

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1902.

Number 214.

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.

President Roosevelt has given out the refrain for the imperialists' Philippine song, and all the imperial songsters have begun to sing it. Though not what you might callegant, it is up to the vaudeville grade, and fairly expressive of the kind of demagoguery for which its distinguished author is noted. Driven to the verge of desperation by the revolting exposures of the past week or two, Mr. Roosevelt breaks through his unwonted reserve, grits his teeth, and defiantly shouts: "The flag will stay put!"

An American general may order the indiscriminate killing of everybody over ten years of age in the distant foreign country he is invading, but "the flag will stay put." He may order devastation by fire and sword until the land he would seize is a howling wilderness, but "the flag will stay put." Prisoners may be shot off hand by order of an American military officer of low degree, but "the flag will stay put." Natives of the invaded country may be systematically tortured by American soldiers to make them treacherous to their country and kin, but "the flag will stay put." A thriving little republic in the East may have been throttled by an outgrown republic in the West, but "the flag will stay put." Its territory may be parceled out to foreign syndicate makers and land grabbers, but "the flag will stay put." A band of freebooters in control of the American government may laugh American ideals to scorn, but "the flag will stay put." The United States may be doing in the Philippines to-day what Great Britain tried to do in the

American colonies in "the days that tried men's souls," but "the flag will stay put." All is well, though the devil reigns, provided "the flag stays put."

It is a singular coincidence that President Roosevelt should have chosen for the display of his cheap demagoguery a meeting of descendants of revolutionary patriots; and more singular still that they should have applauded his nominally patriotic but truly traitorous sentiment—traitorous because it sets the flag against the principles which the flag symbolizes. For these revolutionary descendants are supposed to be concerned in perpetuating memories of a conflict wonderfully like that in the Philippines, in which their forefathers were on the other side. Had there been a meeting of descendants of the British and Hessians of 1776, Mr. Roosevelt's speech would have been in perfect keeping with the occasion, and the applause that greeted it would have been appropriate. But a meeting of descendants of the American patriots of 1776!

Why, they were the Filipinos of their time. Their land was invaded; their homes were burned; their country was devastated by British soldiers and they were slandered by British statesmen, as the Philippine islands now are invaded and Filipino homes are burned and the country devastated by American soldiery while the Filipino people are slandered by American statesmen. The American patriots were fighting for independence, as the Filipino is; and Great Britain was trying to hold their land as dependent colonies, as the United States is now trying to hold the Philippines. What George III. and Lord North were to the progenitors of these degenerate "Sons of

the American Revolution," so are President Roosevelt and Senator Lodge to the Filipino patriots; and as the savage Indians and the ruthless Hessians employed by the British were to the former, such to the latter are the savage Macabebes employed by the Americans, and the callous American soldiers who torture and kill their prisoners. History fails, however, to name an officer in the British attempt at American subjugation, to compare with the Gen. Smith who has won abhorrent notoriety in the American attempt at Philippine subjugation. Yet an American president turns from this significant analogy in his nation's history, hides that nation's shame behind the folds of its flag, and, worse than all, thereby evokes the applause of "sons" of our Revolution!

President Roosevelt's slangy refrain is taken up in scholarly phrase by Senator Lodge. Until now this later Lord North had been content to listen contemptuously to the condemnatory speeches of Democratic senators, while he suppressed the facts his committee had been appointed to discover. But so many facts, and such ugly facts, have thrust themselves upon the committee and squeezed through its carefully guarded enclosures to the public, that he, in common with the President, feels the necessity of going upon the defensive. Contemptuous silence no longer avails. And, in imitation of the President, he simply holds up the flag defiantly. They are like the committee that decorated a rural school house for Washington's birthday. When the orator asked, dramatically, "Why is that flag hanging there to-day?" one of the little boys who had seen the committee at work and understood the true motive for some of the patriotic decoration, exclaimed: "Please,

sir, it's to hide the dirt on the wall!" That is precisely the reason why the flag is flaunted now. What the secretive investigating committee of the Senate could not do by suppression, the flag and a choice assortment of patriotic epithets are expected to do by intimidation.

One of the characteristic things about the Philippine controversy has been the disposition on the part of the imperialists not only to suppress testimony calculated to open up sources of information, but to fill the record with one-sided stories. The most remarkable instance of this is the publication by the war department a few days ago, of documents alleged to indicate that Aguinaldo began the present war, while the Senate "investigating" committee refuses to allow him to be a witness. The Lodge-Roosevelt-Root coterie patterns after the judge who always disliked hearing both sides of a case because it confused him. But even without Aguinaldo's testimony, an unbiased mind cannot be influenced by these documents. To begin with, they purport to be in Aguinaldo's handwriting. Since forgery is one of the arts of war practiced and defended by American military officers in the Philippines, the genuineness of the handwriting comes at once into serious question. And suspicion is not allayed by the fact that the documents are said to have been captured by Gen. Funston. But even if the documents prove, in spite of these questionable circumstances, to be genuine, they cannot cast the onus of beginning the war upon Aguinaldo or his government. For they bear date as late as January, 1899. If the war had opened in February, when the fighting began, they might have some significance, if not forged. But the beginning of the war antedates the beginning of the fighting by several weeks. War was declared by the president of the United States as early as December, 1898. This is the record evidence. When President McKinley, by his proclamation of that time, asserted American sovereignty over the

Philippine archipelago and announced his intention of enforcing his proclamation with arms, he virtually declared war against the Filipino republic, which was then, and this also is record evidence, peaceably governing everywhere in the Christian islands except in Manila. Whatever the Filipinos did between then and the outbreak of hostilities was purely defensive. Responsibility for beginning the war in January, 1899, cannot be placed upon Aguinaldo and his followers so long as American official documents exist which prove that it was begun by Mr. McKinley in December, 1898.

The meat trust prosecution suggests to the Red Wing Argus, that watchful and bright Democratic weekly of Minnesota, the advisability of utilizing the "water cure," as discovered and applied by Americans in the Philippines, for domestic purposes. Since much difficulty is experienced in getting evidence against the trust, owing to the secretiveness of its members, the Argus asks—

Well, then, why not try the water cure?

Witnesses from the Philippines say it is harmless and refreshing. When they suspected natives of having guns, they applied it, and, they add, "we got the guns" The government suspects these men of using instruments of warfare against the people of the United States, but the evidence is concealed. Imagine one of Knox's lieutenants coming in to report: "We applied the water cure," and grinning, "we got the evidence."

You can't imagine it; it is unthinkable? Thank God it is unthinkable. And yet the police in the large cities use daily devices of that sort, what they call the sweat-box method, against vulgar criminals. Where they know a man is guilty, but have no evidence, where they suspect he is guilty, where they believe he ought to be guilty if he isn't, they put him in the sweat box. Wherein is it worse before the law to apply the sweat box method to Morgan or Rockefeller or Armour or Swift, than to Red Leary or Six-Fingered Jake? Are they not equal before the law, are they not presumed to be innocent until they are proved guilty?

If the gravity of the offense is to measure the severity of the means employed to gain evidence, the argument is all on the side of applying it to the

conspirators, against the people. Red Leary snatches a pocketbook; the beef trust takes the meat out of the mouths of whole communities. Six-Fingered Jake pilfers a handkerchief; the great robbers loot a continent.

Out of all the futile fuss in connection with the prosecution of the beef trust, one encouraging fact emerges. The officers of the government announce their intention of proving that for many years the trust has enjoyed an almost prohibitory advantage under secret rebate agreements with the railroads. The existence of these agreements has been disclosed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which attributes to them the very possibility of the trust. And the commission is right. It is by means of monopoly privileges, held directly as in the case of railroads and other owners of valuable public franchises, or held indirectly as in the case of the meat trust under secret contracts with railroads, that trusts can exist. That is the key to the whole trust problem. No oppressive trust can be made by combinations of competitive businesses. If such combinations were to become dictatorial, they would be met at once by new competitors. But when combinations include special privileges, created by law, then competition is checked and ceases to have its normal power of regulating business. If the attorney general has in good faith set about exposing the privileges which the meat trust enjoys, his success in the court may be followed by the collapse of the trust. But, unless it can be deprived of special privileges, any court victory he may gain will be barren.

While the United States Senate pigeon holes the proposed constitutional amendment for the election of senators by popular vote, the people of Oregon are about to test a device for effecting the same object without the consent of the federal government. A recent law of that state provides that any state convention may make a nomination for United States senator, and that such nominee shall be entitled to have his name on the

official ballot. Voters are thereby enabled to declare their preference for United States senator, regardless of their preferences for other officers, and it is assumed that the legislature in choosing senators will be influenced by the popular vote. It is not compelled, of course, to obey. But, whenever it is of the same political complexion as the popular candidate for senator, it would hardly have the temerity to reject him; and in the case of a large popular vote in his favor, even a hostile legislature might be embarrassed.

The first trial of this law is to be made with C. E. S. Wood, of Portland, as the Democratic candidate, at the election to be held on the 3d of June. Mr. Wood is the gentleman whose speech at the Democratic gathering in the Manhattan club at New York last spring (vol. iv., pp. 737 and 765) made the David B. Hill "reorganizers" so uncomfortable. He is distinctly and unquestionably a democratic Democrat; and whatever may be the result at the Oregon election, it is a satisfaction to know that the Democrats of Oregon are democratic enough to name the author of the Wood speech as their leader in national politics. Coming as it does after the wide publication of his New York speech, Mr. Wood's nomination for senator from Oregon certifies to the fact that he spoke for his party in the state, as well as for himself, when he condemned the Hill and Gorman type of politics and flung out the banner of radical democracy.

It may not be generally known that at the same election in Oregon a constitutional amendment establishing the initiative and the referendum is to be voted on. The amendment provides that while the legislative power of the state is vested in a legislative assembly consisting of a senate and a house of representatives, yet—

the people reserve to themselves power to propose laws and amendments to the constitution and to enact or reject the same at the polls, independent of the legislative assembly, and also reserve power at their own option to ap-

prove or reject at the polls any act of the legislative assembly.

The first power reserved by the people is the initiative, and not more than eight per cent. of the legal voters shall be required to propose any measure by such petition, and every such petition shall include the full text of the measure so proposed. . . .

The second power is the referendum, and it may be ordered (except as to laws necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety), either by the petition signed by five per cent. of the legal voters or by the legislative assembly, as other bills are enacted. . . .

The veto power of the governor shall not extend to measures referred to the people.

Any measure referred to the people shall take effect and become the law when it is approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon, and not otherwise.

This amendment passed both houses of the Oregon legislature in 1899 by large majorities, and in 1901 by unanimous vote in the House and with only one dissenting vote in the Senate, and was signed by Gov. Geer, January 31, 1901. If adopted at the state election it will mark another distinct advance among the states in the direction of democratic government.

