social problems," and whether, if they are neglecting this function, the Educational association can "take any steps looking toward concerted action for a proper observance of it." Replying to these questions President Jesse candidly admitted that he knew of no college or university that is doing any practical work on the line of the solution of social problems. But he shrank from proposing action by the association, because, as he said, it is always a long time after an ideal is presented to the people before they are willing to do any-

thing practical in the way of realizing it. So the matter rested about as President Miller described it, when, in asking his questions, he observed that the attitude of the colleges toward social problems reminded him of George Eliot's Mr. Riley, who "had a good knowledge of Latin in general, but no knowledge of any particular Latin."

Another episode had a similar bearing. William T. Harris, United States commissioner of education, had spoken in optimistic terms of the progress of education in the United States, mentioning, among other encouraging facts, the large increase in the number of schools and in the attendance. Mr. Harris struck a keynote, and, as usual, the docile educators began to sing to his tune. Several arose to say that these statements should send every teacher home satisfied. But there was one teacher present who knows the difference between official statistics and facts. This was Miss Margaret A. Haley, of the Chicago Teachers' Federation, which has been so efficient in exposing the tax-dodging corporations of Chicago. In what the press reports call a "rapid-fire" speech, she wanted to know how increase in the number of schools and attendance could be encouraging "when it could be shown that the amount of money available for schools was declining." Some one, she said, must suffer from this condition. Nor was she in any wise indefinite. She told of the tax dodging in Chicago; and what was even more to the point, she showed how the public domain in Chicago set aside for public school purposes would furnish an abundant revenue if it had not been sold or virtually given away. Miss Haley's line of attack bore heavily upon the plutocratic tendencies that more or less influence our educational institutions; and Mr. Harris, instead of meeting her points, evaded them with an attack upon the city from which she hailed. He called Chicago "the great storm center of the country—the place of tornado, whirlwind and fire," said it "has a morbid tenden-

cy that is always manifesting itself in trying to find something disturbing and threatening to things as they are"—a tendency amounting almost "to a hysterical mania;" and declared that "we cannot be influenced by what is going on there." In reply to this somewhat jocular tirade Miss Haley challenged Mr. Harris to debate the sanity of Chicago at a future time and an appropriate place. "If it is morbid," said she, "to look into things and see whether at bottom conditions are sound, then Chicago will not be afraid to be called a morbid city. If it is hysterical to watch not only the evidence of progress, but also to inquire into the ultimate tendency of things, then we are hysterical." Mr. Harris did not accept Miss Haley's challenge. That, however, is of no moment. It makes no difference what opinions may be held regarding Chicago hysterics. The important thing that Miss Haley did was to bring Harris's puerile boasting about school statistics into unfavorable comparison with the plutocratic conditions that threaten the independence of our free school system.

A letter from Prof. Bemis to George C. Sikes, secretary of the Chicago Transportation commission, published in the Chicago papers of the 16th, indicates that the sincerity of Chicago politicians who profess to favor a street car service for the benefit of the people rather than of the corporations, is likely to be brought to a sharp test. Prof. Bemis writes:

My contact with Tom L. Johnson and his deceased brother Albert, and some of the other street railway men associated with them, convinces me that if you can establish the fact legally that the franchises expire in a year or two, and if you can get a city council the majority of whom are prepared to do business without boodle, you can get a proposition for all you want, and a straight three-cent fare besides, although I do not at present undertake to say just who would make the proposition.

The question of expiration of franchises has reference to what is known as the 99-year claim of the Chicago street car monopoly. That question

is now in the courts, brought there by the monopoly itself, and the city authorities ought to be able to push the case to a decision if they want to. The only other point is whether a majority of the board of aldermen can be dealt with without boodle. That goes directly and exclusively to the question of sincerity. There is a point besides, which Prof. Bemis does not mention. His suggestion is upon the basis of a three-cent fare. But Mayor Harrison is opposed to three cent fares, proposing that out of the extra two cents collected from every street car passenger the company shall pay a tax of half a cent (ten per cent. on gross receipts) to the city. The objections to this are obvious. To begin with, it would allow the street car monopoly to tax passengers two cents a ride more than the ride is worth, so as to give the city half a cent a ride. Next, it would maintain a system which would generate competition by tempting the monopoly to undervalue its receipts and to bribe officials in order to facilitate the process of undervaluation. Finally, it would unjustly tax street car passengers. Shop girls, clerks, mechanics, and the like, riding to and from their homes, would be taxed (at two cents a ride besides the fair price of three cents) some \$10 to \$12 a year. Yet Mayor Harrison prefers all this to a three cent fare system; and having that view of the matter he may stand as an obstacle to the plan which Prof. Bemis declares to be feasible upon the two very simple conditions he names.

Perhaps all American believers in the declaration of independence, as they become more familiar with the history of Mr. McKinley's criminal aggression in the Philippines, will be better disposed to sympathize with Gen. Otis's perplexities than to condemn him for his weakness. This is already the view of the Boston Transcript, one of the great papers of New England. Commenting upon the strained relations between Otis and MacArthur which are disclosed

by a recent publication of extracts from their official correspondence, the Transcript significantly concludes:

In his retirement, broken by such invidious publications from his correspondence as that appearing to-day, Gen. Otis might perhaps be pardoned for bitter reflections on what different courses the history-making of which he was so large a part might have taken, had he, on receiving the president's proclamation announcing the enforcement of our possession by conquest, instead of elaborately blue-penciling and emasculating it, in accordance with his ever-conscientious sense of his public as well as his military duty, pocketed it and resigned.

THE DEMOCRACY OF OHIO.

The real fight of the democracy of Ohio this year is on local issues. But both in their news reports and their editorial comments the plutocratic press of both political parties attempt to give it national significance of a sinister sort. They emphasize the fact that the state convention ignored Mr. Bryan and the Kansas City platform, making that appear to be its most important action. One of them, the Chicago Evening Post, a republican paper, frankly says in its issue of the 11th that every "enlightened republican will rejoice and congratulate the Ohio democracy upon its new departure, or, rather, upon its reversion to ante-Bryan doctrines;" and the others express essentially the same sentiment in varying but hardly less guarded phrase.

We have good reason for believing that no deliberate slight to Bryan or the Kansas City platform was intended by the majority of the delegates. Mayor Johnson's associates had gone into the convention with the declared purpose of forcing it to fight a state campaign on the question of local taxation. To that end they confined their energies to the trying struggle in which they found themselves pitted against McLean and the anti-Bryan leaders whom he had brought into the convention. These men represented the Ohio railroad interests as against Johnson's tax reform agitation as devotedly as they represented opposition to Bryan and the Kansas City platform. In that struggle the one demand and constant argument of the Johnson delegates were for a local campaign. This idea

of the Johnson men became the sentiment of a majority of the delegates and secured the adoption of Johnson's taxation planks, of his plan for a referendum on franchises, and of his proposal that hereafter and until federal senators are elected by the people democratic state conventions shall make senatorial nominations.

