

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1902.

Number 221.

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 page.

"The stuffed prophet" is what the New York Sun used to call Grover Cleveland. This wasn't very nice, but then the Sun never was over nice. And it was long ago cordially forgiven by Mr. Cleveland's friends for that epithet, because it invented epithets so much nastier for Mr. Bryan. We repeat the Sun's irreverent characterization of Mr. Cleveland as a "stuffed prophet" because it is so forcibly suggested by that gentleman's speech of the 19th at the Tilden club banquet in New York.

The Tilden club has been established to "harmonize" and "reorganize" the Democratic party along plutocratic lines. Quite appropriately, therefore, it takes the name of a millionaire bourbon Democrat of a former generation, who made his millions by railroad "wrecking," and to whom the Democratic party is indebted for nothing of which it has any special reason to be proud. He introduced the "gum shoe" campaign, with its "whispers," its "literary bureaus," and its "barrels," and, having been exposed in his efforts to bribe returning-boards, was outwitted in a sly scheme to secure the presidency by a combination of 8 to 7, which his equally callous but more astute adversaries deftly turned into a combination of 7 to 8. An excellent patron saint of the plutocratic "reorganizers" is Samuel J. Tilden.

No less sensitive to the proprieties with reference to "harmony" than to "reorganization" was the Tilden club on the occasion of this banquet at which Mr. Cleveland spoke. The kind of "harmony" to which the "re-

organizers" aspire is what existed between the lion and the lamb when they lay down in peace together, the lamb inside. These gentlemen have regarded the party as disorganized because they have lost control of it. They therefore wish to reorganize by regaining control. That is what "reorganization" means and it is all it means. So, in spreading a national "harmony" banquet, to which Democratic leaders from all sections were invited, the Tilden club "reorganizers" chose two Eastern men for the speakers—one because he is an ex-President and the other because he is a local candidate for President—and pasted a courtplaster over the mouth of every other guest, however distinguished. Their anxiety for "harmony" was manifestly intense. They went even so far as to invite Mr. Bryan to be their guest. But in their fidelity to the proprieties of the "harmonious" occasion they carefully refrained from inviting him to be a speaker. Their delicacy was truly sublime—though not usually called delicacy.

Here was a banquet nominally designed to harmonize the discordant elements of the party. An ex-President whom the party had three times nominated for President and twice elected, yet who bolted the nomination and publicly scorned the person of his successor as leader of the party, was invited to speak. Another invited speaker was the presidential favorite of such "reorganizers" and "harmonizers" as William C. Whitney of the Standard Oil trust. He had greeted the party's presidential nomination of 1896 with the remark that he was "still a Democrat—very still," and had acted accordingly. Both speakers were not only selected from the disgruntled minority group of the party, and with reference to the

tastes of the plutocratic element, but from the same locality. But Mr. Bryan, the greatest member of the party outside of the "reorganizing" wing (which modestly claims a monopoly of the great), and the presidential candidate of the party who in 1896 and 1900 polled larger popular votes than any of his predecessors, Cleveland included, and withal an "able and eloquent Democratic orator," as Mr. Hill took occasion to describe him, was ostentatiously invited to attend and as ostentatiously given to understand that he would be expected to be seen and not heard. This is precisely the kind of "harmony" banquet to which the Democrats of the Democratic party are invited by the "reorganizers," not only at Tilden clubs, but in the organization itself and at the polls. They are expected to be seen and not heard.

But to get back to Mr. Cleveland's speech. It was a characteristic production—all democratic "stuffing" and no democratic meat, a speech in the last stages, pathologically speaking, of fatty degeneration of its democracy. While it reads like a Democratic speech, examination shows that the substance of democracy is not there, but only the patter. With the substitution of Republican for Democratic epithets, Republican for Democratic names, and the omission of the wails over defeat, this speech would answer just as well for a Republican meeting as for a Democratic banquet. There is only one paragraph about which there could possibly be any doubt of that, and we quote it in full:

Democracy has already in store the doctrines for which it fights its successful battles; and it will have them in store as long as the people are kept from their own, and just as long as their rights and interests are sacri-

ficed by favoritism in government care, by inequality in government burdens, by the encouragement of huge industrial aggregations that throttle individual enterprise, by the reckless waste of public money, and by the greatest of all injuries, as it underlies nearly all others, a system of tariff taxation whose robbing exactions are far beyond the needs of economical and legitimate government expenditure, which purchases support by appeals to sordidness and greed, and which continually corrupts the public conscience.

But wouldn't even that paragraph pass as a moderately good Republican speech if the first word were changed and the Democrats were the "ins" instead of the "outs"? Try it and see. The only part that might need toning down would be the three or four lines that mention tariff taxation; and that part wouldn't need it if the Gorman Democrats were in power and the speech were being delivered by a Babcock Republican.

About the wails over defeat, however, a word should be said regarding the facts. This word cannot be repeated too often. Mr. Cleveland implies, evidently with intention, that the Democratic defeats of 1896 and 1900 were due to the Chicago platform and the nomination of Bryan. His memory is short. Every political observer who recalls the dark days of 1894, 1895 and 1896, before the Chicago platform was formulated or Bryan thought of as a candidate, knows that the Democratic party was doomed to disaster by Cleveland's administration and leadership. Never mind the blame; we are speaking of the fact. Cleveland had been elected President in 1892 with a Democratic Congress at his back. In the lower House there were 219 Democrats, making a clear majority of 41. Two years later this Democratic majority was swept away. Only 93 Democrats were elected, and the Republicans controlled the new House by a clear majority of 74. Mr. Cleveland takes occasion to say that in Tilden's day "and afterwards Northern Democratic states were not rare curiosities." He implies that "Bryanism" has made them so. But in

fact they became so at the congressional elections of 1894, two years ahead of "Bryanism." In that year not one Northern State, not a solitary one, elected a majority of Democrats in its delegation to Congress; although the delegations of Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Wyoming and Wisconsin had Democratic majorities in 1892. From California there was only 1 Democrat in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Illinois, none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Indiana none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Iowa, none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from Kansas none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from Massachusetts 1 in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Michigan none in 1894, where there had been 5 in 1892; from Minnesota none in 1894, where there had been 2 in 1892; from Nebraska none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from New Jersey, none in 1894 where there had been 6 in 1892; from New York 5 in 1894, where there had been 20 in 1892; from Ohio 2 in 1894, where there had been 10 in 1892; from Pennsylvania 2 in 1894, where there had been 10 in 1892; from Rhode Island none in 1894, where there had been 2 in 1892; from West Virginia none in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Wisconsin none in 1894, where there had been 6 in 1892; and from Wyoming none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892. Even the Southern state of Tennessee had only 6 in a delegation of 10 in 1894, while Missouri had only 4 in a delegation of 15. The Senate, too, was changed from Democratic to Republican. In the Congress which followed the elections of 1894 there were only 39 Democratic Senators to 42 Republicans; whereas in the Congress following the elections of 1892 there had been 44 Democratic Senators to only 36 Republicans. Things Democratic grew steadily worse, until in the spring of 1896 the Democratic nomination for President went a-begging. Excepting the impossible Hill, none of the old "availables" nor the new "possibili-

ties" wanted it. Utter defeat for the Democratic party was regarded as inevitable by the leaders on both sides. Even if all this was not Mr. Cleveland's fault it was a result of his administration and the signal for his "banishment."

Such was the hopeless condition of the party when the Chicago platform and Bryan were unexpectedly put forward to save it from dropping out of the political arena or into a scarcely concealed alliance with the Republicans. At once its prospects revived, and in spite of Cleveland's going over to McKinley's support, it continued to regain strength. Under the circumstances success was impossible. But the heaviest load it had to carry through it all, was not "free silver," nor "Bryanism" of any kind, but the unpopularity of the Cleveland administration. Outside of financial circles that was the tune which the Republican orators sung, and that, together with Hanna's corruption fund, was the cause of Bryan's defeat. Bryan had not only to ward off Cleveland's blows upon his flank; he had also to carry Cleveland's heavy record upon his back. Yet see the result. The popular vote for Bryan in 1896 was larger than that for Cleveland in 1892 by 946,007. His proportion of the total vote was 46.7 per cent., whereas Cleveland's in 1892 was only 46.08—Bryan's being larger by two-thirds of 1 per cent. In harmony with this result was the change in the Democratic representation in Congress. From a total of only 93 elected in the last Cleveland year (1894) the Democratic representation was raised in the first Bryan year (1896) to 130, and the Republican majority reduced from 74 to 24; while in the second Bryan year (1900), the Democratic representation was raised to 153 and the Republican majority reduced to 20. And although it might still be said, in Mr. Cleveland's phrase, that Northern Democratic states were "rare curiosities," they had at any rate regained some of the representation which during his administra-

tion they absolutely lost. The number of Democrats in the California delegation was increased from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896, though both were lost in 1900; that of the Illinois delegation from none in 1894 to 5 in 1896, and 11 in 1900; that of the Indiana delegation from none in 1894 to 4 in 1896 and the gain held in 1900; that of Kansas from none in 1894 to 1 in 1900; that of Massachusetts from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896 and 3 in 1900; that of Michigan from none in 1894 to 1 in 1896, which, however, was lost in 1900; that of New York from 5 in 1894 to 6 in 1896 and 12 in 1900; that of Ohio from 2 in 1894 to 6 in 1896, but reduced to 4 in 1900; that of Nebraska from none in 1894 to 2 in 1900; and that of New Jersey from none in 1894 and 1896 to 2 in 1900; while the Democratic delegation from the Southern state of Tennessee rose from 6 in 1894 to 8 in 1896, remaining at 8 in 1900, and that from Missouri from 4 in 1894 to 12 in 1896 and 13 in 1900. Under these circumstances Mr. Cleveland crowds the line of delicacy very close when he implies that the Democratic defeats since Tilden's day are chargeable to Bryan's leadership.

