

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1901.

Number 182.

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 nomination of Seth Low for Mayor of New York, by a nonpartisan combination, acting in conjunction with the Republican machine of which Senator Platt is the recognized boss, calls for a remark or two on the subject of nonpartisanship in local affairs.

Most emphatically it is not sound doctrine, in our judgment, that municipal government should be conducted without reference to national politics. The idea that it should be is one of those things which may be stated so as to sound well; but it does not bear critical examination. For one thing it is an impossibility, under our system of government.

But we do think it sound doctrine that, when a municipality suffers from corrupt local government, the honest people of both political parties should make temporary unions for the purpose of throwing out of office the thieves of the dominant party. When such contingencies arise, however, good faith and good sense demand that the union candidate for the municipal office which can be made to affect national politics, shall be taken from the dominant party of the locality. If, for instance, a corrupt Republican machine has control of a Republican city, the union candidate should be a Republican who repudiates the corruptionists of his party. If these conditions are reversed, then the candidate should be a Democrat who repudiates his party corruptionists. The minority party that refuses consent to this basis of union, thereby proves its bad faith.

Nor is it a sufficient objection that there are no available reform candidates in the dominant party. Wherever that is really true, public sentiment itself must be so far corrupted that a nonpartisan ticket would be as frivolous at the election as a hen in a cyclone. Now, the nomination of Mr. Low contravenes this sound principle of municipal politics, that in non-partisan movements the candidate for the dominant office should belong to the dominant party in the municipality. New York city is overwhelmingly Democratic, but Mr. Low is a Republican. He is a Republican, moreover, whom Senator Platt's party machine has forced into the field at the head of the "non-partisan" ticket.

If the affairs of New York were alone involved, there would be no objection to the election of Mr. Low as mayor. But more is involved. It is impossible to elect a Republican to the mayoralty of New York without affecting national politics in the interest of the Republican party. First, there would be a strong moral effect in that direction. The election would be heralded over the country as a Republican victory in a Democratic stronghold. Finally, Mr. Low himself would give a Republican tendency to his administration. He couldn't help it if he is honest in his attitude toward national questions, as he presumably is. We do not ignore the point that while Mr. Low is a Republican in national politics, he is a New Yorker in municipal politics. We quite agree that his imperialistic stand in national politics is not inconsistent with his good local management. But there were plenty of Democrats to choose from, who are as good New Yorkers as Mr. Low, and whose Democratic stand on national questions would have been no more inconsistent

with good local management than Mr. Low's Republican stand. Yet they were rejected by the Republican machine in this "non-partisan" movement which has nominated Mr. Low.

They were rejected because they were Democrats. John DeWitt Warner, for instance, has proved his capacity and integrity by quite as useful and immaculate a public career as Mr. Low's. But the Republican managers wouldn't agree upon him because he voted for Bryan a year ago. They could not object to him on the money question, for he is a strict gold standard man. Even if this were otherwise, that is a national and not a local question. But they did rule him out because he voted for Bryan. For the same reason they ruled out Comptroller Coler, also as good a man as Low, but a Democrat. The Republican machine refused to support any Democrat. Yet it has the temerity to ask New York Democrats to waive their national convictions and support a Republican imperialist. If New York Republicans could not stomach Mr. Warner nor Mr. Coler because in national politics they voted for Bryan and anti-imperialism, why should New York Democrats support Low, who in national politics voted for McKinley and the imperial policy?

It is plainly evident, from the way in which Republican objections were raised to every Democratic candidate proposed, that Mr. Low's nomination is intended by the Republican managers of New York city to enable them, on pretense of non-partisanship, to score a Republican victory with Democratic votes. That in itself would be an advantage with reference to national politics, which they were quick to see and would not be slow to use. But a greater advantage is

sought, namely, the advantage of having the metropolis of the country in Republican hands during the next presidential campaign. In these circumstances it is highly important to the Democratic party of the nation that the regular Democrats of New York city name the best possible man as their candidate for mayor. The Democrats of the country at large may justly hold them accountable if, by naming a weak or corrupt candidate, they promote this Republican scheme to establish by Democratic votes a Republican administration over the Democratic metropolis during the presidential year.

It may seem strange that the New York court which tried Czolgosz refused to sentence him to death upon his plea of guilty. Why try a man for a crime which he formally confesses? is a reasonable question. The answer also is reasonable. It is because experience has proved that there is danger of executing innocent men if their pleas of guilty be accepted as final. Not only have innocent men been known to plead guilty to capital crimes, but there are instances of their making circumstantial confessions to crimes of that character which have never been committed. For that reason the English and American courts have long refused to pass capital sentences upon pleas of guilty. In Illinois the courts do not sentence for a crime above the grade of misdemeanor without an inquiry into the facts. There was, therefore, nothing novel in the refusal of the Buffalo court to receive Czolgosz's plea of guilty as conclusive. The court followed the usual and long established practice of examining into the proof of the crime.

So there is nothing to be thrilled with in those gratulatory exclamations in the newspapers to the effect that Czolgosz was forced to have a fair trial whether he would or no. In a sense he had no trial. There was a fair, and, under the circumstances, sufficient, inquiry. But had he been insane and had that issue been raised,

not only would this not have been a fair trial, but he could not have had a fair trial. What expert alienist would have dared to risk his reputation by coming forward as a witness and testifying that Czolgosz was insane, with the press of the country clamoring for a speedy conviction and ready to denounce any and everyone who might possibly contribute to an acquittal? What lawyer would, under those circumstances, have dared defend Czolgosz as James T. Brady defended Sickles? What juror would have dared to vote for acquittal, knowing that he would probably be mobbed before he got to his home? Fortunately, for the good name of American criminal procedure, there was no necessity nor excuse in this case for a contested trial. No facts existed upon which to base a defense for Czolgosz. Beyond dispute he deliberately and with premeditation fired the pistol which killed; and evidently, as his conduct now shows, he was not insane. It was possible, therefore, to conduct his trial decorously and speedily to the fatal end, and this was done. To all appearances at least, the prosecutors, the judge, the assigned counsel and the jury did their duty fairly and with dignity. Except by those who oppose capital penalties in all cases, no objection can fairly be raised in this case to the regular execution of the sentence of death.

But there are vicious-minded men who, not satisfied with exacting the utmost penalty of the assassin, would pursue the innocent family. This order of mind is faithfully represented by the Cleveland Leader, the Republican organ of northern Ohio. The assassin's father, as innocent of the crime as an unborn babe, a poor and hard-fisted workingman, had got a laborer's job at digging water trenches for the city of Cleveland. When this fact was discovered by the Cleveland Leader it opened fire with flaring headlines. Of course the real object of the attack was not the poor father of the culprit. It was the Democratic administration of Cleveland, under

which this old man was working at trench digging. But no feeling was shown for the father nor his family. Since his son had shot the president he must be denied the privilege of earning a living by hard work, lest, forsooth, the Cleveland Leader might lose an opportunity to use the national tragedy for partisan purposes. There is a degree of ghoulishness about that which defies adequate comment. The story has a sequel, however, that furnishes its own comment. An inspection of the Cleveland poll books on file with the board of elections, shows that the assassin's father and all the assassin's brothers are Republicans. They have voted regularly at the Republican primaries in Cleveland. So it seems that instead of encouraging assassination by giving the assassin's father employment at digging city trenches, as the Cleveland Leader charges upon Mayor Johnson, Mr. Johnson's administration has simply followed its policy of getting work done for the city instead of either giving jobs or denying jobs for party reasons.

Mayor Johnson's reappearance before the state board of railway equalization in Ohio, (see p. 356), postponed from the 14th to the 21st on account of the murderous attack on the president, gave him no chance to be heard. The railway attorneys did not make an oral argument. They merely submitted briefs in opposition to the power of the board to revalue railway property. Mayor Johnson was given until the 25th to reply.

A criminal proceeding in the federal courts in Florida was instituted last month which seriously concerns every good citizen of this country. By good citizen we do not mean mob-inciting citizens, whether from the slums, the editorial chair, or the pulpit. Neither do we mean those still more dangerous citizens who clamor, upon every excuse, for a strong and invasive central government, and to whom the wholesome principle of the law that all men are presumed to be

innocent of crime until their guilt has been proven is obsolete. We mean citizens who believe in law, order, justice and liberty; not those merely who prate about these things when their own ox is gored, but those who believe in them and use their influence to maintain them under all circumstances when the disorderly spirit rises up. These are what we mean by good citizens. The criminal prosecution in Florida already mentioned as seriously concerning that class of citizens is pending against Helen Wilmans, formerly well known in Chicago; her husband, C. C. Post, also well known at one time in Chicago, and Charles F. Burgman, Mrs Wilmans's son-in-law. This family manages a health resort at Sea Breeze, Fla. Mrs. Wilmans practices mental healing, and she and Mr. Burgman publish a paper, *Freedom*, in the interest of mental science. What mental science is we are not prepared to explain. Neither is it necessary or important in this connection, beyond the fact that these people are accused of being fraudulent pretenders. The essential fact is that a post office inspector has charged the persons named with using the United States mails for fraudulent purposes. Upon this charge a warrant was issued by a United States commissioner at Jacksonville, and the defendants being arrested were taken to Jacksonville, 110 miles away from their home, for preliminary hearing. They must go there again, and perhaps more than once, for trial.

