

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1899.

Number 41.

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 eternal fitness of things was exemplified on the 11th in Washington when Gen. Shafter, before a Presbyterian club of early pietists, said this regarding the Philippine situation: "My plan would be to disarm the natives in the Philippine islands, even if we kill half of them in doing it; then I would treat the rest of them with perfect justice." It would be interesting to know what Gen. Shafter's idea of justice is, and what those pious young men think of Christianity.

One of the New York papers publishes a Washington interview with some member of the senate committee on foreign relations whose name is withheld, in which the person interviewed says: "If I were the executive of this government I should order the arrest of Messrs. Agoncillo and Lopez to-morrow morning." Agoncillo and Lopez are respectively the representative of the Philippine republic and his secretary, who are now in this country. The ground on which their arrest is advocated is a published interview in which Agoncillo gave it as his opinion that the Filipinos would never consent to become a dependent colony, and that their soldiers would not lay down their arms until Aguinaldo tells them to; and in which also he asserted that American consular officers had promised the Filipinos absolute independence as soon as the islands were taken from Spain. In the same interview, when asked if the Filipinos would resist annexation, he refused to express an opinion, but said he hoped that all differences would be adjusted in a friendly manner and bloodshed

avoided. The imperialistic idea has truly made long strides, when a senator of the United States can on such ground advocate arbitrary arrests. Is Caesar so near at hand?

The administration is beginning to show a better disposition toward the Philippine question. Instead of the belligerent news items which have been coming from the white house and the war department ever since the Filipinos captured Iloilo, we are now favored with inspired prognostications of a smoother presidential policy. This change was emphasized by the speech of Senator Foraker in the senate on the 11th, in which he intimated, as one authorized to do so, that the president has no purpose of setting up a government in the Philippines by force, and maintaining a perpetual colonial system there; but intends only to take possession temporarily as a necessary precaution against the greed of Germany, which has a fleet in the neighborhood. It must be remembered, however, that the president himself makes no such declaration. If he should, it could not be overlooked that he has more than once repudiated solemn declarations. His declarations are less significant than his actions, and they will yet bear watching. Incidentally, let us inquire how we could hold the Philippines only temporarily, without at some time hauling down the American flag, which the president has said must never be hauled down anywhere.

Despite their jubilant exclamations about prosperity, the newspapers themselves are squeezing down wages and dropping men from their pay rolls. This era of prosperity has only a dismal message for the working masses. Often enough we are told that any man able and willing to work

can find work to do if he hunts for it. It is false, as every man out of a job knows full well. It is false, as every man with a job instinctively feels, feels with such a fullness of realization that he would lose his manhood almost rather than lose his job. But even if it were true, what would it prove? Would there be any comfort in the fact, if it were a fact, that any man able and willing to work can find work to do if he hunts for it? Time was, and not long ago either, when men able and willing to work were being hunted for. The demand for them was persistent. Lazy men, even incompetent men, then found it difficult to avoid work. No one needed to hunt for it. From that condition to one in which the able and willing can find work only if they hunt for it is a distinct descent. If that indicates the direction in which the world is moving, conditions are coming, even if they have not yet arrived, when able and willing men will not be able to find work though they do hunt for it. It is only a question of keeping on.

And we are keeping on at a steady gait. The struggle for existence becomes every day fiercer and more horrible; and every now and again the sensitive among us are shocked by some novel manifestation of the pressure of poverty. Hardly have we become accustomed to having our boots blacked by women, when other women, urged on by the baying of the wolf, startle us by appearing upon the streets as walking advertisements. Fancy 20 or 30 women got up in headgear of the sunbonnet type—probably to hide their faces—and with gowns of bright colors covered with glaring advertisements, parading city streets after the manner of "sandwich men," and you have the latest sensational testimony to poverty's increasing pressure. Many

poverty sights that in truth are worse than this, confront us every day; but we have grown accustomed to them. This, however, at least while its novelty lasts, cannot but make thoughtful observers sick at heart.

The evidence that the war department supplied bad food to our soldiers in the field is now supplemented with testimony that it has been selling good food at a sacrifice to merchants in the south. In an interview in the Baltimore Sun of the 3rd, President Donaldson, of the well-known Numsen Manufacturing company, of Baltimore, published a lot of information picked up in the course of a recent business trip in the south, regarding the working of the commissary department last summer. Some of the most prominent jobbers in Savannah told him of having bought from the army hundreds of barrels of vinegar at 4 cents a gallon when it was selling at 16, and thousands of pounds of first rate bacon at 3 cents a pound when it was worth not less than 6. In Jacksonville a leading jobber told him that he had bought 170,000 pounds of bacon at one-half a cent a pound, 160 barrels of vinegar at 4 cents a gallon, and other goods at ridiculous prices. Numerous other merchants and jobbers in the camping district told Mr. Donaldson similar stories. Hay, oats and other feed were sold in the same way. It appears that stores were shipped in enormous quantities to the camps without regard to the soldiers' needs, the surplus being then sold off in this manner. At one point it was estimated that enough vinegar was shipped to the camp to provide each soldier with 15 gallons. These discoveries of Mr. Donaldson still further strengthen the conviction, which has been gaining ground all the fall, that the war department was incapable if not corrupt.

Without any obvious legal authority, but apparently by an act of mere arbitrary power, the postmaster of Chicago has ordered the inside employees of the Chicago post office to

wear uniforms. Only women clerks, the assistant postmaster and the postmaster himself are excepted. There is no justification for this order. When the occupations of large numbers of men are of a character to make it important that they be readily identified by the public as having authority, it is entirely proper that they should be in uniform. In this category would come policemen, firemen, trainmen on railroads, conductors on street cars, and so on, including out-door postal employees. But in cases other than such as these, the requirement of uniforms is indefensible; for then the object, if not merely childish, is either to give a military aspect to a civil occupation, or to degrade men by putting them in livery. Within this principle the postal clerks at Chicago are right in complaining of the postmaster's decree. They come into no such relationship with the public as could make uniforms necessary. While at their public duties they are sufficiently identified by the official surroundings in which the public finds them when it comes to be served; when they leave those surroundings they have no public duties to perform. There would be as much sense in uniforming bank clerks as postal clerks; and congress might engage in worse business than in interfering with the plans in this particular of the Chicago postmaster, if the postmaster general declines to do so.

Not long ago the manager of the Associated Press read before a club a paper on "The Limitations of the Press," in which he enumerated as one of these limitations the inability of editorial writers to get what they write read. This is indeed a limitation of modern journalism. But it is easily explained, and could be easily remedied. The explanation is that newspaper editorial writers have become mere literary clerks to publishers and "backers." There is consequently a flavor of insincerity in most newspaper editorials, which the reader instinctively detects. It is unavoidable, under the circumstances,

for no one can write up to the demands of a boss whom he holds in contempt as a man void of convictions, without putting that flavor into his work in spite of himself. Editorials in the few American papers that are still edited by editors instead of managers are read by the public, and they influence the public. So long as a newspaper remains conscientiously true to its function as a public teacher, its opinions command public interest and respect. But when papers turn their editorial consciences over to business managers to be swapped off for advertising patronage and "backing," as most newspapers of the present day have done, they must expect limitations in the way of distrust of their policies and indifference to their editorials.

Torrey E. Wardner, the editor of the Boston Traveler, whose imprisonment for contempt of court in Massachusetts was a subject of comment in these columns last week, has been released. His discharge was granted by the judge who committed him, he having first apologized for the editorial that gave rise to the proceedings. Mr. Torrey's appeal to a supreme court judge had been decided against him, and he was advised by his lawyers that a similar result would follow an appeal to the full bench. In other words, he became convinced that under the laws of Massachusetts the editor of a newspaper which criticises court proceedings before their termination may be prosecuted for contempt, and without jury trial convicted and sentenced in the discretion of the judge who institutes the proceedings. An attempt is to be made, therefore, to secure the passage of a law in Massachusetts, providing that no person shall be tried for contempt of court committed out of the presence of the court, except after indictment and before a jury. Such safeguards are needed in the laws of every state where they do not already exist. Judges cannot be trusted to regulate private conduct and the freedom of the press in their personal discretion.

During the early autumn, it was reported through the regular news channels that William Waldorf Astor had won a bet by giving a dinner party in London to 27 guests, all of whom found table accommodation around a single section of a California redwood tree. It now appears that the story was manufactured out of whole cloth. Mr. Astor has brought suit for libel against the London paper which first gave it currency. For having done so he is to be commended, and it is to be hoped that he will succeed in punishing the guilty persons. Some of the London correspondents are making fun of Mr. Astor for taking what they call "a palpable fake" so seriously. But the fake was not palpable. And whether it had been or not, newspapers are not the appropriate channels for disseminating fakes, palpable or otherwise. Both in defending his personal right to security against having his name coupled with fakes, and in defending the right of the public to security against being victimized by fakes when it is paying for news, Mr. Astor's course in bringing suit deserves public approval. It is a little curious, however, that the crusade upon yellow journalism should first take legal shape in a suit brought by an American against a London newspaper.

Charles T. Yerkes, the Chicago street car magnate, has unwittingly given the inhabitants of that city one of the best of reasons for refusing to deal with him for franchise extensions, upon any terms. He has placarded his cars with the following information:

Length of grants and compensations paid in the larger cities of the United States:

Cities.	Years.	Compensation.
New York.....	999	Nothing to 3 per ct.
Philadelphia..	999	Pave the streets.
Washington..	99	.4 per cent.
St. Louis.....	50	.2 per cent.
Cincinnati..	50	.5 per cent.
Boston	Perpetual	Nothing to 4 per ct.
Chicago "L" roads	50	Nothing.

If other cities have by dickering with street car monopolists been induced to give away the rights of unborn generations in this style, Chicago would do well to demand of her pub-

lic agents that they do no dickering at all. We cannot think of a stronger argument against street franchises than the possibility of their being extended for a period of 999 years. This is corrupt and fraudulent upon the face of it. Soon or late those franchises must be repudiated.