The speech of David B. Hill on the occasion of this Tilden club "harmony" banquet, is not open to the criticism that it all ran to "fat." Hill did say things. And the things he said were Democratic in substance as well as verbiage. One of them is especially worth quoting, because it puts into compact form a sentiment which needs just now to get emphatic expression. Referring to the Republican trick of confusing the government with the party in power as if they were the same, and taking President Roosevelt's Decoration Day speech as his text, Mr. Hill mentioned that speech as—

the partisan address of President Roosevelt, delivered on Decoration day, in violation of the proprieties of the occasion, wherein he purposely or inadvertently confused the well recognized distinctions which exist between the administration and the government, between the army and the gov-

ernment and between all the other officials of the government and the government itself, and assumed to question the loyalty of those who have ventured to criticize the cruel acts of a few officers of the army, who, if semi-official reports are correct, have undoubtedly disgraced the uniform they wear. This confusion of the state itself with the ruler thereof, is not new in history. It was Louis XIV. who once made the same mistake when he assumed to be France and uttered the famous declaration: "I am the state"—a remark which might have lost him his head in later times of less despotism; and President Roosevelt, in another sense, seems to have already lost his head when he forgets that this country differs from both ancient and modern France in that it is not a crime to criticize the army, or the President, or any other servant or servants of the people; and he needs to be reminded that this is a government of law—a government under a written constitution, wherein the right of every citizen freely to express his sentiments upon administrative questions is expressly guaranteed—and that loyalty to the government does not consist in loyalty to individuals or to the policies of those who happen to hold official positions. Loyalty to this government consists in attachment to our free institutions—in faithful observance of constitutional provisions, in respect for its flag as the emblem of civil liberty, in support of the authorities of the United States against the attacks of our foreign or domestic foes; but it does not consist in ostentatious professions of "intense Americanism," nor in indifference to the preservation or spread of republican forms of government everywhere, nor in suppressing free speech, nor in conquering the free people of other and distant lands who desire to govern themselves. . . .

That is the best democracy that David B. Hill has ever uttered, and he should have credit for it.

On another matter also Mr. Hill was more than usually radical and definite. While condemning trusts he demanded "free trade in all articles controlled by trusts," and said:

Everybody of discernment and intelligence must recognize the folly of the maintenance of a system of tariff taxation which enables manufacturers enjoying a monopoly of governmental favoritism here to undersell foreign manufacturers in the latter's own country and at the same time compel the people of this country to pay a larger price for the manufactured articles which they purchase in their

home markets than American manufacturers themselves are willing to accept from foreign purchasers in foreign lands. . . . The whole system of governmental favoritism, whereby the constitutional power to tax for the purpose of providing revenue for the needs of the federal treasury is improperly used for the purpose of building up one man's business at the expense of another's, by discriminating in favor of one industry as against another, is a vicious system which has long afflicted the country and which has grown more and more intolerable with years and against which Democracy has ever protested. It is utterly indefensible upon any just and proper principle of government. There is no justification for the exercise of the power of legislation to make millionaires out of one class of people and paupers of another. . . . If the policy of protection is to continue in whole or in part to be tolerated by the country it might be well to consider whether it were not better that its evils should not be attempted to be mitigated by piecemeal or popgun legislation, but that our efforts should be reserved until the country has become so surfeited with its monstrous injustice that it is prepared to destroy the whole citadel of protection and to return to a constitutional and just system of taxation for the purposes of revenue only.

If David B. Hill were a man to be trusted, that utterance could be accepted as the strongest and most satisfactory in the direction of free trade which can yet be hoped for. But to know Hill's record is to distrust his professions. He has always been a "peanut politician," with no political principles that he could not throw off or put on as seemed to him from time to time expedient. From such a leader the Democratic party may most devoutly pray deliverance. It were better for the party to suffer defeat at the election in 1904 as in 1896 and in 1900, than to suffer it after the election, as in 1892.

In responding to the challenge of the "harmony" banqueters to whom Cleveland and Hill spoke at New York, Mr. Bryan makes an indictment which is criticized for dealing in personalities. That is a weak evasion. Indictments always deal in personalities. The question is not whether Mr. Bryan's indictment is personal but whether it is true. Let no one who hopes to see the Demo-

cratic party win at the next presidential election imagine that Bryan's words can be treated with indifference. They have a portentous meaning to every one who would place the Democratic party upon the low plane of merely "getting there." They do not mean that Bryan must be nominated. They do not mean that any personal favorite of his must be nominated. They do not mean necessarily even that free silver coinage must be demanded in the platform or that any other particular demand shall be made. They do not mean that past issues must be galvanized. They do not mean that a faction must rule or ruin. But they do mean that there shall be no retreat. They do mean that the money power will not be allowed to acquire the ownership of the Democratic party as it has already acquired that of the Republican party, and that if it should succeed in seizing the party machinery another Democratic party will spring into existence which will at least make the success of the election of the candidates of the kidnaped Democracy impossible. They mean, too, that the acknowledged or manifest leadership of either Hill or Cleveland in the party organization would be regarded as a signal of danger. Those who hope for Democratic victory in 1904, might as well know, now as well as later—it is not a threat; it is a simple fact—that victory cannot be achieved under either Hill or Cleveland. It is not merely Bryan who says this, but also an army of Democratic voters who speak through him. Victory may be impossible without the leadership of Hill and Cleveland. It is absolutely impossible with their leadership.

To divert attention from the main issue in the Philippine question, the imperialists are raising a virtuous cry about "the honor of the army". It is not merely proved, it is conceded, that a general ordered that Samar be made a howling wilderness even to the extent of killing women

and children; it is boasted by the officer who received the order that Samar has been turned into a howling wilderness; it is admitted that the water torture was applied in numerous cases, and the Manila papers make no concealment of its being a general practice adopted not for punishment or retaliation but to extort information from prisoners of war. Yet the apologists for cruelty and the promoters of imperialism, from Mr. Roosevelt down, complain that condemnation of these atrocities amounts to an attack upon "the honor of the army," and ask a suspension of opinion pending investigation. What is there to investigate? The facts are admitted, even boasted of. The question is not whether accusations against the army are true, but whether conceded doings of the army are infamous. It is not whether Gen. Smith ordered indiscriminate killing, for he says he did; but whether indiscriminate killing is civilized warfare. It is not whether Smith and Waller made a howling wilderness of Samar, for one admits he ordered it, and the other admits he did it; but whether that is civilized warfare. It is not whether Waller murdered prisoners of war off-hand, without charges or trial, for he says he did; but whether that is civilized warfare. It is not whether the army all over the islands have administered the water torture, nor whether it was administered only in exceptional cases and under excitement in revenge, for the testimony is uniform that it was administered commonly and in the presence and with the approval of officers, and that in most instances it was administered to prisoners of war to extort information regarding their uncaptured comrades. The question at this point, then, is not whether this torture was in fact used for this purpose, but whether it is civilized warfare to extort information from prisoners by means of torture. If it is, then the honor of the army is as secure in this respect as army honor can be; if it is not, then whoever tries to divert at-

ention from these admitted atrocities, puts his own honor in pawn.

Some, however, of the Philippine atrocities are open subjects for investigation. Among these may be included the reconcentrado camps. Regarding them, it is said in behalf of "the honor of the army" that they are quite unlike the Weylerian camps of Cuba; that, indeed, they are really paternal institutions, into which the natives are invited for their own good but not forced to come. We are unable, of course, to deny these pretty descriptions. All we can say is that the pretenses of affection for the Filipinos which have been spread upon the records of the Senate Philippines committee appear, under the circumstances, to be somewhat over-acted, and that they are challenged by eyewitnesses. Here, for illustration, is an extract from a private letter now before us, written from the Philippines by one who, while he abhors, excuses what he describes:

In [one of the provinces, name excised to prevent identification of the writer] all the people, willy nilly, had to come into towns. All found outside after a certain day were to be shot on sight. I do not know whether these orders were made public, but of their truth I have no doubt, for I heard them issued by one officer to several officers under his command. . . . The crops in [same province] were burned and every living thing was killed outside the concentration towns—that is, everything seen. Now at first sight these measures seem horrible; and, I suppose, will remain repugnant to the merciful and humane no matter how long they are held up to view. But still they ended in three months a war that would have dragged on for three years or perhaps longer. If the slaughter of human beings can be justified at all (I think not), the short, severe method is better than the temporizing one, which starves the innocent and brutalizes the youth.

Of the truth of that description of the American reconcentrado camps we have no doubt. It is confirmed by the atmosphere even of the contradictory testimony. Nor have we any doubt that it could be proved if the Philippine committee of the Senate were conducting its inquiry as openly and thoroughly as investigating com-

mittees are expected to do. There was no necessity for reconcentrado camps at all (and it is admitted that our army established them), except to drive the inhabitants into them and devastate the country so that the enemy would have no place to draw supplies from. Is it not probable, then, that the people were driven in on pain of death and their homes destroyed? At any rate the question is whether the American reconcentrado policy has been what our correspondent describes or not. If it has not been, why not open the doors to testimony? Why suppress the facts? If it has been, why prate about "the honor of the army?" Why not either excuse the barbarity bluntly, as our correspondent does, or frankly admit, what all authorities on civilized warfare teach, that it is atrocious?

Meantime let us not be diverted from the main issue, which is colonialism, imperialism, un-Americanism, and not specific questions of cruelty. Cruelty is a nominal concomitant of colonialism. If the latter is just and wise and beneficent, the former must be patiently endured. Though it is right to expose the incidental cruelties for the purpose of illustrating the wickedness of the colonial policy, it is after all not particular outrages but the general policy that is at issue. The Springfield, O., Democrat, although it rather unjustly criticizes the Democratic senators for too much discussion of individual outrages and failing to center their fire upon the colonial question—unjustly because much attention was given to colonialism in those speeches—is nevertheless right in its main contention when it crisply says of the Philippine civil government bill:

It will rest with the saner Democratic press and speakers during the campaign of the Summer and Fall to enlighten the people upon the iniquities of this colonial scheme. The measure will have become operative meanwhile, but that will be no reason why its unconstitutional and un-American character should not be made known to the great masses of our patriotic people. The encroach-

ments of imperial power upon popular prerogatives throughout history have almost always begun in far-off provinces and, insidiously and unseen, crept like slow poison to the center of national vitality. The Democracy is the only herald left in the field to warn the people and arouse them to resist this liberty engulfing policy.

Mr. Mitchell's address to the public in behalf of the striking anthracite miners is an important document in more ways than one. It is important in the first place as a frank presentation of the case for the striking miners, and in the second for its exposure in detail of the cold-blooded policy of the coal trust. But one of its most important features is the proof it offers of the fact that our much vaunted prosperity, which Republican leaders have exploited for obvious party purposes and certain labor leaders have confirmed for purposes not so obvious, is a delusion.

It is shown by Mr. Mitchell that the average earnings of the anthracite miners is less than \$300 a year; and that while a 10 per cent. increase was granted to save the election in 1900, most of that was afterwards extorted by the trust as the price of abolishing an old powder grievance, and the remainder and more has been swept away by higher living expenses. The "purchasing power of a miner's earnings is less now," says Mr. Mitchell, "than before the strike of 1900," which Mr. Hanna settled so snugly on the eve of the presidential election. Nor is that all. Although wages have been raised only nominally, and their purchasing power has diminished, so that the miners are getting less than in 1890, their productive power has increased. The daily product per employee in 1890 was only 2.16 tons, whereas in 1901 it was 2.36 tons. And as to value of product the showing is similar. For the eleven years preceding 1901 the average selling value of coal loaded on the cars at the mines was \$1.48 per ton; whereas in 1901 the average price was \$1.87. That makes an increase of 39 cents in the value of the

product, while the operators themselves claim an increase in cost of production of only 13 cents, leaving a net gain for the trust of 26 cents. Here, then, is a sample of our boasted "prosperity." The trusts get an increase in product and values, while the workmen produce more but get less. This is the kind of prosperity which Senator Hanna regards as so good that it should be "let alone."