But the same argument that had been a factor in beating the reactionary leaders surrounding McLean, this democratic argument for a local campaign on local issues, enabled those leaders to influence the committee on resolutions and the convention to ignore Bryan and the national platform.

Since that omission is urged by the reactionary elements of the party as a conclusive indication that the really important outcome of the convention was not the complete defeat of the reactionaries on local democratic policies, but was their assumed triumph in overthrowing Bryan and Bryanism and reverting to old leaders and doctrines, the matter demands consideration. To appreciate the meaning of such a reversion, reference to the more recent history of the democratic party is necessary.

In the first period following the civil war the democratic party was distinguished chiefly by its efforts to get its managers and heelers into office.

It had no principles; or if it had, it kept them well out of sight. Even the good democratic doctrine of state sovereignty, as yet identified with the infamous proslavery cause, received from it only half intelligent and half hearted support. Its righteous and advancing free trade policy of the forties and fifties had been overshadowed by the slavery question, and in the excitement of the war in which that question culminated was forgotten. The democratic idol of this time was a rich New York lawyer who had acquired his wealth by railroad wrecking. He was a fit type of the party at that stage of its history.

This period ended with the first administration of President Cleveland. Mr. Cleveland had been elected not because he represented anything. He was a democrat by tradition, and represented nothing. His victory was merely negative. The corruption of

the republican party, together with a long period of hard times under republican administrations, had excited a restless popular demand for a change. "Give us a change!" was the universal cry. Tilden had started it and Cleveland got the benefit of it.

During the greater part of his administration, Cleveland gave entire satisfaction to the so-called "money power." By that term we do not mean the banking interests merely. We include also to the leaders of the great industrial combinations that have since become so menacing, but were then just beginning to crystallize. By pleasing this element he had made his reelection almost a certainty. His party and not the republican, he and not McKinley, would in that event have been foster father to the trusts.

But toward the end of his term, Mr. Cleveland wrote his famous "free trade" message to congress. It was not really a free-trade message. Yet it was so far imbued with the free-trade spirit as to reawaken, to an astonishing degree, the dormant democratic sentiment of the country. But, that same spirit in the message aroused the hostility of all the monopoly interests; for it was a signal of danger to the embryonic trusts which have since grown so great and which protection had then brought almost to the hatching point. In his campaign for reelection, consequently, Mr. Cleveland was defeated. But he had given a democratic impulse to his party.

The second post bellum period of the democratic party began with Cleveland's free-trade message. Although he suffered defeat as the champion of the reinvigorated democracy in its first battle with the plutocratic forces that Mr. McKinley has since so shrewdly fortified, his defeat did not end the struggle. It was a struggle for freedom that Mr. Cleveland had begun, and—

freedom's battle, once begun,
Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
Though baffled oft, is ever won.

The democratic free-trade campaign of 1888 was continued without cessation through the intervening years until the next presidential election. It was a glorious campaign, one of the most inspiring in the whole his-

tory of the country. As its climax approached, such an impression had been made that the democratic platform builders ventured to declare for free-trade principles more boldly than these principles had been formulated since the war, as an issue in national politics. But that was not all. Against the vigorous opposition of the reactionaries, then led by David B. Hill, Mr. Cleveland was nominated as preeminently the leader for a struggle over that issue. When the votes were counted, the victory proved to be overwhelming. Even hide-bound republican states had come into the democratic column. The democratic party had won in a fight for democratic principle. That was a grand era in the history of the party.

But it came quickly to a close. Mr. Cleveland was not the democratic leader he had been taken to be. No sooner did he return to power than he discarded the issue upon which the people had elected him, and brought forward a new one. It was Cleveland, not Bryan, who substituted the money question for the free-trade question in national politics.

That is easily demonstrated. Cleveland had been elected to put down the protection fraud. A congress strongly democratic had been elected for the same purpose. Had he realized the obligation of his responsibilities, he would have called congress together at once, while it was fresh from the people and as yet free from the influence of the protection lobby and protection leaders within the party, and in calling it together would have made the abolition of protection the object of the call. But he thought the tariff question could wait until the regular session, thirteen months after the election. So he let it wait. Meanwhile the protection interests managed to divide the party on the tariff bill, so that this bill when finally formulated turned out to be about as villainous a piece of protectionism as its republican predecessors. Though Mr. Cleveland thought the tariff question, on which he had been elected with such magnificent enthusiasm, could await the regular session of congress, that was not his opinion of the money question.

This he treated as urgent. Yet it had not been an issue at all. There was a free coinage movement in the west, but it affected both parties and nothing had occurred to crystallize it into a political issue. Left alone by the opposition it would never have become an issue. It was too shallow as compared with free trade to gather to itself enough momentum to displace free trade and the more radical reforms that free trade involves. But President Cleveland gave it the momentum it needed. Although he would not call congress together in special session to kill protection, he did call it promptly together to antagonize free silver. Not only did he promptly call congress together for that purpose, but he used the patronage of his office, with every other influence he could command—which he should have used instead to abolish protection—in order to attain his end, specifically the repeal of the silver purchase law. His success, together with his indifference to the tariff question, had a two-fold effect of disastrous character upon the democratic party. By ignoring the tariff question, on which he had been elected, he created widespread distrust. People felt that the democratic party could not be depended upon to carry out its election pledges. As a democratic doctrine, therefore, free trade ceased to appeal to the free-trade sentiment. Republican and independent free traders, as well as a large proportion of democratic free traders, were disgusted with what they reasonably regarded as treachery. Thus room was made for the money issue, which Cleveland's attack upon the silver coinage sentiment by means of the repeal of the silver purchase law, created. The silver coinage doctrine became at once, consequently, the issue in national politics.

Whether Mr. Cleveland was inspired in his fatuous policy by the so-called "money power," we do not know. But we do know that if that power had formulated the programme, it could not have made one better calculated to serve its own peculiar interests. To substitute an issue so comparatively superficial as the money question, for one so far-reaching and deep-probing as free trade, would in a conflict between democracy

and plutocracy be exactly what intelligent plutocrats would desire.

The effect was disclosed in the election returns of 1894. In two short years Mr. Cleveland had, by side-tracking free trade and raising the money issue, disorganized his party and brought it to disaster. The democratic plurality of 95 in the lower house of congress elected in 1892, was overcome and the overwhelming republican plurality of 159 returned in its place in 1894.

In popular disgust did the second post-bellum period of democratic history thus come to a close. So utterly hopeless were the democratic leaders of winning the next presidential election, that even as late as the spring of 1896 the democratic nomination went begging. No one wanted it. By common consent, as reference to the newspapers of the time will show, it was regarded as a foregone conclusion that the democratic candidate, whoever he might be, would have to carry into the campaign the enormous handicap of the record of Cleveland's second administration, and must, therefore, be overwhelmingly defeated.

