

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1904.

Number 319.

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 page.

Some very sensible observations in spelling were recently made by Mr. Arnold Tompkins, principal of the Normal school at Chicago. He does not believe in teaching children to be accurate spellers of obscure words. They can spend their hours of study, he thinks, to far better advantage than in learning how to spell off hand, words like "parachronism," "caoutchouc" and "anterrhinum." He might have added that their memories would be all the better for having other goods in stock. To this absurd memorizing of words infrequently used, Mr. Tompkins wisely prefers "a spelling conscience and a pocket dictionary."

The death of the great painter Verestchagin, who went down with the Petropavlovsk, is a loss to the whole world. He was not only a great artist, but a great man. No writer, no orator, no preacher, has done as much as he, by his paintings, to make war hideous. The artists may criticize him as they please, but he was far greater than any of his critics, and produced a marvelous effect upon the world which will increase with time. Not only in war pictures was he great. His painting of Jesus looking over the Sea of Galilee is one of the most beautiful pictures of modern times, and the fact that the face in this wonderful painting is not seen seems to add to the artist's effectiveness. The Springfield Republican well says of him:

Verestchagin was as characteristically Russian as Tolstoy and there are many points at which these two men meet in their work and its impulse. He was not such an idealist as the great novelist; he was rather

a fatalist; but he was as truly and definitely opposed to the evils of the state, and in his own way engaged to better it.

President Mellen, of the New York, New Haven and Hartford road, is one in authority who is well informed, and so fair in his speech that he seems open minded enough to see farther into industrial conditions than is indicated by his almost admirable address recently reported in the Baltimore Sun. "I would like," he said, "to pay the men of our company better wages and allow them greater privileges than my neighbors, but if I do some one else will take my place who will bring about an equitable comparison." This is a fact. President Mellen can not pay higher wages than his competitors, and this is an answer to those who preach individual righteousness as a means of increasing wages.

We are approaching the 100th birthday of Richard Cobden. This centenary occurs on the 3d of June, and the American Free Trade League urges that it be celebrated appropriately throughout the United States. Extensive preparations are being made for its celebration in Great Britain. In London Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is to preside at a great meeting in the Alexandra Palace, and a large number of prominent public men will address subsidiary meetings in the open air. The American league suggests that a similar programme be followed in this country. A demonstration is already planned for Boston, and the league invites suggestions and cooperation from all centers where Cobden's teachings and principles have taken root. It is a good omen that in this centennial year of Cobden the American Free Trade league should be under the management of two such radical

free traders as John DeWitt Warner, of New York, the president, and William Lloyd Garrison, of Boston, the secretary. Although the suggestion for celebrations comes late, there is still time to arrange for the sincere and simple kind of public recognition which the life work of this world's democrat calls for.

Attention is called by the Commercial Bulletin, of New York, to the startling fact that in that State real estate to the value of \$1,007,992,364 is exempt from taxation—about 20 per cent. of the total of that class of property. And of this exempt property a very large proportion, says the Bulletin, "is held by religious organizations for purely religious purposes of a sectarian or denominational character." It is obvious, of course, that in this manner taxpayers are compelled to support religious establishments in which they do not believe; for just as these establishments are exempt, so are taxpayers in general weighted with heavier taxes. The Bulletin therefore asks if there is "any sound principle upon which this kind of exemption is justified?" Manifestly there is none. It is justified in fact only as all other legal looting is justified, namely, by the plea, more or less disguised, that the legalized looter needs the money. Even among the exempt churches themselves, the system works unjustly. A rich congregation escapes a heavy tax; a poor congregation owning its church property escapes only a small tax; and a poor congregation, worshiping in a hired hall, does not escape at all. There is no sound principle in the custom. It exists because it has existed and its beneficiaries are politically strong enough to ruin any politician or political party that dare propose its abolition.

Why is it that the papers generally have had so little to say about the outrageous conduct of the President in permitting railroads to pay the expenses of his long trip? They have not even mentioned Congressman Baker's attempts to have the government pay the bill. Not so the Springfield Republican. After commending Mr. Baker's attempts, this paper, in a leading editorial, speaks out in healthy reproof of the President's conduct, as follows: "There can be no defense of such conduct. It would be bad enough for the President to accept free transportation in the course of ordinary travel. It is much worse—scandalous, in fact—for him to accept a special train with food, etc., for himself and party in a long turn about the country for the obvious purpose of strengthening himself before the people for nomination and election this year."

