

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1899.

Number 43.

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.

By what right does the administration at this time establish a censorship over political news between the United States and the Philippines? When a censorship was established last summer, no one complained. That censorship was for the protection of military secrets from discovery by a public enemy. But this one is totally different. There is no public enemy now, and the only possible object of the censorship is to protect political secrets from discovery by our own people. The censorship last summer was against Spain; the present one is against ourselves. How long does congress intend to allow the war department thus to govern in civil affairs in time of peace?

When the ballot is offered to women in some restricted way, as for school board officers, and the subsequent voting by women is light, opponents of woman suffrage chivalrously infer that few women want to vote. The fact is ignored that men stay away in large numbers from the polls on off years and at other unexciting elections. So on the other hand is the fact ignored that where woman suffrage is general, as in Colorado and Wyoming, women vote as freely as men. But ignorance cannot always prevail. The experience of Ireland is now to be added to that of Colorado and Wyoming. At the municipal elections which recently came off in Ireland the vote of women was very large. One of the London correspondents for the American press cables that among the most noticeable features of the contests was "the keen

desire displayed by women in the elections."

Eastern democrats who are democrats, and not mere partisans of a political machine, are beginning to congratulate themselves upon the election last fall of Roosevelt. There is not a little sense in the reasoning by which their conclusion is reached. Had Judge Van Wyck, the Tammany candidate, been elected, it is argued, he would have been heralded by Croker as the democrat who could carry New York; and then the whole east would have been invited to make him their presidential candidate. Through him, therefore, the Flowers and Whitneys might have stepped back into power in the national democratic party. Whether or not this would have been a result of Van Wyck's election, it is by no means unlikely that it is what Croker and his Wall street pals were playing for; and the wonder is that monopoly did not catch on to the idea, and give Roosevelt the cold shoulder, especially as Roosevelt's election could not but disturb the hopes for 1900 of McKinley, who is a far more adaptable tool of monopoly at the white house than Roosevelt would be. But monopolists as a body are not far sighted. They begin life every morning. The future, even the near future, they leave to take care of itself.

Senator Foraker, of Ohio, has now declared explicitly in the senate that when he spoke against the assumption by the United States of sovereignty over the Philippines in perpetuity, he spoke only for himself, and without any intention or desire of posing as the representative of the president. We had suspected as much. Nevertheless, Mr. Foraker succeeded wonderfully well in what his purpose probably was—demoralizing the administration in its Philippine policy.

Mr. Foraker's speech forced a halt in the president's headlong rush to make the flag float forever over a foreign people, regardless of their wishes. Under all the circumstances, inclusive of the well known fact that the other senator from Ohio, Mr. Hanna, does represent the administration, there was something delicious in Mr. Foraker's insinuating remark, when declaring he had not spoken for the administration, that the contrary supposition "was due, perhaps, to a misunderstanding as to which of the Ohio senators was speaking."

It is an old saying that "where there is smoke there must be fire." Duly impressed with the truth of this adage, we have looked expectantly, lo, these many months, for evidences of that prosperity which the plutocratic papers proclaim so vociferously, but to the presence of which among the people they bear no substantial testimony. We have looked in vain. Among the masses of the people there is an entire absence of any evidence of prosperity. The coal miners have been on the edge of a great strike for a slight increase of wages; but, confronted with threats of reduction, appear to have decided to take what they can get and risk nothing. And numerous minor instances of fruitless attempts to get higher wages are reported; while the "want ads" that fill the columns of the papers, indicate the eagerness of the unemployed for work. Even discharged soldiers find working opportunities exceedingly scarce. While they were at the front, their places were filled, and now they are hopeless beggars for jobs. Those at the relief barracks in Chicago have been cruelly accused of shirking employment from sheer laziness; but this the soldiers resent, and the superintendent of the relief barracks corroborates them. They

say it is almost impossible to get work, even for a day or so, much less a steady job. That they are telling the truth, every one who wants work knows and none who employ workmen will dare deny. Opportunities for work are scarce. If positive general proof were needed, we have it in the most convincing form. Wages have not risen. There can be no better proof. If there were any marked increase in the demand for workers, there would be an upward tendency in wages. Notwithstanding all the exclamations about our magnificent prosperity, there is no prosperity for the great masses of the people.

Nevertheless, there is a species of prosperity. Back of all the smoke there is indeed some fire. At last we have learned what the prosperity touters mean by prosperity. They mean that a few men, men who are little or nothing but industrial parasites, whose fortunes represent so much wealth extorted from its earners—they mean that these men are enormously prosperous. "It is raining gold in Wall street!" shouted one of the newspaper touters last week. "Stocks are towering!" "On every hand can be heard stories of millions made!" are exclamations that may be distinguished above the din. One man in New York who pawned his wife's jewelry a year ago, is now worth \$5,000,000. Another rose from comparative poverty to affluence in a few weeks. Corporation stocks have increased in value by the millions and tens of millions, sugar trust stock being well up in the list. Roswell P. Flower is richer within a few weeks by \$10,000,000, and James R. Keene by \$5,000,000; while John D. Rockefeller adds \$30,000,000 to his hoard, and the Vanderbilts, another Rockefeller, Russell Sage, one of the Goulds, and some of the smaller fry count their gains at from \$200,000 to \$20,000,000 apiece. The premiums on original subscriptions to some of the trusts are at 79 for steel and wire, 62 for biscuit, 80 for glucose, 37 for Federal steel, 35½ for tin plate, and 19

for carbon. And this is what the touters call prosperity! Prosperity it is, to be sure; but for whom, and at whose expense? Not for the workers, but for the few who know how to plunder them. Not at the expense of the labor of those who gain, but at the expense of the labor of those who must ultimately lose.

We say this in no reckless spirit. It is the sober truth. Aside from all the evidences on every hand of pinching poverty, which so plainly deny the presence of general prosperity, there is proof of general poverty in the very fact of these increased fortunes. What do the fortunes mean? If Roswell P. Flower has made \$10,000,000 does it mean that he has added \$10,000,000 to the world's wealth? He would not claim it. It means that he owns corporation stock which draws an increase of income in labor products sufficient to capitalize into \$10,000,000. Flower's increased power, that is to say, of annually extorting wealth from its producers, is worth \$10,000,000. It doesn't mean even that so much more wealth is or is to be produced; but only that he commands the power of taking that much more from current production, whether current production grow or not. It may mean, and probably does mean, that by so much as his fortune has increased, the earnings of unknown millions are diminished. It certainly means that their earnings are not increased. And to that they themselves can testify. Yet this is the magnificent prosperity we hear so much about!

Premier Reid, of New South Wales, did not wholly succeed, it appears, in reversing his free trade policy in order to make up a deficit, a subject to which we referred editorially in our issue of December 24. The New South Wales parliament resisted him, and to a degree held him in check. The tariff of 6 cents on tea, which he proposed, was reduced to 2 cents; his proposed rice tariff of nearly \$15 a ton, was rejected; and he found it necessary to abandon his proposition

to put a tariff upon coffee, cocoa, and chicory. The Melbourne Beacon speaks of "the refusal of so large a number of his followers, democratic free traders and labor members, to endorse his proposals in their entirety," as "a summary lesson to the refractory premier, and an indication of how deep is the hold of the free trade policy he has done so much to extend in New South Wales."

For lightning change artists, your real estate tax payer is without a superior. When questions of disbursing public revenue are up, he is in a front pew, insisting upon having pretty much everything to say, and even blandly proposing to shut off "non-taxpayers" from having any say at all. His argument then, is that as he alone pays real estate taxes he alone should determine their expenditure. But when it is proposed to increase the burden of taxes, presto! and no longer a tax payer, he pleads with tears in his eyes that this thing be not done, because the increased tax would be added to the rent of his tenants. Now, if the increased tax would be added to rents, then present real estate taxes must also be an addition to rent, and it is the tenant and not the owner who pays it. Upon that theory, to adopt the favorite argument of real estate men, all of them ought to be disfranchised and questions of the disbursement of real estate taxes be left to their tenants.

The simple fact is, that one part of a tenant's rent, that which he pays for house accommodations as distinguished from site, does include taxes. If taxes on houses were abolished, his rent would be by that much reduced; if increased, his rent would be by that much rise. As to taxes on houses, then, the occupants are the real tax payers. But not so with sites. If taxes on sites were increased, there would be no increase of rent; if they were completely abolished, there would be no decrease of rent. Taxes on sites, therefore, are a burden not upon tenants, but upon owners. But as the value of sites is produced by the

community and not by the owners, it is only just that the owners should bear that burden. Their income from that source is by right, to the last mill, a common income. A tax on sites is really no tax at all; it exacts nothing that any individual can say he has earned.

We are led to the foregoing observations by noting a wrangle over taxation now in progress in Greater New York. Once more owners of real estate there complain that they are paying a larger proportion of taxation than the owners of personal property; and astute legislators are setting legislative traps for personal property owners. But among all the legislation proposed, only one bill proposes anything practical. It was introduced by Assemblyman Brennan, of Brooklyn, and would allow counties and municipalities to tax real estate values alone, or land values alone, or the values of real estate and personal property together, in their discretion. Under such a law every municipality would have it in its own power to settle tax wrangles, and settle them equitably. By taxing land values alone, it would lay no burden upon tenants, nor upon owners of personalty, and it would take nothing from real estate owners that justly belongs to them. At the same time it would prosper, because men and capital would flow into a community where public revenues were derived exclusively from the differing values which the community as a whole gives to the various sites within its borders, and no man was periodically fined for doing business.