A letter received by Max Hirsch, a prominent man in public affairs who lives in Melbourne, Victoria, from the town clerk of Brisbane, Queensland, throws satisfactory light upon the operation of the single tax principle in Queensland. Prior to 1891 real estate was assessed for taxation upon the rental basis. That is, the selling value of land was not considered, but only its annual rent, which was taxed at the rate of one shilling tax to the pound of rent—about 5 cents to the dollar. But in 1891 the selling value of the land alone was considered, improvements being exempt, and the tax rate was fixed at three-fourths of a penny tax to each pound of selling value—about three-tenths of a cent to the dollar. This rate of taxation is low, but low as it is it has in Queensland had the effect measurably of equalizing taxes and forcing improvement. The town clerk of Brisbane in writing to Mr. Hirsch of the change, says:

The object of this legislation was primarily to more equitably distribute the incidence of taxation, and this result has in the main been attained. The old system of taxing improvements was undoubtedly defective, as being calculated to retard progress, and I certainly think our present system a distinct advance. Vacant lands, and lands whose improvements are not in keeping with their situation, are now more heavily rated than was formerly the case, and this has a decided effect in urging on building operations.

Continuing he explains that "fully improved properties have benefited by the change, and likewise house properties." In other words, the taxes of improvers have diminished while those of land speculators only have been increased.

The old adage about honest men getting their dues under certain circumstances not necessary now to

specify, finds new verification in the petition to the American-Canadian commission made last month by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. This association, comprising 157 daily newspapers, mostly protectionist, and representing according to its own statement "the bulk of the total consumption of print paper," begs for free trade in paper and paper pulp. It makes a good case, too. Its petition shows, among other enlightening and interesting things, that paper can be manufactured cheaper in the United States than anywhere else in the world, and that the American manufacturers are now supplying foreign markets in competition with foreign manufacturers. This very instructive petition explains also that the paper manufacturers are combined in a trust, which controls 80 per cent. of the entire American output; and that the common stock of the trust, though admitted by the trust to represent no investment, pays dividends and is selling at 60 cents on the dollar in the stock market. For these and other reasons it is urged that a continuation of the paper and paper pulp duty would be a tax upon American newspaper readers for the benefit of the paper trust, and that it ought to be abolished. When it is remembered that most of the papers back of this petition are on record as arguing that under protective tariffs the foreigner pays the tax, the admission here that taxes on paper and paper pulp are paid by newspaper readers and enrich the owners of paper trust stock is a little startling. Nevertheless, the petition of the newspaper trust against the paper and pulp trust is a sound free trade document and entitled to respect as such. In the form of a special plea it sets forth and exemplifies a general principle which leaves nothing for protectionism to rest upon.

President Harper, of Rockefeller's Chicago university, delivered an address not long ago in which he described the university—not referring to Rockefeller alone, of course, but

to universities as an institution—as the “prophet, priest and philosopher” of democracy. “The university,” he said, “must lead the people.” Mr. Harper has a somewhat distorted notion of democracy. In democracies the people lead themselves. They may make use of universities for securing knowledge as it is acquired, as a sort of intellectual storehouse, just as they use the library or the primary school; but the university as prophet, priest and king would be as repugnant to thorough going democracy as any other species of priestcraft and kingcraft. The true object of universities is to help men to think, not to do their thinking for them.

But that is not the object of the university as Mr. Harper sees it, nor as the professorial cult would have it. Another one of this cult, also attached to the Rockefeller establishment, made that plain in a newspaper article published soon after Mr. Harper’s discourse. We refer to C. R. Henderson. He assures us, not without some angry grinding of his teeth, that it is dishonest for any man to set up for a teacher in the field of social reform, economic and political, without equipping himself by many years of special study of industrial history, economic science and modes of administration. Thus, according to the professorial cult, no one is fit to form an opinion as to the righteousness of any public policy, unless he has gone through the professorial mill. Acceptance of that doctrine would indeed make the university the prophet, priest and king of democracy. No one would be esteemed fit even to vote unless he held a university diploma for excellence in industrial history, economic science (“as she is taught”) and modes of administration. What university, governed by professors and endowed by millionaires, could safely be entrusted with such authority? Macaulay said that professors of physical science could not be trusted as authorities upon the law of gravitation if great pecuniary interests were at stake. How much less, then, can economic professors be

trusted as authorities upon questions of fundamental property rights, which do involve great pecuniary interests?

Then what reason is there to suppose that “solid learning,” as it is called, will imbue professors with the good judgment and sound sense necessary to make trustworthy economic priests and kings? Here, for illustration, is Prof. James Mavo, of the University of Toronto. He is doubtless well crammed with industrial history, economic science and modes of administration, to say nothing of Latin and Greek. With the “authorities” he is as thoroughly conversant as any of his cult. But in an article in the Toronto Evening News of Christmas eve, he demonstrated the inadequacy of these acquirements.

Prof. Mavo, of Toronto, had been moved by much the same impulse that stirred Harper and Henderson of the Chicago university. He, too, wants the public to look to the university as prophet, priest and king. Popular propaganda, consequently, is to him exceedingly distasteful. His antique and rather wordy disquisition in the Toronto News we must as a whole pass over. To reply to a paper against propagating opinions in a democracy would be a waste of space; none the less so as the professor’s paper is utterly void of argument. But Prof. Mavo makes two or three observations in his paper to which attention may be called as showing how little “solid learning” has assisted him to do straight thinking. At one point, referring superciliously to socialists, he says: “If the existing ‘competitive’ system is obnoxious to anyone, it is not so difficult after all, on this continent at least, to retire from the competitive field, and to live a wholesome though isolated rural life.” For our part, we have no fault to find with competition. On the contrary we believe it to be essentially as natural and beneficent as gravitation. But the man who seriously and honestly says that it is possible to retire from the com-

petitive field shows lack of perception of the simplest conditions in which he lives. He may be full to bursting with knowledge of all that has ever been written in industrial history, economics and administration, but it wouldn’t be safe to take his advice on the simplest practical proposition. Then again Prof. Mavo observes that “if the payment of rent to the ‘robber landlord’ is disagreeable, land may yet be had for the clearing of it.” This is a professorial slant at the single taxers, of whom there are many in Toronto. If it fairly exhibits Prof. Mavo’s understanding of the single tax, he proves himself again short in sense, however long he may be on “solid learning.” Even a professor should know that the single taxers insist not only that all men have a right to land, but that they have a right to exemption from taxation on their labor, and to equal participation in the values which general growth, as distinguished from distinguishable individual effort, attaches to land. Yet Prof. Mavo implies that single taxers can secure these rights by taking up wild land and clearing it. Even if they abandoned their rights to a share in existing communal values, where could single taxers find a place on the habitable globe in which they would be secure against having their individual earnings confiscated by taxation? There is no such place. Prof. Mavo’s apparent obtuseness goes in some degree to show how woefully incompetent men of his class would be as the prophets, priests and kings of democracy. As school teachers, conveying to immature minds an understanding of what the books contain, the class is useful; but when it sets itself up as authority for full grown men, not only on what the books say, but also on what is true and right, it is pretty apt to expose the intellectual limitations that are inseparable from mental cramming.

Somebody having published a paragraph asserting that a free silver newspaper could not get the news from the Associated Press, the manager of that news-gathering associa-

tion, Melville E. Stone, replies with a flat denial, which he asks to have accepted "in the most comprehensive way." He goes on to explain that the Associated Press—

has no politics of any sort. Its mission is to state facts as they appear. Its board of directors include men of every shade of political opinion, and the mere suggestion that a newspaper should be denied admission because it favored the Chicago platform or because it favored the St. Louis platform would raise a storm which would echo all over the country.

The assertion is admirably denied, because it was faultily made. If a Chicago platform paper were to apply for Associated Press news, it would not be turned away expressly because it was a Chicago platform paper. But it would be turned away. The real indictment against the Associated Press is not that it refuses news to free silver papers not already in its ring, but that it refuses news to all papers not in its ring. If the telegraph system were part of the postal department, this policy of the Associated Press would count for nothing. Independent news associations could then compete on an equal footing with it, and so force it to sell its news to all comers for a fair price. But with the aid of our monopoly system of telegraphing, the Associated Press has established itself as a crushing news monopoly.

A romantic story is told by the New York Tribune, about Charles H. Chapin and his iron mine. Many years ago Mr. Chapin was a village merchant in the upper peninsula of Michigan. In this useful occupation he failed, and all his little property went to his creditors. But the creditors, being generous, gave him back a quarter section of timber land, which, though rocky, might yield him a frugal living if it were cleared. In clearing up that land the presence of iron ore was discovered. Mr. Chapin thereupon gave a mining lease of the land to a corporation, a condition of the lease being that not less than 80,000 tons of ore should be taken out annually, and that for all ore taken out he should receive a royalty of 50

cents a ton. This is the origin of the Iron Mountain mine in Dickinson county. Under his lease Mr. Chapin received \$40,000 a year and upwards for many years; and though the royalty has since been reduced, the mine is so rich that last year the royalty receipts amounted to over \$100,000. Such is the Tribune's story. It is not an isolated case. In Louisiana there is a profitable salt mine, the royalties from which support one idle family in princely luxury; while throughout this country and the civilized world, some men receive for the use of land—mining land, farming land and town lots—incomes, enormous in the aggregate, which are precisely the same as these royalties. They are wholly unearned by the recipients. But what is amazing about it all is this, that so many intelligent and well-meaning people, to whom these facts are patent, see no relation between them and the social phenomenon of poverty in the midst of plenty.