Mr. J. B. Lewright, a Texas lawyer, has made a commendable attack upon the evils of the railway pass. He makes the attack as a railway stockholder and in the courts, asking for an injunction against the San Antonio & Aransas Pass railway, restraining it from issuing free passes to members of the legislature, judges and other public officials. He bases his suit upon the claim that if free passes were not granted, the company would either pay dividends or give the public better service. Not only does he ask an injunction, but he demands that all outstanding passes be canceled. Mr. Lewright has taken a course in this matter which might be advantageously adopted elsewhere and with other railroads. Passes are prejudicial to the honest interests of stockholders, they are bribes of a peculiarly corrupting kind, and they operate to discriminate between travelers having equal rights on the public highways.

Apropos of ex-President Cleveland's lecture (p.55) on the Debs strike in Chicago in 1894, Mr. Debs

himself has made a public statement which is at least worthy of consideration even by the most devoted worshiper at the Cleveland shrine. In this statement Mr. Debs says:

I have never counseled violence in strikes. When I was president of the American Railway Union I never urged a single striker to unlawful deeds. They are the worst enemy of the trades union cause. I am for peace. I love to fight for the cause of labor, but not with bludgeons. Mr. Cleveland justifies himself in sending Federal troops to Chicago during the Pullman strike on the basis that there was rioting and lawlessness incident to the strike. I say that there was no rioting or lawlessness until after the Federal soldiers came on the scene. Mr. Cleveland maintains that he had a right to interfere because the United States mails were stopped. It is true enough that the mail trains were not running. But why? Not because mobs were engaged in rioting or strikers were engaged in lawlessness, but because the railroad companies could not get men to handle the trains which carried the mails.

It is only fair to note that Mr. Debs's statement accords more closely with the well-known facts than Mr. Cleveland's does.

Connecticut's Democratic convention has instructed for Judge Parker, but this is of no more importance than the Massachusetts instruction for Olney. The name concealed behind both these sets of instructions is Cleveland's. Parker is practically out of the race. When so warm a journalistic supporter as Wellman, the Washington correspondent, is obliged to concede that Parker "is not as strong as he was three weeks ago," his chances are hopeless. The Judge Parker type of candidate must be nominated unexpectedly as a dark horse or else grow steadily. Otherwise he fails. With such a candidate, fluctuation spells disaster.

The reason given by Mr. Wellman for the dwindling of Judge Parker's Presidential boom is the "weak, rapid and platitudinous platform" upon which the New York convention placed him. That was indeed enough to ruin the chances of any candidate. But

the circumstances showed that the platform was not only platitudinous but that its platitudes were intended to hide Parker's friendly relations with the Wall street brigands. Belmont, Morgan and Woodward would be the ruin of any candidate holding confidential relations with them, no matter what his platform.

Woodward is not as well known as the other two, but he belongs with them. Even the New York World, Cleveland and Parker partisan though it is, turns sick at the naming of Woodward at the head of the Democratic electoral ticket of New York. It says of this James S. Woodward, in its issue of the 4th, that—

Mr. Woodward never uttered one word, in writing or in speech, directly or indirectly involving any political idea. He never was a statesman, a politician, a speaker or a writer. He never was interested in government, national, State or municipal. He has taken no part in reforms or in any public affairs. He is not and cannot be in sincere sympathy with the Democratic platform. He is not opposed to trusts, monopolies or the rule of a plutocracy. On the contrary, the only thing publicly known of him is that he is a sharp money-maker. This is his only business, his entire record. His particular record, by which he is known to the public, is that of a money-maker out of the government. He is identified with the money-making schemes, pools, tricks and syndicates of Wall street. In the Morgan-Belmont syndicate he was a brilliant member. . . . Yet this man, unable to defend by voice or pen a single idea or principle of the Democratic platform, is put forward as the party's foremost candidate, the head of the Presidential ticket, with the necessary consequence that every man in favor of Judge Parker and wishing to vote for him must vote for Woodward.