It was in those depressing circumstances that the third period opened.

The democratic spirit in the party had been disappointed and disheartened, but it was not crushed. Around the free-trade standard it could not gather, for the national leader who had carried that standard four years before was now discredited and distrusted. But those who held aloft the banner of silver coinage, the owners of silver mines excepted, were at any rate moved by democratic impulses. Their financial policy might be shallow, their financial doctrine might be economically unsound, their reform might be an ephemeral fad, but they themselves were as a whole men of democratic mind, who sincerely believed the silver side of the coinage question to be a genuine expression of democratic principle. Silver coinage, became, therefore, the shibboleth of democratic democrats; while the standard of "sound money," so called, became the rallying point for all the sanctified corruption, all the plutocratic projects, and all the political

reaction that had dominated both parties.

Not that everyone who stood for "sound money" was a plutocrat, any more than everyone who stood for silver coinage was a democrat. Many rallied around the "sound-money" standard not because they liked the plutocratic company it brought them into, but because they could not accept the economic doctrine of the other side. They were academical rather than political. The point is not at all that the democracy of individuals at that time is to be tested by their position on the money question. It is that the "sound-money" side of that question was the plutocratic side, with reference to its tendencies as a political force; and that the silver side was democratic, with reference to its tendencies as a political force.

So the democratic spirit which, under the banner of free trade, Cleveland had revived in the democratic party toward the close of its first period after the war, only to baffle it in the second period, rallied at the opening of the third, under the banner of free silver. The old discredited, distrusted, and plutocratic leaders of the party either withdrew or sulked. Cleveland threw the influence of his administration against his party, Hill played for Cleveland's place as the great democratic representative of aggregated financial interests, and all the little Cleverlands and the little Hills followed suit. The campaign was left to Bryan and the democratic democrats whom his courage, ability and sincerity drew about him.

Defeat came. But it was one of those defeats of which history affords illustrious examples, where the victory of the victor is overshadowed by the manifest superiority in all but numbers of the vanquished.

This period of democracy extended over from 1896 to 1900. It is not yet closed, though possibly it may be closing. With nearly the entire press of the country against him, with all the financial institutions exerting their subtle influences to crowd him off the pedestal of party leadership, with ambitious members of his own party begging him to face both ways so that they might get into office, with new and trying questions coming up to make the situation complex, with odds

such as no party leader ever before had to meet, Mr. Bryan, nevertheless, almost alone in leadership, and supported faithfully by only a small group of men having political experience, held the party to its democratic course.

When for a second time the plutocratic power of the country, reinforced by blatant jingoism and neurotic patriotism, had defeated the democracy behind Bryan, this defeat, like the one before it, was instantly made the occasion for demands from plutocratic sources that the party be returned to the control of its old leaders. For this is the true meaning of the plutocratic opposition within the party to the party policy of the past five years. It is not at bottom so much a question of general policy. It is a question of particular control.

Upon the determination of that question depends the future career of the democratic party—whether it shall on the other hand go backward, under reactionary leadership, to a career of spoils hunting like that of its first ante-bellum period, or to one of treachery to its pledges such as that which characterized the close of its second; or whether, on the other hand, it shall go forward under genuine democratic leadership, from the silver question to the higher ideals and truer policies of democracy.

Only silver enthusiasts object to advancing from the demand for silver coinage to demands more truly democratic and radical. Only platform fanatics insist upon clinging to the Kansas City platform merely as a platform. Only man-worshippers insist upon unnecessarily obtruding Mr. Bryan's personality. But when the silver issue is laid aside, when a substitute for the Kansas City platform is brought forward, something more distinctly and radically democratic must take the place of the silver issue, and the new platform must breathe the democratic spirit of the old one. Moreover, the change must be made by the democratic democrats of the party as a step in advance along the pathway of democracy, and not by plutocratic reactionaries as a step backward. With all the rest, this must be done in no spirit of hostility to Bryan and Bryanism, but in full and cordial recognition of Bryan's de-

servedly high place in the councils of genuine democracy.

Let no one suppose that the bitter antagonism of plutocracy to Bryan rests upon his adherence to the silver-coinage policy. There are plenty of silver coinage men to whom no such antagonism attaches. Plutocratic hostility to him is due to two causes. In the first place, he is known to favor silver coinage because he believes it to be democratic; and, in the second, he deservedly commands universal confidence in his unyielding integrity. As was innocently objected to him in the recent campaign, "he is dangerous because he is honest."

So much for the action of the Ohio convention, on the assumption that it deliberately intended the slight upon Bryan and Bryanism that the plutocratic press attributes to it.

But Mayor Johnson declares, doubtless upon the assurance of his friends who were there, that there was no such intention. In an interview published in the Cleveland Plaindealer of the 13th Mr. Johnson says—

I am just as ardent an admirer of William Jennings Bryan as I ever was, and I stand in the same position on the silver question that I formerly did. I do not believe that the action of the democratic state convention was a repudiation of Mr. Bryan at all; it simply indicated that the convention wanted the battle this fall fought out on strictly state issues. This not being a presidential year there was no reason why any reference should be made to either the Kansas City platform or to Mr. Bryan. The eastern papers have carried strong accounts about the repudiation of Bryan and silver by the Ohio democrats, but I do not believe that Ohioans see it that way at all.

Even if Johnson were mistaken, even if the plutocratic press and reactionary democratic leaders are right in treating the omission from the platform of all reference to Bryan and the Kansas City platform as indicating a reversion of party control to the old and recreant leadership, nevertheless it would be folly to meet this reaction in blind passion. It must be met with definite purpose and intelligent methods. Likewise it must be met with that superlative form of courage which men call patience—the patience that endures until the time is ripe to strike. The sugges-

tion of a bolting party now is suicidal. Nothing could be more earnestly desired by the reactionary reorganizers. Every democrat who goes into a third party movement in Ohio this year weakens by that much the power of the democratic democrats of the state to prove by the action of the convention two years hence, or in the next presidential year, that the old leaders are after all not in the saddle.

Nor should the jubilation of the reactionaries be allowed to foster the impression that the most important action of the state convention was the omission from its platform of references to the national platform and to Bryan. That was not its most important act. The most important act of the Ohio convention, for the real democrats of the nation as well as for those of the state, was the adoption of Johnson's planks on taxation. Johnson's tax reform is democratic. It is radical. It attacks plutocracy where its armor is weakest, and it cuts deep. It was adopted by the convention in spite of the determined opposition of McLean and the other plutocrats. It should be made the burning issue of the campaign. Its indorsement by the people of Ohio would put a quietus upon the jubilant outcries of the reactionaries.