A rich brewer of St. Louis has got into trouble by donating a sum of money to a western college. He was asked to do it, and now he wonders why friends of the college denounce him for it, and demand that the money be refused. Their point is that he made his money by brewing beer; but he says he has made money in other ways as well as in his brewery. In all probability the money he made in his brewery was made with least injury to his fellow men. At any rate his income from beer is not plunder. It is paid him voluntarily. Why may it not, then, be acceptable for college purposes, so long as the plunder of oppressive monopolists like Rockefeller is welcome. Is drink money worse than blood money?

Some of the best work done upon newspapers is done by men whose names are never heard of outside their own circle of friends and acquaintances. Not the least important of this class of work is that of the scissors man. Scissors work when well done is as valuable and re-

quires as high an order of skill and judgment as pen work; yet it usually goes without other reward than the weekly stipend. For that reason them readable. It is by all odds the scissors work of the Chicago Chronicle. The reprinted clippings which appear in the Chronicle are selected by some one who knows what items are worth clipping and how to make them readable. It is by all odds the best reprint department of any Chicago daily, if not of any American daily.

English working men of the public servant class are learning a valuable lesson about "tips." The American system of checking baggage having at last been largely adopted in England, the "tipping" of porters has fallen off, and in consequence railway servants who have heretofore been "tipped" for helping passengers with their baggage are beginning to feel the pinch and are urging an increase of wages. Thus the fact has been brought to light that the real person "tipped" is not the "tippee," but his employer.

This has not been generally understood in England, nor is it in this country. Yet a moment's thought should make it plain. Hotel waiters where "tips" are good are no better paid than are those where "tips" are poor. They are often not as well paid. The wages of waiters at Delmonico's used to be \$25 a month. We don't know what it is now, but doubtless it is less rather than more. The waiter was expected to eke out his wages with "tips." So on Pullman cars, the "tips" go in reality not to the porters who collect them, but to the Pullman company. Porters' wages on Pullman cars range from \$15 a month to \$35, according to the opportunities for "tips," \$15 being the wages where "tipping" is best and \$35 where it is supposed to be worst. But for "tipping," Pullman car wages for porters would have to be double the highest now paid. It is the Pullman company, therefore, that gets the "tips." Most workingmen whose

wages are now eked out with "tips" would be as well off in money, and better off in self-respect, if they refused to accept "tips." This is appreciated by the railway servants' trade union of England, which is seeking to abolish "tipping" and substitute full wages.

Official election returns for governor of New York for 1898, as compared with those for 1896, are interesting. Roosevelt polls 661,707. In 1896, Black, the republican candidate polled 787,516. Roosevelt's loss, therefore, is 125,809. On the other hand, the democratic candidate makes a gain of 69,397. He polls 643,921, against 574,524 for the democratic candidate in 1896. Part of this democratic gain is easily accounted for. The gold candidate in 1896 polled 26,698. There was no gold candidate in 1898, but the citizen's union candidate drew most of his strength of 2,103 from the same source, which leaves 24,595 as the number of gold voters who probably returned to the democratic fold. But even then Van Wyck, the democratic candidate, would have a gain over the democratic gubernatorial vote in 1896 of 44,802. This could not have come from the socialists, for their vote has increased. Only 18,362 in 1896, it is 23,860 in 1898. Nor could it have come from the prohibitionists. They too increase their vote. It was 17,449 in 1896 and 18,383 in 1898. Van Wyck's net increase of 44,802 must have come, therefore, from the republican vote. This was possible, of course; for as already stated, Roosevelt's vote in 1898 was 125,809 less than Black's in 1896. Assuming that Van Wyck's gain came wholly from that source, except as already accounted for, we still have a loss to Roosevelt of 81,007 to explain. Naturally, that would be attributed to the falling off in the general vote, 1898 having been as compared with 1896, an "off year." But Roosevelt's loss cannot be wholly accounted for in that way. The total vote which in 1896 was 1,424,549, is in 1898 1,359,190—a falling off of only 65,359. On the whole, Roose-

velt does not appear to have won over many votes. Military fuss and feathers must have counted for very little in the New York election.

A MERICAN "CROWN COLONIES."

On one of the side streets of Chicago a business sign announces that the proprietor is prepared to ship goods to any part of the United States "and its colonies."

Far seeing proprietor! When that sign was first observed swinging upon its hinges, before the war with Spain had fairly begun, knowing passers-by smiled at the innocence of the foreign mind—for of course the proprietor must be a foreigner—which failed to understand that American theories of government do not tolerate colonies. Remembering their history lessons, the knowing passers-by reflected upon the incongruity of the idea of United States colonies. Had not the patriots of the American revolution shed their blood, in the days that tried men's souls, for the purpose of wresting England's American colonies from her grasp and establishing them as sovereign states? And did they not act upon the principle that government derives its just powers "from the consent of the governed?" This business sign, then, with its assumption that the United States could possibly be an owner of colonies, seemed ludicrously out of place in an American city.

But less than a year has passed, and the once ludicrous sign is already like a prophecy nearly fulfilled. It certainly is no longer ludicrous. The United States has acquired colonies and is in imminent danger of establishing a permanent colonial system.

A colony, in the sense in which the term is used in this connection, is a people governed by another people.

Usually the colonial territory is occupied by emigrants or their descendants from the governing or mother country. That, however, is not an imperative condition. The essential idea is that the governing country shall exercise arbitrary authority over the country of the governed. Thus Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines were for a long time colonies of Spain, as were also the republics of South America. So the

American states were once colonies of England; and Canada and the Australasian provinces are still. France, England and Germany possess colonies in Africa; and England governs India as a colony. Some of these colonies enjoy greater freedom than others, and all colonies of the present time are probably freer than any were a century ago; but whatever the degree of freedom any colony may enjoy, it derives it from the governing country as a privilege. Instead of limited powers going up from the people to the government, degrees of privilege come down from the government to the people.

When this principle prevails within an independent nation, the government is called monarchical; when it prevails in the relations of a nation to its territorial possessions, the government is called colonial. The colonial idea of government, and the monarchical are essentially the same.

Three grades of colonial government have come to be recognized under the English system. Canada, for illustration, belongs in the highest grade. This neighbor of ours to the north has been invested with the privilege of "responsible government." Though the mother country appoints the governor-general and retains a veto on legislation, it exercises no other control. And as the veto is in fact hardly more than nominal, and the governor-general a figurehead, Canada is in reality as self-governing as the United States. The secondary grade of colonies comprises those possessing "representative institutions." In these the home government not only retains a veto on legislation, but also the control of all public officers. The third and lowest grade are "crown colonies." They are controlled entirely and absolutely by the mother country; and in this they resemble the proposed colonies of the United States. The kind of colonies it is intended to make of our "new possessions" is crown colonies.

This is evident from what the imperialists say. Senator Frye, one of the American peace commissioners, while evading the question of the capability of the Filipinos for citizenship, says that "the Philippines, of course, cannot be admitted as a state

of the Union; they must be governed by us at first somewhat in the manner of the British government in East India." Senator Thurston does not think there is "anything in the federal constitution which compels us to extend American citizenship, free commercial intercourse, or prospective admission into the Union as states to our new possessions." Senator Platt, of Connecticut, maintained in his speech in the senate on the 19th of December that the United States has the constitutional power to take foreign territory and hold it without ever making a state of it or intending so to do. Without multiplying quotations, it will be enough to add a reference to the published argument of Prof. McMaster, the historian who has leaped into the arena as a defender of the right of the United States to govern outlying territory without regard to constitutional limitations. His argument for the right of the United States to establish crown colonies, is utterly lacking in interest except as a plea in support of a purpose to exercise the right.

There can be no doubt of that purpose. All the speeches and editorials in support of the policy of the administration, and the declarations of the administration itself, show the design most clearly. It is that the United States shall perpetually govern outlying possessions without the consent of the inhabitants. They are to be and remain dependent colonies, governed without their consent and taxed without representation—the very type of "crown colonies."

This would indeed be a reversal of the American theory of government. Government without the consent of the governed is a bed-rock American principle.

True, we have not always lived up to it; we do not live up to it now. But we have grown closer to it; and the present administration is the first to propose to abandon it. Not to have fully realized an ideal, while moving toward it, is a very different thing from casting the ideal aside. There is all the difference between the two of progression and retrogression.

So of taxation without representation. Upon this doctrine our freedom from colonial thralldom was

fought for, and it has ever since been our political pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night. We have, indeed, levied taxes without representation, and we do so yet; but always because of our blindness as a nation to the application of the principle in the particular case. Now, however, it is proposed that we repudiate the principle itself. Instead of pressing forward to a full realization of the principle, we are urged to recede from the advances already made.

Not only would the colonial system be contrary to the American theory of government. It would be in conflict also with the constitution through which the United States derives from the states all the sovereignty it possesses.

Numerous attempts have been made, since the expansion question came forward, to satisfy the people that the United States has the same constitutional power that England has to set up and govern colonies. So far as these arguments have any plausibility, they rest not upon the provisions of the constitution, but upon acts in violation of it, which are marshalled as precedents. Gen. Merritt is more candid. He advocates the colonial system not as constitutional; but in spite of the constitution; his simple but comprehensive argument being that "we have outgrown the constitution." Men like Prof. McMaster, who are interpreting away the safeguards of the constitution, seek the same object as Gen. Merritt. They differ from him only in method. He excels them in candor; they excel him in discretion.

Among the arguments of these imperialists, urged in support of the colonial system upon which they wish this nation to enter, is one that overleaps itself. This argument, too, is the one upon which all depends. It is insisted that congress and the president are absolute except in the states; that they may acquire any territory they please outside the states; may acquire it, as they please; and, having acquired it, may govern it in their discretion, without regard to the constitution! There is, according to this theory, no limitation whatever upon the powers of the federal government as regards outlying territory.

Upon this theory, as we have said, the colonial system must rest. When it falls, that falls. For, if constitutional limitations do apply, we cannot take possession of the Philippines without either abandoning our protection policy, or inviting the hostility of a "closed door" in the far east.