Mark Bangs, the Chicago lawyer who died this week at the advanced age of nearly 81 years, deserves to be remembered for more than his accidental fame as one of the oldest citizens, or his well earned reputation as a lawyer. He was a democrat—one of those democrats who retained their democracy through all the shifting positions of political parties, from his youth to the very latest years of his life. It was as a democrat that he became one of the founders of the Republican party, then the only party of real democracy; and as a democrat that he saw with sorrow this party of his young manhood turn from its ideals and become to the generation of to-day what the degenerate Democratic party of Pierce and Buchanan was to the generation of more than half a century ago. As Mark Bangs had been an anti-slavery man, so he continued. His abolition was not limited by the social crime of another section of the country than his own. It was a living and universal principle, which made him welcome the leadership of Henry George as that of a later prophet in a newer abolition for the destruction of a more subtle slavery.

#### THE LIMITATIONS OF EXPERTS.

It is a remarkable and very significant fact that experts are seldom pioneers. When Sir Isaac Newton has been named, the list of men who have ranked high as experts in any calling, yet who have led in the development of its great primary truths, is almost exhausted.

To be sure there are many who come to rank high after the truths they disclose have been generally ac-

cepted. Edison might be named as one. He is now recognized as a mechanical and electrical expert, but his reputation came after his extraordinary inventions had been proved. He was not a recognized expert making radical inventions, but a radical inventor forcing recognition as an expert. The same thing in the military field is true of Napoleon, and in the naval service of Nelson. Neither was a recognized expert until he had put the experts of his time to rout.

The usefulness of experts seems to be closely limited to the field of the old and conventional. As a rule they are incapable as to the new and radical in every department of human progress.

In the military department, for instance, to which we have already referred, Napoleon, the military upstart, revolutionized tactics to the amusement at first but to the discomfiture, until they had learned from him, of the great military experts of Europe. Nelson, who saved the naval battle of St. Vincent, and laid the foundations of his fame as a naval expert, by what was derisively called his "patent bridge"—whereby he prevented the two wings of the enemy from coming together—was denied even so much as honorable mention in the dispatches by the expert admiral in command, who mistakenly regarded Nelson's "patent bridge" as folly.

Coming down to later times and our own country, but still with reference to the military art, examples are numerous. John Brisben Walker has collected the data regarding several which he published a few years ago in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*. From this data it appears that there were excellent breech loading rifles as early as the period of the Mexican war, but the weapon was so discouraged by the experts that it did not come into army use to any extent until the civil war. The ironclad principle was exemplified by Stevens, an engineering but not a military expert, at great private expense; but the expert naval officers appointed to report upon his work, were almost contemptuous about it. Ericsson's "Monitor" (Ericsson was also an engineering but not a military expert) was still unaccepted by the government when the operations of the "Merrimac" threw the country into a panic and the "Monitor" was permitted by the experts, as a desperate chance, to fight her. The kind of powder

which makes possible the triumphs of modern ordnance, was long denied recognition by the military experts. And finally the experts rejected the submarine boat, so that it could not be used in the Spanish-American war, although its feasibility had been demonstrated five or six years before.

Mr. Walker saw no general lesson in the military data he had collected. To him it appeared only that "long training in this art seems to have the effect of bringing the average ordnance officer to the mental attitude of regarding anything he does not know as not worth knowing." But Mr. Walker would have stated the case better had he said that long training in the accepted canons of any art, seems to have the effect of bringing the average man to the mental attitude of regarding anything that he has not been taught as not worth knowing.

The principle does not apply alone to ordnance officers; its application is universal. Everybody remembers how a copy of the elaborate demonstration of the navigation expert of London that no steamship could cross the ocean, was brought from London to New York in the hold of the first steamship that came over the Atlantic. It is also common knowledge that Morse, the inventor of the electric telegraph was not an expert scientist but a portrait painter, and that the scientific experts ridiculed him and his invention. Possibly it may not be so generally known that Rowland Hill secured cheap postage for England against the protests of the expert postmaster general, who declared it to be impossible financially; nor that Fulton with his steamboat was hindered more by the obstructive wisdom of the scientists than by the ignorant incredulity of the populace.

Passing into the other but less materialistic spheres of human progress, we find the same general principle at work. Everywhere the expert seems so tied to old discoveries, and confined to old paths, that he has no energy or inclination for the new. It was not Edward Everett, the most expert orator of his time and the orator of the day at Gettysburg, who made the oration that has lived; but Abraham Lincoln, the prairie lawyer, who was at Gettysburg officially as President and "spoke a few words." It is not expert college professors and statesmen who see primary truths in economics when they unfold, and write living books about them, but men of the people like Henry George,

at whom expert college professors sneer. It is not the expert theologians, with dead or dying creeds in the head, but "infidels," with the love of man and God in the heart, who have always made for progress in religion. It is not expert "patriots" like George III., but bold "traitors" like George Washington, that lead along new paths of patriotism. It is not expert publicists like Hobbes or Hamilton, but democrats like Jefferson, to whom the primary truths of government are visible.

Yet there is a powerful impulse at the present time to turn over everything to experts. Some socialists would put even government into the hands of experts. Other socialists abhor this, but what they themselves advocate would lead on to it just the same. And then there are others, who think they are not socialists, if they ever think at all, to whom the idea of having the government managed by experts is very attractive.

This idea is really the core of that philosophy of government which scouts the democratic principle of "government of the people, for the people and by the people." Whoever denies the principle that "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," will discover, if he proves his philosophy, that he is advocating government by experts. There is no other alternative. Government must either be by the governed, democratic in essence, or it must be by experts or those claiming to be experts in government, which is monarchical in essence.

For if the people cannot govern themselves, who can govern them, if anybody? Evidently persons who know more about governing than the people do, not only its history but its possibilities, and how to make it not strong alone but good as well; and if there are such persons they are experts in government. This drives the adversaries of popular government to the alternative of government by experts. And that is the kind of government that kings administer. The king is the expert in government par excellence.

But here again we find an illustration of the inability of the expert to follow new paths. To paraphrase Mr. Walker's comment upon ordnance officers, quoted above, "long training in this art seems to have the effect of bringing the average expert in government to the mental attitude of regarding anything that he does not

know as not worth knowing." So long as beaten paths are patiently accepted the government expert does well enough. But when new paths are to be struck out, a different order of mind is needed. Knowledge of the dead or dying past is then much less important than that truly religious faith which consists not in superstitious credulity as to what is improbable, but in absolute confidence in the practicability of what is right.

The expert really has no advantage over the non-expert, other faculties being the same, than his special knowledge of certain facts already established or supposed to be. And his minute and precise knowledge of these facts is not infrequently acquired at the expense of deadening his sensibilities to the larger and commoner facts. He cannot decide upon what is wanted any better than the next man, and maybe not so well; but the purpose being decided upon, he may execute it better if he devotes his special knowledge and skill to furthering instead of obstructing the purpose.

The trouble with the expert, however, is that he ties his common sense to the dead body of his science as it has been taught. Consequently though he may progress along old lines, he is unfitted for pioneering. This is the reason that upstart Napoleons and Nelsons upset military experts, that artists instead of scientists make electricity carry messages, that printers confound economic professors in their speciality, that "infidels" leave theologians behind in religion, that "traitors" become the greatest patriots, and that inspired democrats map out popular governments which learned publicists condemn but of which experience approves.

Because that is so the function of the expert is more properly one of subordinate execution than of superior leadership. In matters of government, at any rate, while experts may be necessary to execute commands, the commands must come from the people or the government will deteriorate. As Buckle says, "No country can long remain either prosperous or safe, in which the people are not gradually extending their power, enlarging their privileges, and, so to say, incorporating themselves with the functions of the state."

What government of the people by

the people means, what is meant by the doctrine that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed is not that the people must execute the powers; but that the common sense of the people is a better monitor than experts as to what government should or should not do, and as to the general direction in which it should advance. Knowledge and skill are requisite for doing things; but common sense is the prerequisite. It is the sense which determines upon what shall be done.

In public affairs this common sense is monopolized by no expert, by no king, by no oligarchy of learning; it is the attribute of the people as a whole. They cannot afford to divest themselves of it. They cannot afford to place in the hands of experts the directing power which belongs primarily to themselves. Though experts are repositories of accumulated knowledge, the future has been hidden from them to be revealed unto babes in knowledge and skill—unto the common people.

Experts have their uses and their limitations. When special facts and peculiar skill are needed, the expert should be in demand; but when it is common sense, the expert is no better equipped than the untutored man, and in some respects not so well.

The absurdity of placing experts in supreme authority is illustrated by this story of a physician. In bandaging the leg of an Irishman, who had learned to respect the superior knowledge and confide in the comprehensive authority of experts, the physician noticed that one of the pins went in with great difficulty. Upon removing the bandage afterward the difficulty was explained, for the pin had gone through the skin and into the flesh. "Why, Pat," said the physician, "didn't you know that that pin was sticking into you?" "To be sure I did," said Pat, "but I thought you knew your business, so I held me tongue."

In criminal law courts, we employ legal experts to expound the law and summon scientific experts to reveal the facts of their particular trades and offer their opinions; but for a decision upon the law and the facts we submit to the common sense of a jury of ordinary men. In this custom there is a suggestion which may be considered to advantage in connection especially with all the larger questions of government. Even as to experts in general, the old adage

about fire would be a good one to apply. They make good servants, but bad masters.

## NEWS

The British coronation festivities (vol. iii., pp. 657, 663, 664, 680, 695, and vol. iv., pp. 25, 218, 554, 641, 651, 659) were suddenly suspended on the 24th, under circumstances which admit of little room to hope for their renewal. The suspension was caused by the probably fatal illness of the king himself.

Rumors that the king was seriously ill gained currency on the 14th, when one of the royal physicians was summoned from London to Aldershot to attend him, and in consequence he canceled all his engagements for the 15th. The Court Circular which appeared in the evening of the 15th announced that he was unable to leave his room and attributed his indisposition to an attack of lumbago. Two days later these rumors of illness were superseded by hysterical reports of the discovery by the Scotland Yard police of a plot to assassinate the king, which was given as the explanation of his withdrawal from public activities. The authorities at Scotland Yard refused either to deny or confirm these reports. He drove out on the 17th in a closed carriage and official reports of the 21st were designed to be reassuring. But thousands of pounds were then wagered that the coronation would never take place, the betting at Lloyds in London on that day being £3 to £100 that the king would not live till coronation day. Not until the 24th was any authentic news of the king's condition given out. It was then announced officially that the coronation had been postponed indefinitely because the king was suffering from perityphlitis and was undergoing a surgical operation.