By the adoption of those taxation planks the power of McLean, heretofore unquestioned, has been broken. In two years it can be destroyed. And with the destruction of McLean's power in Ohio will go all the plutocratic manipulation that has bedeviled democratic politics in that state since he began to influence its management.

The duty now before the democratic democrats of Ohio is not to abandon the democratic party to plutocratic control, but to get full command of it and head it unmistakably toward radical democracy. And manifestly the way in which to do that is to make the best possible fight, within the party and not guerrilla fashion, for a legislature which can be depended upon to vote against McLean for senator, and to give legislative sanction to the far-reaching tax and franchise reforms to which the party is now committed. Were that successfully

done, the seal of popular condemnation would be ineffaceably stamped upon the plutocratic proclamation that the Ohio democracy has discarded Bryanism and gone back to bourbon leadership.

NEWS

The event of the week is the steel strike. Though this strike began on the 30th, there was supposed to be a possibility of settlement until the 13th, and it did not actually become formidable until the 15th.

As explained two weeks ago (p. 200), the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, which, under the leadership of its president, T. J. Shaffer, has declared and is conducting the strike, is striking neither for higher wages nor for shorter hours, but for the life of the organization. Before the consolidation of the various steel plants into one great trust, some of the plants were accustomed to making contracts with their employes which prohibited the latter from becoming members of unions. In that and other ways these plants prevented the organization of their employes. So long as the plants that did this were independent, the matter was not vital to the Amalgamated association. But it became vital when the nonunion plants were absorbed in the trust and still continued their custom of preventing organization. The Amalgamated association soon realized that the trust would not long continue part union and part nonunion. Obviously it must be wholly unionized, or by gradual extension of the customs and labor contracts of the nonunion plants the Amalgamated association would be crushed by the trust. But a direct demand for the unionization of all the plants was not made by the association. Its demand was that all obstacles to organization should be removed, the association maintaining that if the nonunion employes were left in freedom they would join the union. Even this demand was not made in specific terms. The specific thing demanded by the Amalgamated association was an agreement making the new wages scale apply to all the mills of the trust, whether union or nonunion. In other words, the organization put itself in the position of acting for the protection not alone of its own members but also of workmen who do not belong to it. Like the an-

thracite coal miners' organization, it extended its jurisdiction voluntarily over the whole mass of workmen in the entire industry. This raised the issue. The trust magnates knew the purpose of the association, and foresaw that this demand if accorded would have the effect of opening up all its plants to union influences. They therefore rejected the demand. Though willing to agree as usual upon a wages scale for the year, and willing also to pay nonunion workmen the union rates, as matter of private arrangement with the nonunion men individually, they were not willing to agree with the union to make the scale applicable to both union and nonunion mills. To have done so, would, they felt, have been to agree virtually to the unionization of every mill in the trust. It will be seen, therefore, that the strike that has ensued is at bottom a conflict over the question of labor organization in the mills of the steel trust—whether they shall be union or nonunion. The first result of the trust's rejection of the association's demand was the strike ordered on the 30th. As reported two weeks ago (p. 200), some 35,000 men then struck in the sheet mills, and were soon followed by a strike of some 15,000 in the hoop mills. These figures appear now to have been excessive. The actual number of strikers in both sheet and hoop mills did not exceed 30,000. As most of those mills were then temporarily closed, the effect even of this large strike was not noticeable. Now, however, the mills are ready to work, and the magnitude of the strike is evident. Conservative estimates put the number of men now on strike at 51,500.

The orders for extending the strike on July 15 were issued by Mr. Shaffer on the 13th, after a conference between the committee of the Amalgamated association and representatives of the great billion-dollar steel trust. The conference met at Pittsburgh on the 11th. After a session of two days, Mr. Shaffer, in behalf of the Amalgamated association, offered the following compromise proposition:

We hereby repeat our request for the signing of the scale for all mills owned and controlled by the sheet, hoop and tin plate companies. We agree, if the scales are signed as stated above, to classify Monnessan tin plate works as a special mill, and arrange a special scale for it. Also there shall be a reconstruction of the scales for the mills working hoop and cotton ties

exclusively. And we also agree that if our work of organizing mills outside the possessions of the above named companies should cause the shutting down of plants and the calling out of men there shall be no interference with the operation of the mills belonging to or operated by the American Sheet Steel company, the American Steel Hoop company and the American Tin Plate company during the scale year. This agreement is to abrogate all contracts signed by the men of these companies, in which they agree not to join or be connected with the Amalgamated association or any other labor organization.

The trust representatives would not accept that compromise, and the conference dissolved. After its dissolution they made this informal explanation to the public of their position:

The conference between the Amalgamated association and the sheet, hoop and tin companies failed to come to an agreement because the Amalgamated association did not recede from its original position, which was that the three companies in interest should sign the scale for all their mills without regard as to whether these mills had in the past belonged to the Amalgamated association or not. The manufacturers did not refuse them the right to organize, but having many men in mills not in the Amalgamated association who did not wish to become association men, claimed that they must respect these men in their wishes as well as those who are members of the Amalgamated association. In order to effect a compromise, the manufacturers offered to sign for several mills which have always in the past been out of the association. No compromise was offered by the Amalgamated association. The American Tin Plate company has only one nonunion mill. It requested the privilege to make a special scale for this mill and sign same. This was refused and the companies were given to understand that the men in all tin mills would be called out, even though the scale had been signed for all the mills and the privilege as requested above would settle all differences between the tin plate company and the Amalgamated association.

Immediately upon leaving the conference Mr. Shaffer declared a general strike, to take effect July 15, in all the sheet, hoop and steel mills; and he has been obeyed to an unexpected extent. Reports from western Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Illinois and Indiana, where these classes of mills are located, tell of a general stoppage of work. Even mills that have been running as nonunion shops for years, are tied up. As yet the

strike has not been extended to any other plants of the great steel trust than those of the three classes mentioned above—sheet, hoop and tin—but if necessary it will be extended to all. Should that be done it will involve 200,000 men, and be the largest strike in the history of the modern labor movement.

On the stock market the strike had the effect on the 15th of reducing preferred stock of the steel trust from 91½ to 86½, and common stock from 41½ to 37.

Besides reports of the steel strike very little news of importance has appeared this week in the daily papers. From the Philippines the dispatches indicate that the fighting is not yet over, and there are ominous intimations of arbitrary retaliatory acts against the natives. "Many native murderers," says one dispatch, "have been hanged or imprisoned." One surrender, that of Gen. Gobarro with 70 men, is reported; and a native chief is credited with having forbidden slavery and slave-trading in the Zamboango district, in the island of Mindanao. Like the Americans in the Philippines, the British are still struggling with their problem in South Africa. Sporadic fighting in a small way is taking place, and evidence of the complete abrogation of responsible government in Cape Colony accumulates. References to solemn hearings before "the vigilance committee," accounts of British attacks upon Boer laagers in Cape Colony and the capture of Cape Colony rebels, and brief reports of the hanging of these rebels for treason, interspersed with allusions to the "suspension of responsible government," all indicate that the war is active far within the borders of Cape Colony itself. What the facts really are is hidden from the outside world by the censorship. Among the few items of war news is one to the effect that Lord Kitchener has captured the papers of the Orange Free State government, in a skirmish at which President Steyn himself but barely escaped capture.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Trans-Mississippi Commercial congress began its session at Cripple Creek on the 17th.