To maintain our protective policy, we should have to bring the Philippines within its operation, giving us free trade with that archipelago while imposing high tariffs upon all other nations. That would be the "closed door." It would discriminate in favor of our trade with the Philippines and against that of others. On the other hand, if we established an "open door" in the Philippines, it would have to be a free-trade door, for we could not put any tariff upon American goods.

All this would be so, that is to say, if the Philippines upon annexation became part of the nation called the United States, and so fell under the protection of the United States constitution. Since the constitution provides in paragraph 1 of section 8 article I, that all duties shall be uniform throughout the United States, it would be impossible under the constitution to make an "open door" in the Philippines without adopting free trade as the national policy. Hence the great necessity to the imperialists, of their argument that the Philippines would not be part of the nation, but would be mere national property, like a park or a post office site, subject perpetually to arbitrary government from Washington. Upon the basis of this argument they insist, or imply, that congress and the president could open the colonial ports in the Philippines to commerce under low duties, while closing the national ports in America by high ones.

But observe what is involved in this imperialist argument. Since the constitution would not apply to the Philippines, of course its amendments would not apply to them either. Thus the bill of rights, introduced in the first ten amendments, and upon which so much stress was laid at the formation of the government, would offer none of the protection to the Filipinos that they do to us. The Filipinos would be as dependent upon

the good nature and good sense of congress for the simplest human rights as a French peasant of the seventeenth century was upon the humanity of his seigneur.

Read the first ten amendments to the constitution and note the terrible power over the Philippine natives this colonial theory would vest in congress. Their religious freedom could be interfered with but for the protection not of the constitution, but of the Spanish treaty. Spain alone could object. The rights of free speech, free press and peaceable assembly could be denied them. They could be forbidden to arm themselves: soldiers could be quartered upon citizens; their persons, houses, papers and effects could be seized and searched without process of law; they could be hanged or shot for alleged crimes without indictment or trial; they could be put in jeopardy over and over again for the same alleged offense; they could be forced to testify against themselves if tried for crime; they could be deprived of life, liberty and property without due process of law; and cruel and unusual punishments could be inflicted upon them.

Is it said that no congress would dare to pass nor any president to sign a bill denying rights like these to the Filipinos? Why not? If we at home, with votes and state governments to protect us against federal aggression,—if we need these constitutional safeguards for our security, how dare we say that the Filipinos do not need them? Is congress likely to be more just toward them than toward us?

Yet it was thought important in the highest degree to annex these provisions to the constitution when this government was formed; and no voter would consent to having them struck out even now. We do not trust future congresses and presidents with unlimited power over ourselves. How shall we in good faith, then, defend the proposition to give them unlimited power over others?

There is but one righteous course to pursue toward the Filipinos. It is to set them free. If they ask our protection until the world recognizes their national independence, let us give it to them. Otherwise it is our duty—what our destiny may be we cannot know—to let them alone.

It is insisted, however, that they are unfit for self-government. They always will be unless they are left to govern themselves. Fitness for self-government comes from experience in self-governing. It cannot be taught by rote like a lesson at school. Neither can it be forced into a people. We might impose the names and forms of self-government upon the Filipinos; but not its essence. Self-government is a necessary prerequisite of fitness for self-government. No people can ever acquire fitness while governed by a foreign power as a "crown colony."

NEWS

The full text of the proposed treaty of peace with Spain, together with the president's message of transmittal and collateral documents, was made public on the 5th at Washington. The message of transmittal merely announces the submission to the senate for ratification, of "a treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, signed at the city of Paris on Dec. 10, 1898, together with the protocols and papers indicated in the list accompanying the report of the secretary of state." The papers thus indicated comprise credentials, records of daily proceedings of the commissioners and correspondence. They make a printed volume of 675 pages. An abstract of the treaty is given in the next paragraph.

After a brief preamble, the treaty specifies the terms of peace in 17 articles, the substance of which are as follows:

Article 1 relinquishes Spain's sovereignty in Cuba, the United States to discharge all obligations of international law during occupancy.

Art. 2 cedes Porto Rico and other Spanish West Indian islands, together with the island of Guam in the Ladrões, to the United States.

Art. 3 cedes to the United States the Philippine archipelago, upon payment of \$20,000,000 within three months after the exchange of ratifications.

Art. 4 provides for the admission for 10 years of Spanish ships and merchandise into Philippine ports on the same terms with American ships and merchandise.

Art. 5 requires the United States to send back to Spain the Spanish soldiers taken as prisoners of war on the capture of Manila, and arranges details of Spanish evacuation of the Philippines and Guam.

Art. 6 provides for the release and return home of all prisoners of war and political prisoners held by either side in connection with the Philippine and the Cuban insurrections or the Spanish-American war.

Art. 7 cancels all claims for indemnity.

Art. 8 conveys to the United States all immovable public property in the islands belonging to the crown of Spain, such as wharves, forts and highways.

Art. 9 agrees that native subjects of Spain domiciled in the relinquished territory may retain their Spanish allegiance by making a declaration of their intention within a year, in default of which declaration they acquire the nationality of their residence; but "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the territories ceded to the United States are to be determined by congress.

Art. 10 secures the right of free exercise of their religion to the inhabitants of the relinquished islands.

Arts. 11 and 12 relate to civil and criminal proceedings affecting private rights.

Art. 13 secures rights of property in Spanish copyrights and patents held in the relinquished islands, and provides for the admission free of duty for 10 years of Spanish scientific, literary and artistic works.

Art. 14 gives Spain consular rights in the relinquished islands.

Art. 15 pledges each country to give to the merchant vessels of the other, for 10 years (or until sooner terminated by six months notice from either country to the other), the same treatment in respect of port charges as it accords its own.

Art. 16 limits the obligations of the United States as to Cuba to the period of its occupancy, it agreeing, however, to advise any government hereafter established there to assume the same obligations.

Art. 17 provides for ratification "by the president of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the senate thereof, and by her majesty the queen of Spain," the ratifications to be exchanged at Washington within six months from December 10, 1898.

Opposition in the senate to the ratification of the treaty was led by Senator Hoar who, on the 5th introduced a resolution that the president—

so far as in his judgment not inconsistent with the public interest, be requested to communicate to the senate all instructions given by him to the commissioners for negotiating the pending treaty with Spain, and all correspondence between the executive or the department of state with such commissioners, and all reports made by them to him or to the department.

When the resolution came up on the 6th, an attempt was made to refer it to a committee; but Mr. Hoar expressed his fear that this was meant for delay and he succeeded in securing its prompt adoption by the senate.

Mr. Hoar had already given notice of his intention to discuss the Vest resolution, and on the 9th he did so at length. Following is the Vest resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That under the constitution of the United States no power is given to the federal government to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently as colonies. The colonial system of European nations cannot be established under our present constitution, but all territory acquired by the government, except such small amount as may be necessary for coaling stations, correction of boundaries, and similar governmental purposes, must be acquired and governed with the purpose of ultimately organizing such territory into states suitable for admission into the union.

The burden of Mr. Hoar's speech, which was a reply to Senator Platt, of Connecticut, who had opposed the resolution, may be inferred from this quotation: "When you raise the flag over the Philippine Islands as an emblem of dominion and acquisition, you take it down from Independence Hall."

Senator Hoar's speech of the 9th was followed on the 10th by one from Senator Mason on the same side. Mr. Mason, however, spoke to a resolution of his own, which he had offered on the 7th. It is as follows:

Whereas, All just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed; therefore, be it resolved, by the senate of the United States, That the government of the United States of America will not attempt to govern the people of any other country in the world without the consent of the people themselves, or subject them by force to our dominion against their will.

In favor of the treaty, the more important speech of the two so far made in the senate was delivered on the 11th by Senator Foraker. Its importance lay in the fact that Mr. Foraker intimated, with an assumption of authority, that the administration has no intention of interfering with local self-government in the Philippines, or of making the United States occupancy more than temporary.

When he said that it had been "decided to take possession ourselves—for the present at least—until the people of those islands are ready and capable of self-government," there was a stir of astonishment in the senate at the suggestion of temporary occupancy, and Mr. Foraker reiterated his assertion, adding:

I do not understand that anyone desires anything but the ultimate independence of the people of the Philippines, neither the president nor anyone in this chamber.

Mr. Foraker also said, answering a question asked by Mr. Hoar as to the right of the Philippines to self-government:

With the determination of the ultimate policy respecting the Philippines, their feelings will have much to do. No one, so far as I am able to learn, is prepared by force and violence to take and hold them. I am willing to trust the administration. I have no sympathy with those who talk of making war on Aguinaldo any more than I had with those who talked of making war on Gomez.

President McKinley's proclamation to the Filipinos, referred to in these columns last week as having been cabled but not made public, was promulgated on the 5th at Manila by Gen. Otis. According to the version of the Associated Press, Gen. Otis, after reciting briefly President McKinley's instructions, expressed the opinion that it is the intention of the American government while directing affairs generally to appoint representative Filipinos forming the controlling element, to civil positions. He also expressed himself as convinced that the United States government intends to seek the establishment in the islands of a most liberal government, in which the people will be as fully represented as the maintenance of law and order will permit, and susceptible of development, on lines of increased representation and the bestowal of increased powers, into a government as free and independent as is enjoyed by the most favored provinces in the world. To this end he invited the full confidence and cooperation of the Filipinos. Nothing was said in the proclamation regarding the disarmament of the Filipinos.

Gen. Otis's proclamation was followed by a manifesto from President Aguinaldo accusing the American government of bad faith and calling upon the people to work together for Philippine independence. The re-

publican papers of Manila do not yield in their demands for independence.

The news reports from Washington have all along indicated a war-like disposition toward the Filipinos; but the more recent reports go to show that the instructions to the American troops off the island of Panay have gone no further than to order them to land, and, getting into communication with the Filipinos at Iloilo, to make public the purposes of the United States. "The policy to be adopted now," says the Associated Press report from Washington, "is a gentle one. Persuasion will be used before power." At last accounts the Americans had not landed at Iloilo, and the city was still held by Filipino troops. Filipino committees in Paris, Madrid and London telegraphed on the 9th to President McKinley a protest against the disembarkation of American troops at Iloilo, as premature before the ratification of the treaty of peace.

