

Dr. H.J. Woodhouse
Nov 2-01 Box 541

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1901.

Number 152.

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.

The extraordinary street car enterprises in which Tom L. Johnson is reported to have engaged since declaring himself out of business and entering upon his long cherished plan of smashing monopoly, have a strikingly suspicious appearance of having been manufactured by the Associated Press. The motive is not far to seek. Men who manipulate the Associated Press for business and political purposes have learned from experience that they can fool some of the people all of the time.

Indiana furnishes another negro lynching bee. The murderous mob in this case, however, showed evidence of being a degree in advance of the regular negro lynching mobs, along the lines of civilization, for it did not burn its victim's body until it had killed him by hanging. That is some evidence of improvement. But it was characteristic of this mob as of all the others that it was composed of citizens who believe so profoundly in "law and order" that they will have it if they have to defy all the laws and break up all the order there is to get it.

Representative Crafts, of Chicago, introduced in the legislature of Illinois on the 26th a resolution for amending the constitution with reference to the Illinois system of taxation. This resolution is substantially the same as the Elsberg bill of New York, heretofore commended in these columns and which the New York chamber of commerce has indorsed. It would abolish the state board of equalization, substituting the auto-

matic method of the Elsberg bill for apportioning state taxes among the counties, and would also establish local option in taxation in the counties for purposes of local revenue. This is a good measure, and Representative Crafts should be made to understand that in promoting its passage he will have the support of all intelligent students of taxation.

Some Chicago real estate agents are trying to play upon too confiding people the trick they played a year ago. Aided by real estate reporters they are serving the local papers with baseless yarns about rising rents. The principal sufferers by this trick last year were small owners, especially of apartment houses. Believing the boom reports, these landlords notified their tenants of an increase in their rents. But the tenants were not so easily gulled, and in consequence many small landlords faced the 1st of May with empty flats upon their hands. Rents did not go up last year, the predictions of real estate agents and real estate reporters notwithstanding. Neither will they go up this year. The tenant who cannot renew his lease upon last year's terms has a fool for a landlord. If he agrees to a higher rent his landlord has a fool for a tenant.

Having been advised by the attorney general, and advised soundly, that it cannot investigate the Dowie bank, the Illinois legislature is urged by some of its members to pass a law putting all private banks under state control. The itch for regulating private affairs by law is always breaking out somewhere and somehow.

Already the people of Cleveland have been treated to a surprise in connection with Tom L. Johnson's mayoralty campaign. At the begin-

ning it was asserted and believed that he would not have the support of a single daily newspaper besides the Recorder. But that has all changed. The Recorder has been with him from the start. The Waechter-Anzeiger, the leading German paper of northern Ohio and one of the most progressive in the country, is giving him its hearty support. The Press, which eschews editorial matter, gives him a frequent lift in the news columns. And on the 26th the Plain Dealer, which had never been friendly to Johnson, came out for him in a long and strong editorial, in which it described him as "a man of unquestioned business ability and unimpeached honesty," whose "capacity for managing large undertakings has been frequently demonstrated," and who, as "those who have known him best and watched him most closely have good reason for believing," will, if elected, "be the actual mayor of Cleveland and not the puppet of any party, faction or clique." There is no newspaper opposition to Johnson in Cleveland now except the two hard and fast republican organs, the Leader and the World.

The American senate has decided to invest the president with greater power than is possessed by the most despotic civilized sovereign on earth. It is a power, moreover, that may be withdrawn only by a two-thirds vote of each house of congress, unless the president himself voluntarily relinquishes it. The colossal magnitude of the proposed power may be appreciated by considering that it would confer on the president the right to make, repeal and extend at pleasure, all laws for the government of over 10,000,000 civilized people; and would enable him to appoint and remove at will all officers for the execution of

those laws. It would be the most remarkable modern instance of the creation of a despot so absolute that millions of human beings are dependent upon him even for their lives. He would be literally legislator, judge and executioner, with no one to check him or hold him to account. And as to the perpetuation of this despotic power, the whole story may be found in a single sentence of the proposed law—that which provides that the power shall continue “until otherwise provided by congress.” No provision otherwise can be made by congress, except through the enactment of a law. The president’s unlimited power would continue, therefore, until congress should repeal, or amend, or enact a substitute for the imperial clause proposed by the senate as a rider on the army appropriation bill. But congress could not do any of these things by less than a two-thirds vote of each house, without the president’s consent. If he refused that, by vetoing bills terminating his imperial power, the power would continue until two-thirds of the members of each house were sufficiently aroused to the growing dangers of imperialism to pass a bill over his veto.

We have no notion that any such usurping programme is now contemplated. Mr. McKinley doubtless expects to yield up his despotism as soon as “good government” is established in the Philippines. Doubtless, also, his supporters in congress expect him to do so. There is probably no other iniquity intended now than such as relates to the distribution of Philippine lands among presidential favorites. But never in all history has a novelty in despotism been made permanent at the start. Seldom has its permanency been intended. Despotism of the most vicious character usually develops from mischievous benevolence. Before the good Mr. McKinley succeeds in benevolently assimilating the Filipinos, his term may expire with this despotic power still attaching to his

office; and a president may come in with less inclination to part with such tempting authority. Should that contingency occur, the real despot would need the support of only one-third of each house to continue him in office as the absolute monarch of the Philippine islands. Beyond that point, all is conjecture. It may be worth considering; however, that imperialism seldom subsides until it has spent its force. And there would be much force, even at home, in absolute imperial power over 10,000,000 people, though they were 10,000 miles away.

Another move of the McKinley confederacy is dishonorable as well as imperialistic. We refer to the Cuban clause which the senate has also, under the white house lash, attached to the army appropriation bill. With unparalleled cheek this amendment makes the solemn declaration of our government, put forth at beginning the war with Spain—the declaration that we would leave Cuba to her people as soon as they had established a stable government there — makes that declaration, by a bold distortion of language, the basis for insisting upon suzerain conditions. It is enough to say of these conditions that if conceded by Cuba they would furnish all manner of pretexts for invading the island whenever the party in power in the United States might wish to do so. A repetition in Cuba of the British policy in South Africa would be a perennial danger. But more than that, they dishonor our country, by making of its solemn pledge an indecent mockery. For these conditions fly full in the face of our national declaration regarding Cuba, upon going to war with Spain, of the declaration already referred to and which reads:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accom-

plished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

What Cuba ought to do is to ignore any suzerain conditions which the United States may seek to impose. She is represented by a constitutional convention which this country recognizes. That convention has adopted a constitution which her people would approve. Let them vote upon it. If they confirm it, as they doubtless would, let them proceed calmly and peaceably to organize their government under it. Then let them send a minister to the president of the United States for recognition. Mr. McKinley would be obliged either to recognize him, and thereby admit Cuba into the family of nations, or to refuse to recognize him, and thereby take the responsibility upon himself of stultifying the declared purpose of this government in going to war with Spain. To the doctrine that it is the function of the president, and not of congress to recognize new nations, President McKinley is already committed. For after both houses of congress had recognized the republic of Cuba in 1896, President McKinley as well as President Cleveland refused to acknowledge their authority. The Cuban republic was therefore denied recognition, notwithstanding the action of congress, upon the ground that the constitutional power of the president to receive foreign ministers carries with it exclusive authority to decide for the United States the question of recognizing new nations. We do not believe in the soundness of that doctrine. But Mr. McKinley acted upon it when he wished to overrule congress in recognizing the republic of Cuba. Let him, then, have an opportunity to overrule congress in directing that the republic of Cuba shall not be recognized unless it makes concessions that this nation has no right to exact and which if conceded would be destructive of its independence. This would be a wise policy for Cuba to adopt. But whether she adopts it or not, she is now at a point where only the most

discreet behavior can save her independence. A peaceable, persistent, patient policy, which withholds acceptance of American suzerainty, yet continually but not boisterously forces upon the attention of our government and our people the Cuban pledge of 1898 and the fact that the time for redeeming that pledge has arrived, is the policy that all good friends of Cuba will hope to see her statesmen pursue. Her constitutional convention has already indicated its inclination toward that policy. The adoption by it of the series of concessions to the United States, printed in another column, which in dignified form yet with full regard for the island's independence intimate a "thus far and no farther," is the most encouraging event of all this Cuban controversy.

The part played by the McKinley confederacy in this crusade against the independence of Cuba has been in the last degree hypocritical. Here and there obscure confederates have turned up who made no secret of the matter. In the presidential campaign one of them, less obscure than the other candid ones—we allude to Senator Beveridge—declared at a great campaign meeting in Chicago, with the boldness of a pirate, that the United States ought to disregard its pledges to mankind in general and the people of Cuba in particular, and seize upon the richly-stored little island without ceremony. But as a rule the confederates have protested, with hand upon heart, their most earnest, most heartfelt, most pious desires to surrender Cuba wholly to her people, provided only they were fit for self-government. The hypocrisy of these protestations is now apparent. The Cubans have proved their capacity for self-government. Never before, under such trying circumstances, have a people proceeded to organize their own government with so much regard for peace, order and sound principle. Their elections and the sessions of their constitutional convention were marvelous in-

stances of popular self-control. The pretense that they must be left under American tutelage for their own good, has consequently of necessity been abandoned. It is a bird that will no longer sing. And now the mask is thrown off. The whole McKinley confederacy comes out as boldly as Beveridge for the subjection of Cuba not for her sake but for ours.

