

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1901.

Number 144.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

The London Speaker naively reminds Lord Roberts that the war in South Africa is [still] over.

The American counterpart of the Philippines to the British in the Transvaal, phrases our plight somewhat differently. Recent dispatches from the Philippines assure the folks at home that "the bottom of the insurrection is dropping out, but an early reduction of the army would be fatal"!

By releasing himself from his street railroad responsibilities in Detroit, ex-Congressman Tom L. Johnson makes a further advance toward the realization of his long-cherished intention of wholly devoting his energies to undermining the fundamental causes of poverty in this era of great productive power.

The treasury officials at Washington express their gratification over the rapid refunding of the national debt. They announce a saving of interest in the refunding so far made of \$10,000,000. No boast is offered of success in perpetuating the debt. Yet that is the principal object of the refunding policy, and its success is promising.

Reluctant advocates of the theory that women are inferior creatures will be glad to learn that out of 62 applicants for licenses as registered pharmacists under the New York law, Mrs. Marietta Harmon, of Syracuse, one of the inferior creatures, has received the highest rating. It is not

only higher than that of any of her 61 competitors, but the highest ever given. The New York state board of pharmacy rated her examination as perfect.

One of the vice president elect's contributions to the gaiety of nations at the close of the nineteenth century was a remark, in his speech on "The Prospects of Young Men in the Twentieth Century," to the young men of the continent gathered at various Y. M. C. A. halls. "Woe to us as a nation," he said, "if we ever follow the lead of men who seek not to smother but to inflame the wild-beast qualities of the human heart." Next to the emperor of Germany, the man who in our generation has done most to "inflame the wild beast qualities of the human heart," and been boastfully proud of his inflammatory distinction, is this same Theodore Roosevelt.

Maj. John R. Lynch, of Memphis, who is said to enjoy the distinction of being the only negro paymaster in the army, is evidently a shrewd observer. Having been in Cuba, he says that nine-tenths of the people want independence; and that nobody wants annexation but the foreigners and a few land-holding Cubans. Yet they hardly dare express themselves, he concludes, so overwhelming is the sentiment the other way. Maj. Lynch regards this as ungrateful on the part of the Cubans. He thinks apparently that as "the United States drove out the Spanish tyrants," it ought to be welcomed in their place. It does not occur to him that independence is a sentiment which possibly other people than black and white Americans may cherish. And he forgets that when the United States drove out the Spanish it did so under a pledge to recognize Cuban independence. By the

way, there is significance in the fact that Cuban landowners want annexation. When we remember the simple, not to say obvious, truth, that landowners benefit at the expense of land users, much as slave owners benefit at the expense of slaves, it is possible to infer that the Cuban landowners expect the United States to be less particular about the rights of land users than the privileges of landowners.

Since ex-President Cleveland has emerged from his political hibernation upon hearing of Bryan's second defeat, he has kept the linotype machines active. One piece of advice he gives has reference to the length of the presidential term. He would extend it. In support of this proposition he advances two arguments. In the first place, business and other important interests would be less frequently "disturbed and disquieted by the turmoil and heat of a presidential election;" and in the second, "a substantial extension of the executive tenure would pave the way for establishing the ineligibility of an incumbent to succeed himself." What length of tenure he would personally prefer, Mr. Cleveland does not say; but that which would best meet his expressed objections to the four-year term would be a tenure for life. Short of the abolition of popular elections altogether, that would be most effective in lessening the frequency of "the turmoil and heat of a presidential election;" and it would completely establish "the ineligibility of an incumbent to succeed himself."

Great Britain begins the new century with an exasperating and apparently irrepressible war upon her hands, in which the outlook is gloomier to her than it was a year ago.

