

ress should always be prepared by thorough organization. In my opinion the absolute and unreversible triumph of our principles may be looked for not later than 1904 if it does not come to us earlier.

These suggestions are not in the nature of prophecy, but are based upon the reasonable expectation that the alternation of periods of prosperity and depression which have followed each other during the last century with the regularity of changes in the moon's phases will continue for some time in the future.

As to the issues which will be paramount in the next three elections, I can but surmise. In my opinion the money question will be the paramount issue of the campaign of 1900 and may cut an important figure in the state campaign of 1902. The land question in some form will, I think, be one of the prominent issues, if not the paramount issue, in the campaign of 1904. Whether it will take the form of a struggle for the adoption of the single-tax or otherwise I do not attempt to predict, but it will be a movement intended to attach the people of our country to the soil of our country as the holders and owners of independent homes; to turn back the tide of rural population now congesting the labor markets of our cities, restore the individual independence of our citizens which for the last 30 years has been steadily undermined, and elevate American labor to a plane of industrial freedom and freedom of opportunity never before enjoyed in the history of the world. That in my opinion is the destiny and the early destiny of our nation. The alternative is the fall of our republic, not through revolution nor by invasion, but through the destruction of liberty by monopoly.

During the depression from which we are just emerging I saw a newspaper published in one of the middle western states which contained 12 pages of foreclosure notices embracing about 30 notices to the page. Every one of those notices meant the reduction of an American family from the independent position of occupying ownership to the homeless and helpless struggle for existence in the labor market. This tendency must be arrested, and it will be in my opinion. The single-tax is our proposition to that end. If a better remedy for land monopoly is suggested which will be at the same time practical, just and constitutional, I for one will readily accept it in place of the single tax; for the single tax is to me but a means to the accomplish-

ment of the end, namely, the universal attachment of our people to the soil of our country as the occupying owners of independent homes.

The single tax was not a political issue in the late campaign in California because no party had declared for it. I do not know whether or not it will be a political issue in this state in the near future, but it is an issue in modern civilization, and must some day, and I trust at an early day, be the paramount issue in state and national politics unless, as I have suggested, some better and equally effective remedy for the evil of land monopoly shall be presented.—Hon. James G. Maguire, in San Francisco Examiner.

QUEEN WILHELMINA'S CORONATION.

The coronation of 18-year-old Queen Wilhelmina of Holland has called out many pleasant comments and good wishes for the young sovereign. This is natural; for, according to all accounts, Wilhelmina is a good and intelligent girl, as well as a charming one. Even newspapers strongly opposed to suffrage for American women are warm in their congratulations of the winsome Dutch maiden.

This shows how completely the opposition to political rights for women is a matter of habit and prejudice. Every argument used against allowing a woman to vote applies with double force against allowing her to be a queen. Is it said that contact with public affairs must be destructive to womanliness? Then Wilhelmina should be pitied instead of congratulated. Is it said that political rights involve too much publicity? What amount of publicity is incurred by the average American voter, in comparison with "that fierce light that beats upon a throne?" Is it said that political duties would take so much time as to compel a woman to neglect her family? Wilhelmina during her whole life will have to give more time to political duties than 99 voters out of 100. Yet the very persons who object to equal suffrage for fear some woman might occasionally be elected to office, are ready to congratulate Wilhelmina on her being placed for life in the highest office in her country.

Nearly 40 years ago Henry Ward Beecher called attention to this inconsistency. He said:

For ages, woman has been advanced to honor, influence, office, and the highest public trusts, if she will accept them in aristocratic forms. She may be an abbess, a countess, a queen. It is only woman without a title that must have no privileges. With a crown on her brow, she may enter parliaments and govern empires.

With only her own simple virtues, she may not lift up her hand to cast a vote. Now, as a Christian democrat, I assert for her every right and every privilege that aristocracy accords her. That which is good enough for a queen is not too good for my wife. That which is noble in a duchess is honorable in my daughter.

Good and bright as young Queen Wilhelmina doubtless is, yet there are thousands of American girls just as good and bright as she. Why should they be debarred as unfit from all share in political rights and responsibilities? Thoughtful men are more and more coming to say, with a late distinguished senator: "If women are fit to rule in monarchies, it is difficult to see why they are not qualified to vote in a republic."—Alice Stone Blackwell, in New Christianity.

NATIONAL EXPANSION UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.

Extracts from an address on the above subject, delivered by Edwin Burritt Smith, of the Chicago bar, before the Sunset club of Chicago, October 27.

"In vain we call old notions fudge,
And bend our conscience to our dealing;
The ten commandments will not budge,
And stealing will continue stealing."
—Lowell.

The new policy of national expansion, into which we are drifting, calls for a reexamination of the essential conditions of free government. What will our new possessions do with us, not what shall we do with them? is, as Bishop Potter suggests, the real question. Our institutions rest upon the proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This consent means more than mere acquiescence. It contemplates the active participation by the governed in a government which is their own and which they alone control. Our governments, local, state and national, exercise only such authority as is conferred upon them by the people. None of them claims or exercises original or arbitrary power. All, as the agents of the governed, execute none but delegated authority.