Doubtless Mr. Woodward was put at the head of the Democratic electoral ticket of New York by the convention which instructed for Judge Parker after making a bunco platform to please him, because birds of a feather naturally flock together.

"All dat some men gits out of an education," said Uncle Eben, "is de ability to talk foolishness grammatically."—Washington Star.

CLEVELAND'S BOND-ISSUE STORY.

One of the notably black spots in the dark record of President Cleveland's second administration, is his issue of government bonds in the years 1894, 1895 and 1896, whereby the public debt was largely increased without a corresponding increase of public property. A large proportion of these bonds were issued to his friends, Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. August Belmont; and some were issued under secret contracts, at prices far below their market value. It was, indeed, a remarkable, not to say suspicious, example of public financiering.

After the lapse of almost ten years Mr. Cleveland breaks his silence on the subject of these bond issues, and tells the story according to the circumstances as he professes to have seen them. His story, which appears in the Saturday Evening Post, of Philadelphia, in its issue of May 7, is a veritable contribution to our history and needs to be read with care by every thoughtful citizen.

It is a long story, naturally, and we can offer only a very condensed syllabus. We shall endeavor, however, to make this with the utmost fairness to Mr. Cleveland. That our syllabus of his story may be distinguished from our comments, we print the former in smaller type:

The bond issues were made to obtain gold coin for the purpose of maintaining a treasury reserve of that metal to the amount of \$100,000,000.

There was no specific legal authority for maintaining this reserve. The practice had begun in the late '70's, in consequence of a frustrated attempt to withdraw the greenbacks from circulation. An act of Congress of 1875 had provided for redeeming and retiring all the greenbacks progressively, and for this purpose had authorized the treasury to issue bonds for the purchase of gold. By the sale of such bonds and from other sources a fund of gold was secured, and the redemption and retirement of greenbacks proceeded until its interruption by an act of Congress of 1878 reversing the policy of retirement. At that time the outstanding greenbacks had been reduced to \$346,681,016, and the fund of gold remaining for redemption and retirement purposes was \$103,000,000.

Although the act of 1878 forbade any further retirement of the greenback currency, it did not forbid redemption, but required that redeemed greenbacks

should be "reissued and paid out again, and kept in circulation." It was assumed by the treasury, therefore, that greenbacks must continue to be redeemed in gold upon demand, and for that purpose the gold fund of \$103,000,000 was treated as a redemption fund, and called the "gold reserve." In 1882 this practice was recognized by law. An act regarding the issue of gold certificates recognized it in these words: "whenever the amount of gold coin and gold bullion in the treasury reserved for the redemption of United States notes falls below \$100,000,000," etc. Under those circumstances, and also because of a popular notion that if the gold reserve fell below \$100,000,000 financial disaster would result, it became necessary, in Mr. Cleveland's opinion, to sell bonds, in order to buy gold to maintain that reserve, if it could not be maintained otherwise.

The difficulty of maintaining the reserve was greatly enhanced by the silver purchase act. In 1878 Congress directed a monthly purchase of silver, and its coinage into silver dollars, the silver coins, (or certificates redeemable in them), to be issued as currency. This act was superseded by the act of 1890, which increased the silver purchase limit, and made redemption of silver notes in gold obligatory. The redemption clause was in part as follows: "Upon demand of the holder of any of the treasury notes herein provided for, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may provide, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin at his discretion." Had the redemption clause stopped there, the holders of these silver treasury notes would, according to Mr. Cleveland, have been bound to take either gold or silver, as the Secretary might elect; but the clause proceeded: "it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals at a parity with each other, upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law." That addendum, says Mr. Cleveland, "had the effect of transferring the discretion of determining whether these treasury notes should be redeemed in gold or silver from the Secretary of the Treasury to the holder of the notes;" because the holder's demand for gold redemption could not be refused, and silver redemption offered, without "either subjecting to doubt the good faith and honest intention of the government's professions, or creating a suspicion of our country's solvency." The parity between the two metals could not be maintained, but, on the contrary, would be distinctly denied. "If the Secretary of the Treasury persisted in redeeming these notes, against the will of the holder, in dollars of silver, instead of gold." Consequently these silver notes took their place beside the greenbacks as demands redeemable out of the gold reserve.