In another state also an initiative amendment is to be voted on at the next general election. We refer to Rhode Island. This initiative, however, is restricted, being applicable not to legislation generally, but only to constitutional amendments. Yet in effect it would be a full legislative initiative, owing to the ease with which it might be resorted to and the comprehensiveness of its scope. It provides that 5,000 voters "may propose specific and particular amendments" to the constitution, which shall be submitted to the electors at their town meetings, and if then approved by a majority voting thereon, they shall become a part of the state constitution. One great advantage of this measure is that it would enable the people to legislate directly without encountering constitutional barriers. The living would no longer be shackled by the dead.

As reported by the Buffalo En-

quirer, a police justice of Buffalo has raised his voice judicially against the infamous police method of securing testimony in criminal cases, which is commonly known as the "sweat box." Experts intimate that in the "sweat box" there are three degrees. In the first degree the police, having the prisoner in custody, subject him to a searching and confusing cross-examination, lying to him incidentally by telling him that his friends have given testimony against him. If this reveals nothing, they give him the second and then if necessary the third degree, which are characterized by physical torture. With confessions or incriminations thus secured, the police proceed to "make a case." Such a confession was offered before the Buffalo magistrate referred to above, and he refused to accept it as evidence on the ground that it was procured by duress. The strange thing is that any doubt should have arisen among lawyers and judges as to the invalidity of confessions so obtained. Confessions extorted by duress have been treated by the courts for generations, until recently, as unlawful. More than that, even though no torture be used, a prisoner under arrest upon charges of crime, is presumed to be under a duress which vitiates his confessions; unless he makes them voluntarily, after being informed that he need say nothing, but that if he does speak what he says may be used against him. So just is that rule that no magistrate, no judge, no prosecuting attorney, would think of asking a prisoner questions about his alleged crime, unless the prisoner, after being fully advised as to his rights, had volunteered to give information. Yet policemen, whose sole duty it is to detain prisoners in safe custody, subject them to unlawful questionings and torture, without advising them of their rights, and often after deceiving them in that respect; and judges accept confessions so extorted as evidence. It is full time that a stop were put to these "sweat box" proceedings. Every policeman who participates in

them commits a crime; every state's attorney who encourages them commits another; and every judge and grand jury that ignore these violations of law are derelict. It is a poor excuse to argue that only criminals are put into the "sweat box." In the first place, it is not true. In the second, security for the innocent always depends upon conserving the rights of the guilty. When the rights of criminals are outraged by officers of the law, the rights of all are in jeopardy.

Secretary Hay has asked Congress to amend the passport law so as to provide for passports to "loyal residents of our insular possessions traveling or sojourning abroad." At present the law restricts the issue of passports to persons who are "citizens of the United States." The proposed amendment would restrict it to persons "owing allegiance, whether citizens or not, to the United States." This would clearly be a congressional recognition of persons who owe allegiance, but are not citizens. Now, what are persons who owe allegiance to a government, but are not citizens of it? There is only one word to describe them. They are subjects. Of what are they subjects? Of a republic? That would be a contradiction in terms. Then it must be of an empire. Yet it is less than two years ago when the Republicans were assuring the American voter that the Philippine conquest did not involve the turning of the republic into an empire.

The Chinese are said to be the most imitative race in the world, and it seems to be true. No sooner had they learned of Gen. Smith's devastation order in the Philippines than they set about imitating this noble example of American civilization. A colonel and 50 men of the Chinese imperial troops had been cut to pieces by rebels in the Wei-psien region, whereupon the imperial government sent 1,000 regular troops into that

region, with orders, says the Peking dispatches—

to use the most extreme measures and to burn everything and behead all rebels until the uprising had been eradicated.

That order might almost have been copied literally from Gen. Smith's, though the Chinese seem to have balked at specifically including children of ten within its sanguinary provisions. However, civilization proceeds slowly with Orientals.

"BENEVOLENT FEUDALISM."

Only once in a great while does a magazine article appear which can long outlive its first reading. Most of them are manufactured to excite or to gratify a momentary interest, which is impatient of anything that exacts other than the laziest thought. Like a plucked rose, even the best of them usually give out but a passing fragrance and then wither away. The popular demand is for ephemeral subjects, for a fatuous optimism, and for the light literary touch. Such, at any rate, is the prevailing opinion of many magazine editors, and they ought to know. They doubtless do know, for it is by gauging the popular taste aright that they make their living. But now and again, something finds its way into the magazine pages which, while meeting, in most respects, the frivolous popular demand as to form, possesses also serious qualities and invites profound and frequently recurring reflection.

These are articles of which it may be said, as the Independent of April 3, 1902, said editorially, and said truly, of a contribution to that issue of the same magazine, from the pen of W. J. Ghent:

Every American who can read anything will read Mr. Ghent's article on the coming "Benevolent Feudalism." Not everybody will read it in the next ten days, but everybody will read it some time. Not everybody will read it in Mr. Ghent's own words, as printed in our columns; but everybody will read it in substance, as it goes from journal to journal and from mouth to mouth. For this is one of the articles that, once published, live. Like all great work, in science or in art, it is essentially a report, a description, a picture of a situation, made by one of those men who have the power to see what other men look at without see-

ing, and, by a few strong, clean strokes, to make other men instantly see.

There is no overpraise in that commendation. Mr. Ghent's article is in truth a vivid picture of a social condition which is much nearer at hand than he implies, if, indeed, in its essentials, it does not already exist. He treats it as "the next distinct stage in the socio-economic evolution of America," and characterizes it as "a benevolent feudalism."

Although Mr. Ghent has met the usual magazine requirements of a light touch as to composition and a bubbly manner of thought, and has done this so well that his article is light enough to be read after dinner without disturbing digestion, and although he has succeeded in giving to a profound treatment of a profound subject so charming an air of superficiality and ephemerality as to secure some degree of attention from even the most frivolous victims of the reading disease, he has not been able altogether to conceal a flavor of what is commonly called "pessimism."

It is not a disturbing pessimism, to be sure. He has avoided giving offense in that way. For, while he foretells a condition in which the many will again be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the few, he seems to see it through rosy-hued spectacles. The benevolence of the few more than compensates for the dependence of the many. Mr. Ghent himself probably does not think this a rosy view, but he wisely avoids hurting the sensibilities of those who do by refraining from painting it in dark colors.

His postulate is the probable persistence of the now familiar phenomena of the concentration of capital and the increase of individual holdings of wealth, in support of which he summons Prof. John B. Clark, one of the most noted of orthodox economists, from whom he quotes this testimony, extremely significant when the affiliations of the writer are considered, which Prof. Clark had already given in the Independent:

. . . The world of the near future . . . will present a condition of vast and ever-growing inequality . . . The rich will continually grow richer, and the multimillionaires will approach the billion-dollar standard.

That there are facts at variance with that conclusion, such as a marked

persistence of "small-unit farming" and "small-shop production and distribution," Mr. Ghent concedes; but he does not regard this tendency as indicative of economic independence. On the contrary, he urges that—

it is attended by a constant pressure and constraint. The more the great combinations increase their power, the greater is the subordination of the small concerns. They may, for one reason or another, find it possible, and even fairly profitable, to continue; but they will be more and more confined to particular activities, and in time to particular methods, all dictated and enforced by the pressure of the larger concerns. The petty tradesmen and producers are thus an economically dependent class; and their dependence increases with the years. In a like position, also, are the owners of small and moderate holdings in the trusts. The larger holdings—often the single largest holding—determine the rules of the game; the smaller ones are either acquiescent, or if recalcitrant, are powerless to enforce their will.

In this dependence of the individual producer, supplemented by the already dependent condition of laborers and mechanics, clerks and helpers, and of the more or less and constantly increasing deference to the very wealthy of preachers, teachers, editors, legislators and judges, Mr. Ghent foresees "a socio-economic status that contains all the essentials of a renescent feudalism."

He does not expect, of course, that history will repeat itself in form. The personal fidelity, for instance, which the old feudalism exacted from vassal to lord, is not likely to revive; but "group fidelity, founded upon the conscious dependence of a class, is already observable, and it grows apace." It is manifested in the deference we yield and the homage we pay, "not as individuals but as units of a class," to men of wealth. Though we do not know them personally, and have no sense of personal attachment, yet in most things we grant them priority."

In another and more important particular the new feudalism is to differ in form from the old. Democracy will tend to restrain it and ethics to moralize it.

Ethical influences will qualify it by "a growing and diffusive sense of responsibility and kinship." This is already indicated by the flourishing growth "in the erstwhile barren soil

of mammonism" of the principle of "the trusteeship of great wealth."

Democracy will hold it in check, because democracy endures; like death, it gives back nothing.

Something of its substance it gives back, it must be confessed; for it permits the most serious encroachments upon its rights; but of its outer form it yields nothing, and thus it retains the potentiality of exerting its will in whatever direction it may see fit. And this fact, though now but feebly recognized by the feudal barons, will be better understood by them as time runs on, and they will bear in mind the limit of popular patience. It is an elastic limit, of a truth; for the mass of mankind, as both Hamlet and Thomas Jefferson observed, are more ready to endure known ills than to fly to others that they know not. It is a limit which, to be heeded, needs only to be carefully studied. Macaulay's famous dictum, that the privileged classes, when their rule is threatened, always bring about their own ruin by making further exactions, is likely, in this case, to prove untrue. A wiser forethought begins to prevail among the autocrats of to-day—a forethought destined to grow and expand and to prove of inestimable value when bequeathed to their successors. Our nobility will thus temper their exactions to an enduring limit; and they will distribute benefits to a degree that makes a tolerant, if not a satisfied people. They may even make a working principle of Bentham's maxim, and after, of course, appropriating the first and choicest fruits of industry to themselves, may seek to promote the "greatest happiness of the greatest number." For therein will lie their greater security.

So the new feudalism is to be benevolent.

Having broadly outlined this drift toward benevolent feudalism, Mr. Ghent essays the more difficult task of filling in the details and drawing specific parallels with the barbarous feudalism from which we have emerged.

