

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 2-01 Box 541

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 23, 1901.

Number 155.

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 democratic and the republican machines of Chicago are vigorously charging each other with having received a \$10,000 campaign contribution for spring election purposes from the city railway monopoly. It is not improbable that both charges are true.

Peoria is in the midst of a municipal campaign in which the democrats are well represented on the street franchise question, both in their candidate for mayor and in their platform. William F. Bryan, the candidate, has a record of two years in the city council, where he has won public confidence as a consistent adversary of franchise grabbing. Of the platform nothing more need be said than to quote the first plank:

That, in all franchises hereafter granted by the Peoria city council, reservation should be made for the city to purchase the franchise plant whenever it decides to do so—the purchase price to be the fair market value of the plant, nothing to be allowed for the unexpired term of the franchise.

A movement among women is reported from Germany which has for its object a gigantic protest against the agrarian tariff duties. The call has been signed by more than a million women. They complain that these duties raise the price of the necessities of life, to the injury especially of the working classes. Essentially this is an uprising against protection. The agrarian duties have been imposed upon agricultural products for the purpose of buttressing the values of farming land. It is a landlord's policy, as all protection movements

are. In Germany now, as in England 60 years ago, protection is in the interest mainly of the great landlords of farms; in the United States it is in the interest of the great landlords of mines, forests, etc. Everywhere it is a policy of oppression and plunder.

The American allies of the British ministry seem to be in a hurry to recognize British sovereignty over the South African republic and the Orange Free State. In the annual review of the commerce of the United States, just issued by the American state department, the former is described as "the Transvaal" and the latter as "Orange River Colony," the British appellations; and in a footnote it is explained that the two republics have been annexed by Great Britain. Since Great Britain herself has not yet formally announced the annexation to the other powers, this documentary recognition of British jurisdiction is at least premature, not to say unfriendly to the republics, which continue to contest the British conquest. Probably this act of recognition is attributable either to a stupid or to a swift clerk; but coming as it does from the state department there should be promptly made an authentic disclaimer of intention. Silence under these circumstances would give color of authority to the implied recognition.

A very significant remark came to light through the Chicago Tribune of the 11th. It was packed away in an inside paragraph of the Washington correspondence, and related to the demands this country is making upon Cuba. If these demands are not submitted to, it reads, the shrewdest Cuban leaders fear that—

Congress will interpret this at once as a refusal to accept independence. The offer to Cuba and the refusal by the Cubans would be considered as a

fulfillment of the Teller pledge, and the way to immediate annexation would be opened at once.

Of course that notion originated with no Cuban leaders, shrewd or otherwise. But, as the Chicago Tribune is the western organ of the administration, it may not improbably have originated in the white house. There is ample evidence, at any rate, of a burning desire on the part of certain Americans to redeem the Teller pledge in some such hypocritical fashion.

Tom L. Johnson's mayoralty campaign in Cleveland has opened with enthusiasm. His meetings are numerous and large. A feature is the questioning. It is freely invited, and questioners are courteously treated. Johnson greets his audiences with startling but characteristic candor. At a meeting in the heart of the labor district, some one described him in a question as a friend of the workingman. Usually candidates for office make the most of that kind of flattery. But Johnson promptly explained:

I don't know as to that. But I know I've been a mighty good friend to Tom Johnson. I lowered the working hours of the men on my street railroad and I raised their wages, but I did not do that because I loved them. I did that because I thought it was the best thing for the company.

It is stimulating to American self-respect to find a candidate for office who does not think it worth while to be a demagogue. Usually, also, when a rich man runs for office he doesn't go out of his way to offend anybody—not even the fellows who want to get at his barrel. But in the same speech Johnson gave notice that he intended to open no barrel. "I want to say right here," said he, "that in this campaign I have no use for boodlers, and any man who thinks he can get money out of

me might just as well stay away. I won't buy votes. If I can't be elected honestly, I don't want the office." To this plain spoken notice he added that his election was a matter of slight personal concern to him and that whether elected or not he intended to serve his city to the fullest extent in his power.

The objection to Johnson which is being worked most vigorously is the accusation that he is not sincere. This is an allusion to the fact that while he opposes monopoly he has made his fortune from monopolies. One peculiarity about this objection is the fact that it is the monopolists and their henchmen who use it. They try to create the impression that as a monopolist he cannot be sincere in assailing monopoly. But he has himself put a question which takes the ground from under that objection. He wants to know why it is, if these monopolists think him insincere in opposing monopoly, that they so strenuously oppose him. The truth is that what really disturbs these people is their conviction that Johnson is sincere. Insincere anti-monopolists have never given monopolists a moment's uneasiness nor excited in them a particle of hostility, since time began. Not a few of the insincere sort, some of whom are now more or less openly fighting Johnson in Cleveland, are secretly upon monopoly pay rolls.

It is because monopolists of the Johnson type are so rare, that he is charged with insincerity. The superficial contradiction between his former business connections and his economic principles—a monopolist anti-monopolist—excites wonder, which hunts for an explanation and takes up with the first thing that comes along. Yet there is nothing suspicious about this contradiction. The most depressing thing about our political life is not that a monopolist should be opposed to perpetuating monopoly by law, but that monopolists generally should be in favor of it. The former attitude implies a de-

sire for better things even at personal loss; the latter implies a desire to subordinate the better possibilities of social life to personal gain.

Be it observed that monopolists cannot make things better by ceasing to be monopolists; they can make things better only by throwing the weight of their influence against the perpetuation of monopoly. This is the sane policy that Johnson has adopted. He adopted it more than 15 years ago. At that early day he was one of the contributors who made Henry George's first mayoralty campaign a possibility under the burdensome election laws of the time; and from that day to this he has consistently, devotedly and disinterestedly promoted the principles he imbibed from George. And when occasion has demanded it, he has proved his fidelity by a defiant manifestation of moral courage that nothing short of the profoundest sincerity could evoke. In the estimation of those who have been close enough to Tom L. Johnson to know what his ambitions are, his sincerity is as far above reproach as his ability is above question. After an intimacy with him of ten years Henry George retorted to a caviller, "I should as soon think of doubting my own sincerity as Tom L. Johnson's."

Mayor Harrison is brought up with a round turn by the Chicago Tribune upon his trifling with the street franchise question. His hobby in connection with this question is "adequate compensation." He seems never to have considered, says the Tribune very justly, "where such payments really come from and what the alternative to their exaction would be." Where such payments really do come from the Tribune pointedly explains. "The exacting of such compensation," it says, "in the case, for example, of street railway franchises, is special taxation of street railway passengers as such." It adds that this constitutes "one of the most unjust and impolitic in-

stances of indirect taxation anywhere to be found;" because it forces the working class families to contribute most heavily toward the compensation fund, they being the principal users of street cars. The alternative to compensation which the Tribune names is reduction in fares, and as it truly observes, "public opinion is going over steadily, and irresistibly to this alternative."

Facts are coming to light which show that in proposing "compensation" to the city for franchises, Mayor Harrison is playing into the hands of the street car monopolists. They could well afford to pay a large percentage upon gross receipts for such an extension as Mr. Harrison is disposed to concede, with its privilege of exacting fares of five cents. Ten per cent. of gross receipts would be only half a cent a fare, and even 20 per cent. would be only one cent a fare. That extraordinarily large rate of compensation to the city would leave the monopolies a net fare of four cents. Yet Tom L. Johnson has offered to take the Columbus system on a three-cent fare, to buy off all rights at a fair valuation, and at any time to turn over the plant to the city upon being reimbursed for its actual cost and interest, meantime managing it so as to furnish the highest class of service and to pay the highest rate of wages. The motive of this offer was not, it is true, strictly a business one. Mr. Johnson simply intervened in behalf of the people of Columbus against local street car monopoly. Yet he asserted at the time that it was a business proposition essentially, because he knew from experience it would yield a fair business profit. And now comes Albert L. Johnson, in the character simply and solely of a business man aiming to make money, who, with prominent capitalists behind him—capitalists who are not philanthropists—offers to establish in the city of Philadelphia a street car system with universal transfers, on the basis of a three-cent fare. This Philadelphia proposition

should admonish public officials everywhere that the day of five-cent fares is passing, and that extensions of franchises with higher than three-cent fares may be justly regarded as conclusive evidence of official corruption.

On the subject of the Chicago municipal election, Gov. Altgeld published an able letter last Sunday, in which he exposed the administrative weakness of the present city administration, with the directness and incisiveness that characterize all his utterances. At first Mr. Harrison expressed his inclination to laugh at the Altgeld letter rather than answer it. But better advice prevailed, and he made a formal response. We trust that democrats who still assume Harrison's fidelity to their party will read his letter, whether they read Altgeld's or not. To read it with intelligence and without coming to the conclusion we expressed last week, namely, that Harrison had less than no interest in Bryan's election, is, it seems to us, almost impossible. Of course, he does not admit Altgeld's charges. But with respect to his political manipulations, everybody familiar with Cook county politics suspects at least that Altgeld is right when he says that "if Mr. Harrison is elected Mr. Lorimer will be the supreme boss of the republican party for the next two years and the democrats will be traded off at all elections except the city elections." In other words, Harrison's faction of the democratic party and Lorimer's faction of the republican party, swap county offices for city offices—Harrison getting the latter and Lorimer the former. The only way to break up this game, injurious alike to the city of Chicago and to the genuine democracy of the city, of the state and even of the nation, is to turn Harrison's faction out of the city hall. That is the necessary first step to any substantial civic reform in Chicago.