Soon thereafter the gold reserve began

to decline. From August, 1890, to March, 1893, it had fallen from \$185,837,081, to \$100,982,410, the latter being the amount that was turned over. March 4, 1893, to the incoming Cleveland administration by the outgoing Harrison administration. So low had this reserve fallen that the Harrison administration had already taken steps to issue bonds with which to purchase gold for replenishment, but avoided the necessity by raising some \$8,000,000 in gold by an unexplained arrangement with certain unnamed New York bankers.

Although strenuous efforts, temporarily successful, were made by the Cleveland administration to replenish the gold reserve, it shrank within six weeks, and kept on shrinking. Thereupon the special session of Congress of August, 1893, was called to repeal the silver purchase law. The House voted the repeal promptly, and the Senate, more deliberately. Nevertheless the gold reserve continued to fall. By the middle of January, 1894, it had fallen to \$70,000,000, and we were menaced with "the destruction of our gold reserve, the repudiation of our gold obligations, the humiliating fall of the nation's finances to a silver basis, and the degradation of our government's high standing in the respect of the civilized world." There was only one way to avert the calamity, and this was adopted.

Bids for \$50,000,000 five per cent. bonds were solicited at a premium of 11 per cent. They came in slowly, and the menacing withdrawals of gold from the reserve continued. The offer would have met disastrous failure, had not the Secretary of the Treasury succeeded, with a number of New York financiers, "in so arousing their patriotism, as well as their solicitude for the protection of the interests they represented," that they made the offer a success, and the bond issue sold for \$58,660,917.63. This raised the reserve to \$107,440,802.

But before the summer of 1894 it had fallen back to \$78,693,267, and kept on falling. In November it was down to \$61,878,374. Another offer of \$50,000,000 five per cent. bonds was made, and the bid of a financial syndicate of \$58,538,500 for "all or none" was accepted. But this income of gold was nearly offset by an outgo during the same period of \$32,000,000; and in January, 1895, the reserve was down to \$45,000,000.

Mr. Cleveland now addressed a message to Congress describing the "endless chain," whereby greenbacks and silver purchase notes were used to draw gold out as fast as it got in, this currency being required to be reissued notwithstanding its redemption. He urged Congress to provide by an issue of long-term interest-bearing bonds for the final redemption in gold and the cancellation of the redeemed greenbacks and silver purchase notes. But Congress refused

to adopt any plan for withdrawing the paper currency of the government from circulation.

Early in February the reserve had fallen to \$41,340,181 and in this emergency Mr. Cleveland solicited Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's advice and aid. The interview was at the White House, February 7, 1895. Mr. Morgan made an entirely new suggestion. The Administration had supposed it possessed no power to issue bonds except under the greenback redemption law, but Mr. Morgan called attention to section 3700 of the Revised Statutes, which reads: "The Secretary of the Treasury may purchase coin with any of the bonds or notes of the United States authorized by law, at such rates and upon such terms as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest." As the interview proceeded it appeared that Mr. Morgan, Mr. Belmont and their associates were not only willing to take an issue of four per cent. bonds at 104½ in exchange for gold, but were also willing and "abundantly able," in consideration thereof, to protect the treasury against the withdrawal of gold for speculative shipment abroad. A contract was accordingly made with J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York, for themselves and for J. S. Morgan & Co., of London, and with August Belmont & Co., of New York, for themselves and for N. M. Rothschild & Son, of London.

In connection with the execution of this contract the desirability of making the bonds payable in gold by their terms was discussed. All bonds were by law payable in "coin," and might legally be paid with silver. The only safeguard was "a reliance upon such a measure of good faith on the part of the government and honesty on the part of the people as would assure their payment in gold coin." Mr. Morgan "expressed not only a willingness but a strong desire" that a substitution might be made, for bonds payable by their terms in coin of bonds payable by their terms in gold, and "readily agreed to allow" the Administration "time to procure the necessary legislation for that purpose." This change in terms would have saved \$16,000,000, for that was the amount Mr. Morgan was willing to allow, in difference in interest rates, for a "gold" agreement resting upon Congressional sanction, in place of a "coin" agreement with a gold interpretation. Congress refused assent. "Quite in keeping with the Congressional habit prevailing at that time," says Mr. Cleveland, "the needed legislation was refused and this money (\$16,000,000) was not saved."