Mr. Burgman, writing of this proceeding in *Freedom*, says that "the government is right in its effort to protect the public against fraud and in declining to have the postal facilities used as a medium for fraudulent purposes." But that is precisely where the government is not right. Fraudulent acts are essentially local and not federal crimes; and the fact that the mails are used to promote them does not change their essential character. It is the business of local authorities, therefore, and not of the

federal authorities to protect the public against fraud. And what is of infinitely more importance is the right of innocent persons charged with fraud to be tried in their own neighborhood, where the people know them, where the witnesses are accessible, where they may find bail, and where they may secure vindication without the expense of going to a distant city. To Mrs. Wilmans, Mr. Post, and Mr. Burgman, who are well known not only in Florida but over the country, and who are in comfortable circumstances, these rights may seem to be of only trifling or academic importance. But they are of great practical importance to the average citizen. Moreover the tendency to give the federal courts jurisdiction over crime in general, instead of confining their jurisdiction to federal crime, is becoming a menace to the saving principle of local self-government. The tendency has advanced gradually but rapidly and it is insidious. It began with laws making it a federal crime to mail obscene literature. Of course nobody—that is to say, no thoughtless body—could object to this. And if anybody did object, no matter how clean minded he was known to be, he fell at once under the extremely disagreeable suspicion of being a defender of obscenity. The next step was to extend these laws so as to include lotteries, acts of fraud, and the like. That they could be easily extended, in the present excited condition of the public mind, to anarchist literature—not the literature of assassins merely, but also that of peaceable and argumentative writers who believe that all invasive government is wrong, without drawing any "fine-spun distinctions" between the two, as the astute David B. Hill puts it—there is no reason to doubt. When that had been done the chasm between American freedom of the press and Russian censorship would have been bridged. The regulation of private conduct in every corner of the American republic would be under the control of the cen-

tral government at Washington. It is this tendency that makes the Wilmans case in Florida especially important.

How far the Russian censorship tendency has gone is illustrated in the same case. Not only is Mrs. Wilmans prosecuted under federal law and in federal tribunals for a local crime, but, without a trial, without any hearing whatever, in spite of the fact that she is presumably innocent, all her mail has been stopped. By orders from Washington the postmistress confiscates it until further directions. On the 30th of this month Mrs. Wilmans is to have a hearing in Washington, but in the meantime no mail matter addressed to her can be delivered. They don't go much beyond that in Russia.

The partisan newspapers and preachers that are trying to trace responsibility for President McKinley's assassination to cartoons of Mr. McKinley, to which he as well as other public men was subjected, might find a subject for prayerful reflection in their own cartoons and misrepresentations of Mr. Bryan.

The New York judge, Holbrook by name, who told John Most that he would not be allowed to defend himself in that court but must employ a lawyer, made a spectacular play to the galleries. Time was when persons charged with crime were not allowed the assistance of a lawyer; but time never was when they were forced by the courts to employ one. John Most has the legal right to get convicted without a lawyer if he wants to.

President Roosevelt's continued refusal to make the president appear like a divinity, is one of the hopeful things about the new administration. He is treating the office of president as a business occupation, going about with the same freedom and in the same unostentatious way that other business men do. This is as it should be. The people have never intended

to turn the president into a king for four years. He was intended to be the head business man of the government. Not only does Mr. Roosevelt show the right spirit in rejecting guards and other kingly paraphernalia, but this makes his life more secure. The psychological effect upon men with a mania for assassinating rulers, of a course of life in the presidential office which makes the president appear to the public as a business man instead of as a ruler, cannot but be wholesome.

LANDMARKS OF LIBERTY.

Without in the least minimizing the public dangers of which the assassination of President McKinley gives warning, all thoughtful persons who believe in popular government will see in the reaction toward imperialism which that crime has intensified and emboldened, far greater dangers than such crimes themselves involve. We do not refer to the lawless spirit of anger and revenge which has recently paraded with the sorrowful and passed for grief. That is only the spirit of the mob; it has no lasting qualities. What we refer to is the imperialistic purpose, hitherto unpopular and restrained, but in consequence of the murder of the president now freely expressed and widely applauded—the purpose to abolish free government in this country.

I.

The Virginia constitutional convention has set the example. By an almost unanimous vote, it proposes to abolish in that state the constitutional guarantee of free speech, one of the bulwarks of free government and a landmark of liberty of which the great statesmen of Virginia have always been eminent defenders.

This reactionary movement is not confined to Virginia. The Western Society of the Army of the Potomac, which exists to perpetuate the memories of a bloody civil war, demands in formal resolutions that—adequate legislation be enacted wherein liberty of speech and right of assembly shall be clearly defined and regulated, the alien doctrine of anarchy suppressed, and all supporters of this political heresy banished from the United States and its territories forever.

President McKinley's old comrades, the 23d Ohio regiment, demand also by resolution that a law be enacted—banishing all anarchists from the United States.

The chairman of the republican state committee of New York announces that a law will be speedily passed in his state—defining anarchism and providing severe penalties for all anarchists.

He predicts that similar laws will be passed in all the other state legislatures.

The Chicago Turn Gemeinde, a large and influential organization, while expressing its appreciation of the blessings of free speech and liberty of the press, deliberately declares in resolutions:

We realize that these blessings are abused by unreasoning and irresponsible persons, and therefore advocate laws which will restrict such abuses.

The State League of Republican Clubs of Pennsylvania demands that congress stamp out anarchy and uproot its causes, naming as among these causes—

the defamation of private character, the vilification of public officials, the reckless criticism of the legislative, administrative and executive branches of government and the outrageous cartooning of public and private characters for ridicule, malice or profit.

And here comes a religious organ (Baptist) with a proposition to set up a Russian censorship. This paper is the Christian Herald, of Detroit. We quote from its issue of September 12:

Is it not time that there should be censorship of the press? The supreme court of the United States has declared public health and public morals of first importance. It has defined the police power as unlimited in the preservation of these civic and personal rights. We have a department of agriculture, justice, war, interior, post office, treasury, with a cabinet officer in charge of each. We have commissioners of education, pensions, internal revenue and taxes, why not a department of press censorship in the interests of public morals and the safety and well being of society.

Further quotations would be an unnecessary draft upon space. These are samples of thousands that might be made, as the intelligent reader knows. He needs only to be reminded of it to recognize the fact that newspapers, preachers, lawyers, politicians, and a thoughtless populace everywhere have, by speeches, resolu-

tions and interviews been demanding legislation of various kinds against free speech, the purpose, generally declared and always understood, being to suppress anarchism and to exclude, exile and punish anarchists.

Not only is it proposed for this purpose to abolish free speech and to establish a press censorship, but there is also a demand for the overthrow of another landmark of American liberty by amending the federal constitution so as to make anarchism treasonable and anarchists punishable as traitors.

Naturally, the average man asks himself why these precautions against anarchy should not be taken.

To his imagination an anarchist is an ill-kempt person of forbidding visage, with a shock of uncombed hair upon his head, a bloody knife between his teeth, a pistol in one hand and a torch in the other, while every pocket bulges with dynamite bombs. This is the picture which incendiary newspapers of the respectable sort have made for him. Even if sensible enough to know that it is a caricature he is not as a rule well enough informed to understand that the caricature is vicious.

For he sincerely believes that anarchism is a theory of no-government, to be realized by assassinating and terrorizing the conspicuous agents of government. This conviction has been fixed in his mind partly by assassinations of rulers by persons who declare themselves anarchists, partly by anarchist speeches which he has not heard but garbled reports of which he has read in his paper, partly by editorial and police misrepresentation, and partly by the assurances of persons who know no more about the subject than he does, but who impose upon him by looking profound and talking wise.

And unfortunately there is something to justify this common notion of what anarchism is. Some anarchists do believe in murdering public officials. Some anarchists do advocate this method of warfare against all government—republics as well as absolute monarchies. Some anarchists do join in plots to kill.

But be his conception justified or no, the average man not unnaturally

wonders why anybody should object to stamping out such a terrible conspiracy and punishing such detestable criminals. In charity to him let it be remembered that he knows little of the history of the struggle for human liberty, and nothing at all of its philosophy. The narrative may interest him here and there with its dramatic incidents, but he has no conception of its relation, otherwise than chronologically, to his own time, place and circumstances. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," is his motto, and he gets him to his breadfruit tree. Why bother about history, or the landmarks of liberty, he asks, when here and now there is a snake to be scotched?

It is upon such meat that tyranny has fattened and thrived since long before the struggle for liberty began. For security from a little temporary danger, the very essentials of freedom have been bartered away, again and again, by the profligate posterity of freedom loving and heroic ancestors. Shall that experience be repeated at this time and in this country? It cannot be repeated if only the masses of the people, aye, if only file leaders of all political parties, will but stop and think. Let them reverse this fatuous question of the average man. Instead of asking why drastic laws against anarchists should be objected to, let them ask why they should be demanded.

II.

At the outset in the search for an answer to that question it may be assumed that anarchism and anarchists are all that the average man pictures them to be. We may start, that is, with the supposition that all anarchism is a philosophy of murder and that all anarchists are cowardly and dangerous assassins. We may take Czolgosz and his instigators, if he had any, as the type. We might agree also, as all good citizens will, that it is of the utmost importance to suppress this species of crime and to rid ourselves of this kind of criminal. Let all this be understood. Yet the question remains, Why should there be a demand for repressive laws?

Existing laws abundantly meet the case. If an anarchist kills, he com-

mits murder; and our laws provide for the crime of murder. If others conspire with him, they also commit murder and can be punished along with the principal. If an anarchist attempts to commit murder but fails, he is amenable to laws that already exist. If he conspires to commit murder, and the slightest act in pursuance of that conspiracy is done, either by him or any of his associates, even the making of a speech or the publishing of a paper, a pamphlet, a circular, an editorial or even an item of news, with that intent, the law takes cognizance of his criminal purpose. And though he is free to speak, to write, to print and to publish, he is responsible to the law for making criminal use of that freedom. There is, in brief, nothing whatever that murderous anarchists can do in furtherance of their murderous designs, which is not covered by existing criminal law. Why, then, the question recurs, should further laws be enacted?