Boston has been listening, at her Lowell Institute, to 12 lectures in series by Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott on the general principles of government and the rights of man. Ostensibly these were the topics, but the evident purpose of the course was to whitewash imperialism. As for the rights of man, in Abbott's extraordinary apologetics for the holy wars waging in the Philippines, South Africa and China, they are practically disposed of in the manner of the chapter on snakes in the celebrated account of Ireland. The barbaric dog in the manger of the Anglo-Saxon ox has no rights, says Dr. Abbott, in so many words. Rev. Dr. Berle, another Congregational clergyman, suggests the substitution of the word "hog" for "ox" in Dr. Abbott's golden aphorism, and there are other signs that Dr. Abbott has slopped over badly and well-nigh worn out his welcome with the enlightened part of the New England public. But there is a good deal of the genuine, unadulterated article of British jingoism entrenched in the Boston public and Harvard university. There are two or three professors there who were born and reared in Canada, like President Schurman, of Cornell and the Philippines commission. Boston had a bad habit of importing English and Scotch divines a little while ago, and some of them still linger to impose the Anglo-Saxon gospel upon their hearers. One of the most prominent of these, Rev. Dr. Gordon, of the Old South church, last Sunday week actually introduced Mark Twain into his prayer, not by name, of course, but in a way to give the savage gratification that all Christians of the

Abbott type must feel to have the author of "The Person Sitting in Darkness" lambasted in God's sight. Dr. Gordon prayed that those who criticised Mr. McKinley might be led to see the impropriety of their conduct, not knowing the difficulties of the job in hand as do Mr. McKinley, the Almighty—and Dr. Gordon.

What a time-serving opportunist a doctor of divinity is apt to be when he gets into politics! A few years ago Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, as Henry Ward Beecher's successor, was raising all kinds of trouble to get a probation for the heathen in the next world, in the American board trouble; and now he wants them to have only a limited liability (Anglo-Saxon Salvation Co., Limited) chance in this.

Admiral Sampson has had a chance to learn that discretion is the better part of American snobbery. He is probably no worse snob than a large majority of naval officers. They, as well as he, look upon enlisted men as inferior creatures, and shrink from promotions that give to these inferiors a place among themselves. But Sampson has made the mistake of saying so. In a letter advising the secretary of the navy not to issue commissions to warrant officers, for no other reason than that warrant officers "are recruited from a class of men who have not had the social advantages that are requisite for a commissioned officer," he explains:

In time of peace the navy's function consists to a certain extent of representing the country abroad, and it is important that the navy's representatives should be men of at least refinement. While there are perhaps a certain few among the warrant officers who could fulfill this requirement, I am of the opinion that the vast majority of them could not. Once they are commissioned they will have the same social standing as other officers, and no distinction properly could be made in extending general invitations. The consequences that would arise from their acceptance might not redound to the credit of the navy or the country which the navy represents. I do not mean to detract from the sterling worth of the warrant officers of the

navy. I merely mean to suggest to the department that, unfortunately for them, they have been deprived of certain natural advantages and in consequence their proper place is that of leading men among the crew and not as representatives of the country in the wardroom and steerage.

That letter is a candid expression of wardroom sentiment, and the denunciations it has evoked from naval circles reflect rather upon the writer's sense in thus exposing naval snobbery than upon the fact that he is himself a naval snob.

Nor is that view of the matter confined to naval circles. Sampson has fallen under the animadversions of the press for two reasons. In the first place, the warrant officer whose application for promotion called out the Sampson letter, proves to have superior social connections. It is regarded as especially snobbish for Sampson to embrace such a person in his category of exclusion. The second reason is the discovery that Sampson himself is the son of a common ditch digger. A man with these antecedents presumes too much when he becomes exclusive. But the real significance of this sensational disclosure of snobbishness receives scant attention. At Annapolis, and also at West Point, we are educating a brood of snobs. The air they breathe at those places is tainted with caste distinction. It is more than doubtful if any possible use they can be to the real welfare of the country offsets the injury that their false social standards may yet do to our national ideals. Sampson is a product of one of these institutions, and his letter does credit to his powers of absorbing the aristocratic virus.

It is impossible to read last Sunday's sermon of Rev. R. A. White, of Chicago, without some sense of pain. When atheists propose human breeding schemes, or advocates of special privileges try to confuse the scent by accounting for poverty and crime as hereditary evils, it is to be expected and endured with patience. But

from a man of Mr. White's theistic convictions and profound desire for the establishment of social righteousness, propositions of that kind come with a shock. "When society is wise enough," Mr. White says, "to take as much care in the breeding of human beings as it does in breeding cattle, race-horses, cats and dogs, much of the evil of life will disappear." What could be more repulsive than that? If no one is wise enough and virtuous enough to govern another, assuredly no one is wise enough and virtuous enough to regulate the production of another's children. When the marital and parental instincts fail us, we shall be lost indeed. No impertinent paternalism can then avail. Nor is there any value in this connection to the heredity theory which Mr. White, along with all other stirpiculturists, invokes. Crime has not been scientifically traced to heredity. There is no more reason for believing it to be hereditary than there is for believing language to be hereditary. Mr. White cites a case. It is a familiar one, the only real value of which is the proof it gives of the pigmy premises upon which "scientists" rest gigantic conclusions. This case is to the effect, we quote Mr. White, that—

out of 709 descendants of a criminally inclined ancestress 106 were illegitimate, 162 were beggars, 181 of the women were dissolute, 76 were criminals, seven were condemned for murder, etc. Five hundred and ninety-six out of the 709 were tainted with the criminality of their ancestor.

Suppose we were told that 596 out of 709 descendants of a German woman spoke no other language than German, what should we infer? Would it be that those descendants were born with their ancestor's habit of speech rooted somewhere in their systems? Would it not rather be that they had grown up in the environment of the German tongue? Yet the hereditary "scientists" from whom Mr. White quotes, ignore the simple probability that those criminal descendants of a criminal ancestor had come to maturity in criminal surroundings, and jump to the dubious

conclusion that a spiritual taint of criminality had affected their physical blood.

Two reports on the removal of Prof. Ross from Leland Stanford Junior university, have again brought that case to public notice. One report comes from a committee of the San Francisco alumni, and the other from a voluntary committee of members of the American Economic association, headed by Prof. Seligman, of Columbia. The committee of San Francisco alumni report their inability "to find any evidence that Mrs. Stanford ever took exceptions to Dr. Ross's economic teachings." In their opinion "her ultimate demand for his resignation" was based upon her estimate of his unfitness made in 1896 and confirmed by three years of subsequent trial. It appears from this report that in the presidential campaign of 1896 Dr. Ross issued a pamphlet entitled: "An Honest Dollar," signed by him "as 'Professor of Economics in the Leland Stanford, Jr., university,'" illustrated with political cartoons, and published and circulated by one of the political parties. Though the committee does not say so, this pamphlet was a plea for the free coinage of silver and was published by the democratic party. Mrs. Stanford regarded the pamphlet as "undignified in its form and manner of treatment," and objected to the time and manner of its publication as "jeopardizing the university's right to a reputation for political non-partisanship." That incident, "together with Dr. Ross's general conduct throughout the campaign of 1896," says the alumni report, "was deemed by Mrs. Stanford a symptom of unfitness for the responsible position of head of the economics department of the university." But this was not because her opinions were at variance with Dr. Ross's. "She had at that time no opinion upon either side of the particular financial theories then in issue," and whether her views are hostile now to what his were then is immaterial, since "his views

upon the silver question thereafter radically changed." The want of confidence engendered in Mrs. Stanford's mind by Ross's indiscreet behavior in the campaign of 1896, the committee continue, was never removed, but was "accentuated by other incidents impairing her faith in his good taste and discretion"—such as "the use of slang in his public and class-room lectures" and "reports that his class-room lectures contained references derogatory to her deceased husband." In conclusion the committee finds that "the action of Mrs. Stanford in asking the dismissal of Dr. Ross involved no infringement of the right of free speech." A majority of this committee, when appointed, believed that the right of free speech had been restricted.

If the foregoing report is unsatisfactory it is not more so than that of the committee of economists headed by Prof. Seligman. In fact, the text of the former, and such telegraphic quotations from the latter as have come to our knowledge, raise a strong suspicion that there are back of all the published facts in the Ross case some carefully guarded secrets.

When Dr. Ross was dismissed from his chair in the Stanford university, we supposed from the newspaper reports that the case was a peculiarly flagrant one of plutocratic dictation, and we commented briefly upon it accordingly. Since then we have been assured by persons whose opportunities for knowledge are exceptional and whose integrity and devotion to the principles of freedom are above question, not only that the dismissal of Prof. Ross rests upon just grounds entirely compatible with professorial freedom, but that Mrs. Stanford, so far from being actuated by plutocratic motives, is an uncompromising enemy of the money power—a woman with worthy ideals who is striving, against plutocratic opposition, to have them realized. We have been very much impressed, also, with the attitude of "The Land of Sunshine,"

the California magazine of which Charles F. Lummis is editor and which is one of the few publications in this country that truly stand for freedom. Mr. Lummis and his magazine have defended the cause of Mrs. Stanford in calling for Ross's removal. Nor have we overlooked the fact that David Starr Jordan, the president of the university, has a reputation for courage as an advocate of freedom which commends to public confidence his assurances that the removal of Dr. Ross was no infringement of the right of free speech. For these reasons we adopt the conclusion of the alumni report that the dismissal of Dr. Ross was not made for the purpose of checking free speech. But we cannot overlook the fact that upon the very face of the report Dr. Ross was not dismissed by the university unless the university is Mrs. Stanford. It was "her ultimate demand for his resignation," her want of confidence, etc., that drove him from his chair.

If Mrs. Stanford is, indeed, the Leland Stanford Junior university, if she supports it and for that reason governs it, and in cases of alleged interference with professorial free speech, her motives are the issue, then it is nobody's business whether Prof. Ross was denied free speech or not. Mrs. Stanford has an indisputable right to run her own university in her own way. And that is the light in which the alumni committee puts the matter. Unless their report does her and the institution an injustice, Leland Stanford Junior university is not a university at all, but Mrs. Stanford's private boarding school.