Much has been said in condemnation of the new ballot law of Mary-

land as a method of suppressing the negro vote of that state. That this is its purpose is doubtless true. Senator Gorman would hardly be suspected of a legitimate purpose in anything political. For that reason the democrats who voted against the bill, explaining that they were unwilling to disfranchise negroes, deserve especial commendation for their democratic intentions. Nevertheless, the law in itself, so far at any rate as the disfranchising clause is concerned, is not only legitimate but desirable. It abolishes the party column on the Australian ballot, and requires the names of candidates to be printed in alphabetical order. Consequently, no one can vote with effect unless he can read well enough to pick out the name of the person he wishes to vote for. If this disfranchises anyone, he ought to be disfranchised; and whether white man or black man makes no difference. It is not even an educational test, except incidentally. While we do not believe in educational tests, we do believe that the prescribed ballot should be of the kind required by the Maryland law, which follows that of Massachusetts. It should be in such form as to demand of the voter some intelligent act of choice when he comes to the polls. If in doing this it imposes incidentally the requirement of sufficient book education to enable the voter to distinguish one printed name from another, that is not an objection. When Maryland republicans complain of this desirable ballot reform as a scheme to disfranchise negroes, they expose themselves as more solicitous for their own privilege of voting negroes than for the negroes' privilege of voting.

Considerable uneasiness has been caused by the action of the Pennsylvania legislature and governor in enacting a law—"the ripper bill"—which arbitrarily deposes the elected mayors of three cities, and empowers the governor to appoint in their place "recorders" with authority to remove all heads of departments and to

fill the vacancies. Such legislation is, of course, utterly destructive of local self-government, and may well excite an uneasy feeling. The Outlook refers to it as carrying to a "startling extreme" the "present reactionary tendency to deprive cities of self-government." But the Outlook is not in an advantageous position to protest. Local self-government is a political principle, by assailing which the Outlook has encouraged just such legislation as what it now complains of. To oppose that principle fundamentally in one application, as the Outlook has done with reference to the Philippine subjugation, is in effect to oppose it in all applications. The people of Pittsburgh, Scranton and Allegheny have no more right, upon any principle, to complain of Senator Quay's process of benevolent assimilation than the Filipinos have to complain of Mr. McKinley's.

In the work of George Kennan, the famous investigator of Russian modes of governmental "benevolence," whom the Outlook commissioned to write up the Philippine question, the Outlook management must have suffered some from a sense of disappointment. Although it placed Mr. Kennan in a journalistic straight-jacket, it could not wholly suppress the terrible truth about the Philippines. In his paper on present conditions and possible courses of action in the archipelago, published in the Outlook on the 9th, Mr. Kennan was restricted, it seems, "to plans and suggestions based on the existing state of affairs, without reference to the manner in which such state of affairs has been brought about." For a religious paper, those were, under the circumstances, rather worldly instructions. They rendered it, as Mr. Kennan writes, "unnecessary, if not impossible, to treat the subject fully from the ethical point of view." For, as he adds, and as ought to be obvious, "our duty, and consequently our proper policy, depend very largely upon the morality and justice of the acts by which, historically, the exist-

ing situation has been created." Restricted thus by his instructions, Mr. Kennan refrains from dealing with the question of the moral and legal validity of the American title to the Philippines; but his views of the situation even as it is are not reassuring either to the American conscience or to American expectations.

To begin with, Mr. Kennan finds that we must stay in the Philippines, and must exercise there the powers of government—with emphasis upon "must"—for a term of years, at a cost to us of "perhaps, some thousands of lives and tens of millions of dollars." His estimate of the army needed for this purpose and this indefinite period is from 50,000 to 60,000 men. It is with reference, however, to that behavior of our government which has turned our one-time Filipino friends into implacable foes that Mr. Kennan's paper is most suggestive. At the same time it is shocking. To quote him—

We have offered them many verbal assurances of benevolent intention; but, at the same time, we have killed their unresisting wounded; we hold 1,500 or 2,000 of them in prison; we have established at Guam a penal colony for their leaders; and we are now resorting, directly or indirectly, to old Spanish inquisitorial methods, such as the "water torture," in order to compel silent prisoners to speak or reluctant witnesses to testify. That the present generation of Filipinos will forget these things is hardly to be expected. . . . It is painful and humiliating to have to confess that in some of our dealings with the Filipinos we seem to be following more or less closely the example of Spain. We have established a penal colony; we burn native villages near which there has been an ambush or an attack by insurgent guerrillas; we kill the wounded; we resort to torture as a means of obtaining information; and in private letters from two officers of the regular army in the Philippines I find the prediction that in certain provinces we shall probably have to resort to the method of reconcentration practiced by Gen. Weyler in Cuba.

"'War,' perhaps, 'is hell,' as Gen. Sherman said," comments Mr. Kennan; "but it need not be hell with Spanish improvements." These

quotations, let it be remembered, are published in an imperialist magazine from the pen of its own chosen commissioner. Are Americans yet ashamed of the Philippine situation? Or have they got piously used to it?

It will be remembered that during the winter Gen. MacArthur deported a young man, George T. Rice, from Manila to the United States for publishing libels of an "incendiary" character and "menacing to the military situation." When Mr. Rice arrived in San Francisco that vigilant democratic democrat of a weekly newspaper, the *Star*, secured from him the facts in the case, which it has published in its issue of the 16th. The story is long and circumstantial, but is intensely interesting. And as a concrete instance it throws more light than any amount of general description could upon the Cossack methods of government that now prevail in the Philippines under the "starry flag of freedom."

Mr. Rice was editor of a maritime paper. In that capacity he rightly regarded it as his duty to criticise a military officer who, as a custom-house official, was derelict in duty. The criticism were based upon complaints of sea captains and merchants who had business with the custom-house and were insulted and defrauded. Rice verified the complaints. They extended from insolence and official neglect to official malfeasance. The subject of these criticisms resented them by arbitrarily forbidding the editor access to the public office and the public reports in his charge. That was a further malfeasance, and Mr. Rice exposed it. Then Gen. MacArthur took the matter up. But instead of investigating Rice's circumstantial charges against the officer, MacArthur allowed his secretary to browbeat Rice. A pretense of investigating the delinquent official was made, but it was a star chamber proceeding. Rice was not allowed to confront the accused, nor to examine the record, and re-

spectable witnesses, business houses whose names he furnished to substantiate his charges, were not examined.

Having in this primitive fashion whitewashed their associate upon the military records, the military authorities tried to frighten Rice into putting on an extra coat in his paper. They summoned him to headquarters, where Lieut. Col. Crowder (MacArthur's secretary) subjected him to the following imperious interview:

Crowder—Don't you think you are wrong in this matter?

Rice—No, sir.

C.—Then you still think you are right?

R.—Yes, sir; I know I am.

C.—I am sorry for you, young man; if you still persist in saying you are right, my orders are from Gen. MacArthur to deport you.

R.—If you will give me a fair trial in court I can prove that I am right.

C.—Under martial law such characters as you receive no trial. We have not the time.

R.—Can I see the evidence in the investigation which you claim proves my charges false?

C.—No; the investigation was placed in competent hands and does not need your approval. Your statements have been proven to our satisfaction to be without foundation and you will be deported as an incendiary character and a menace to the military situation. You are too young to let go on slandering men of honesty and capability, and I consider your character as having fallen to its lowest level. In writing and publishing such articles you endanger the foundation of our military system. Such conduct as this I consider equal to traitorism.

R.—So far as being a traitor, I have served my country in the field for over a year, and never had my love of country so much as questioned, while you have never been under fire and never expect to be, and you dare question my patriotism! I have more patriotism to the square inch than you have in your whole carcass.

C.—Be careful; a few more words and I will put you in Bilibid! [the jail.]

R.—Put me there! I would rather be an honest prisoner than be a craven and deny the truth through fear of your power.

The order for deportation was then issued. While this was in Lieut. Col. Crowder's hands he said:

The military governor [MacArthur] directs me to ask you that if your conduct is satisfactory up to the time of

your deportation and he sees fit to remit your sentence, will you promise that in the future you will never write articles of a similar character against any officer of the military?

R.—No, sir. I hold the right to publish anything anywhere and whenever I have proof of my statements.

C.—Your case is hopeless.

Crowder thereupon turned Rice over to the provost marshal, who placed him in solitary confinement on the 23d of January, where he remained until the 27th, when he was sent under guard to the United States transport Pennsylvania, which sailed for San Francisco the next day. Rice's experience is an enlightening example of the actual workings of American imperialism.

IMPERIALISM.

In the heat of the presidential campaign pure partisanship held such resistless sway that hundreds of thousands of American voters who in their hearts would abhor the degradation of the republic, closed their eyes to the signs and their ears to the warnings of a political current that is carrying us on with majestic sweep from republic to empire. Possibly they may look and listen now.

When in that political conflict they were told that McKinley's reelection would be regarded as a popular indorsement of his imperial policy, their prompt response turned upon the point of the necessity to empire of having an emperor. Because they felt not only that McKinley would not and could not make himself an emperor, but that no emperor at all would be tolerated by the American people, they were confident that the cry of "imperialism" was a mere campaign slogan.

But it is possible to have an empire without an emperor. It is possible to set up imperialism without any of its trappings. That is in fact the usual way.

When Rome passed from republic to empire the name of king held the detested place in the Roman mind that both king and emperor hold in the American. Baldly to have proposed a king would have been as fatal to Roman imperialism then, as baldly to propose an emperor would

be to American imperialism now. To thrice refuse the kingly crown, whether sincere or not, was the best of Roman politics. Yet the Roman republic was strangled by the Roman empire, and there was no king. The title of "imperator," which the Caesars adopted, was but a common expression of republican authority, as innocent then as "manager" would be now.

Nor could anyone at that time have told where and when the republic ended and the empire began. The transition was effected by a series of departures from old standards and old ideals, each of which commended itself to superficial observation as being in the interest of the republic. No imperial policy was deliberately proposed. Probably none was dreamed of even by the imperialists themselves. But more or less unconsciously they turned the current of events toward imperialism. We know how the current of a great river in the bottoms may be turned by small cuttings into the bank at a bend. The analogy holds true to Roman history. In times of stress masterful ambitions prevailed in the settlement of temporary issues, until at last an imperial current had broken through the republican banks at a bend and torn out a channel for itself. There was no conscious setting up of an empire to take the place of the republic.