A useful contribution to the handy reference literature of taxation has been made by Geo. J. Bryan in the January number of Frank Vierth's "Why," published at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Mr. Bryan has in this contribution collected the more important facts regarding the practical effect of advances in tax law in New Zealand, New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland, Manitoba, British Columbia, the Northwest Territories of

Canada, Ontario, Great Britain and the United States. Practical men interested in subjects of taxation will find in Mr. Bryan's article a great amount of information which is not elsewhere so easy of access. Among other interesting and instructive facts it shows that in New Zealand, between March, 1897, and October, 1898, majorities—and in some instances, large majorities—were polled in 16 municipalities in favor of exempting land improvements from local taxation and casting the burden upon the value of the land itself. A tendency toward this mode of taxation is also shown to exist not only in other Australasian colonies, but also in Great Britain and parts of Canada.

The protection spirit is at work in the Chicago school board; which is proposing to compel public school teachers to live within the city limits and to exclude married women from the ranks of teachers. There may possibly be involved in the latter proposition genuine public considerations. It may be that a married woman is for that reason less satisfactory as a school teacher than an unmarried one. If so, married women should be excluded. The first consideration should be the efficiency of the schools. But we don't believe that married women are on that account poorer teachers than single women. The presumption is the other way. Moreover, the motive for excluding them, like that for requiring all teachers to live within the city limits, has nothing to do with school efficiency. It is purely a matter of home industry, of protection, of patronage. Teachers are regarded as pensioners, who ought not to draw the pension when they have a husband to support them, nor to spend it beyond the limits of the city from whose treasury it comes. Such is the view of the teacher's function that everywhere inspires such restrictions as those we have noted. It is a false view, radically false. A good teacher leaves in the community where she works greater value in the teaching

she gives than she takes from its treasury. And when in exchange for her teaching she draws her pay, it is her own, to spend wherever she pleases and as she pleases; and whether she be married or single does not upon that score in the slightest degree concern her employers. She is no more a pensioner than is a foreign merchant who draws Chicago money in exchange for the goods he sends there.

Ex-Gov. Altgeld well describes the obligations and duty of a party man to his party. The ex-governor is an independent democratic candidate for mayor of Chicago. His reasons have been already dwelt upon in these columns. Briefly they may be summed up to be the necessity, as he sees it, of defeating Mayor Harrison for reelection, so as to prevent a deal between the city under Harrison, with the street railroad interests, for an improper extension of franchises, and at the same time to defeat the combination between Harrison in Illinois and Croker in New York, to control the next democratic national convention, in the interest of eastern monopolists. For taking this stand Altgeld has been questioned by his own party friends in the state; and one of them, Senator Shumway, has addressed him an open letter on the subject. Altgeld replying, gives his reasons specifically. In addition to the reasons already mentioned, he shows the necessity of independent action, explaining that Harrison, through his control of the city departments, has the primaries of the party completely in his hands, so that a genuine expression of party sentiment cannot be obtained there. Then comes the ex-governor's description of what constitutes party fealty. "To bolt a party," he says, "is to disagree with its declared principles; but a man who is ready to sacrifice everything he has to prevent the principles of the party from being betrayed, is not a bolter. To worship a corrupt political organization as a fetish, and blindly follow it when it is moving toward destruction, is unworthy of a free citizen; and

this practice has done infinite harm to our republic. Political machinery is a curse when prostituted to base purposes." That definition of what is and what is not bolting, is indicative of the sterling democracy of which Gov. Altgeld is a pronounced representative.

Satisfactory progress is reported by R. S. Thompson, of Springfield, Ohio, chairman of the state committee of the new Union Reform party, which aims to effect a national organization at Cincinnati on the 1st of March. Close to \$1,000 has been contributed in small sums toward expenses, and special transportation and hotel arrangements have been made. A two days' convention is anticipated. The object of the organization is to secure a union of the independent forces in politics upon one or more propositions regarding which all agree. The initiative, the referendum, and proportional representation will probably be the original basis of union.

The postmaster of Chicago, in his efforts to clothe his civil service subordinates in livery, has come into collision with the local organization of postal clerks. With but one dissenting vote that body has decided to put the livery question upon official ballots at the election of officers to take place on the 1st of February. Both the regular and the opposition candidates are opposed to the livery proposition. Judging by what was said at this meeting and by what the postmaster said and refused to say in public interviews afterward, he has insinuated threats of arbitrary discipline against clerks who oppose his livery project. In one interview he remarked that he didn't mind saying that he was going to have discipline in his office at all hazards. That would be perfectly right were it not for his very broad interpretation of discipline, in which he includes a right arbitrarily to order his subordinates to wear liveries instead of men's clothes. He might as well order them to shave their mustaches, and

call it discipline. Discipline is one thing; wearing liveries or shaving beards is another.

We have already stated our view on the question of uniforming public servants. When their service is on the street, a uniform is proper for purposes of distinction or identification, so that the public may know that the person wearing a uniform has the authority which it implies; but when a uniform is not necessary for this purpose, as in the case of indoor clerks, there must be something of the spirit of the military martinet or the civil snob in the man who requires his subordinates to wear one. It is understood that the postmaster general has been appealed to in behalf of the Chicago postal clerks in this matter. If he does not interfere with the postmaster, congress ought to.

Last May we on this side of the Atlantic heard vaguely of bread riots in Italy. Of their magnitude and cause we learned little, for a strict Italian censorship was maintained; but the inference from such news as came was that the riots were extensive and that an absorbing system of taxation upon the poor was the bottom cause. It is only recently, however, that information begins to reach us of the merciless way in which the Italian government dealt not only with the actual rioters who, clamoring for bread, were shot down like wild animals in a corral, but also with peaceable men who dared to express sympathy with the desperate victims of plundering taxation. "A reign of terror," says the Manchester Guardian, "prevailed throughout the summer months. The military courts, on evidence often ridiculously inadequate, convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment many well known radical and socialist leaders." It appears upon the same authority that "opposition journals were suppressed, radical and socialist clubs were closed, whole provinces remained in a state of siege long after order had been restored." At last public opinion has recovered from the shock of these

revolutionary measures, and some of the victims have been released from imprisonment. How vicious the persecutions were may be inferred from the fact that the number at first liberated, doubtless comprising the least aggressive agitators, is as high as three thousand. Let it be borne in mind that the classes responsible by their tax persecutions for the Italian riots, and for the legalized reign of terror that followed, are of the classes who are generally regarded as not only capable of self government but of governing others!

It is reported that a cooperative company of painters has been formed in Illinois for the purpose of competing with contractors who refuse to pay union wages. The company is to be composed, it is said, of working painters, and its projectors expect to be able to underbid "unfair" contractors because it can figure upon jobs at cost price. By cost price is meant the actual cost of materials and the actual wages of workmen, without allowance for "profits." This is another instance of miscalculation due to a careless understanding of the meaning of "profits." It is assumed that the profits of contractors are unearned; in other words, that contractors have no function except to charge for a job more than it costs, and then pocket the difference between what it costs and what they get. The inference is drawn, therefore, that a cooperative company of workmen could underbid contractors because they could dispense with the contractors' profit. But they will find themselves sadly disappointed. The reason is almost obvious. It is because the so-called profits of contractors are not all unearned. Contractors have an industrial function. They cannot be dispensed with, without a substitute which would be nearly or quite as expensive.

Contractors' profits have at least three sources. In the first place the contractor is an organizer and director of industry. His income from that source is wages, his own wages. In

the second place, by reason of his special knowledge as an organizer, he knows better than people in other lines of business how to beat down and keep down the wages of workmen in his particular line. His income from that source is wages also, not his own, but theirs, which the stress of conditions forces them to forego. And in the third place, there is an uncertainty about the expense of every job. Gambling upon this, the contractor often wins a stake, though he sometimes loses. On the whole, however, contracting is profitable to the contractor, or he would have to quit the business; and on the whole it is economical to the parties with whom he contracts, or they would stop contracting with him. Yet in the absence of fraud it is not exorbitantly profitable to the contractor, or his competitors would underbid him. For these reasons it should be evident that no body of workmen could successfully underbid contractors without hiring a competent man to do for them what the contractor does for himself. Such a man would be expensive, and they could not afford to take jobs at what they mean by "cost"—that is, for workmen's wages and expense of materials.

It is told of George D. Herron, professor of Applied Christianity in Iowa college at Grinnell, that he was once the cause of the dismissal of a clergyman for reading in that clergyman's pulpit the sermon on the Mount with proper emphasis. Now it seems not improbable that he may himself be dismissed from the faculty of Iowa college for teaching the sermon on the Mount to his class. A dead set has evidently been made against Prof. Herron, in which at least one of the college trustees is engaged. This trustee is John Meyer. He elaborates his views in a letter to the Iowa State Register. As one critic of Mr. Meyer observes, he has much to say in this letter about the integrity of Congregationalism, but nothing about the integrity of Christianity. Mr. Meyer's long letter is of the kind which cannot be answered

in limited space except by a general denial. Any more specific reply would necessitate the reproduction of the long letter, and a straightening out of nearly every one of its multitude of sentences to conform them to the facts. Of Mr. Meyer himself, however, one thing is evident from his letter, and that is that he tests Christianity by business principles, instead of testing business principles by Christianity.

Prof. Herron has not Meyer alone to fear, assuming that he fears anyone in such a matter. The governor of the state publicly denounces his teachings; and the republican papers, as if by preconcert, are united in attacking him. A staff letter to the Marshalltown Times-Republican collects data to prove that Herron is injuring the college. This collection of data shows how difficult it is for any teacher or preacher hailing from Grinnell to get a job at his profession, lest he may be "tainted with Herronism." From that letter it appears also that a school board member at Union will vote against any Grinnell graduate for school superintendent who may be "tainted in the least with Herronism." In another Iowa town a Grinnell graduate upon being ordained as a minister was told, so the Marshalltown paper says, that "they did not want and would not have a minister in sympathy with this movement"—meaning Herronism. Another young minister from Grinnell was advised not to show any recommendations from there, as it would prevent his ordination. It is said also that at New Hampton "there is a general understanding among the Congregationalists not to send their children to Grinnell college;" and the writer of the letter in question adds that upon information, and presumptively upon belief also, "the children of many Congregationalists in northwestern Iowa are sent to Northfield, Minn., where Herronism is not taught." How very much all this reminds one of the days when teachers and preachers were not wanted, even at the North, if "tainted in the least"

with abolitionism. Then it was heresy to teach that slavery was un-Christian; now it is heresy to teach that monopoly is un-Christian.