Professorial freedom in a public university is something that cannot properly be left to the discretion of a donor, especially a sole donor, who has no responsibility to anyone. It is a matter that belongs to the faculty, the alumni, the students, the public, and should be under the government of trustees who may be held accountable for abuses. This very Ross

case illustrates the point. While we are inclined from collateral information and the general circumstances that have come to light, to believe that Ross's dismissal may have been justified by his indiscretions, we are nevertheless constrained to say that, upon the basis of the alumni report alone, it appears to have been due to Mrs. Stanford's personal dislike. No sufficient reason for his discharge is given. The one stated in the report is his action in connection with the silver pamphlet. But that was in 1896. He remained in the university four years after that, though in a social science instead of an economic chair; and so frivolous are the later charges against him—the use of slang in his public and class-room lectures, and mere reports, without pretense of verification, that he had spoken in the classroom disrespectfully of the late Senator Stanford—that the alumni committee made the old silver pamphlet and not any recent derelictions the substantive charge. To give new vitality to that they find that his retention was probational and that the objectionable qualities which that episode disclosed were confirmed by his later conduct, referred to above as making the basis for charges frivolous in themselves. The inference that he was dismissed because and only because Mrs. Stanford wished to dismiss him is irresistible. For the sake of the university, and for her own sake as a person who has undertaken to devote her fortune to educational ideals, it is to be hoped that a better explanation of the Ross affair than that of the San Francisco alumni committee may be forthcoming. We might hope for this also for the sake of all university education. For if Mrs. Stanford, however strongly opposed to plutocracy, may regulate the tenure of professorial chairs at Stanford Junior in accordance with her own arbitrary inclinations, Mr. Rockefeller might by the same token regulate the tenure of those at the Chicago in accordance with his own plutocratic interests.

The tories of Great Britain, driven to desperation by the need for revenue caused by the enormous expenses of their indefensible war in South Africa, are turning for relief to the great American bunco game of a protective tariff. To sweeten the pill they advise the working classes that by this means cheap Yankee goods can be kept out of the English market. Their scheme, like the common law, is the perfection of reason. The Yankee is to be made to pay the expenses of the South African war, through so high a tariff upon his goods as they come into England that he will keep his goods out rather than pay it and so leave the British market to the British workingman! How a tariff which yields revenue can protect the workingman, or one which protects him can yield revenue, the tory claquers do not venture to explain. What they want is to get revenue by making the common people pay it in higher prices on the imports they buy, thereby relieving the income tax payer and saving the great landlords; and if by constant repetition they can make the British consumer believe that the Yankee will pay the tax, and the British workingman that this will protect him, the job is done. Let the British "beggars" who have fought, fought, fought, also pay, pay, pay, is the motto of tory statesmanship.

Two weeks ago (page 705) we called attention to newspaper reports which quoted Prof. Jenks, of Cornell university, as saying at a Chicago banquet that Providence intended the many to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. In commenting upon this we refrained from characterizing the sentiment as Prof. Jenks's, for the expressed reason that his language might have been misreported. So we made the report an occasion for pointing out what is undoubtedly true, that the comfortable classes do very largely entertain the notion that the "inferior" classes have been providentially provided for them as hewers of wood and drawers of water. We

are glad now to be able authoritatively to state that our suspicion of bad reporting was correct. Prof. Jenks writes us, under date of February 25, that the report was—mistaken with reference to my opinion regarding the "hewers of wood and drawers of water." I said that that had been the opinion of very many people in different periods of the world's history. I myself was inclined to combat that opinion, and to show how our public schools could prevent that being the case. Modern inventions have done much to prevent it.

We do not agree, and in support of our objection we might cite authority, that modern inventions have done much to raise the working classes above the necessity of being "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the privileged. But that is another story.

A published interview with Mr. Roosevelt's guide upon his strenuous lion-hunting expedition in Colorado, gives some suggestive indications of Mr. Roosevelt's notions of fun. Every lion the party killed was first treed. After being hit he fell off his perch, and "then the fun began." Here is the guide's description of it:

The lion, mind you, is handicapped. He is fatally wounded and he is stunned by his fall. But the dogs are on him as soon as he reaches the ground, and I must say I have some of the best fighting dogs in the lion hunting business. Often a lively fight followed, for, under the circumstances, the lion will fight and he generally sells his life for all it is worth. Into this fight Roosevelt entered, and ended the fight by locating the lion's heart with his hunting knife. Dangerous? Well, not very. This is the way it is done. Any hunter knows it is safe. I should not have permitted Roosevelt to expose himself to danger had he been so disposed, which he was not.

One would suppose there might be as much strenuous fun in knocking down and stabbing a stuffed cat. But there would be nothing bloody about that.

ON OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM.

"Pessimism is a vulgar form of atheism." In this epigram a popular clergyman has expressed an undeniable truth. But there is a species of optimism, which, worse than vulgar atheism, would justify the retort

in paraphrase that optimism is a refined form of devil worship.

Optimism, as commonly understood, is a spurious thing. So far from being a living protest against atheism, it is nothing better than mental and spiritual indolence. "Things always have come out right, and they always will," laughs your contented optimist, as he turns his back upon the task the Lord offers him.

He thinks of God as a miracle worker, who makes brick without straw, and improves the condition of mankind by means of omnipotent fiat instead of human cooperation. Said the lazy farmer one beautiful May day, standing upon his front stoop and looking out over a fallow field: "If God wants a crop of corn in that field, he will grow one; if he doesn't, he won't; whatever is to be will be, and where's the use of my plowing and planting? Nay, I believe in the goodness of God, and will go to the circus and enjoy myself, while he makes a corn crop for me." The lazy farmer was a true type of your everyday optimist.

It did not occur to him that God is rational, and works in human affairs through human channels. He did not realize that although God giveth the increase, some Paul must plant and some Apollos must water. Instead of resting his faith in God, as he in his pagan ignorance supposed, he was resting it upon an irrational fetish.

Precisely so with most of the optimists who joyously proclaim their faith to-day. In their philosophy everything is for the best, and will come out all right in the end. God in his goodness will bring the increase, whether a Paul and an Apollos plant and water or not. Too lazy mentally to think, too lazy spiritually to act, they make contentment a virtue and denounce as pessimists all who disturb their serenity by preaching against injustice. It is not for your spurious optimist to consider indications of social decadence, nor to work for social improvement. Leave all that to God. To doubt the certainty of progress is to doubt him.

Are we as a nation breaking away from our democratic moorings and

drifting as the republic of Rome did into the whirlpool of imperialism? Never fear. God will take care of us. Don't blaspheme him by urging that the prow of the ship of state be turned in another direction. He will do that if it is for the best. Let us enjoy the exciting voyage. Don't be a pessimist!

Are our institutions making classes of very rich and very poor, of luxurious idlers and impoverished and degraded workers? Impossible. God is too good to allow that, and he is too wise and powerful to need help from us. Let us laugh at these idle fears, let us throw our hats into the air in joyful frenzy as we see the greatness of God's work in raising up a pious Rockefeller, a generous Carnegie, a masterful Morgan, and in providing millions of inferior mortals for them to pillage and coddle. Don't be a pessimist!

That is the optimism of the child in a boat gliding swiftly down the Niagara river, which claps its hands in baby glee at the flowers on the banks as they rush by, until the boat is upon the very edge of the abyss. To shift the metaphor, it is the optimism of the thoughtless housewife, who is so happy over the beauty of her garden that she pleasantly rebukes her "pessimistic" friend for warning her that weeds are growing there, which will soon choke the plants.

At all manifestations of this most popular kind of optimism, we may well imagine that the devil kicks up his hind legs in wicked glee.

What commonly passes for optimism is really not optimism at all. It is as we have said, nothing better than an expression of mental and spiritual indolence. Those who affect it do so because it is easier to trust in God than to help him. On the other hand, much that passes for pessimism, even with the so-called pessimists, is genuine optimism.

There are times when the best expression of optimism is an aggressive pessimism, vitalized with a sense of outraged justice. And these are such times. The man who is hopeless of the triumph of justice over injustice, of right over wrong, yet fights for justice, dies for justice,

lives, or pleads or suffers for justice—that man, though he deny God with his lips, proclaims him from his heart. Though he professes to be hopeless, his work asserts his confidence. In comparison with this kind of pessimism, your lotus-eating optimist, whom we find so numerous now, is a sorry creature.

To warn the people that they must amend their ways or perish, is not atheistic pessimism. The frivolous who heard Jonah foretell the overthrow of Nineveh doubtless thought him a pessimist. But he was certainly not an atheist, and his pessimism saved the city. In our own time as in Jonah's, God speaks through so-called pessimists. "If ye keep on denying in your lives this truth and that," say they, "ye are doomed! Unless ye mend your ways, ye shall surely perish!" That has been the cry of the pessimism that in reality is optimism, all down the ages. It is the cry to-day of the prophets whom spurious optimists call pessimists. It is the cry that has made the world advance.

For the world has advanced, and does advance, not only in victories over external nature, but also along the lines of righteousness. He must be blind who cannot perceive it. There are fluctuations, now up and now down, but the trend is upward and onward. This progress is the stock in trade of the lazy optimist. But to it none of his kind have contributed. They have done less to promote it than the optimistic fly did to turn the cart wheel. They have had no more to do with it than to sing about progress accomplished, and good naturedly to obstruct further progress. They neither give warning like Jonah, nor mend their ways like the people of Nineveh.

The essence of optimism is not the state of the mind. If it were, the mother weeping for her first born would be a pessimist, while the laughing fool at the funeral would be an optimist. A gloomy outlook is not necessarily inconsistent with optimism, nor a smiling face with the lowest depths of atheistic pessimism.

Optimism or pessimism depends upon the direction of the life. To live towards the development of

righteousness is to be an optimist; to live indifferent to righteousness is to be a pessimist. The selfish man is no optimist, however contented and happy and hopeful he may be. The happier he is in his selfishness and the more hopeful about it, the less right has he to rank as an optimist. Nor is the unselfish man necessarily a pessimist, though his outlook be gloomy. No man can be inwardly hopeless of ultimate righteous adjustments who gives the first place in his life to the cause of justice, of that comprehensive justice which means equality of rights. But he who does not give that cause a high place in his life is a pessimist, and his pessimism is indeed a form of atheism. If it assumes an optimistic garb, his optimism is worse than atheistic; it is 'devilish.'