Is it because the penalties under existing laws are too mild? There are several answers to that. As to murder, the penalty already in most states is death; and nothing more severe would be tolerated upon the statute books. For unsuccessful attempts at murder, the penalties may be too light; but that defect in the criminal law can be corrected without abolishing free speech or making anarchy treason. What reason, then, we repeat—what reason is there for the demand for constitutional changes?

Is it because conviction is too difficult under existing laws? Surely that cannot be the point. Difficulty of conviction raises a question not of a new crime but of security in all cases for the innocent. There must be a jury and it must be unanimous. Can we afford to change this rule, trusting to a bench of judges or a majority of jurors to shield the innocent? The jury must be impartial. Shall we abolish that rule and make it a rule of law to select juries expressly to convict? The crime must be proved affirmatively and beyond a reasonable doubt. Would it be wise to set that requirement aside and enact into law the code of the lyncher, who hangs or burns on mere suspicion? The accused must have been of sane mind when he committed the crime for

which he is upon trial. Shall that principle of the criminal law be abrogated? Possibly it should be. We refrain from discussing the point, because our laws can easily be changed so as to authorize convictions regardless of sanity, without effacing landmarks of liberty; and it is the question of effacing those landmarks that we have now under consideration.

These reasons do not furnish the slightest pretext for making fundamental changes in order to stamp out murderous anarchy. Why, then, should such changes be demanded? Observe that the crucial question is not why they should be objected to, but why they should be demanded. Why demand revolutionary changes for a purpose for which existing law is as adequate in every major respect as human law can be, and may be made so in every minor particular without setting aside the landmarks of liberty?

There is, we think, a simple but evident explanation.

The reason that revolutionary laws are demanded for the suppression of anarchy, when existing laws meet every legitimate requirement unless it be in some minor and easily corrected particulars, is twofold. In so far as this is a popular demand, it is due to popular ignorance of existing law and of the history of those landmarks of liberty which the proposed laws against anarchy would efface. In so far as the demand is not due to ignorance, it does not contemplate the suppression of murderous anarchy at all. Its object is to stifle unpopular opinions.

The Bar Association of Chicago, for instance, knows full well that the existing laws of homicide and conspiracy would be as effective for the restraint and punishment of murderous anarchists and the suppression of "red anarchy" as any law which the best lawyer among them could draw against anarchy and anarchists of that kind alone. But those are not the kind of anarchists it is especially desired to suppress. The real objective is anarchists who do not believe in murder, who do not advocate it as a method of opposition to government, who do not countenance it

but do denounce it, yet who teach that government is a weapon in the hands of the few for the oppression of the many, and should therefore be abolished.

This species of anarchy is simply the extreme of the Jeffersonian doctrine that "that government is best which governs least." But it is against its advocates that all these demands for drastic laws are really leveled. So the Chicago Bar association declares its abhorrence not merely of assassination, but—

of the doctrines, when and however expressed, the demonstrated tendencies of which are in open hostility to all governmental authority, and the results of which find their development in such acts of desperate violence and crime as is illustrated in the death of President McKinley.

That declaration is guardedly drawn, doubtless because there are lawyers of high standing in the Chicago Bar association who would protest against any pronounced declaration for the suppression of opinions on government. But under all the circumstances the meaning is clear enough.

It has been phrased very frankly by David B. Hill, once governor of New York, later a senator from that state, and still a candidate for the Democratic nomination for president. Mr. Hill unreservedly asserts that no "fine spun distinctions" should be drawn between murderous anarchists and philosophical anarchists—between anarchists who advocate assassination and those who advocate the abolition of government by peaceably abstaining from participation in its operations. He would class both as one in the criminal law and punish and suppress them alike.

It is evident that Mr. Hill's impatient brushing aside of what he is pleased to call "fine spun distinctions" between murderous and anti-murderous anarchists, fairly represents that public sentiment which is demanding revolutionary changes in our laws. It is not the murderous anarchist, with his bombs and incendiary writings and speeches, whom it is intended to suppress. It is the philosophical anarchist, with his peaceable assemblages and his lawful discussions. Not murderers like Czol-

gosz, but lovers of their kind like Tolstoi.

Let it be observed, in passing, that the impelling motive for trying to silence philosophical anarchists is not because they declaim against government. That would arouse neither fear nor antagonism. It is the plea they make, namely, that government is the instrument which enables the few to oppress and plunder the many.

They point to trusts, for instance, as an institution that would die of inanition if government were abolished and competition thereby freed. And in doing so, they vigorously denounce the social conditions, attributed by them to government, which maintain a few idle or worse than idle rich at the expense of millions of working poor.

That is what hurts. That is the thing to be suppressed. Talk of that kind "arrays class against class." It makes the many feel that "their incapacity and weakness is the result of a tyrannical social system." It inflames men like Czolgosz, "embittered by the sharp struggle for existence, to the commission of hideous crimes." It "sows seeds of discontent" among the "prosperous" poor, and disturbs the serenity of the privileged rich. It unsettles society at the base, and weakens government at the source. That, we submit, is by no means an unfair interpretation of the real objection to philosophical anarchists.

Now, under existing laws, philosophical anarchists cannot be restrained nor punished. So long as free speech is constitutionally guaranteed, no one can lawfully forbid their assembling and making or listening to expressions of opinion, even if the opinions are opposed to government, for it is no more criminal to advocate abolition of government than to advocate restraints upon government. In America, as the law now exists, speakers are responsible to the law only for criminal utterances actually made and riotous assemblages actually riotous. So long as men may constitutionally act together freely for any purpose, without danger of prosecution for conspiring against the government, being re-

sponsible to the law only for actual crime committed, advised or encouraged,—so long peaceable anarchism cannot be suppressed. And that is the reason—not fear of assassins or the instigators of assassins, for whose conspiracies and crimes the criminal law is already adequate—why revolutionary changes in the law are demanded. That is the reason why it is proposed to abolish constitutional guarantees of free speech, to exile anarchists, and to enlarge the crime of treason. The object is to silence anarchists of the peaceable sort.

But blind indeed must that man be who sees in this programme only a move against anarchists. The sentiments of philosophical anarchists that really make their speeches objectionable to the plutocratic engineers of this conspiracy against free government in America, are cordially shared by every one who opposes the political and economic influences which are everywhere making a few rich through privilege and keeping the many consequently poor. This crusade of plutocracy, nominally against anarchists, is in reality against all who express those sentiments. It includes, also, such as oppose the policy of conquest, colonialism and imperialism. Indeed it includes all who criticise with any vigor at all the political party which happens to be in power.

Is this not so? If not, why has the assassination of President McKinley been coolly charged to Bryanism? If not, why is it traced to Bryan's speeches criticising the imperialistic policy upon which our republic has embarked? and the inequitable distribution of wealth which its laws promote? If not, why has it been charged to anti-imperialists? If not, why has it been charged to public men and private men upon no other basis than that they have spoken against conquest, against militarism, against colonialism, against trusts and against other public policies that tend to subvert the principles of liberty and to make the few rich at the expense of the many?

Let there be no mistake. This movement for the abrogation of constitutional guarantees of free speech and for the creation of a new form of

treason—or rather, the revival of an old one,—has for its object larger game than philosophical anarchists. No effective law to suppress philosophical anarchists can possibly be drafted which would not be a most powerful weapon for any party in power to use against the opposition.

III.

The proposition to make it treason to commit an assault upon the president, would, if adopted, be one of the hardest blows possible to level at American liberty. It is freighted with even greater danger to individuals than is the abrogation of the right of free speech. For if it were treason to make an assault upon the president, then, an assault being made, everyone who could be connected with its perpetrator personally or shown to have spoken or written vigorously against the president's policy, would be subject to trial as a traitor. What a drag net that would be for catching in its meshes patriotic men who were distasteful to a corrupt administration at Washington! Speakers and editors would speak and write with a sword hanging over their heads or a noosed rope dangling menacingly before them. They could never know when the "confession" of a crazy assassin and the malice of political enemies would not torture their legitimate criticisms into words counseling treason.

Nor is it necessary to guess that this would be so. The constitutional provision respecting treason has a most important history—a history so important that if our people were half as familiar with its general outline as they are with more dramatic incidents of their country's history, no public man would dare, under any circumstances, to propose a broadening of the existing constitutional definition of treason.

This definition will be found in article iii., sec. 3, of the federal constitution. It reads:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

It was by no accident or indifference that treason was limited to those

two acts—levying war against the states and adhering to their enemy. The limitation was most deliberately made.

When defining treason the framers of the constitution turned to the English treason statute of the 25th year of the reign of Edward III. In that statute several acts are denounced as treasonable, but only three are relevant to this discussion. They are as follows:

(1) "When a man doth compass or imagine the death of our lord the king"; (2) "if a man do levy war against our lord the king in his realm"; or, (3) "be adherents to the king's enemies in his realm, giving to them aid and comfort in the realm or elsewhere."

From these three acts of treason, the framers of our constitution chose the latter two, and, adapting them to the republic, made treason to consist (1) in levying war against it, and, (2) in adhering to its enemies. They deliberately omitted everything else which the statute of Edward specifies, including the clause which makes it treason to connive against the head of the state—the very act which it is now proposed to add to our list of treasons.

Mr. Curtis, in his history of the constitution, gives this explanation of the omission:

The levying of war against the government, and the adhering to the public enemy, giving him aid and comfort, were crimes to which the government of the United States would be as likely to be exposed as any other sovereignty; and these offenses would tend directly to subvert the government itself. But to compass the death of the chief magistrate (etc.) . . . however necessary to be regarded as treason in England, were crimes which would have no necessary tendency to subvert the government of the United States, and which could therefore be left out of the definition of treason. . . .