So the Morgan-Belmont contract was carried out as originally made, whereby the syndicate obtained \$62,315,400 in four per cent. 30-year bonds for \$65,116,244.62—at the ratio, that is, of \$1 in bonds to \$1.04½ in gold.

The syndicate kept its contract. "The

terms of the agreement were so well carried out," writes Mr. Cleveland, "not only in the matter of furnishing gold but in procuring it from abroad and protecting the reserve from withdrawals, that during its continuance the operation of the 'endless chain' which had theretofore drained our gold was interrupted."

But when the contract had been fully performed and its safeguards terminated, the "endless chain" began again to revolve, and by December, 1895, the reserve was down to \$79,333,966, and early in January, 1896, to \$61,251,710. Thereupon \$100,000,000 of four per cent. bonds were offered to the public. J. P. Morgan & Co. bid for the entire issue at a fraction less than \$110.69, and secured less than half. This raised the reserve to \$124,000,000, and, "whether from fatigue of malign conditions or other causes," ever since the last large sale of bonds was made, "the gold reserve has been free from eruptive movement and its condition has caused no alarm."

One cannot read Mr. Cleveland's story without wondering at his idolatry in the presence of this \$100,000,000 Icon of the treasury department. His whole action in the matter appears like a species of rotational gymnastics.

What if the gold reserve had been exhausted? The government is not a bank, whose solvency depends upon a reserve fund. It is a sovereignty, and its solvency depends upon its taxing power. Only one thing could have happened if the reserve had given out. "The endless chain" would have snapped and hurt none but the conspirators who were trying to keep it in motion. Yet Mr. Cleveland played into their hands, in worshipful adoration of this gold reserve fetish, which had no legal origin and no legitimate function. In doing so, he added \$262,315,400 to the interest-bearing debt of the country, and the country got nothing for it.

But it was not all fetishism. Nor was the endless chain nor yet the Morgan-Belmont contract with its \$16,000,000 bait, altogether a matter of ephemeral speculation and momentary plunder. The bond issue episode was an episode of the banking conspiracy which began in the '60's and had this for its purpose: to transform bonds redeemable in currency into bonds redeemable only in gold; to abolish all legal tender but gold; and to confer upon banking syndicates the power to expand and contract

the currency at will. Mr. Cleveland, following the lead instead of reversing the policy of his Republican predecessors, made himself a willing participant in this conspiracy, and is now a rather boastful defender of it.

Let us glance at the framework of the conspiracy. At the close of the Civil War there was a certain volume of greenbacks in circulation, and the bonds of the government specified no particular money of redemption. The bonds, bought at par with greenbacks, were presumably redeemable in the currency of the country whatever that might be at the time of redemption. But the Republican party, already becoming the party of our then incipient plutocracy, adopted the surreptitious policy which has almost culminated in secretly revolutionizing our bonded debt and abolishing our national currency.

In 1866 Congress set about substituting interest-bearing bonds for non-interest-bearing greenbacks. The scheme excited suspicion, and in 1868 it was checked. But in 1869 Congress was led by the Wall street ring of that day into adopting the so-called "act to strengthen the public credit." This act ordained that the payment of our bonds, already issued and purchased with greenbacks and redeemable in any currency, should be paid "in coin or its equivalent" except where the law authorizing the issue expressly provided for payment in "other currency than gold or silver." The same act made the greenbacks redeemable in "coin or its equivalent." It was out of opposition to this law that the Greenback party sprang.

