

town or social club, right or wrong; etcetera, etcetera; etc., etc., etc., &c., &c., &c., and so on. We have tried to imagine what kind of democratic paper *The Public* might be were it to aim to please fully every "democrat, but—," who is its enthusiastic admirer "in all respects but—" in its policy with reference to his own particular excentricity in the application of democratic principle. The result is somewhat staggering. We find that it would either consist of a series of blank pages, or be an imperialistic, anti-Filipino, pro-British, "nigger"-hating, Chinese-excluding, woman-dawdling, mammon-worshipping, organ of Hannaistic Republicanism. It wouldn't do.

Because some of the outer forms which have clothed more or less vague perceptions of democracy are being ruthlessly destroyed—now in South Africa, now in the Negro regions of the United States, now in the Philippines, and in general by the universal tendency to wealth concentration—there is a class of superficial writers who assert the decay of democracy. This is like the men who a generation ago asserted the collapse of religion because faith in literal interpretations of whale-and-Jonah stories was being successfully assailed. But true religion is to-day all the better for that iconoclastic experience; and so will true democracy be in the near future for the period of temptation through which it is passing now.

One of the assumptions of those who are now rejoicingly reciting the "dust to dust" and "ashes to ashes" committal service over what they regard as the dead body of democracy, an assumption which exposes the superficiality of their thought, is the notion that democracy consists in government by majorities; in the idea of "the greatest good for the greatest number," as it used to be expressed, or in that of "the mechanical basis of numbers," as it is put in this more "scientific" era. In fact that is not and never was democracy. Democracy consists in the right of every ma-

ture and sane individual to govern himself, so long as he does not injure his fellows. Inasmuch as some affairs are of common concern, some method of arriving at the common desire is necessary, and the mechanical basis of numbers is doubtless best. It is certainly far better than the monarchical basis of experts. But with reference to individual affairs, as distinguished from those which are common or non-distributable, government by majorities is as undemocratic as any other kind. And in so far as government by majority has been unsatisfactory, the failure can be traced not to democracy but to obtrusions by majorities upon private affairs. Recognition of this fact is one of the benefits which democracy may be reasonably expected to get out of the new ordeal which its enemies fatuously imagine to be its death agony. In the light of these considerations the attitude of the *Chicago Tribune* is interesting and instructive. That paper, admirably representing the Republican party, which has for a decade or more been shedding the democratic principles for which Abraham Lincoln stood, joins happily in the funeral chorus over democracy.

Several months ago we told (pp. 386-87) of a criminal prosecution against Helen Wilmans, of Florida, for carrying on a fraudulent business—"mental science." We told also of the stoppage of her mails by arbitrary orders from a bureau of the postal department. And now the Federal court rules in her case that no legal crime had been charged against her, because there was no evidence that her occupation had been devised with fraudulent intent. So this woman, legally guiltless of fraud, has been not only stigmatized as a common defrauder, but her mail has been confiscated and she has been deprived of the right to receive any letters addressed to her under her own name; they have been returned to the writers, stamped "fraudulent." And all this without trial, but upon the mere

arbitrary say-so of a bureau officer. How much longer ought Congress to allow that kind of bureaucratic power over the distribution of letters to exist?

Senator Bucklin and his supporters have passed triumphantly through an exasperating legislative fight to prevent the repeal of a proposed constitutional amendment before it could be submitted to the people. Their enemies were the speculative real estate ring of Denver and some of the larger cities. This was natural, for the amendment, if adopted, as it is now almost certain to be, would allow counties to shift tax burdens from enterprise in making improvements to the obstruction of mere land grabbing. One passage from one of the opposition speeches in the lower house shows how painfully scared the ring is at the danger to it of a popular vote. This acute orator begged, in the name of the people, that the people be not permitted to decide the question for themselves. He said:

I believe the people want the bill repealed, and are not in favor of letting the matter go to a vote next fall.

Queer people.

JOHN PETER ALTGELD.

I.