Gen. Wood arrived at New York on the 10th en route from Santiago, Cuba, to Washington. His departure from Santiago was noted last week, its object being to confer with the Washington authorities regarding Gen. Brooke's order requiring Santiago customs receipts to be sent to Havana. This had aroused great indignation in Santiago, and, as already reported, a mass meeting of citizens had requested Gen. Wood to intercede. Gen. Brooke revoked his objectionable order before Col. Wood reached New York; and Santiago will retain its customs receipts.

Politics in the United States are assuming shape in the democratic party for the presidential campaign of 1900. The indications now are that the party will be split both by the money question and the question of colonial expansion. At the Jackson day banquet on the 6th in Cincinnati, Wm. J. Bryan struck the keynote for the wing of the party which he represents. He emphasized the doctrine of free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, as set forth in the Chicago platform, and then took up the colonial question. His speech upon that issue was largely in answer to this searching interrogatory:

Whether we can govern colonies as well as other countries can is not material; the real question is whether we

can, in one hemisphere, develop the theory that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed, and at the same time inaugurate, support and defend in the other hemisphere a government which derives its authority entirely from superior force. And, if these two ideas of government cannot live together, which one shall we choose?

His answer was sufficiently explicit in the peroration, when he said:

We cannot afford to destroy the declaration of independence; we cannot afford to erase from our constitutions, state and national, the bill of rights; we have not time to examine the libraries of the nation and purge them of the essays, the speeches and the books that defend the doctrine that law is the crystallization of public opinion, rather than an emanation from physical power. But even if we could destroy every vestige of the laws which are the outgrowth of the immortal law penned by Jefferson; if we could obliterate every written word that has been inspired by the idea that this is "a government of the people, by the people and for the people," we could not tear from the heart of the human race the hope which the American republic has planted there. The impassioned appeal, "Give me liberty or give me death," still echoes around the world. In the future, as in the past, the desire to be free will be stronger than the desire to enjoy a mere physical existence. The conflict between right and might will continue here and everywhere until a day is reached when the love of money will no longer sear the national conscience, and hypocrisy no longer hide the hideous features of avarice behind the mask of philanthropy.

Mr. Bryan took the same ground regarding the democratic policy at the Jackson day banquet on the 7th at Chicago that he had taken in Cincinnati; and ex-Gov. Altgeld, in an eloquent speech at the Jackson day banquet on the same day at Omaha, a speech pitched in a high moral key, endorsed the same policy. Another speaker at the Omaha banquet was Congressman Sulzer, a Tammany democrat of New York city, who is mentioned as Tammany's choice for democratic leader in the next house. Mr. Sulzer placed himself in his speech squarely upon the Chicago platform.

But Richard Croker, the "boss" of Tammany hall, has taken pains to outline a democratic policy diametrically opposed to that advocated by Bryan and Altgeld. He wrote a letter on the 6th to the New York papers in which he opposed the free coinage of

silver at 16 to 1 as a dead issue, and advocated expansion. On the latter question he said: "I believe in holding whatever possessions we have gained by annexation, purchase or war."

Wm. A. Poynter, as governor of Nebraska; Roger Wolcott, as governor of Massachusetts; Chas. S. Thomas, as governor of Colorado; Lewellyn T. Powers, as governor of Maine; Frank Rollins, as governor of New Hampshire; and W. E. Stanley, as governor of Kansas, have been inaugurated since our last issue. Among the governors' messages read to legislatures were those of Stephens, of Missouri; Thomas, of Colorado; Stanley, of Kansas; Ellerbee, of South Carolina; Mount, of Indiana; Wolcott, of Massachusetts, and Pingree, of Michigan. Pingree's message was largely devoted to the subject of equal taxation, though he took occasion to attack the colonial policy proposed by the Spanish treaty. He also severely scored the improvident granting of street franchises. His remedies for this were twofold; first, reference of street franchises to popular vote; and, second, municipal ownership of street car systems. As to the latter he said:

The arguments in favor of municipal ownership are too many to be stated here in detail, but a few may be briefly stated: (1) The taking out of the control of the council of a matter which has always, in large cities, been the most fruitful source of municipal corruption. (2) The tendency of a public plan to give the greatest consideration to the lives and comfort of passengers. (3) The tendency of such a system to confine the tracks to as few streets possible, instead of, as in the franchise system to cover as many as possible. (4) The reduction of fare to as low a point as is consistent with the cost of maintenance.

The governor of Vermont, on the 11th, appointed Chief Justice Jonathan Ross, of the state supreme court, to the vacancy in the United States senate made by the death of Senator Morrill; and the following candidates for United States senator have been agreed upon by caucuses of the dominant party in their respective states: Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, republican, Massachusetts; A. J. Beveridge, republican, Indiana; Senator J. C. Burrows, republican, Michigan; John Kean, republican, New Jersey; Senator Joseph R. Hawley, republican, Connecticut; Senator Hall, republican,

an, Maine; and Senator C. D. Clark, republican, Wyoming.

The legislature of Delaware, which had not been able to organize last week after 54 ballots for speaker, succeeded in organizing this week on the 91st ballot. The democrats with 12 members finally united with the regular republicans who had 11, and thus defeated the so-called "union" republicans who had 12. Other legislatures to organize since our last issue are those of Indiana, Nebraska, Missouri, Massachusetts, Texas, Kansas, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and West Virginia.

The extraordinary session of the Kansas legislature, the proceedings of which were noted in these columns last week, came to a close on the 9th without further legislation than that already reported.

Proceedings were instituted on the 5th in the supreme court of Ohio, by the attorney general of the state, for the forfeiture of the charters and the dissolution of the Standard Oil company. Eight instances of violation of charter are specified as grounds for the forfeiture proceedings. The attorney general has for several weeks been engaged in procuring evidence upon which to base these proceedings, and the company has thrown a great variety of obstacles in his way. He asserts among other things that he has positive proof that the company, in the midst of the investigation, burned several boxes of books containing incriminating entries. Two weeks have been given the company in which to answer the petition for forfeiture of its charters.

Across the water, the Dreyfuss trouble in France has broken out in a new place. The sensational resignation of the president of the civil section of the court of cassation has thrown Paris into an uproar again, and fears are expressed that in this judge a revolutionary leader will be found. On the 8th it was first reported that M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire, the presiding judge referred to above, had resigned his office but refused to assign a motive. On the 9th, however, he published a statement in which he charged a conspiracy on the part of the criminal section of the court of cassation, which has the Dreyfus case under consideration, to exonerate Dreyfus. He declared, also, that his resignation was intended to

avenge the army and its generals for the sufferings they had to endure in silence. This publication he followed on the 10th with another, in which he exhorted the government to take the Dreyfus case from the criminal section of the court and refer it to the 49 magistrates composing the whole court, or to five of the oldest judges. The gist of his accusations seemed from this last publication to be that M. Loew, the president of the criminal section, had conferred with Col. Picquart privately in an anteroom. M. Beaurepaire's resignation was accepted on the 10th by decree of President Faure, and Ballot de Beaufre appointed to the vacancy. On the same day, to remove any taint of suspicion which Beaurepaire's resignation and statements might have created, the minister of justice announced that when the evidence in the Dreyfus case is in, and the arguments begin, M. Mazeau, the first president of the court of cassation, will preside over the criminal section, instead of M. Loew, the president of that section. Meanwhile M. Mazeau has been appointed by the minister of justice to institute an inquiry into M. Beaurepaire's accusations. Another statement was published by Beaurepaire on the 11th in which he set forth further reasons for doubting Loew's impartiality. The situation is regarded in Paris as the most dangerous yet to the republic. Beaurepaire is looked upon as the needed leader of the anti-Semite and military reactionaires, and his public statements are construed as bids for the favor of those factions.

On the 10th a new president of the French chamber of deputies was elected without the disorder in anticipation of which extreme precautions had been taken. The new president is Paul Deschanel. He was elected by a vote of 323 to 187 for M. Brisson, the radical.

Greece is on the eve of an election. The king has dissolved the chamber, and the second ministry of M. Zaimis—that which he appointed upon the resignation of his first ministry, reported in *The Public* of November 12, on page 10—will appeal to the constituencies. M. Delyannis leads the opposition, and is supported by Gen. Smolenski, who was minister of war in the first Zaimis ministry. The election is set for February 20.

The English forces in Egypt have routed the last of the formidable

dervish chiefs in the Soudan. Emil Fedil, the chief alluded to, while crossing the Blue Nile on December 26, was attacked by Col. Lewis and his force dispersed. Col. Lewis lost 27 men killed, and 7 officers and 18 men wounded.

Little effort is any longer made to conceal the purpose of the English to assume sovereign power in the Soudan. At a reception to Soudanese sheiks given on the 5th at Cairo by Lord Kitchener and Viscount Cromer, the British diplomatic agent in Egypt, Lord Cromer, said to them; "For the future you will be governed by the queen and the khedive. The sole representative in the Soudan of the two governments will be the sirdar, in whom both the queen and the khedive have the fullest confidence. No attempt will be made to govern the country from Cairo, still less from London." Then announcing that they must look to the sirdar alone for good government, Lord Cromer promised them perfect religious freedom, and in reply to a shiek's question assured them that the moslem sacred law would be applied. He also declared that taxation would be moderate and just. The *London Times* says of these declarations that "they constitute the plainest assertion of British sovereign rights in the Soudan yet made."

NEWS NOTES.

—Lord Curzon formally assumed the governor-generalship (commonly called viceroyalty) of India on the 6th at Calcutta.

—On the 11th the battleships Oregon and Iowa sailed from Callao, Peru, the former for Honolulu and the latter for San Francisco.