Pursuant to the same general policy, the act of 1875, to which Mr. Cleveland refers, was passed; and under that act the gold reserve grew up in the treasury. The underlying purpose of the act of 1875 was to enable the banks to control the volume of the currency. To that end it removed the limit from the amount of the currency guaranteed by the government which banks might issue; and in order to clear the way for currency contraction whenever banking syndicates might find contraction profitable, the act provided for the retirement of greenbacks,

as banking currency increased, until only \$300,000,000 of greenbacks should remain. After January 1, 1879, this remainder was to be redeemed "in coin." Authority to sell bonds for "coin" for redemption purposes was embodied in the act.

Hardly had that act got fairly into operation when the pressure of hard times was felt, and startling examples of the inordinate power of banking syndicates in New York were observed. A great outcry arose. The Greenback party grew, and the Democratic party joined with it in denouncing the policy of contraction. As a result, the further retirement of the greenbacks was prohibited in 1878.

But the Republicans were in full power in the Executive branch of the government, and their treasury officials, by interpretation and construction, set out to sustain the Wall street policy which Congress had obstructed. It was thus that they established the gold reserve at whose shrine Mr. Cleveland afterwards forced the country to worship—if not devoutly yet expensively.

Although Congress had now forbidden the retirement of greenbacks, the treasury officials assumed that it had not only not forbidden redemption in coin, but had retained the redemption clause in full force as a mandatory provision. More than this, they assumed that "coin" meant gold. So they established, without legal sanction, a reserve fund of \$100,000,000 in gold, thus arranging the mechanism for the "endless chain" which revolved so excitingly during Cleveland's second administration.

It was not until 1882, four years later, that Congress gave even the shadow of sanction to this fund, and then it adopted the sly clause that Mr. Cleveland cites: "The secretary of the treasury shall suspend the issue of such gold certificates whenever the amount of gold coin and gold bullion in the treasury reserved for the redemption of United States notes falls below \$100,000,000." This provision was smuggled into an act "to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, and for other purposes," an act which has no apparent relation to the subject of that

proviso, but which is highly suggestive of its source. The little joker in the proviso was the innocent-looking recognition of the "gold reserve" fund which until then had had no legal status whatever.

Here, then, we have the reserve fund in gold recognized by Congress, four years after the treasury lawlessly institutes it, and then recognized only in an indirect manner and by a surreptitious clause in a law regarding the incorporation of banks. It had been maintained for greenback redemptions in the execution of a policy of contraction, after that policy had twice been checked by Congress; and it was composed of gold, although Congress had authorized redemptions only in coin.

If we add one fact more we have another link in the chain of evidence regarding the plutocratic financial policy of the Republicans which our Democratic President brought to a culmination in his negotiations with his friends Morgan and Belmont. One of the excuses for interpreting the word "coin" in acts of Congress as "gold," was the law, also surreptitious, which demonetized silver coin; it being urged that as coin primarily means silver and gold money, it must mean only gold money when silver money is abolished. This argument is a gem of logic. But is it not suggestive of the underground policy which financial syndicates have pursued since the '60's to place our currency in their control and to enhance the value of our public debt to its owners while augmenting its weight to the payers? Besides, silver money had been restored three months when the "gold reserve" was set up. At that time the demonetization excuse for treating gold as the only "coin" did not exist.

Such was the policy which by hook and by crook had reached the point, in Cleveland's second administration, of changing the character of the required currency for paying the public debt from paper to coin and from coin to gold, and of making the greenbacks part of an endless chain for the bedevilment of the treasury and the enlargement of the debt. Mr. Cleveland had the option of exposing this policy and reversing it,

or of approving and promoting it. He adopted the latter course.

It is assumed by Mr. Cleveland that redemption of the greenback was mandatory after its retirement had been forbidden. Such a construction is indeed possible. But so is the opposite construction.

By the act of 1875 the treasury was required to redeem greenbacks in coin on demand. Redemption in that act evidently meant redemption and retirement, and was so construed in practice. Retirement was forbidden by the act of 1878, which provided that "when any of said notes may be redeemed"—"may be" is permissive and not imperative—"or be received into the treasury under any law from any source whatever, and shall belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled or destroyed, but they shall be reissued and paid out again and kept in circulation." The sensible construction of those two laws is that the contraction policy of the one was reversed by the other, and that redemption was no longer obligatory. A President who had looked upon the people, rather than his financial chums, as his constituency might at least have given the people the benefit of the doubt, by refusing to redeem in any coin when the "run" upon the reserve set in.