A bleak landscape stretching away from his open grave, fierce March winds bearing down the bitter cold of a northern blizzard as they howled through the leafless trees, tumbling waves beating on the near-by shore of the angry lake, and a lowering but not altogether sunless sky overhanging the scene—this was the emblematic tribute which external Nature paid to the memory of John P. Altgeld, while his friends returned his mortal part to the absorbing elements of the earth from which it came.

It was a grand and fitting tribute.

No other could so well have symbolized the man. The bleakness was the bleakness of March and not of December, of life renewing and not of life at an end; and the signs and sounds of stress and storm, in the midst of which the dead body lay—composed,

silent, indifferent, and as cold as the furious blast itself—pictured forth with graphic fidelity the story of a devoted life lived out to the mortal end in unflinching loyalty to principle and with cold indifference to the malignant clamorings and their inane echoes which had assailed it on every hand.

Nor was the picture wholly harsh.

Perfect artist that she is, Nature was faithful to the whole truth. She had cast a thin veil over the sky, and through the fleecy meshes of that token of grief, the bright sun thrust its softened rays to symbolize at once the hope which lies "beyond our mortal ken," and the tender love that had vitalized this brave man's nobly strenuous career.

Altgeld's transcendent love was known to all and felt by all who understood his ideals. What if it were true, as one of his political contemporaries writes of him, that "he had but few friends"? What matters that, if it be also true, as the same writer says, not admiringly but critically, that "he loved the whole human race"?

Can any man have greater love than that? Is not he of whom this can be said one of those radiant souls whose memory is most sacredly cherished by mankind? Surely we may say of Altgeld, then, in only slight paraphrase of the eloquent language of Henry George, whose career is now recognized to have been guided by the same comprehensive love, that in his breast there arose a desire, higher yet than the desire to "know how the globe was forged and the stars were hung and to trace to their sources the springs of life," that there arose in him that desire which is—

the passion of passions, the hope of hopes—the desire that he, even he, might somehow aid in making life better and brighter, in destroying want and sin, sorrow and shame. That in obedience to this desire he mastered and curbed the animal; that he turned his back upon the feast and renounced the place of power; that he sacrificed wealth and left it to men of narrower affections to gratify pleasant tastes and bask themselves in the warm sunshine of the brief day. That he worked for those he never saw and never could see; for a fame, or maybe but for a scant justice, that could only come long after the clouds had rattled upon

his coffin lid. That he toiled in the advance, where it was cold and there was little cheer from men, and the stones were sharp and the brambles thick. That amid the scoffs of the present and the sneers that stab like knives, he built for the future; and that he cut a trail which progressive humanity may hereafter broaden into a high road.

This career, so righteously inspired and so suddenly and splendidly closed to mortal comprehension, cannot have ended. Like the everlasting forces which we observe in material nature, it cannot, but go on forever in the direction in which it has set out. To question this is to doubt purpose in the universe; and to doubt universal purpose is to ignore the testimony offered even by physical law.

Though we excluded wholly from consideration the significance of the moral sense in man, to doubt universal purpose would be to disregard the significance of all that is rational in the theory of evolution itself. If moral character ended with physical disintegration, if it were a mere fleeting expression of chemical action and reaction, if the soul were analogous to the fruit instead of the seed of the tree, if the physical body only generated and maintained life instead of having derived its original impulse from life and being continually dependent upon the source of that impulse, if man were a material body with an ephemeral soul instead of an immortal soul with an ephemeral body, if the moral sense were only a crystallization of matter—if this conception of humanity were true, then, indeed, might the ideals of noble men be barren and all their service under righteous standards but a hopeless struggle. The universe would be utterly without beneficence and manifestly without purpose—a self-manufactured, self-perpetuating, self-operating, inconsequent and gigantic Frankenstein.

The imagination abhors and the reflecting intellect recoils from a monstrosity so hideous and irrational.

But the question of Altgeld's personal and conscious immortality need cause no dissension between those who believe in it and those who do not. He has entered into an immortality which all his admirers perceive more

or less clearly, however much they may disagree about its significance as a representation of spiritual immortality. For his dramatic death has served to cleanse his name and character of the evil reputation which sordid rascals manufactured for him and the thoughtless mob acknowledged; and in consequence the world will now see Altgeld as he was, and not as the "law and order" enemies of just law and true order painted him. With his real character thus revealed, his writings and speeches and other public acts will be appreciated by the many as only a few could appreciate them during his maligned career. Though his body lies mouldering in the grave, and even though the man himself had perished with his body, yet his works will go marching on, and with longer strides and infinitely greater effect than ever before.