It is always so. When a people are about to pass from freedom to tyranny, nobody shouts from the house tops: "Hurrah boys, let's change our freedom for tyranny!" Probably nobody desires the change, and only a few realize the tendency. What really happens is this: Things that really make for empire, but which are supposed to be desirable in themselves, are done regardless of where they may lead on to; and one step following another, the time comes when succeeding generations are awakened by sore experience to the fact that the freedom their fathers had is gone. Says James Bryce, "the greatest changes are often those introduced with the least notion of their consequence, and the most fatal those which encounter least resistance."

The history of republics furnishes a never-failing admonition to us that

our republic may pass into empire without exciting alarm by any of those outward indications with which securely established empires advertise their power. The price of liberty is now, as it always has been and always must be, eternal vigilance.

The essential characteristic of empire, in the objectionable sense of the term, is absolutism.

Whether absolute power be administered benevolently, makes no difference. The evil is in the power itself; not in the nature or manner of its administration. Benevolent absolutism is, indeed, the most fruitful seed of tyranny. Let absolutism begin malignantly, and a people accustomed to freedom will recognize it for what it is, and rising up in their might will put it down. But let it begin benevolently, and by the time the people see and feel the tyranny which is as natural to every species of absolutism as plums to a plum tree, they will be powerless to resist its aggressions. The little finger of a small standing army will then be stronger than the loins of the unorganized masses.

Neither is it important whether absolute power be centered in one man or in several. An empire ruled by an emperor, a Caesar, a king, a boss, a tsar, a sultan, or whatever other title he may adopt, is not more intolerable than one ruled by an oligarchy.

The true distinction, the only test distinction, turns not upon the number of despots or their benevolence, but upon the question of self-government or superimposed government. Whatever may be the titles of its administrators, the government that is at all times responsible to the people governed is a free government; the government that governs without responsibility to the governed is imperial.

What made Rome a terrible empire was, at first, not despotism at home. So far as the heavy hand of tyrannical government concerned him, the Roman citizen was long as free under the empire as under the republic. As between citizens, we are told that there was under the empire a strict observance of justice,

and that for the protection of Roman citizens abroad the whole power of the empire was on call. But there was utter contempt for the rights of other peoples.

Long before she was known as an empire, while republican forms were unaltered and the republican spirit still seemed vital, Rome had set out to be a world power. In this ambition for universal dominion, she succeeded; and as her sway extended she established colonies. They were of two sorts, "senatorial" and "imperial." The latter were governed absolutely from Rome, being colonies in which the "inferior" and subjugated peoples would have been dominant but for the armies of the empire that were quartered upon them; and though the former were self-governing to a degree, that was because through Roman immigration and other causes they had become submissive to the mistress whose decrees went forth from the banks of the Tiber. Superimposing her imperial government upon all, Rome held no relation whatever of responsibility to the governed in her colonies.

England has in modern times followed the ancient Roman example. Like Rome, she protects her citizens abroad with the ferocity of a she-bear defending a litter of cubs. But "inferior" peoples have no rights, as peoples, that she feels bound to respect. Again like Rome, she aspires to rule the world. In this she has been more successful than any other modern nation. Around the globe her drums alone beat a continuous reveille. And in imitation of Rome she has subjugated "inferior" peoples and attached them to her empire as colonies. Where the "inferior" peoples are in the ascendant her colonies are "crown" colonies, which correspond to the "imperial" colonies of Rome; but as the superior Anglo-Saxon immigrant secures dominion over the natives, privileges of self-government are extended and the colonies rise to the dignity of what Rome knew as colonies of the "senatorial" class.

Some of these have achieved a certain power of self-government which precludes England from holding them to her empire by arbitrary ties. Their devotion to the mother country

is no longer one of imperial power emanating from Westminster hall; it is one of imperial sentiment fostered within the colonies themselves—within the nations rather, for in all but name and international recognition the provinces of the Canadian dominion and the states of the Australian federation are independent units in the category of Anglo-Saxon sovereignties. They are essentially less the colonial dependencies of England than her military allies.

And it might almost be said that our own federal republic is becoming part of this allied group. It is at any rate following England's lead. Once a collection of British colonies, it made a successful struggle for independence, but after more than a century of bitterness toward Great Britain is now falling into line with her for an epoch of Anglo-Saxon empire.

That is the outward form that American imperialism is assuming. With an "understanding between statesmen," as Mr. Joseph Chamberlain phrased it, a preliminary understanding between British tory and American republican statesmen that has since become all too evident, the American republic has been projected upon the same career of colonial empire that Great Britain copied from Rome.

Already she has set up one "senatorial" or "self-governing" colony, in Puerto Rico, and an "imperial" or "crown" colony, in the Philippines; and over the latter her president now possesses legislative, executive and judicial powers that are absolutely without limit either as to extent or duration. Receding from her traditional policy of government by consent, she is thus following the British lead and developing a system of colonial government without responsibility to the governed.

Looking backward over the history of the past three years, we can identify the beginning of this career of colonial imperialism with the American naval victory in Manila bay. That event seems to have generated the ambition at the white house which has resulted thus far in investing the American president with more autocratic power over 10,000,000 Filipinos than is possessed

over anybody by any other civilized potentate on earth. The first published indications of this ambition appeared in the Washington correspondence of the Manchester (England) Guardian of Wednesday, May 11, 1898, page 9, being credited to Senator Hanna, the president's political and personal friend and confidant. According to this report Mr. Hanna said:

The president realizes, as we all realize, that the problem presented by the capture of the Philippines is the most important and most serious that confronts the administration and the country. To say what we will do is impossible at this time, but this much has been determined upon. We will take possession of the islands first, and discuss the disposition of them afterwards. Some sentimentalists seem imbued with the idea that we are going to give the islands back to Spain. It seems there is no probability of that. To retain them will, as the English newspapers have pointed out, necessitate a departure from the traditions of our government. Of course such a step is not to be taken hastily. In cursory talk among republican leaders I find that there seems to be very little opposition, except on the idea that some day our system of statehood might be extended to these outlying territories. I think nobody has any idea of doing that. When the time comes our policy will be made clear, to the effect that statehood is to be restricted to the present limits of our nation, and is not to be extended to territory separated from the country, even when it is so close as Cuba. All these details can be settled when the time comes. It seems to me, and must be clear to everybody, that the United States are entering upon one of the most important crises of their existence.

In the light of subsequent events those words from Mr. Hanna indicate either that our imperial plans had already been formulated, or that he is the most remarkable prophet in history. Although this programme was outlined by Mr. Hanna within a fortnight of the Dewey victory, and before we had set foot upon Philippine soil, everything has been done in precise accordance with it.

The peace commission was instructed by the president to insist upon purchasing the whole archipelago. The native government which, under the leadership of Aguinaldo, had acquired authority over all the civilized regions and driven the Spanish into Manila, was remorse-

lessly assailed and finally destroyed by the president's orders. Congress, under white house pressure, has invested the president with unlimited power over the islands. And a crown colony system there is now being set up.

We are thus superimposing upon that people a government which holds no relationship of responsibility to them. That is the imperialism of Rome. It is the imperialism of Great Britain. And it necessitates, as Mr. Hanna truly said it must, "a departure from the traditions of our government."

In the same interview Mr. Hanna hinted at that Anglo-Saxon imperialism of which this American departure from American traditions is part, as we have indicated above. He said:

We are on the eve of an alliance of the English speaking peoples of the world, which is bound to bring forth great results. I believe that this is inevitable.

Is it reasonable to suppose that in this interview Mr. Hanna was merely ruminating aloud? Is it not much more reasonable to infer that his expressed expectation of an Anglo-Saxon alliance points to one of the elements of that "understanding between statesmen" to which Mr. Chamberlain subsequently alluded when he asserted that in this informal manner an alliance actually existed between Great Britain and the United States? And is not that inference confirmed by the friendly attitude of the authorities of each country toward the aggressions of the other? British Tories applaud our invasion and subjugation of the land of the Filipinos, while American republicans palliate the British invasion of the land of the South African Boers.

That is the imperialism that is engulfing us—an imperialism in which the English-speaking peoples unite in a general policy for the conquest and subjugation of "inferior" peoples.

For a defense, the advocates of this policy are driven to appeal to the stern decrees of Fate. "Destiny determines duty," said Mr. McKinley, with the air of a Christian but the inspiration of a fatalistic pagan.

There is no other appeal. Tried

by the Christian standards of justice, or their corollaries the democratic standards of equality, this whole imperialistic programme must be put aside. By every principle of Christian government, it is a wicked assumption for any nation or any race to esteem itself "superior" in such a manner as to have a commission to superimpose its authority upon "inferiors," for the regulation of their domestic affairs. This assumption derives all the plausibility it has from the fact that the self-styled superior peoples have superior force, and from nothing else. We are able to superimpose our authority upon inferior peoples not because we are superior in any of the things that go to make men morally better or socially more useful, but solely because we are superior in the manipulation of coercive agencies. We are better than they "because we can lick 'em," as a rough and ready imperialist has put it. Reduced to its last analysis, then, the pretense that superior peoples have the moral right to superimpose their authority upon inferior peoples is a mere euphemism for the brutal proposition that the stronger have the moral right to subjugate the weaker.

That proposition is no truer of peoples than of individuals. If "superior" peoples have a right to govern "inferior" peoples, then it must be that "superior" individuals have the right to govern "inferior" individuals. And in the one case as in the other, the ultimate test of superiority must be superiority of physical power.

Our imperialists are entitled to full credit for consistency on this point. They do maintain, with more or less caution according to circumstances and their own disposition to be discreet, that the "inferior" members of a community should be governed by the "superior." This is what imperialism must ultimately and logically lead to. We cannot build up a system of imperialism for "inferior" peoples in Asia without sooner or later allowing our traditions of equal rights to be torn down at home.

This notion that the "better"

classes should govern will not bear the slightest investigation. "Government by the best" has a seductive sound, but there is no substance to the conception. There is no way of picking out the best.