That Prof. Herron will have to leave Iowa college is almost a foregone conclusion. Christianity and churchianity do not thrive together, and churchianity owns the edifice. The principalities and powers which Christianity rejected twenty centuries ago, churchianity received gladly; and the sulphurous donor steadily exacts his tribute. When there is to be an eviction, therefore, it is Christianity not churchianity that has to go; and Herron, in this instance, represents Christianity. Herron is clearly marked for expulsion. But as in all similar cases, he will be turned out of his university chair only to be called to work in a larger field. The pious apologists for social wrong who drive him out, will but the more widely extend his usefulness. Thus it is that in the divine economy even the pharisee is made to serve the Lord. Look at Munkacsy's picture of "Christ before Pilate." See there, sitting near the dais of the Roman governor, the fat pharisee who sought the Nazarene carpenter's life. He thought he was silencing a disturber. How could he have known that he was helping to establish upon earth the religion of religions?

#### TRAMPLING UPON NATIONAL IDEALS.

There come times in the history of nations when events compel them to bring their actions to the test of first principles. Such a time has now recurred in the history of the American people. We are being forced into a searching and momentous comparison of our immediate national purposes and policies with our national ideals.

Specific problems confront us, upon the decision of which measurably depends our national future—whether we shall rise toward our ideals or sink away from them. These problems cannot be ignored. For better or worse, for good or evil, for growth or decay, for advance or retreat, in har-

mony with our ideals or in defiance of them, they are problems which we must decide.

Similar critical moments come also in the lives of individuals. There are times when they, too, brought face to face with some conflict between their purposes and their ideals, are forced to choose. These are the best periods of a good man's life. Well may such a one exclaim: "Thank God for sin!" Resisting temptation, he comes out of the struggle better and stronger. He is then nearer to his ideals, though not abreast of them.

No man is as good as his ideals, if he has ideals. Still, it is not to be inferred that all men are hypocrites. Given moral ideals, a man is to be judged not by the closeness with which he commonly lives up to them, but by the willingness with which he makes them his standard in times of temptation. If he then squares his purpose with his ideals, he grows toward his ideals; if he modifies his ideals to suit his purpose, he grows away from them.

To illustrate, let us imagine a born thief, who nevertheless accepts as one of his moral ideals the eighth commandment. He believes it wrong to steal, he tries not to steal, and on the whole he virtuously refrains from stealing. But now and again he awakes to a realization of the fact that acts which he had not before understood to be larcenous are larcenous. His decisions when tempted to repeat these acts will determine whether he is growing toward his ideal or away from it—whether he is becoming less of a thief or more of one. If, holding to the ideal, he struggles against the temptation, then he gains in moral strength and invites further moral enlightenment. But if, giving way to the temptation, he modifies his ideal—calls the eighth commandment a glittering generality, construes it in the light of the larcenous precedents he himself has made, and interprets out of it its moral force—then it were better for him never to have had an ideal.

As with an individual in this respect, so with a nation. When events bring its purposes into open collision with its moral ideals, and the necessity is admitted of altering the one or

modifying the other, the decision of that nation determines the direction in which it is going. If it decides for its ideals, it is advancing; if it decides against them, it is declining.

This suggests the test by which to determine the policy of the United States in the present crisis. Whether our nation has always been true to its moral ideals, is of minor importance. Whether it is even now true to them in many of its customs is, in connection with the crisis before us, of no importance at all. The vital question that confronts us is whether the new policy we are urged to adopt, the new customs we are asked to establish, the new national habits we are advised to form, are in harmony with our national ideals. If they are not, then their adoption would be not merely inconsistent with our ideals; it would be equivalent to their deliberate repudiation.

The ideals of the United States are summed up comprehensively in the first clause of the declaration of independence. This describes as a self-evident truth the proposition that "all men are created equal," which means, of course, not that they have equal physical and mental qualities, but that they come into the world with the right to equal consideration under the law.

Supplementary to that fundamental proposition, the declaration further asserts that all men "are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights," among which "are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and that for the security of these rights "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." But these clauses and those that follow them are only elaborations of the first clause. That states the whole principle. The proposition that "all men are created equal"—with equal rights—includes not only the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" not only the principle that governments derive their "just powers from the consent of the governed;" but also that right by means of which alone the governed can peaceably give their consent to the government,—the right to the ballot.

That the laws and institutions of

the United States have not always been and are not now completely consistent with these ideals, is true.

When the ideals were proclaimed, the African slave trade was a recognized occupation; and it continued for ten years or more under the sanction of our fundamental law. Slavery itself was protected by our fundamental law for three-quarters of a century. Here were plain denials of liberty.

In many states the right of men to vote unless they had property was long legally denied; while in all the states the right of women to vote was denied until recently, and in most it is still denied. Here we find another bald inconsistency. Equality of rights under the law implies, and government only by consent of the governed virtually specifies, the ballot as a right. To deny the ballot to any person is to deny him the power of even protesting against the manner in which he is governed. The right of consultation is inseparable from the right of self-government; and no right of consultation can be enjoyed by a ballotless man. Even the lives of members of a ballotless class are dependent upon the good will of their political superiors.

These violations of the right to life, liberty and self-government were indeed inconsistent with American ideals; but they were not denials of those ideals. The inconsistencies were in vogue when the ideals were proclaimed. The ideals have survived; most of the inconsistencies have been repudiated.

The slave trade was taken out of the category of legitimate occupations and denounced as piracy. Slavery was abolished, its reestablishment forbidden, and the former slave armed with the ballot. The ballot has been extended in most of the states to all men and in some to all women. The history of slavery and of ballot restriction goes to prove, not that the nation has been deliberately untrue to its ideals, but that it has been growing steadily toward them.

But we have now come to a time when we are asking ourselves as a nation not whether we shall struggle to throw off some ancient custom which is inconsistent with our ideals, not whether we shall make a further advance toward our ideals, but whether

we shall adopt a new policy which denies, and is on all hands admitted to deny, those ideals flatly and affirmatively, positively and aggressively. We are asking ourselves whether we shall flout our ideals and consciously and deliberately recede from them. It is this that we propose, when we contemplate the acquisition of 8,000,000 people whom Senator Teller, with no less accuracy than brevity, describes as our "subjects."

To make conquests and establish over the people we conquer a government which they do not voluntarily accept, and in the management of which they are to have no voice, a government that is under no constitutional obligations to protect their lives and liberties, but which according to the senators and college professors who advocate it, could dispose of all their rights in its discretion, would be to deny the fundamental right of self government in a new relationship. Thus we should not merely remain inconsistent with our ideals; we should be turning our backs upon them. This is perfectly well understood by the advocates of imperial colonization, and they brazenly urge us to turn our backs upon those ideals, arguing that the ideals are illusory.

Their argument is most plausible when directed against the ballot right as an inherent right of the citizen.

Men of common sense are not misled very readily by the pettifogger's plea of precedent. To them it is no argument against the right of all to the ballot that in practice the ballot has been extensively withheld, or, more correctly speaking, not fully extended. As well argue against the right to life and to liberty because both rights have been denied. That we have not realized our ideals is easily seen to be no sane reason for abandoning them. Because only have in fact been allowed to vote is clearly a weak excuse for denying the soundness of the American ideal that all are entitled to vote. To allow precedents thus to overrule principles, would be to make fetishes of precedents; or to use them as bushels to put candles under, instead of lights to illumine the pathway.

But regardless of precedent there are apparently inherent objections

to universal suffrage. Troublesome questions necessarily arise. We ask: Who shall vote? What shall determine a man's right to vote? What about children, idiots, lunatics, convicts, Indians, negroes? Children are too young; idiots and lunatics are incapables; convicts are social enemies; Indians are savages; negroes, if permitted in the south to "express their wish through the ballot and to have it counted," to quote an objector, "would ruin the country." Are all these entitled to vote? If not, they are governed without their consent, and then what becomes of the American ideal? Such is the drift of the questions.

With children there is a debatable line. No one can say exactly when they mature. Each individual differs. But every normal person does mature at some time between his first day in the world and his one hundredth year; and if the voting age be fixed reasonably, none but a logic-chopper could persistently object that deprivation of the voting right prior to that age is essentially inconsistent with our national ideals.

As to idiots and lunatics, they are in abnormal states. Disease makes them incapable of performing any social function; and as consultation regarding government is a social function, it is their disease and not a legal discrimination as to social rights, that really excludes them from voting. Idiots and lunatics, like children during immaturity, are naturally—not through legal discrimination, but naturally—under guardianship. So long as their social rights are secured them upon their emerging naturally from that state, their equality of rights is not essentially denied.

Convicts fall into a different class. By preying upon society they have forfeited social rights. To outlaw a man for his crimes is not to deprive him of equal rights under the law. It is punishing him for depriving others of those rights.

As to Indians, it will hardly be claimed that resistance to their aggressions is governing them. A people may certainly defend themselves against savages without being seriously charged with attempting to govern without the consent of the governed. In so far, however, as we have governed the Indian without his consent,

what success have we had? Would either he or we be worse off if we had invested him with the suffrage, or left him alone to govern himself?