In fact there was a deeper reason. The framers of our constitution were well aware of the oppressive interpretations that had been put by English courts upon the English statute. They knew that English courts in treason cases were, as Hallam writes, "little better than the caverns of murderers." They knew that the clause making it treason to compass the death of the king, and the judicial theory of

constructive treason to which it gave rise, make black pages in English history. They so framed the American definitions, therefore, as Judge Cooley writes in his Principles of Constitutional Law, that, "if the attempt to revive constructive treason should be made, the constitution by this clause provided against it as far as possible."

It is in the face of this history of the American doctrine of treason that we are now asked to reverse the deliberate judgment of the framers of our constitution, by incorporating into that instrument an adaptation of that clause of the English statute, rejected by them, which makes it treason to "compass or imagine the death of our lord the king."

IV.

Of like unpatriotic character are the schemes proposed for suppressing free speech. After centuries of struggle, English-speaking peoples have secured the right of free speech and free press—two rights which are and have long been considered as essentially one. Other peoples have not secured these rights yet. In nearly all the countries of continental Europe they are at best but precarious rights, and in Russia the censorship is strict enough to satisfy the desires even of the Marquette club of Chicago. But in England the accession of William and Mary, a little over 200 years ago, marked the beginning of the end, among peoples of our speech, of that era of thought-suppression which recreant Americans now seek to revive.

William and Mary came upon the throne of England not as heirs to the English crown, but as heads of the state voluntarily chosen by the people and subject to constitutional restraints. "Divine right" was at an end. And though the bill of rights, which these elected monarchs accepted as binding upon them, made no specific provision for free speech and free press, yet a degree of freedom of press and speech began with this reign. The king no longer arbitrarily suppressed obnoxious publications. But the judges now assumed the role of censors. They could not prevent publications; but they could punish publishers after publication. This they managed to do, and over the heads of

jurors at that, by usurping a function of the jury. They held in libel cases that the province of the jury was only to determine the fact of publication, and whether the libel meant what it was alleged in the indictment to mean; and not whether the meaning were criminal or innocent. The latter point they held to be a question of law which the court exclusively was competent to decide.

Under the cover of this holding the courts of that time came up to the fullest requirements of our own reactionaries. They protected not only the head of the state from criticism, but his ministers and other agents. To traduce the queen's ministers was held, in the reign of Queen Anne, to be a reflection on the queen herself; and any publication calculated to give the people an ill opinion of the government, however general and non-personal its bearing, was punishable as a libel. This usurpation of the judges lasted in England a century. It was abolished in 1792 by an act of parliament which invested juries with the right to find a general verdict in libel cases, not only upon the fact of publication and the meaning of the libel, but also upon the law—whether the publication were libelous or not.

Meanwhile this judge-made law of England, that the court and not the jury determined the criminal character of publications alleged to be libelous, had been imported into the American colonies. By its means a burdensome censorship of the press was maintained for the protection of oppressive and corrupt colonial officials sent over from London. Subservient colonial judges held with the English judges that the jury must take the law as to what constitutes libel from the court; and, also following the English judges, that the truth of a libelous publication could not be proved in justification. It was as bad a libel or worse if true than if false. The colonial press was thereby gagged. No matter how corrupt an official might be, to criticise him publicly was to incur criminal penalties.

But one brave printer refused to be intimidated. His name was Zeisler. He lived in New York city. A score or so of years before the outbreak of

the American Revolution he exposed and criticised the colonial administration of the colony through the columns of his paper. An indictment for libel followed. The people were with him, but the government was against him, and it retained every lawyer in New York to prosecute. Zeisler was unable, consequently, to get a defender at the local bar. But his friends sent to Philadelphia for Alexander Hamilton—not the more famous man of a later day, but the greatest lawyer of his time in the colonies. There was no defense which the judges would consider. Zeisler had published the criticisms. They meant what the indictment charged them with meaning. They were true and just, but the judge held this to be immaterial. So Hamilton met the matter boldly by turning away from the judges and appealing to the jury to decide the law as well as the facts of the case themselves. The judges directed otherwise, instructing the jury that the publication was libelous and that it was their duty to find a verdict of guilty. But the jury, responding to Hamilton's appeal, acquitted Zeisler.

So intense had been public feeling in favor of Zeisler, that this verdict virtually broke down the suppression of press and speech in the colonies, and made the Zeisler case one of the decisive events in the history of the country. Free press and free speech became cherished rights in the minds of the people. It was not remarkable, therefore, when the federal constitution appeared with no clause protecting from attack by the central government these and other rights essential to civil and religious liberty, that it excited for that reason great public opposition and came near failing of adoption by the necessary number of states. In consequence of this opposition and the recommendations of some of the important states a bill of rights was added to the constitution within two years after the establishment of the federal government. It consists of the first ten amendments, wherein is found the emphatic expression of the American sentiment on the subject herein under consideration—

Art. 1. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of re-

ligion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Notwithstanding this precaution, however, it was not long before congress undertook to override this guarantee of free speech. The circumstances were not unlike those of the present time; the object, however, of the popular animosity then being Frenchmen, whereas now it is anarchists.

This was in 1798. Public excitement over the rude behavior of the French Directory toward the American envoys ran high; and the Federalists, reinforced by what we should now call "jingo" from the other party, were loudly demanding that the country join England in her war against France. All who opposed this policy, and there was a large minority, were denounced by the majority as Frenchmen and traitors, somewhat after the manner of many Republicans to-day who denounce as traitors and anarchists all who protest against making President McKinley's assassination an excuse for throwing away the essentials of free government. The press of the country replied with counter denunciations. President Adams being among the officials attacked. At this juncture, a Federalist congress passed and the Federalist president signed what is known to history as "the sedition law," which is thus summarized by Prof. McMaster (in vol. ii. of his "History of the People of the United States"), a historian whose Federalistic sympathies are a guarantee that he has not made the law to appear worse than it was:

This act was . . . directed against seditious acting, speaking, writing, publishing, and putting in print. Henceforth any hothead who conspired with intent to oppose a law of the United States, who, by intimidation, hindered any person holding place or office from doing what his duty required, who caused, advised, even attempted to procure, any insurrection, riot, or unlawful gathering, behaved seditiously, was guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, and might, on conviction, be fined as much as \$5,000 and imprisoned for as long a time as five years. This, in the eye of the law, was the worst form of seditious

could take, and next to it came writing, printing, uttering, publishing or causing, procuring, or willingly and knowingly helping anyone to write, print, or publish any false, scandalous and malicious writing against the government or against the senate or the house, or the president of the United States, with intent to defame and bring them, severally or collectively, into disrepute. For this offense the greatest fine was \$2,000 and the longest term of imprisonment two years. The offender might at the trial give the truth of the matter contained.

This law had been preceded by a few days by one aimed at Frenchmen coming to this country. The latter is associated historically with the former, and the two together are known as "the alien and sedition laws."

The alien law, like the sedition law, bears such a striking analogy to the legislation now demanded for the suppression of anarchists that we are sharply reminded of the old saw about history repeating itself. Under "the alien law," we quote again from Prof. McMaster—

the president was vested with power to send away all such aliens as he judged dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, or had reason to think were hatching treason or laying plots against the government. Should anyone so ordered to depart be found at large, without a license to remain, he might be imprisoned for three years and could never become a citizen. Aliens imprisoned in pursuance of the act were subject to removal from the country on the order of the president, and on voluntarily returning to reimprisonment for such time as the president might think the public good required.

It must be matter of profound regret to the imperialists who are now trying to make the anarchistic scare a leverage for prying up the essentials of liberty in this country, that the "alien and sedition laws" are not still in force. But those laws did not last long, and they ruined the Federalist party, which was responsible for them. Though that party was as dominant in 1798 as the Republican party is today, and was as confident of remaining in power, it met inglorious defeat in 1800. McMaster says that—

the sedition law was most untimely and unwise. Had the Federalist congressmen assembled in caucus and debated by what means they could make themselves more hated than they had ever been before, by what means they

could destroy their present powers, by what means they could turn thousands of "black cockaders" [the Federalist badge] into bitter and inveterate foes, they could not, by any possibility, have found a means so efficient as the law against libelous and seditious writing. Hamilton saw this plainly, and begged them not to set up tyranny. Energy, he reminded them, was one thing; violence was another. But they would not listen to him. Their faces were set toward destruction. And from the day the bill became a law, the Federal party went steadily down to ruin.

If there is in that episode no warning to the Republican party of our day, in this crisis when free press and free speech are being again assailed, then is history void of all warning.

V.

Writing of the bill of rights in the federal constitution, Judge Cooley, in his "Principles of Constitutional Law," concludes that—

freedom of public discussion was meant to be fully preserved; and that the prohibition of laws impairing it was aimed, not merely at a censorship of the press, but more particularly at any restrictive laws or administration of law whereby such free and general discussion of public interests and affairs as had become customary in America should be so abridged as to deprive it of its advantages as an aid to the people in exercising intelligently their privileges as citizens, and in protecting their liberties. The freedom of the press may therefore be defined to be the liberty to utter and publish whatever the citizen may choose, and to be protected against legal censure and punishment in so doing, provided the publication is not so far injurious to public morals or to private reputation as to be condemned by the common law standard, by which defamatory publications were judged when this freedom was thus made a constitutional right. And freedom of speech corresponds to this in the protection it gives to oral publications.

It does not follow, of course, that state legislatures are thus restricted; for the bill of rights in the federal constitution is a restraint only upon congress. But the spirit which prompted the federal guarantee of free press and free speech was the American spirit of liberty, and an attack upon it anywhere in this country is reactionary. Judge Cooley's statement, therefore, is what men imbued with the spirit of American liberty must stand by in state as well as in nation.