Education is not a test. Some of the best educated men are the most accomplished knaves, and others are the most consummate fools.

Property is no test. All have heard of the man in Rhode Island who, having been allowed to vote one year because he owned a jackass equal in value to the property qualification, but being denied the right the next year because his "property qualification" had meanwhile died, innocently asked which had really voted the first year, himself or the jackass. This old-time anecdote probes the absurdity of the property qualification to the core.

There might be a society, to be sure, in which property qualifications could offer a reasonable test of special fitness to participate in government. If everybody's wealth were the measure of his usefulness—if, that is, he could accumulate only in proportion to what he earns—his wealth would be some sort of index to the degree of his intelligence, sanity, civic loyalty, thrift, and so on. But we have no such society. The amount of a man's wealth to-day is as a rule an index only to his degree of cupidity, and of his shrewdness in playing in a predatory game.

Similar objections apply to every other test. To determine who shall administer government only two effective ways can be conceived. One is to leave the decision to the governed; the other is to resort to force. "Government by the best," as distinguished from government by the governed, is nothing when examined but a discreetly phrased synonym for government by the strongest. It is the same concept with reference to local government as imperialism with reference to colonial government. And to a realization of this concept the American people will surely come if they allow the current of imperialistic tendencies, now daily gathering force, to get beyond their control.

Any discussion of imperialistic

tendencies would be incomplete without some reference to the influence in promoting them of the belief that by this means civilization is spread over the world.

That the feeling that imperialism, conquest, subjugation, or by whatever term one may choose to distinguish the policy of government of "inferior" by "superior" peoples, does extend civilization contributes largely to its acceptance, we are well assured. Nor do we doubt that in this feeling there is the germ of a true conception of progress. Why then should we oppose imperialism? Why not encourage the extension of superior civilization, even by means of conquest and slaughter?

If for no other reason, for the simple one that all the possible benefits of imperialism in this and every other respect can be secured in greater degree without it. The great promoter of true civilization is not military conquest. It is not conquest of any kind by means of force. The great promoter of civilization is trade. Not the trade that is said to follow the flag. Not the trade that consists in exporting without importing. Not any kind of strangulated trade. But free trade.

Left to itself, in obedience to a natural law as obvious and persistent as it is beneficent, trade penetrates from every center into every nook and corner and cranny of the inhabited globe. And as it extends, it carries with it a knowledge of the best customs and the best ideals, as well as the best goods, that the world has to offer the world. And with knowledge of what is best, comes voluntary selection of the best. Thus the best in all things conquers when trade is free to stimulate peaceful intercourse and exchange.

But this natural and peaceful and serviceable conquest of inferiors by superiors is artfully checked. With deceptive phrases about protecting trade, trade is obstructed. Nor are the "inferior" peoples the great sinners in this particular. They always give the warmest welcome to foreigners until they find that foreigners are bent upon plunder. China, for instance, did not shut herself in commercially for commercial reasons. It was because the civilized barbarian

began to lord it over her. We must turn for the worst attacks upon freedom of trade, to the statutes of civilized countries, including our own. The extent to which the spread of civilization is prevented by the deliberate policies of checking trade, can only be conjectured. But it is certain that if conquest, subjugation, imperialism, contributes at all to the spread of civilization, it does so only in so far as it breaks down the barriers to trade that our barbarous protection policies set up.

Let us drop our policy of obstructing trade, let us make bargaining as free as breathing, let us hold out this policy as an example of civilized ideals—let us do these things, and long before imperialism could slaughter enough crown colony natives to make the survivors tractable, peaceful trade will carry what is best in our civilization to the uttermost parts of the earth; and what may prove to be of more moment, will bring to us what is best in civilizations that we in our ignorant pride hold in contempt as "inferior."

By this means, too, we should make alliances for peace instead of alliances for war.

There have been dreams of annexing Canada to the United States. But Canada could be more firmly annexed by free trade than by political bonds. It is not the political federation of our states that benefits them as units in the American union; it is the free trade which that union maintains between them. Abolish our domestic trade-freedom, and there would be chaos here though the political union were preserved. Abolish the political union but preserve the trade-freedom and we should hardly be conscious of the change. Free trade between the states is the real substance of the American union. This is the alliance that makes the states one.

Such an alliance would unite us to Canada, to Australia, to New Zealand, to Great Britain, to all the civilized and all the uncivilized peoples of the world, in bonds of perpetual friendship and mutual service. It would not require annexation. It would not require subjugation. It would not require even treaties. Nothing is necessary but to abolish the trade

barriers which we ourselves have erected and maintain.

It is highly significant that this normal method of extending civilization, this Christian kind of alliance, finds no favor in the minds of imperialists. The more ardent they are for extending trade at the point of the sword the more determined are they to suppress trade by protection statutes. Though they are solicitous for military alliances, they are fearful of trade friendships. When in this country we were pleading for free trade and friendship with England, we were taught to hate the English. But now that England offers us a barbaric imperial alliance for the subjugation of inferior races, the same teachers tell us of the masterful character and the glorious future of Anglo-Saxon dominion. And to give moral color to the infamy they discourse upon the duty of extending civilization.

If it is civilization that we wish to spread, if the progress of the world is our object, we have only to become universal free traders instead of imperialistic free booters. Here is the choice. Free trade with the olive branch of peace and the horn of general plenty, or imperialism with the destructive implements and the demoralizing influences of war.

Which shall it be?

NEWS

Alarm over the Russian occupation of Manchuria, the circumstances of which we reported last week, has been superseded for the moment by excitement over the lining up at Tientsin of a British against a Russian force of troops. The Russians claim a territorial concession at Tientsin from the Chinese government, which, about the middle of the month, was entered by British railroad builders for the purpose of constructing a siding. The Russian military authorities ordered them off. The British military authorities, with a force at this point outnumbering the Russians ten to one, ordered the construction to proceed. Thereupon both parties entrenched, within 50 yards of each other, the British flying their flag over ground claimed by the Russians, after having removed the Russian flag. Gen. Waldersee, the German commander of the allied forces in China, made

earnest efforts to adjust the quarrel, but without success. The Russians refused to listen to any proposition short of the unconditional withdrawal of the British from the Russian concession, and the British refused to withdraw. Until the 20th each commander held this position upon his own responsibility; but since then both have been acting upon instructions from home. On that day the Russian general, Wogack, made a formal demand upon the British for the withdrawal of their force and an apology for removing the Russian flag, and the British returned a negative reply.

Another matter of concern to the allies in China is the action of the Russian representative in the meeting of foreign ministers at Peking on the 13th. He opposed any further punishment of Chinese officials for participation in the Boxer uprising. This merciful policy on the part of Russia is suspected to be in part consideration for further Chinese concessions.

The United States is discreetly retreating from this inflammable neighborhood. Formal orders were issued on the 15th for the withdrawal from China by the end of April, of all American troops except a legation guard of 150 men.

The American troops as withdrawn from China are to go to the Philippines, where the American force is weakened by the expiration of enlistments and the scarcity of recruits. Of the operations there, but little is now reported. The week's event that is made most of is the surrender of the Filipino General Mariano Trias, of whom Gen. MacArthur says that his prestige in southern Luzon "is equal to that of Aguinaldo's." Gen. Trias immediately took the oath of allegiance. "This indicates," reports Gen. MacArthur, "the final stage of the armed insurrection." It appears that during Gen. Otis's regime, Trias was offered the American governorship of the province of Cavite as a bribe to desert his countrymen, but at that time he refused all overtures. Another important capture is that of Gen. Diocino, whom MacArthur describes as "the most troublesome insurgent general in Panay." Havoc has been raised with Philippine shipping by the wholesale destruction of vessels under American military or-

ders, 300 vessels of various sizes having been recently seized and destroyed. Most of them are native craft, but leading Manila firms also are among the sufferers. One of the Philippine dispatches is peculiarly significant. It tells of the reconcentration, in imitation of Weyler in Cuba, of the inhabitants of the Island of Marinduque. After closing the ports and confining the inhabitants to six towns, the Americans, says this dispatch, published in the Chicago Tribune of the 1th, "devastated the interior." The result, adds the dispatch "is that every one" except 200 armed Filipinos, "is now begging for peace."

Some further progress appears to have been made in setting up American local governments in the Philippines, and the war department at Washington has defined the standard flag for the division headquarters in the archipelago. This flag is to be made of—

khaki colored silk or bunting, measuring three feet on the staff and four feet six inches fly, cut swallow-tailed 12 inches to the fork, bearing in the center two circles overlapping each other, one-third radius, resembling the figure eight, one foot six inches high, and of corresponding width. The symbol to be in red, bordered in white one and one-half inches, and edged in blue three-quarters of an inch, surmounted by a red scroll bearing the device, 'Division of the Philippines,' embroidered in blue letters. Total length of lance to be nine feet, including spearhead and ferrule.

Our Cuban relations are still in suspense, the special committee of the constitutional convention not having reported on the American demands. Intense feeling, however, has been stirred up in Cuba by these demands. Correspondents who insist upon the importance of making the adjustment in accordance with them, nevertheless admit the bitterness of Cuban feeling, and blame the American authorities at Washington for lack of tact.

Recurring to the difficulty between Great Britain and Russia, the irritating incident over the British occupation of Chinese land claimed by Russia, comes doubtless at an awkward time for Great Britain; and hints from responsible quarters are not lacking that Russia appreciates it. For while the Boers continue to worry the British army in South Af-

rica, the British ministry is obviously in no condition to deal decisively with any first-class power. Great expectations, therefore, were raised in London, as we reported last week, over the rumor that Gen. Botha wished to surrender. At the time of that report it was known that Lord Kitchener had granted Botha an armistice until the 14th to enable him to confer with other Boer generals. Nothing was known then, nor is anything known yet, of the details of the Kitchener Botha negotiations. The British authorities have made public only the fact that negotiations were in progress and that they have collapsed. Their collapse was divulged by a statement that Mr. Chamberlain, secretary for the colonies, made on the floor of the house of commons on the 20th, from which it appeared also that the negotiations for surrender had been initiated not by Botha, as had theretofore been implied, but by Lord Kitchener, and pursuant to instructions from the British ministry. Mr. Chamberlain explained that Botha had informed Kitchener that he did not feel disposed to recommend the British terms of surrender to the consideration of the Boer government, and that through its chief officers the Boer government agreed with his views.