—A conference of officers of Wisconsin municipalities was held at Milwaukee on the 6th. It developed a strong sentiment in favor of municipal ownership.

—The president has nominated Charlemagne Tower, of Pennsylvania, as ambassador to Russia, and Joseph H. Choate, of New York, as ambassador to Great Britain.

—The various steel and wire interests in the United States have formed a trust to be known as the American Steel and Wire company of New Jersey, with a capital of \$90,000,000—\$40,000,000 preferred, and \$50,000,000 common stock.

—The attorney-general of Illinois is prosecuting for penalties all corporations which neglect to file affidavits showing that they are not parties to

any trust or combination in restraint of trade. The penalty is \$50 a day for each day's neglect.

—The annual meeting of the sugar trust was held on the 11th at Jersey City. A resolution carried to reserve all profits, less dividends declared to date, for working capital, which is understood to mean that the trust intends to kill off all competition by cutting prices so low as to leave no profit.

—Single tax men of Chicago are organizing to support ex-Gov. Altgeld for mayor. Temporary headquarters have been taken in the Unity building, under the management of Walter F. Cooling. The committee responsible for the work consists of Walter F. Cooling, chairman; John Waaze, secretary; George A. Shilling, John Z. White, Franklin H. Wentworth, F. D. Butler, W. H. Maguire, Gustaf Holehr, H. F. Williams, Leon Hornstein, J. McGrath and A. T. Johnson. A public meeting of single taxers favorably interested is called for the 14th at Orpheus Hall, Schiller Building.

IN CONGRESS.

Week ending Jan. 11, 1899.

Senate.

Mr. Hoar presented a resolution on the 5th requesting the president to communicate the instructions to the commissioners for negotiating the pending treaty with Spain. It went over the day under the rule.

On the 6th Mr. Davis moved to refer Mr. Hoar's resolution to the committee on foreign relations, to which Mr. Hoar objected. The resolution was then adopted in secret session, without reference. Mr. Caffery spoke at length in support of the Vest resolution against a colonial system.

A resolution was submitted on the 7th by Mr. Mason, declaring that the government of the United States will not attempt to govern the people of any other country without the consent of the people themselves, and at his request it was laid upon the table subject to his call. The District of Columbia appropriation bill was then taken up and passed.

Aside from routine business the time of the senate was occupied on the 9th by Mr. Hoar in an address in support of the Vest resolution.

Mr. Mason called up his resolution on the 10th and spoke at length in support of it.

A resolution declaring that any armed action by our government against the Philippines would be an unwarranted act of war on the part of the president, was introduced on the 11th by Mr. Allen; and on the same day Mr. Foraker spoke at length in support of the Spanish treaty. The treaty was reported in executive session by the foreign relations committee, without amendment, and the senate authorized

the treaty and all the proceedings of the commission to be made public.

House.

The day on the 5th was spent chiefly in consideration of the Alaska crimes bill.

On the 6th, 7th and 9th the legislative executive and judicial appropriation bill was considered. A motion to strike out the civil service appropriation was defeated on the 9th by 124 to 96, and the bill was then passed.

Consideration of the Alaska crimes bill was resumed on the 9th and continued on the 10th, and also on the 11th, when it was passed.

MISCELLANY

THE SPECTRAL GUEST.

For The Public.

The landlord lived in a house of stone;
With purple and gold, his livery shone;
To supply his wants taxed every zone;
And he lived a life of ease.
But the landless poor spent life in toil;
They delved in the mines, and tilled the soil;
And the fruits of their labor were the landlord's spoil,
Which he ever would greedily seize.

In the homes of the poor sat a specter gaunt;
That specter was "Want, and the Fear of Want."
Them awake or in dreams, like a fiend, he would haunt,
Till life was dreary and bare.
They summoned a priest, and bade him tell
A way of relief from the specter's spell.
The good priest said: "By candle and bell,
And exorcism and prayer."

As the rubric prescribes, to the specter he said:
"Cursed be thou, from the crown of the head,
To the sole of the foot;" but the specter dread
Never winced or fled away,
Though the lighted candle was dashed on the ground,
And the bell was tolled with a solemn sound.
Said the priest, when futile his efforts were found:
"God wills the specter's stay."

As drowning men will clutch at a straw,
So hungry men will clutch at the law.
Lo here, or lo there, as anyone saw,
They framed and enacted laws.
Astounding results, from their laws, ensue;
From vast to vaster the specter's form grew,
As if from their laws he sustenance drew;
But they could not fathom the cause.
An implous few, who could not understand,
While plenty and more was produced in the land,
Why they should go with an empty hand,
Eternal Justice blame.
And throughout the land was a vague unrest,
And even the landlord seemed unblest,
Forebodings dire his heart oppressed,
And fears he could not name.

But there came a man, a friend of the poor;

And he spake as man never spake before,
Since the days of Him on Galilee's shore,
"Whom the common people heard gladly."

"The specter," he said, "that vexes your lives,
Brings hunger and cold to your children and wives,
Is the child of Injustice—on monopoly thrives."

And he kindled a hope in each poor man's breast,
As he told him the way, with the keenest zest,
To oust the unwelcome spectral guest.
But the landlord heard him sadly.

BENJAMIN H. DAVIS.

Foxcroft, Me.

FREE TRADE AND PEACE.

What divides the Cobdenite from his opponent is not, strictly speaking, the cause of peace as against war, but the greater cause of humanity as against cynicism and materialism. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the cause of peace and humanity are the same. In the hundredth case where peace means acquiescence in a colossal crime the true exponent of imperial greatness becomes suddenly conscious of imperial weakness, the jingo roars at you as gently as any sucking dove, and it is left to those who most hate war in itself to press for the execution of justice upon a criminal. Apart from this exception the creed of Cobden is the creed of peace, and we do not know what modern statesmanship has to offer us that is better. Those who charge Cobden with a narrow commercialism forget that to him free trade meant not only the redemption of the masses from a state of abject poverty which is now almost forgotten, but a permanent basis for the peace of the world.—Manchester (England) Guardian.

HOW PROTECTION MAKES WORK.

For the Public.

Dave Wells is a liberal-minded fellow, but he cannot take in that point. Now, I am broad-minded, and willing to admit whatever good there is in any theory, so I said: "I'll make it clear to you for once—Pat had a pig worth a pound and potatoes worth a pound. The land owner takes the pig for rent and leaves the potatoes. See?"

"Yes," says Wells, "he would do that."

"Now," says I, "the land owner sends the pig to Jamaica for rum and drinks the rum."

"So he does," David put in.

"But," I continued, "Pat has now no pig, and no way of getting one. But, if the land owner trades back the pig to Pat for whisky made out of the potatoes in Ireland, Pat can eat the pig instead of the potatoes, and has the work (for

which he gets wages in his profit) of making the whisky. See?"

"Where does his profit come in?" says Wells.

"Why," I replied, "of course the potatoes are worth more after Pat has put his labor on them making whisky of them, than they were as plain potatoes, so Pat can keep some of them to eat and use the rest for the whisky, which the land owner employed him to make. Now you see how keeping the trade to ourselves gives work."

Wells said: "But, if rum is cheaper in Jamaica, so that the land owner sends there for it, why couldn't Pat have sent his spare potatoes to Jamaica in exchange for rum, and traded some of the rum to his land owner for the pig? Then he'd have had the profit without the work."

Wells isn't so liberal as I had supposed.

BOLTON HALL.

HARD QUESTIONS.

State Superintendent of Schools Stetson was visiting a school down in Pembroke, when he got into the pleasant mazes of nature studies, and asked some interesting questions about the little things of the world about us.

"How many seed compartments are there in an apple?" he queried. No one knew. "And yet," said the state superintendent, "all of you eat many apples in the course of a year, and see the fruit every day, probably."

"You must learn to notice the little things in nature. Now perhaps some little boy who has driven the cows to pasture every day this summer can tell me on which jaw the cow has her teeth?"

No answer. Rather was there blank astonishment, at last pierced by one little fellow volunteering the information, that "our cow has teeth on both jaws, 'cause she chaws hay all up fine."

"If that is so, my boy," replied the head of the state schools, "I'd advise you to sell that wonderful cow with teeth on both jaws to some museum. I'm afraid, children, that you haven't studied nature quite closely enough."

The talk of the state superintendent deeply impressed the children. They earnestly discussed the matter at recess time, and the teacher next day overheard this conversation in the playground:

A little girl got some of her companions around her and gravely said: "Now, children, make believe that I'm Mr. Stetson. You've got to know more about common things. If you don't you'll all grow up to be fools."

"Now tell me," she said, looking sternly at a playmate, "how many

feathers has a hen?"—Bangor Commercial.

THE VULNERABLE POINT OF OUR CIVILIZATION.

Extracts from a paper on "Private Business is a Public Trust," by Albion W. Small, Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago, published in the American Journal of Sociology for November, 1895.

It will possibly be news to many men, who look from the calm heights of professional position upon the struggles of organized wage earners, that only those children who inherit a title to land or its use are born into a legally protected right to earn a living. Other children may inherit money or equivalent personal property, and so long as it lasts the law will protect them in its use. Then they must apply, with the crowd born without inheritance, to those who possess the land, for the privilege of working in further support of life. They have no legal right to the pursuit of the occupation in which they have previously tried to bear their share of the world's work, nor to any of the revenues of that occupation. Our institutions guarantee them no right to be men; they simply enforce a claim to a share of paupers' dole. True, only comparatively few men suffer in their purse from this condition. Neither did the southern slaves as a rule endure physical privations in excess of those which they have borne since emancipation. As in the case between the American colonies and Great Britain, however, it is not the money cost but the manhood cost of submission that makes the relation oppressive. A quickened social consciousness is calling for reconsideration of this phase of our social order. Impeachment of our industrial organization is meanwhile not an attack upon men, but judgment of a system.