And then the negro. We are told that if he had his ballot counted in the south he would ruin the country. What is meant by the country? White men, of course. Whether he would really ruin the white men of the south if he voted upon an equality with them, we have no means of knowing. The experiment has not been fairly tried. But we do know as matter of history that the white men of the south with all power in their hands ruined the negro—kept him a slave, which is about as near ruin as a live man can be driven to. Shall we, therefore, infer that the white men of the south are unfit to be trusted with the ballot? By no means. Yet upon the facts it is a more legitimate inference than the other.

Sweep away these hypercritical objections to the ballot right, and no plausible objections remain. When mature men and women are denied the ballot they are not only denied a fundamental right, but are prevented from performing a fundamental duty—that of advising and participating in government. All adverse arguments lead logically to monarchy, and if adopted as sound in principle will lead there practically. Not a single one that has ever been put forward against voting by the poor, by the "unintelligent," by "inferior races," by women, by any social class, but is a legitimate corollary of the arguments for divine right. Grant the premises of those who argue for a restricted suffrage, and the prerogatives of the Tsar of Russia become as unassailable logically as they are legally.

This is true not alone of the right of voting among ourselves, but also of the principle of government by consent of the governed in that broader sense in which we use the words when we refer to the policy of imperial colonization. We cannot impose our government upon alien peoples against their will, without lining up our government alongside of the autocratic powers of the earth. It is only by assuming some fanciful divine right in derogation of their obvious natural rights that we can make them our "subjects."

Nor is it any answer to say that the alien peoples are incapable of self-government. No one is capable of self-government, in the eyes of those who wish to govern him. What is our warrant for declaring a people incapable of self-government? Any people are far better able to govern themselves than are any other people to govern them. Super-imposed government may exterminate a people; it cannot elevate them.

One of the greatest as well as most delightful of American writers, a man who in the guise of a humorist has given us much sound philosophy—we refer to Mark Twain—satirizes the assumption of superior ability to govern, in "A Yankee at the Court of King Arthur," and then moralizes in this admirable way:

There is a phrase which has grown so common in the world's mouth that it has come to seem to have sense and meaning—the sense and meaning implied when it is used; that is the phrase which refers to this or that or the other nation as possibly being "capable of self-government;" and the implied sense of it is, that there has been a nation somewhere, sometime or other, which wasn't capable of it—wasn't as able to govern itself as some self-appointed specialists were or would be to govern it. The masterminds of all nations, in all ages, have sprung in affluent multitude from the mass of the nation, and from the mass of the nation only—not from its privileged classes; and so, no matter what the nation's intellectual grade was, whether high or low, the bulk of its ability was in the long ranks of its nameless and its poor, and so it never saw the day that it had not the material in abundance whereby to govern itself. Which is to assert an always self-proven fact: that even the best governed and most free and most enlightened monarchy is still behind the best condition attainable by its people; and that the same is true of kindred governments of lower grades, all the way down to the lowest.

Neither is it an answer to the objection to American imperial colonization to cite American precedents in its favor. As we have already said, they prove nothing at the worst but that we have been at times indifferent to our ideals. Their best use is to show, by those we have set aside, how far we have advanced toward our ideals.

It is not now with us a question of indifferently allowing old national customs or laws to prevail against our

national ideals, nor even of clinging stubbornly to those questions. We are proceeding with knowledge, with deliberation, with intention, to set up a new policy which is confessedly hostile; and in doing so we seek justification not in an attempt to elevate the policy to the level of the ideals, but in an attempt to pull down the ideals to the level of the policy.

It is true that heretofore we have permitted government by consent of only some of the governed, while asserting the broad principle of government by consent of all the governed. But we are now about to amend the principle itself, and establish government by consent of some of the governed as the American ideal. This is also the Russian ideal.

We cannot make that decision under existing circumstances without going backward in the path of democracy. With a nation, as with an individual, it were better that it have no ideals than that having them it should deliberately cast them aside. Let us in this crisis but choose to substitute the Russian ideal of government for the American, and we shall not be long in descending to the Russian mode. It is not only the liberties of our "subjects" that are at stake; the liberties of our citizens also hang in the balance.

But if we decide for our ideals instead of against them, if at this crisis we determine to be true to the principle of self-government, we may then be grateful for the temptation which will have made it possible for us to become stronger in our love of liberty and to draw closer to our national ideals. For we may be sure that even in so far as by disregarding the liberties of others we imperil our own, we shall by recognizing theirs make ours more secure and perfect.

## NEWS

Most important among the events of the week was the passage by the United States senate, on the 21st, of the Morgan bill for the construction of the Nicaragua canal. This bill is in the form of an amendment to the act of congress approved February 20, 1889, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company

of Nicaragua;" and it provides for the immediate construction of a ship canal across Nicaragua.

The passage of the Nicaragua canal bill by the senate appears to be the beginning of the end of a series of events which connects the problems of the present with those of the time of Columbus. It is matter of school-boy knowledge that when Columbus discovered the American continent he was in search of a passage westward to Asia; and that navigators who succeeded him sought diligently for a natural waterway through the continent. When it had been demonstrated that there was none, propositions were made to pierce the isthmus of Panama with a canal. These propositions are traced back as far as 1513. In 1550 four different routes were suggested, one being across the Isthmus of Panama and another across Nicaragua. The second was recommended as most practicable. An actual attempt was made late in the seventeenth century by an English company to cut through the Isthmus of Panama, but Spain interfered; and for one cause or another all the plans proposed prior to the present century were dropped.

The subject was revived in 1827 by Simon Bolivar, president of New Granada, now the United States of Colombia; and in 1838 New Granada gave a concession to a French company to cut a canal through the Isthmus of Panama. That company did nothing more than to make a survey; but at the time of the gold excitement in California a company under the leadership of Gen. Aspinwall built a railroad across the isthmus along the line of a canal survey that had been made under the auspices of President Bolivar. In the early '80s the United States of Colombia granted another concession for a canal across the isthmus—this time to a French company under the management of Ferdinand de Lesseps, the father of the Suez canal. Work was begun, but was soon suspended. It was out of this enterprise that the French Panama scandals grew. The United States had opposed this enterprise as calculated to infringe upon the Monroe doctrine by giving control of the waterway to France, and that had caused the French government to withdraw its aid. The company was reorganized, however, and it now claims to own valuable concessions and property, with a half-finished canal.



# The Public

Before Bolivar's first concession for a Panama canal, the Central American republic, in 1825, invited the United States government to construct a canal across Nicaragua. Henry Clay, then secretary of state, accepted; and a company was formed under a charter from congress, with Dewitt Clinton, father of the Erie canal, at its head. Surveys were made, but failing to raise satisfactory capital the company dissolved. The project was revived in different forms, but without promise until after the ratification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty between the United States and England.

England, upon establishing a protectorate over the Mosquito Indians along the north coast of Nicaragua, had taken possession of San Juan del Norte, now Greytown, the natural eastern terminus of any Nicaraguan canal that might be built; and the United States protested. It was in adjustment of this grievance that on the 19th of April, 1850, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was made. That treaty provided that neither country should obtain control over or special commercial advantages in any ship canal between the two oceans. Its bearing at present will be seen when it is understood that the canal bill just passed by the senate assumes to place the canal under the exclusive control of the United States. The right to do this has for several years been claimed by the United States, and England has always heretofore diplomatically resisted the claim; but there appears to be a manifest disposition on her part now to agree with the United States in regarding the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as in this respect obsolete.

Several Nicaragua canal projects were set on foot after the making of this treaty; but no work was actually done until 1889. Work was then begun by the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, under a concession from Nicaragua, ratified in 1887, upon the basis of which the United States congress, in 1889, had chartered the company. It is this charter that the bill just passed by the senate proposes to amend. Since 1893 work on the Maritime company's canal has been suspended.

The senate bill for amending the Maritime company's charter fixes the capital of the company at \$100,000,000. It then requires the company

to call in and cancel its stock, bonds, etc., and discharge all its liabilities and contracts, except stock reserved for the republics of Nicaragua and Costa Rica; whereupon the United States is to buy \$92,500,000 of the \$100,000,000 of stock. All the officers of the company, except such as represent Nicaragua and Costa Rica, are then to resign, and the company is to be reorganized with 11 directors, 1 for Nicaragua, 1 for Costa Rica, and 9 for the United States—the latter to be appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate. The bill thus puts the Nicaragua canal project not only under the control of the United States, but except as to \$7,500,000 of the stock, virtually within its ownership. The reorganized company is authorized by the bill to contract with responsible American citizens for the completion and equipment of the canal within six years at a cost not to exceed \$115,000,000, which amount is appropriated for the purpose. To secure this expenditure the government is to have upon all the property of the company a lien, which it may foreclose without judicial proceedings, in case of default in payment. With reference to the neutrality of the canal, the bill guarantees—

its innocent use by all maritime nations, on equal terms as to tolls and all the privileges of navigation.

But as the canal is a—

necessary connection between the eastern and western coast lines of the United States, the right to protect the same against all interruptions, and at all times, is reserved and excepted out of this declaration of the neutrality of said canal and its free use by other nations.

Topographically, the Nicaragua canal project has differed from that for Panama, in that the Panama project has heretofore contemplated a sea level canal—one without locks—while the Nicaragua project contemplates crossing the mountain by means of locks. A cut through a ridge 284 feet high was therefore necessary in the former project. The latter would utilize the San Juan river from Greytown on the Atlantic to Lake Nicaragua on the table land summit of the mountain, and then the lake to its western shore, whence it would descend to the Pacific at Brito. The elevation would be slightly more than 100 feet, and the whole distance about 180 miles. By far the greater part of the distance

would be along the river and across the lake.