—Charles Nordhoff, the eminent journalist and author, died at San Francisco on the 14th, aged 71.

—Gov. Allen sailed from Porto Rico on the 13th for the states, bringing

with him his family and household effects.

—Gen. Daniel Butterfield, a famous federal officer in the civil war, died at Cold Spring, N. Y., on the 17th, aged 70 years.

—The thirty-fifth anniversary meeting of the Universal Peace union was held at Buffalo from the 15th to the 17th.

—A labor union of servant girls, under the name of "The Workingwomen's Protective Association of America," was organized on the 11th at Chicago.

—A call for a convention of the Bryan democrats of Ohio to assemble at Columbus on the 31st has been issued from Cleveland. No names of responsible signers are reported.

—Hugo Jone, assistant city chemist of Chicago, claims to have invented a mechanism for producing electricity directly from coal, thereby reducing the loss of power from 80 or 90 per cent., as at present, to 65 per cent.

—Robert H. Newell, an old-time journalist and author, well known as a humorist in the civil war period by the nom de plume of "Orpheus C. Kerr," was found dead in his house in Brooklyn on the 12th.

—The duke of Connaught, brother of King Edward, who succeeds the king as grand master of the free masons of England, was installed in that office on the 18th at London, in the presence of an immense throng of masonic notables.

—Santos-Dumont, a Brazilian, made a successful demonstration of the possibility of air ship navigation at Paris on the 13th. Leaving St. Cloud in his balloon at 6:41 in the morning, he navigated it to the Eiffel tower, rounded the tower, and, almost dead in the eye of the wind, steered it back to St. Cloud, making the journey at the rate of 13¾ miles an hour. He lost the prize of \$20,000 because he did not return to the exact starting point within half an hour, which would have been at the rate of nearly 20 miles an hour.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, as given by the June treasury sheet, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M ...	\$1,487,656,544	\$822,756,533	\$664,900,011 exp.
G ...	53,229,520	64,571,852	11,342,332 imp.
S ...	54,285,180	36,384,041	17,901,139 exp.
	\$1,595,171,244	\$923,712,426	\$671,458,818 exp.
1900.	1,499,457,718	927,780,483	571,677,235 exp.
1899.	1,320,864,443	816,778,148	504,086,295 exp.
1898.	1,301,993,960	767,369,109	534,624,851 exp.

Total exports of wealth (merchandise, gold and silver all included) since July 1, 1897, which remains unpaid for—the so-called "favorable balance" \$2,281,847,199

MISCELLANY

SONNET.

To One Espousing Unpopular Truth.
Not yet, dejected though thy cause, despair,
Nor doubt of Dawn for all her laggard wing.

In shrewdest March the earth was mellowing.

And had conceived the Summer unaware.
With delicate ministrations, like the air,
The sovereign forces that conspire to bring

Light out of darkness, out of Winter Spring,

Perform unseen their tasks benign and fair.

The sower soweth seed o'er vale and hill,
And long the folded life waits to be born;
Yet hath it never slept, nor once been still:

And clouds and suns have served it night and morn;

The winds are of its secret council sworn;
And Time and nurturing Silence work its will.

—William Watson, in the London Speaker.

ORGANIZED CAPITAL—ORGANIZED LABOR.

The following is a late daily press dispatch from New York:

Stockholders of the Pennsylvania Coal company were notified to-day of an extra dividend of 43 1-5 per cent., making a total of 59½ per cent. received by them since the acquirement of the company by J. P. Morgan & Co. for the Erie railroad.

Under precisely the same date was a dispatch from the same place announcing that many employers were resolved upon a war of extermination against "trades unionism" or labor organizations. This action being the result of the strike of the organized machinists of the country for a nine-hour day without change of pay. If organized labor deserves extermination for demanding the mild concession noted what sort of a fate does the above mentioned coal trust deserve, is a naughty question that will occur to an occasional naughty citizen, who, if he voices the question, will be accused of trying to "stir up strife," to "create discontent," and disturb the present prosperous and satisfactory business situation. If organized labor would publicly declare a war of extermination against trusts, and proceed to carry on the war there would be a deal more said about it than about the same declaration by employers, and it would not be complimentary to organized labor, either. It seems to make a deal of difference whose ox is gored, capital's or labor's.

—Farm, Stock and Home, of Minneapolis.

THE MODERN WOMAN.

There are more ways of crushing a masher than one. The average woman silently endures the cowardly crea-

ture's attentions, others hurry into the nearest store and a few are sufficiently courageous to call an officer and give the pest into custody. Rarest of all is the cool-headed female who turns ridicule on her tormentor, and one of these had an adventure in a North side street car last week. She was trying to button a tight glove when a well-dressed coward who sat near leaned over and said insinuatingly: "Let me help you. I am very handy at that sort of thing." The young woman was at first inclined to freeze him with a steady glare, but changed her mind and with a slight blush extended her hand to the fellow, the other passengers looking on with much interest. The thing in man's shape fastened the glove and the hand was withdrawn. The girl dipped a couple of taper fingers into her purse and in the most matter-of-fact way took out a ten-cent piece, which she offered to the masher with a smiling "Thank you." The creature flushed up and began a stammering protest, on which the girl put the dime back and extracting half a dollar, said: "That surely ought to be enough for your trouble." This was too much for the masher, who hurried from the car. The girl settled herself back in her seat with a satisfied look, and the other passengers had difficulty in restraining a cheer.—Chicago Chronicle.

"PATRIOTISM AND ETHICS."

A letter from C. O. Ovington to the London Speaker, published in the Speaker of June 15.

"Patriotism is nationally that which egoism is individually—has, in fact, the same root; and along with kindred benefits, brings kindred evils." This dictum of Mr. Herbert Spencer sums up, from the point of view of modern science, the whole psychology and ethics of the question. We now understand how the natural self-assertion of the individual develops, first into the self-assertion of the family, and thence into the self-assertion of the nation, which is called patriotism.

All three types of egoism are necessary, and, within due limits, admirable; but all are degraded by the excess which has no consideration for the feelings and the rights of other individuals, of other families and of other nations.

Such an explanation comes almost as a truism to those who reflect; but the "Jingoes," carried away by the first promptings of a primitive instinct, do not, unfortunately, stop to reflect. That one who invariably acts upon the maxim: "Myself, right

or wrong," is an egoistic criminal, they readily admit, but when they themselves proceed to act upon the parallel maxim: "Our country, right or wrong," they fancy they must be altruistic heroes. Accordingly, they do not hesitate to annex even civilized states by force and call it imperialism. At the same time they denounce as traitors those of their fellow countrymen who prefer justice to unscrupulous patriotism.