II.

In considering the true character of this unique man, in connection with the vicious reputation which parasites gave him and the swell mob adopted, it is worthy of special mention that the qualities they now agree in attributing to him are the very qualities which in his lifetime they denied him. Then they said that he had neither ability nor honesty. But now they agree that ability and honesty were his distinguishing characteristics. Those who still speak of him as dangerous explain that it was his ability and honesty that made him so.

This encomium, so eminently just and known so to be by all who were familiar with the man's character, must come as a surprise to thousands who had learned through the same newspapers which now praise him for these distinguishing qualities, that he was an illiterate and brainless demagogue. But the motive for the slanders of Altgeld is not far to seek. While he lived it was necessary to discredit him in order to keep open the channels for respectable and legal plunder; and a hint was taken from the method of housebreakers who poison the watch dog in the yard before venturing to climb into the dwelling at the window. But now that he is dead, and supposedly no longer dangerous to the beneficiaries of vested wrongs, the truth about him is allowed to come out.

The pity of it all is, not that Altgeld was slandered by those whose villainies he fought. That was part of the fight. The pity of it is that the slanders of those he fought were believed and repeated by so many for whom he fought. Of him it was sadly true as of all the heroes of whom Lowell thought when he wrote—

...they were souls that stood alone,
While the men they agonized for
hurled the contumelious stone.

Two of these slanders upon Altgeld stand out in bold relief. One relates to his pardoning of the anarchists, and the other to his course in the Debs railroad strike of 1894. With reference to them there could be no more appropriate occasion than this for again setting forth the truth.

III.

The anarchist pardon was the culmination of a labor-meeting tragedy on Haymarket square, Chicago, on the 4th of May, 1886. A labor strike was in progress and a meeting of workmen had gathered at that point, early in the evening, to protest against the recent disturbance by policemen of a peaceable labor meeting and the killing of workmen in attendance. The mayor had been present at the meeting of protest and had remained until it was about to break up, whereupon he returned to the station house of the police precinct, and, after assuring the police captain that the meeting was orderly, went home. No sooner had he gone than the police captain, without further information, led a detachment of police to the meeting place and ordered the remnant of the meeting, there being still no disorder, to disperse. As the police approached, a bomb was thrown from an alley. It exploded and killed several policemen. No one knows or suspects to this day who it was that threw the bomb. Yet certain persons who have never been proved to have had any connection with the crime were convicted as co-conspirators of the unconvicted murderer. Some of them were hanged and some were sentenced to imprisonment. As these convicts had taught the doctrine that government by force is a moral crime, and that the abolition of coercive government would tend to foster order and peace

in society, they were called "anarchists."

When Altgeld came into the office of governor of Illinois he was petitioned to pardon the still living and imprisoned anarchists. Had he done so as matter of official mercy, there would have been no criticism. Thousands of Chicago citizens, including the wealthiest and most influential business men of the city, had signed the pardon petitions. The recent secretary of the treasury, Lyman J. Gage, was one of the active men in the pardon movement. There could, therefore, have been no condemnation of Gov. Altgeld had he simply pardoned the men. Indeed, the Chicago papers have said as much. A leading daily paper of the city, always hostile to Altgeld, has declared editorially within the past three years, referring to Altgeld's action in this matter, that—

Had he freed the so-called anarchists and assigned no reason therefor, the incident would speedily have been forgotten—even applauded as a wise exercise of executive clemency.