The vulnerable point in our present society is not its permission of large wealth to some of its members, but its maintenance of institutions which, in the last analysis, make some men's opportunity to work for wealth under any conditions dependent upon the arbitrary will of other men.

In so far as agitations for social changes squint toward the notion of equal reward for unequal work, or equal division of the products of industry, they seem to me covetous not only of the impossible, but of the unjust, the unreasonable, and consequently of the altogether undesirable. So long as men contend for such extravagances, the real vice of our civilization will be obscured. A social system which incorporates the assumption that a por-

tion of society may righteously monopolize the productive forces of nature, so that other men must ask the permission of the monopolists to draw on the resources of nature, practically denies to the unprivileged class not merely a rightful share of goods, but an intrinsic claim to any share at all. In other words it establishes at least two castes among men, the caste of the propertied and the caste of the pauperized.

The resources of the world are divided up among the members of the propertied caste, and the remainder of men depend upon the members of this caste for permission to get a share of nature by labor in improving nature.

Equal revenues from unequal services is an immoral conception. Desire for such a condition deserves no sympathy from honest men. Desire for equality in title to a place in the world where happiness may be pursued without power of veto by any other human being is an outcropping of our common humanity.

Security of right to be on the earth and to use the full measure of personal power to gain happiness, is not yet completely assured in human society. Every human being who belongs in society at all belongs there as a citizen, not as a suppliant.

The men who cleared parts of Manhattan Island a hundred years or more ago, deserved generous returns for their labor. If any of their remote grandchildren are collecting large ground rents from the success of the family in compelling other people to go out of their way and improve less desirable land, the legality of their claim may be undisputed, but its justice is more than doubtful. I should be much surprised to learn of an economist today so mortgaged to tradition as to believe that our present system of landed proprietorship corresponds with the largest interpretation of equity. It is defended simply as a lesser evil.

A WARNING.

For The Public.

The first half of this story appeared in the last issue of *The Public*. The hero, an Englishman named Dick Norris, is relating to his home friends in England his experiences during a visit to the United States, made presumably in the latter part of the coming century. The republic has decayed and its civilization has almost disappeared under the shadow of a huge autocratic industrial socialism, which not regarding land-ownership as an evil, has developed two classes—the bloated landlords who are petty kings; and a degraded slave class which works at all grades of employment for a bare sustenance. Dick had no alternative upon landing in America, but to live at a hotel, become attached to a landlord, or enter a government work-

shop. Having made several trials to attach himself to a landlord, but without success, he applied to the state industrial bureau, and after examination as to his ability as an engineer was assigned to a workshop. He was at the same time given citizenship papers conferring the right to vote. For that right, though no longer actually exercised by the working classes, still existed in legal theory. The second and concluding part of the story begins with Dick's first experiences in the government workshop.

To return to the government workshop. The superintendent is an important personage of undoubted loyalty to the landlord interest. Combined with the United States commissioner of industry, the superintendents determine, subject to congressional indorsement, all matters pertaining to manufactures and their disposition. They also have, in connection with a subdivision of the census bureau, another important office. They receive and award annually a certain number of marriage permits, whose issue is regulated with a view of controlling the increase of population. Marriage is not made compulsory, but the superintendent has the power of awarding or withholding these permits at his discretion.

Every workshop is policed with a guard of militia, commanded by a commissioned officer.

Well, I received further honors. Upon leaving the superintendent's office I was ordered to doff my civilian's clothes and don the workers' uniform. I was also informed that I was number 1,260, and I had already been informed that I would have to obey under penalty the orders of the foreman of my department, and that in return for my services, I would be supplied, free of charge, with board, clothing and implements.

The factory buildings were arranged around a hollow square, on one side the workshop, on another the dormitories, one for each sex, and one for the married workers; on another the restaurant, if so dignified a title could be used. The entrance, guarded by a sentry, was flanked on either side by sleeping quarters for a small guard of militia. There was also a hall for religious worship, at which attendance on Sundays was compulsory.

The visible origin of these workshops was, generations back, in prison labor. Against this there were many protests from the labor unions of those days, which at one time promised to become powerful bodies. Some laws, indeed, were passed in their favor, but they might as well have tried to sweep back the ocean as hope to maintain labor's rights while tax laws giving landowners the power to control and rob industry remained in force.

The land question, the root of these evils, was at this critical period in the nation's affairs neglected, and the present deplorable conditions are the logical outcome of a direct reversal of fundamental justice.

There came at last a deadlock between the government and the controlling syndicates, for every trade, manufacture and profession had by that time become syndicated. The government needed an enormous annual increase of revenue for the support of paupers, criminals and insane, caused directly and indirectly by landlordism. To meet this increased need for revenue, money and the products of industry were taxed more and more year by year, with the inevitable result of increasing failure to respond to such heavy taxation. This deadlock was gradually broken by putting paupers and criminals to work, with the purpose of making them self-supporting, and to that extent relieving the state treasuries. Thence they gradually became a source of national revenue by supplying government stores. Meanwhile industry after industry was grasped by the government, and independent labor and enterprise were step by step crushed out of existence. Laborers and wage-earners with their families dying from exposure and starvation, sought refuge in the state workshops, and at last labor was safe under hatches, so to speak.

It seems incredible that there was no successful attempt at resistance, and that the majority of a nation of over 60,000,000 walked meekly into the shambles. The government, it is true, began by running the workshops at reasonable hours, treated the workers well, and gave all except criminals freedom when the day's work was over. They paid them, too, for their labor. But all this gradually changed. The government saw in the moral and intellectual deterioration of the workers the lessening of their power of resistance, and at the present moment they are, as a class, degraded almost beyond recognition as human beings.

Another powerful factor in the downfall of that nation was the perversion of the public school system. Like other free institutions in that country, public education gradually decayed. Its original purpose, as you well know, was the free education of all children whose parents were unable to expend money for the purpose. Rudimentary education in reading, writing and arithmetic, and above all the development of the child's reasoning faculties, were the main points to be considered; affording the pupils sufficient knowledge to

enable them, if they so willed, to carry on their own studies when their school days ended. This original purpose was gradually abandoned. Instead of extending operations on this simple and broad plan, which would have enabled the pioneering of other reforms into the poor, densely crowded districts, the public school system extended upwards, and the children of the well-to-do began to appear among its scholars. Costly buildings were erected in prosperous localities, whereas poor and crowded districts were neglected. Then, of course, came the tax problem; funds ran short or were misappropriated, and at last the original purpose of this inspired act was totally lost sight of. Education, from university down to primary school (save where endowments existed), was carried on at the expense of the tax-producer, or in other words at the expense of the worker whose children were practically denied admittance to the schools. At the present time there are for the children of workers none but technical schools.

The controlling class moreover perceived that popular education threatened their institutions, and, in addition to perverting the original purpose of public education, saw to it that a rigid censorship was exercised over all that was taught, and later a system of secret espionage was inaugurated, with the result that many a teacher was dismissed upon some trumped-up charge, whose only sin had been that of developing the independent thought of his pupils. All was prohibited which the government deemed inimical to the landlord interest.

Public utilities must of necessity fail while laws remain which in effect deny man's equal natural rights. The situation, indeed, is like presenting a man with gun and ammunition in a country where, whichever way he turns, or wherever there is game, he is warned off as a trespasser—he stands no chance of bagging game. And as a man under similar circumstances will at last throw down his gun with a curse, so will the people treat with sullen indifference that which results in no material benefit to themselves.

I started in my workshop—and such a workshop, draughting room, or whatever it might be called, I never was in before. Workers are given no insight into the final purpose of the work upon which they are engaged, but I drew the inevitable conclusion that so far as the department was concerned there was little demand for engineering work of any kind. I am, you know, experienced in field work, plotting, topographical and railroad work generally. My

foreman must have been appointed for his ignorance of such work, and it did not suit my purpose to enlighten him. I soon understood that dense ignorance prevailed in high quarters, that appointments were necessarily made blindly, and that the purpose and custom of all the workers was, while appearing to be busily employed, to do as little work as possible. Is it to be wondered at that eventually workers produced little, if any, more than the value of their miserable maintenance?

The work in the department was connected with the construction and maintenance of railroads and canals, which are owned and operated by the government.

Subsequently I worked in many of these workshops, workers being transferred at the whim of the government. In all the same paralysis was evident. Inefficiency, dishonesty, ignorance and brutality were supreme. There was such a plethora of workers that the use of machinery seemed like a monstrous absurdity, so, incredible as it may appear, there was a tendency towards its disuse. When an old machine was worn out or disabled, the costly process of replacing it was usually abandoned to give employment to idle hands. Both the manufacture and handling of machinery, too, required a degree of intelligence and care which apparently had become extinct.

Now I will relate an incident which brought to an abrupt termination my stay in the United States.

I was finally transferred to a workshop where clothing was made out of shoddy. My work consisted in pressing out seams with a hot iron. It was in this workshop that I became acquainted with one of the workers named Mary Tristem.

The work benches were arranged in rows running at right angles with the length of the room, and divided by aisles. The workshops were long, low sheds, lighted by skylights or glass roofs, each workshop accommodating about a thousand workers. Mary worked across the aisle, close to which was my bench, and sufficiently near for me to easily observe her.

She was born in New York. Her parents, long since dead, had both been workers in the same shop. They had twice attempted their escape; the first time recaptured, the second time they gave themselves up, reduced to the last extremities of suffering, as their escape had been attempted in the winter. As a result of their terrible exposure, added to confinement and low prison diet, her father died. His wife

soon followed him, and this poor child was alone amid her terrible surroundings.

At the age of seven years Mary began her apprenticeship in garment making. At twelve she was a full-fledged worker and under full discipline. She was sixteen when her mother died, and three years before our acquaintance began. She had one brother, who had succeeded in making his escape, she thought, to this country, but no letter from him had reached her. This, she told me, did not surprise her, all letters to workers being intercepted and examined by the superintendent.

