

the report of the Pennsylvania commissioner of internal affairs, the average wages were three cents less per day in 1899 than in 1896.

It is further remarked by Col. Wright in his September Bulletin, that "the figures for 1899 to 1900 show a gratifying average increase over the conditions of 1891 and 1892, when wages in gold were higher than at any period in the history of the country prior to the present year." This last statement, as Col. Wright must be well aware, is not true. Fairly summarized, the data of the Aldrich report show wages (gold values) 20 per cent. lower in 1891 than in 1873. In a full and fair analysis of the data of the Aldrich report, made in "Present Concentration of Wealth in the United States," by Charles B. Spahr, Mr. Spahr proves that result. Only by the most palpable juggling of figures can the Aldrich report be made to show even a slight increase in wages in 1891 over 1872 or 1873.

H. L. BLISS.

Chicago.

THE PARTY OF PROGRESS.

In a country which believes in progress it is natural that every party should claim that it is the party of progress. It is manifest, however, that this claim cannot in all cases be substantiated. Two parties diametrically opposed to each other on vital issues cannot both be parties of true progress. As a matter of fact, in every great contest in the political world, like our present national campaign, one of the two great parties represents and embodies the principle of real and true advance, genuine growth and progress, while the other represents and embodies the principle of retrogression and decay, perhaps even the principle of revolution and ruin. Which is which in the present conflict?

It will not do to judge in such a matter by professions or declaimings. The body that mouths the most about the forward march, expansion and the like, may really be the retrogressive or revolutionary party, claiming everything but cloaking its real designs, intentions and tendencies under fine phrases and loud boasts.

Nor will it do to judge entirely by the past, without taking into consideration new factors that may arise.

Men change. Parties change. Issues change. Nothing is more frequent in human experience than to see a party which has gained one great victory for reform or human progress pitch its tent upon the once won field, become demoralized through giving itself over to the enjoyment of captured spoils upon its Capuan plain, or fight to the death those who desire to win another victory and make another advance.

The republican party of to-day loudly claims to be the party of progress. It ardently and noisily proclaims itself as the advocate of expansion. Its claim, however, will not bear analysis.

The forcible annexation of conquered territory and unwilling people is no more expansion, in any true sense of the word, than the dropsy is healthy growth. The dropsy adds to a person's weight. The imperialistic annexation of purchased or subjugated peoples adds, likewise, to the nation's extent. But in each case there is the addition of disease, there is gross and perilous deterioration, there is the surrender of health—in the one case individual, in the other national. How can we extend our institutions to the Philippines when, in order to reach and seize them, we drop our institutions on the way? How can we extend our government over the Filipinos when, to govern them at all, we must abandon the fundamental principles upon which our government is based and degenerate until we become low and base enough to join the barbaric parade of nations whose only right is might and whose only god is greed? How can we even expand our trade when we either kill those with whom we are talking of trading or treat them in such fashion as to invite their everlasting enmity? Is it not easier to trade with live men than with dead men? Is it not easier to trade with friends than with foes? We might have had—we might still have—the friendship of the Filipinos, by the simple expedient of treating them justly, a road "as plain as way to parish church." The contention that imperialistic subjugation is essential or even advantageous to trade expansion is an argument too hollow and too canting to deserve aught but contempt. Trade follows

the flag! How comes it then that the trade of the United States is larger with Great Britain than with any other country in the world? How comes it that Great Britain's trade is greater with the United States than with any other country in the world? Alleyne Ireland shows, in his recently issued work on "Tropical Colonization," that while the annual purchases of English goods average only \$1.02 for each colonial subject, such purchases average \$1.50 for each citizen of the United States. Furthermore, Mr. Ireland shows that the United Kingdom's tropical colonies consume annually only 71 cents' worth of English goods per head of population. Trade follows the flag? Bosh! It follows the converging lines of demand and supply.

In flat contradiction of the contention that the conquest of distant and alien peoples is genuine or truly profitable national expansion, history speaks. James Anthony Froude unanswerably says, in his life of Julius Caesar, modestly called by him "A Sketch"—"If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this, that free nations cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties." Prof. Thorold Rogers, in his admirable "Story of Holland," bears like testimony. He says: "If one searches through history, one can never find a single case in which public opulence can be traced to foreign conquest, in which the cost to the public of occupying and maintaining such conquests has not been greatly in excess of all the profit which private interests have secured from them." No standard or reliable historian says other than this. This is the verdict of universal history. Is it "progress" to disdain the universal lesson of all trustworthy history?

The simple fact of the case is that the present republican administration's course in regard to both Puerto Rico and the Philippines is the most marked retrogression. It is reversion to the barbaric type of government, the type our revolutionary forefathers had outgrown—government resting on no better basis than military

force. The republican party's policy is grossly and greatly revolutionary. It involves the subversion of all the principles which justified our separation from Great Britain, of all the fundamental principles of national righteousness and a people's liberty.