This war is in a double sense one of her own making. She forced it upon the Boers in the first place, by pressing forward a policy that was obviously intended to culminate in the abrogation of Boer independence in South Africa. And when she had achieved a victory, she forced the Boers into the adoption of guerrilla tactics by the relentless terms of peace she demanded. The Boers offered to negotiate. Lord Salisbury refused to listen. He demanded unconditional surrender, and clearly indicated his purpose of totally wiping out Boer independence. The Boers appealed to other nations to intercede for peace. The United States gingerly transmitted the appeal to Lord Salisbury, and he responded with a curt refusal to tolerate intercession of any sort. Annexation and nothing short of that would satisfy British honor. So annexation was proclaimed. A British military government was set up. And naturally enough the Boers began a system of guerrilla warfare. It was their only recourse. The British commanders retaliated by making war upon women and children. They imitated the reconcentrado policy of Weyler, and even outdid Weyler's cruelty by burning farm houses over large districts. So indefensible was their policy in this respect, that after the world began to learn of it, when it had been in operation for half a year, Lord Roberts himself was obliged to order its modification. But the modification came too late. Every possible disposition to submit had been beaten out of the Boers; death had become preferable to submission. And now, spurred on by Lord Salisbury's relentless policy of subjugation and Kitchener's merciless policy of destruction, they have not only revived the war, but have carried the seat of active operations over the Orange river and far down into British territory. Nor have they abandoned the fight at home. Over a field 500 miles long from south to north, and from 50 to 200 from east to west, they are making the British respect their valor

as soldiers and their devotion to the cause of their independence. This revival of their war in South Africa is the penalty the British people have to suffer for Salisbury's arrogance. Whatever may have been the merits of the war originally, there is no room to deny that its destructive revival has been forced by Salisbury's policy of unconditional submission and unqualified subjugation.

Arthur Saiter, the son of a well-known citizen of Vincennes, Ind., who has just returned from military scenes in the Philippines, bringing back an honorable discharge and one leg, gives a report of the situation in the Philippines which does credit to the good sense of himself and his comrades. He declares that the soldiers who have seen active service are generally of one opinion. They regard it as a waste of time, labor, money and lives to hold Luzon. They believe that we shall not get back one-tenth of what we spend on Luzon if we keep the island a thousand years. But they are sure that the only way to "quiet the insurrection is either to exterminate the natives or withdraw the troops." But Mr. Saiter and his comrades have evidently not given full weight to the possibilities of that rich Luzon mine a mile high, the report of which so profoundly impressed Mr. McKinley; nor to the chances for lumber speculation in Luzon, in which the chairman of the house military committee is so deeply interested.

Among the new century greetings to the Red Cross society in response to its invitations, were four messages which we should like to see preserved for the enlightenment of posterity. One was in these words:

I bring you the stately matron named Christendom, returning bedraggled, besmirched and dishonored from pirate raids in Kiao-Chou, Manchuria, South Africa and the Philippines, with her soul full of meanness, her pocket full of boodle and her mouth full of pious hypocrisies. Give

her soap and towel, but hide the looking glass.

In this generation that message will be recognized as the work of Mark Twain. It could have come from no other pen. Let it serve to remind future generations of the greatest humorist of his time, whose humor seldom failed to rise above mere fun into the realms of Christian philosophy. The three other messages are as follows:

During this century we have on a whole moved upward; I hope we shall continue so to move, but whether we do or not will ultimately depend upon whether on the average the individual man shows courage, honesty, common sense and a knowledge of duty alike to himself and to others.

I send cordial greetings to the American National Red Cross on its auspicious entrance upon the enlarged fields of usefulness with the new century.

During the century just closing the Red Cross society has done much to alleviate the sufferings of the battlefield. Let us greet the twentieth century with the hope that a higher regard for the inalienable rights of man and a broader recognition of the people as the source of power will hasten the coming of the day when nations will have war no more.

The first two would not be worth preserving but for the important official stations of their authors. One is commonplace, and the only principle it suggests is that principle out of which all tyrannies grow—the principle of courage in the performance of self-assumed duties toward one's self and others without reference to the rights of either. Its author needs to learn that duties and rights are correlative. The second is a pompous piece nothingness. Need it be explained that Vice President-elect Roosevelt wrote the first and President McKinley the second? The third is worth preserving for its own sake. Relating 'rights and duties reciprocally, it makes an eloquent call to the higher levels of patriotism. Its author is a simple citizen, but one whose fame this message alone should preserve long after the men who wrote the other two are remembered only