NEWS NOTES.

—Frederick E. Coyne has been appointed postmaster of Chicago to succeed Charles U. Gordon.

—An act of the Tennessee legislature, signed on the 14th by the governor, forbids coeducation of the white and negro races in that state.

—By a vote of 250 to 163 the British house of commons on the 13th defeated a bill for the relief of congested districts in Ireland by means of compulsory land purchases.

—Mayor Samuel M. Jones, who is the no-party candidate for reelection as mayor of Toledo, was indorsed on the 16th by the democratic convention by a vote of 193 to 139.

—The Chase, Robeson, Merchants', American Linen, and Metacomet cotton mills, of Fall River, operating 350,000 spindles, closed down on the 18th pursuant to a mutual agreement to curtail production.

—There are reports of rioting in many cities of Russia, under circumstances which suggest the possibility of a premeditated revolt; but the cabled details give no satisfactory account of the matter.

—Wu Ting-Fang, the Chinese minister to the United States, delivered a

notable address on "Chinese Civilization" at the thirty-seventh convocation of the University of Chicago, at Studebaker hall, on the 19th.

—Ex-President Benjamin Harrison, upon whose public life we commented last week (page 770), was buried in Crown Hill cemetery, Indianapolis, on the 17th. President McKinley attended the funeral.

—Count Boni de Castellane, husband of a daughter of Jay Gould, fought a pistol duel at Paris on the 17th with M. Rodays, proprietor of Figaro, in which he wounded Rodays severely in the thigh.

—The bill prohibiting prosecutions for polygamy, passed by the Utah legislature (page 776), was vetoed on the 14th by Gov. Wells, and the veto was sustained in the senate on the 15th by a vote of 9 to 9. To pass the measure over the veto 12 votes were necessary.

—Prince Krapotkin, the world-famed anarchist, is to arrive in Chicago on the 7th, for the purpose of delivering a series of lectures. He comes under the direction of Prof. Ely, of Madison university, Wisconsin. Krapotkin's headquarters are to be at Hull house.

—A graduated income tax bill has been favorably reported by the taxation committee of the Michigan senate. It provides for rates varying from one-fourth of one per cent. on incomes of more than \$1,000 and not more than \$2,500, to one per cent. on incomes in excess of \$5,000.

—An impeachment trial was begun on the 14th, at Raleigh, before the North Carolina senate, in which the accused are two supreme court judges, Furches and Douglas (the latter a son of Stephen A. Douglas). They are charged with usurping legislative functions in a court decision.

—The gigantic steel trust, of the organization of which, with its capital of \$1,100,000,000 in stock and bonds, we told at page 746, has absorbed the Rockefeller iron interests. This additional consolidation gives to the new trust all the Rockefeller railways, lake transportation lines and ore mines, including the rich iron mines of the Mesaba range.

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

| | Exports. | Imports. | Balance. | |
|---------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----|
| M | \$112,947,361 | \$63,927,265 | \$49,020,096 | exp |
| G | 417,612 | 1,830,274 | 1,412,662 | imp |
| S | 4,580,499 | 2,829,927 | 1,750,572 | exp |
| | \$117,945,472 | \$68,587,466 | \$49,358,006 | exp |

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, and including February 28, 1901, as given by the treasury reports, were

as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold, and S for silver):

| | Exports. | Imports. | Balance. | |
|---------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----|
| M | \$1,015,185,374 | \$522,960,360 | \$492,224,994 | exp |
| G | 32,332,722 | 56,219,117 | 23,886,395 | imp |
| S | 45,221,916 | 27,270,500 | 17,951,416 | exp |
| | \$1,092,740,012 | \$606,449,997 | \$486,290,015 | exp |

—The duke of Cornwall and York, eldest son of King Edward VII., began a journey around the world with his wife on the 16th. The duke and duchess sailed on the Ophir for Australia via Gibraltar, intending to be present at the inauguration ceremonies of the Australian commonwealth in May. From Australia they are to come across the Pacific to Canada. They were royally received at Gibraltar, where they touched on the 20th.

MISCELLANY

THE SHADOW OF THE MINE.

I.

These were men not less than the men who stole their bodies,
 These were the heft of incomes, the burrowing potentialities of fortune,
 These were hunted souls who went from the sun at the call of noisome dividends,
 These were saviors, explanting a law, servants of plenty in plenty denied,
 These, the lost miners, crushed in fell chambers, maimed and veiled from the asking day,
 These, called at the mouth of the pit by fond names in melting voices,
 Caught in the network of schemes, crunched in the jaws of a theft.

II.

I had been told that these things were no more,
 I had been told that men were so that they could not be happy on the sorrows of others,
 But when I looked into your face I did not see that this bloody sacrifice had altered one cartilage,
 And when I saw you taste your food I did not see you wince as must one who eats death,
 I have only seen in you the same indifference and doorways to hell,
 And the blindness that could not grope towards the great west
 Where lie your buried slaves.

III.

The lapsing day transmits a charge to the night, demanding its sundered children,
 The sweet day that is widowed and orphaned of its own fiercely calls for reparation,
 The honor and obedience which piloted fortunes through underground tortures, transmuting want into luxury,
 Staking all for the alien, for him too losing all, the emptied vessels of cushioned shrines,
 Leavening men's bread with salt, salt tears.

IV.

You have eaten the flesh of your fellows,
 You have incarnated man in your crime and drawn man's blood in proof of your mercy,

You have weighed your peace against another's struggle, your safety against another's wreck,

And while you have feasted in life they have feasted in death,

You in your open air, breathing rare aromas of health,

They in their stifed pit, in the blackness stilled and unrecovered,

You in the eyes of those who love and laugh,

They in the eyes of those who love and weep.

V.

Do you sleep anywhere at night and not dream yourself to the mouth of the pit.

There into the darkness peering, with hungry eyes gnawed by the rack of your guilt,

Hearing far down somewhere the dull voices, helpless to help, yet also helpless to still?

VI.

Given to ease, to caution pledged, yet you must account for this.

The men who cry no more in the darkness will forever cry to your heart,

Till some day you will answer, you will arise to the recognition of an awful truth.

Then you will leave your meals untasted, You will go forth among men bravely proclaiming your own degradation.

In the end resolved that no more shall food pass your lips

Till all are fed, till all men have ceased to eat the bodies of their brothers.

—Horace L. Traubel, in The Conservator.

THE QUESTION OF LOCAL OPTION IN TEXAS.

The principle or practice of home rule, or local option, in taxation, is of slow growth in this country, where custom and tradition are so uniformly and so strongly opposed to it, but once the new method becomes tried it is likely to recommend itself to a general and rapid adoption.

In purely local affairs a community, it would seem, on general principles, ought to have the right to tax itself, or use its money for local purposes, virtually as it pleased—provided that the taxpayers be given full "sayso" in the amount and the direction of use of the taxes. So long as they do not object to local policies of local taxation of any description, it would appear to be nobody's business but their own.

This is the general argument in brief on which the theory of home rule or local option in taxation is based.

The senate of Colorado the other day passed a home rule taxation bill and, as such a measure passed a previous house in that state, it is probable Colorado will become a kind of pioneer in such legislation among the American commonwealths. The state sent a commission to Australasia to inquire into the advanced methods of taxation in that part of the world, and

the land value tax and local option feature, generally in vogue there, especially recommend themselves to the commission. The land value tax, while it has some things in common with the single tax theory, is not to be confounded with that system, which it ante-dates and from which it also differs materially.

Propositions are now pending in the Texas legislature looking to local option in taxation in purely local matters, and it would be gratifying to a large and growing element in Texas if our legislators would find time to thoroughly discuss these measures and reach some practical conclusion with reference to them.

Many cities are hampered by the inflexibility and the general nature of the restrictions upon even local taxation. It might be well enough to fix a maximum beyond which communities could not go, but if any city, acting under a special charter, desired to place the bulk of taxation upon one kind of property, or wanted to exempt certain other kinds of property from taxation, for a certain period or even permanently, it ought to have the right to do so by vote of the taxpayers. These latter can always be depended on to take care of themselves in the matter of voting taxes.

A reform like this would give an independence and a flexibility of government to our growing Texas cities that would enable them much better to promote their own development in many directions than now.—Editorial from the Houston Daily Post, of Sunday, March 3, 1901.

CHINA A WELL GOVERNED COUNTRY.

An extract from an article on "The Settlement of China," by Thomas F. Millard, published in Scribner's Magazine for March.

The patriarch among nations which now exist on earth, China is none the less imposing, nor to be less respected, because she is at present surrounded by a halo of pathos. Now that I have seen her from within, I marvel at the mist of misrepresentation which has, in the guise of partial truths, been wrapped, by a myriad of book-writers, about her. It seems to me that the average traveler who writes about China, unable to overcome his amazement at innumerable petty social customs so different from those to which he is used, overlooks the most fundamental and important elements in the enduring national structure. That China is badly and tyrannically governed, that she is rotting away from age, and will fall into

pieces unless western civilization assists her in managing her internal affairs, are familiar conclusions persistently thrust before the world by the class of commentators I have in mind.

