

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1898.

Number 8.

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.

There appears to be little doubt at the hour of going to press that Admiral Cervera's fleet is in the harbor of Santiago, on the southern coast and near the eastern extremity of Cuba. This harbor is approached by a narrow channel, through which but one ship can pass at a time, whether going in or out. It is, therefore, not likely that the American fleet will venture in over the destructive mines with which the channel is certainly defended; and it is certain that the Spanish fleet cannot emerge, even though the mouth of the harbor be guarded by only a small detachment from either Schley's or Sampson's squadron. Admiral Cervera, then, unless he surrenders, is likely to pass the remainder of the war period in Santiago harbor.

It may well be asked why the Spanish fleet crossed the Atlantic and came into the enemy's sphere of operations, if it could find nothing more effective to do there than to dodge the enemy's ships for a week and then bottle itself up in a harbor from which it cannot emerge, and in which it can render no service. Time may answer the question. An explanation now can only be inferred. The probabilities indicate that Cervera crossed the Atlantic for the purpose of establishing a rendezvous for the Spanish fleet at San Juan. Clearly San Juan was the point for which he was making when he stopped at Martinique and first disclosed his presence in American waters. Had he succeeded in quietly entering San Juan harbor, he might have held Sampson off until the Cadiz squadron

could slip in and join him, or, if necessary, assail Sampson in the rear. In either case the Spanish would have had a good rallying point. But instead of finding San Juan open, Cervera found it under bombardment, and was obliged to accept a battle which he wished to avoid, or to dodge. He dodged. And if he is in fact in Santiago, the Cadiz fleet is now as harmless as his own, and the end of the war is near. With one formidable part of her fleet held in check by a small part of ours, with another part at the bottom of Manila Bay, and with the third part much inferior to the force that we could safely withdraw from our Cuban squadrons, Spain can hardly hope much longer to keep on playing her game of war in the hope that something may turn up to bring other European nations to her aid. There was an inclination to sniff at Sampson's bombardment of San Juan, but it may prove to have been the decisive event of the war.

Capt. Clark, of the Oregon, is said to have sent to the Board of Strategy, when fears were entertained for his safety, the following message: "Don't tangle me up with instructions. I am not afraid of the whole Spanish fleet." In the latter sentence there is a good deal of the spirit of Yankee bluff; but it is no worse than Spanish bravado, and the first sentence redeems it with Yankee sense. The greatest danger we have to confront in this war, so far as the war itself is concerned, is not the Spanish fleet; it is the tangling up of military and naval officers with instructions from Washington.

A number of antique preachers at the Presbyterian general assembly, at Winona Lake, Ind., last week, during a discussion of the question of Sun-

day observance, bunched themselves with the pious gentlemen of old Judea who on a memorable occasion criticized the gathering of corn on the Sabbath. There happened, however, to be no one present at Winona Lake to administer the Judean rebuke. Some of these nineteenth century by-law worshipers objected to riding on railroads on Sunday. "You can't ride on Sunday morning, and atone by preaching in the evening!" exclaimed one of the pietists. Many others shouted, "Yes!" to the inquiry: "Do you condemn the metropolitan clergy for riding on street cars on Sunday?" And one remnant of New England puritanism, who hailed, however, from Baltimore, said that he had given up eating ice cream on Sundays, because he liked it! It would be interesting to know what the Nazarene would have said, had He been present in the flesh when these pagans were thus expressing themselves.

It is significant that so many clergymen—of the Christian, in contradistinction to the pietistic type—have accepted the teachings of Henry George. Chief among these, perhaps, is Father McGlynn, the Roman Catholic priest whose controversy with the mediæval archbishop of New York, from which Dr. McGlynn emerged the victor after an appeal to the pope, attracted universal attention a few years ago. The controversy was over the right of a Catholic priest to hold and publicly advocate George's doctrines; and by overruling the archbishop and reinstating Dr. McGlynn in the priestly office from which the archbishop had removed him, the pope decided in favor of that right. Many other Catholic priests are in accord with Dr. McGlynn on this subject, though he is the most famous. To the list of clergymen who believe