Truly, the patriotic bigotry which prompts aggressive war, is, to any nation calling itself civilized, an unmitigated curse. It squanders human lives and money earned by human energies, only to bring not glory but dishonor, not progress but degeneration.

Tantum . . . potuit suadere malorum.

THE SOON-ER AND THE MAN FROM YES-TER-DAY.

The Man from Yes-ter-day had learn-ed the old-fash-ion-ed vir-tues. So he work-ed in-dust-ri-ous-ly. But the Soon-er, having pre-empt-ed the land on which the Man from Yes-ter-day must work, charg-ed him rent every time he was in-dust-ri-ous.

E-vent-u-al-ly, when the Man from Yes-ter-day had raised all the po-ta-to-es the Soon-er could eat, the Soon-er gave him no-tice to quit.

The Man from Yes-ter-day took up ed-u-ca-tion in order to in-crease his op-por-tun-i-ties; where-up-on the Soon-er bought up all the land a-round him and held it for a rise, which he in-tend-ed to take out of the Man from Yes-ter-day.

The Man from Yes-ter-day, see-ing that the Soon-er was get-ting more pos-ses-sions than he could man-age, rea-son-ed with him-self that if he could show his de-vo-tion to his em-ploy-er's in-ter-est, he would be more val-u-able; so he be-came very hon-est. This de-creased the Soon-er's ex-pense of man-ag-ing his prop-er-ty, so it in-creas-ed in val-ue, and he took up more land.

Seeing that his share of his own pro-duct would bare-ly keep him, the Man from Yes-ter-day stud-ied e-con-omy, where-up-on, see-ing that he could live cheap-er than before, the Soon-er cut down his wages; and when the Man from Yes-ter-day ob-ject-ed, the Soon-er told him that if he was not sat-is-fied he could quit work—and quit living.

The Soon-er en-dow-ed a coll-age to teach the Man from Yes-ter-day that it was all right and when the Pro-fess-ors said that Hon-es-ty, Indus-

try and Per-sev-er-ance were the ways to raise the rents, they were dis-miss-ed for in-sub-ord-in-a-tion.

Then the Soon-er, see-ing that the Man from Yes-ter-day was be-com-ing rest-less en-gag-ed a clergy-man to point him to the sky for the sat-is-fac-tion of his wants.—Bolton Hall, in Life, of New York, of July 4.

WHY THE HOBO AVOIDS THE KANSAS HARVEST FIELDS.

Editorial in the Chicago Record-Herald of July 10.

The Record-Herald has received from an indignant hobo of Carl, Mich., a spirited defense of his tribe for preferring the shady park benches of northern cities free to the harvest fields of Kansas at princely wages. He professes to speak from experience, and says that the offers of labor agencies of three dollars per day and free railway fare to work in Kansas are a delusion and a snare—springes to catch woodcock. He says that he could recruit 5,000 men in a week to accept these terms if the Record-Herald would guarantee that they are in good faith.

This, he assures us, they are not, but that if a hobo applies for a three-dollar-a-day job in Kansas he has to put up so much money for his ticket and two dollars to the agency, and, continues:

Then you are loaded into an emigrant coach and shipped west to some little town on the prairie. You get off to start your three-dollar-a-day job, but right here is where the hobo goes up against it. The train pulls out and the farmer comes over the fence and offers you \$1.25 per day. You refuse it and try another. But they are all the same. They have all agreed to pay \$1.25 and no more. You go over to the little store and try to buy something to eat and they refuse to sell it to you, thinking to starve you to it, and in many cases they succeed.

If you go to work for them you are called at 3:30 in the morning from your bed in the barn (usually a pile of corn husks) to a breakfast of sour belly and corn bread. You are in the field at work by 4:30 and work until 8:30 in the evening.

After the harvest comes pay day. By the time the farmer takes his extras out you have usually less than one dollar a day. Well, you think that you will go back east, and you see the railroad agent. He tells you it costs three cents per mille to ride on his road. You wait for a freight. You give up a dollar for the shack and get ditched in the first town, where the marshal is waiting for you. He will either rob you outright and kick you out of town or take you in, and they will fine you all you have made. When you get back east you have nothing but a sore head.

This, we are assured on the word of a hobo and a traveled gentleman, is a true story. It is said to be based on the experience in Kansas of our

correspondent and 10,000 others. It presents the reverse of the picture of thousands of acres of yellow grain in Kansas and the Dakotas waving in the sunshine and crying to the idlers in the cities of the east: "The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few."

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the original manuscript.

Dear John: I notice one of your Boer prisoners got away from Bermuda, swum three miles to a ship and was brought into New York, nearly dead from exertion and exhaustion. A boy of twenty-five years, he was, and deserves to get away for his pluck. It's a tough man who wouldn't let a rat get away who had swum three miles for liberty, let alone fightin' like a Boer. But my administration is holding him up and considerin' if they shall send him back to you. They are! Considerin' it! My administration!

I wish Dan Webster was Secretary of State again!

Do you mind Dan? Well, Dan couldn't be President, but he could say a thing about as well as any boy I ever had. And while he was Secretary of State it happened that Kosuth, or some one of those foreign fellers, came over. Well, it never occurred to Dan, or the President then, to send him back. This was America—Land of the free—Home of the brave, etc.; and we were a little proud of ourselves, and jaunty about it, and truckled to nobody.

And so the people yelled and whooped for the patriot, till the Emperor—of Austria, I think it was—got mad and complained to the President. Then Dan got hold of his pen to reply.

Now there never was an Emperor since the world began, knee high to Dan Webster in usin' words; and Dan jest slaughtered him. I forget his lingo; it's in the state papers; but Dan told him that we had no special objection to kings and emperors so long as they stayed at home and attended to business in a modest way; but when any people wanted a republic, this nation was with 'em heart and soul.

And it was! Why, I believe in my soul that Ohio would have tarred and feathered McKinley in '61 fer holdin' a patriot republican as McKinley holds that Boer.

But about every thirty or forty years a lot of toadies get in, and go into the slave catchin' business.

We used to catch niggers, and return 'em to their masters, and I had an awful job putting an end to it. But I did it and I will show you a land yet where a patriot can land without being held up and returned to a king, or my name is not UNCLE SAM.

WALT WHITMAN AND THE DEMOCRACY OF THE NEW CENTURY.

Writes Anne Gilchrist in her "Confession of Faith:"

Fifteen years ago, with feelings partly of indifference, partly of antagonism—for I had heard none but ill words of them—I first opened Walt Whitman's poems. But as I read I first became conscious of receiving the most powerful influence that had ever come to me from any source. What was the spell? It was that in them humanity has, in a new sense, found itself, for the first time has dared to accept itself without disparagement, without reservation. For the first time an unrestricted faith in all that is and in the issues of all that happens has burst forth triumphantly into song.