New opposition to the Nicaragua canal bill just passed by the senate has sprung up. A syndicate in which William R. Grace of New York and Edward F. Cragin of Chicago are principals—known as the Grace-Cragin-Eyre syndicate—procured a concession last autumn from Nicaragua, to take effect upon the expiration of the Maritime company's concession. This expiration will occur, it is claimed by the syndicate, on the 9th of next October; and though by the terms of the grant the concession will be then renewable, the syndicate maintains that its renewability depends upon steady progress having been made in the work, a condition which has not been complied with by the Maritime company, no work having been done for six years or more. This syndicate aims to make the canal the property of private capitalists, whereas the senate bill passed on the 21st would to all intents and purposes make it government property.

Following the passage of the Nicaragua canal bill by the senate, the Paris treaty of peace receives more constant attention. Friends of the treaty claim a full two-thirds of the senate as in favor of ratification without amendment. On the 25th it was unanimously agreed in executive session to vote on the treaty and all amendments on Monday, February 6, at three o'clock in the afternoon. Meanwhile, senatorial speeches are being made from day to day on the fundamental principles of American government set forth especially in the declaration of independence, as bearing upon our relations to the Philippines.

News from the Philippines is scanty and unreliable, owing to the censorship which the American war department has established. Reports from Washington indicate that considerable alarm is felt by the administration over the situation at Manila and Iloilo, but reliable particulars are not forthcoming. It is said, however, on the authority of Secretary Alger, that Gen. Miller has effected a landing on Guimaras island, which is about 10 miles distant to the southeast from the Island of Panay, on which Iloilo is situated. But no attempt to land at Iloilo is to be made. The Filipino junta at Hong-Kong issued a statement on the 24th in which they com-

plained of "the purchase by the American authorities of steam launches for river work in the Philippine islands" as "high-handed, unnecessary and vexatious," and spoke of American "domiciliary visits" throughout Manila as exasperating. The dispatch of reinforcements from the United States is described in the statement as "incompatible with peace," and the appointment of a United States commission is referred to as a ruse to gain time. The same statement announces that the Filipino congress has unanimously voted against American annexation. Through other sources it is reported that Gen. Otis has been arresting Filipinos, a report which has disturbed the Filipino junta at London, lest the natives may be thereby irritated to the point of making hostile attacks; and the London junta cabled to Manila on the 24th, urging the Filipinos "not to start hostilities if there is the remotest possibility of averting trouble."

The United States commission, referred to in the Filipino statement, quoted above, as a ruse to gain time, consists of five members appointed by President McKinley to act as an advisory board. They are to live in the Philippines and advise him as to each new step in the American occupation. The members are Admiral Dewey; Gen. Otis; Charles Denby, formerly minister to China; President Schurman, of Cornell university; and Prof. Worcester, of Michigan university. Messrs. Schurman, Worcester and Denby had a conference with the president on the 19th, and on the 20th received their commissions, Schurman being designated president of the commission.

While President McKinley's commission was preparing to leave for the Philippines, Aguinaldo's commission from the Philippines arrived in Washington. It consists of Jose Lazada, Marti Burgos, and Juan Luna. They say they have established a free and independent government, which is recognized throughout the island, except in Manila, where the Americans are in power; that they have a postal and telegraph system; that they issue postage stamps, coin money, collect taxes, and in other ways perform the functions of government. This commission brought with it Agoncillo's credentials as envoy from the Philippine republic; and on the 24th Agoncillo delivered an official communica-

tion at the state department at Washington, calling for official recognition, and asking for assurances regarding the warlike attitude of the United States toward the republic he represents. His express request in this connection is for a disclaimer of any intention to attack the liberties and independence of the Filipinos. Agoncillo's American legal adviser is Jackson N. Ralston.

Among the American protests of the week against an aggressive policy in the Philippines, one is put forth by the directors of the American Peace society, and another by a mass meeting at Cooper Union, New York. The mass meeting was addressed by James B. Eustis, formerly ambassador to France; by Samuel Gompers, president of the Federation of Labor; and by Bourke Cockran. Letters were read from Grover Cleveland, William J. Bryan and Bishop Potter; and the resolutions declared unalterable opposition "to the abandonment by this republic of the American ideal of national growth in favor of the European ideal of colonial conquest."

From Samoa nothing further has been heard of the outbreak over the election of a new king, which we reported last week. But it is understood that the government at Washington is in communication with the German government relative to the reported assumption of authority by the German representatives in Samoa.

In American domestic affairs, senatorial elections claim first place. Ex-Gov. Charles A. Culberson, democrat, has been elected by the Texas legislature to succeed Roger Q. Mills; Porter J. McCumber, by the legislature of North Dakota to succeed William N. Roach; and John Kean, republican, by the legislature of New Jersey, to succeed James Smith, Jr. Clarence D. Clark, republican, has been reelected by the legislature of Wyoming, and William M. Stewart, silver republican, by the legislature of Nevada. There are deadlocks in the legislatures of Delaware, Washington, Montana, Nebraska, Utah, California, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. In Pennsylvania the deadlock is due to the determination of a large number of republican members to defeat Senator Quay's reelection.

The governor of West Virginia has at last recognized the organization of the lower house, and though the sen-

ate continued to refuse for a time, the two bodies came together in joint session on the 25th when Nathan B. Scott, republican, was declared elected by a majority of 1. The vote stood, for Scott 48, for McGraw, democrat, 46, and for Goff, 1. A contest will be made on the ground that two of the state senators who voted for Scott were legally disqualified because they hold lucrative positions in the federal army.

The court-martial for the trial of Gen. Eagan, for having used the language regarding Gen. Miles, which we reported last week, began its sittings at Washington on the 25th. The formal charges are conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, and conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline. Gen. Eagan claims immunity under the promise of the president that witnesses before the investigating committee should not be held responsible by court-martial for their testimony.

The industrial event of the week is the conclusion of the joint convention of coal operators and coal miners, at Allegheny, Pa. As reported last week, the miners had determined to demand an advance in wages and the operators to insist upon a reduction; and over this and other issues a great coal strike was feared. But before the joint convention adjourned, on the 24th, an agreement was reached and the strike averted. Wages were neither raised nor reduced.

Turning from affairs that immediately concern the United States, to those of European concern, we find that England has taken another long stride in the direction of permanent occupation of Egypt. A treaty between Great Britain and the khedive of Egypt was made public on the 19th, in which joint control of the Soudan is agreed upon. The Soudan is described to mean—

all the territories south of the 22d parallel of latitude, which have never been evacuated by the Egyptian troops since 1882, or which, having been administered by the khedive's government prior to the late rebellion were temporarily lost to Egypt and have been reconquered by the British and Egyptian governments acting in concert, or which may hereafter be reconquered by the two governments acting in concert.

Throughout this territory the British and Egyptian flags are to be used together, on both land and water, ex-

cept at Suakin, where the Egyptian flag alone is to be used. In this treaty the Sultan of Turkey, as suzerain of Egypt, is ostentatiously ignored, the agreement being between Great Britain and the khedive directly. Gen. Kitchener was on the 24th appointed governor-general of the Sudan.

### NEWS NOTES.

—The national prison congress convened on the 23d at New Orleans.

—The Lake Carriers' association met on the 24th in annual session at Detroit.

—The National Live Stock association met in its second annual session on the 24th at Denver.

—The National Association of Manufacturers has been in session during the week at Cincinnati.

—The reputed remains of Christopher Columbus arrived at Seville, Spain, on the 19th, on board the gunboat Giralda.

—Adelina Patti was married on the 25th, at Brecon, Wales, to Baron Cederstrom, director of the health gymnastic institute at that place.

—The Rev. John W. Kramer, of the P. E. Church of the Holy Spirit, Brooklyn, N. Y., whose death was recently reported, was a cherished friend and follower of Henry George. He conducted the services at Mr. George's burial.

—A party of 2,300 Doukhobortsi or "spirit wrestlers," arrived from Russia at Halifax on the 20th, for the purpose of colonizing in Canada. They have left their native country to escape persecution. Their exodus from Russia is being promoted by Tolstois.

—An earthquake of exceptional magnitude occurred on the 22d, in the peninsular part of Greece. There were five shocks in 50 minutes, and several villages were destroyed. Further shocks occurred the following day. On the 24th the severest earthquake ever known in Mexico was felt all over the republic.

—The commission for the arbitration of the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela met in preliminary session at Paris on the 25th. The meeting was held to comply with the stipulation that it should take place within 60 days after the final exchange of briefs. The next meeting is set for May 25. Meantime the commissioners will be engaged in the examination of briefs and testimony.

—The second, or January, issue of the National Single Taxer as a monthly, which has just appeared, is a special number, devoted especially to matters of single tax interest in Massa-

chusetts. It contains a full account of the banquet given at Boston by single taxers last fall to the Young Men's Christian associations of Massachusetts, at which the Rev. S. S. Craig was the orator; also of the one given by them there on the 17th to Massachusetts boards of charities and correction, at which Father Huntington spoke. Among the contributors are William Lloyd Garrison and Thomas G. Shearman.

### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

Week ending January 23, 1899.

#### Senate.

Routine business on the 17th was followed by a long discussion of the Nicaragua canal bill; which was resumed on the 18th after some miscellaneous business had been transacted, and Senator Bacon had spoken at length in favor of government by consent of the governed in the Philippines. On the 19th, besides doing miscellaneous business, the senate listened to Senator Turner in opposition to the establishment of a colonial system, and continued the discussion of the Nicaragua canal bill. Senator Caffery introduced on the 20th a resolution requesting the president to furnish copies of documents received by the state department from representatives of "the so-called Philippine republic," which went over for the day; and Senator Nelson spoke at length against the Vest resolution. Senator White questioned the power of the legislature of his state, California, to command him to support the Paris treaty, as it had attempted to do, and as his colleague, Senator Perkins, conceded its right to do. No action was taken. The remainder of the day was occupied with a consideration of the Nicaragua canal bill. Discussion of the canal bill was continued on the 21st, when it was passed—48 to 6. Consideration of the Indian appropriation bill was then resumed. Senator White spoke on the 23d in support of the Vest resolution, and Senator Chandler offered amendments to the "anti-scalping" bill.