On the other hand, no clear, unprejudiced eyes can fail to discern that, whatever the democratic party may or may not have been under Polk, Buchanan or Cleveland, the democracy of to-day is the true party of progress. It advocates the expanded application of the principles of free government—the application of them to the orient and to South Africa as well as to America. It has pronounced in favor of direct legislation, which means the bringing of governmental functions into more direct and complete touch with the people. It declares in favor of the abolition of private monopoly and special privilege, which means the abolishment of governmental favoritism for the classes and the guaranteeing of governmental justice to the masses. The republican idea of prosperity is this: Make the few prosperous by favoring tariffs, by granting franchises, by the bestowal of various and sundry special privileges; then some drops of prosperity will trickle down until they reach the very least and lowest. The democratic idea of prosperity is this: Every special privilege helps one or a few but injures the many; the only law for establishing and maintaining prosperity for the common people is the law of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Along all these lines, as well as others we have not named, the democracy of to-day is the party of genuine progress, notwithstanding the fact that unlike its adversary it does not perpetually mouth the word.

But the most important thing to-day is not even true progress. It is important to distinguish the true from the false, and to make note of the fact that the republican party of to-day is headed towards the centralization of wealth and power in the hands of the few, and is rapidly moving in that direction, while the living democracy of to-day is faced towards equality of rights, equity in

governmental administration, the uplifting of the pyramid of humanity by lifting its lowermost stratum. More important even than progress, however, is conservation; and the democracy of to-day is the party of conservatism, in the true and good sense of that much-abused word.

What step of progress in the realm of material invention or discovery could compensate us for the loss of the printing press? Or of written language? Or of articulate speech? None whatever. Could aerial navigation? Could liquid air as a motor? Could the discovery of some new fuel? Certainly not. No step of advancement we can conceive would or could compensate us for the loss of any of the great acquisitions of the past which we have named. More important, then, by far, than any new advance in art or science is the holding fast that which humanity has, through ages past, already won.

The same is true in the political world. No step of progress, however great, no advancement, either apparent or real, could possibly compensate us for the loss of the ground already gained. Out of the past there reach the hands of generations gone before—the tear-wet, toil-scarred, blood-stained hands of struggling humanity—entrusting to our use and trusteeship the infinitely rich and precious heritage of the past. The founders and saviors of this republic have handed down to us the unspeakably sacred heritage of free government, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. Shall we barter this away for whatever somebody calls "prosperity" or "expansion" or "progress," but which certainly is the abandonment of all that Thomas Jefferson lived for and Abraham Lincoln died for?

Remember that not all motion is progress. A ship is said to "make distance" whenever it traverses the water as measured by the log. But it may be "making distance" towards a peaceful harbor, or towards a maelstrom, or the rocks upon which it will be dashed asunder.

Remember that reversion, deterioration, degeneration, is, for the nation, as well as for the individual organism, always possible. The ship's barnacle begins life as a member of the verte-

brate sub-kingdom, the highest of the five sub-kingdoms into which the animal kingdom is divided; but it soon attaches itself to some ship's hulk, or some old piece of wood, adopts a retrogressive life, and loses the myelonic or cerebral eye, the perforated gill-slits, the spinal cord; the backbone, the interior articulated skeleton—loses all the five characteristics of the vertebræ, and becomes like unto a man standing on his head and kicking his food into his mouth.

Social or national organisms may also degenerate and at length perish. Rome declined. Israel fell. Athens perished. Shall America follow in their footsteps? The policy of the republican party of to-day is making distance toward the rocks on which popular government goes to pieces. Imperialism, disguise it how they will, is but reversion towards the barbaric type of government; it is degeneracy worse than that of the ship's barnacle.

The paramount issue of the present national campaign, then, is not, Shall we achieve this or that step of further progress? but this: Shall we preserve the infinitely rich heritage bequeathed to us by the builders and makers of free government, or shall we surrender this heritage at the bidding of selfish ambition or commercial greed? Shall we hold fast what the past has won and handed down to us as our sacred inheritance, or shall we barter this away for the sake of a little gold and glory?

An Irish land-lubber went on board ship, and, help being scarce, was one night given the helm and told to steer straight by the north star. Presently Patrick went to sleep, and by the time he awoke the ship had veered and drifted 'round until the north star hung over the ship's stern. Patrick carefully kept the vessel in that position the rest of the night, and when, at daybreak, the captain came on deck and found the vessel far out of her true course he soundly berated Patrick for failing to follow his instructions to steer straight by the north star. Patrick replied: "Faith, and we sailed past that star long ago!"

The republican party would have us believe that we sailed past the star of liberty long ago; that the Declara-