I do not agree with such conclusions, but I mention them here, not in order to air my own views, but because they become pertinent on account of the certainty of their being assumed as facts in the discussion of the terms of the forthcoming settlement. The brevity of this article forbids elaboration of my own point of view, but I believe that China has still a great deal of vitality, and that it is to-day, in any profound analysis, a well-governed country. Furthermore, I believe that any outside attempt to govern China is certain to have disastrous results, not only to the empire, but also to the powers who interfere and the world at large. All sound governments are founded upon, and derive their strength from, a certain mental reciprocity between the population and the governing authority. This is usually called "the consent of the governed." Is it not preposterous to assume that the Chinese government could have endured thousands of years unless it rested on such consent? Its very endurance is a passive guarantee, to which history can present no parallel. I think that when a European says that China has a bad government, what he really means is that it is a different government from the one to which the European is accustomed. This class of observer seems unable to comprehend that what would satisfy him perfectly would not content the Chinese at all. The Chinese government, as it exists to-day, is the result of peculiar social and economic processes, working in certain grooves for centuries upon centuries. No western civilization can replace, in internal industrial and political utility, the conditions which now obtain. And is it not conceit gone mad, for nations which are, comparatively speaking, mere babes in age, to apply to the Chinese empire terms suggesting instability?

Only the other day I met an American friend, a lawyer, who questioned me about the Chinese.

"I guess they're very uncivilized?" he said.

"Why, not at all," I replied. "They were civilized when our forefathers were naked savages."

He seemed a bit staggered by my answer, although he must already have known what I told him.

"Well, if they're so civilized," he re-

turned, "how does it happen that we can lick them so easily?"

This was the first time I had heard the notion, that a man's claim to superior civilization rests on his ability to kill some other man, put so tritely. That this idea is so general and deep-seated, even among the most intelligent classes, must puzzle people who cherish the belief that enlightenment is the guide of western progress.

MR. WU TING FANG ON THE CHINESE CIVILIZATION.

An extract from the speech made by Mr. Wu Ting Fang, minister from China to the United States, before the convocation of the University of Chicago, March 19.

Does civilization consist of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, electric light, battleships, rapid-firing guns, magazine rifles and a thousand and one things which are often regarded as necessary for a progressive nation? This would be a narrow interpretation of the word. Civilization has, I believe, a broader meaning, with intelligence, order, morality and refinement for its essential elements. Such a civilization China undoubtedly has—a civilization different, to be sure, from that of the west, but a civilization nevertheless. In other words, civilization is the elevation a nation has reached in its progress from a lower to a higher state of society. It is to be expected that the civilization attained by China should be different from that attained from the nations of the west by reason of their difference in national development. Chinese ways are not necessarily bad because they often seem strange to western eyes. It is merely a question whether one is accustomed to them or not.

The people of the west may know more than the Chinese about the building of railroads, the floating of foreign loans, the combination of capital, the development of resources and the like. All this is granted. But the Chinese naturally feel that they are in a better position to judge what is best for their own interest and welfare than any outsider can be. Therefore any attempt to impose upon them any reform or religion they do not feel the need of is apt to create trouble. . . .

It is not easy for foreigners to look at the Chinese question from a Chinese standpoint, and many misunderstandings which have occurred between foreigners and Chinese can be traced to this source. Fortunately there is an increasing disposition on the part of many public men in America and Eu-

rope to deal with Chinese affairs, not in a high-handed way as of old, but in a spirit of forbearance and with an earnest desire to do what is right. It would be a great mistake to put the Chinese in the same category with the tribes of central Africa or the inhabitants of the South sea islands.

That occidental civilization in all its phases is superior to oriental civilization is not clearly established. The burden of proof is on the side that endeavors to effect a change in the existing order of things. The mere assertion that one system is superior to the other is not sufficient. It does not follow that a system which has been tried and proved successful in the west must be suitable to the conditions which prevail in China. A superb landau runs with great smoothness and rapidity on the asphalt pavement of a city, but that does not show that it can go any faster and more safely than an old express wagon in a muddy country road. Sixty years of foreign intercourse have by no means convinced the Chinese than western ways and methods are better than their own in all respects and under all conditions.

If the people of the west would study the civilization of China instead of trying to pull it down they would save themselves a great deal of trouble. They will find that the Chinese are not addicted to "ways that are dark and tricks that are vain," as they are represented to be by an American poet. They will find that China, old as she is, still exhibits all the strength and vigor of full maturity. They will find that the civilization that has stood the test of forty centuries is far from being effete. They will find that the proper course to be pursued in putting China on the road to prosperity and happiness is not to shake the foundations of her social and political fabric, but to allow her to incorporate such elements of western civilization as she can assimilate.

PUBLIC "PUTZ."

I do not remember having seen an announcement of the meeting, but I am told that the heads of several of the leading universities in the east did recently have a meeting to decide upon the regulation gowns, caps, hoods, etc., to be used at public functions. There was, it seems, some rawness of knowledge, or misunderstanding, as to the proper colors for masters and doctors of this and that de-

gree and place. The fact of this meeting of learned men was urged as an indication of the real importance of such badges of dignity. Such men, it was urged, would not meet to discuss mere foolery. I admit that some may honestly look at it in this way. There are many good folks who still think kings are infallible and must be taken seriously.

There is, however, another way of looking at the matter. May not the aforesaid meeting be another outward and visible sign, like our rapid development of liveried coachmen, butlers, etc., of the reactionary trend which our democratic country has taken? The tendency would naturally show itself in matters small as well as great. But is there not something in the thought of this meeting which appeals to the good American humor of even an American imperialist; that learned men here in America, in the closing days of the nineteenth century, should meet in grave conclave, discuss gowns, and take themselves and the subject seriously!

Where costumes, once employed, have acquired time-honored association, there may be something appropriate in the continuance of their use. But that new institutions should deliberately borrow the plumage and decorations of other folks' effete paraphernalia is so absurd that it could not come to pass except in a conceited and shallow epidemic. It is absurd to argue that such procedure is necessary to the doing of things decently and in order, and, if you please, with dignity. There is in it rather the unconscious confession of some loss of hold upon the simple realities of life that go to make true dignity. The growth of ceremony has always indicated affectation of dignity, emphasis of class distinctions, and the artificial exaltation of prerogative.

So then it was to be expected, in view of the prevailing revolution of ideals in this country, that President McKinley's second inauguration should have been marked by an increase of what the Germans call "Pütz und Ceremonie."

We were not quite ready yet for a robe. But why should it be long delayed? Why should not the most distinguished officer of the nation wear a robe of state on great occasions? *Scotus Maximus!* if President Seth Low cannot lay a cornerstone without a gown, why should President McKinley take the oath of the greatest office on earth, or receive the variegated diplomatic corps, in just the ordinary coat, vest and trousers?

When it comes the time that we shall see the propriety of enrobing, as they do abroad, all the officers of the state, let us hope that something new may be devised. The artistic ability of America ought to be able to give us something original, so that we may not be compelled just to copy the old-fashioned robes and gowns of Europe. If we had only kept them going it might be all right; but having given them up for a century what a confession of weakness it would be to return to just the same old things.

J. H. DILLARD.

O YAM—A SKETCH.

This story, by Miss Sul Sin Fah, was published in *The Land of Sunshine* for November. Of the author the editor of the magazine, Mr. Charles F. Lummis, says:

"This 'Chinese Lily' (for that is the translation of Sul Sin Fah) was born in 1868 in Macclesfield, Cheshire, England; her father was an English merchant in Shanghai, and there married her mother, a Chinese lady of rank and beauty. Her education was limited by reverses before she was 12; and ever since she grew to woman's estate she has supported herself as a stenographer. What her other wanderings have been, I do not know, but her stories have come from Montreal, Seattle, San Francisco and the Island of Jamaica; and last year we had the pleasure of a visit from our little 'Chinese Contributor.' She is a wee, spiritual body, too frail to retain much strength for literature after the day's bread-winning; with the breeding that is a step beyond our strenuous Saxon blood, and a native perception as characteristic. For all her father, she is evidently her mother's daughter—a Chinawoman transplanted and graduated. And her work has a poignant intuition for her people that makes it good to all who understand that literature is, after all, something more than words. They are its skin-deep beauty—its birth-right, indeed, but its minor organ. For, like woman, literature must have a heart."

It was a southern California village, a picturesque spot, where summer held sway all the year 'round, and sea and mountain air mingled. Searchers for health basked in its sunshine and tourists wandered amongst its flower-buried cottages and crumbling ruins; for there, in times gone by, a Spanish mission had stood.

Five years ago Wo Kee had come to the village, bought a piece of ground outside its limits, built a little shack and started a market garden for the purpose of supplying the community with the succulent vegetables a Chinaman knows so well how to raise. His garden thrived and his little daughter, O Yam, thrived with it. She was a pretty little thing, and when she first appeared before the villagers, attired in tiny scarlet vest, mauve jacket and trousers, her

six-year-old cuteness quite captivated the hearts of the ladies, who became her father's patrons. From that time she grew amongst Wo Kee's asparagus, artichokes and vegetable marrows, as happy as a bird; trotting after her father as he worked around his garden, running to and fro for the old woman who cooked their meals, or talking broken English to the ladies who were wont to pass that way, and who always stopped for a few words with the quaint little maid. One lady was so interested that she made a request to Wo Kee that O Yam should be sent to her house every day for the purpose of learning all that a little American girl should know—for O Yam was a native daughter of the Golden state, even though she did wear a long braid interwoven with many colored silks hanging down her back and reaching almost to the heels of her tiny embroidered shoes. But though Wo Kee agreed to the proposal, O Yam would not be weaned from her father's side for even one hour out of the twelve. There was only one person in the world for her, and that was her father. And Wo Kee's love for the child and his care for her were such that those whose knowledge of the Chinese was limited to books could not help but express surprise.

"Ah, no," said Wo Kee one day, "not true that all Chinamen not care for girl child. Some think son better for honor family, and some too poor to keep girl, put her away, but parent-love parent-love always, boy or girl."

Like all Chinamen living in America, Wo Kee was subjected to considerable annoyance from thoughtless boys. One day a number of them, passing his garden and seeing him there, began to pitch earth and pebbles on his back, at the same time making remarks on his dress and features.