His condition had been so satisfactory on the 21st that it was believed he would be able to go through the coronation ceremonies; but on the 23d in the evening he had grown so much worse that the surgical operation became necessary. Perityphlitis, the king's disease, is described by Dr. John B. Murphy, of Chicago, one of the great surgeons of the United States, as the ancient name for appendicitis, but now the term applied

to an advanced stage of that disease, namely, the stage where the appendix bursts and forms an abscess in the region of the caecum. The surgical operation was performed at 2 o'clock on the 24th. A large abscess was found and evacuated and reports of satisfactory progress were given out. But later reports are not encouraging. The advanced age of the royal sufferer, the effects upon his system of dis-solute living, and the delay in operating, all militate against his recovery, and make almost certain a speedy change in the nominal headship of the British empire.

Progress in the adjustment of peace in South Africa, (pp. 137, 151), with the achievement of which the stricken king is credited, goes rapidly on. The Boers had been given until July 10 to complete their surrender and avail themselves of the peace terms, but they have done so already, and the surrender is complete.

Up to June 11, over 10,000 had surrendered, and on the 17th Lord Kitchener announced the surrender as satisfactory. The Boer leaders had been active in promoting this work, and Schalk-Burger and De Wet were reported as making conciliatory speeches, De Wet urging the Boers "to do their utmost to show Great Britain what good colonists" they can be, and Schalk-Burger speaking to them in similar strain. This assistance was recognized by Lord Kitchener in a telegram of the 17th to Botha, Delarey and De Wet, in which he said:

Now that the surrender of the burghers is completed, I desire to place on record my high appreciation of the unflinching energy and unflinching tact with which you have facilitated the work of my commissioners. I recognize how much it is due to your exertions that the burghers ever have displayed such a loyal spirit in accepting the change of government, and I can inform you that the manner in which the burghers have surrendered has greatly pleased his majesty the king and deeply impressed the British people, who are heartily anxious to welcome them as fellow citizens. I feel confident that a new era of complete reconciliation between all races has now dawned in South Africa.

In announcing the completion of the surrender to his government, Lord Kitchener summarized the details as follows:

In the Transvaal 11,225 men surrendered and 10,813 rifles were given up.

In the Orange River Colony 5,395 men surrendered and 5,280 rifles were turned in. The figures for Cape Colony have not been fully received, but Lord Kitchener reports on the situation there that he has handed over the South African constabulary to the civil authorities, as the necessity for further military operations has ceased.

Lord Milner took the oath of office on the 22d as British governor of the Transvaal, and on the 23d Lord Kitchener started for home. He arrived at Cape Town in the morning, where he received an enthusiastic welcome; and in the afternoon, in a public speech at a luncheon given him at Cape Town, at which he was presented with a sword of honor, he took upon himself the responsibility for resorting to martial law in Cape Colony, declaring that it had "prevented a general rebellion by the dissemination of lies," and assured those present that the "rebels would not be dealt with vindictively." After the luncheon he sailed for England along with Gen. French, on board the "Ovatava."

In American politics the speech of ex-President Cleveland at the opening banquet of the Tilden club in New York on the 19th has brought out a response from Mr. Bryan which indicates that the rumbling storm within the Democratic party portending an organic rupture, has broken. The invited speakers at the banquet were ex-President Cleveland, of New Jersey, and ex-Senator Hill, of New York. Prominent Democrats from all sections of the country had been invited, Mr. Bryan among them, but none had been invited to speak. Some attended. Mr. Bryan did not. The banquet was given for the purpose of consulting, with a view to harmonizing the discord in the party. Both Mr. Hill's and Mr. Cleveland's speeches are too long to reproduce, but Cleveland left no doubt that his was a call to the party to reverse its policy of the last two presidential campaigns. After saying that when "Mr. Tilden was elected President" and "afterward, Northern Democratic states were not rare curiosities," but that they have since become so, he declared that the less prominent rank and file of the party, in which he included himself, "are longing to be led through old Democratic ways to old Democratic victories," and asked—

Is it too much to ask our leaders to avoid paths that are known to lead to

disaster? Is it too much to ask that proven errors be abandoned and that we be delivered from a body of death and relieved from the burden of issues which have been killed by the decrees of the American people? Ought we not be fed on something better than the husks of defeat? If these questions are met in an honest, manly fashion, I believe it will be productive of the best kind of Democratic harmony.

Mr. Cleveland's challenge was replied to by Mr. Bryan through the press on the 23d. Referring to the Tilden club banquet as having been advertised as a "harmony meeting" which had "turned out to be what might have been expected from such a gathering, an ovation to the chief guest, former Democrat Grover Cleveland," he said:

There can be no such thing as harmony between men like him and those who believe in Democratic principles, and he is frank enough to say so. He spent no time in looking for "middle ground" upon which to gather together discordant elements. He boldly called upon the members of the party to abandon their convictions and accept the construction which he placed upon Democratic principles. He even taunted the party with being a sort of prodigal son, and invites it to give up its diet of husks and return to its father's house. . . . He not only boasted of his course, but put his brand upon those who sat at meat with him. Having asserted that his Democratic faith compelled him to leave the party (or resulted in his banishment) he described the banqueters as sharing in that faith. He is not only defiant, but he insists that party success can only be secured by an open and avowed return to his ideas. Harmony is to be secured not by the suppression of differences, but by the elimination of those who differ from him.

Then Mr. Bryan described his understanding of Mr. Cleveland's Democracy in these words:

He secured his nomination in 1892 by a secret bargain with the financiers; his committee collected from the corporations and spent the largest campaign fund the party ever had; he filled his cabinet with corporation agents and placed railroad attorneys on the United States bench to look after the interests of his former clients. He turned the treasury over to a Wall street syndicate, and the financial member of the official family went from Washington to become the private attorney of the man who forced the treasury department to sell him government bonds at 105 and then resold them at 117. He tried to prevent the adoption of the income.



tax provision, he refused to sign the only tariff reform measure passed since the war, and while thundering against the trusts in his message, did even less than Knox has done to interfere with their high-handed methods. . . . Having debauched his party he was offended by its effort to reform and gave comfort to the enemy. Virginius killed his daughter to save her chastity; Cleveland stabbed his party to prevent its return to paths of virtue. And now, still gloating over his political crimes, he invites the party to return to him and apologize for the contempt which it has expressed for him. Will it? Not until the principles of Jefferson are forgotten and the works of Jackson cease to inspire. . . . The fight is on between a Democracy that means democracy, and a Clevelandism which means plutocracy. Every speech made by Mr. Cleveland shows more clearly the odiousness of the policies for which he stands. We have even more to fear from those who, like Mr. Hill, indorse Mr. Cleveland's views, but conceal their real purpose in ambiguous language.

It was only by determined opposition that Mr. Bryan succeeded in preventing his nomination for governor of Nebraska on the 24th by a fusion of the People's party and the Democrats of that state. Early in the month an urgent demand was made upon him to allow the use of his name as the only means of concentrating the opposition to the Republicans, but he insisted that he could not become a candidate. His wishes were not at once deferred to, however, for ex-Senator Allen and other leaders of the People's party did all in their power to press Mr. Bryan to accept. It was only after going himself to the conventions and uniting his efforts with those of his Democratic friends that he headed off the movement. On the 24th, consequently, the Democratic convention, meeting at Grand Island, nominated Constantine J. Smyth, who has been twice attorney general of the state. The People's party convention meeting at the same time and place nominated M. T. Harrington. But, urged on by Mr. Bryan, each convention continued balloting with the intention of doing so until an agreement could be made upon a joint candidate. This object was accomplished on the 25th, when W. H. Thompson, Democrat, was accepted by both conventions as the joint candidate for governor. Of the remaining eight places, five were filled with People's party candidates and three

with Democrats, and the fusion ticket was thus completed.

The Democratic platform declares against the Fowler banking bill, against trusts, and against the permanent colonial system designed for the Philippines by the Republican party, and in reaffirming the Kansas City platform, points to the vindication it has received from the events of the past two years. On the subject of taxation the platform demands—

that railroads and other public franchised corporations, whether state or municipal, shall be taxed in proportion to the value of their property, both tangible and intangible, and in determining that value the rule of the supreme court should be adopted—namely: the sum of their debts represented by bonds and floating indebtedness should be added to the market value of their stocks.

Fusion has been effected in Kansas between the People's party and the Democrats. The first authoritative step in this direction was taken by the Democrats in their state convention at Wichita, on the 23d of May (p. 120), when a skeleton ticket, consisting of 6 candidates out of 14 was nominated and the convention adjourned to the 24th of June at Topeka, the time and place of the People's party convention. The object was to unite the two parties upon two of the tickets for the 14 offices, one with 6 Democrats and the other with 8 People's party candidates upon it. This was accomplished on the 24th by nominations of candidates by the People's party convention for the 8 offices for which the Democrats had made no nominations. Much trouble in arranging the fusion has been encountered in consequence of the anti-fusion law adopted by the Republican legislature last winter. This necessitated (1) no fusion; (2) that one or the other of the parties desiring to fuse merge its identity in the other, or (3) that each so nominate only part of a ticket that the two tickets would name a full set of candidates. The last course has been adopted. For governor, the candidate, named by the Democrats, is W. H. Craddock, ex-Mayor of Kansas City, Kan., who announces his intention of making the campaign on the issue of the taxation of corporations, regarding which the Democratic platform commits the party to—  
reform in the tax laws of the state and such changes in the law as will

reach the trusts and monopolies and give to municipalities the right to determine as to methods of taxation respecting local matters provided that no law shall authorize any violation of the constitution.

In South Dakota, as in Kansas, the Republican legislature had passed an anti-fusion law, but the People's and the Democratic parties came together on the 25th and nominated a fusion ticket, with John F. Martin for governor, to go into the Democratic column. The Kansas City platform was reaffirmed.

In Pennsylvania the Democratic convention met at Erie on the 25th, and nominated Robert Pattison for governor. Mr. Pattison was elected governor by the Democrats many years ago, and it is hoped that his reputation for personal integrity, together with the quiet support of the Elkins wing of the Republican party, will enable him to defeat the Quay wing which is now in control and has dictated the Republican ticket (p. 153). For this reason all reference to national politics is omitted from the platform, which is so drawn as to hold the campaign exclusively to state issues.