All agree that in individual life God helps them who help themselves. In other words, in working for the individual he works with the individual. To deny this is atheistic pessimism; but the only effectual way of denying it is to withhold one's own contribution to the partnership. The idea holds good with society. God helps the society that helps itself—whose members, that is, justly help one another. It is not mere verbal denials of this that constitute atheistic pessimism. Neither is it gloomy forebodings and ominous prophecies. Atheistic pessimism in this connection consists in disregarding unjust conditions and tendencies. And tried by that test, the dearest pessimists of our day and generation are to be found among our most cheerful "optimists."

NEWS

American imperialism has now boldly come to the fore at Washington. On the 25th, the senate committee on relations with Cuba, of which Senator Platt, of Connecticut, is chairman, recommended the following provisions regarding Cuban independence, as an amendment to the army appropriation bill:

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the

government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the president of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the president is hereby authorized to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution, which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

1. That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

2. That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

3. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

4. That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

5. That the government of Cuba will execute and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemics and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

6. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

7. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as

well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the president of the United States.

8. That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

This amendment was forced through the senate at a night session on the 27th by a vote of 43 to 20. Both Hoar and Hale voted for it. Mason did not vote. It was finally adopted by the senate, as part of the army appropriation bill, which passed that house after midnight of the 27th. The measure now goes to the lower house.

The foregoing conditions precedent to the recognition of Cuban independence had for several days been foreshadowed from the war department and the white house. As early as the 6th a Washington special to the Chicago Chronicle reported, "from the highest source possible," that the president's views were "something like the views of Senator Platt, of Connecticut," and gave an outline of the president's ideas. They harmonized with the conditions subsequently specified in the Platt amendment quoted above. On the following day the Chicago Record published a special from a correspondent who, though his habits of journalistic veracity are not of the best, is known to be a favorite channel for white house announcements, from which the identity of the president's plans and those of Mr. Platt's committee, as subsequently reported, is distinctly noticeable. All the circumstances indicate that the conditions of Cuban recognition prepared by the senate committee were formulated by the secretary of war and the president.

These demands are not relished by the Cubans. From the moment when, early in the month, the Cuban leaders were informed by Governor General Wood, who acted under instructions from the American war department, that certain conditions of recognition would be exacted by the American government, they changed their manner. Until then they had exhibited a confidence, almost childlike, in American good faith. After that they became restless and in some instances hostile. Governor General Wood's instructions were to the effect that the Cuban constitution would

not be approved by the American government nor American troops be withdrawn until Cuba had conceded the right of the United States to interfere with Cuban sovereignty whenever necessary to preserve the peace, to prevent foreign entanglements and protect foreigners, to prevent the creation of objectionable public debts, to protect American commercial interests, to maintain at least two coaling stations, and to prevent a recurrence in Cuba of the experiences of Hayti and Santo Domingo. These specifications appear in the Washington correspondence of the Chicago Record of the 8th—a dispatch which is intended to be friendly to the president.

It is understood that Governor General Wood divulged his instructions to Cuban leaders about the 15th or 16th, when he took with him from Havana to Batabano a committee of five members of the constitutional convention to confer upon a scheme with reference to the relations of the United States and Cuba. Upon the return of the committee to Havana on the 16th, its members exhibited considerable feeling. So did other convention delegates when the exactions were made known. Some were bellicose, but the more thoughtful favored throwing the whole question on the United States by refusing to concede anything. One delegate declined to sign the constitution on the 21st, when the others signed it, because it was being signed in duplicate, one of the two originals being intended for submission to the United States. This was Senor Cesneros, ex-president of Cuba. He said: "Cuba is now independent, and I can see no reason for sending this constitution to the United States for acceptance. The United States government has no right to pass on it, for it is distinctly a Cuban document." He charged the Americans with seizing all they could, and intimated the probability of armed resistance. The other delegates signed. The American duplicate was to have been delivered to Governor General Wood on the 22d, but there are no reports that this has even yet been done. Washington dispatches indicate that Governor General Wood was instructed not to receive the document until the American demands had been conceded and either incorporated in the constitution or added to it by ordinance of the convention. The convention held daily sessions after signing the

constitution, and on the 27th, at three in the morning, came to an agreement, almost unanimous, upon the following additional constitutional clauses:

1. The government of Cuba will not make a treaty or agreement with any foreign power which may compromise or limit the independence of Cuba, or which may permit or authorize any power to obtain by means of colonization or for military or naval purposes, or in any other manner, any foothold or authority or right over any portion of Cuba.

2. The government will not permit its territory to be used as a base of operations for war against the United States or against any foreign nation.

3. The government of Cuba accepts in its entirety the treaty of Paris, in which are affirmed the rights of Cuba, to the extent of the obligations which are explicitly indicated in these, and especially those which the international law imposes for the protection of life and property, and substitutes itself for the United States in the pledge, which they assumed in that sense, according to articles 12 and 162 of the treaty of Paris.

4. Cuba recognizes as legally valid all acts of the military government during the period of occupation; also the rights arising out of them, in conformity with the joint resolution and the Foraker amendment and the existing laws of the country.

5. The governments of the United States and Cuba ought to regulate their commercial relations by means of a treaty based on reciprocity, and with tendencies toward free trade in natural and manufactured products, mutually assuring ample special advantages in their respective markets.

In a preamble it is explained that in so far as security for the independence of Cuba is sought by the American demands other than those thus conceded, there is ample security in the constitution; and that the demand for coaling stations militates against independence, while that for sanitary regulation should be subject to future adjustment.

Concurrently with the precipitation of the question of Cuban independence in the senate the question of conferring upon the president unlimited power in the Philippines—civil as well as military, and legislative and judicial, as well as executive—was in the same way introduced in the same body, the Spooner bill being offered as an amendment to the army

appropriation bill. This Philippine provision is in these words:

That all military, civil and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris December 10, 1898, and at Washington November 7, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by congress, be vested in such manner as the president of the United States shall direct for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion; provided, that all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend or repeal the same.

Mr. Vest moved to amend by making all action on the part of the president's representatives in the Philippines subject to the constitution and laws of the United States. This was defeated, 45 to 25. Mr. Rawlins offered an amendment denying any intention of holding permanent sovereignty over the Philippines, and limiting such sovereignty to the pacification thereof and the establishment of a stable government therein. This was defeated, 45 to 24. Mr. Bacon proposed to limit the operation of the president's unlimited power to March 4, 1905. This was defeated, 46 to 26. Mr. Pettus proposed that every appointee under this presidential power be required to take an oath of office to support the constitution of the United States. It was defeated, 41 to 25. Mr. Teller proposed that the civil government to be established in the Philippines should allow the inhabitants the fullest participation consistent with safety. It was defeated, 39 to 23. He then moved to guarantee to the Filipinos our own bill of rights—no ex post facto laws, etc. It was defeated, 41 to 23. Mr. Hoar moved that none of the Philippine officials to be appointed under this authority should exercise more than one kind of the three great powers—legislative, executive and judicial—"to the end that the government might be one of laws, not men." It was defeated, 43 to 26.

Two amendments were offered by the majority, as follows:

Provided that no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon or the mining rights therein shall be made.

And, provided, further, that no franchise shall be granted which is

not approved by the president of the United States, and is not in his judgment clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interest of the people thereof, and which cannot, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government.

So amended, the Spooner clause was adopted on the 27th at 10:30 in the evening, after a session from 11 in the morning, by a vote of 45 to 27. Hale voted for it. Hoar and Teller voted against it. Mason did not vote. After midnight, as already stated, the Cuban clause having been meantime inserted, the army appropriation bill passed with these Philippine and Cuban clauses by a vote of 43 to 18, and now depends upon the action of the lower house.

While the fate of the Philippines is thus hanging in the balance in congress, soothing reports of conditions in the archipelago come from Manila. They are to the effect that the Filipinos in large numbers are becoming convinced that the United States sincerely intends to confer upon them the blessings of civil liberty, and so are welcoming the organization of provinces under American sovereignty. The latest provincial organization reported is that of the province of Bulacan, in which Malolos, the old Filipino capital, is situated. Local government here was organized by the American commission on the 26th. Jose Serapio was made governor, and Capt. Ernest A. Greenough, treasurer. Salaries in this case are not stated in the dispatches. This province is not yet fully cleared of hostile Filipinos, Col. Morel, with a force of 300, being reported as operating from Santa Isabel.

A skirmish took place on the 22d near Santa Cruz, in the province of Cavite, in which several Filipinos were killed. Another hard fight occurred on the 25th near Cavinta, province of Laguna, and six Filipinos were killed. The same report tells of two others in the province of Albay, and still another in the island of Panay. In the first, 18 Filipinos were killed; in the second, nine; and in the third six. No American casualties are reported.

We turn now to China. The indications of the note of the 20th from

the Chinese plenipotentiaries, mentioned at the close of last week's report, were confirmed on the 21st, when the plenipotentiaries notified the foreign ministers of an imperial decree conceding their preliminary demands as far as possible, namely:

Gen. Tung Fu Sian, to be degraded and deprived of his rank; Prince Tuan and Duke Lan, to be disgraced and exiled; Prince Chuang, Ying Lien, and Chao Shu Chiao, to commit suicide; and Hsu Chen Yu, Yu Hsien, and Ki Hain, to be beheaded.