#### House.

Consideration of the naval personnel bill was resumed on the 17th, and the bill was passed—127 to 64. The 18th was devoted to lighthouse legislation. The post office appropriation bill was considered on the 19th and 20th and passed. On the latter day private bills were discussed, and the house adjourned to the 23d. On the 23d, besides giving attention to private bills and matters affecting the District of Columbia, the house passed the bill to extend to the Hawaiian islands, so far as applicable, the laws of the United States relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen.

## MISCELLANY

### THE CREEPING DESOLATION.

Whistling over the meadows,  
Covered o'er with weeds,  
Winds are blowing broadcast,  
Land monopoly's seeds.

Once the waving wheat fields  
Caught the breezes light;  
Now rank desolation  
Marks the land-shark's blight.

The farmer, once brave and thrifty,  
With heart as light as air,  
Has fled to town, his sorrows to drown,  
Looking for work in despair.

While landlord greed is allowed to feed  
Upon their unearned rent,  
What wonder, indeed, the landless should  
need  
To suffer, starve and lament?

Waving over the fruit lands,  
The ground-lord's flag flaunts free!  
While, ragged and cold, the toilers are sold  
For wages of poverty.

ERNEST J. FOORD.

### HOW THE OTHER ONE MILLIONTH LIVES.

The display of the rarest and most beautiful roses was a feature of the Vanderbilt ball last week, and distanced everything in the way of decoration that has ever been seen at any function in this city. It is very doubtful if any of the greatest of state balls given in foreign courts ever approached the Vanderbilt ball in its floral magnificence. Foreign courts have never been famed for their liberality of expenditure, and even the most extravagant of kings and princes can be easily left far in the rear by an American millionaire. The poet who commanded roses to bloom in winter in honor of the approach of his lady love has always been regarded as a creature of fiction, but this is exactly what was accomplished to deck the Vanderbilt house for a ball that will always live in social annals. Weeks ago the order was given to the city artist, who at once telegraphed to the leading florists of the country, who wired him extensive lists describing the choicest blossoms of their stock. Selections were made and then began the work of coaxing into perfect bloom the thousands of roses and orchids that were to grace the festival. Each rose used in the decoration was a perfect specimen of its kind. The great Carnot roses were lavishly used, and the American Beauties, some of them with stems more than ten feet long, were a wonderful feature of the rooms, commented upon during the evening as a veritable bit of floral magic. Many thousands of blossoms were used in the different varieties of the rose; rare orchids, the stems of which were three and

four feet in length, were arranged about the dancing-room, some of them strewn beneath the feet of the guests, forming a carpet more costly than any yet devised. Tons of the lesser blossoms were used, among which were branches of mignonette that were marvelous in their size, color and perfume.—The Criterion.

#### PROF. PECK ON WOMEN'S EDUCATION.

Prof. Harry Thurston Peck, of Columbia university, writes in the January *Cosmopolitan* on "The Overtaught Woman." He discusses "the expediency of assenting to the demand which women are now making for access to the higher education," and gives his opinion against it. A number of requests have been received for a review of this article, but, after reading it, one feels that to reply to it seriously would be, in the words of Carlyle, to waste time "attacking extinct Satans." Except in a few remote and belated countries, women are not now demanding access to the higher education, because access to it has been almost everywhere accorded them. The fight for admission to the higher education has been fought and won, and the battle of reform has moved on to other fields. . . .

Far from lowering the standard, women have taken rather more than their share of the prizes in the universities where they study on equal terms with the men. Prof. Peck disposes of this inconvenient fact by the ingenious theory that the women reported to have thus distinguished themselves were really "very commonplace girls," but that the professors were so influenced by their femininity as to award them honors which they had not earned over the heads of the more deserving men. If this were so, it would be not so much an argument against the fitness of women for higher education as an argument against the fitness of some men to be college professors.

Throughout this article Prof. Peck displays, in a marked degree, the precise qualities that he says unfits women for the highest education. He looks upon women as unscientific and sentimental; but what could be more sentimental or less scientific than his comparison of man and woman to "a war-horse and a fawn?" The scientific comparison would be to a horse and mare, or to a male and female fawn. Again, Prof. Peck says of woman: "Her self-consciousness—the tendency to judge of all things in relation to herself alone—is omnipresent;" and then he lays it down as an axiom: "Woman is never to be thought of otherwise than

in the relation which she holds to man." He speaks of women's lack of logic, yet declares women to be specially fitted to bring up children because of their "infinite patience," and specially unfitted for scientific research because they "will lack patience to wait for matured and ripened effort to bring about achievements of a lasting value."—The Woman's Journal.

#### "THE CRIME OF HUNGER."

About two o'clock on the morning of Thursday, November 17, some 200 men were lined up along the Bowery in New York, near Fifth street. There was no special excitement in the locality. Neither fire nor fight had brought them there. The reason for their standing thus in the street in the chill of a late autumn night was the fact that a kind-hearted restaurant keeper was known to set out nightly at this hour a big caldron of hot coffee and a basket of bread, and to give to every man who was hungry enough to come after it, a cup of coffee and a piece of bread.

While they stood thus waiting for the distribution to begin, down upon them swooped a body of the well-fed blue-coated guardians of the city with drawn night-sticks, and 50 of the hungry men, who were not quick enough in running away, were hustled off to the station house. They had been guilty of no violence, no disturbance, no crime named in the laws of God or man; but the proprietor of a saloon near at hand objected to their presence. The incident furnishes the groundwork for a timely study.

There are, while you are reading these lines, many hungry men and women in the United States; not weary, glad-hearted toilers hurrying homeward to the evening meal, but men and women to whom the sounding bells and whistles bring no hope of supper, and for whom, in the midst of the plenty of this land whose products could feed the world, no table is spread.

How many are there of them? Nobody knows. They come and go; they find work; they starve to death; they turn criminal. The number today is never the same to-morrow. So no one has ever made a census of the hungry.

But there are enough of them that in all the centers of population the fact of their presence makes itself known, and the minor note of their woe makes itself heard now and again, amid the diapason tones of business and the keen treble of pleasure.

Of course everybody knows how, when the winter's storms sweep down upon the land, when shops close and workmen are laid off, there are found in all our great cities thousands of homes where there are no fires and no food. There were 100,000 starving people in a single day in Chicago in a recent winter.

But it is not of sporadic, but rather of chronic, hunger that we are going to study. We are going to look at a few of the symptoms of the widespread disease of the body social that makes everywhere and constantly present among the emblems and trophies of our civilization a great mass of people who share none of these things, and walk amid them all searching only for bread to stop the pangs of famine.

The 50 men who were arrested that chill November morning were, when taken before the magistrate, so plainly a body of honest, though unfortunate men that his honor flatly refused to commit any of them to prison. Not one of them had a cent in his pocket, though a number of them had some of the tools used in the trades in which they were trying to find work. Judging their companions whom the police were unable to capture by these whom they did arrest, there were in that part of New York city that night 200 honest but unfortunate men, who were hungry enough to remain upon the street in the chill of a November night until two o'clock in the morning in the hope of getting a cup of coffee and a piece of bread.

Two hundred unfed, hungry men in the street waiting for a morsel of bread at two o'clock in the morning! Don't be excited; the sight is not uncommon in New York. Only half a dozen blocks away from the place where these men were waiting for food, every night, week after week and month after month, at 12 o'clock, the doors of one of the great bakeries of the city are thrown open, and sometimes 200, sometimes 300, sometimes 500 men pass in line to take a dole of bread. Voice representatives have watched them on summer nights, when the blocks around seemed some vast and strange picnic ground, as on curb and step men sat eating dry bread with the sauce of hunger. Voice representatives have watched them again when the cold winds of autumn swept along the street, and the line, as it waited, clung close to the shelter of the towering walls, and again when the winter's snow fell like a white winding sheet, and the waiting wretches shuddered and crouched.

The "dead-beat" and the "rounder" were there beyond question, but there were others. Men whom the world had "gone against," men whom a week or two weeks of sickness had "thrown out of a job," men whose mill shut down and never started, men whose "boss" died and the business was abandoned, men for whose trades there "don't seem to be any call any more anyhow"—all there and all hungry.

"Faith, and I don't see, indeed, why a man should be waiting here in the cold at this hour of the night if he isn't hungry," said a pinch-faced Irishman of whom the Voice representative asked questions.

Each man with his generous cutting of bread, they turn away from the door; some to hurry away perhaps to carry it to others who can bear hunger less than they, some hiding the bread under their coats as they pass the glare of the street lights, and others eating already, tearing the loaf into great wolfish mouthfuls.

Nor are these alone hungry. Across the street stood a watchman of a street railroad, and with him, too, the Voice man talked. He, too, had known what it was to walk the streets of New York, day after day, "without a job," and with the wolf night by night howling nearer and nearer the door. "But I could never stand in that line," he said. "I could starve first; yes, I would steal sooner than do that."

He represented another part of the great army of the unfed, usually the recruits, who are too proud to let their hunger be known.

Nor do these classes contain them all. Besides these, in this proud imperial city, there are fathers who, night after night, watch their pinched children eat the last crumb, still unsatisfied; mothers who go hungry that their children may be fed; children who even thus are unfed or poorly fed; and thousands of men and women who choose to be dishonest rather than to be hungry, and embrace vice rather than endure famine.