As "bondage to the land was the basis of villeinage in the old regime, bondage to the job will be the basis of villeinage in the new." The secured job will be the laborer's fortress, which he will hardly dare to evacuate. Prudence will, therefore, restrain him from surrendering one job with the hope of getting a better, or of otherwise improving his condition. When he revolts it will not be as an individual but in conjunction with great masses of his fellows, and even

this he will do more and more reluctantly as he is conscious of recurring failures, and feels the force of the blacklist. Consequently classes will become more stable, show more distinct differences, and tend to the formal institution of graded caste. At the top will be a class corresponding to the barons of the old feudalism, who will be graded by their wealth. Then will come the courtiers. After them the professions—scientists, artists, physicians—patronized liberally by the superior classes. Fourth in grade will be the managers of great industries, a high salaried class, and next beneath them, foremen and superintendents recruited not from lower classes of skilled workers but from technical schools. Skilled workers of cities and towns, more or less regularly employed and partially protected by their organizations, will come next, and beneath them will be the unskilled workers of towns and cities not at all protected by organization. In a still lower grade will be the working attaches of great estates, then the small land-owning farmers, petty tradesmen and manufacturers; and after them subtenants of great estates, followed in turn by a class living in isolated places and corresponding to the ancient cotters, and at the bottom of all the old time "wastral," known in our day as the "tramp."

This classification which is intended to be suggestive rather than exact, grades the classes not according to wealth, nor earning capacity, nor economic freedom, nor intellectual ability, but according to—the relative degree of comfort—material, moral and intellectual—which each class contributes to the nobility. The wastrels contribute least, and they are the lowest. The foremen, superintendents and entrepreneurs contribute most of the purely material comfort, and their place is correspondingly high. But higher yet is the rank of the courtiers and court agents, the legates and nuncios. This class will include the editors of "respectable" and "safe" newspapers, the pastors of "conservative" and "wealthy" churches, the professors and teachers in endowed colleges and schools, lawyers generally, and most judges and politicians. During the transition period there will be a gradual elimination of the more unserviceable of these persons, with the result that in the end this class will be largely transformed. The individual security of

place and livelihood of its members will then depend on the harmony of their utterances and acts with the wishes of the great nobles; and so long as they rightly fulfill their functions their recompense will be generous. They will be at once the assuagers of popular suspicion and discontent and the providers of moral and intellectual anodynes for the barons. Such of them, however, as have not the tact or fidelity to do or say what is expected of them will be promptly forced into—lower classes, or, “in extreme cases, banished from all classes, to become the wretched pariahs of society.”

The process of adjustment will not be frictionless. Large displacements of labor and business interests will arouse popular discontent, which will be fomented somewhat by cautious and relatively barren agitation, the possible danger of which will be averted by a host of economists, preachers and editors, who will demonstrate that—the evolution taking place is for the best interests of all; that it follows a “natural and inevitable law;” that those who have been thrown out of work have only their own incompetency to blame; that all who really want work can get it, and that any interference with the prevailing regime will be sure to bring on a panic, which will only make matters worse.

When the evolution into this “benevolent feudalism,” this domestic “benevolent assimilation” of other people’s rights, shall have become complete—

the nobles will have attained to complete power, and the motive and operation of government will have become simply the registering and administering of their collective will. And yet the state will continue very much as now, just as the form and name of the Roman republic continued under Augustus. The present state machinery is admirably adapted for the subtle and extra-legal exertion of power by an autocracy; and while improvements to that end might unquestionably be made, the barons will hesitate to take action which will needlessly arouse popular suspicions. From petty constable to supreme court justice the officials will understand, or be made to understand, the golden mean of their duties; and except for an occasional rascally Jacobin, whom it may for a time be difficult to suppress, they will be faithful and obey. . . . A happy blending of generosity and firmness will characterize all dealing with open discontent; but the prevention of discontent will be the prior study, to which the intellect and the energies of the nobles, and their leg-

ates will be ever bent. To that end the teachings of the schools and colleges, the sermons, the editorials, the stump orations, and even the plays at the theaters will be skilfully and persuasively molded; and the questioning heart of the poor, which perpetually seeks some answer to the painful riddle of the earth, will meet with a multitude of mollifying responses. These will be: From the churches, that discontent is the fruit of atheism, and that religion alone is a solace for earthly woe; from the colleges, that discontent is ignorant and irrational, since conditions have certainly bettered in the last 100 years; from the newspapers, that discontent is anarchy; and from the stump orators that it is unpatriotic, since this nation is the greatest and most glorious that ever the sun shone upon. As of old, these reasons will for the time suffice; and against the possibility of recurrent questionings, new apologetics will be skilfully formulated, to be put forth as occasion requires. On all sides will be observed a greater respect for power; and the former tendency toward rash and bitter criticism of the upper classes will decline.

Peace and stability are expected to be the defensive arguments of the new regime—

and peace and stability it will probably bring. But tranquil or unquiet, whatever it may be, its triumph is assured; and existent forces are carrying us toward it with an ever accelerating speed.

It is at this point that Mr. Ghent’s dash of pessimism appears. The certainty of the coming benevolent feudalism, evidently without charms for him, arouses him to one mildly hopeful suggestion. “One power alone,” he writes, “one power alone might prevent it—the collective popular will that it shall not be.” But of this he discovers “no fear on the part of the barons, and but little expectation on the part of the underlings.”

No thoughtful American, alive to the inspiring traditions and high ideals of his race and country, and observant of the signs of the times, can read Mr. Ghent’s remarkable article without feeling that what he describes is not coming, but that it is here. There may yet come a heightening of the special features, but in general outline we already have the living model of the picture as he has painted it. Feudalism has revived, and its distinguishing characteristic is benevolence.

To many, doubtless, the picture is

not revolting. Its benevolence purifies it. Their highest ideal of righteousness is “doing good to others” and regulating their lives. They do not see that a benevolent despotism is the most degrading of all despotisms. It degrades him who lives under it by making him proud of his dependence, proud of his yoke; it degrades him who administers it by making him vain of his self righteousness.

But to most persons traditions of American manhood are yet fresh enough to inspire hopes of recovering American independence, and to them the appeal must lie. How can the yoke of this new feudalism be thrown off? Mr. Ghent looks hopelessly to the power of the collective will. He is hopeless because every revolt against the new condition has proved so futile. “We subscribe,” he says, “to newspapers and other publications which criticize the acts of the corporations, and we hail as a new Gracchus the ardent reformer who occasionally comes forth for a season to do battle for the popular cause. But this revolt is for the most part sentimental; it is a mental attitude, but rarely transmutable into terms of action.

The indictment is true, but it need be true no longer. Let the great interests that are turning the forms of our free republic into the service of a new feudalism, be interrogated. How have they succeeded? They have used political methods, the same methods by which alone they can be and must be repulsed. How have they used them?

The answer is simple and obvious. They found ready to hand a great political party, with a great history in the struggle for human liberty. It was the “strong government” party, a fact which adapted it admirably to their purposes. Hosts of the rank and file of that party were out of sympathy with their aims, and leaders were intractable. But they stopped at no such obstacles. They took possession of the party.

What they have done for evil with the aid of the Republican party can be done for good with the aid of the Democratic party. Its fundamental principle of “individual liberty” is adapted to opposing the new feudalism, just as the Republican principle of “strong government” is adapted

to fostering it. There are hostile elements in it, but why care for that, any more than the plutocrat cares for elements hostile to him in the Republican party?

To neglect the opportunity, to fail to take advantage of the momentum of this existing organization, so well adapted to the purpose by its fundamental principles, would be a crime against humanity which nothing could condone. And the responsibility lies largely with the truly democratic elements of the party. Being in the majority in the party they have the duty to inspire others of their way of thinking with confidence in its professions. They must assert themselves and their principles without compromise. They must turn a deaf ear to the blandishments of "reorganizers" who would make this party the servant of feudalism even as the Republican party has already been made its servant. Thus only can the Democratic party be made to draw to itself the masses of the people who are opposed to the Republican policy of the past 25 years, which has at last plunged us into benevolent feudalism. There is no other organization that can hope to accomplish any immediate results. Let the leaders of the new party—this renewed democracy, this democratic Democracy—boldly appeal to, and by an aggressive policy, deserve the right to appeal to, all the forces—many now vague and scattered—that believe in "equal rights to all, and special privileges to none," not as a sounding phrase, but as the one essential truth for preserving freedom and manhood.

By this principle shall we conquer. The new feudalism comes from natural causes no more than did the old. An evolution it may be, but only as all disease is evolutionary. It has evolved from an abnormal adjustment which may be summed up in the one word Privilege. Abolish all legal privileges, restore equality of right under the law and feudalism will die. Democracy alone is the cure for feudalism, whether it be the feudalism of the middle ages or the benevolent feudalism of our own time.

Funston has been reminded of the old adage that "little folks should be seen and not heard."—Boston Transcript.

NEWS

The Philippine revelations reported last week have caused the Republican side of the Senate to change their former plans and enter vigorously into the discussion of the Philippine civil government bill. Senator Lodge takes the lead in the debate on that side, the keynote of which is the defense of the army in the field against Democratic attacks upon it. The debate began in earnest on the 3d and is still proceeding.

Gen. Smith's court martial trial at Manila for ordering the killing of all natives over ten years of age and the burning of their homes (p. 54) closed on the 3d. No announcement of the findings of the court has been made, but it is the general impression in Manila that Gen. Smith, although he admits having given those orders, has been acquitted. The findings have been forwarded to the President for review.

Another court martial has been formed by presidential order. It is to try "Maj. Edwin F. Glenn, Fifth infantry, and such other persons as may be brought before it," the object being to try officers charged with administering the water torture and inflicting other cruelties upon Filipinos. The members are Gen. Frederick D. Grant, Col. Almond B. Wells, Col. Alfred C. Markley, Col. Henry C. Ward, Lieut. Col. Argalus G. Hennissie, Lieut. Col. P. Henry Ray, Maj. William L. Pitcher, Maj. John C. Dent, Maj. Frank De L. Carrington, Maj. William W. Wotherspoon, Maj. Bernard A. Byrne and Capt. Abraham P. Buffington, with Maj. Harvey C. Carbaugh as judge advocate. This court martial is to meet at Catholonan on the 12th.

While American atrocities in the Christian parts of the Philippines are undergoing investigation, and reports of the complete pacification of this region are forwarded by Gen. Chaffee, the American war has been carried into one of the Mohammedan islands of the Philippine group. As reported two weeks ago (p. 36) Gen. Chaffee was given a free hand by the President to send a punitive expedition into the Mohammedan island of Mindanao, the home of the Moros. On the 24th of April Col. Baldwin, in command of the expedition, reported the capture of a fort at Pulas as having had a salutary effect, white flags being put out by the chiefs in place of the red

battle flags with which the Americans had at first been welcomed. The Pulas fort was captured after only slight resistance and without casualties. A less pacific condition was reported on the 2d. An ultimatum sent to the chiefs by Gen. Davis, in command of the island of Mindanao, had not been answered and his messenger had not returned. On the same day the American outposts were fired upon, and a hard battle was fought in the territory of the sultan of Bayan, about six miles from Malabang, on the southern coast of Mindanao. The American loss was nine killed and 41 wounded, and the defenders were overcome with terrific slaughter. Their survivors, 84 in number, surrendered on the morning of the 3d. A few hours later they attempted to escape, and all succeeded except 35, who were killed by their American captors, and nine who were wounded.