"Out of the bulk, the morbid and the shallow,

Out of the bad majority, the varied countless frauds of men and states,
Electric, antiseptic yet, cleaving, suffusing all,

Only the good is universal."

It is in the prophetic, master handling of this theme—the universal religious faith in man—that Walt Whitman stands forth as the Poet of Democracy. Not alone of any present crude and elementary idea of mere political equality, but of a democracy involving such a world wide unity of faith in the goodness of God and the glory of his creation, that men everywhere will rise to claim their heritage of sonship with the Divine. In Walt Whitman one might almost fancy come back to earth the inspired writer of Genesis. Returned with the wisdom of ages upon him so he might amplify and expand that great revelation. In the beginning God saw everything that He had made and it was very good and God created man in His own image. "In His own image"—with Walt Whitman this "great idea" is so great that again and again as he sits down to play on the organ of his magnificent imagination, this theme sounds first and is followed by a poetic figure of such width and variation as bewilders his audience. "Heaven high, hell deep" is his reach of the harmonies of creation; all chords, discords, melodies, single notes, in his inspiration he endeavors to sound, till at last he is driven to confess his impotence of expression before the glory of it all.

When I undertake to tell the best, I find I cannot,

My tongue is ineffectual on its pivots,
My breath will not be obedient to its organs,

I become a dumb man.

And so he sums up his aspirations and focuses his belief in a "Song of the Universal,"

Give me, O God, to sling that thought,
Give me, give him or her I love this quenchless faith,

Belief in plan of Thee enlaced in Time and Space,
Health, peace, salvation universal.

And the practical outcome of his faith is his democracy. A twofold democracy, which on its Godward side reveals man aware of his high destiny and conscious that obedience to his Creator involves, not self-abasement, but nobility of bearing; while manward this democracy demands not only an equality of advantage political and economic, but throughout the whole range of life freedom and a chance for all to develop, mentally their minds, and spiritually their characters, to the utmost limit of capacity.

By God, I will accept nothing which all cannot have their counterpart of on the same terms.

First, then, the true democrat is to stand upright and fearless before God; for if we are to have any dealings with Him it must be as men, and not as anything lower in the scale of creation. Comrades, coworkers with Him in the edification of the universe, we are to hold ourselves before God as do Kipling's angels, "gentlemen unafraid."

I have said that the soul is not more than the body,

And I have said that the body is not more than the soul,

And nothing, not God, is greater to one than one's self is.

We may well reflect that this attitude is, indeed, the first condition of receiving direction and instruction from God—even as the voice came to the prophet of old, prostrate in his self-abasement, "Son of Man, stand upon thy feet and I will speak with thee."

Thus we are to say to the young man facing the world, as he sets out on his moral adventure, "you have declared war against a powerful foe, you have a stern battle to fight, you are entered on a perilous quest, but you are not a poor helpless creature, you are born for success, you are made for a conqueror. Yes, and your victory depends on your own pride of character, your dignity, your high self respect." So will his life and its object become positive and not negative, so will he be drawn

upwards by and to an attractive ideal and not merely impelled mechanically towards a goal.

And humility! which some fancy has been lost sight of. No, not lost sight of, but humility—to quote again Anne Gilchrist with her "Eternal Womanly" insight into the spirit of the New Age—

Humility is the sweet spontaneous grace of an aspiring finely developed nature which sees always heights ahead still unclimbed, which outstrips itself in eager longing for excellence still unattained.

Secondly, and for their attitude to society we are to say with our poet to men and women everywhere,

Whoever you are! claim your own at any hazard.

Not indeed as suggesting an ultimate ideal of life but as a step towards fulfillment, as a democratic principle of progress. For as the Law preceded the fuller revelation of Love, so the ever completer establishment of justice must keep preceding the fuller development of Christian life social or individual. We must be just before we can presume to be generous, love must be based on integrity, peace on purity. Thus we are to call on men to claim their own, their just rights, no more but no less; that is their moral own, which is far enough from to-day's standard of ownership, namely "to keep all you get and get all you legally can." "Whoever you are! claim your own" inalienable rights—for however much schoolmen may protest against the theory they rail in vain against the consciousness of the divine rights of men. Whoever you are, man or woman, claim your right to think, speak and be heard on any matter affecting the common welfare, yes, and your right to register your opinion so it may be counted among the sum of opinions on either side the controversy. "Whoever you are! claim your own," your right of access to nature and to nature's opportunities for labor or for enjoyment—the bounty of the All Father—of which you are now deprived to your soul's great loss, by social maladjustment and a collective perversion of the moral law. "Claim your own," not indeed for your own sake but that having "laid her foundation in sapphire"—that is in truth and justice—the city may rise to the full adornment of a beautiful and lovely civilization.—W. L. Torrance, in *The Hiram House Life of Cleveland, O.*

Real conceit is only hurt by what is not said about it.—Puck.

SALEN'S SPEECH AT THE OHIO CONVENTION.

The speech of Charles P. Salen, temporary and permanent chairman of the Ohio state convention at Columbus, delivered at the opening of the convention, July 10, as reported in the Cleveland Plaindealer of July 11.

You are gathering in state convention, not alone to nominate a ticket which shall command the respect of the voters of the state, but also to define your attitude upon questions which to them are of the most vital concern. It is for you to decide whether this gathering shall be the commonplace kind which nominates a ticket, indulges in platitudes and adjourns; or whether it shall take action so forceful and so productive of results as to entitle it to a page in history.

In this election our first concern is with state affairs, and the democratic principle which settles national questions right can do so with local ones as well. But, while holding that national issues should not control this campaign, yet as one of the great representative bodies of the American democracy we are deeply concerned in those which now are uppermost and which relate to domineering trusts at home and to subject colonies abroad.

The party in power fosters mammoth monopolies as its domestic policy, and in its foreign policy it imitates the crown colony system of Great Britain. Against both policies the democratic party must be unwavering in its hostility. When our party ceases to oppose these policies it ceases to be democratic. And let no one protest that this opposition is negative and reactionary. In fact, it is affirmative and progressive.

By opposing trusts we promote liberty. In fighting against them we fight for the just rights of property, for an equitable distribution of wealth, for industrial peace, for social order, for individual and national advancement. The trust stands like a dragon in the path of American progress. It must be destroyed or our country cannot go forward. Though some classes flourish where trusts are fostered, the great masses, the country as a whole, must soon realize the words of Goldsmith when he describes the conditions where "wealth accumulates and men decay." The republican policy of feeding and fostering the trusts is a policy of negation and reaction. The democratic policy of destroying

trusts is the true policy of progress.