This decree was a concession of all the lives the ministers had demanded, except that of Tung Fu Sian, whose followers are so loyal to him that the Chinese authorities are unable to molest him. Yet it required the Chinese to execute only one person, Yu Hsien, the other two who were sentenced to decapitation—Hsu Chen Yu and Ki Hain—being in the custody of the Japanese. Nevertheless the ministers expressed their satisfaction, and on the 20th Hsu Chen Yu and Ki Hain were beheaded upon the spot in Peking where four members of the Chinese foreign office had been put to death during the siege for favoring foreigners. The execution took place in the presence of a large crowd. French, German and American troops guarded the streets. Just prior to his decapitation Ki Hain said to the military attache of the Japanese legation:

I do not know what I have done to make me deserving of death, but if beheading me will make the foreign troops evacuate Peking and my emperor return I am satisfied to die. I will die a patriot.

There is as yet no report of the execution or suicide of the other condemned Chinamen; but Field Marshal Waldersee has postponed indefinitely the military expedition into the interior, of which we told last week.

The day before the two executions mentioned above, the American minister, Edwin H. Conger, turned over the affairs of the legation to W. W. Rockhill, the American special commissioner. Mr. Conger expects soon to come home upon a six months' vacation. He has already been granted a 60 days' leave of absence.

When we closed our report of the South African war last week, De Wet was dashing through Cape Colony with Lord Kitchener and six flying

columns on his heels trying to surround him. That was on the 18th. On the 24th Lord Kitchener reported that Plumer had De Wet in full retreat, and that his "attempt to invade Cape Colony has evidently failed." This was supplemented by an Associated Press dispatch of the same date which told of the defeat of De Wet by Plumer near Disselfontein, on the south bank of the Orange river. But De Wet split his force in two, sending one detachment east and the other west, and Plumer spent the 24th and 25th trying vainly to find them. On the 26th De Wet's own detachment was heard from to the south of Hopetown, which is on the Orange river in Cape Colony, several miles west of the western boundary of the Orange Free State. Nothing has since been heard of him, though the British war office believes that he will be caught in a trap between the British pursuing columns and the rising river.

In the eastern part of the Transvaal, where the British general, French, is trying to drive the Boer general, Botha, over the Swaziland border (see page 711), much progress is claimed by the British and but little shown. The latest report tells of Botha's having with 2,000 men broken away from French's pursuit, in the direction of Komatipoort, which is where the northern railroad line from Pretoria crosses into the Portuguese territory.

A terrible indictment of the British was issued on the 20th over the signatures of Steyn and De Wet. It is in the form of an address to the civilized world, and declares that the war "still rages over South Africa;" that the British disregard the laws of civilized warfare; that they "capture doctors and ambulances and deport them in order to prevent our wounded from getting medical assistance;" that they "send out marauding bands to plunder, burn and damage burghers' private property;" and that "they have armed Kaffirs and natives and used them against us in the war." This address is still further specific, but so circumstantial that it does not lend itself to condensation. The last charge quoted above derives confirmation from one of Lord Kitchener's reports, in which he mentions the service of "Victorian bushmen." The British government

has not yet made any denial of Steyn and De Wet's accusations.

The great steel trust, of the formation of which we gave probable details last week, has since been perfected. This authoritative announcement was made on the 26th by J. Pierpont Morgan:

The following offer is to be made for stock of the several companies named:

	New Pfd.	New Com.
Federal Steel preferred.....	110	107½
Federal Steel common.....	4	107½
Am. Steel and Wire pfd.....	117½	102½
Am. Steel and Wire com.....	8	102½
National Tube preferred.....	125	115
National Tube common.....	8	115
National Steel preferred.....	125	125
National Steel common.....	8	125
American Tinplate pfd.....	125	125
American Tinplate com.....	20	100
American Steel Hoop pfd.....	100	100
Am. Steel Hoop common.....	8	100
American Sheet Steel pfd.....	100	100
American Sheet Steel com.....	8	100

As to the stocks of the last four companies, the aggregate amount of stocks so to be offered was arranged with the principal stockholders of those companies who have requested the distribution of such amount among the four companies to be made in the percentages as stated.

Mr. Morgan personally explained that the capital of the consolidated trust will be \$1,100,000, of which \$300,000,000 will be in bonds, \$400,000,000 in preferred stock, and \$400,000,000 in common stock. The name of the trust is the United States Steel corporation. It was incorporated in New Jersey on the 25th. The charter is reported to permit the corporation—

to do almost every line of business that can be imagined, with the exception of building a railroad in New Jersey. It is a blanket charter and its framers have taken advantage of the liberal New Jersey laws. The principal object of incorporation is to manufacture iron, steel and manganese, coke, copper, lumber, and other materials, and all or any articles consisting or partly consisting of iron, steel, copper, or other materials, and all and any other products thereof. It can buy and sell and market these commodities. It can build bridges, boats, cars, engines, railroads, docks, elevators, water works, electric works, viaducts, canals, and all manner and means of transportation, and sell the same. A liberal provision is also made for the register, purchase and development of patents and inventions. Four paragraphs are devoted to the acquirement of stocks and bonds of other companies and the investment of these securities.

NEWS NOTES.

—John M. Mitchell was on the 24th elected a senator from Oregon.

—Ex-Senator Stephen M. White, of California, died at Los Angeles on the 21st, aged 48 years.

—The second annual convention of

the Association of American Universities is in session in Chicago.

—The superintendence department of the National Educational association met at Chicago in annual session on the 26th.

—A local option tax bill has been introduced in the lower house of the Michigan legislature by a single tax member—Mr. Franklin Moore.

—A strange star of the first magnitude was observed on the 22d in the constellation Perseus. It had flared up suddenly. It is a temporary star, and has already much decreased in magnitude.

—On the 23d President McKinley issued a proclamation calling a special session of the senate for executive purposes. It is to meet immediately after the dissolution of congress on the 4th.

—A bill for the separate assessment of land values and improvement values—a single tax measure—has passed the lower house of the Delaware legislature, and local option tax bills have been introduced.

—The discovery of a curious fuel deposit of great value is reported from Rio Grande City, Tex. Scientists are said to pronounce it either an unknown mineral, or ordinary clay highly charged with natural gas.

—By the German census of December 1, 1900, the population of the empire appears to be 56,345,014, of which number 27,731,067 are males. The increase since 1895 is 4,000,000, and the average to the square mile is 250, or ten times that of the United States.

—The attorney general of Illinois has advised the Dowie investigating committee that it has no power to enforce the attendance of witnesses. He holds that legislative action cannot single out private institutions, and that if Dowie's bank is doing anything wrong the remedy must be sought in the courts.

—At Toronto, on the 15th, Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, and Dr. J. B. Clarke, a member of the British parliament, who was defeated for reelection last fall because of his opposition to the war in South Africa, addressed a large audience on the subject of the single tax. Admission to the hall had been sold, but at Mr. Johnson's request, says the Toronto Mail and Empire, the money was refunded. He objected to speaking to a pay audience, saying he believed the truth should be free.

—The steamship City of Rio de Janeiro, of the Pacific Mail company's line, struck a rock at the entrance to San Francisco harbor on the 22d, at the end of her voyage from Hong-Kong. A large number of lives were lost, including those of Rounseville

Wildman and his wife and two children. Mr. Wilaman was the American consul general at Hong-Kong, whose name became familiar two years ago in connection with the Philippine question. The San Francisco coroner's jury place the blame for the disaster upon the captain and the pilot.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

Feb. 19-23, 1901.

Senate.

On the 19th the senate rejected the conference report on the military academy appropriation bill, and called for a further conference. It proceeded on the 20th with its consideration of the post office appropriation bill; and on the 21st discussed the trust bill (printed on page 3,012), sent up from the house, until the hour for regular order, when it resumed consideration of the post office appropriation bill. Washington's farewell address (printed in full at page 3,083) was read on the 22d, after which consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed and the bill passed. In the course of debate Mr. Butler read so much of the minority report of the postal commission as relates to the post office cars. It is printed at page 3,104. The diplomatic and consular appropriation bill was next taken up and passed, and after that the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill was considered and rejected. On the 23d the house bill for the celebration of the Louisiana centennial (printed at page 3,167), was amended and conferees appointed, which was followed by the passage of the fortifications appropriation bill, and consideration of the army appropriation bill. The day closed with memorial addresses on the late Richard A. Wise, a representative in congress from Virginia.

House.

The conference report on the Indian appropriation bill was rejected on the 19th, and further conference asked; and the sundry civil appropriation bill was considered. On the 20th the sundry civil appropriation bill was passed, and the general deficiency appropriation bill taken up. The latter was further considered on the 21st and passed. The 22d was devoted to private pension bills; and on the 23d the agricultural appropriation bill as amended by the senate was agreed to, after which consideration of the bill to promote the efficiency of the revenue cutter service began.

MISCELLANY

DE WET.

For The Public.

We looked on the Boers with wonder
As we measured their pitiful chance,
Till the skill of each wary advance
Like a marvel of living romance
Showed never the hint of a blunder.
Not a star in that galaxy set
But foreshadowed a coming De Wet.

The ominous hush of their moving
Was unbroken by drum-beat of boast,
When a handful, each grim at his post,
Was awaiting the blare of a host,
The triumph of numbers disproving.
Faith in their cause was the amulet
That held it safe for Christian De Wet.

With no fever of consternation,
With no passion of slaughter to slake,
Knowing well that their all was at stake,
Seeing exile and death in their wake,
Their souls had no room for elation;

And no fear of an after regret
Had the heralds of Christian De Wet.

The world's admiration still lingers
With those marvelous doers and deeds,
As a devotee prays at her beads;
Nor till ear of posterity heeds
Will the rosary fall from our fingers.
The goal of hope may be far off yet,
Its bow of promise is Christian De Wet.

Hail to his name! enwrapped in splendor
That has come as a birthright unsought,
To which king-bestowed titles are naught.
Hail to his wisdom no school has taught,
To his will, defying surrender.
Time will not fail to honor the debt
That freedom owes to Christian De Wet.
D. H. INGHAM.

THE BEAUTY OF INCINERATION.