Reporting the battle and its result, Gen. Chaffee cables the war department:

In light of present knowledge, could have besieged the principal forts and in time forced surrender, but that would probably have resulted in a sortie for freedom and escape for many. By attacking them they have been completely crushed—the only kind of lesson these wild Moros seem to be able to profit by. . . . The result to follow this action very important, namely, it secures respect for United States authority in the center of Moro savagery.

The British war in South Africa, though to a degree in suspense pending the decision of the Boers on the peace proposals, is kept alive by occasional small engagements. Gen. Kitchener reports, however, that the British are allowing unrestrained meetings between the Boer leaders and their various commandos.

Tariff duties on food (p. 41), as a means of raising revenues for the war, are exciting much feeling in England, fears of a revival of old-fashioned protectionism being freely expressed. This agitation has made an opportunity for the British advocates of land value taxation, known better as "the single tax," to attract attention generally to their reform. The London cable dispatches of the 5th note the fact that a letter from Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, Ohio, is being extensively circulated from London, in which Mr. Johnson encourages the movement. "New life and strength," reads one of the press dispatches, "have been given

the single tax movement in England by the constantly increasing revenues of the country, due in so large measure to the taxation upon private incomes."

Later reports from Paris show that the result of the French elections noted last week (p. 56) is an emphatic endorsement of the already long-lived Waldeck-Rousseau ministry. The total vote cast was 8,000,000, and out of the 584 deputies to be chosen 414 were elected at this first ballot. Of these only 164 are anti-ministerialists, the other 250 being supporters of Waldeck-Rousseau. They are composed of Republicans, Radicals, Radical Socialists and Socialists. There remain 170 seats to fill at the second elections to be held on the 12th, and it is estimated that 130 of these are safe for the ministry.

Domestic disturbances in Russia (p. 56) are reported as growing and spreading. The movement among the impoverished peasants appears to be distinctly agrarian—an uprising for "the land for the people." Apparently it is not an organized conspiracy, so far as the peasants are concerned, but is a spontaneous outbreak among them due to a sense of injustice which has been cleverly played upon by means of a forged proclamation or ukase purporting to come from the Czar. This document is as follows:

My grandfather, who is now resting in God, Emperor Alexander, by abolishing serfdom gave you peasants liberty and at the same time divided the land among you. The magnates of the land, however, were discontented with this, and they have brought the land again into their possession and thus robbed you. The country which for needy wage you cultivate in the sweat of your brows is your own land, and the corn in the barns of your oppressors is your corn. I love you, and as I desire to be a just emperor I allow and command you to demand back your property and to divide it among yourselves as your legal possessions. If they refuse to give it to you peaceably then take it from them by force, together with the cattle in their stalls and the corn in their barns.

The proclamation also directs the peasants to disregard officials who interfere, reminding them that officials are always trying to thwart the Czar's good intentions. "In the peasants' eyes," reads the inspired dispatch, "this is simple justice;" and, indeed, when the fact is understood that the Czar is to Russian peasants not only the puissant head of the state

but the divine head of the church, whom they worship as the "Little Father," and in whose name wicked officials do wicked things, the forged proclamation accounts for the insurrection. Events, also, are in harmony with the inference that it has been precipitated in some such way, for all over the provinces of Paltova and Kharbov, and probably throughout southern Russia, the peasants have demanded the lands of the stewards who manage them for the great landlords; and, upon being refused, they have seized any arms they could find and proceeded to destroy the chateaux. The stewards flee for their lives, and the local officials temporize with the mob until troops arrive. Sometimes the troops refuse to fire, and this is the disturbing fact in government circles. One detachment of troops has already been punished for that appalling breach of discipline.

A revolt on our own side of the ocean, in San Domingo, culminated a few days ago in the overthrow of the government of President Juan I. Jimenez. He himself came into power through a revolution in 1898 (vol. i., No. 11, p. 9), when as a rebel he succeeded in deposing President Heurieux. News of the present successful revolution against Jimenez began to reach this country early in the spring. Martial law was declared by the congress of the little republic in March; and at about the same time the town of Borahona, on the south coast, was captured by the revolutionists after a severe battle. Within a month a large region in the north also had been wrested from the government, and on the 2d of May the revolutionary forces were reported to be marching upon the capital. The whole republic except Porto Plata and the capital, San Domingo, was then in the hands of the rebels. On the 4th the capital capitulated, and Vice President Horatio Vasquez, the leader of the revolution, entered the city at the head of his troops, President Jimenez taking refuge in the French consulate.

And now the republic of Cuba comes upon the threshold of sovereignty, subject to the suzerainty of the United States. The Cuban senate and house of representatives assembled at Havana on the 5th pursuant to the call (p. 27) of Gov. Gen. Wood. Salvador Cisneros was elected president of the senate and Pedro Albarron president of the lower house. Gov. Gen. Wood addressed the two

houses, welcoming them "in the name of the President of the United States," and admonishing them that they could exercise no legislative power until after the formal transfer, to take place on the 20th at noon.

The president-elect, Tomas Estrada Palma, arrived in Cuba from the United States on the 20th of April, and is now preparing his inaugural address.

Orders from the American war department for the evacuation of Cuba by the United States on the 20th of May were issued on the 25th of last March, and on the 5th of May President Roosevelt appointed Herbert C. Squires, now first secretary of the American legation at Peking, to be American minister to Cuba, and Gen. Edward S. Bragg, of Wisconsin, formerly a Democrat, and famous for having invented the phrase "we love him for the enemies he has made," to be American consul general at Havana.

"Ripper" legislation in Ohio is becoming a burning question in that state. One of the cities "ripped" is Toledo, of which Samuel M. Jones has been Mayor for several years. He was elected originally as a Republican, but during his first term he cut loose from the political machine and, abandoning parties altogether, pledged his service to the people as a whole. So satisfactory has his administration been that with an overwhelming majority he has been re-elected twice as an independent candidate. To obstruct his administration and serve the party machine the legislature has legislated the police commission, of which Mayor Jones is ex-officio president, out of office, and authorized the governor to appoint a police board in its place. At first Mayor Jones seemed disposed to submit. At any rate he was so reported (p. 42) in the press dispatches. But if he had any such intention he has abandoned it. When on the 5th the new police board of Toledo, appointed by the governor, applied for possession of the police department, Mayor Jones refused to surrender it. In his formal written reply to the demand, he said:

I positively refuse to comply with your request and decline to recognize your authority or the authority that assumes to confer your authority. The board of police commissioners have been elected to their positions by the voters of the people of Toledo at a regular election, and I have been elect-

ed for the third time to the position of mayor, and ex-officio president of the board, by their votes. We believe that the will of the people is supreme, and that there is no "authority" under our form of government, superior to ours or that can supplant the will of the people, as expressed at the polls. If we once concede that there is some other authority greater than the people that can at will remove or dismiss a public official chosen by the people, according to the forms of law, then it is clear that there is no hope for the survival of liberty or free government among men, and the provisions of the constitution guaranteeing popular government are, therefore, valueless.

Taking this view of the case, we feel that to cravenly surrender the trust that the people have reposed in us, and abandon the position to which they have called us, would be an act unworthy true manhood, and we, therefore, propose to stand in defense of this principle of human liberty to the last extremity, provided for honorable and liberty-loving men. Assuring you, your associates and the public, that there is nothing personal in this controversy, and that I bear for you all the utmost good will, I am, very sincerely yours,

This decision by Mayor Jones was evidently not lightly made. It had been considered by the whole board, presided over by the mayor, which adopted, and all the members of which but one have signed, the following resolutions:

Whereas, we, the mayor and members of the board of police commissioners of the city of Toledo, having been elected to our official position by the popular vote of the people, according to the principles of democracy and the right of self-government, to which we, as a people, are committed; and whereas, the legislature of Ohio has recently passed a "law" that denies the right of the people to select their own public servants, amounting virtually to disfranchisement, and seeks to arbitrarily remove this board and substitute a board "appointed by the governor" of the state; and whereas, we regard such a proceeding as an assault on the fundamental principle of liberty and a menace to any just conception of freedom; and whereas, the service of this board and of the police department has been singularly free from criticism during the past five years, and there having been no charge of "partisan favoritism" or other scandal, the financial statement showing that while every other important department of the city has had its fund exhausted or overdrawn there is today to the credit of the police fund

the sum of \$52,503.40, proving that from this point the management of the board has been prudent, wise and economical; and whereas, the proposed action is not only an assault on the rights of the people, but further, an implied reflection on the personal integrity of the members of the board; now, therefore,

Resolved, That we regard this act of the legislature as a species of tyranny that we as free men must resist, as a meek surrender of our responsibilities would prove that we are unworthy of the confidence reposed in us by the voters who elected us; and, further, be it resolved that the chief of police is hereby instructed to take his orders from this board as heretofore. "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

Mayor Jones was interviewed regarding these resolutions by the representative of a Toledo paper, with this result:

There is no doubt that the mayor means to hold on to his position as presiding officer of the police board until he is forcibly deposed. He said this afternoon:

"We are not going to fight but we will make a stand. I wonder if those fellows thought we would lie down. We have been simply waiting till the right time came. The chief will have his orders to take his instructions from the old police board and from no one else."

"Suppose he does not do so?" queried The News.

"We will not suppose," said the mayor.

"But the chief may elect to obey the new board?" said The News.

"Then we will have a new chief," said the mayor. "If it comes to a showdown we will see whom the force will follow, the new board or the old. I think we shall win, whether we win or lose. If we are defeated, it means that what I have all along contended, that we have not self-government, is true; if we win it will be a contribution to good government. We are not going to give up anyway."

As already explained in these columns (p. 42), the city of Cleveland, under the administration of Mayor Tom L. Johnson, is another victim of Ohio "ripper" legislation. The first attack upon that city was by means of a bill passed April 17, which takes the park system of Cleveland out of the control of the city and places it under a special board. This was followed on the 1st of May by the passage, as a Republican party measure, of a tax board "ripper" bill. It provides that the county auditor in any county may

request and secure from the state board of appraisers and assessors the appointment of a board of tax review to supersede all other taxing bodies. The generally recognized object of this bill was to legislate out of office in Cleveland the city tax board, appointed by Mayor Johnson, which undertook to raise the valuation for taxation of local monopolies, including the street railways, to the 60 per cent. basis at which other kinds of property are appraised for taxation. If it becomes operative this bill will strip Mayor Johnson of all power to bring about an equalization of taxes in Cleveland and nullify all the work which has been done by his tax bureau in anticipation of the power to equalize that would have vested in the annual city board next June under the present law. Mayor Johnson says of the bill that—

it was especially aimed to take off the \$20,000,000 from the tax valuation of the Cleveland street railroads, which was placed on the duplicate by the local board of revision. It was also calculated to prevent similar occurrences in Toledo, Cincinnati and other cities of the state. It is a street railroad measure pure and simple, and had the undivided backing of all the street railroads of the state.