Wo Kee paid no attention whatever to his tormentors, but a little figure suddenly appeared on top of the garden fence, and with much childish dignity said:

"Boys, foolish! has not my father a spirit that be much respect-worthy, and if that be so, what matter his face and his coat be not like yours? It be the spirit, not the nose, you ought to love and respect."

O Yam was then 11 years old, and though the boys laughed, they could not help feeling small.

And now word had come from

'Frisco that Wo Kee, who had been called to the big city to see a sick cousin, had met with an accident and was dying—would die that night.

It was the telegraph operator's mother and sisters who carried the news to the Chinaman's little daughter, and explained that if it had been possible for her to see her father before he died, they would have taken her to him; but although the railway ran past the village, the nearest railway station could not be reached within four hours, and the north-going train was due to pass there in two hours.

O Yam received the news quietly—so quietly, indeed, that the women wondered amongst themselves, and after the old Chinese woman had closed the door of the little shack upon them, remarked on the strange and stoical behavior of the Chinese people in general and one little girl in particular. But even as they spoke a small hand plucked at their skirts.

"I go see my father," O Yam said; and there was resolution in her voice.

"Come home with me, poor little dear!" coaxed the old lady, taking O Yam's hand and seeking to lead her along. But the child would not be persuaded, and darted from her.

Presently the youngest, who was walking behind the others, cried: "Mother! Mother! Look at O Yam."

They were standing on a hill below which ran the railway track, and between the rails stood O Yam holding aloft a broom. Tied to the sweeping and upper end of the broom was a magenta silk garment—O Yam's best blouse. It fluttered in the breeze like a banner, and stretched itself out as if to greet the approaching train—not five minutes' distance off.

"O Yam! O Yam!" the women screamed, clinging to one another.

And to their straining ears was borne: "If I no see my father to-night, I no be live."

They understood then; the child was risking her life to see her father die.

"Good Lord!" cried one, "it is the fast express, and the chances are a hundred to one that it will go over her."

The train thundered down. Its breath was on the child.

The sisters covered their eyes, their mother fell on her knees murmuring a prayer.

But the chance in a hundred was

vouchsafed to O Yam. The train stopped—almost too late. And Wo Kee died that night with his little daughter's arms around him.

THE FILIPINO CIVILIZATION.

A portion of the address delivered by Senor Sixto Lopez in the New Century hall, Philadelphia, March 12.

At the period when the Normans were invading Britain, and bringing to Celt and Saxon new institutions and a greater degree of social refinement, the Moors were migrating to the Philippines, taking with them their science and arts. Long prior to the Spanish occupation, the degree of civilization and culture to which the Filipinos had attained was remarkable, and was regarded by many as superior to that of Mexico, Peru or Japan. Their form of government was similar to European feudalism, and was as good in practice as were those of European countries of the same period. Education was further advanced, and was more general than in any country in the world at the time. The people had a written language, Moorish in character, which was taught in almost every village school, and "there were very few," says Dr. de Morga, the first Spanish governor general, "who could not write well and correctly." The religion of the people was similar to that of Zoroaster. When Christianity was being introduced into the islands, it was found that there were words in the language of the Filipinos capable of expressing all the higher spiritual phases and doctrines of the Christian religion.

The industries of the country at that time were extensive. Most of the arts of peace and domestic life were flourishing. There were factories for the weaving of delicate silks and other textile fabrics. Father St. Augustine mentions that the making of cotton stockings for exportation was then a large and flourishing industry. The secret of the manufacture of gunpowder was known to the Filipinos from an early period. They had powder and ammunition factories; and there were brass and iron foundries in Bulacan, Pangasinan, Ilocos and Manila. When some of the European armies were assaulting city walls with the battering-ram, the Filipinos were making double-barreled revolving cannon, or "lantacas," as they were called, many of which were afterwards exported to Spain and South America.

But it would be impossible, without wearying you, to even mention all the industries and evidences of the civilization attained by our people prior to

the Spanish conquest. It is sufficient to say that, with the exception of the religion and the literature of Europe, we have received nothing of value from Spain.

Returning to the present time, or rather to the time immediately preceding the present unhappy condition of our country, I shall endeavor to give you some idea of the Filipinos as they are.

Many recent writers have essayed to describe the characteristics of my countrymen. The thing that strikes one most in these descriptions is their bewildering contradictions and anomalies. Dr. Schurman, for instance, says of the masses of the Filipinos that they are "uneducated and very ignorant;" that they have been guilty of "inhuman procedure;" and that the "Philippine islanders who are educated are few." At another time and place he speaks of "the Filipinos, who in general are most promising, estimable, and even lovable people." He further declares that "they possess admirable domestic and personal virtues;" and that "the educated Filipinos * * * are far more numerous than is generally supposed, and are scattered all over the archipelago." And after bearing testimony "to the high range of their intelligence, and not only to their intellectual training, but also to their social refinement, as well as to the grace and charm of their personal character," Dr. Schurman pronounces the following encomium: "These educated Filipinos, in a word, are the equals of the men one meets in similar vocations—law, medicine, business, etc.—in Europe or America."

These are the words not only of Dr. Schurman, but of his colleagues on the first Philippine commission, as given in their final report (p. 120). It is impossible to harmonize them with Dr. Schurman's own statements of last November, or with the "war head" statements of those who describe the Filipinos as savage, cruel, treacherous, and ignorant "Malays." The peace-loving American who desires to know the truth may well find it difficult to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion if he be guided solely by these contradictory reports. But in reality it is only necessary to bring to the question a little common sense, freed from passion and prejudice, in order to arrive at some conception of the truth. The Filipinos are not strange and unknown creatures, of whom spectacled professors need to write ponderous volumes. I will tell you who and what the Filipinos really are. They are the same as any other

civilized, Christian community. They have their educated and their ignorant, their wise and their foolish, their good and their bad. Like every other people in this world, there are those who are kind and gentle and refined, and there are others who lack these qualities. It is no doubt true that during this war some irresponsible Filipinos have been guilty of acts of cruelty. It is said that some such Filipinos buried alive one of the Macabebe scouts who had tortured Filipino prisoners of war. I do not know whether that is true; I hope it is not. But in any case, it should no more be taken as a gauge of Filipino character generally, than the burning alive of a negro should be taken as a gauge of American character generally. Burying alive is no more characteristic of the Filipinos than burning alive is characteristic of Americans. The charge of atrocities has been common to every war within known history. I believe that there is a substratum of truth in these charges, but I believe also that they are much exaggerated. Yet these isolated cases have been made the basis of a general charge against our people of cruelty and savagery. It is unfair to judge of a people during a period of war, when the worst passions are aroused, and when, of necessity, life itself is held in light esteem. It is, therefore, necessary to go back to the time prior to the insurrection of 1886, in order to obtain a just estimate of Filipino character.

If time permitted, I would like to describe to you the religious and social condition of our people; their family life, the respect of children for their parents, and the love of parents for their children; the position of equality which woman occupies, and the respect paid to her as the counselor and coequal head of the family. But in all these things the Filipinos do not differ from the people of Europe and America. If they can be said to have any special characteristics, they are those of politeness and hospitality, which are not confined to the educated and wealthy, but are characteristic of the artisan and laborer as well.

I would like also to tell you of the wonderful talent of the Filipinos for that highest of all forms of human expression—music, in which they stand in remarkable contrast with all the nations of the east. But what I wish to draw special attention to, as having an important bearing upon the present issue, are the conditions of education, and the national unity of the people of the Philippines.

I have already stated that the Fili-

pinos were at one time foremost among the nations of the world in the extent of elementary education. Had they not been brought, and compelled to remain, under the influence of Spanish mediaevalism they would, no doubt, have maintained that preeminence. But, notwithstanding Spanish indifference and monastic opposition, the Filipino record is creditable to a degree.

My own Province of Batangas will serve as an example of the educational conditions obtaining throughout the whole archipelago, with the exception of Central Mindanao and Sulu islands. Batangas, with a population of over 300,000, had 448 teachers, or one teacher to each 600 inhabitants. Of these only 62 were provided by the Spanish authorities, and these, it should be remembered, were paid out of revenues collected from the Filipinos. The remaining 426 were supported entirely by voluntary contribution. These teachers confine their attention almost exclusively to elementary education, and each teacher gives instruction to probably twice as many children as do the teachers in Europe or America. This, in a measure, accounts for the very high percentage of literacy in the Philippines.

The number of those who can read and write has been estimated by various authorities at from 70 to 90 per cent. of the entire population. My own opinion is that between 70 and 80 per cent. of the people can read and write. This compares very favorably with the 58 per cent. of Italians, 31 per cent. of Russians, and, according to the census of 1887, the 28½ per cent. of Spaniards who can read and write. The percentage in the Philippines is higher than in any European country, with the exception of Germany, France and Switzerland. It is higher even than in some of the states in America, and very much higher than in any of the South American states. This result is largely due to the fact that the Filipinos learn to read and write much more quickly than the children of other countries. Thus, Fray Santiago Paya, ex-Provincial of the Dominican Order, and president of the Royal university of Santo Thomas—one of the most bitter opponents of the Filipinos—had to admit, in his evidence before the Schurman commission, that "the Filipinos have a wonderful faculty of learning to read and write. In Europe," he continues, "it takes children five or six years to read and write, here they learn it with extraordinary facility. . . . As a matter of fact, considering the state of advancement

of this country, education in this country is very far advanced, both in the primary grades and in the university grades."

The record in higher education is also creditable. There was a university in Manila several years before the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock. This university was founded by a Filipino lady—a wealthy landowner in Binang in the Province of Laguna. One of the conditions of the bequest was that all students, whether Spaniards or Filipinos, who were unable to pay were to be accepted as resident students without fee of any kind. This was characteristic of the Filipinos in all educational matters; they never forget the deserving poor. It was equally characteristic of the Spaniards that as soon as their benefactress died they entirely ignored this condition in so far as it related to Filipinos, only Spanish students being admitted free.