It must be 15 years now since
— watched, from beginning to
end, the first incineration west of
the Missouri. He went merely in the
line of duty, as a city editor. He
carried all the prejudices and super-
stitions of his sort—but they did not
all come back with him. He had
never really shared the compli-
mentary fear of some, that God
could not reassemble a personality
from ashes as easily as from the di-
gested dust of 10,000 worms; but fire
—burning — roasting — that rather
went against what he was pleased to
deem his finer feelings. And he had
never known how ignorant he was.

For this is what he saw—watching
for hours at the glazed peep-hole of
the new retort which many people
deemed "irreligious." A little vault-
ed chamber swept and immaculate
for its silent guest, and lighted with
such a glow as is upon the peaks
when shadow has come upon all the
lower world. No hint of flame; no
more suggestion of heat than there
is in the Alpenglow; nor scent, nor
sound nor motion, nor other remind-
er of the physical. In that radiant
chamber, a spotless mound—a wom-
an's body like a slender snowdrift un-
der its alum sheet. And that was all.
Save that from hour to hour the
snowdrift waned. It did not melt.
There was not one possible sugges-
tion of flesh and fire, of combustion
or liquescence. It simply grew less
and less, still in the same gentle, elo-
quent outlines; till at last the snow-
drift was but a snowdrift's wraith—
a faint, vague, wistful presence one
might see a breath would scatter,
but in that peaceful cell unruffled and
unconfused. And — — came
away awed and humbled, but with a
new hope.

Death is part of nature, and there-
fore honorable; but its settings we
have made ghastly with tiptoe hire-
lings and rented plumes and pomp

and the rattle of the clods, and the surrender to corruption. For the first time — — had seen beauty and hope and spirituality for the poor clay. He has seen life and death and love, the heart of nature and her greatest glories. But he has never seen another thing so beautiful as was that translation of a corruptible body into the cleanest and the most imperishable thing in the visible world.—Land of Sunshine for February.

MR. STONE AND THE EXPANSION BEE-TREE.

Adapted from "Uncle Remus," for The Public.

Ex-Gov. W. J. Stone's imperialistic predilections are well known in Missouri. It is also known that while Bryan was in the army languishing in a state of military quiescence, Stone used his efforts to commit the democracy in Missouri to a sort of quasi-imperialistic programme, and measurably succeeded, for the time; but when the Bryan voice rang out for freedom to all men, the Stone movement was prematurely eclipsed.

"W'en I see deze yer swell-head folks like dat 'oman w'at come en tell yo' ma 'bout you chunkin' at her chilluns, wich yo' ma made Mars John strop you, hit make my mine run back to ole Brer Stone. Ole Brer Stone, he got de swell-headedness hissef, en ef der wuz enny swinkin', hit swunk too late fer ter he'p ole Brer Stone. Leas'ways, dat's w'at dey tells me, en I ain't nevah hearn it 'sputed."

"Was his head sure enough swelled, Uncle Remus?" asked the little boy.

"Now yo talkin', honey!" exclaimed the old man.

"Goodness! what made it swell?"

"Hit was dis way. One time w'en Bryan was goin' lopin' home frum a frolic w'at dey bin havin' up at Miss Democracy's, who sh'd happen up wid 'im but ole Brer Stone. Co'se, atter w'at done pass 'twix um dey want no good feelin's 'tween Brer Bryan and Brer Stone, but Brer Bryan he want ter save his manners, en so he holler out:

"'Heyo, Brer Stone! how you come on? I ain't seed you since I done jine de army. How's all down at yo house?' Brer Bryan he ax 'im howdy, he did, en Brer Stone he 'spon' dat he was mighty po'ly, en day amble 'long, dey did, sorter familius like, but Brer Bryan he keep one eye on Brer Stone, and Brer Stone he study how he gwine nab Brer Bryan. Las' Brer Bryan, he up en say, sezee:

"'Brer Stone, I speck I got some bizness cut out fer you,' sezee.

"'W'at dat, Brer Bryan?' says Brer Stone, sezee.

"'Wiles I wuz cleanin' up my new groun' day fo' yistiddy,' sez Brer Bryan, sezee, 'I come 'cross wunner deze yer ole time bee-trees. Hit start holler at de bottom, en stay holler plum ter de top, en de honey's des natally oozin' out, en ef you'll drap yo 'gagements en go 'longer me,' sez Brer Bryan, sezee, 'you'll git a bait dat'll las' you an yo fambly twel de middle er nex' mont',' sezee.

"'Brer Stone say he much obleege en he b'leve he'll go 'long, en wid dat dey put out fer Brer Bryan's new-groun'. w'ich twan't so mighty fur. Leas'ways, dey got dar atter w'ile. Ole Brer Stone, he 'low dat he kin smell de honey. He wuz pow'ful fon' er honey. Brer Bryan, he 'low dat he kin see de honey-koam. Brer Stone he 'low dat he kin hear de bees a zoonin'. Dey stan' roun' en talk biggity, dey did, twel bime-by Brer Bryan, he up 'n say, sezee:

"'You do de clim'n, Brer Stone, en I'll do de rushin' 'roun'; you clime up ter de hole, en I'll take dis yer pole an' shove de honey up whar you kin git 'er,' sezee.

"'Ole Brer Stone, he spit on his han's en skint up de tree, en jam his head in de hole, en sho nuff, Brer Bryan he grab up de pole, en de way he stir up dem bees wuz sinful—dat's w'at it wuz. Hit wuz sinful. En de bees dey swawm'd on Brer Stone's head, twel 'fo' he could take it out'n de hole hit wuz done swell up bigger dan dat dinah-pot, en dar he swung, en old Brer Bryan, he dance 'roun' en sing:

"'Tree stan' high, but de honey mighty sweet;
Jes watch dem bees wid stingers on der feet!"

"'But dar ole Brer Stone hung, an ef his head ain't swunk, I speck he's hangin' dar yit."

SPEED MOSBY.

Jefferson City, Mo.

BEATING THE BUSH.

"When night dogs run, all sorts of deer are chased." So when the tax man starts out with his beaters and crashes through the forest on a hunt for assessable personal property, the heavens are darkened by the innumerable multitude of wild fowl that are flushed by his uproar, but among them are seen strange, surprising shapes before which the most relentless hunter would lower his gun in wonder. The list published yesterday from the official record of personal assessments levied this year by the department of taxes and assessments probably was the cause of more innocent mirth in this community than the most gifted professional humorist could have occa-

sioned by the launching of his best joke. In that list Mr. Feitner truly pressed down the mighty and exalted the humble, for gentlemen with hardly a free dollar to their names found themselves thrust into the society of open and notorious millionaires whose fortunes had been suddenly apocated to effect the unusual association.

But who can blame Mr. Feitner? He is doing his best with the light given to him. Why shouldn't the tax assessor scurry about in pursuit of missing personalty when the comptroller of the state of New York holds this discourse in his report to the legislature, dated January 9:

The attention of your honorable body is again called to the great disparity between the assessed valuation of real and personal property, as appears from the returns of the supervisors last year. The assessed valuation of real property was \$4,811,593,059, while the assessed valuation of personal property was but \$649,709,693. * * * Attention is specially called to the fact that while in 1870 personal property bore but 22 per cent. of the burden of taxation, seemingly a small proportion, in 1900 it bore but half as much (11 per cent.), which is certainly out of all proportion to the known increase of the vast amount of personal property in this state.

These statements are all true, but they inspire, and it is their purpose to inspire, tax assessors all over the state to redouble their exertions to get upon their lists all the personal property owned within their jurisdiction. Always and invariably the results of their zeal take the form of the list given out by Mr. Feitner—a grotesque guesswork, a burlesque performance of the assessors' sworn duty. Yet it is doubtless the very best he can do, unless by adopting the suggestion that he should assess everybody at \$1,000,000, and let justice be done in the swearing-off he might get at a sounder result.

But there is and in the nature of things can be no sound and just result in the assessment of personal property for taxation, because of the fact that it is in most cases susceptible of perfectly successful concealment, while by far the greater part of it is not property at all, but only evidence of property. The attempt to tax personal property has been a failure through all the ages. It has been a fountain of wrong, inequality and injustice, and those who suffer most by it are the very persons who are least able to bear an undue share of the burden of taxation. Mr. Feitner's \$3,000,000,000 of personal assessments in New York will shrink about \$500,000,000 in the swearing-off process, that is, to a sum that will include property in estates, in trust, or in other forms of which official cognition has already

been taken, and such part of the possessions of living owners as they are willing to avow and have taxed. Of the vast amount that will escape some ought to pay and some ought not to pay taxes. There is no way to ascertain or get at either class.

This is, of course, as has been demonstrated hundreds of times, a most unsound and unscientific system of taxation. It has become worse than unjust—it has become ridiculous. The legislature, however, refuses to see the light or listen to reason. It goes on year after year tinkering away at the old clumsy hulk of our tax laws, and trying to devise ways to accomplish the impossible. The present legislature has before it the chamber of commerce bill, introduced by Senator Elsberg, a short and simple measure that would be the beginning of reform if it could be passed. It provides a way for establishing local option in taxation, leaving the counties free to determine for themselves how and on what basis of assessment they would raise their state and local taxes. But somebody has introduced a bill taxing corporations one-tenth of 1¼ per cent. on their share capital, and we have no doubt that the legislators will, according to their notion, find such merit in that measure that they will give scant consideration of the Elsberg bill.—N. Y. Times, of Jan. 23.

WHEN THE TARIFF COMES HOME TO ROOST.

"Russia seems to be getting a little gay, too, doesn't she?" remarked the Shoe Clerk.

"What did you want her to do?" queried the Inspired Idiot.

"It looks to me as if some friend over here ought to have wired her: 'Don't do a thing till you see the Elks' circus,' or something like that," said the Shoe Clerk. "Then we could see what the supreme court was going to do with this sugar tariff."