But Altgeld was not the man to bow before manifest injustice. Two kinds of petition were before him. One kind assumed the guilt of the prisoners and asked for clemency on the ground that they had suffered enough. The other asserted that guilt on the part of the prisoners and of their associates who had been hanged was never proved, but that the convictions had been secured by infamous methods of procedure. Having compared these two grounds of appeal, Gov. Altgeld said in the outset in his memorandum:

Upon the question of having been punished enough, I will simply say that if the defendants had a fair trial, and nothing has developed since to show that they were not guilty of the crime charged in the indictment, then there ought to be no executive interference, for no punishment under our laws could then be too severe. Government must defend itself; life and property must be protected, and law and order must be maintained. Murder must be punished, and if the defendants are guilty of murder, either committed by their own hands or by some one else acting on their advice, then, if they have had a fair trial, there should be in this case no executive interference. The soil of America is not adapted to the growth of anarchy. While our institutions are not free from injustice, they are

still the best that have yet been devised, and therefore must be maintained.

Let history decide which was right—Gov. Altgeld, who refused to pardon a crime so heinous, merely because the convicts had suffered a few years' imprisonment in expiation, or the leading citizens of Chicago, who asked a pardon for the men for that reason, but denounced the governor when he granted one because the convictions had been procured by unlawful methods.

When he had decided that no pardon could be properly granted if the men had been fairly convicted and still appeared to have been guilty, Gov. Altgeld turned his attention to the plea that the prisoners had been fraudulently convicted and were suffering unjustly. With extreme care this admittedly able and honest jurist personally examined the record of the trial; and there he found evidence of such gross distortions of the law and frauds upon it as to leave him no alternative, as a sincere man and upright magistrate, but to pardon the prisoners, not as an act of mercy to unfortunate criminals, but in simple justice to innocent and outraged men.

Instead of drawing the jury in the usual manner, from the body of the county, the trial judge had appointed a special officer, selected by the prosecuting attorney, to summon such jurors as he pleased.

This officer boasted in advance of the trial and while selecting jurors, that he was managing the case and that the prisoners would hang as certain as death, because he was calling such men as the prisoners would have to challenge peremptorily, thereby wasting their challenges, and that when these had been exhausted they would have to take such jurors as the prosecution wanted. And it all came out in that way. The prisoners did exhaust their challenges, and consequently did have thrust into the jury box to try them for their lives a body of men almost every one of whom had confessed in open court, upon entering the jury box, that he was prejudiced against the prisoners.

The attention of the trial judge being called to this proceeding and its

manifest injustice, he nevertheless declined to interfere, but on the contrary was strangely persistent in questioning confessedly hostile jurors, even those who said in terms they did not believe they could render a fair and impartial verdict, until, under the pressure of leading questions, they were led on to answer categorically that notwithstanding their hostile opinion already formed they believed they could try the case fairly on the evidence produced in court.

In the jury so selected there was at least one man who had not only formed and often expressed the opinion that the defendants were guilty, but who thought it "a pretty hard question to answer whether or not he would feel bound as a juror by these former expressions of his opinion." At least one other had an opinion in his "own mind that the defendants encouraged the throwing of that bomb," and also thought it "a pretty hard question to answer" whether or not he believed that his prejudice would influence his verdict.

By such jurors were the so-called anarchists convicted.

After the verdict of guilty, the prisoners moved for a new trial, and in connection with the motion they argued that the jury had been packed. Besides the circumstantial evidence on this point, they filed a formal charge that Otis S. Favor, one of the most reputable business men of Chicago, had been approached by the special bailiff already mentioned in a manner which furnished direct and positive proof of this crime against justice; but that Mr. Favor would not make an affidavit voluntarily, though he was willing to come into court and submit to interrogation. The trial judge refused, nevertheless, to call Favor and examine him, and also to consider his damning revelation unless his affidavit were produced.

On these facts alone, Gov. Altgeld was of opinion that justice demanded a pardon. But he went further.

Examining the decision of the Supreme Court of the state in the famous Cronin case, decided after the same Supreme Court had sustained the conviction of the anarchists, the governor found that in this case the court

had declared the Illinois rule as to the impartiality of jurors to be the very reverse of what had been accepted as correct procedure in the anarchist case. Said the court on this point in reversing the Cronin case conviction:

The holding of this and other courts is substantially uniform, that when it is once clearly shown that there exists in the mind of the juror, at the time he is called to the jury box, a fixed and positive opinion as to the merits of the case, or as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant he is called to try, his statement that, notwithstanding such opinion, he can render a fair and impartial verdict according to the law and evidence has little if any tendency to establish his impartiality. . . . To compel a person accused of a crime to be tried by a juror who has prejudged his case is not a fair trial. Nor should a defendant be compelled to rely, as his security for the impartiality of the jurors by whom he is to be tried, upon the restraining and controlling influence upon the juror's mind of his oath to render a true verdict according to the law and the evidence. His impartiality should appear before he is permitted to take the oath.