Only when the public peace is broken by print or speech, or when private rights are assailed or common morals defied, must government be allowed in any way to interfere with speaking and writing. The right to express opinions must remain inviolate. That is the American principle. That is one of the essentials of liberty which our fathers won and we inherit.

Should the unpatriotic effort now making to destroy this inheritance succeed, should conspiracy against the person of the president be made treason and the right of free speech be abolished, it will be for no other reason than the ignorance of the masses of the people. Not ignorance of reading and writing, not ignorance of the things that would give the right to vote under educational tests, not ignorance even of history in respect to its incidents. Not ignorance of those kinds. But an ignorance far more dangerous to the commonwealth, an ignorance which the learned share with the illiterate—ignorance of the lessons which the history of Anglo Saxon struggles for liberty teach. This kind of history is not taught in our schools. If it were, free speech, free press, free assembly, and security from prosecution for constructive treason would be as dear to the hearts of the people now as they were to those who fought for our independence, who framed our constitution, and who in overwhelming numbers overrode those earliest attempts at anti-anarchist legislation which hold an infamous place in our political history under the name of the alien and sedition laws.

Conspiracies to overturn the government by force are already punishable as every lawyer knows. Seditious publications promoting such conspiracies are punishable if an overt act be committed. That, also, every lawyer knows. Libels upon officials or candidates are punishable if both false and malicious. Writings and speeches advising crime are likewise punishable. So is every other crime with which anarchists are charged. These laws should be enforced. But further than that the law cannot go with safety to free government.

NEWS

To go further is to involve society in greater dangers than the most virulent anarchists could possibly contrive. The safety of society demands that discussion shall be free, even though the perpetuation of the government itself be debated. "The right of the people," says Judge Cooley, "to change their institutions at will is expressly recognized by federal and state constitutions, and this implies a right to criticise, discuss and condemn." These rights are essential to freedom of conscience, and free government can rest only upon freedom of conscience.

But, as has been often and truly said, "freedom of conscience must include not only the freedom of belief, but also the freedom of unbelief." It would be absurd to say that we may discuss the wisdom of having this government or that, but must be silent upon the subject of whether government of any kind is just and wise. At this point intelligent and patriotic Americans will agree with Zenker, who, though utterly opposed to anarchy, has written a judicial and scholarly book on "Anarchism" (published by the Putnams), wherein he says that—

the right of freedom of opinion must not be confined merely to the forms of the state: one should be equally free to deny the state itself. Without this extension of principle, freedom of thought is mockery.

For ourselves we disagree with those who deny the state. We believe that their philosophy is unsound. While recognizing its force and accepting its principles in so far as they relate to matters of individual concern, we believe that there are matters of common concern which necessitate government. But if they are to be converted from their views, we hold that it must be done by argument and not by penal laws, by free discussion and not by censorship. We repeat and adopt the patriotic words of Father Thomas E. Cox, of Chicago, uttered at the McKinley memorial meeting in this city last Sunday, when he said: "America symbolizes liberty—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and a free press. If a republic cannot foster these and flourish, it cannot exist at all."

The funeral of the late President McKinley being over, attention turns to Leon F. Czolgosz, his assassin. As noted last week, the grand jury of Erie county, New York (the Buffalo county), found against Czolgosz on the 16th an indictment of murder in the first degree, for having assassinated President McKinley. Being immediately arraigned, Czolgosz refused to plead personally, and one of the counsel assigned to him by the court entered a plea of "not guilty." The trial was then set for the 23d, and on that day it began. Before the jury had been impaneled, the district attorney read the indictment to Czolgosz, in open court, and asked whether he was guilty or not guilty. In a low voice the prisoner replied: "Guilty." But in New York judgment cannot be pronounced in capital cases upon a plea of guilty; so the jury was impaneled and the trial proceeded as if the plea had been "not guilty," except that the lawyers for Czolgosz made no effort to secure an acquittal or reduction of the grade of crime. They concerned themselves simply with seeing that the forms of law were properly observed and that the jury was advised to act with discretion and not with passion. The trial occupied two days, the jury bringing in its verdict late in the afternoon of the 24th. The verdict was, "Guilty of murder in the first degree as charged in the indictment." Sentence will be pronounced on the 26th.

While Czolgosz was upon trial in Buffalo, Miss Emma Goldman and Mr. Isaak and his associates as publishers of Free Society, who had been charged in Chicago with complicity in the assassin's crime, were formally and unconditionally released from custody. The arrest of these people was reported two weeks ago, at page 361, and the circumstances were further explained and discussed at pages 369 and 375. At the last report (p. 375), all but Miss Goldman were before the court on habeas corpus proceedings, the hearing in which had been adjourned to the 23d. Appearing before the court at that time, the prosecuting officer consented to the discharge of the prisoners. He explained that they had been held in custody since their arrest upon no evidence whatever, but simply upon the telegraphic request of the police

authorities of Buffalo. On the following day, the 24th, Miss Goldman also was released, the committing magistrate having decided to allow the action in the other case to govern in hers. No attempts to molest any of the prisoners were made after their release, though written threats to murder them, coming from anonymous sources, had been made. A police guard which the authorities offered them from the jail to their home they refused.

A brief interruption of the Schley-Sampson inquiry (p. 375) occurred on the 24th. It was occasioned by the sudden death of ex-Judge Wilson, one of Admiral Schley's counsel. Proceedings were resumed, however, on the 25th.

Part of the aftermath of the steel strike, settled on the 14th (p. 376), is a statement of all the circumstances by President Shaffer. Mr. Shaffer attributes the failure of the strike to malicious misrepresentations by the newspapers, to treachery on the part of members of the Amalgamated association, and to the questionable loyalty of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Shaffer describes in this statement the terms of settlement, but they are too technical to be understood without a longer explanation than the circumstances call for in these columns.

In Chicago a movement has begun for the release, through American influences, of the reconcentrado prisoners held by the British in South Africa. This movement was started before the assassination of President McKinley, and has been delayed out of respect to his memory. On the 23d, however, a public meeting was held, which decided to call a large meeting at the Auditorium at an early day for the consideration of and action upon a series of resolutions which this initial meeting adopted. The resolutions quote from the London Standard the following news item:

At the end of July the total number of people in different camps in the Transvaal was 62,479, of whom some 10,000 were men, over 23,000 women and over 28,000 children of from one to twelve years of age. The total number of deaths in July was 1,067, of which 860 were children. In the Middleburg camp alone there were 342 deaths, mostly from measles. At Potchefstroom, where there is also

a very large camp, there were over 133 deaths, including 109 children.

Upon the basis of those facts the resolutions denounce the British for the "out-Weylering of Weyler's regime of Spanish barbarity in Cuba," which, to quote President McKinley, was—

not civilized warfare; it was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave.

The resolutions consequently call upon the president—

to advise the British government that American public sentiment calls strenuously for the release of these non-combatant prisoners, to the end that they may find refuge in friendly lands where their needs may be relieved, their comfort provided for, and their lives preserved.

The Boers themselves are strengthening the impression that the war in South Africa, a victorious termination of which was celebrated in London a year ago, has revived, with prospects of a different ending. Some indications of this we gave last week at page 376. Further indications are now reported. Though Lord Kitchener tells of two or three British victories, the burden of the news is the other way. For one thing, a Boer commander met a party of Lovatt's scouts, and though prevented by them from crossing the Orange river, he caused them heavy loss, including the death of their lieutenant colonel. The British prisoners captured near Scheepers Nek, which we reported last week, have been released, in accordance with the Boer custom. But the most discouraging news for the British relates to the uprising in Cape Colony, of which there have been indications, in spite of the censorship, for the past two or three months. A Cape Town correspondent of a London paper, the Daily Express, whose letter appeared on the 23d, declares that "the Dutch element in the colony is in revolt, and it is useless to disguise the fact." From Orange river to the sea, he explains, Cape Colony is in a condition of open or incipient rebellion. This is confirmed by advices from Boer circles in Holland to the effect that everything is in readiness for a Dutch uprising in both Cape Colony and Natal. Further confirmation may be found in the fact that the British government, which prorogued the Cape Colony parliament until August 27, so as to make the government free to

resort to martial law, has extended the prorogation to November 20; and also from the fact that the British cruiser Barracouta is on its way to Mossel bay, only about 225 miles east of Cape Town, with reinforcements for the trenches that defend the bay. Lord Kitchener has carried out the threat in his proclamation declaring the war at an end on the 15th, to the extent of permanently banishing from South Africa ten Boer leaders captured since that date.

Meanwhile friends of the Boers in Europe are working to secure peace on the basis of arbitration. The Dutch minister of foreign affairs has forwarded to the members of the administration council of the court of arbitration at The Hague and also to the legations, a copy of the Boer appeal for arbitration, with a notification that he intends to bring the appeal up for consideration at the first meeting of the council. A news dispatch of the 23d from The Hague intimates that the council will declare itself incompetent to deal with the subject; but action by the council has not yet been taken, no day for its meeting having been fixed.

The Filipino cause is less promising than that of the Boers, though pacification is certainly not yet established. Our last reference to this struggle was at page 344. The unsettled conditions at that time are apparently not improved. A mail dispatch to the Chicago Tribune, dated August 12 and just published, says that—

it is freely predicted that a renewal of guerrilla hostilities is to be expected. Malvar still has enough men to be troublesome. . . . There seems to be little doubt that the Hong-Kong junta is in communication with him and is still holding forth the hope of intervention.

Telegraphic dispatches of the 25th report that all the Filipino forces in the province of South Camarines have surrendered and that the province, therefore, is now pacified. An official report of casualties received at the war department on the 25th summarizes as follows:

Killed: Engagement of August 7—2.
Wounded: Engagements of June 10, 17 and 20 and July 27—8.
Died of disease, drowning and suicide: 30.