"Oh, well," returned the Inspired Idiot, warmly, "the supreme court's opinion will keep. You won't have to put any ice on that. You've only to get ready to take a little of your own dope out of your own spoon. When you have bolted it, then if you can't find something to take that puckery feeling out of your mouth, at least you'll be in a pretty good position to whistle.

"The trouble is we have been using shop secrets for campaign purposes until immigration isn't all that it once was cracked up to be. We used to be one of the greatest countries on earth for making the foreigners pay the tax.

The only way he could escape it on manufactured goods was to come to the United States and take out naturalization papers in some First ward. We would promise him immunity from anything but smallpox then, and we would vaccinate him for that.

"But we overworked that in national campaign years. We told how we were having prosperity by the grace of a high protective tariff, which not only made the foreigner pay the tax, but which left our own wealthy manufacturers nothing in the world to arbitrate. On the stump the advocates of teething rings for infant industries told how a pair of shoddy trousers of American manufacture were good enough for the American citizen and he hoped that America would be for Americans just as long as the eagle continued to come home to roost. 'Just make sure that you always buy American-made goods,' he said, 'and we'll make the foreigner pay the tax till these guys for revenue only will look like a plugged nickel.'

"Well, we couldn't copyright this piece of feenawnee. We went on A. P. A.-ing the foreigner until Europe began to realize that she had a few foreigners herself who were not coming down with the stuff in American long green.

"When Germany wanted the foreigner to pay the tax on its imported meats from the United States we threw Anglo-American convulsions at the stock yards until barrel pork fell off 20 points. We jumped on the agrarians as unfriendly for declaring that German wienerwursts were good enough for the Germans and there was talk in congress of calling the reichstag an association of slobs and cheap skates and of refusing to let the German people pay another pfennig of tax for us.

"It was the same way with Russia when we held up a vessel loaded with sugar and asked the foreigners to come down with a little more than usual of the stuff. When your Uncle Nicholas called the bluff and said that if we soaked him for any more gate receipts he would sock a tariff on United States manufactures that would stop every watch in Waterbury, Conn., we didn't believe it. Mr. Hay said if Russia did such a thing she would be no lady; that he would regard such a move as a distinctly unfriendly act, especially in view of the fact that nearly every Filipino we've got just now is loaded and dreadfully easy on the trigger.

"But that's what Russia has done with a jolt that is considered below the belt. If she'll only stick to it, too, and get the neighbors in on it, the

tariff won't be a local issue, even for revenue, by the time the St. Louis fair is taking gate receipts.

"Some of the greatest mouths of American statesmanship have frothed over this protective tariff business. For 30 years it was a paramount issue between the two great parties in the United States. In all this time the democratic party was promising that if it ever got a whack at the robber tariff it's own mamma wouldn't know it. It was going to fix things so that a free-born American citizen abroad could buy three suits of clothes that didn't fit without having his trunk examined when he got back to New York. The United States would have to let up on the foreigner or Tammany would know the reason why.

"But the things that a democratic house, senate and white house did not do to the robber tariff were funnier than grand opera. Mr. Cleveland used the word 'traitors' where it stuck and David Bennett Hill went to Wolfert's Roost, where he drew the drapery of a ridgepole about him and squatted down to grewsome nightmare.

"Since the great democratic bluff was called Mr. Dingley, of Maine, has got into big type by asking the manufacturers how much they wanted and putting it down that way. They wanted more of him than they did of McKinley, in the main, and the way the foreigner has been paying the tax since that time makes it look as if the open door were one of the greatest evils that ever happened to a nation which hadn't been licked first into an appreciation of the fact that only man is vile.

"In the meantime our infant industries each year have been selling \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 worth of manufactures abroad cheaper than you could have bought them for spot cash at home. We have been letting the foreigner pay so much of the tax that we've got a billion-dollar steel trust which even a republican congress is talking about pruning in spots.

"Infant industries have thrived so well, in fact, that we have had a few substitute babies palmed off on us. English capital is doing well here in various protected lines. But it is only when some one-horse civilization on the continent gets gay over our protection that we become huffy and pull the tail of the eagle a few. We invented the tax-paying foreigner long before the teachers got out their interrogation point, and we ought to have the exclusive right to him. We have millions for retaliation, but not one cent for rebate."

"You don't believe in a protective tariff, then?" suggested the Shoe Clerk.

"Well—no," admitted the Inspired Idiot, "and yet if I had pulled myself up four miles by lifting on my bootstraps I don't know whether I'd jump back all at one jump."—Chicago Daily News of February 20.

A CAMPAIGN OF REVENGE.

Extracts from an article on "Punishment and Revenge in China," by Thomas F. Millard, published in Scribner's Magazine for February.

The war in China has already developed, on the part of the allied powers, three distinct phases—resistance, punishment and revenge. The first was natural, the second necessary. The third is criminal. . . .

This third phase of the trouble, insidiously begun as early as the middle of September, though it then gallantly flaunted some of the colors of real war, culminated in the expedition to Pao-ting-fu and the subsequent operations in the south and west of Chihli province. It may be unfair to place the entire responsibility for the campaign of revenge upon the Germans; but it is certain that it would have been promptly nipped in the bud had not Field Marshal Count von Waldersee appeared on the scene. . . .

In October, when the Germans took the field against the phantoms raised by the foreign resident, the Pao-ting-fu expedition was not a new idea. It had been on the tapis for some time. Suggested in the beginning of September, it had been postponed from time to time for a variety of reasons. At one time it was regarded as a military necessity, on the supposition that the place afforded the Boxers a mobilizing point from which they could descend with equal ease on Peking or Tientsin. Then, when the incorrectness of that view became evident, it was advocated as a measure of punishment, which meant revenge. Half a dozen dates had been fixed for the expeditionary force to start, but the weeks drifted by and still the chastisement of Pao-ting-fu was deferred. The country was as quiet as roving bands of brigands wearing the uniforms of the allied powers would permit it to be. Russia, Japan and the United States had declined to participate in any more offensive operations, and were reducing the number of their troops in China as rapidly as circumstances would permit. Gen. Chaffee, who is not given to braggadocio, had stated, in the presence of a number of officers, that he would undertake to march through China from the great

wall to Canton with a single troop of cavalry. . . .

On October 12 the Pao-ting-fu campaign was set in motion. Barnum's circus was never better advertised. Pao-ting-fu had even been formally warned of the wrath to come. The Tientsin division, some 4,000 strong, marched in three columns. Its story can be told in few words. Suffice to say that the 80,000 Boxers at Chao-pei-Khon did not materialize. The march was absolutely unopposed. At a village beyond Chao-pei-Khon a regiment of Bombay cavalry hacked to pieces a hundred or so supposed Boxers. An officer who saw this fight told me that all the Chinese thus slaughtered were unarmed. Most of them were sabered while on their knees praying for mercy. Even some of the Sepoy soldiers, who are not at all squeamish, shrunk before the task of hewing down helpless men. The division was delayed by duststorms and did not reach Pao-ting-fu until October 22. It was three days behind the Peking division, which arrived a week after the battalion of French had occupied the city.

The Peking division of 2,500 men (Germans, French and British), commanded by Gen. Gaselee, started on October 12. Gen. Gaselee seems to have had a more rational idea of the task before him than the commanders of the Tientsin column. He did not expect to encounter opposition. Li Hung Chang had dispatched runners from Peking to warn the imperial troops to keep out of the way of the foreign troops, who were to be treated as friends, not enemies. The fan-ti and tao-ti at Pao-ting-fu were also commanded to open the gates and provide food and quarters for the allies. Wu, the general in command of the Chinese imperial troops in that locality, tried hard to obey orders. In their efforts to keep out of the way of the Peking division, some of his soldiers bumped into the Tientsin division and were dispersed and deprived of their arms. Some of them were cut up by the Bombay cavalry. The remainder scattered in all directions.

The commander of the French battalion which took the city contented himself with occupying the gates and walls while he waited for the allies to come up, merely looting the treasury of 180,000 taels which it contained. He had been received cordially by the municipal officials and provided with food. On the day following his arrival, he dispatched a mes-

sage to Gen. Lorne-Campbell, from which this is quoted:

"You will be happy to learn that the gallant French soldiers under my command have succeeded in occupying Pao-ting-fu without slaughter."

I shall not attempt to depict the happiness of the British general when he received that message.

Gen. Gaselee reached Pao-ting-fu October 19, and billeted his command on villages outside the walls. A deputation of civic officials and prominent citizens waited upon him and volunteered to supply the troops with provisions, which had been collected in large quantities under Li Hung Chang's instructions, in anticipation of the arrival of the allies. For three days the troops remained outside the city, not even officers being permitted to enter. The Germans and Italians were furious. Officers openly fumed, protesting that the French were looting the city and that there would be nothing left. October 22 the Germans, French and Italians entered the city, which had been divided into four parts, each to be exclusively controlled by a different nationality. Gen. Gaselee would not permit the British troops to enter, and issued stringent orders against looting. These orders were obeyed as well as such orders may be. The officers and men grumbled a bit. "We might as well not have come," they said.

Of the British it must be said that on this expedition they behaved rationally, with few exceptions, a compliment which cannot be paid their allies. Your Indian soldier is, when not rigidly curbed, the most ravenous looter in China; which may seem a rash assertion. The British paid for most of the provisions they consumed. The Germans, with exquisite irony, paid in due-bills on the Chinese government. The French and Italians simply appropriated.

The effects of quartering the Germans, French and Italians in the city soon became apparent. When they moved in, conditions were about normal. The streets teemed with life, and the shops and markets did business as usual. By the next day nearly all the shops were closed and the markets vacated, except in the quarter policed by the British. The major part of the population had disappeared. The ways were comparatively deserted. Carts trundled by French, German or Italian soldiers, and laden with loot, could be seen everywhere. The town was evidently being pillaged deliberately and sys-

tematically. Now and then a woman's piercing scream broke from the muffling depths of a cluster of houses, and spent its echoes in the empty streets. Such sounds, with their sinister meaning, were frequent in the French and Italian quarters. Columns of smoke, lifting their snaky forms high above the thatched roofs, showed where fires were raging. Uncertainty and apprehension marked the faces of the residents who showed themselves. Coolies, who were to be had in any numbers, when the allies arrived, were hard to find, and soldiers with bayonets coerced them at their tasks. Three days of civilized rule accomplished a revolution.