Had the principle of this decision in the Cronin case been applied to the anarchist case, a new trial would have been granted on the ground that the defendants were denied the benefit of an impartial jury. But public sentiment had been so strongly swayed by a local press bent on convicting these men, that its baneful influence reached even into the sanctuaries of the law, and found no resistance until it dashed against the unyielding cliffs of Governor John P. Altgeld's sturdy character.

The governor went even further than this. He inquired into the merits of the anarchist case as disclosed by the record made in court, and from that inquiry he concluded that—the facts tend to show that the bomb was thrown as an act of personal revenge, and that the prosecution has never discovered who threw it, and the evidence utterly fails to show that the man who did throw it ever heard or read a word coming from the defendants; consequently, it fails to show that he acted on any advice given by them. And if he did not act on or because of any advice coming from the defendants, either in speeches or through the press, then there was no case against them,

even under the law as laid down by Judge Gary [the trial judge].

So Gov. Altgeld pardoned the imprisoned anarchists. But as he did so because their guilt had never been proved, and their conviction was secured by a packed jury, he did more than pardon the imprisoned men. In effect he also acquitted the hanged men.

That was more than the "better element" of Chicago could bear, more than the local press which had hounded the men on to their death could tolerate. If Altgeld had made out a weak case, it would have been easy to put him down once for all. But the case he made was invincible, and the press, the "better element," even the judiciary of Chicago, stood condemned by the governor's historic pardon—condemned for judicial murder, convicted of lynching under the forms of law. There was the situation that aroused the vicious animosity of the classes against Altgeld, and helped foster it until his death forced the admission which in every fair mind must confirm his awful judgment against the pliant tools of a reckless press and a crazed community—the admission that he was an able and honest man.

IV.

The other slander upon Altgeld's character, that which relates to the Debs railroad strike of 1894, had to do with his statesmanship.

It is generally understood that Chicago was in a hopeless state of disorder, with which the governor, in a spirit of partisan sympathy with the strikers, refused to interfere; and that if President Cleveland had not come to the rescue with Federal troops Chicago might have been razed from its site. The truth is that the governor was performing his duty fully and faithfully, while the President committed the unpardonable constitutional offense of invading a state with Federal troops without the request and against the protest of its duly constituted authorities.

Immediately prior to the railroad strike a miners' strike in Illinois had demanded military interference in different parts of the state, and Gov. Altgeld had promptly and effectively

supplied the needed State troops. When the railroad strike broke out disturbances in connection with it occurred at various points in the State, and upon the application of local authorities for State troops Gov. Altgeld promptly forwarded them. At different times the Federal marshal of the Southern District of Illinois applied for State troops to aid him in executing the processes of the Federal courts, and his requests were complied with without delay. These circumstances indicate that if any applications had come from Chicago they would have met with a similar response. But no applications were received from that quarter. The resort to Federal troops was made without the slightest regard to the governor's authority and the dignity of the State. It was made, moreover, under the evident influence of a railroad ring.

President Cleveland had appointed a special counsel to represent the United States at Chicago in connection with the strike. Though the Cleveland administration was Democratic, the counsel selected was a Republican. Though the administration professed to have no special sympathy for corporations, the Republican it appointed was a corporation lawyer. Though it professed to be indifferent to the conflicting interests of the parties to the conflict—railroad corporations on one side and their striking employes on the other—the Republican corporation lawyer was also at the time the retained attorney of one of the railroads involved in the strike.

What the purpose of this railroad attorney, so invested with Federal authority, may have been is not generally known nor at all important. But in fact, one full day before there had been any damage to property in Chicago, and only the day after the roads had publicly declared that their business was proceeding without interference, he sent a dispatch to Washington calling for troops, and on the same day Federal troops appeared in the city and camped on the lake front.