The Minnesota convention of Democrats met also on the 25th. It nominated L. A. Rosing for governor, —John Lind, who was elected four years ago and defeated by only a scant majority for his adversary two years ago, having declined the nomination on the ground that the governor's office in Minnesota has been deprived of all authority and the governor has nothing to do but draw his salary. In the platform the convention paid a tribute of respect to William J. Bryan, and reaffirmed the Kansas City platform.

Regarding the anthracite coal miners' strike (p. 170), the point is being mooted that even if the general convention to meet at Indianapolis on the 17th of July (p. 171) decides to call a general coal miners' strike, most of the bituminous miners cannot in honor join because their organizations are under contracts which do not expire until next winter. Meanwhile President Mitchell has issued a manifesto for the information of the general public in which he pleads for arbitration.

In this manifesto, Mr. Mitchell asserts that—  
every delay and precaution, every conceivable conciliatory effort that

honorably and conservative men could take to avert a rupture, and every means that thought could suggest to bring the matter in dispute to arbitration, was resorted to by the union, both before the strike order was issued and since it went into effect, but without avail; the coal magnates replying that there was nothing to arbitrate.

Regarding this refusal as equivalent to saying that the strike is without sufficient cause, he explains its merits. The anthracite miners, he says, numbering 147,500, are never employed more than 200 days in the year, and as they receive only \$1.42 for a 10-hour day, their average annual earnings are less than \$300, which—

may supply a living on a par with some classes of European laborers; but who will say that it is sufficient to support American citizenship, or enable parents to educate and properly maintain their families

As to the 10 per cent. increase in wages granted two years ago, Mr. Mitchell says that—

a large portion of this 10 per cent. was paid back to the companies to buy the suppression of an old powder grievance. Moreover, according to reliable commercial agencies, the cost of living has increased, particularly in the purchase of foodstuffs, from 30 to 40 per cent.; so that the purchasing power of a miner's earnings is less now than before the strike of 1900.

To the assertion of the presidents of coal carrying railroads that the effectiveness of the miners diminished 12½ per cent. during the year 1901, Mr. Mitchell responds:

From 1890 to 1900, inclusive, the mines were in active operation an average of 182 days per year, and for each person employed there were produced 363.58 tons of coal per year, or for each day the mines were in operation 2.16 tons were produced per employe, while in the year 1901, against which the operators so bitterly complain, the mines were in operation 194½ days, and there were produced 475.43 tons for each person employed, or for each day the mines were in operation 2.36 tons were produced per employe, thus showing conclusively that instead of a deterioration there was a decided improvement in the productive capacity of the men after they became thoroughly organized. Can the unprejudiced reflect upon these facts and conclude that the anthracite miner is not a better workman than he was before the 10 per cent. concession in wages two years ago?

In reply to the plea of the employers

that they cannot increase wages without increasing the price of coal 10 cents a ton, Mr. Mitchell observes that—

their solicitude for the public weal has not deterred them from advancing the market price of their coal more than \$1 per ton since the strike was inaugurated without giving any part of this increase to the mine workers.

And to show that the companies could increase wages without increasing the price of coal he produces extracts from government reports showing that the average selling value of coal, loaded on cars at the mines and sold during the 11 years beginning with 1890 and ending with 1900 was \$1.48 per ton, while a press bulletin recently issued by Charles D. Walcott, director of the United States geological survey, says that for 1901 "the average price for the marketed anthracite coal, that is, the product shipped to market or sold to local trade, was \$1.87, the highest figure obtained since 1888." Mr. Mitchell then proceeds:

In other words, while, according to President Olyphant, 13 cents per ton represents the operators' increased cost of production in 1901, 39 cents per ton—as compared with 1900—represents the increased value of the product to the operators. In view of the fact that this enormous increase in the selling price of coal has been extorted from the consumer by the coal trust, can anyone say that the demands of the miners for a small portion of the increased wealth their labor has produced are unreasonable or unwarranted?

After presenting other points in detail and pleading in behalf of the miners for sufficient compensation for their labor "to relieve them of the necessity for sending their boys and girls of tender years and frail physique to the mines and mills, there to destroy their youthful vigor in an effort to assist their underpaid parents to maintain their families," Mr. Mitchell concludes:

Conscious of the great responsibility resting upon us, apprehensive of the danger threatening our commercial supremacy should the coal miners of the entire United States become participants in this struggle, we repeat our proposition to arbitrate all questions in dispute; and, if our premises are wrong, if our position is untenable, if our demands cannot be sustained by facts and figures, we will again return to the mines, take up our tools of industry, and await the day when we shall have a more righteous

cause to claim the approval of the American people.

The labor rioting of the 19th at Paterson, N. J., (p. 172), is reported to have grown worse, though no subsequent outbreaks are described. The mayor has suspended the chief of police for not suppressing the riot promptly, and some classes now demand his own removal for permitting what the reports call "anarchist" meetings, but of the real character of which there is no certainty. On the 20th 600 troops of the state militia were called out early in the morning to guard the silk factories, the manufacturers having asked for them on the ground that their operators were timid and afraid to return to work if protected only by the police and firemen. But every silk factory in the county (Union) with one exception was closed on that day, the owners fearing to attempt resumption of operations so soon after the riots of the day before. It is reported among other things that 50 wealthy business men of Paterson have formed a vigilance committee with the object of expelling "anarchists" from the city. They are said to have raised a fund of \$250,000 for the purposes of the committee. This was announced to induce the employment of detectives, which probably accounts for a variety of terrorizing revelations of "anarchy" plots, most extraordinary in number and character. One anarchist, William MacQueen, editor of "Liberty," published at Paterson, was arrested in New York on the 23d.

Legal news from Ohio with reference to Mayor Johnson's tax reform and street railroad agitations is somewhat full this week, and altogether against him. For one thing the decision of Judge Babcock in the lower court (p. 165), holding the recent so-called "ripper" statute, which is aimed at abolishing local tax boards in the discretion of county auditors, to be unconstitutional, has been reversed by the circuit court, an intermediate appellate tribunal, and Mayor Johnson has carried the case to the supreme court of the state. Another decision comes from the supreme court. It sustains the constitutionality of what is known as the "Willis" tax law, which was passed last winter (vol. iv., p. 742, and vol. v., p. 18) as a measure of Gov. Nash (Republican) against the opposition of Mayor Johnson (Democrat). Johnson's

contention is that this law puts an onerous tax upon competitive business corporations with the effect and for the purpose of favoring the monopoly corporations—steam railroads, etc. The question of the constitutionality of the law was raised in the courts by a large number of competitive business corporations. The other decision against Mayor Johnson relates to the 3-cent street car ordinance (p. 73), under which John B. Hoefgen had undertaken to build a 3-cent fare line and to surrender it to the city on demand, at cost and a small advance, when the city should secure permission from the state to own municipal street car systems.

In the lower court that ordinance was sustained (p. 165), but the circuit court, to which the case was carried on appeal in the interest of the existing street car companies, has now reversed the lower court's decision. The reversal rests chiefly upon the ground that the whole route had never been open to bidding. This occurred because consents of property owners could not be obtained for a small proportion of the original route. Consequently, after the bidding, the route was slightly changed to overcome that obstacle. The appellate court holds that if the route had been opened to bidding just as it was finally granted, better bids might have been got. It therefore invalidates the grant. This court further rules that the clause in the ordinance requiring the company, as one of the conditions of the franchise, to arbitrate disputes with employees, and also the clause providing for ultimate municipal ownership, are unreasonable, and consequently calculated to prevent low bidding, which also invalidates the franchise. Mayor Johnson has not appealed this case to the supreme court. No decision of that tribunal could be obtained for many months, and meantime the new company would be tied up with an injunction. He has, instead, taken steps to have a new ordinance adopted by the city council, in conformity in its provisions with the requirements of the circuit court, so that 3-cent fares may be given to the people of Cleveland without long delay.

As the time for the adjournment of Congress approaches,—for, although no date for adjournment has yet been fixed, it is understood that the ses-

sion will not extend beyond the 3d—proceedings in that body begin visibly to converge upon the measures that are to be disposed of if possible. In the lower House the exciting subject of debate this week and last has been the Philippine civil government bill, which came down from the Senate (p. 138) on the 3d. The House committee proposes to strike out of the Senate bill all after the enacting clause and substitute a bill of its own, and this is the point around which the debate swings. The important differences between the bills are two. For one thing, the House bill provides for a gold standard in the islands instead of the silver standard now in use there, which the Senate measure leaves undisturbed. The other point of difference is in the provision for the establishment of a second chamber in the Philippine legislature. By the terms of the Senate bill the Philippine Commission is made the sole legislative body until such time as it can take a complete census of the islands. Then, if it is of the opinion that the time is ripe for the establishment of a popular chamber, the Commission is to certify that fact to the President, who will order an election, if, in his judgment, the opinion of the Commission is sound. But the House bill provides for the election of a lower chamber as soon as the Commission can make the necessary arrangements, the suffrage to be limited to those who can read and write English or Spanish, or who pay taxes amounting to \$15 Mexican a year, or who have held municipal offices under the Spanish regime. The Commission is to act, according to the House bill, as an upper chamber, and, in case the lower chamber fails to vote supplies, is empowered to make appropriations equal to those of the year preceding. Judge Taft and his colleagues are in favor of the adoption of the House bill. They believe that a lower chamber will act as a safety valve, and, in spite of the annoyances which they expect to result from the inexperience of Filipino legislators, that it will, on the whole be beneficial to the people. The supporters of the Senate's proposition point out, on the other hand, that once established a lower chamber would be difficult to abolish, even if it proved injurious.

Another of the important measures which are coming to a head is the Isthmian canal bill (vol. iv., pp. 633, 649, 663, 760). This bill passed the lower House on the 9th of January,

with the Nicaraguan as the chosen route (vol. iv., p. 649). On the 19th of June it passed the Senate, but not until all of the House bill after the enacting clause had been struck out and the Spooner substitute (preferring the Panama route) had taken its place. The Spooner substitute authorizes the President to acquire for the United States all the rights of the "New Panama Canal Co." of France, including the Panama Railroad Co., or at least 68,863 of its shares, for not more than \$40,000,000; also to acquire from the Republic of Colombia perpetual control of a strip of land 6 miles wide across the Isthmus of Panama for such sum as may be agreed upon; and, also, thereupon, to construct a canal across the Isthmus of Panama for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use. But if the President should be unable to acquire the rights mentioned above within a reasonable time, then he shall adopt the Nicaraguan route. So amended this bill passed the Senate by a vote of 42 to 34, and is now again before the lower House. That body refused to concur in the Senate's amendments and conferees from both houses were appointed. It is now (June 25) reported that the conferees have agreed to accept the Senate measures.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Mark Bangs, one of the old lawyers of Chicago, a copartisan and personal friend of President Lincoln, died on the 23d, at the age of 81.