NEWS NOTES.

—A federal judge has decided that the anti-trust law of Nebraska is unconstitutional.

—Owing to floods in the Yang Tse valley, China, 10,000,000 persons are reported homeless.

—Simon Sterne, a prominent lawyer and distinguished publicist of New York, died on the 22d at the age of 62.

—The statue of Alfred the Great was unveiled at Manchester on the 20th, Lord Roseberry delivering the oration.

—The czar of Russia, whose arrival in France on the 18th we noted last week, departed on the 21st, after reviewing the French army. He did not go to Paris.

—A committee of the Marquette club, of Chicago, of which Congressman H. S. Boutell is chairman, has been organized to agitate for congressional legislation against "anarchist" doctrines.

—A socialist congress is in session at Lubeck, Germany. Two official stenographers have been assigned by the Prussian government to report the proceedings, for the purpose of making proof of forbidden utterances.

MISCELLANY

THE MENDICANT.

I.

Sakya-Muni, Gautama Buddha, what dost thou proffer of hope or of mirth?

"What shall I do to be saved" from the sorrow, passion and terror, and madness of earth?

What is thy gospel, O prophet of India? What hast thou left to me, child of the sun?

What is the balm for my pain thou hast promised me? What is the crown when the race hath been run?

II.

"What shall I do to be saved?" Thou hast answered it: "Labor not forever, but beg for thy bread;

Live as a mendicant; marry not; mortify flesh; let a life of Nirvana be led.

So shalt thou find in the depth of thy passions, growth of thy spirit, composure and rest,

Passing through indolent days of humanity on to intangible joys of the blest."

III.

Sakya-Muni, Gautama Buddha, bending I heed thee, but find in thy law Something that baffles me, doubtful consistency.—lo, in the web of thy wisdom a flaw—

Look to it, Gautama, Sakya-Muni, sweet is the bulb, but hollow her egg.

How shall thy gospel suffice for the many? If all men are beggars, from whom shall men beg?

—George Francis Savage Armstrong.

A GOOD CITIZEN.

When attention is called to the manly and able fight being made by the present mayor of Cleveland

against the robbery of the citizens by favored corporations, wonder is expressed that a man of such wealth and business capacity can be willing to give so much of his time to the work of defending the public rights of his fellow citizens. The very expression of the wonderment thus excited is proof of the fact that we have degenerated as a nation and that we need a revival of true citizenship and a better comprehension of its duties. The very fact that men wonder at the labor of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, for a salary which is no importance to him is of itself alarming proof of the degeneracy of the times. It is indication that we have come to look upon official position as means to personal ends. The simple truth is that Tom L. Johnson stands for a happily growing class in the state. He has convictions as to the real functions of government. He has the courage of those convictions and believes that he can attain the best ideal of American citizenship by so conducting a municipal office as to illustrate them to the world. How far such an ideal is above mere fads for the impossible purification of politics by enlisting men of wealth in the degrading and demoralizing work of alienating public rights and further increasing the power of plutocracy is becoming better understood by men of intelligence.—Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat.

THE DEATH RATE IN THE RECONCENTRATED CAMPS OF SOUTH AFRICA.

At the end of July the total number of people in different camps in the Transvaal was 62,479; of whom some 10,000 were men, over 23,000 women, and over 28,000 children of from one to twelve years of age. The total number of deaths in July was 1,067, of which 860 were children. In the Middelburg camp alone there were 342 deaths, mostly from measles. At Potchefstroom, where there is also a very large camp, there were over 133 deaths, including 109 children.—The Standard, of London, Eng.

The annual death rate among the children in the Transvaal camps is about 370 per 1,000. In less than three years, if the war goes on and the camps remain as deadly to their inmates, everyone of these babies, our prisoners, will be dead. The death rate for men, women and children in these Transvaal camps was at the annual rate of about 210 per 1,000. That is to say, if the present arrangements

were maintained for five years, every Boer inmate of the camps, man, woman and child, would be dead. There is no parallel in history, as far as we know, to this process of extermination, steadily continued month after month, in which the enemy's casualties in the field seem likely to be completely eclipsed by the holocaust of women and infants.—The Manchester Guardian.

AN AMERICAN REMEDY FOR ANARCHY.

Remarks made by Judge Amidon, in the United States court in Minneapolis, prior to granting a motion of adjournment on account of the death of President McKinley, as reported by the press.

The first impulse upon hearing of the terrible crime has been one, apparently, of vengeance; and that spirit seems still to prevail in many minds and many circles. One thing, however, is very certain; and that is that we shall not find a remedy for anarchy in lawlessness. It would be difficult to estimate how much the evil spirit of lynch law found lodgment in the brain of the man who slew the president. It is one of the features of our recent history that makes every patriotic American considerate if not humiliated, that over wide districts of this country there has been a suspension of the ordinary course of justice, and in place of it lynch law has been substituted. Now, lynch law is the very essence of anarchy, and the expressions that we hear in the north now, in the large cities, and that we read in this morning's papers, of laying aside all the ordinary forces of justice and resorting to lynch violence do not speak creditably for the sobriety and reserve judgment of those who share in these sentiments.

If history teaches anything, it teaches that the opinions and beliefs of men, however erroneous or wicked they may appear to be, cannot be cured by the sheriff or jailer, or by criminal punishment. We have the record of 1800 years of persecutions for belief to teach us that belief cannot be changed by violence or by blood. The safety of the country in regard to such matters was voiced by one of the great commoners of England, John Milton, when he said in defense of freedom of speech:

Let truth and error grapple. Who ever knew truth to be worsted in an open fight?

And when we come to deal with the evil that has led to this sad termination, as I said at the outset, our remedy will have to be an American remedy, a remedy consistent with those founda-

mental principles of civil liberty, of freedom of thought and freedom of speech, upon which this government is founded.

We shall not find our remedy in the despotic countries which have given rise to this very class of people who have come here now to trouble us. If drastic measures, if the eternal presence of the police, the dungeon and banishment were a remedy for anarchy, there would be no anarchists in the old world; but we all know that notwithstanding the exceedingly drastic remedies that have obtained there, the class has grown under it.

When we speak of freedom of speech and freedom of thought we, of course, do not mean to justify that speech which incites directly to the commission of crime. That is criminal itself, and ought to be punished. But that is a very different thing from freedom of speech, for example, which consists in criticism of the government. That is a very different thing, I say, which incites directly to the murder and assassination of public officers, from the criticism of governmental measures.

If our laws are insufficient now to deal with such matters, as they seem to be, they will have to be amended or new laws adopted. But those laws, when they are framed, will be laws consistent with the principles of civil liberty upon which our country is founded. We shall find our remedy for anarchy to be an American remedy, and not a foreign remedy. We certainly shall not find it in any method of violence.

IMPRESSIONS OF AN ENGLISH SPECTATOR AT THE FUNERAL OF PRESIDENT M'KINLEY.

From a Private Letter.

My conclusions, after my day in Canton, are that the people I saw had not been rightly trained in either a noble cultivation of emotion, nor—what is of perhaps less importance, but still, to me, a matter of very great interest—in the artistic expression of the same. For, to refer to the latter first, I do not hold that the democratic necessarily means the plain, the inartistic, the commonplace. To my mind ceremonial and pageant are by no means the monopoly of aristocracy and superstition. Splendor and magnificence, especially in public matters, are perfectly consistent with democracy, so they express democratic principles, and are the outpouring of a catholic spirit. You can see trades processions in Manchester which breathe independence, not to say defiance, from start to finish, which are also most interesting and enjoyable spectacles.

Yesterday's function seemed to me crude in plan and conception from beginning to end. Some of this was perhaps involuntary disappointment and longing for those things which in England would not have failed in creating an atmosphere. The muffled peal—faint, musical, exquisite—like a welcome in the very bells of heaven, and yet by their weird softness suggesting the spiritual and unseen. Sad music—the trained music of great composers—Beethoven, Chopin, Handel—this was absent, and one almost resented the omission. Bands there were, but second rate, and the music they made unimpressive. Matters were very much delayed, which is always an artistic mistake, speaking generally; perhaps, however, this was unavoidable.

I was not at the church, so I cannot speak of the effect which would have been produced on us there. The papers this morning, however, inform us that after the organ prelude a ladies' quartette sang: "The Beautiful Isle of Somewhere." They only give the title, but I do know that that is downright pagan, and all that is unworthy and inappropriate.

I did not go to the cemetery, but of the procession I will say that to me it was unimpressive, cold and only redeemed from vulgarity by the evident effort made by these composing it to do the right thing. It was neither a military, nor a religious, nor a civic affair, being largely composed of masonic organizations, whose quasi military character is to me very tiresome. They don't do what they attempt to do well, so instead of order and solidarity, which are inspiring, we have irregularity and "slipshoddiness."

The procession itself was ill-arranged in my estimation—ill-proportioned. The equipages were ill-ordered, and the horses ill-mounted and ill-groomed. Democratic simplicity might not merely allow, but will appreciate the country vehicle driven many miles to pay tribute of affection, but the attempt was at an organized function.

Now, as to the people. It seemed to me there was a general indifference. I did not notice any case of personal emotion during the day at any time. On the line of procession the crowd was good-natured, not gay, perhaps, but at any rate thoughtless. During the funeral procession one marked that the people were quite passive. While the bier was passing, to get a better view I got upon a low wall,

and was ordered off. "But you can come inside for 25 cents." The dead president was to that man worse than nothing.

The bright spot in the procession was Tom Johnson in the midst of his politicians, dignified, grave, thinking, doubtless, most seriously.

I came to the conclusion that the people could not—happily enough—exhibit what they did not feel—that the occasion was not one to teach an obvious lesson, but yet I should like to have been six hours earlier one of the 6,000 in St. Paul's in London.