The bill is iniquitous in that it gives a discredited county auditor in this county the power to throw out a board of revision which has gone against him and placed the added valuation on the street railroads. It is iniquitous because at the "request" of this auditor it authorizes the state board of revision to name a board of equalization to take the place of the ousted board. This state board of revision, consisting of the governor, attorney general and state auditor, is the body which remitted the additional valuation placed on the railroad property. It is needless to inquire what kind of men would be named on the board for Cuyahoga county by this body.

The injunction case against the three-cent fare franchise, granted by Mayor Johnson and the Cleveland city council to John B. Hoefgen (p. 10) was decided on the 6th by the lower court. By this decision the franchise is sustained and the injunction dissolved. An appeal was immediately taken by the old street railroad interests, for whom the injunction was got, and the appellate court granted another temporary injunction pending argument. The building of the three-cent fare road of Cleveland is

thereby still further indefinitely delayed.

Meanwhile the Cleveland city administration has taken steps to call immediately for bids for renewal of the street car franchises which are to expire in 1904, on the basis of reduced fares. This action, which was a disconcerting surprise to the old companies, is explained by the Mayor in these words:

The legislature has not yet adjourned, and it is important that we take this action while there is yet in time for the railroad companies to go down to Columbus and secure another ripper. To pass this resolution at this time will serve to give a timely notice of our intentions to the railroads, a sort of kindly warning. It will give them an opportunity to go down to Columbus and get through a ripper taking away from the council and board of control the granting of franchises and turn the power over to the governor of the state, board of tax revision or something of that nature. Undoubtedly the railroads would have much easier sailing under some such plan. But we haven't any too much time, anyway. The first steps should certainly be taken now, so that everything will be in readiness when the franchises expire and the time comes for action.

NEWS NOTES.

—Rear Admiral Wm. T. Sampson, U. S. N., died at Washington on the 6th.

—Potter Palmer, one of the richest citizens of Chicago, and owner of the Palmer house, died on the 4th.

—Bret Harte, the California poet and novelist, who has long resided in London, died there suddenly on the 6th, aged 63.

—Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, issued an address on the 4th declaring that he will not go before the Democratic primaries for renomination and giving his reasons.

—The sixth biennial convention of the Federation of Women's Clubs assembled at Los Angeles on the 1st. The question of admitting colored clubs was decided adversely, though by an indirect method.

—Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, famous in connection with the excommunication and reinstatement of the Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn as a Roman Catholic priest, died at New York on the 5th. He was 62 years old.

—The Jefferson club, of St. Louis, has issued a handsome volume as a souvenir of its pilgrimage of last October to the home and tomb of Thomas

Jefferson, where it unveiled a granite memorial stone which it had erected on the spot.

—The 25th year of Bishop Spalding's priesthood was celebrated at Peoria on the 1st. In attendance at the ceremonial were some of the highest dignitaries of the Roman Catholic church in the United States, including Cardinal Gibbons.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for April shows on hand April 30:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	184,739,983 55
Total	\$334,739,983 55
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1901.....	326,833,124 02
Increase	\$7,906,859 53

—The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, at its meeting on the 1st reelected as president President Schaffer, who conducted the recent strike. It also amended the by-laws prohibiting "political and economic" discussions in the lodges, so as to permit "economic" discussions.

—The eighth annual convention of the National Municipal League began at Boston on the 7th. The secretary, Clinton Rogers Woodruff, described the overwhelming majority for municipal ownership in the recent municipal ownership referendum in Chicago, as "the most significant event of the year in the matter of franchises."

—The April treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1901, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$211,029,570 24
Internal revenue.....	225,122,165 60
Miscellaneous	28,066,546 95
.....	\$464,218,269 79
Expense:	
Civil and misc.....	\$96,459 175 46
War	95,853,349 75
Navy	56,548,894 53
Indians	8,414,255 71
Pensions	114,834,773 27
Interest	26,514,461 06
.....	\$398,624,999 77
Surplus	\$65,593,270 02

PRESS OPINIONS.

PHILIPPINE SUBJUGATION.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), May 6.—President Roosevelt apparently has found it necessary to declare a policy. . . . The keynote of it is militarism.

Detroit Journal (Rep.), May 2.—Before the Republican party finally declares—as it has not yet declared—for forcible conquest for the sake of permanent subjugation of the Filipinos or any other people, we take the liberty to protest. In so doing we are, we hope, among those who build; not among those who stand silently by while men's minds are being made up on one of the most important issues that ever arose in any country for consideration.

Albany Argus (Dem.), April 30.—It ought to be evident to everybody that if the subjugation of the Filipinos is to be accomplished, it can only be done by the methods of extermination which Smith has borrowed from Weyler, sparing neither age nor sex, women nor child. If the American people mean to deny the Filipinos their independ-

ence, they should give Gen. Smith a vote of thanks, and let the tragedy proceed.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), May 5.—Every schoolboy knows that the iniquitous policy of subjugation pursued by Great Britain in the American revolution roused the ablest British statesmen to the most open, sustained and heavy attacks on a war carried on by their own nation. The "copperhead" speeches of these men are a part of classical literature, and ring in the ears of tyranny to this day.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), May 7.—If the island of Mindanao can only be reduced to subjection to our flag by turning it into a shambles and "wading" through a sea of blood" the American people will turn from the revolting alternative in horror and disgust. . . . The President has said that the American flag will "stay put" in the Philippines. It cannot and will not stay put there with the consent of the American people at the cost of a war of relentless, vengeful extermination.

THE PHILIPPINE ATROCITIES.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), May 4.—Smith's order has precedent, not in Order No. 100, but in the rules of all barbaric warfare. It has precedent in Nero's murder of the Christians, in Hastings' extermination of the people of India, in Attila's campaign of cruel persecutions.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), April 30.—Gen. Smith has shown that he does not intend to be made the scapegoat of the strenuous President. He has boldly admitted that he gave the order which has excited the horror of the whole civilized world and that transcends anything in savagery which ever emanated from a civilized authority. But at the same time he lets the people know that the responsibility rests, not upon him, but upon his superiors.

Cole County (Mo.), Democrat (Dem.).—Some of the administration supporters are setting up, as a kind of fictitious apology for the barbarities practiced by the American army in the Philippines, that "our troops have had great provocation." This reminds one of Shakespeare's statement, in the original manuscript of his Julius Caesar, that "Caesar never did wrong without just cause," for which incongruity the immortal bard was taken to task by Ben Johnson, and with such effect that Shakespeare amended the ridiculous line, in accordance with common sense.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), May 6.—General order 100 has been obsolete and a dead letter for 39 years. It never would have been heard of again but for Secretary Root and his methods. Its existence was recalled by some memory useful only for evil. Civilization has advanced by leaps and bounds since the order was issued, more than a generation ago. The revival of this order after it had been a dead letter so long carries the same responsibility as if it had been of recent origin. The authorities responsible for issuing it in new form have the same responsibility as if they had originated it.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), May 7.—The honor of our soldiers! What true American can bear to have it assailed? They are our agents, our representatives, our substitutes on the firing line. We have sons, brothers, husbands, sweethearts among them. They are fighting for us. We sent them out there. They suffer for us the weary marches, the perils of the field, the dangers of the ambush, fatigue, torture, disease and death itself. They carry our flag. They support our cause. They wear our uniform and eat our bread—when they can get it. They have fought for us—worse yet, they have starved for us. Shame upon the man calling himself an American who would dishonor them.

New York Tribune (Rep.), May 1.—To devastate a country with fire and sword, to make it a "howling wilderness," to slaughter its inhabitants indiscriminately, noncombatants as well as combatants,

women as well as men, is not legitimate. It is not war. War is hell, but it is not that kind of hell. The Japanese did not do it in their war with China, though they had dreadful provocation. Our troops did not do so in our Indian wars, though the provocation there was incomparably greater than any that has been offered in the Philippines. The British did not do so in India, not even after the nameless horrors of Cawnpore. To legitimize such an order now would be to turn back by a century and more the hands upon the dial plate of time.

TRUSTS.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), May 4.—It is impossible to deal intelligently and effectively with the trust question and avoid the tariff question.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), April 30.—So long as the Republican party is in power the trusts will not feel uneasy. The question of regulating trusts is a hard problem for any political party, but the Republicans are not worrying over it. Their party has always favored class legislation.

Pendleton (Ore.) East Oregonian (Dem.), April 26.—So long as men persist in the privilege of taking for private gain the increasing value of land due to an ever increasing population, the trusts and combines will continue to rob the many for the benefit of the few. In short, land monopoly is the parent monopoly of all monopoly.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), May 2 (weekly ed.).—The course taken by the government offers little prospect of immediate relief, even supposing it to be true that present prices of meat rest upon trust manipulation. The more practicable and promising method would be to remove the duties on cattle and meats which might then come in to some extent from Canada and Mexico.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), May 1.—Monopoly resting on merit and efficiency is an advantage to all; monopoly based on unfair privilege is a curse. The former kind is constantly regulated and restrained by potential competition; the latter has nothing to fear from ordinary economic rivalry and has the consumers at its mercy. The remedy, however, is not prohibition, but the withdrawal of the improper privileges.

Denver Post (neut.), May 4.—Heretofore it has been the "business interests" of the country that have protested most loudly whenever any proposition of interference with the trusts and their methods has been made. But now these same "business interests," of which the New York Times and the Boston Globe are especially close representatives, are awakening to the fact that the great industrial combinations, with their enormous capitalizations and centralization of business, are, in fact, their greatest enemy.

Atchison (Kan.) Champion (Rep.), April 10.—The real issue to be determined in the discussion of the so-called trust problem hinges upon the distinction between individual values and social values. The trust, merely in so far as it is a concentration of an immense amount of capital in any business enterprise, is not necessarily harmful or dangerous. . . . The real evil of the trusts is to be found in the fact that they are permitted to get something for nothing, that they are not required to make compensation for the measure of those social values which they are permitted to take.

The New Era (Un. Ref.), May 2.—Take away the legislative support of the beef trust. It would then go to pieces, and the price of meat would be regulated by the natural law of supply and demand instead of by the unnatural greed of those who have been enabled by legislation to control the meat market of the nation. The beef trust owes its existence mainly to three causes. First, the tariff; . . . second, discriminating rates on the part of the railroads; . . . third, the monopoly of land

in the great beef producing sections. All of these things are the result of special privileges granted by special legislation. But then to remove an effect by removing the cause would be entirely too simple a plan to suit the ideas of our legislative solons.