Besides them, there are thousands still who toil for a wage that keeps starvation away only an arm's length, and thousands of employers and professional men harassed with burdens of debts and hounded by the sleepless furies of hard times.

Does anyone know why all this is?

The police who dragged the hungry men away to jail are the representatives of our social system, the agents of organic society, organized to help the unfortunate, to provide for the needy, to protect the weak, and to

check the wrongdoer. The promptness with which men guilty of the crime of hunger are made to feel the night-stick is a sign that society's forces are active.

What makes men starve? What is it that sends a man out at midnight to stand in a line of equally hungry men to wait for a morsel of bread?—N. Y. Voice.

#### TIBERIUS GRACCHUS, LEADER OF A FORLORN HOPE.

A lecture by Rev. H. S. Bigelow, of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, O., delivered January 1, 1899, being the first of a series of five lectures on the subject, "Leaders of Forlorn Hopes." From the author's MS.

Jesus said the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Since the doings of man have been recorded there have existed side by side the spirit that seeks to be ministered unto and the spirit that seeks to minister. Herein is the key to history. The ceaseless conflict between these two spirits is the one thread around which the plot of human history has been woven. The scepters of power, the temples of dominion, the institutions which, under one guise or another, have enabled the few to live by the toil of the many, these bear witness to the spirit that seeks to be ministered unto, while the story of the spirit that ministers has been written upon the tombstones of the martyrs.

The story of a given people is comprehensible only when it is seen to be the record of that ceaseless struggle between the lust of power and the love of liberty. Such is the history of Rome.

Fourteen miles up the Tiber there arises a group of hills so closely set together that at a very early age the shepherds and husbandmen who inhabited them were compelled to make a choice between an intolerable warfare or a peaceful alliance. The desire for peace prevailed. The three tribes, the Romans, the Tities and the Luceres built a wall about the Palatine and Capitoline hills, and, by the aid of a disciplined army, defended their confederacy against the rest of the world. This was the beginning of Rome.

The members of these three original tribes constituted the ruling class. They were the germs of the future nobility. In later years other tribes were added to the confederacy, but not on equal footing. The population of Rome grew, but these patricians, who possessed the common lands and arrogated to themselves the special privileges of a ruling class, were jealous of their prerogatives and would allow no ad-

missions to their ranks. This exclusive class grew smaller as Rome increased. With the increase of population their lands were enhanced in value until the wealth of Rome became concentrated into the hands of the few. The populace, though not permitted to enjoy any of the privileges of citizenship, were called upon to bear arms in defense of the state. These husbandmen who followed their patrician leaders to war, often at times when they should have been sowing seed for the harvest, returned home frequently to find themselves and their families impoverished. Unable to pay their rent or their taxes, they were compelled to give up their mortgaged farms and become tenants. The business of collecting taxes was given over to private companies, precisely as our streets are given over to companies now, organized for private gain. When the people could not pay their taxes they were seized and sold as slaves. Thus the tax gatherer was also a slave-hunter. Tenants unable to pay their debts became known as slaves of the land. The tendency was to reduce to increasing depths of misery the great masses of the people, while the lords, the landholders and the ruling class rolled in luxury.

But this tendency was opposed by another force in the state. The common people developed a class consciousness. They made repeated attempts to assert the right of self-government and throw off the burdens which their masters had placed upon them. The real history of Rome is the history of this conflict between patricians and plebeians, between the "haves" and the "have-nots," between the few who lived without working and the many who worked without really living. Even in the distant past, in the legendary times of Tarquin the Proud, the people of Rome asserted themselves, and under the leadership of the patriot Brutus expelled the kings and established the Roman republic.

But they found that the lords could rule them as well under the forms of a republic as under a monarchy. Soon they were clamoring for another change. One morning one-third of the arms-bearing population, tired of their masters, marched out of the city and took up their abode on the Sacred Mont. The patricians knew, however, that their power depended on the presence of a population from which to collect rent. So they entreated the seceders to return. This the seceders did on the condition that they were to have rulers of their own. And this was the origin of the Tribunes of the Plebs.

These tribunes came, in time, to exercise the power of calling the people together in the Forum, and while they had at first no voice in the senate they proposed measures in these popular assemblies which the insistent multitude found ways of forcing upon the senate and into law. Thus the people had gained a substantial victory, and in the persons of the tribunes henceforth they were to have champions to help them in their struggle against their masters.

That chapter of Roman history in which we are especially interested tonight deals with the doings of one of these tribunes of the people. As early as the middle of the fourth century B. C. a tribune of the people by the name of Licinius had sought to relieve the distress of the people by bringing forward three laws which, after a bitter struggle lasting for ten years, were finally adopted. These laws show the direction in which the statesmen of the time were looking for relief. These proposed, among other things, to limit the amount of land which any citizen might hold to about 360 acres, thus showing at a very early date that the land question was considered of importance. From this time the land question was a burning question in the politics of Rome.

In the course of time the struggle of the people for their political rights resulted in such a modification of the constitution that the republic had become, in form at least, a pure democracy. The old patrician class was practically abolished. Even freedmen were raised to seats in the senate. But just as the expulsion of the kings did not relieve the people of their burdens, so now, although the old patrician class had been deprived of their special privileges, the people discovered that a new aristocracy had grown up in spite of democratic changes in the constitution, and that they still had masters. This is one of the most important lessons of history. Though a government, in theory, be an absolute democracy, yet, if laws are retained on the statute books which make it possible for any class of men to acquire enormous wealth and thus exert a disproportionate influence in the state, there still remains in that government the very essence of monarchy and aristocracy. Though we abolish all titles, though we call no man duke or lord, still, if we continue to grow millionaires, if by our laws we encourage the growth of overtowering corporations, if we make it possible for individuals under the protection of the laws to gather unto themselves fortunes which

really represent the fruits of other men's labor, in spite of our boasted liberty we do in fact pay tribute to dukes and lords and we are ruled by the uncrowned kings of wealth. Such was Rome's experience. It seemed as though the people in wresting political privileges from the haughty patricians had been pursuing a phantom. In spite of these political changes, by the middle of the second century the senate was supreme. The days when each Roman was a self-respecting freeholder were no more. The independent farmers of Italy had been driven into the city to swell the proletariat population. The little farms of Italy had given place to vast estates that were worked by slaves and owned by the lords of the new aristocracy whose days were spent in ostentation and debauchery in their city palaces and seaside villas.

The great middle class had been destroyed; the Roman state had resolved itself into masters and slaves. These landless, penniless plebeians might comfort themselves with the thought that the laws of the state denied no one of their number even a seat in the curule chair; yet how idle their boast of liberty; how truly dependent was their condition; how absolute was the power of their masters and how hopeless was the task of him who at this late day should attempt to secure any radical reform of the economic conditions which had brought about the enslavement of the Roman people. We shall presently see.

Tiberius Gracchus was born in the middle of the second century B. C. He belonged to a family of the new nobility; a young man of commanding personality, of noble birth and high connection, eloquent in speech and brave in war, there was no gift of fame or fortune which seemed not to be within his reach. Most gifted of all the Roman youth, very early he became a favorite of the people. Illustrating his great popularity the story is told of Appius Claudius, who was then at the head of the Roman senate, that, on going home one day, he called out to his wife in a loud voice as soon as he had reached the door: "O Antistia, I have contracted our daughter, Claudia, to a husband;" and that Antistia, being amazed, answered: "Why so suddenly," or, "What means this haste? Unless you have provided Tiberius Gracchus for her husband?"

Tiberius, on returning from a foreign war, where his brave and modest manner had won for him the affection of the soldiery, stood for election as a tribune of the people. Being elected,

he might have used his power to enrich himself and his family; he might have used it as his wealthy and powerful friends and relatives in the senate desired; but, strangely in contrast with the spirit of the times, and with an unselfish devotion to the right for which a corrupt age has no name but madness, this young and eloquent son of Rome, nephew of the conqueror of Carthage, son-in-law to Appius Claudius, turned his back upon the ambitions of youth and resolved upon assuming the duties of office to devote himself to the task of relieving the people from their miserable condition. This, originally, was what the tribune was expected to do. Now, at last, a friend of the people had arisen. The monopolists of the senate soon began to dread the popularity of a man who was impervious to their bribes. The clouds of civil strife began to hover over the Eternal city as threatening as when Hannibal encamped with his fighting elephants at her gates. Had the people's champion waited too long? Had their masters grown omnipotent? Or, was there still enough virtue left in the Roman people to make Tiberius another Brutus who should drive out of the state these Tarquins of the Roman democracy? It is characteristic of true heroism that it never pauses at the beginning of a great enterprise to calculate the chances of success. If Tiberius had done so, the outlook would not have been encouraging. He might have posed as a reformer, without endangering his own security, by demoralizing the people with doles of corn. Tiberius, however, did not appear to be a protectionist. He wanted a government, not to feed the people, but to secure to each man his sovereign right to feed himself and respect himself; therefore the task which he proposed to himself was to break the land monopoly which had crushed out the small freeholders and populated Italy with a horde of slaves. He might have been warned by the similar effort of Caius Laelius who undertook to reform this abuse. Laelius met with such bitter opposition from the ruling class that he desisted from his efforts; whereupon the monopolists rewarded him for his wordly prudence by calling him "Sapiens," the wise. So the world bestows her titles upon those who fall down and worship her. But Tiberius was not to be restrained. Putting his trust in his own eloquence, and in the loyalty of the people, he proposed to brush aside all half-way measures and strike a blow at the real seat of the trouble.