Mary told me what she knew of the early history of her family, and from it I gained an insight into the rapid downfall of industries in that unhappy country. Small farms languished and small industries failed. Independent manufacturers were swallowed up or squeezed out by syndicates backed by big capital. One after another the smaller landowners succumbed, until some of the big estates equaled in area some of the larger states in the union.

When disaster threatened they thought their salvation lay in themselves speculating in land, thereby in reality aiding the force which was surely crushing the national prosperity; for as land speculation and landlordism as a whole are opposed to the best interests of the worker, be he laborer, farmer, manufacturer, merchant or professional man, so each and every such transaction has its proportionately depressing influence. In land speculation, more than in anything else, do the big fish swallow the little fish, and we can with certainty foretell the hopeless struggle, the mortgage growing little by little, with the inevitable ending—the foreclosure.

The workers were allowed two hours' liberty every evening, and many an evening I would accompany Mary on a stroll in the country, quickly reached by a conveyance. On these little trips I told her whatever I thought would interest her about the outside world. In return she, poor child, had but little to relate save the cruelty and wrong incident to her short life. Yet under such a slavery she had by some marvelous agency retained to a wonderful degree her intelligence, sweetness and natural grace. I mentally likened her to a rare and delicate exotic blooming amid a wilderness of rank weeds. What power sustained her was to me a mystery, until we became better acquainted. She was an enthusiastic lover of natural scenery. On one of our short evening rambles

she led the way by some steep climbing until we found ourselves in a level place, shut in in three directions by gigantic lichen-covered rocks and pine woods. The ground was carpeted with moss and myrtle. From this charming resting place the river, which a little higher up took a turn westwards, was visible for miles. We seated ourselves, delighted with the prospect, and watched the glowing western sky which threw into dark relief the wooded hills on the opposite shore. Mary told me that her mother had loved this spot, and that summer and winter they had never missed an opportunity of coming here together, adding that since her mother's death she still loved to come here alone.

In addition to her delight in nature, Mary had another wellspring of happiness. The workers were allowed a few odd possessions and books, the latter undergoing the customary censorship. I judged that the library was not extensive, but she had read and re-read until she had by heart selections which showed, to my thinking, rare discrimination. Her speech, too, betrayed a power of imagery which, had opportunity existed, might have found lasting expression. She had a soul of rare beauty and purity, fed and sustained by never failing resources, and was thus enabled to withstand the contaminating influences which surrounded her.

With the one exception of this girl, the inmates of the workshops with whom I had come in contact it would be hard for you to form any conception of. Their lives had been for generations subjected to restrictions which had rapidly worked their mental and physical deterioration. Their minds seemed to be blotted out; even resentment for their sufferings rarely appeared.

Each workshop was subdivided into ten sections, and each section was under control of a foreman, who, like the overseers of ancient slave times, were doubtless selected for their brutality, which thrived on what it fed upon. At least, so I judged from those whom I had seen, and our present foreman was no exception. His features expressed no positive character, good or bad, but when provoked by passion they became distorted by animal ferocity. He made the rounds of the benches several times during the day, but it was only those workers in whom mental sensibility still lingered who afforded him any pleasure. These he would endeavor to goad to some act of insubordination, for which they

would receive lashes and solitary confinement. The others he would openly strike without wasting words.

Mary had never complained to me of the wretch's tyranny, but I well knew how her sensitive nature must have offered itself as a tempting mark for his cruel taunts and insults. I had frequently been on the verge of interference, and was soon to be tempted beyond my endurance, as you will hear.

One morning our foreman was going his rounds, apparently in a more rapacious mood than usual, and as he approached Mary's bench I had a presentiment of what was about to happen, and felt the devil rising within me. I thought I saw the poor child tremble as he came up behind her and roughly seized her work. In answer to her remonstrance, he cruelly insulted her, and appeared to threaten violence. Unable to stand any more, I sprang from my place, wild with anger, and endeavored to interpose. I was very weak, and my passion made me tremble as if I had the ague.

My interference lashed the brute to ungovernable fury. He pushed me aside, and with an oath seized the helpless girl, and shook her with such violence that when he released his hold she fell and struck herself with great force against a sharp corner of the bench. I sprang at him with a curse, and, having in my hand the iron which I had been using in my work, aimed a blow at his head. But he was too quick for me; he wrenched the iron from me, and must have dealt me a pretty bad blow with it, for the next thing I knew I was in a prison cell, almost too weak to move, and with my head throbbing painfully.

I was confined thus for a month, under loathsome circumstances, and with nothing to eat but bread and water. Meanwhile I learned from my jailer that Mary had been so seriously injured that she had been removed to the hospital. Upon my release my first efforts were to obtain news of her, for upon resuming my work I noticed that her place was taken by another. So, after work hours I obtained a permit to visit the hospital, and after some little delay was conducted to her cot.

Always fragile and delicate, I scarcely recognized her, so great was the change wrought by her sickness. Her wan face brightened as I approached. I knelt down by the side of her bed, and seizing the poor, emaciated little hand, which she extended to me, said what I could think of to encourage her and strengthen her resolution to get well enough to enable us both to escape to this country. But I

was conscious, even as I spoke, that my words were commonplace and meaningless in the awful presence of approaching death. When I paused she turned her head with difficulty, and as her eyes met mine I read in them my answer: "Too late."

The following day she died. I fled that night, and lay in hiding until close upon the time of sailing of one of the Liverpool steamers, and once on board knew I was secure from capture.

So ended Dick's story, containing revelations which to the reader must appear improbable beyond belief. But let him consider the forces at work during the critical period of that country's history, the close of the nineteenth century. Let him consider the lethargy—the stupidity of the working classes, which perforce increased as their lot became harder; their fatal pursuit of false issues raised for the very purpose of misleading them; the influences constantly at work for evil—a press whose ill-concealed purpose was to promulgate falsehood in order to perpetuate economic wrong; the church a relic of medievalism, fearful of raising its voice for the truth; and the few with honesty to accept and courage to fight for that truth, subjected to ridicule, persecution and social ostracism. Is not Dick's story the logical outcome of such conditions?

"SPERO MELIORA."

If the Philippines are to be governed by us, they are to be governed as dependent colonies, and there will be two classes of American citizens—one class enjoying the full privileges of the constitution, the other class governed without their consent and under the dominion of the superior class. If we are going to have two classes of American citizens—one at home and one in our colonies—the time will come when there will be two classes of American citizens at home. In other words, imperialism is a step toward monarchy and aristocracy. — Richmond (Va.) Times.

The Disciple—And you teach that we should bear pain and trouble without complaint? I don't think I could do that.

The Stoic Philosopher—Nobody expects you to do it. That is merely our platform.—Puck.

The university professor who refers to government by all the people as an "experiment" confesses hopeless ignorance of all that he should know. No great national life can ever be with-

out a great people. A people which does not do its own thinking, and which does not direct its own acts, can never achieve anything worth doing in art, science or statecraft. The choice is between democracy and militarism; only a fool or a hopelessly ignorant man can be in doubt as to which to choose.—San Francisco Star.

The Rev. J. B. Spiers, writing in the New Church Messenger in reply to a conservative who had buttressed himself against social reform with religious arguments, says that it is one of the curious things in such arguments that some things are "providential," while others are not.

According to these it is providential that the social conditions under which we live are as they are, but not providential that there should be discontent, unrest, anarchy, etc. If this be true, it was providential that England ruled her American colonies tyrannically, but it was not providential that the colonies were dissatisfied; hence it was of evil and the work of evil that the declaration of independence was made and George Washington led the people to become an independent nation. It was providential that slavery should exist with all its uncounted miseries and suffering, but not providential that the slaves should desire freedom, nor that by means of a terrible war they should be set free. The southerners were the conservatives, the northerners the radicals—those who desired a change, a reform, which, not being able to bring about peaceably, they fought to secure. * * * It is providential that the present inequalities and injustice in state and national affairs should exist, but not providential that the restless discontented desire should exist to do away with such conditions.

Teacher—Willy, what is a mushroom?

Willy—A mushroom is one of those things you think you eat, but you don't, and it kills you.—Norristown Herald.

An astonishing innovation of custom is reported from India, where Mrs. Solomon Gossoon, the managing partner of a well-known Jewish firm in Bombay and president of several companies in which the firm takes an interest, has been proposed for a place in the governor-general's council. The proposal comes from a leading Indian paper, and

God Winning Us.

BY

REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:

GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US (Incarnation)
 GOD WINNING US (Atonement)
 GOD OPENING OUR EYES (Faith)
 GOD GROWING IN US (Regeneration)
 GOD ACTING THROUGH US (Religion)
 GOD CARING FOR US (Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
 GERMANTOWN, PA

is probably due to two reasons—her great business ability and the fact that she has made great efforts to draw together the women of Bombay.—Chicago Chronicle.

Finance and Transportation

BY

JAY D. MILLER.

Paper; 96 pages; Single Copies, 10c.,
 20 Copies, \$1.00.

Gov. H. S. Pingree, Lansing, Mich.
 "This publication presents in their true light questions that immediately concern the American people."
 Mayor S. M. Jones, Toledo, O.

"It is one of the most comprehensive statements of our social and economic problems that has come to my hands."

Prof. Geo. D. Herron, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.
 "Its facts are presented in a very unprejudiced and helpful spirit, and can not be set aside. I use it among my students and recommend it everywhere."

Louis F. Post, Chicago.
 "It is an intellectual mine which all parties to the controversy may profitably explore."

JAY D. MILLER'S SONS, Oak Park, Ill.

FRIENDS

of this paper are requested to send us the names and addresses of persons of their acquaintance who would be interested in reading it regularly.

The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office, . . . \$0.02
 Quantities delivered at office, per 100, . . . 1.00
 Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, .03
 Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100, 2.00
 In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100, . . . 1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. **Nero-Tone**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

The Public

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of creditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,
 Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.