When the allies occupied the city, a joint commission was appointed to investigate the outrages on and murders of the missionaries, and mete justice to the responsible authorities. This commission began sitting immediately in secret session. No correspondents were permitted to be present. Evidence was secured on which the fan-ti and a number of officials were condemned to death. It was further decreed that the temple of the city's tutelary god be destroyed, as well as many other temples, and the gate-towers leveled. The corner of the wall, where some of the missionaries were executed, was also to be razed. These are degradations terrible to the Chinese mind. It was decided that the city should not be burned, provided all persons implicated in the anti-foreign riots were delivered to the commissioners. Thus was Pao-ting-fu to be punished.

Three days elapsed after the French reached the city, before the imprisoned Green family learned of their presence. A faithful Chinese servant conveyed to the French information of the Greens's predicament, and their release was immediately demanded of the fan-ti. I shall not dwell here on the harrowing story of the suffering of the Greens, nor relate the details of the murder of the other missionaries at Pao-ting-fu. Evidence given before the joint commission developed that the women were not outraged before being put to death, which conveys a certain consolation. The mob must have been in some degree orderly, for a sort of trial was held before the missionaries were condemned. This does not palliate the offense. Rather does it aggravate it, for it implies deliberation. The little Green girl, wasted by hardship and disease,

died a few days after the allies reached Pao-ting-fu, and Mr. Green was not expected to survive. I can easily understand the indignation which the suffering of this unfortunate family, and those of other missionaries, will cause throughout the civilized world. There is a pathos in the helpless agony of children which powerfully strikes the heart-strings. But, to me, the spectacle of a Chinese baby torn from its dead mother and bayoneted or thrown to drown in a river, is as pathetic as if that child were white. Such scenes have been common enough since the allied troops occupied China. The graves of the Simcox and Green children might be inclosed by a fence, each picket bearing the name of a Chinese boy or girl who has, within the three months just passed, suffered worse at the hands of men whose skins are white. Against the awful background of this war, the death of the few missionaries is lost in the mists of a ghastly perspective.

Had relief come sooner the little Green girl might have been saved. For full two months the situation of the family had been known in Tientsin and Peking. Several expeditions were organized to succor them, but the anxiety of the Germans to participate in some movement which could be given a color of importance caused it to be deferred. I assert this to have been the real reason, no matter what inconsequential excuses may be given. Nor can I conceive anything more ridiculous or farcical than this expedition when it did finally, with all the pomp of war, move on the enemy which the imagination of its leaders had conjured up. Any sane view of the situation would have sent a lieutenant and a troop of cavalry early in September to bring the Greens to Tientsin. Instead, a month later, 7,000 or 8,000 troops, with a strong artillery, reached the city, to find it in the peaceful possession of a single battalion of Frenchmen. The taking of Pao-ting-fu, when it was taken, was a job for a sergeant and squad of police. Yet it was magnified into a campaign fit to baptize a field marshal's baton. And the little child was dead.

However, the Pao-ting-fu campaign was not without its battles. A few days after the city was taken, a British Indian soldier reported that he had been fired upon from a near-by village, and exhibited a wound in proof. A detachment of lancers was dispatched to punish the village, which it did with enthusiasm, impaling some scores of

unarmed inhabitants on its lances. A correspondent who witnessed this fight (?) described it to me as a most sickening sight. "Pure murder," was his comment.

That same day a report reached Pao-ting-fu that a French patrol had fought a bloody fight to the eastward and suffered a loss of 76. Investigation proved that one Frenchman had been injured by the falling of some brick while he was battering in the door of a house. Unarmed Chinese, as usual, provided the "loss."

The Pao-ting-fu expedition furnished the excuse to march an army into a region hitherto only scratched by the hand of pillage. The expeditionary army was the body from which scores of smaller forces (called scouting parties, reconnaissances, or whatever you like that sounds military), issued forth, licensed to burn, loot and murder, and fulfilling their license to the letter. These detachments scoured the country, living off it, and making war at will upon the inhabitants. Yes, literally making war, where no war existed.

A civilian who accompanied the expeditionary force had, when he left Tientsin, only a few dollars, and rode a borrowed horse. When he returned, he had two horses, four mules, 1,000 taels in sice, and two carts laden with miscellaneous loot. At Pao-ting-fu he left the troops and returned over a part of the country where the allies had not been. He was accompanied only by a Chinese servant and guide. At each town and village through which he passed he announced himself to be a "top-side English war man," and demanded tribute, which the head men promptly produced according to their wealth. Two nights he slept in walled towns, the only foreigner within 20 miles, and was entertained at the yamens of the tao-tis, who knocked their heads on the floor in his presence. Armed only with a revolver, he trav-

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.

eled alone from Pao-t'ing-fu to Tientsin by unfrequented paths, far aside from the line of march of the returning column, and collected tribute by the way. He has already sold his loot and departed after more. This is a sample of what is daily occurring in North China. A reign of terror holds the land enthralled.

To the north, along the Gulf of Pechili, the French and Russians have been committing the most unpardonable atrocities. At Shan-hai-Kuan the market for produce was established three miles from the town, as the venders cannot be induced to come nearer the French and Russian camps. Even at Taku, Russian soldiers were detected robbing coolies of the 15 cents a day which they receive for working at the United States quartermaster depot. Their common enemy having disappeared, the allies are bickering among themselves. Every day that large bodies of troops remain in China adds to the roll of murders and lengthens the list of burned villages. Their conduct is a provocation which may even wear through the miraculous patience of the Chinese and create a new war out of the ashes of the old. The present is a hiatus of irresponsibility. Seized with a vertigo of indiscriminating vengeance, the powers are trifling with the peace of the world. Events such as the months of September, October and November brought to China have carried war back to the Dark Ages, and will leave a taint in the moral atmosphere of the world for a generation to come.

THE FILIPINO SOLDIER.

For The Public.
On a battlefield in Luzon,
Lying there among the dead,
Was a Filipino soldier
With a bullet thro' his head.

He had fought to save his country—
For his country he had died;
And he should have been successful,
For the right was on his side.

He had left his wife and children
When he heard his country's call,
And for liberty and freedom
He had given up his all.

He had given up his children,
He had given up his wife,
He had given up his fortune,
He had given up his life.

But it all had served no purpose,
All his efforts had been vain;
And he lay among his comrades,
With a bullet in his brain.

But has it served no purpose?
Have his efforts all been vain?
If they have, then, God forgive us,
Liberty indeed is slain.
LEOPOLD SULZBERGER (16 years of age).

If every attempt at epoch-making were successful the supply of epochs would be greatly in excess of the demand.—Puck.

JANUARY MAGAZINES.

—Words of Truth Series. Quarterly (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald Publishing Co. Price, 10 cents per year; 3 cents each) contains a presentation of the nature of hypnotism.

—Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Bi-Monthly (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science. London: P. S. King & Son, 2 Great South, street, Westminster. Price, \$5.00 a year; \$1.00 a number) contains a notable communication on "The Function of Saving," in which L. G. Bosted lucidly and satisfactorily refutes Bohm-Bawerk's theory that saving is the primary factor in the formation of capital.

FEBRUARY MAGAZINES.

—Home and Flower (Springfield, O.: The Floral Publishing Co. Price one dollar per year).

—The International Socialist Review (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. Price, \$1 a year; ten cents a copy) leads with a paper by the editor, A. M. Simons, on the relation of the United States to world politics, as seen from a socialist point of view, which is followed by a socialistic solution of the negro problem.

—Why (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth. Price, 25 cents a year; 5 cents a copy) is given over to an article in which "things that are up-side-down are turned right-side-up." The article is a novelty in single tax discussion, and though printed anonymously might bear the author's name without discrediting him.

—The Quarterly Journal of Economics (Boston: George H. Ellis, 272 Congress street. London: Macmillan & Co. Edited by F. W. Taussig. Price, \$3.00 per annum) devotes the first 50 pages of the February number to a survey and criticism of the literature of trusts by Prof. Charles J. Bullock of Williams college. The survey is extensive and the criticisms direct. One of the things that Prof. Bullock emphasizes deserves more consideration than it usually receives, and is coming more and more to be realized in actual experience. It is this: That "the growth of a business enterprise is limited by the fact that companies of a certain size will secure 'maximum efficiency' of investment, and that beyond this point concentration brings no increase in productive capacity." In other words, combination has its economic limitations. And that is doubtless true, except as to combinations of monopolies. Prof. Bullock is especially satisfactory also, though somewhat over-cautious, when he asks if it would "not be well to make a genuine trial of competition before condemning it for producing evils which are greatly increased by governmental interference with industrial freedom." He adds that "competition cannot be proved a failure until it is given a trial."

MARCH MAGAZINES.

—The Chautauquan (Cleveland: The Chautauquan Assembly. Price, two dollars a year; two cents a copy).

The Arena (New York: The Alliance Publishing Co. Price \$2.50 per year; 50 cents a number), has an article on crushing trusts, by Judge Clark, of North Carolina; and one on direct legislation, by Eltweed Pomeroy.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 6,000.

GIBSON ART GALLERIES

CHICAGO'S GREATEST
PHOTOGRAPHERS .:

N. W. Corner Wabash and Adams.

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

The Public

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

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

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

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015
NEW YORK.

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

Try those
out of boxes

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

J. & B. MOOS,

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

For any Book on Earth
Old or New Write to
H. H. TIMBY,
Book Hunter,
Conneaut, Ohio.
CATALOGUES FREE!