The president and the congress of the United States must govern all new acquisitions of territory under and by virtue of the constitution, or by self-assumed and arbitrary power. The constitution created a nation of states, "an indissoluble union of indestructible states." It called into being a United States of America, not a United States of America and Asia. Every person born or naturalized within its borders was to be a citizen of the nation and of the state of his residence. All the people of the nation were to constitute a brotherhood of citizens having equal rights before the

law, which might not be denied or abridged because of race or color. There were to be no subjects, but only citizens. Congress might organize territorial governments for the administration of the sparsely settled national domain outside the states; but the territorial form of government was to be but temporary and merely preparatory to statehood. Such was our noble scheme of popular government; such was our splendid vision; and until now there has been no desire among us to have it otherwise.

Those who hold that fatalism in the form of "duty determines destiny," and that destiny itself is an affair of the heart rather than of the head, lightly reply to all this that they have proposed no such annexation as will make these islands subject to the constitution and general laws of the United States. They assume, without shadow of authority, that congress may deal with such acquisitions free from all constitutional restraints. This seems to be the view at Washington. It is even reported that the president will recommend to congress the appointment of a commission to recommend a plan of insular taxation, both local and general. No commission is needed to point out the constitutional requirements that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The cool assumption that congress may itself acquire and hold new territory conditioned that it shall not be subject to the constitution and general laws of the United States, is the most dangerous development of the expansion craze through which we are passing. It means in plain language that there are those among us who, for the moment at least, are prepared to discredit and even abandon representative government. Thus far it has been our greatest glory that ours is a government of laws, not a government of men. Presidents and congresses have exercised only delegated powers. They have ruled as the servants and with the consent and cooperation of the people. It is now proposed that in addition to their duties as public servants, they shall take on other duties of an entirely different character; that they shall exercise a self-assumed, arbitrary and uncontrolled authority over distant and subject peoples. If this extraordinary programme can be carried out, we shall see the president and congress daily exercising from Washington both delegated and self-assumed powers. At one moment they will act as the duly authorized servants of a free people, and the next as despotic rulers of sub-

ject races. Their authority over us will remain at least in name expressly delegated. Their authority over their remote subjects will remain self-assumed and unrestrained.

It is a law of physics that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time. Abraham Lincoln but declared the application of this law to the realm of politics when he declared that "this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." Under his great leadership his prediction that the union would cease to be divided was gloriously fulfilled. The question for our generation is whether we shall voluntarily again divide it; whether we shall permit to be set up at the seat of government despotic power to compete with representative authority for final supremacy.

Those among us who have so suddenly awakened to what they are pleased to call our national "isolation," exhibit a growing impatience with the counsels of the fathers. They even lightly refer to them as puritanical and timid old souls, whose advice was well enough for a boy. They have just discovered that the nation has become a giant, who "is no longer content with the nursery rhymes which were sung around his cradle."*

They are especially certain that the Farewell Address is outgrown, and is no longer of value to a nation that has suddenly become a "world power," and that even the Monroe doctrine has become somewhat shopworn, or at least of but one-sided application. Yet the counsels of the fathers were not born of weakness or fear. The policy of non-interference by us in the affairs of Europe was early announced in the face of the pressing demands of France that we redeem the supposed obligations growing out of her assistance in our revolt against England. That of non-intervention by European powers on this continent was suddenly proclaimed in 1823 by a nation of less than 12,000,000 souls, in opposition to the "holy alliance" which had been organized by the emperors of Russia and Austria and the king of Prussia to conserve and maintain absolutism in Europe and over all lands claimed by European powers. The policies thus announced were believed by their authors to be of permanent application. It is, of course, possible that Washington was mistaken, but his counsels if wise are for all time. His solemn admonitions were not for temporary purposes. They ring in our ears to-day with the added

*President Northrup, University of Minnesota, at Chicago peace jubilee banquet.

weight of a century of successful application.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. * * * 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. * * * Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity and interest. The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.

These are not the words of transient wisdom or temporary expediency. Only what Washington and Hamilton expected has happened in America. We have merely reached the position which they clearly foresaw, "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, aided by our justice, shall counsel." Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Shall we dash to the ground their splendid vision of national life that shall lead the world to higher things by a spectacle of peace, liberty and prosperity? Shall we adopt a policy that will mark a complete departure from our well-considered course for a century, and convert a nation whose chief glory it has been to achieve a position to command permanent peace—the opportunity for the steady pursuit of an entire people of their chosen occupations—over a vast area, into a high priest of militarism? Taxation without representation is still tyranny. Government by force is still despotism.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

While woman suffrage was defeated in Washington at the recent election, South Dakota approved it. There are now five states in which women may vote, all of them west of the Missouri. The states have 17 electoral votes, and woman has therefore become an important factor in national politics. Her vote in the five states may determine the election of a president. Instead of a waning equal suffrage is a growing cause. The long agitation of the Anthony's and Stanton's for endowment of their sex with the full rights of citizenship is finally bearing fruit. States which have not yet gone so far as to extend unlimited have extended limited suffrage to women. And in operation