BRITISH TAXATION.

Manchester Guardian (Lib.), April 15.—There is no denying that the protectionists have won a substantial victory over free trade in the budget expounded yesterday by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. After 33 years of full free trade, there is once more to be a duty on foreign imports of an article of food which is also produced in England. The duty of threepence per hundredweight on unground foreign corn and fivepence per hundredweight on flour is precisely such a duty as the Anti-Corn Law league existed to abolish.

Minneapolis, Farm, Stock and Home (Agr.), May 1.—Those who have always maintained that "the foreigner pays the tariff tax" would like to assert—and, in fact, do so—that the British tariff would make no difference with prices here, which is a confession that the foreigner does not pay the tax. The British public evidently takes no stock in the foreign taxpayer theory, for it is protesting vehemently against the tariff, except the landowners and farmers, who do not attempt to conceal their glee over the "protection" the tariff is to them. This proves that a tariff is a "special privilege," and the advance in price of wheat and flour in Great Britain proves that a tariff is a tax on the people of the country that imposes it.

"RIPPERISM."

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), May 4.—"There is a bare possibility of the Ohio Republicans going into the municipal ripping ring just once too often," says the Washington Post. And just once is quite often enough to insure the usual penalty.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), April 29.—Director Salen, of Mayor Johnson's cabinet, hits the nail on the head when he says that each city should have absolute home rule and form its own government. Home rule is being made more popular as an issue by vicious ripper legislation, not only in Ohio but in other states. The people of any organized community should be best qualified to determine the form of local government they want. If the legislature, as Mr. Salen suggests, would put an end to ripperism forever by passing an enabling act permitting municipalities to have their own constitutional convention and establish a system of home government subject to ratification by a referendum, our state solons would find something more useful to do during a session of the legislature than connive and conspire to rip, reorganize and disorganize the system for governing our chief cities. Home rule in temperance laws and home rule in taxation do not comprehend all the vital interests of a community, but the reasons advanced in favor of these issues could easily be broadened into arguments in favor of absolute home rule on all local affairs.

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, Apr. 28-May 3, 1902.

Senate.

During the morning hour on the 28th the senate concurred (p. 5039) in the House amendments to the oleomargarine bill; and at two o'clock resumed consideration of the Philippine bill (p. 5042), Mr. Simmons (p. 5042) making the only speech. This subject was interrupted to consider the conference report (p. 5050) on the Chinese exclusion bill, which was adopted (p. 5051). On the 29th there was a desultory discussion of the Philippine question, in the course of

which several documents and newspaper reports were formally read (p. 5088-5106); and on the 30th Mr. Patterson offered a resolution (p. 5174) regarding the calling of Maj. Gardener as a witness before the Philippine committee. The resolution went over for the day, but an extended discussion as to the conduct of the Philippines committee followed its introduction, and the remainder of the day was devoted to consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill. On the 1st, after some desultory discussion of the Philippine question (pp. 5248-57), the sundry civil appropriation bill was further considered, as it was also on the 2d, after a more formal discussion of the Philippine measure. The resolution regarding Maj. Gardener was taken up on the 3d (p. 5353), and Mr. Lodge presented numerous documents from the war department bearing upon the subject. An acrimonious discussion followed. This was interrupted by the regular order for the afternoon hour, the Philippine bill, which occupied the remainder of the day, except for action upon a resolution regarding the death (p. 5366) of Representative Amos J. Cummings.

House.

Consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill was resumed on the 28th, but not disposed of (p. 5073), and the conference report on the Chinese exclusion bill was adopted (p. 5074). On the 29th the omnibus public building bill came up on a privileged report (p. 5110) and after discussion was passed (p. 5128). Consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill was then resumed. It was continued on the 3d and the bill adopted (p. 5200), whereupon Mr. Goldfogel addressed the house (p. 5200) on the subject of the exclusion of Jews, American citizens, from Russia. Resolutions relative to Gen. Smith's "devastation" order in the island of Samar being reported by the committee on military affairs on the 1st (pp. 5264-65) they were adopted. The rest of the day was devoted to the District of Columbia appropriation bill which passed on the 2d (p. 5334); whereupon the Cuban diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (the text of which appears at page 5335) was taken up and passed. The committee on foreign affairs then asked immediate consideration of a bill, suggested by the secretary of state as necessary for the protection of "loyal residents of our insular possessions" (p. 5335), to amend the passport law so as to provide that passports shall be granted only to persons "owing allegiance, whether citizens or not, to the United States." The resolution was not finally disposed of. On the 3d the House adjourned out of respect to the memory of Representative Amos J. Cummings, of New York, who died on the 2d.

Record Notes.—Speeches by the following named congressmen on the following subjects respectively are reported at the pages indicated: Senators Rawlins (p. 5141), and Carmack, (p. 5215) on the Philippine question; Representatives Feeley (p. 5232), on American neutrality in the South African war, and Bartlett (p. 5289) on sham reciprocity.

Text of the petition of the Chinese exclusion commission of the state of California (p. 5032); text of Senate resolutions of inquiry as to Gens. Bell and Smith (p. 5240), and resolution calling for Maj. Gardener as a witness before Philippine committee (p. 5240).

MISCELLANY

THE SPEECH OF THE STARS.

One hour spent in contemplating the stars and gazing into the silent depths of the universe will lift you higher and carry you farther, will give you more lofty purpose and elevation of soul than would a whole year spent in the most splendid drawing-rooms of the land.—John P. Altgeld.

Ah, yes, the stars!—the silent, the serene,
And eons old, that yet were ages old,
When did the shepherd-soldier, Moses, lean
Upon his staff on some far Midian wold,
And plan his life, his labors, marches, wars,
Beneath the counsel of the silent, far-off stars.

A haunting wall from Egypt pierced his heart;
His brethren's cry rang in his troubled ears;
Self may have pleaded well its narrow part,
And warned him with a thousand doubts and fears,
Till, poised between two fates, he raised his eyes
To read the message of the still, eternal skies!

Thus said the stars, this is their message yet:

"Life's brief, brief candle can but briefly burn;
No profit hath the mighty, none shall get
More than his ashes in a funeral urn!
Who shirks his task is but a fatuous slave,
Coquetting with thin phantoms by the grave."

"It is not well to speak or live a lie,
To slink through life concealing brave belief,

To lust for shadows or to wildly fly,
Chased by a breeze-blown, rustling, autumn leaf;

To be the slave of self, held as with chains and bars,

And linger, but not live, beneath the watchful stars.

"If heaven hold no throne but chilly space,
If man hath no sure hope of future bliss,
If this pent life be all his dwelling-place
Then let him play the man, at least, in this!

Life flies—and, lo, the gains of life are lost,
Hard-earned, soon gone, they are not worth their cost!

Or if, dear dream, man be a deathless part
Of th' unpassing Majesty behind the veil,
Then steer thy course with fixed and fearless heart;

Thou canst not perish nor thy mission fail!

Heed well thy strain, thou more than kings and czars,

Thou art own brother to the everlasting stars!"

And Moses heard, and, glad to live or die,
Went down to where he heard his troubled kinsmen cry.

—Howard S. Taylor, in Chicago Inter Ocean of May 23, 1896.

MR. FLIN ON THE MEAT TRUST.

From the Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.
It is a privilege to publish the views of Clarence Fitzmaurice Flin. You know him, heir of old Pat Flynn, who made his million in the big Connemara lode and doubled it in the rich "Old Hundred" strike. Clarence Fitzmaurice Flin, for all his languid airs, inherits the old man's gifts. First thing when he came to New York he went gunning for some of the big ones and nailed their hides to the fence. Yes, yes, a man of rare talents—fifteen millions, I guess.

I got this from his own lips as I hung on a strap of the L while he was talking to a gentleman beside him.

Disgusting, old man, perfectly disgusting, how the papers go on about the beef trust. I don't believe they've raised prices at all. Though I never notice myself. It's vulgar, I think, to bother with those details. I get my bill once a month from Bergunday's, and my tab at the club, and that's all there is to it. But I don't see any difference.

Our people eat too much meat, anyhow. I never eat meat myself more than once a day. Maybe a splinter of bacon at breakfast and a roast beef sandwich at lunch or something like that, but not what you'd call eating meat, except at dinner. It's quite enough. Oh, of course, when a fellow's out in the woods he'll eat more. Say, how I did eat last fall on the Nepigon. But that's another affair.

I say, old man, our people would be better off if they didn't eat so much meat. They're too fat and sassy.

Why, only last week my man Hogan, the feller that runs our mine, sent word that the miners wanted a raise in wages. I don't know how much they get, never asked, but Hogan says they are getting higher wages than ever before.

Well, sir, I told him not much. I'd shut down the mine first. Not that I mind the amount, of course, but it's a matter of principle. Do you suppose they can dictate to me? Not much. Where do you suppose we'd come to, says I, if those fellers are going to tell us the terms on which they'll let us do business? No, sir, it wouldn't be business.

Ungrateful? My father gave them \$10,000, to establish a hospital at the mine. And now they talk about striking. I told the old man he was foolish to expect any recognition from those cattle. I believe he did it just to be a good fellow. You bet, they don't get any of my money, the way they've treated me. The mine's pretty near ausgespielt, anyhow. Last year it paid hardly four dollars a ton, where it used to run \$10 to \$15. A few years more, I suppose we'll have to shut down. Those fellers had better consider, or they'll find themselves out of a job. We can't run the mine at a loss, that's sure.

This rot about the beef trust is just the sort of stuff to inflame those ignorant men and make 'em think they're abused. I tell you, it's dangerous. First thing you know there'll be the dickens to pay. As it is, the West is full of downright socialism now. Some of those demagogues wouldn't stop short of sheer confiscation. That man Tom Johnson is the worst of them all, putting all sorts of ideas into the heads of folks that would never have thought of it if he hadn't started them. A man with his money ought to know better. I wonder what he's up to.

It's a wonder respectable papers print such stuff. Can't they see the harm they're doing? I tell you, that sort of thing ought not to be allowed.

If I had my way I'd stop it mighty quick. That's the trouble; we ought never to have let those fellows vote. Now, when you try to do anything, the politicians stir up a row and inflame the masses against us. That was the worst mistake that we made, the old duffers, I mean, who got up the constitution. If we had to do it again, we'd know better. My coachman's vote counts for as much as mine. What do you think of that? But what are you going to do?

As a matter of fact, I've about quit reading the papers. They're full of such beastly rot. I think if ye all quit taking them, they'd soon come to time. It would put journalism on a more dignified plane, and that's what we want.