—King Albert, of Saxony, died on the 19th, at the age of 74, after reigning 29 years. His brother, Prince George, was proclaimed king on the 20th.

—The President's business office was removed from the White House on the 24th, into temporary quarters near by. Permanent quarters are to be ready in the fall.

—The finest vessel of the Chinese navy, the cruiser Kai Chi, blew up on the 22d in the Yangtze river, killing 150 of 152 of its officers and men who were on board. The rest of the crew was ashore.

—The supreme court of Wisconsin decided on the 21st that the law of that state which prohibits employers from discharging workmen because they belong to labor organizations is unconstitutional.

—The supreme court of Illinois, by a decision rendered on the 19th, invalidates as unconstitutional a statute making it lawful for public warehousemen to store their own grain

in their warehouses, on the ground that it would exempt them from the discharge of public duties imposed for the protection of producers and shippers.

—The commercial telegraphers of Chicago have organized a union in affiliation with the American Federation of Labor. Nine members were discharged on the 20th by the Western Union Telegraph Co., for joining the organization, but a threatened strike secured their reinstatement on the 23d, with full pay for the time they were off.

—A serious and riotous street car strike broke out in Toronto, Ont., on the 22d. The troops were called out, and street car service was abandoned until the next night, when the service was resumed, the company having made concessions at the request of leading citizens. Its concessions consist of virtual recognition of the union, and an increase of pay to 18 cents an hour for the first year and 20 cents the second year.

### PRESS OPINIONS.

#### DEMOCRATIC HARMONY.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), June 21. — Mr. Cleveland clothes his advice to the party, which is beginning again to listen to him, in ponderous sentences and long words, but it is good advice.

Chicago Daily News (neut.), June 24.—At least it is clear that a new leader must spring up from somewhere or a poignant issue must arise if the Democratic party is to be reunited soon.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind.-Rep.), June 21.—An inefficient party cannot be made suddenly efficient by any number of political speeches, but the address of ex-President Cleveland and ex-Senator Hill at the Tilden club will undoubtedly inspire the Democrats with new hope.

Pendleton (Ore.) East Oregonian (Dem.), June 21.—The gist of his (Cleveland's) advice appears to be in the direction of making the Democratic party as much like the Republican party as one pea is like another, so that the "respectable element of the party," who left it on the money question in 1896 and 1900, will be prevailed upon to return to its warm and affectionate embrace.

Chicago Chronicle (cons. Dem.), June 25.—Does a man cease to be a Democrat when he refuses to become something very different from and antagonistic to a Democrat? That seems to be Mr. Bryan's idea. He seems to think that a man must support doctrines which are utterly repugnant to democracy when those doctrines are incorporated in a platform labeled Democracy or he ceases to be a Democrat.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), June 21.—But not only was there no rehearsal "boom" set afoot for Mr. Cleveland's fourth candidacy for the office which he filled so admirably and patriotically twice, but all question of his ever again cherishing an ambition to reside in the White House were set at rest by himself in that emphatic manner for which he has gained such a worldwide reputation.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), June 25.—"There can be no such thing as harmony." Mr. Bryan asserts, between such Democrats as himself and such Democrats as Grover Cleveland. True enough, and, fortunately for the nation, which needs a sane opposition to the Republican party, there

is an evident disposition to eliminate Mr. Bryan from the partnership in the interest of peace.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), June 19.—The difference between Bryan and Cleveland was not solely with respect to the money question. A fundamental difference existed between these two gentlemen. Cleveland believed that this government should be operated according to the whims and caprices of Wall street. Bryan believed that the government should be a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Albany (N. Y.) Argus (Dem.), June 20.—While not all Democrats will agree with him (Cleveland) as to details, his views, expressed with characteristic vigor, are void of offense or personality to which any might fairly take exception. The fact that Mr. Cleveland was present, as well as the character of what he says, will make the Tilden club a memorable landmark, in the efforts now making for Democratic rehabilitation, and a more complete unity.

Nashville News (Dem.), June 20. — Mr. Cleveland spoke with the strength of a manly man and with the sincerity and sagacity of one who reads the future in the light of the present and of the past. His counsels were wise and directed towards true harmony as an ultimate end. Mr. Hill touched the keynotes of sound Democracy, announced a platform acceptable to all good Democrats, and made a telling and unanswerable arraignment of the Republican administration.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.), June 21.—As the only man that the Democratic party has been able to elect President of the United States in 46 years, Grover Cleveland is entitled to speak words of advice to Democrats, and they should weigh those words well. . . . As far as the News-Tribune can see, though Mr. Cleveland's words are those of wisdom, they form a very small contribution to the kind of harmony with which Mr. Bryan would rally the demoralized Democracy.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), June 20.—Mr. Cleveland recognizes that his retirement is in fact a banishment. The party which once did him unrivaled honor no longer holds him in respect. His voice no longer has authority. He is an unhappy reminiscence. Only those who shared with him in the infancy which culminated in the bolt of 1896 now do him reverence. And he is at least circumspect in declaring that henceforth he will remain in that political exile which is the proper fate of men who betray a cause.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), June 20.—The country has had a surfeit of the mock brand of Democracy that should be labeled "Cleveland Commercialism." Grover affects to believe that "the times point to another Democratic opportunity," but it is not an opportunity that promises hope to such Democracy as he and those who applauded him Thursday night would once more foist upon the masses. By all means let Grover remain in retirement. His phantasies and fallacies may be soothing to him in his indolence, but the Democratic voters of the nation to-day want Democracy that is democratic, that is specific, that is positive, that is courageous rather than evasive, that is honest instead of hypocritical.

#### OHIO JUSTICE.

Chicago News (neut.), June 25.—"Boodlers" in Ohio will never feel quite secure until they can secure an injunction against Tom Johnson.

Cleveland (O.) Recorder (Dem.), June 25.—Hanna seems to have begun his campaign against Tom L. Johnson in Cuyahoga county already and the circuit court is the scene of his activity. That court is certainly very good to Mark and he ought to be very grateful. All in one week he is given two very soulful and juicy decisions. The court first steps in and says that it is

all right to have a tax review board appointed who shall relieve Mark of the necessity of paying his proportion of the taxes on his street railroad and other property, and then it says that the people of Cleveland must pay five-cent fare and the attempt which has been made to build a three-cent road is all wrong. There are so many things which are in the interest of all the people which the court says in these decisions are not permissible that it is certain that they will remain as memorable landmarks in the jurisprudence of Ohio.

### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, June 18-21, 1902.

#### Senate.

Private and local legislation occupied the morning hour on the 18th (after a report of the judiciary committee on the bill for the protection of the president—Senate bill No. 3653—recommending non-concurrence in the house amendment, had been agreed to—p. 7339), and the Isthmian canal bill was debated in the afternoon, Mr. Cullom (p. 7343) and Mr. Kittredge (p. 7353), holding the floor.

Before this subject was resumed on the 17th, Mr. Lodge presented a memorial signed by Charles Francis Adams and others, asking for a full investigation of the condition of affairs in the Philippines (p. 7406), and upon the resumption of the Isthmian canal debate Mr. Perkins (p. 7406), Mr. Stewart (p. 7419), Mr. Gallinger (p. 7419) and Mr. Morgan (p. 7419) addressed the Senate. In the morning hour of the 18th Mr. Carmack spoke (p. 7498) on civil service reform in connection with the discharge of Rebecca J. Taylor from the classified service in the war department; and in the afternoon Mr. Morgan (p. 7497), Mr. Spooner (p. 7497), Mr. Teller (p. 7497), Mr. Hanna (p. 7498) and Mr. Pettus (p. 7506) spoke on the Isthmian canal question. The speakers on the same question on the 19th were Mr. Clark (p. 7564), Mr. Allison (p. 7566) and Mr. Morgan (p. 7566); and the question coming to a vote on that day, the vote was taken first on the Bacon amendment creating an Isthmian canal commission (p. 7567), to the Spooner substitute selecting the Panama route and authorizing the President to adopt the Nicaragua route, if unable to get satisfactory title to the other (p. 7568), which was agreed to (p. 7568)—52 to 22. Several other amendments were rejected; after which the Spooner substitute, as amended, was adopted as in committee of the whole—42 to 34—and favorably reported to the Senate (p. 7568). A further amendment authorizing a loan of \$130,000,000 was then agreed to—38 to 36 (p. 7570) and then (p. 7571) the bill, as amended, was passed. No business of general interest was done on the 20th, and the Senate was not in session on the 21st.

#### House.

On the 16th a motion to lay upon the table a resolution calling upon the secretary of war for the reasons for the dismissal of Rebecca J. Taylor from the classified service was carried (p. 7368) by 108 to 85. No other business of general interest was done either on that day or on the 17th. The general deficiency appropriation bill was passed (p. 7532) on the 18th, after which a night session (7533) was held for the consideration of Indian bills. On the 19th the House went into committee of the whole for the consideration of Senate bill No. 2286, for the temporary government of the Philippine Islands (p. 7586), which chiefly occupied its attention also on the 20th (p. 7612); the only important interruption being a refusal to concur in the Spooner amendment, of the Senate, to the Isthmian canal bill (p. 7626), and the appointment of conferees. The Philippine bill was further considered at the evening session (p. 7627) and at both the regular (p. 7677) and the evening sessions (p. 7694) on the 21st.

Record Notes.—Speeches of Senators Gallinger (p. 7471), Stewart (p. 7493), Morgan (p. 7639) and Spooner (p. 7647) on Isthmian canal bill; Representatives Mon-

dell (p. 7323), Ransdell (p. 7334), Sutherland (p. 7399), Shackelford (p. 7408), Shafroth (p. 7468), Morton (p. 7479), Tirrell (p. 7483), Jones (p. 7598) and Reeder (p. 7665), on the irrigation of arid lands; Representative Mann (p. 7330), on the Pacific cable; Representative Lacy (p. 7477) on privileges on public lands; Representative Bartell (p. 7540) on the bankruptcy bill; Representative Loud (p. 7552), on the salaries of postal employes; and Representative Kahn (p. 7668) on the Philippine question.  
Text of the memorial of Charles Francis Adams, Andrew Carnegie, Carl Schurz, Edwin Burritt Smith and Herbert Welsh, praying for a congressional investigation committee to proceed to the Philippines, and make full inquiry into the facts of the situation (p. 7406).  
Text of canal treaty between United States and Costa Rica (p. 7640).

MISCELLANY

MY COUNTRY, A. D. 1900.

For The Public.