What the trust question is to our domestic policy such is imperialism to our foreign policy. To make new feeding ground for trusts, crown colonies are established under the American flag. Our country once boasted the Monroe doctrine, which guaranteed the independence of all American republics. But that beneficent doctrine has been bartered away for ignoble ambitions to be a grim world power. From being the great protector of American republics we have become a confederate of the war lords of Europe. Once the world's exemplar of the Jeffersonian doctrine of self-government our beloved republic is now embarked upon a shameless career of conquest. It has abjured the fundamental principles of the grand old declaration of independence and set up the British system of crown colonies and of making obedient subjects of unwilling people. This is not progress, whether British Tories do it in South Africa or American republicans do it in the Philippines. This imperial foreign policy must be reversed. A democratic foreign policy must be substituted for it.

Am I told that the democrats have no foreign policy? Whether they have or not depends upon what is meant. It is true that they have no dishonorable policy of conquest. It is true that they have no autocratic policy for governing subjects by military power. But it is not true that they have no foreign policy. They have inherited one from Washington and Jefferson which is as far in advance of world power policies as the twentieth century is in advance of the middle ages. The foreign policy of the democrats of this country is to make our republic the model of political and commercial progress. They would again have the American flag upon every sea; not by subsidies wrung from the labor of the people, but through commercial freedom. They would inspire all mankind with confidence in the fidelity of the nation to its pledges—not its money pledges alone, but also its pledges to abstain from conquest; not only its promises to European bondholders, but also its promises to Cuban patriots. The democratic party would have this nation give to the world an example of self-government, of equality of all men under the law, of equal opportunity for all men in the race of life, of orderly freedom—such an example of democracy as

would make the American nation a world power of transcendent influence. No nation should dare or even wish to attack it. All nations should seek its trade. Its word to the humblest should be as good as its bond to the greatest. Under every government upon the globe the democratic masses should watch our glorious example, should study our inspired history, should consider our unsullied reputation as a great and faithful democratic republic. Our splendid realities should be their noble ideals. And, pointing to our flag as the beautiful symbol of it all, they should exclaim—as at times in the past liberty loving men of other lands have exclaimed: "By this sign we conquer."

With such a foreign policy, this foreign policy of the democracy, the United States would grow in true republican strength and true democratic equality. And as it grew, it would make that conquest with which no grasping territory can compare, that conquest which military conquerors have never known and sanguinary swords can never achieve—the conquest of the confidence and affection of the masses of mankind.

Without detracting from those great questions, there are in this campaign in Ohio questions of such transcendent importance to the people of the state that they overwhelm all other issues, and foremost of all is the adoption of an equitable system of assessing and collecting tax burdens. If we can win for the people of Ohio at this election relief from the inequality of steam railroad taxation alone, it will be a lasting blessing. The steam railroads are paying less than one-fifth of their just share of taxation by comparison with the owners of farms and other small properties. Every county in the state loses greatly by this scheme of injustice, and through it every citizen in every county in Ohio is paying more than his just share of taxes.

Much of the inequality could be corrected by the fidelity of the county auditors. It has developed largely from the favors distributed by railroads to state and county officials. Not only this convention but every county in the state should rise in arms against this inequity and install as auditors men who will respect their oath of office and stand for truth and justice in the assessing of railroad property.

The whole taxation scheme is foul with inequalities. It vitiates public trusts and completely defeats the ends of justice. Can we do the people of Ohio any greater service than to correct these inequalities? Can we do

more for our party than to earn the gratitude of the people for destroying such abuses?

Five million dollars of steam railroad property in Ohio to-day escapes taxation. It is not on the duplicate. The home, the farm, the little industry hopelessly struggling against the privileged trust, are there, listed frequently above their salable value. You who own them have no favors to offer. You have not learned the art of bribery. Your protest is unheeded. You must pay the tribute to injustice or lose your home. You must endure.

The republican convention, while trying to conduct this campaign on national issues and avoid all state questions, still was forced to make a vague reference to this issue. If the republicans are successful the people may expect legislation as vague and unsatisfactory as their platform. Let our declaration be so clear that the people may realize its meaning.

Let us not, as many democratic conventions have done, merely meet and parcel among individuals a few nominations. Let us by decisive action start the movement that will ultimately lift the worst burdens from the poor, that will establish a reign of justice in our civilization, that will among the masses substitute contentment for despair and love for hatred.

A SONG OF FREEDOM.

For The Public.

The flag which symbol'd equal rights
And peace to all mankind,
Which shone on freedom's flashing heights,
To strike the despot blind,
Hath been degraded from its place,
Its starry pride brought low,
To triumph o'er a conquered race:
I'll not believe it—

—No!

The country, whose undying pride
Was still to shelter all,
Which flung its eastern portals wide
To patriot and to thrall,
And raised a calm and mighty hand
To stay the tyrant's blow,
In bloody conquest draws the brand:
I'll not believe it—

—No!

The fire upon the sacred place,
The emblem of the day,
The star which turned each noble face
To where the dawning lay,
Tossed liberty's great harbor light
Is burning red and low;
Its reeking embers cloud the night:
I'll not believe it—

—No!

Ah, no! This land shall wake once more
From conquest's bloody dream;
The starry banner, on its shore,
To freedom's winds shall stream;
The fire of freedom, through the night,
Shall flash against the sky,
And all the world shall see the light:
I WILL believe it—

—Ay!

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

A BIT OF BOOK-KEEPING.

To one archipelago.	\$20,000,000	By two years' exports to Philippines say \$3,200,000 profit on which at 12 per cent. is	\$384,000
To benevolently assimilating the same, 730 days, at \$750,000 a day....	547,000,000		
To expenses able negotiators Paris Treaty	222,000		
To two islands which able negotiators thought they had bought.	100,000		
	\$667,322,000		
	384,000		
Profit and loss....	\$666,938,000		

—N. Y. Evening Post.

Van Bibber—When Kruger comes to this country and goes to see McKinley, do you think the old man will have a pleasant call?

Van Kuber—He will if he doesn't know what jollyng is.

G. T. E.

"I see they've discovered oil in Texas."

"What! Did the Standard Oil company give its consent?"—Puck.

Thornburn—Aguinaldo is becoming more like Funston every day.

Bradley—How is that?

Thornburn—We are getting to hear so little of him.

G. T. E.

Sometimes a public office is a public trust administered in the interest of a private trust.—Puck.

The Visitor in the Midway—Your "What-is-it" looks like an ordinary human being.

The Freak Manager—He's a Portorican.

G. T. E.

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 687, Chicago.**

Volume III of The Public

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

Bound Volumes Now Ready. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, **PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.**

For any Book on Earth Old or New

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

CATALOGUES FREE.

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,
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW.
Suite 420, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Long Distance Telephone, Central 3361.

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

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 254.

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.
Fresley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 911-912A.
NEW YORK.

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**