"Up to this time," writes Gov. Altgeld, who is at last conceded to be an honest man, "there had been no serious

disturbance of mails, no destruction of property, and, according to the reports of the railroad managers themselves, no serious interference with the operation of the railroads or with interstate commerce."

So grave an assault upon the sovereignty of the State could not have been ignored by any governor without gross neglect of his sworn duty. Gov. Altgeld accordingly sent a respectful protest to President Cleveland, in which he assumed that the President must have been misinformed as to the situation, explained that the ample military force of Illinois was at the service of the Federal government for the enforcement of the Federal laws and had not been sent to Chicago because no request for aid had come from there, and, after supporting his general statements by a circumstantial narration of the facts, concluded with these dignified words:

As governor of the State of Illinois, I protest against this [the ordering of Federal troops into Chicago], and ask the immediate withdrawal of the Federal troops from active duty in the State. Should the situation at any time get so serious that we cannot control it with the State forces, we will promptly ask for Federal assistance, but until such time I protest with all due deference against this uncalled for reflection upon our people, and again ask the immediate withdrawal of the troops.

To that respectful message of a Democratic governor to a Democratic president there came a reply which, save for its insulting tone, might have been dictated by a Federalist of the old school. It made no pretense that military assistance had been either sought from or withheld by the State, but stated that the troops had been sent to Chicago upon the demand of the postal and the law officers of the United States—a justification which, if valid, would utterly annihilate statehood at the whim of a district attorney or a postmaster; and it concluded with the gratuitous and obviously insulting suggestion that in thus sending Federal troops into Chicago without consulting with the State officials there had "been no intention of thereby interfering with the plain duty of the local authorities to preserve the peace of the city;" a peace, by the way, which

was not broken until after the Federal troops appeared.

In reply to that extraordinary message from the President, Gov. Altgeld telegraphed a statesmanlike explanation of the constitutional grounds upon which his protest rested, closing with the further respectful assurance that the very presence of Federal troops in Chicago was a menace to the peace of the city, because it had "aroused the indignation of a large class of people who, while upholding law and order, had been taught to believe in local self-government, and, therefore, resented what they regarded as unwarranted interference." His final words were—

Inasmuch as Federal troops can do nothing but what the State troops can do there, and believing that the State is amply able to take care of the situation and enforce the law, and believing that the ordering out of the Federal troops was unwarranted, I again ask their withdrawal.

The President returned to this respectful, thoughtful and statesmanlike message another curt reply. Said he—

While I am still persuaded that I neither transcended my authority or duty in the emergency that confronts us, it seems to me that in this hour of danger and public stress discussion may as well give way to active effort on the part of all authority to restore obedience to law and protect life and property.

Could utter indifference to the fundamental law of the nation be more plainly expressed, without departing from diplomatic phrases and adopting colloquial terms? And now we are reaping some of the harvest of this indifference. When a Democratic president, without the excuse of necessity—for the troops of the State had been offered by the governor to enforce the Federal laws—imperiously silenced the argumentative protest of a faithful governor whose state had been invaded by Federal troops, the seeds of the imperialism which is now rampant and defiant under Republican authority, were sown in the public mind.

The comparative qualities of Gov. Altgeld as a profound Democratic statesman may be safely left to the unbiased historian who compares his able state paper on the question of or-

dering Federal troops upon active duty into a State, with the autocratic replies of his antagonist in this passage at arms in the field of higher politics.

V.

One of Altgeld's acts as governor was never openly criticised. It is briefly told by the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican paper, from which we quote:

In the 1895 session of the legislature . . . franchise corporation bills were passed very like those which made the session of 1897 a reproach. Mr. Altgeld could have made a million, and probably millions, by letting them become laws, but they were vetoed.

The truth is that one million dollars in cash had been placed at Altgeld's disposal, under circumstances which would have enabled him to appropriate it with absolute safety to himself. The sole condition was that he should sign those bills. But he vetoed the bills.