My country, dearest land on earth, my heart  
beats true to thee;  
I love thee, for I love all lands, and all man-  
kind to me  
Are brothers,—nearest, dearest thou: first  
in my heart's embrace,  
The first to love, to guard, to serve of all  
the human race.

The greatest nation of all time! From  
'neath the oppressor's heel  
'Twas great to rise and break his chains, the  
throb of Freedom feel;  
And in that supreme moment on despairing  
nation's call  
—Proclaim the brotherhood of men, the  
equal rights of all!

Thou wert the hope of earth's oppressed.  
Who felt the generous flame  
Of Freedom—all who sigh, and all who suf-  
fered in her name  
Were stronger when they thought of thee.  
A great world-power wert thou,  
An inspiration to all men on earth. What  
art thou now?

Oppressors feared thee; and the oppressed  
turned wistful eyes to thee;  
And Freedom's sons o'er all the earth took  
heart again to see  
Thy growing strength, till evil came and  
bright hopes passed away,—  
For she that broke the tyrant's chains is  
forging them to-day!

Traitors and tyrants hold the helm. 'Tis  
gold they love and power;  
Not Justice, Freedom. Oh, my country, 'tis  
thy trial hour.  
He loves thee wisely who discerns the dan-  
ger of the times;  
He loves thee well who loves thee well  
enough to hate thy crimes.

Who is the patriot? Not he whose guilty  
hands are red  
With blood of weaker peoples in unequal  
conflict shed;  
Not he whom base ambition prompts to rule  
o'er serf or slave,  
Whose foot is on a subject race. No pa-  
triot is a knave.

Lay down thy murderous sword, my coun-  
try. Shame! 'tis not for thee  
To join the cut-throats of the earth, to ter-  
rorize the sea,  
To rule against their will brave brown men  
struggling to be free,—  
A crime in old-world nations, but a viler  
crime in thee.

Would'st thou be free? Love Freedom.  
Make aspiring states this hour  
Free as thyself. Let wondering nations see  
one giant power  
Obeying universal law, the golden rule. So  
shalt thou find  
Not fear and hate, but friendship, trust,  
good will from all mankind.

Deathless among the fleeting nations, that  
endures alone  
Which on the rock of righteousness se-  
curely plants its throne.  
Spurn down the tyrant's plea, my country!  
Choose the right and live  
A power eternal in the earth. Earth's  
benison received!

SAMUEL BRAZIER.

DECLARE YOUR PURPOSE.

Extract from the speech of Senator Hoar  
on the Philippine government bill in the  
United States Senate, May 22, 1902:

Was it ever heard before that a civil-  
ized, humane and Christian nation  
made war upon a people and refused  
to tell them what they wanted of  
them? You refuse to tell these peo-  
ple this year or next year or perhaps  
for 20 years, whether you mean in the  
end to deprive them of their independ-  
ence or no. You say you want them  
to submit. To submit to what? To  
mere military force? But for what  
purpose or what end is that military  
force to be exerted? You decline to  
tell them. Not only you decline to  
say what you want of them, except  
bare and abject surrender, but you  
will not even let them tell you what  
they ask of you. . . .

The senator from Ohio says it is not  
wise to declare what we will do at  
some future time. Mr. President, we  
do not ask you to declare what you  
will do at some future time. We ask  
you to declare an eternal principle  
good at the present time and good at  
all times. We ask you to reaffirm it,  
because the men most clamorous in  
support of what you are doing deny  
it. That principle, if you act upon it,  
prevents you from crushing out a  
weak nation, because of your fancied  
interest now or hereafter. It pre-  
vents you from undertaking to judge  
what institutions are fit for other na-  
tions on the poor plea that you are  
the strongest. We are asking you  
at least to go no further than to de-  
clare what you would not do now or  
hereafter, and the reason for declar-  
ing it is that half of you declare you  
will hold this people in subjection and  
the other half on this matter are  
dumb. You declared what you would  
not do at some future time when you  
all voted that you would not take  
Cuba against the will of her people,  
did you not? We ask you to declare  
not at what moment you will get out  
of the Philippine islands, but only on  
what eternal principle you will act,

in them or out of them. Such declara-  
tions are made in all history. They  
are made in every important treaty  
between nations.

The Constitution of the United  
States is itself but a declaration of  
what this country will do and what  
it will not do in all future times. The  
Declaration of Independence, if it have  
the practical meaning it has had for a  
hundred years, is a declaration of  
what this country would do through  
all future times. The Monroe doc-  
trine, to which 16 republics south of  
us owe their life and their safety, was  
a declaration to mankind of what we  
would do in all future time. Among  
all the shallow pretenses of imperi-  
alism this statement that we will not  
say what we will do in the future is  
the most shallow of all.

PHILIPPINE CIVILIZATION.

Extract from the speech delivered May  
29, 1902, before the New England Woman's  
Suffrage association, by Senorita Clemencia  
Lopez, a native of the Philippine Islands.  
She is a sister of Sixto Lopez, who is an  
exile from his country. Another of  
her brothers has been hanged by the  
United States, while the property of her  
family has been confiscated by the same au-  
thority for like reason. Reprinted from the  
Woman's Journal.

You will no doubt be surprised and  
pleased to learn that the condition of  
women in the Philippines is very differ-  
ent from that of the women of any  
country in the east, and that it differs  
very little from the general condition  
of the women of this country. Mental-  
ly, socially, and in almost all the rela-  
tions of life, our women are regarded  
as the equals of our men. You will also  
be surprised to know that this equality  
of women in the Philippines is not a  
new thing. It was not introduced from  
Europe, but was innate, and the nat-  
ural expression of the love and respect  
which a man ought to feel toward his  
mother, his wife and his daughters.  
And I believe there is no country in  
the world where family life is held in  
higher esteem, or where there is more  
respect for family relations than in  
the Philippine islands.

Long prior to the Spanish occupation,  
the people were already civilized, and  
this respect for and equality of wom-  
en existed. Dr. Antonio de Morga, the  
first Spanish governor general, in his  
history published in 1609, gives an in-  
teresting account of Philippine life be-  
fore the Spanish invasion.

"The grand ladies," he says, "wear  
crimson, and some have silk and other  
stuffs woven with gold, and edged with  
fringes and other ornaments. . . .  
Many wear chains of gold around the

neck, bracelets on the wrists, earrings, and rings on the fingers, of gold and precious stones. . . . They are also daintily shod, with shoes of velvet and embroidered with gold, and wear white robes like petticoats. They also use silk parasols, which they carry as a protection against sun and rain. . . . They take great care of their hair—rejoicing in its being very black—which they tie gracefully in a knot at the back of the head. They take much care also of their teeth."

Dr. De Morga also gives a brief description of their occupations, and of the respect in which women were then held, which corresponds with the conditions found in this country.

"The women," he says, "have for their employment and occupation needle work (i. e., fancy work), in which they excel very much, as in all kinds of sewing. . . . In their visits, and in going about the streets and to the temples, both men and women are careful in their deportment. The ladies go in front, and behind them come their husbands, fathers and brothers."

All this, although relating to a period between three and four hundred years ago, is in striking contrast with the condition of women in India and China, and the East in general.

But perhaps it will be more interesting to you if I tell you something about Philippine women at the present time. I know that the Philippine women are not as highly educated as the majority of American women; they have never had the same opportunities; but they are in general very devoted to their families. A mother, there as here, is willing to make every sacrifice for her children; she will deprive herself of luxury, of pleasures, even of necessities, in order to give them a good education and assure their well-being. The wife is very faithful to her husband, and assists him in every way. If he is rich, she assists in the management of the business, acting as cashier and bookkeeper; so that, in case her husband dies, she is able to carry on the business successfully. Among the poorer rural classes, the wife helps in the lighter agricultural work, assisting to harvest the rice, corn and other grains. But, whatever her station, she always unites her fate to that of her husband, even in danger and misfortune; and even though her marriage be not a happy one, she never abandons him. So true is this, that both in the war with Spain and in the war with America, many sol-

diers' wives followed their husbands to the field, traversing mountains and forests, and facing every danger that they might not be separated from their husbands, but might prepare their food, and care for them if ill or wounded. An example of this is the fact that the wives of Gen. Aguinaldo, of Luchan and of Malvar were in the field, as were the wives of many other officers. A great many Philippine patriots have given up the struggle earlier than they would otherwise have done, because of the dangers to which their wives were exposed from hunger and the attacks of the enemy. It is also interesting to see how faithful the Philippine women are when some member of the family is imprisoned, whether it be a husband, a father or a brother.

The Philippine women are also devoted to their parents, and ready to sacrifice themselves. It is very unusual for a woman to marry contrary to the pleasure or consent of her parents, and while unmarried they never live away from home. They usually marry at 20 or 25 years of age, but the women of the poorer classes marry younger, often at 15. I have several friends who have had opportunities to make excellent marriages; but, because their father or mother opposed, they have sacrificed their love for their parents' sake.

We have been interested to observe that the American women have greater liberty than we, and different customs. They, for instance, can go alone in the streets, they can make visits, they can travel alone to other places, as I have done; but I am the first Philippine woman to leave my home and travel so far alone.

You may also like to know what are the occupations of the women of my country. Almost all busy themselves with domestic cares; those of good position do much fancy work, such as embroidery in silk, and in linen; those of the middle classes weave cloth of silk, pina and linen. In some towns many of the well-to-do families weave the cloth for the household in their own homes, as, for example, in my own home, where we have especial servants for this purpose.

The Philippine women are also very fond of music, but the majority prefer sad and melancholy airs. Many play the piano and the harp, and some the violin and the guitar. But very few devote themselves much to reading, and we cannot compare in education and general progress with

the women of America, for we have not yet had any woman with the title of doctor or lawyer, and who has entered any profession, except, indeed, that of teaching, to which many devote themselves. It is, however, true that there is no university in Manila open to women, but there are six good schools for women, some of which have as many as 300 pupils, and the instruction given compares favorably with that of the best schools in Spain.

Before closing, I should like to say a word about the patriotism of the women. This is a delicate subject, for to be patriotic to our country means that we must oppose the policy of yours. But patriotism is a quality which we all ought to be able to admire, even in an opponent. I should indeed have reason to be ashamed if I had to come before this association with the admission that our women were indifferent to the cause of their country's independence. You would have a right to despise me and my countrywomen if we had so little love for our native land as to consent that our country should be governed by foreign hands. So true is this that the present Spanish archbishop, who is not accustomed in his own country to the idea of equality between the sexes, apparently came to the conclusion that the Philippine women are the superiors of the men, and understand political questions better. I should be sorry to have you believe this, however, for it is not true. But then, a celibate archbishop knows so little about the opposite sex that he cannot be expected to be a judge of such matters. It is possible that some Americans may have said the same thing; but the reason is that the men in the Philippine islands never had freedom to declare their opinions and feelings because of the sedition laws there; but we women, taking advantage of the gallantry of the Americans, and because the law was not passed for our sex, are more free to speak our minds frankly and take part in discussion.