As in the case of every man who at-

tacks time-honored institutions, the purity of Tiberius' motives was called into question. Some said that an old philosopher, Belossius by name, some Roman Henry George, had incited him to do this thing. Others said he had been instigated by the ambition of his mother, Cornelia, daughter of Scipio, who was anxious that her sons should distinguish themselves and who frequently upbraided them that she was only known as the daughter of Scipio and not as the mother of the Gracchi. Still others said that he was prompted by the desire to outdo his rivals in bidding for popular favor. But Tiberius' brother has related how Tiberius, in traveling through Italy, had found a country almost, depopulated, there being hardly any free husbandmen or shepherds, but only barbarians, imported slaves, and that, being appalled at this state of affairs, he resolved that the land should be restored to the people. It must have been an exciting campaign that resulted in his election. There were no newspapers in that day, but the people set up writings on the street corners and in public places, calling upon this new champion of the people's rights to reinstate the poor citizens in possession of the lands which had been taken from them.

Rome carried out the policy of confiscating the lands of the conquered enemy. A large portion of these confiscated lands was added to the public domains. As the victory of her arms extended her boundaries on every side, and as the vanquished people were reduced to slavery, Rome came into the possession of vast territories which, in theory at least, were held by the state and out of the rentals of which a revenue was derived. From the very beginning laws regulating the occupancy of this public domain had been made, but these laws were evaded. For instance, there were laws limiting the amount of land which any one citizen might occupy. These laws were as futile, however, as the attempt of the present administration to secure a popular loan by issuing bonds of small denominations. As to-day the corporations have made use of the names of their employes in subscribing for these bonds, so, before the days of Tiberius, the millionaires of Rome rented their lands in the names of their slaves. By endless evasions of the laws matters had come to such a pass that this public domain had been almost lost sight of. They were held by the rich men of Rome, and handed down from father to son as though they had always been the property of private individuals; and it is questionable whether the state, for

the larger part of these lands, collected any rent at all. Private property in these lands was no worse in effect and no worse in principle than private property in other lands, except that there were laws on the statute books in violation of which these lands had been seized. While all landholders were guilty of a social wrong, these landlords were actual law-breakers. They had not only usurped the rights of the people, but they had also violated the laws of the state. It was not, therefore, the principle of private property in land that was directly attacked, but private property in those lands which belonged to the public domain. The only real difference, however, between those reforms urged by Mr. George and those of Tiberius Gracchus is that Mr. George recognizes the fact that all lands in the beginning are part of the public domain, and that the principle of private ownership, if allowed at all, is bound in time to lead to just those results against which Tiberius was struggling.

Tiberius proposed, however, to deal gently with these law breakers. Instead of punishing them for their violation of the law, or instead of demanding that this iniquity be stopped at once, he actually proposed that these landlords be compensated for their ill-gotten gains. The way one looks at this question of compensation depends largely upon how keenly the wrong of the system is appreciated. In 1858 Emerson advocated compensating the southern slave holders. But Emerson came in time to appreciate more keenly the wrongs which the slaves had suffered, for in 1863 he wrote:

Pay ransom to the owner  
And fill the bag to the brim.  
Who is the owner? The slave is owner,  
And ever was. Pay him.

But Tiberius knew the strength of his enemy, and doubtless wished to be as conciliatory as possible. Instead of thanking him for the mildness of his measures, as they might well have done, these landholders broke into a perfect storm of disapproval. They denounced him before the people as a demagogue. They misrepresented his intentions. They affected to believe that he was trying to overthrow the government. This is not the last time that the real enemies of liberty have assumed a false and pious reverence for law, while they denounced the true friends of righteous law as anarchists and law breakers. For a time, however, the eloquence of Tiberius was more than a match for his enemies. How the Forum must have rung with his stirring words. "The beasts have their dens," he cried to the eager multitudes, "they have

their places of repose and refuge; but the men who bear arms and expose their lives for their country are permitted to enjoy nothing but the air and light. They have no houses or settlements of their own, and are constrained to wander from place to place with their wives and children."

"Soldiers of Rome," cried the orator, "what folly for your generals to exhort you on the field of battle to fight for your sepulchers and your altars! Which of you is possessed of a house that he may call his own, or of an altar or of a monument? You fight, indeed, and are slain, but to what purpose? To maintain the luxury and the wealth of other men. Your flatterers call you the masters of the world, when you have not so much as a foot of ground which you may call your own."

By such speeches Tiberius carried the people with him. With difficulty he secured the adoption of his measures. It was not, however, until he had deposed a tribune of the people who persisted in opposing the reforms, that his propositions were enacted into law. It was this exercise of arbitrary power which enabled his enemies to undermine his influence. Octavius, who was associated with Tiberius in that year as a tribune, was a landholder himself, and in sympathy was opposed to these measures of reform. The tribune by his power of veto could effectually check all legislation. This Octavius determined to do. Tiberius, after every other expedient had failed, called the people together and formally deposed his colleague. He justified this action by saying that "he who assails the power of the people is no longer a tribune at all." This act of Tiberius was what reformers to-day would call the imperial mandate. The sound democratic principles upon which it was based did not, however, prevent his enemies from making effective use of it in the campaign which was to follow. Tiberius, in order to secure the thorough working of his reforms, offered himself for reelection. This again was unusual, and gave his enemies a good opportunity of accusing him of disrespect for the laws. Upon his appearance in the Forum on the day of election there arose a tumult of the people and many forebodings of evil. Soon a friend announced to him that his enemies had formed a plan to assassinate him. Unable to be heard for the great uproar, he stepped forward to indicate to his friends, by holding his hand to his head, that he was in danger of personal violence. Whereupon his enemies ran straightway to the senate and declared that Tiberius was asking the

people to crown him. The senate appealed to the consul to arrest the usurper. This the consul refused to do. Whereupon the high priest arose from his seat in the senate and said: "Since the consul regards not the safety of the commonwealth, let everyone who will defend the laws follow me."

They seized such arms as they could, wrapped their gowns about them and started for the Forum. They were personages of the highest authority in the city. The multitudes hastened to make room for them. Soon all were in flight and confusion. Tiberius was struck in the head by a tribune, one of his colleagues, and was killed. Several of his friends were murdered with him. Thus ended the career of Tiberius Gracchus, a man who offended the rich because he asked them to get off the backs of the poor.

The truth for which in reality he contended was the right of the people to the use of the earth. He was the leader of a forlorn hope. But the truth for which he died was not put to death with him. By that blow Rome sealed her own fate. Without a reform of the land tenure whereby the people were compelled to give over to the holders of land all the fruits of their toil, save what was necessary to keep breath in their bodies—without a reform of this system there was no salvation for Rome. Rome fell because when the barbarian hordes swept down from the north there were none to resist them but voluptuous masters and miserable slaves. And the martyrdom of Tiberius Gracchus only serves to call attention to the truth that they who own the land own the people on the land, and that it is idle for any nation to hope for immortality while it harbors within its bosom this insidious form of slavery which subjects to private ownership, not the man, but the land upon which the man must live.

Guizot in his history says that Providence upon all occasions in order to accomplish its designs is prodigal of courage, virtues, sacrifices—finally, of man; and it is only after a vast number of unknown attempts, apparently lost, after a host of noble hearts have fallen in despair—convinced that their cause was lost—that it triumphs. Tiberius was one of these men whose life seemed, when he died, to have been spent in vain. Nor are there lacking men who still ridicule the truth for which he lived. But it is one of the hopeful signs of our times that this truth is now gaining everywhere. Just the other day news came across the water that the liberal party in England, of which Gladstone was so recent-

ly the leader, is settling upon this land question as one of the issues upon which it proposes to conduct its campaign. But, as Henry George has said:

"It is sad, sad reading, the lives of the men who would have done something for their fellows. To Socrates they gave the hemlock; Gracchus they killed with sticks and stones; and one greatest and purest of all they crucified."

Yet something tells us that the faith of these brave men has not been in vain, while the horizon is bright with promise that the words of our latter day Tiberius Gracchus are destined to speedy fulfillment.

"The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be, it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends, those who will toil for it, suffer for it, if need be, die for it. This is the power of Truth."

#### HE'S NOT SO VERY CRAZY.

John McNamara was found wandering about in Jackson park Friday evening, muttering vague things about "embalmed beef" and "Iloilo."

"I'm President McKinley," he said when the policeman came up and invited him to spend the evening at the Woodlawn police station.

"No wonder I'm crazy," he continued. "This fellow Alger would drive anybody crazy. He's worse than Eagan. Eagan bothers me a good deal, but I could put up with him, because it's all so exciting and so much like a Spanish bullfight. But Alger—he's different. He's like a clay pigeon out of a trap. You never know which way it's going to fly or whether it won't shy off and hit some worthy person in the eye.

"And then there's Iloilo—that place with a name like a Tyrolean yodel song, and people in it that don't know what's good fer 'em. Why, we civilized the Indians, didn't we? Do they think we can't civilize them—these islanders?"

"He's not so cr-r-raazy, afther all," said the policeman.

But he took the man to the station, and later he was conveyed by wagon to the detention hospital, where, after a rest, his mind became clearer and he said he had no home.

"But you couldn't call the white house a home, anyhow," argued the attendant, who was trying to prove that the man's delusion was still in force.—Chicago Chronicle of Jan. 15.

"They say all diseases proceed from microbes."

"Then, I suppose, 'a complication of

diseases' means that a lot of assorted microbes have agreed on a harmonious plan of campaign."—Puck.

## 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.....(Baptism)  
 GOD CARING FOR US.....(Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,  
 GERMANTOWN, PA

## Finance and Transportation

BY

JAY D. MILLER.

Paper; 96 pages; Single Copies, 10c.,  
 50 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.

## HARRIS F. WILLIAMS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

1101 Chamber of Commerce Building . CHICAGO

## 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

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 discreditable 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 522,  
 Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.