THE GOSPEL THAT WILL SAVE FROM TERRORISM.

A portion of a sermon with the above title delivered at the First Universalist church, of Buffalo, Sunday morning, September 16, by Rev. L. M. Powers.

There is one thought in all our hearts at this time. All this week we have been asking: Why? Why should a man of the highest personal character, an admirable type of American manhood, a man who went through two fiercely fought campaigns with no blot on his escutcheon, be laid low by the hand of an assassin? For however little one may have agreed with the president in his foreign policy, of his personal worth no one ever had any doubt. A loyal friend, a most exemplary and devoted husband, a good citizen in whom his neighbors took pride, a president with fewer personal enemies probably than any other who has occupied that difficult position, and, as the last few days have shown, a man of magnanimous spirit. Why, we ask, should anyone seek the life of such a man?

And when we pause to think, we see that it was not the life of this friend, or citizen, or husband, or large-hearted man, that was sought. That shot was fired at the president, and solely because he was the president. The fact that he was the president of a particular party had nothing to do with it. He was killed because he was the president of the United States. That shot was aimed at church and state.

Let us think together. Ever since the Christian church was established, from all its pulpits men have been preaching: "God is love," "All men are brothers," "Love your enemies," "Overcome evil with good," and yet every now and then we are startled to find how near the surface hate lies in all hearts. Once in awhile one appears with hate so deadly that in order to give that hate its deepest expression he is ready to throw away his life. Then comes the answering rage. Min-

isters who read for a Scripture lesson: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," manifest hate, and counsel murder. Reason is displaced by a blind desire to do something we know not what. Society feels a sense of impotency, a feeling which always expresses itself in unintelligent anger. As in a flash we see how ineffectual is all that we have relied upon for safety. A few desperate individuals insane in their rebellion against society, and we know not what widespread evil might result. Such is the apprehension which the wild and awful deed of one man has spread over the whole land.

How can this evil be cured? How can this danger be avoided? For the question is not how to deal with one murderous individual. All feel that. There is nothing to fear when one man hurls himself against 70,000,000. A mean and worthless individual may indeed exchange his life for one most precious and valuable, but that is all he can do. Against society he is powerless. But somehow we now feel that we are confronting an evil that does not reside in an individual, but in a class—a small class to be sure, as yet, but still a class.

In our country now, as in all other lands, are men who have a deadly hatred of government. This is startling, but if this is not so, then all our fears are foolish. This is startling, because for the first 75 years of our history the dissatisfied of all other lands found a refuge here, loved our government with a passionate love, and terrorism found not a friend among all those who lived beneath the flag. This was the land of opportunity, the land of social equality, the land where all might hope to rise. An early president used to ride unattended on horseback where he chose, safer in the protection of the people's love than he would have been if a standing army had kept them from him.

How can we account for the change? It will not do to place it to the account of foreigners. From the first there has been a ceaseless stream of immigrants to this country, who have become and are to-day its loyal and devoted citizens. No man of foreign birth has ever raised his hand against the head of the nation. We must bear the responsibility of having educated all the men by whom our presidents have been killed. It cannot be charged to sensationalism in the press. The newspapers are of incalculable value to society. If they promote terrorism at all it is by the law of opposition, and because they

are so uniformly on the side of vested interests.

Nor is it due to freedom of speech. No man capable of thought will make such a suggestion. In Australia and New Zealand, the two places in the world where freedom of speech is most nearly absolute, the terrorist is as yet unknown. In England, for years a refuge for all kinds of radical thought driven from other countries, no terrorist has ever, on English soil at least, attempted the life of the sovereign; while in Russia, where no one is permitted to speak aloud, there is perpetual commotion; the reds are found even among the nobility, and the czar's life is never for one moment safe.

If I lived in a different country I might be able to suggest it. If I lived in a country where many of those who minister in the name of religion were advocates of lynch law; if I lived in a country where some men make \$40,000,000 a year, while others, working harder, cannot make \$300; if I lived in a country where great corporations were uniformly lawless, burning men's property, yet by bribing the judges escaping punishment; if I lived in a country where in all the great cities rogues were protected and honest men afraid of the policemen; if I lived in a country where lazy idlers, spending money they had not earned, gave course dinners to their dogs, while the children of the men who earned the money were hungry and ragged; if I lived in a country where men could be arrested on suspicion merely of having bad thoughts, and held without bail, and hung for opinion's sake—even then I would not consider it any justification for a Man's going insane. But if I lived in a country like that I SHOULD think it an explanation.

And if I lived in a country like that I should not attribute the danger of such insanity to foreigners incapable of appreciating the blessings of the country; or to free speech—the best thing the world has gained in 500 years; or to sensationalism of the press, which, after all, can never be more sensational than the facts.

If I lived in a country like that I should not hope to cure such insanity by any punishment severer than death's penalty, for there is none. You cannot punish a dead man, or one who does not care for his life. I should not expect to cure it by annoying and persecuting men who cared very little for their lives. I should be afraid it might cause them to care nothing at all. I should try to make life so good for all that all would want to live.

And now I come to the gospel that will save from Terrorism. It is a very old gospel, but it has been of great service to the world. It is the eternal gospel of the Fatherhood of God. Spoken, but never lived; dimly seen, but never attained—that gospel of a God whose impartial Fatherhood is over all men, is the gospel to save from hate and disorder and fear. It is because our individual lives, our religion, our social institutions are all a denial of divine Fatherhood, that hate finds its home in human hearts. Such hatred cannot be cured by hating back again. "Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time," says Buddha; "hatred ceases only by love—this is an old rule."

That hatred, fierce, despairing hatred, is found in human hearts no individual is alone responsible. Yet in each one of us is found the cause, and to ourselves we must look for the remedy. That shot the other day, which we in Buffalo can never forget, was not fired at William McKinley. If this man had ever met or known him he could never have done that deed. That shot was aimed at your heart and mine. If you do not see that, then you are incapable of seeing anything. And unless you pause to think why you and I are hated, then the lesson of this awful deed, which God in his inscrutable wisdom permitted, will not be learned. I do not for a moment expect that any man will cease to hate me so long as I take advantage of his ignorance and helplessness, deny him the opportunities I enjoy, or live at his expense. If that is the reason why a man hates me I can cure him of that hatred in two ways only. I must either show him I am not doing those things he imagines I am doing, or, doing them, I must do no more. If we are children of the same infinite love, then I must acknowledge that his claim is just as good as my own to the opportunities that infinite love has provided. If I dispossess him, if I make all the laws myself and for myself; if I get the judge's ear in advance; if he is voiceless, powerless, hopeless, while I with no better claim have all, then I cannot expect that man to love me. The God in him will become a devil, and his hatred I cannot escape.

Do you for a moment suppose that if in all the churches of this land, where, every Sunday millions of people repeat: "We believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth," a real belief in God were found, there could exist any class of people with hatred in their hearts? Jehovah complained of the children of Israel: "They have forsaken me, the fountain

of waters; and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." It is so with us to-day. When things go wrong it is natural to look for something or some one to blame outside of ourselves. So we denounce some political party, or the papers, or free speech. But in a country of which we are a part, and which we help to make, upon ourselves at last all responsibility rests. No matter how much we profess God with our lips, if we deny him with our lives, if we educate men to think, and deny them the opportunity to live if we permit a few to own this great big earth God meant for all, if we tyrannize one over the other, if we encourage a system of society which permits courtesans the luxury of milk and champagne baths while honest girls go hungry, then shall we reap as we have sown, for God is not mocked and—

The God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet.
And the responsibility rests not upon the man gone mad, for every assassin is a suicide, and suicide is insanity; nor yet upon the head of the nation, who is but one of ourselves exalted for a moment to lofty place. The responsibility rests upon you and me. William McKinley is a victim to society's ignorance and greed and sin. He died for your sins and mine. To learn to live together as God's dear children is the goal of all our effort. Says Frederick Harrison:

The problem is: How can the devil of separate interests, the power that drives man apart from man, be banished from the human heart. Hope lies in the progressive realization that despite all transient contrary seemings we have all really one life, that we are members one of another; that the true order of the universe is such that the interests of all men and all nations are identical, that in universal mutual service alone are to be found true progress and true prosperity for all.

Once in the Alps I climbed with several others a very high mountain. About each one of our bodies was a common rope so that no one of us could fall without the others falling with him. From the time we started we knew we were all to live together or die together. In the world to-day we are bound in the same way. The cord is not visible, but it is there. Moreover it is a cord we cannot sever. God has made it so that we cannot get very far away from one another in wisdom, goodness or safety. If the health officials are ignorant or careless it may result in typhoid fever in your home. The beggars we make by denying men opportunity we have also to support. The criminals we produce by

permitting children to grow up uncared for, make our property and lives unsafe, and necessitate the ever-increasing burden and menace of the police. The hatreds we foster in human hearts, strike back at us; the ugliness we permit makes our lives ugly; it's ignorance makes us incapable of clear thought; it's malice makes us brutal. No man can suffer or go to ruin alone. The man who scuttles the ship in which you and I are sailing, drowns himself to be sure, but he also drowns all who are in the ship.

If we permit a class of people to exist whose interests are all hostile to society, who have no homes to defend, no good of life to be preserved by law and order, when terrorism appears, why should we wonder? We have simply come to our own.

Rich by my brother's poverty!

Such wealth were hideous.

I am blessed only in what they share with me,

In what I share with all the rest.

It may take us long to learn that wisdom, but learn it we must. A colonial governor of the Bahamas who was about to return to England, offered to procure for the people of the colony any favor from the home government that they desired. Now what do you suppose those people said? "Get us permission," they said, "to tear down the light houses. They are ruining the prosperity of the colony." The people were wreckers. To-day I have no doubt those same people are in the life-saving service, helping to preserve the lives for whose destruction they were once so anxious. To make life-savers out of the wreckers of society, is your business and mine, and the permanent work of the church.