If it isn't one thing, it's another. They print columns and columns of stuff about our own people. And they get the names all wrong. Scandalous stuff. For instance, the way they went on about Schwab. I never met him, but he must be a mighty smart feller, from all they say, made it himself, too. No nonsense about him. Well, the stuff they printed about him, I tell you they ought to be suppressed.

I tell you, old man, if this thing keeps on much longer, I don't see where it's going to end.

SUNSHINE ON A DARK PROBLEM.

"The discovery of a new dish does more for the happiness of the human race than the discovery of a planet," wrote Talleyrand. Is not any discovery that will help to solve the present household-servant question of more value than the taking of a Ph. D.?

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in keeping a satisfactory class of women content and self-respecting in our kitchens is the lack of business methods in housekeeping, and especially the unevenness of demand on the different days of the week; and this trouble is largely centered in wash-day. Other days can be more readily put on a business basis, but Monday and Tuesday—for the washing and ironing—bring every week a friction and inconvenience that have long seemed inevitable, but none the less interfere with the comfort of the family.

The remedy—"Put out the laundry"—has many drawbacks; but, in spite of these, for a long time many hundreds of families in Boston and its suburbs have resorted to Chinese or steam laundries, sacrificing too often, for the comfort of undisturbed kitchens and smiling servants, the appearance of the finished "wash," and, almost always, the wearing powers of the clothes.

The people who wish this gain without this sacrifice are numerous; and, to meet the needs of this class, two college women in Brookline, Mass., have planned and are conducting a scientific laundry. With greater care of the clothes than prevails in ordinary machine washing and ironing, and by a method vastly more presentable in its processes than is the Chinese, they are now offering in the Sunshine laundry work that is—as all work in the hands of our trained women should be—an art product.

The conditions are made as perfect as modern science can suggest. All possible drying is done in the open air, in a large sunny grass-plot facing a park. All other processes are carried on in a spacious, well-aired, and perfectly-kept building, put up by the proprietors, the Misses White. No one who enters can fail to discover the fitness of the name "Sunshine," for the room is flooded with light and sunshine from its many large windows.

The men and women—mostly women—seem to be, as they are, a picked class, and are evidently working with a trained zeal not often found in the unspecialized labor of the kitchen. The foreman, carefully experimenting with the few chemicals used, aims, with the precision of the science laboratory, at finding out the exact amount of each preparation that will successfully remove all soil and stain without injury to the fabric. The separation, from the outset, of the more and the less soiled clothes, makes it possible to treat them with this discrimination.

Nearly all of the ironing is done by hand, as the owners are convinced that, even in this age of machines, the prevailing prejudice in favor of hand laundry-work is not unwarranted, and that the hand alone can give fine and beautiful finish to delicate fabrics.

The ironing is done to better advantage than at home, because there is a greater variety and specialization of tools; there are "books" with damp leaves, for pressing and evenly dampening the starched collars and cuffs, irons and boards of many shapes, weights and sizes, fitting to the varying styles of shirt-bosoms, cuffs, or infants' sleeves, and to make the work as easy, and at the same time as finished, as possible, various devices have been hit upon by the proprietors. The preferences of patrons are carefully recorded, so that each one may have his special hobby of high or low finish

on shirt or shirt waist, softness or stiffness in necktie or tablecloth or curtain, faithfully respected.

It really seems as if these two college graduates had found and brought into successful operation methods of conducting the laundry business that not only afford them a fair profit, but are a real and valuable remedy for some of the gravest troubles in many homes. Those who are interested in all efforts on the part of women to widen the field of opportunities for work, will be glad to know that this business enterprise has passed beyond the experimental stage, and, after three years of serious effort, is realizing in good measure its ideals, both in what it has aimed to do and in the patronage it is receiving.

Its success is an object lesson, too, for other women desirous of helping in a trained and effective way in the work of the world, while achieving their own contented independence. And in such work there is no refinement or breadth of training that cannot find a full and satisfactory exercise.—Jessie A. Chase, in *Woman's Journal*.

AN OVERHEATED CONSCIENCE CURED.

For The Public.

To the Editor:

It may be a matter of interest to some of my friends to know that I have just been discharged from the hospital. It was a pretty bad case, but the doctors think there is no danger of any relapse. I am proud to say that it was the first case of "overheated conscience" ever treated in our hospital, and the temperature was the highest to be found in our record.

For fear of misunderstanding, it may be well to say that this "overheated conscience" is a new disease, recently discovered by Gen. Funston.

Aguinaldo was suffering with it at the time Funston played the "Heathen Chinese" on him, and coaxed him to surrender. When Funston came over here after his commission and some military and oratorical fame he discovered that Hoar, Atkinson and some of the other great men, including myself, had the disease badly. I was the only one that had sense enough left to go to the hospital for treatment. The rest of those great men are suffering from it yet.

"Overheated conscience" bears no resemblance to what is called the "elastic conscience," and it will not do to use the same treatment for both diseases.

The disease is characterized by hallucinations and aberrations of the mind of the strangest character.

In my case the right of self-government as a principle applicable to all peoples, seemed to be a truth; and so weak in intellect did I become that I often quoted the poor old Declaration of Independence in support of the idea. Can you imagine a man in a worse condition than that?

Soon after taking the treatment at the hospital my head became clear and it was as plain as day that this right of self-government does not belong to weak peoples, or colored peoples, or unfortunate peoples, that have not adopted the armored battleship, the Krupp cannon, the torpedo boat, the water cure, and other appurtenances of the highest Christian civilization.

No! this right, as well as many other rights, belongs solely to strong nations, that have a proper appreciation of their standing in the world, and know that they are just a little bit better than other peoples. In this light the Americans and the Pharisees are peculiarly adapted to self-government. The British people are nearly up to the standard and will certainly be entitled to govern themselves as soon as they have exterminated the Boers and put a tariff on a few more things. This latter is a characteristic of true Christian civilization that many people overlook. A Christian nation without a tariff would be no better than the heathen.

Another erroneous opinion was removed by my treatment for this disease. I had an idea that liberty was something that all men would seek to get if left alone. It is a bad mistake. Liberty must be carried in turreted battleships, guarded by infantry and cavalry, and stuck into people like a hypodermic injection. After this is done they will know they have it, and I must say, there is no more enthusiastic advocate of liberty on the face of the earth than Gen. Funston, unless it may be the czar of Russia, or Emperor William, who are well known to be strenuous advocates of liberty.

There is this to be said about the "overheated conscience," however: The man that has it will not commit burglary, or make a "howling wilderness" of any place, unless forced to it by some overwhelming power.

Yours very truly,

JACKSON BIGGLES.

IS IT TREASON TO PROCLAIM LIBERTY?

Extract from the speech in the Senate on American government in the Philippines, made by Senator Edward W. Carmack, of Tennessee, as reported at p. 5219 of the Congressional Record of May 1.

So far as I am concerned I have never permitted myself to be disturbed by this cry of treason. We have got used to it down in my part of the country. There is hardly a man of distinction in my section of the United States who has not at some time or other been denounced as a public traitor by some public thief. Men have been denounced as traitors because they opposed the protective tariff. They have been denounced as traitors because they opposed extravagant pension legislation. So long as men have the courage to oppose wrong and denounce it there will be knaves to raise the cry of treason and fools to repeat the cry.

For the most part, sir, such abuse comes from brawling demagogues and may be passed with patient and serene contempt. But I regret to say that there have been men whose utterances usually command and usually deserve respect who have used language that will give countenance and encouragement to crawling slanderers who are not worthy to lick the dust at their feet.

I believe, sir, that I have as high respect for the office of president as any man in the country. I have much admiration for some of the strong and splendid qualities of the distinguished gentleman who now occupies that office, and because I have I very greatly regret that he has uttered language which for his honor I am glad to believe he will some time be ashamed of. In his address glorifying the strenuous life he says:

No small share of the responsibility for the blood shed in the Philippines—the blood of our brothers and the blood of their wild and ignorant foes—lies at the thresholds of those who so long delayed the adoption of the treaty of peace, and of those who by their worse than foolish words deliberately invited a savage people to plunge into a war fraught with sure disaster for them.

And again:

It must be remembered that their utterances are saved from being treasonable merely from the fact that they are despicable.

Mr. President, I have not quoted that language for the purpose of expressing resentment. I do not feel any. I know, sir, that we must make many allowances for that remarkable man, and especially must we not expect from him the language of

moderation when dealing with the character and the motives of his political opponents. We must not judge the President in his moments of oratorical ferocity or by the way he ejaculates his parts of speech when the maniac frenzy of battle is in his blood.

The President is not vindictive, he is simply strenuous; and these outbursts are due to that abounding animal energy which makes it impossible for him to move except with a bound, to speak except at the top of his voice, or to express his disapproval except with the full strength of his vocabulary. He is the strong man Kwasind, and rends and tears not from fury but from sheer excess of strength and energy. He resembles, in his habits of speech, my friend Joe Ballanfant's horse, of which remarkable animal it was said that running away was his natural gait.

Now, I say that the President is not vindictive. I do not believe that he hates Democrats any more than he hates grizzly bears or mountain lions. He just loves to shoot them. He is an always loaded gun, and can only go off with the full force of the powder that is in him. In his talk about the "treasonable" and "despicable" utterances of men whose motives and opinions are as honest as his own, just as when he described Mr. Bryan as a red-handed anarchist in the last campaign, the President was simply "going off."

Mr. President, we are no more responsible for the resistance of the Filipinos than any man who anywhere or at any time has spoken the language of liberty and left his words upon the page of history as an inspiration to mankind. We are no more responsible than the author of that great document now being reveled by some of our military heroes as a "damned incendiary document."

I wish to suggest to our friends on the other side that when they get out a special Philippine edition of the Declaration of Independence they ought to edit it after the fashion of the distinguished junior senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Lodge), who in a recent address paraphrased one of its immortal sentiments so as to make it read: "All civilized governments ultimately derive their power from the whole body of the people." Diluted with this word "ultimately," it is not half so incendiary, and I doubt whether

in this form it would have ever set the American colonists on fire.

But, Mr. President, if we are to be held responsible because we are said to have held out words of hope and encouragement to the Filipinos, what shall be said of the responsibility of those who have habitually maddened them with words of insult and opprobrium, whose every utterance has been made as though with a deliberate purpose to destroy every hope of a just and liberal government at our hands and to plant in their bosoms an inextinguishable hatred of American rule?

THE MORGENTHALERBURG INSTITUTE ENTERS PRACTICAL POLITICS.

By Wardon Allan Curtis, in Puck, of Feb. 5. Reprinted in The Public by the courteous permission of Messrs. Keppler & Schwarzmann, publishers and proprietors of Puck. (Corner Houston & Elm Sts., New York.)