In addition to this college, which is now the Royal university of Santo Thomas, there are in Manila the college of San Juan de Letran, the Ateneo Municipal (Jesuit college), the Nautical college, the Medical college, the Pharmaceutical college, the College for the Instruction of Nurses in Obstetrics, and the seminary of San Carlos. All of these colleges are affiliated with the Royal university, and there are also about 35 private colleges not so affiliated, but which teach the university course up to the third or fourth year. There are on an annual average about 20,000 students in Manila. There are also two training colleges, one for male and one for female teachers. And there are five large colleges for women and girls, some of which have as many as 500 students each.

It must not, however, be thought that university education is confined to the city of Manila. In other parts of the archipelago there are the colleges of Vigan (South Ilocos); Neuva Caceres (South Camarines); Cebu (Island of Cub); Jaro (Island of Panay); and Guinobatan (Albay), all of which are affiliated with the Royal university. In addition to these there are, as in the case of Manila, innumerable colleges and collegiate schools throughout the archipelago, in which the university course is taught up to the third or fourth year.

Now I wish to tell you—and I do so with very great pride—that the funds for the foundation and maintenance of every one of these colleges have been provided exclusively by the Filipinos themselves. This is also true of

95 per cent. of the elementary schools. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at, as the Schurman commission admits in its report, that: "A system of free schools for the people has been an important element in every Philippine programme of reforms;" whilst Gen. MacArthur, in his recent report, says: "This almost universal aspiration for education should appeal strongly to American sympathy."

HAIL TO THE MIGHTY CAESAR!

Extracts from advance sheets of the Court Laureate's Epic, on the majestic and inspiring pageant to William of Canton at the installation of the great American empire, March 4, 1901, writ in Hiawatha measure, as furnished to the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 3, by S. P. Butler.

Many moons imperial Viceroy,
Ruling provinces and vassals,
Caught and tethered mortals countless,
Black and red, and brown and yellow,
From the isles and from the jungles,
Male and female of their people,
For the panoramic babel;
Till, at last, the day of glory
Dawned on color scheme chaotic,
On a human herd prismatic,
All, in jargon diabolic,
Babbling plaudits to the Caesar.

Early rose the chant of virgins,
On the wings of incense wafted
To the nation's patron goddess,
Rare and opulent Tarifa,
Lady Bountiful of Commerce.
Round her shrine and round her image
Wove they, singing, votive garlands—
Fairest sight in all Columbia.
Hard by, in a sculptured temple,
Fringed with grove of sacred laurel,
Sang her maids to Saccharissa,
Goddess of the giant Combine
In the sugared field of traffic.
Dotted o'er the lordly city
Pillared fanes arose in marble
To the god, or goddess, regnant
Over many a Trust colossal,
Under royal grant of Caesar.
And each temple, o'er its portal,
Bore the legend—"One from Many"—
Holy text of all the Combines.

Blare of trumpets! Boom of cannon!
To the roar of drums and plaudits
Swept the pageant's mounted vanguard
Full into the Royal Plaza.

Oh, the glitter and the grandeur!
Oh, the legions and the standards!
Oh, the sights grotesque and novel,
And the carnival of color!
Strung upon a thread historic
Came the plebeal groups of subjects—
Marched the Redskins, grim and sullen,
Souvenir of first Expansion,
Rich in feather-duster helmets,
Bright of blanket—sad and silent;
Olive maids, in Cuban plumage,
Clicking castanets with muleteers
In the mazes of fandango;
Saffron girls of Porto Rico,
Raven-eyed and hair of midnight;
Midsea hula-hula damsels,
Brown, décolleté and winsome,
Sirens of the Sandwich Islets,
Garland-decked and crooning love songs;
Tagals fair, and tough Negritos
From the mountain wilds of Luzon;

Captives from the sleepy Cebu,
Where the bamboo waveth ever
And the crocodile lies dreaming;
Fig-leaf fashions from the Pasig,
Erstwhile red with gore of rebels;
Cannibals in clouts and irons,
Brutes carnivorous and shaggy
From the Zamboanga jungles;
E'en the mute, unwashed Alaskan,
And the frowsy Klondike miner,
Muffled hot in robes of sealskin—
Wild and weird composite chromo
Was the human junk, in job lots,
From the Empire's distant corners.

Last of all, into the Plaza
Wheeled a grim and somber cortege;
Stately hearse, with plumes of sable,
Drawn by chargers black and mettled.
Crowding near, and mute in wonder,
Curious the hordes did view it;
Peered into the solemn chamber
Where there lay, on bier, a parchment;
Written scroll, but old and yellow,
Guarded well by silent watchers,
Clad in costume Continental.
None could tell its mystic import,
Why it figured in the triumph,
Ghostlike and uncanny object.
Sudden boomed the voice of cannon,
Rang the bugles of the heralds—
Signal for to halt the columns.
Then arose from marble Terrace,
From the mighty Caesar's presence,
Hannanius, Lord High Keeper
Of the Emperor's mandates.
"Loyal citizens," he thundered,
In a voice of many billows,
"By the sovereign Caesar's edict,
To bedeck this day of grandeur
Comes a small and moidy relic
Of an age long gone, forgotten;
Of a time when in its cradle
Rocked the Empire, pulling infant.
'Tis a musty scroll of parchment,
Yellowed with the dust of cycles.
Once 'twas called the Constitution;
'Twas the Fetish of the Fathers,
Worshiped by them with an homage
We accord to Caesar Divus.
Writ upon its hoary pages,
In a language quaint and stilted,
Are the frail, infantile statutes
Once that bound a race of nurslings,
In the days of flabby childhood;
Days of Continental wampum,
Squirrel guns and caps of coonskin.
Food primeval, tough and scanty,
Served the men who went to battle.
Not on beef, embalmed and luscious,
Nor on viands canned by contract,
Fed the legions of the Eagle
When the land was young and hungry.
As the sapling to the forest;
As the brooklet to the ocean;
As the cabin to the palace,
So the nation in its cradle
To the Hercules of Empire;
So the musty parchment, ancient,
To the globe-encircling edicts
Of the august Emperor.
And in merry jest our Caesar,

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.**

To amuse his loyal subjects,
Hath ordained, to grace his triumph,
That from out the Tomb of Records
Be exhumed this parchment olden;
That, in mock funereal fashion,
It be borne amid the pageant.
Smile ye, then, that Caesar, jocund
In the heyday of his splendor,
Should bethink him of this plaything?
'Tis that ye may read the moral
'To be drawn from trinkets olden;
Moral forced by contrast vivid
Of the Empire, rich and regal,
With the mockery of power
'Told in yonder carkered parchment!
Mark ye well how sits the laurel
On the brow of noble Caesar!
Think ye any graven bauble
Like to shape the deeds immortal
Of our Jovian Imperator?
Think ye wealth, in golden showers,
From the lands of mammoth conquest;
Think ye games, and corn and revels,
Furnished by Imperial largess,
Ever fell from moldy parchment?
Laugh ye well, and laugh ye hearty!
Now, methinks, the burnished eagles
On the standards joint, hilarious,
And the Temple's bust of marble
Grin beneath the pennons flying—
March ye on"—so to the heralds—
"And let mirth, in joyous measure,
Jeer the relic of the Fathers,
Jeer the mummied Constitution!
Then, upon the broad arena,
Feast and drink to mighty Caesar!"

So he spake, great Hannanius,
Maker of Imperial edicts;
And to blare of brazen trumpets
Moved and wound the human serpent,
Dazzling in its rainbow splendor;
Through the arch triumphal, midway
Of the city's walls, embattled,
Past the throne whereon the Caesar
Sat in gold and purple glory.
Smiled he like a Jove incarnate
On the motley throng of captives,
On the Senators and nobles;
Smiling best his royal pleasure
When the moldy Constitution,
To the noise of mirth tumultuous,
Crossed the line of regal vision.

Beamed the face of Hannanius
As he whispered to the Caesar:
"Thou art now the whole thing, William;
Not the pygmy, tariff Princeling
Once I found in rural Canton,
But a full-fledged Imperator.
Firm thy throne as rock of granite;
Congress gagged—the masses servile—
Jeered the ancient Constitution!"

Smiling with imperial unction,
Said the Caesar: "Hannanius,
Staff and mentor of my fortunes!
Thou art greater than Expansion.
Now, to soft, enchanted music
Let us dine, and then—more taxes.
In my realm the fattest Province
Shall be thine to pluck forever."

Mamma—"And what was the min-
ister's text this morning, dear? Do
you remember?" Elsie—"Yes, ma'am:
'Many are cold, but few are frozen.'
—Philadelphia Record.

The Pleader — All that Aguinaldo
wants is independence.

The Greeder—All! Why, an Ameri-
can wants no more than that!

G. T. E.

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

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 Hoanoke 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, 1333 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

Volume III of The Public

Will be completed with No. 157,
to appear April 6th.

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

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

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

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

HENRY GEORGE

Shortly before his death wrote: "I most heartily com-
mend 'From Earth's Center,' it contains
an entertaining form an explanation of the practical work-
ings of the 'Single Tax.'" **From Earth's Center**
is a book of 274 pages. We mail it to any address for 25
cents, 3 copies for \$1.00; 100 copies by express for \$7.50.
We prepay expressage within 500 miles of Chicago.
CHAS. H. KERR & CO., Publishers, 56 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO.

Rare OLD Books!

CATALOGUE FREE.

THE ANTIQUARIAN BOOK STORE,

43 East Van Buren Street,
CHICAGO.

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

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

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

WE DON'T SELL OUR

CIGARS

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE
WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE
TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE,
NO MORE, NO LESS.

J. & B. MOOS,
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn
Street, . . . CHICAGO, ILL.

GIBSON ART GALLERIES

CHICAGO'S GREATEST
PHOTOGRAPHERS . .

N. W. Corner Wabash and Adams.

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

For any Book on Earth
Old or New

CATALOGUES FREE.

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

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC,
FOURTH YEAR.

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