And since time began, and till time shall be no more, the only way this can be done is by the patient wisdom and suffering love and enlarging justice which are ours when we have full faith in God's all-inclusive Fatherhood.

For out of this faith in God there comes a fuller faith in men. Yes, in the face of this most awful deed I dare affirm that the world's need is more trust in men. The natural hearts of men abhor violence, and seek to gain their ends by self-sacrifice—know that those ends can be gained in no other way.

I am not willing to believe that any one class of people is more dangerous than another. The man who believes in murder is unsafe to be at large. Judged by all the tests we

know the man is a lunatic. If such men can be detected before they have done harm they should be put where they can do no harm. But to talk of special legislation for such people is folly. There is a class more dangerous to society than they are. It is the class that produces them. For even lunatics do not come by chance. They are produced by causes and conditions. If there is one class more dangerous than another it is the men who corrupt legislatures, who defy the laws they do not like, who oppose every movement that looks to larger justice and equality, and whose silent, powerful influence often makes both lawyer and minister their paid agents in the defense of wrong.

But flinging epithets is poor business. Rich and poor alike, we have been lawless. And because human laws are so easily evaded we imagine there are no divine laws. We have lost faith in God. We believe in fate; we think there must be a first cause. We believe in God and a divine law some of the time, while only faith in a personal God can inspire to patient, obedient, serviceable lives. The terrorist is always an atheist. We ought indeed to believe in law—eternal, unchangeable, unescapable law. The people of the world spend half their time trying to cheat the inevitable. We need to see with Lowell that "We've got to get up early to get ahead of God," and that up to date that early riser has not been found. Cheat ourselves, cheat one another, break the laws we have made, we all may and do; but from the divine law there is no escape. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man are not two beliefs, but one; and it is because we do not believe the one that we do not believe or live the other.

The world needs the faith of this church: One God above, One life below, Universal Love, Universal Life, Universal Progress, and the one divine spirit in all hearts.

If we could see as God sees we should know that President McKinley, saying in his suffering: "Do not let them hurt him," and the man who fired that abhorrent shot under the insane delusion that he was doing humanity a service, are not separated by such an awful gulf as at first appears. One was wise, the other foolish; one sane, the other insane; but in each some life from God.

Both are victims. In myself I find

the criminal. I look at my hands and know that they are not free from stain of blood. In these tragedies of our social life we all have a part. When we look within and see what has kept us and caused us to differ, the wisest and fairest and best among us could go and sit down by the side of the one who seems most depraved, and say: "Brother, do not despair, for I am beginning to hope."

When we come to realize what Universal Fatherhood means, when we come really to believe that every man is a brother—believe it and live it—then will hatred cease, and love will cover the earth as the waters cover the seas.

The crest and crowning of all good,
Life's final star, is Brotherhood;
For it will bring again to earth
Her long-lost Poesy and Mirth;
Will send new light on every face,
A kingly power upon the race.
And till it come, we men are slaves,
And travel downward to the dust of graves.

And now if you have followed me with your intelligence, I need say no more. I have shown you why hate is found in human hearts. I know of no way to cure that hate except by justice and love. Almost every other counsel will be given in the press and pulpit. Believing in God and the religion of his Son, I can give no other.

And yet I cannot close without expressing the feeling, so strong that it makes us impatient of the lesson we ought to learn—the feeling of horror at such a deed, regret at the reactionary measures they always provoke, the indignation and even hatred we cannot down. Our abhorrence of the deed and the spirit that prompted it, our sorrow that it should happen in this city we love, and our deep, heartfelt sympathy—all these are facts which all feel. They need no emphasis. I have tried to make clear what is not so obvious. President McKinley has suffered as our representative; let us be grateful for his services, cherish the memory of his virtues, and in our own lives do works meet for repentance.

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.

"Have you sent your regrets, Dorothy?" asked mamma of her little daughter, who had decided not to go to a party to which she had been asked.

"I haven't any to send, mamma," answered Dorothy. "I don't want to go."—Indianapolis News.

Alarmist—I see that the Terians have again decided that there is a hell, and that it is hotter than many had heretofore believed it to be.

Idol Smasher—Well, this organization is old enough to know the needs of its people.

C. E. L.

Capt. Hildt—You see, chaplain, the civilized races have every advantage.

Chaplain Helldt—Yes.

Capt. Hildt—I believe the civilized man will yet subdue and exterminate the savage.

Chaplain Helldt—That depends on how savage the civilized man is.

N. P. B.

"A financier is a man who makes lots of money, isn't it, father?"

"No, Freddy; a financier is a man who gets hold of lots of money other people have made."—Our Dumb Animals.

City Cousin—Do you see that tall gentleman, passing on the opposite side of the street?

Country Cousin—That old fellow with shiny clothes and slouch hat?

City Cousin—Yes.

Country Cousin—The husband of a new woman, I suppose.

City Cousin—Oh, my, no. That is Prof. Knowit, phrenologist. He can tell you what vocation to follow to be successful in life, by just putting his hand on your head. Strange, isn't it?

Country Cousin—I should say so. I wonder why he never put his hand on his own head?

C. E. L.

BOOK NOTICES.

Webster Davis's book, "John Bull's Crime, or Assaults on Republics" (New York, London and Montreal: The Abbey Press, 114 Fifth avenue, N. Y. Price, \$2:50) should be widely circulated and attentively read. Being a narrative of personal experiences, simply told and plentifully illustrated with photographic pictures of places and scenes, it has all the readability of a story of travel and adventure; yet it is a trustworthy presentation of the

case of the Boers in their defensive war against British invasion. Mr. Davis had been Assistant Secretary of the Interior at Washington, and went to Cape Town to visit his friend, the American consul general there, taking advantage of his right to a long vacation to do so. When he left this country his sympathies, so far as he had any, were with the British. All he knew about the merits of the war was what he had learned from British sources, and he supposed that the "Boers were uncouth savages and that the war was waged against them for the purpose of civilizing them." But after spending some time in Cape Town, where he saw a party of Boer prisoners, his sympathies were drawn toward the Boers sufficiently to induce him to make a journey into the Transvaal. This visit completely changed Mr. Davis's sympathies; and his book is a defense of the Boers. One great mistake, however, he attributes to them. He believes that if they had acted upon the aggressive from the beginning, instead of merely resisting invasion, "the British government would have had to content itself with simply retaining a coaling station at Cape Town," and that a great republic would have been erected by the Boers of all South Africa "embracing the territory from the Zambesi river to the Cape of Good Hope. In this Mr. Davis is doubtless right. By standing upon the defensive too long, the Boers enabled the British to equip themselves for conquest.

MAGAZINES.

—The Arena for October leads with the full text of, Wayne MacVeagh's remarkable and famous Harvard address on ideals in politics. A symposium on the single tax as the remedy for trusts contains three papers by Louis F. Post, Jackson H. Ralston and Bolton Hall respectively. Charles Brodie Patterson makes a needed exposure of the spirit of modern Christianity, in which the preachers with "some brains but no religion," a well-known class, are neatly castigated. B. O. Flower pays a tribute to Sam Walter Foss as a poet, which lovers of that poet's verse will heartily enjoy.

—The bi-weekly Facts About the Philippines (Boston: Philippine Information Society, 12 Otis place. Price, \$2 a year; ten cents a copy), for September 15, deals with "Progress in Pacification from September, 1900, to July, 1901." It is a compilation of official reports, captured documents, telegrams, etc. The reign-of-terror policy adopted by the Americans in the Philippines appears here in the instructions of the provost marshal general in Manila, which expressed a desire "to create a reign of fear and anxiety among the disaffected," without "altogether ignoring the dictates of justice and without transgressing the well-known laws of self-restraint imposed by civilization in connection with operations of war."

—Municipal Affairs, that most excellent quarterly (New York: Reform Club, 52 William St.) is especially strong in its June number, which has just appeared. Four articles are peculiarly timely and enlightening. One is by Hiram B. Loomis, on franchise taxation in Illinois; another is a description, by W. A. Somers himself, of the Somers method of valuing city real estate for taxation, which Mayor Johnson has adopted in Cleveland; the third is an exposure by Judge W. J. Gaynor, of the subway ring of New York, and the fourth is a complete exposition, by M. R. Maltbie, of the street car systems of Chicago. According to the latter article about \$72,600,000 out of \$118,000,000 of the liabilities of these concerns is "water."

The Public

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC reproduces in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms.

Single copies, delivered at office,	\$0.02
Quantities delivered at office, per 100,	1.00
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid,	.03
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100,	2.00
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100,	1.25

The following pamphlets have been issued:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. **Nero-Then**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. **The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust**, by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. **Monopoly and Competition** (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. **Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case** (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900).
8. **Assassination and Anarchism** (from THE PUBLIC of September 14, 1901).

ATTORNEYS,

Chicago.

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

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

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

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

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

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.

INSTRUCTIVE BOOKS AND HELPFUL READING FOR PROGRESSIVE STUDENTS and THINKERS. BY EX-GOV. JOHN P. ALTGELD.

LIVE QUESTIONS 1,000 pages; Cloth, \$2.50; half Morocco, \$3.50. This volume contains all of Mr. Altgeld's important Speeches, Essays and State papers, including his reasons for pardoning the Anarchists, since his advent into public life in Illinois.

ORATORY Its requirements and its rewards. Written in his most forceful style. coming such should read this most helpful book. Suite 12, 70 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Cloth, 50c. This is Mr. Altgeld's latest work and is Every public speaker and every one desirous of being Address all orders to **GEO. A. SCHILLING,**