The faculty of the great Morgenthalerburg Institute of Sociology had emerged from the seclusion of academic discussion of sociological problems, into the field of actual politics. Ever since the establishment of this renowned post-graduate institution upon the John Charles Henry Williamson foundation, its faculty had studied every possible sociological problem from every possible point of view and the results of their studies had appeared in divers reviews and sociological journals, where they were devoured with avidity by scores of professors and students of sociology everywhere.

But when Dr. Charles Ephrosatus Raynebeaser assumed the presidency of the institute, he announced that it was high time for the school to take on a more practical phase, and, abandoning the mere academic discussion of theories, struggle to have them put into actual use.

The doctor was a faddist—what sociologist is not?—and for years he had meditated upon the problem of the treatment of the defective classes, the mutes, the imbeciles, the degenerates and criminals, and the best methods of preventing them from perpetuating their defects as a sad heritage to their descendants. The doctor was a disciple of the doctrine that for the benefit of the whole race, the defectives should not be allowed to perpetuate themselves. To attain this desirable end, there was but one effectual way, the most radical:—not segregation, but death. "True, some sadness is occasioned by

the initial movement of the eradication from the race of the taint, the execution of the defective," said the doctor, "but think what it means. It saves the sorrow of the individual descendant himself, it saves the sorrow of his friends, it saves money to the state."

It was the first experience in practical politics that the Morgenthalerburg faculty had ever had. They had criticised politics, they had built ideal systems of politics, but when they were about to launch their programme, they found they did not know how to do it at all; so they resorted for aid to the Hon. James McGann, chairman of the state central committee of the Republicrat party.

"You came to the right folks," said the Hon. James. "This plan calls for cutting down expenses. Our crowd is great on that. Anything that promises economy takes with the people just now. Economy, economy, is the cry, and we've been wondering what we could offer 'em. Your plan seems to be a good thing. I think it'll take. I'll bring it before the central committee and I think we'll vote to offer it to the nominating convention for insertion in the party platform. It would have been no use for you to have offered it to the other party. They're too conservative and old-fashioned. But we're radical and progressive and right in for such things."

After this interview, the Morgenthalerburg faculty found itself in the whirl of politics. They sometimes demurred at the methods of the Hon. James McGann, but early appreciating the fact that to gain the ultimate good they must tolerate some present evil, they made the best of the situation.

"Now, there's Jerry Donahue. We want him fixed," said Mr. McGann. "He has a big pull with the central committee and will have lots of influence with the convention. He controls a whooping big vote down in the tough end of Milwaugo and is one of the boys, and no mistake."

When Dr. Raynebeaser laid eyes on Mr. Donahue and learned that he had twice been in the penitentiary, he was somewhat disconcerted, for this brute, physically powerful, but with all the signs of mental degeneracy in his plug ugly face, was as promising a subject for execution under the proposed law as he had ever contemplated. And so were Messrs. Flynn, Coughlin, Burke and Donnelly, hench-

men whom Mr. Donahue called into the back room of his saloon, where they met and discussed ways and means with Dr. Raynebeaser.

"In order to properly carry out the law," said the doctor after he had read the bill and voluminously explained its bearings to the stolid array of gorilla faces before him, "I had thought that it would be best to create a special commission to attend to it. Judges are subject to local conditions which would tend to prevent them from thoroughly carrying out a law which might operate to the sorrow of their friends and neighbors. We want a state-wide committee which, hampered by no ideas of false humanitarianism, and which knowing the cases brought before it only in an impersonal way, can act for the best interests of the commonwealth and posterity, uninfluenced by any mistaken sympathy for the present and temporary sorrow of the relatives of the defectives. A clause providing for this commission will be inserted in the bill. They are to be appointed by the governor. They must be strong, resolute men, unwavering and determined, say eight in number. They will sit in session at the capital, consider the cases of defectives and pass sentence upon them. As I said, this commission must be of picked men. I am not one who believes that unusual ability should be given the public free. Men of high quality are attracted and stimulated by high rewards. This commission should be paid. I believe that they ought not to receive less than \$2,000 and expenses per year."

"I am in favor of the bill," said Mr. Donahue, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Burke and Mr. Donnelly.

The Republicrats swept the state. The Hon. Samuel Rammerton was seated with great pomp in the gubernatorial chair at Springville. The Raynebeaser law had been the principal feature of the party platform and the legislature promptly passed it. Immediately upon its passage, the governor sent for its erudite author.

"Do you know," said he, beaming upon the doctor, "your bill pulled us through. The idea of economy expressed in it, pleased the people. No asylums to keep up, the final abolition of penitentiaries, it took. That made us win. I thank you. I am deeply grateful to you. By the way, you would probably like to know whom I have appointed on the commission. Let me call in the chairman, Mr. Lenox Buxby, attorney at law."

Dr. Raynebeaser half started from his chair when his eyes fell upon the individual who came into the private office from the outer room with the messenger. He was a powerfully built, but loosely hung man of medium size. Great arms with hairy wrists protruding beneath his cuffs, hung down his frame from an abnormally broad pair of shoulders. A long gash of a mouth stretched across the wide lower part of a head that narrowed unpleasantly above the great pouch-like cheeks. Little black beads of eyes, shifty and cunning, but with that fullness beneath them which betokens fluency of speech, a Mongolian nose, an enormous chin and enormous ears projecting straight out from a shock of bristly, low-growing black hair, completed the front view of Mr. Lenox Buxby. Dr. Raynebeaser shuddered.

"Just the man for the place!" said the governor, when Buxby had retired. "He won't be afraid to pass sentence of death, or even to put it into execution. In fact, he was in the pen on a sentence of ten years, and they let him out on five, because he did the hanging. Here are the names of the rest of the committee."

The doctor's weak eyes winked rapidly as he read: "Jeremiah Donahue, Terrance L. Flynn, Patrick G. Coughlin, Timothy S. Burke, Matthias Kauwenhoven, Casimir Lapinski and Wencelas Nowacek." Not a single professor in the Morgenthalerburg faculty. A commission, the members of which were degenerates themselves and subjects for the operation of the law. He gasped. Inarticulately, but unmistakably, he expressed his disappointment and disgust.

"What's the matter with that commission?" asked the governor in a hard voice, looking at the doctor with a hard eye. "They're all fearless fellows. Besides, Donahue and his gang demanded the places before election. They carried Milwaugo for us. The other fellows are butchers who did work for us in other parts of the state. You wanted men of resolution, and who wouldn't hesitate for maudlin sympathy, and you've got 'em, and I'd like to know what you're kicking about."

"Did I and the other Morgenthalerburg professors do nothing to elect you? Did we deserve no consideration? I shall, with the assistance of the rest of the faculty, air this thoroughly in the reviews and in the press of the state, and if you are renominated or reelected, I am very much mistaken."

The commission was convened by or-

der of the governor that afternoon. Mr. Lenox Buxby arose with a roll of paper in his hands.

"This defective law is a good one. Look at us, powerful of limb and lung, sound of digestion. I could eat a door knob and never feel it. Of such stuff as us, this world ought to be made. But these little weak-kneed Johnnies, with weak eyes, weak stomachs, and all that, what right have they to be perpetuating their weaknesses by having unfortunate children? I say they haven't any. Ain't that so, Mr. Kauwenhoven?"

"You bet you!" said Mr. Kauwenhoven emphatically.

"Look at them weak, half-blind, near-sighted, dyspeptic runts of fellows on the faculty of the Morgenthalerburg Institute of Sociology. What right have such cusses as that to perpetuate their weakness in a line of unhappy descendants?"

"They ain't got any!" said Mr. Wencslas Nowacek.

"I move you, Mr. President," said Mr. Kauwenhoven, "dot der gommision recommend for execution der body of defectives known as der faculty of der Morgenthalerburg Institute of Sociology."

"Second the motion," said Mr. Jeremiah Donahue. Whereupon the motion was put and carried unanimously. But before the sentence of execution was ordered to be sent out, the commission betook itself to the task of making out their expense accounts and vouchers for salaries, and, being gentlemen more handy with other things than the pen, in some manner news of their action found a way to reach the faculty of the Morgenthalerburg Institute of Sociology in time to allow that august body to fly the state before the minions of the law could seize their persons. After that, the commission, for reasons known to its members and to his excellency the governor, failed to meet again, and the great public, used to the slumping out of reforms mooted before elections, speedily forgot it.

PERIODICALS.

"Cecil John Rhodes," by Wm. T. Stead, is the principal article of the May Review of Reviews.

The March Bulletin of the Department of Labor (Washington) just issued is devoted to a statistical examination into the "course of wholesale prices" from 1890 to 1901.

The "Psychology and Ethics of Fun," by Walter B. Hill, chancellor of Georgia university, which opens in the April and closes in the May number of the Kindergarten Magazine (Chicago), is an interesting as well as instructive paper.

The Anglo-Japanese treaty, by Dr. Maxey, of the University of Wisconsin, is the leader in the Arena for May, which contains also a symposium on Japanese Buddhism, a discussion of the popular election of United States senators, and in an article on "the iconoclast as a builder invites spiritual-minded agonistics to get together for constructive work."

The Railroad Trainmen's Journal (Cleveland) for May, opens with an interesting description of the native Mohammedan rulers of the Sulu islands, by an American corporal late in the volunteer service in the Philippines. In the same number W. H. Stuart, an "evolutionary" socialist, criticises "scientific" socialists, and Jose Gros makes a plea for the enthronement of morality in law, while F. A. Burlleigh exposes the fallacies lurking in the notion that "giving work" is a good thing.

The Single Tax Review (62 Trinity Place, New York) completes its first volume with the Spring number, which opens with the first installment of an account by Lewis H. Berens, of "the life and writings of Gerard Winstanley, the digger, the Henry George of the Commonwealth period" of English history. Among the other articles is a paper on the progress of the single tax movement, by Hamlin Russell; one on the character of the late James E. Mills, by John Filmer; Hamlin Garland's reminiscence address at a single tax dinner given in New York in his honor, and an address by John E. Turner on the meaning of the problem of taxation. The number is illustrated with half-tones of Richard George's busts of Henry George and Thomas G. Shearman.

Volume IV of The Public

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

BOUND VOLUMES NOW READY. PRICE, \$2.00.

Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

VOLUMES II AND III.

We have on hand a limited number of volumes II and III, bound in the regular half leather style of THE PUBLIC at \$2.00 per volume. Express charges to be paid by consignee.

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

THE MULTITUDE MAGAZINE.

The exponent of Imperial Socialism. The domination of the world by the white race united and perfected by socialism. Walter Vrooman, editor. 50c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 128 E. 28th St., New York City.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

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

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.

Table with 2 columns: Subscription type and Price. 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, 614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER, COUNSELOR AT LAW, BENNETT BLDG., 90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan. Tel. Call, 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012. NEW YORK.

THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of four weeks for 10 CENTS.