in Henry George's single tax the Episcopal church also contributes. Bishop Huntington, of the diocese of Central New York, is one. His son, Father Huntington, is another. Still another is Dean Williams, of Trinity cathedral, Cleveland, Ohio, whose graphic paper on the right to the use of the earth, read before the Boston single tax society last winter, and published in pamphlet form by the National Single Taxer, of Minneapolis, identifies him most distinctly with the George movement. Dean Williams is a man of extraordinary eloquence and force. In the Church of the Disciples, Rev. Harris R. Cooley, also of Cleveland, is a notable follower of George; and among the Presbyterians Rev. S. S. Craig, the Canadian, may be said to lead the list. The Methodists also contribute a strong Canadian in Rev. Salem Bland. Among the Swedenborgians, clergymen of pronounced single tax views are numerous, while the Congregationalists and the Jews are well represented. Rabbi Sale, of St. Louis, is a leading single taxer. To give the names of even a small proportion of the ministers of all denominations who have found inspiration in George's writings and volunteered to propagate the truths he taught, would require an alphabetical index for convenient reference. One name, however, that of a man who to the general religious and educational public of America is perhaps best known of all, must not be omitted. We refer to Prof. George D. Herron, D. D., of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa. Prof. Herron's tendencies at first were regarded as socialistic; but of his complete acceptance of Henry George's doctrines there is now from his writings no room for doubt. Among the later acquisitions to the single tax movement is Rev. Alexander Kent, of the People's church, Washington, D. C., whose sermon on the subject, which appears in the May number of "Why?" published at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is an exceptionally discriminating and forceful presentation of the substance of George's teachings.

A recent discussion of the theory of an Austrian professor of embryology who holds that the sex of children is determined wholly by the mother, has brought out some arguments which go to show the shallowness of much that is said for pre-natal influences, including the influences of heredity, upon the minds and morals of children. One well-known physician, arguing that while the mother has a potent influence hers is not the only one, is quoted as saying: "A clever father having five children and a dull wife will be lucky if more than one rises above mediocrity intellectually; but, per contra, if a clever woman is married to a dull husband and has five children, probably four will be bright. Even here, however, we see the male has still some influence, for history shows us that the finest intellects come from the union of a bright father and mother." This observation is especially valuable because it admirably illustrates the tendency of heredity theorists to ignore an influence which is certainly not less potent than pre-natal conditions, namely, the influence of environment. The ordinary man of common sense, if he stopped to think when told that a clever father having five children and a dull wife would be lucky if more than one of the children rose above mediocrity intellectually, would suspect the reason to be that during the impressionable years of the children their mental development had been influenced chiefly by the mother, through her maternal relationship, which during that period is as a rule closer and more impressive than the relationship of the father. If then this ordinary man of common sense were told that on the other hand, if a clever woman is married to a dull husband and has five children probably four will be bright, he would regard his suspicion as fairly well verified. And if after that he were told that history shows that the finest intellects come from a bright father and mother, he would conclude that the child's future intellectually is

determined not at all by heredity, but wholly by his bringing up. In so concluding, he might be in error. Heredity doubtless plays a part in the physical qualities of men, and it may play a part also in their mental qualities. But he would not be so grossly in error as is the speculative scientist or faddist who turns to heredity for an explanation of all mental and moral peculiarities, while leaving environment wholly out of consideration.

When the supreme court of Washington was about to pass upon the constitutionality of a law of that state prohibiting the specific enforcement of contracts for payments in gold coin, it introduced a method of reaching sound conclusions which might well be imitated by appellate courts generally, whenever questions affecting the public at large are before them. It invited the leading lawyers of the state, though not interested in the case, to submit briefs supplementary to those of the regularly retained counsel. The only objection to this innovation is that it does not go far enough. It ought to be the privilege of every lawyer to submit a brief on questions of law in any case, without being either retained by one of the parties directly in interest or personally invited by the court. Since decisions become precedents affecting interests far beyond those immediately involved, there should be an orderly method by which all persons who are to be affected by the decision as a precedent may be heard. In the Washington case, the innovation does not appear to have worked very well. The court decided that the law in controversy was unconstitutional because it undertook to regulate a subject over which congress has exclusive control. When it is considered that the law did not assume to determine what is legal tender, nor to interfere with contracts already made, but only to provide that future contracts made payable in gold coin may be satisfied with "any kind of lawful money or currency of