At that time Altgeld's pecuniary difficulties were pressing. From a rich man he had become comparatively poor, through no fault of his own but chiefly because he refused to join any of the respectable rings that make money for themselves and squeeze money out of others by means of predatory laws. The legislature had been bribed to enact the corporation bills in question. They were so thoroughly bribed that the Senate passed them even over Altgeld's veto, and in the House only a few votes of the necessary two-thirds were lacking. The latter body remained in session long past its hour for sine die adjournment, turning back the official clock for the sake of appearances, to allow the corporation lobbyists time to buy their goods. Altgeld's veto stood, in spite of the Democratic leader on the floor, in spite of the Republican speaker in the chair, in spite of the lobbyists all over the House, and in spite of as fine an aggregation of respectable gentlemen at Chicago furnishing the funds as one could wish to meet.

Yet all this might have been avoided. Nothing was needed but another respectable gentleman of the same marauding type in the governor's chair. Had Altgeld signed those bills he might have retrieved his broken

fortunes, have grown as rich as the richest, have been honored by a debased press and fawned upon by the sycophants, might have gone to associate and conspire with other such characters in the Federal Senate, and instead of being denounced as a reactionary demagogue been lauded as a progressive statesman. But he was too able to be beguiled and too honest to betray his trust. He held the mercenary plotters back, knowing full well that the rich and influential ones among them would punish him without mercy. And they did. They plotted against this able and honest governor until even the wreckage of his fortune had disappeared. Yet, through it all he defied them and went his way—impoverished, lonely, but faithful.

VI.

Democracy like that which inspired John P. Altgeld to excite the vindictive wrath of corporation influences by challenging the Federal administration of his own party when it cast aside party ideals and defied national limitations by invading a state of which he was governor with an armed force; sincerity like that which inspired him to incur obloquy by pardoning unpopular prisoners because they had been unjustly convicted, though he might have avoided censure by giving them their liberty as an act of grace; honesty like that which impelled him, rather than bow before Baal, to sacrifice the private fortune he already had and to refuse another which he could have got without even the asking, winning at the same time applause from the powerful but sordid moneyed interests which had bribed both political parties in his legislature and needed only his signature to make their conquest of enormously valuable public privileges complete—these were the qualities which made Altgeld's patriotism vital.

Voters tell us they want able men in office; but do they? Altgeld's ability is conceded, but they turned him out of office. He was too able to be the tool of corporations unconsciously.

They say they want honest men in office; but do they? Altgeld's honesty is now admitted, but they turned him out of office. He was too honest to become the agent of corrupt and

corrupting corporations consciously.

They say they are hunting with lanterns for sincere men. But if they are, why do the rays of their lanterns never search out the man of sincerity, through the shadows of predeceous misrepresentation and malignant abuse, until after he is dead?

It was a brief and painful life, that of this able, honest, sincere, unyielding and unswerving, democratic statesman; but it closed as all such men might wish to have their own lives close. His sincere democracy made him plead the cause of the Filipinos; not for their sake alone, but for ours as well. It made him plead the cause of the Boers; not for their liberties alone, but for English liberty too. And in this fight for democracy, facing overwhelming odds, but with democratic truths pouring hot from his lips, he died while yet hardly past the middle years of human life. But now as of old, and with John P. Altgeld as with all other men, the inspiring words which Macaulay attributes to Horatius still hold true, as they ever will:

Then out spake brave Horatius,
The captain of the gate:
"To every man upon this earth
Death cometh soon or late.
And how can man die better
Than facing fearful odds,
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his gods."

NEWS

A sensation second only to that of the capture of Gen. Methuen by the Boers, reported last week, was caused on the 13th by news that Methuen had been released. His captors brought him to Klerksdorp and delivered him over to the British without conditions.

Regarding the particulars of the battle in which Gen. Methuen was captured, but little news from newspaper sources is at hand, the British censorship being especially strict with reference to this event; but Lord Kitchener's official report of Gen. Methuen's account of the affair is in substance as follows: When the Boers pressed a flank attack, the British mounted troops attempted to fall back on the infantry and got completely out of control. A rout ensued. With 200 men and two guns Lord