For this reason it would seem to me an excellent idea that American women should take part in any investigation that may be made in the Philippine islands, and I believe they would attain better results than the men. Would it not also seem to be an excellent idea, since representation by our leading men has been refused to us, that a number of representative Philippine women should come to this country, so that you might become better acquainted with us?

## GIVE THEM A HEARING.

Full text of the Memorial of Charles Francis Adams, Andrew Carnegie, Carl Schurz, Edwin Burritt Smith and Herbert Welsh, to the Congress of the United States, presented in the Senate on the 17th of June, 1902, by Senator Lodge and referred to the committee on the Philippines:

The honorable, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States: The undersigned would respectfully represent that they are a committee appointed at a recently held meeting of persons, irrespective of party, interested in the policy pursued by the United States toward the Philippine islands and the inhabitants thereof. As such they were instructed to investigate the condition of affairs connected therewith, and take such subsequent action as might seem expedient. Having, to a certain extent, performed this duty, they now submit the following memorial:

It is not our present purpose to discuss any controverted questions connected with events which have recently taken place in the Philippine islands, or to call in question the policy which either has been pursued by the United States or which it is proposed to pursue in regard to these islands or the inhabitants thereof. In the performance of the duties imposed upon us these matters have to a greater or less extent engaged our attention, and the results at which we arrive may not improbably be brought to your notice at some future time. Certain facts, however, which seem to us of much import are not open to dispute. To these, and the conclusions to be drawn from them as to the exigency seems great and immediate, we now respectfully invite your attention.

It is apparent that, as an outcome of the policy and course of action hitherto pursued, which may or may not have met the approval of those we represent, certain things have resulted:

The United States, as a nation, has assumed charge of communities of Asiatic descent, occupying many islands of an archipelago at a great distance from our nearest continental possessions. Those communities, numbering millions, are of a race wholly distinct from ourselves, with other traditions and habits, speaking foreign, and, in many cases, unknown tongues. The acquisition of the Philippine islands and their inhabitants, while imposing on us treaty obligations, has been followed by prolonged warlike operations marked by acts of fierce resistance, not quickly overcome, on the part of the Filipinos, and by military severities on our part of a character unprecedented in our an-

nals. Those islands are now held by us partly under military law and partly under civil authority, but in absolute subjection. In the course of this mixed administration of affairs no inconsiderable degree of friction has existed, and apparently still does exist, between our military and civil representatives. Such could, indeed, hardly be avoided. In the prosecution of military movements the establishment of camps of concentration for the inhabitants of large districts has been thought expedient; and the people of those districts of both sexes and all ages thus gathered from their homes and usual vocations have therein been compelled to live, with sanitary results concerning which only very indefinite information has been received. In the course of military operations also large regions have been devastated, towns have been burned, and the food supply of the country destroyed. It has hence resulted that when the inhabitants have been returned from the camps of concentration to their former places of abode they have found their shelters gone and the means of subsistence greatly impaired or wholly lacking. It is known that the epidemics usually, and, indeed, inevitably, incident to such a state of affairs are now raging in the islands, though only very partial statistics as respects mortality are made public, if, indeed, they are in any wise obtainable. Extensive districts inhabited by our dependents have thus been scourged and are now stricken with war, famine and pestilence.

For the people thus afflicted, whether excusably or otherwise, America stands responsible. That responsibility cannot be evaded. Those people have, moreover, no means of communicating directly with us. Removed by the width of an ocean, they are unable to make their situation known, whether to ask for aid and relief or to obtain redress of grievances, if such exist. They have not been invited, perhaps, not even permitted, to speak unless they seemed to approve of our doings. But they are still our subjugated dependents. To us, and to us only, can they look, and from our decision they have no appeal.

Such being, as we understand, the undisputed facts, we desire, respectfully, to represent that the Congress of the United States, as the supreme lawmaking authority, is of necessity the grand inquest of the American people. It alone possesses the power necessary adequately to deal with a situation such as now exists. The inquiry at present being carried on by

one of your honorable bodies has unquestionably been productive of valuable results—results the far-reaching importance of which, both to the people of this country and to the Filipinos, it would, in our judgment, not be easy to exaggerate. But that inquiry has also demonstrated to us—and we think must have satisfied all careful observers of its course—that no inquiry instituted in this country, and carried on under similar limitations, can possibly meet full present requirements.

It is plain that, at best, only odds and ends of evidence, stray scraps of information not always of unquestioned authenticity, are forthcoming or obtainable; the dependent communities are not represented; one side, in a conflict of races, debarred from testifying, remains, and must remain, substantially unheard, where not in a measure dumb. To reach any satisfactory results inquisition must be made on the spot and among the people concerned—the dependents of the United States, our so-called subject races. Under these circumstances did we ourselves, the undersigned, representing an unrecognized constituency and clad with no official authority, undertake to go out to the Philippine archipelago or to send there a committee of our number, we would have no power to gather evidence, to elicit facts, or to prescribe remedies. We could at best appear merely as volunteers, and, as such, would probably be ordered at once to return whence we came. It would be altogether otherwise with those coming from the Congress of the United States, and members of it. Its delegates would represent the full dignity, authority and power of the American people. To them every source of information would be accessible, while their mere presence would vastly improve the situation.

The facts being thus, we respectfully ask, on behalf of ourselves and those we represent, that the Congress of the United States will forthwith provide for the appointment of a committee of investigation of its own number, to proceed at the earliest practicable moment to the Philippine archipelago, and there enter upon such an investigation as will cause the people of the United States to feel assured that full information is being elicited, that all grievances will be considered, that any measures necessary to the protection and a reestablished prosperity of our dependents will in due time be instituted, and that, in the light of the fullest possible knowledge of facts and conditions, the American people may form their judg-

ment of the policy so far pursued, as well as that to be adopted for the future.

We further desire to point out a full precedent for the appointment of such a joint congressional committee of inquiry. In the year 1865, at the close of our civil war, when a state of affairs not altogether dissimilar to that in the Philippine archipelago existed in the so-called Confederate States, cognizance was taken of the fact, and Congress, by a concurrent resolution of December 13, acting as the grand national inquest, appointed such a committee as is now suggested. Composed of six members on the part of the Senate, and nine members on the part of the House of Representatives, William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, was chairman on behalf of the former, and Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, on behalf of the latter, while among those composing the committee were James W. Grimes, Jacob M. Howard, Reverdy Johnson, E. B. Washburne, Justin F. Morrill, Roscoe Conkling and George S. Boutwell. The committee thus composed then made, as respects the region which had constituted the so-called Confederacy, an investigation similar in character to that we now ask for as respects the Philippine archipelago.

We would accordingly petition your honorable bodies that such a joint special committee be now provided, and that it be of sufficient size to command public confidence by containing representatives of both parties and advocates of all different lines of policy, to the end that full information may be elicited and the greatest possible volume of variant light shed upon the duties and obligations which this people have had forced upon them or voluntarily assumed.

We would further respectfully request that this committee be so constituted as to enable it to cover the entire field of investigation within the limited time at its disposal. To make this possible it should be accompanied by a body of experts, military and civil, representing the medical, sanitary, industrial and other scientific phases involved in the great and complex problem to be considered, and upon which the committee will be called intelligently to pass.

On the spot, and in this way only, we submit, can the American people be properly and fully advised as to the duties and obligations now imposed upon them. As a portion of the people, realizing those obligations and impressed with a not undue sense of the responsibility which has been in-

curred, we submit this memorial and ask for it your early and favorable consideration.

### BOOK NOTICES.

#### NOVELS AND NOVELS.

It was my duty one evening recently to listen to one of the numerous tribe of professional lecturers. There was a large audience, most of whom seemed well pleased. The lecture—so called—was a mixture of cheap humor and clap-trap pathos; but it saved all trouble of thinking, and dealt in agreeable platitudes painted o'er with the garish caste of rhetoric. The fact that such a lecture could give pleasure and entertain goes far to show the still rudimentary condition of public education. We have taught most of our people the mechanical art of reading, but we haven't taught them judgment and taste.

It is with the same thought that one notes the immense popularity of many of the novels of the day. They have no style. They show little knowledge of character. When semi-historical, they show a superficial knowledge of events, but no real insight into the spirit of the times. They are fit only for wasting time. Their readers had about as well not be able to read, if their reading is to reach no higher plane.

Such is the new novel by Charles Major, "Dorothy Vernon, of Haddon Hall," (Macmillan). This, however, is neither better nor worse than many others. They are made to sell and make money, and they are eminently successful.

Perhaps we should not complain. It is, let us think, inevitable that quick-raising processes of culture must result in this transitional lack of taste and judgment.

One pity of this result is that it tends to bring discredit upon the whole branch of literature which we include under the word novels. But there are novels and novels, and the novel is that branch of literature which most distinguishes the last half-century. The novel is for us as natural a way of presenting thoughts about things as dialogues were to Plato or plays to Shakespeare.

Mr. Howell's new novel, "The Kentons" (Harper), is as different from the novel mentioned above as it is possible for two objects to be that are classified under the same general name. We have in this book the sure knowledge of a master, and see the clever distinction of character which can come only from one who has studied men and women at first hand, and not in books. As an artist, Mr. Howells may be too scientific, too patient with petty details, too steadily devoted to the commonplace, but he is true. This is the high quality which gives value to all his work.

J. H. DILLARD.

### THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

With the political campaign now opening, in which important questions of government, both political and economic, are at stake, we follow our usual custom of offering *The Public* at a reduced rate for the campaign, with the view of extending its influence and promoting its circulation. We will therefore receive

#### CAMPAIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS

from bona fide NEW SUBSCRIBERS from now on, to and including the issue of November 8, next, for

#### FIFTY CENTS.

This price is considerably below the regular terms, but we have found that a large proportion of campaign subscribers, becoming acquainted with and friends of the paper in that way, become regular subscribers, which makes it worth our while to encourage campaign subscriptions.

Address **THE PUBLIC, Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.**

## The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It reads the daily papers and tells its readers what they say. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with *THE PUBLIC* will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

#### TERMS.

Annual Subscription . . . . .	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription . . . . .	1.00
Quarterly Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.10
Single Copies . . . . .	.05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

### THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

1641 UNITY BUILDING  
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:  
THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

#### ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

**CHARLES H. ROBERTS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
618 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, 1253 Cortlandt. Rooms 111-112A  
NEW YORK.

#### BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which *THE PUBLIC* may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 90 cents, postpaid. *tf*