There was no better reason for redeeming silver notes in gold than for so redeeming greenbacks. Mr. Cleveland's argument in favor of it is not the argument of a man who had to; it is the argument of a man who wanted to.

As plain as English could make it, the silver purchase law empowered the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem those notes "in gold or silver coin at his discretion." Mr. Cleveland concedes this, but argues that the addendum clause changed it all; the clause, namely, which follows the discretionary provision, and reads: "it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals at a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law."

When that addendum was made it was commonly spoken of as "a stump speech in the belly of the

act," and that is all it was. Its manifest purpose was to warn the Secretary of the Treasury that Congress intended to encourage no discrimination between gold and silver in redemptions of paper money. In his greenback redemptions the Secretary had been treating gold as the only coin, maintaining for that purpose not a coin reserve but a gold reserve, notwithstanding that the law required only coin redemption if it required any redemption at all. The addendum that Mr. Cleveland quotes was therefore inserted in the silver purchase act for the purpose of advising the Secretary that when Congress said gold and silver "coin" it did not mean gold coin alone.

The advice was necessary, in view of the slipperiness of the treasury department in matters in which the financiers were interested. But a stubbornly perverse interpretation was put upon the clause by the Republican administration, and Mr. Cleveland dutifully followed suit. The very clause that was intended to emphasize the policy of paying out either metal according to its preponderance in the treasury, was made an excuse for paying out the scarcer one. The very clause that was intended manifestly to free the treasury from "endless chains" was utilized as a reason for making them revolve the merrier. The very clause that was intended to reiterate the purpose of Congress to rest gold or silver payments on the basis of the discretion of the debtor nation, was used to place them on the basis of the discretion of its Wall street creditors.

The whole thing would be funny if it were not so significant of conspiracies, stratagems and loot.

The resulting "endless chain" was evidently part of the old-time yet uncompleted conspiracy. Its promoters had a purpose beyond taking gold out of one treasury window and shoving greenbacks in at another. Their purpose was to force Congress to cancel the greenbacks and in terms to make "coin" obligations payable in "gold."

This is evident upon Mr. Cleveland's own testimony. Who was it, does he say, that was "abundantly able" to stop the speculative withdrawal of gold from the

treasury? J. Pierpont Morgan and his associates, Belmont and the rest. Who was it, does he say, that did stop those withdrawals when they were paid for it? Morgan and Belmont. What happened, does he say, after that contract had been performed? The withdrawals began again. Who was it, does he say, that "expressed not only a willingness but a strong desire" to sacrifice \$16,000,000 in order to get bonds payable in gold by their terms? His patriotic friends, Morgan and Belmont. And why? Why does Mr. Cleveland suppose that they had this \$16,000,000-desire for "gold" instead of "coin," when the treasury was already interpreting "coin" to mean "gold"? Was it because they feared a loss on this particular transaction? By no means. Insurance against the possible payment of \$62,000,000 of bonds in depreciated silver would have been exceedingly high at \$16,000,000; but to commit Congress in terms to the gold policy would have been a cheap purchase at that price.

That is what Congress saw and that is the reason Congress refused "the needed legislation" so strongly desired by Mr. Cleveland's financial friends. That is doubtless also the reason that the "endless chain" stopped revolving with the last bond issue that Mr. Cleveland made. It was evident by that time that the Congress then in office could not be coerced by the "endless chain" and Mr. Cleveland's responsive bond issues, into committing the country to the gold basis of public indebtedness. So far as speculative opportunities were concerned the "endless chain" could have served as well or better in 1896 than before. But there was really no speculation in it, and, its principal object having clearly failed, it was dropped for the better methods which developed at the Presidential campaign of that year. That was what fatigued "the malign conditions."

Mr. Cleveland could have stopped the "endless chain" at the very start, had he but done what the Secretary of the Treasury in his first administration, Daniel Manning, is reported to have done under similar circumstances. Instead of meekly appealing to Mor-

gan and Belmont, and giving them \$75,000,000 worth of bonds for a little over \$65,000,000, if Mr. Cleveland had said to them in effect: "Gentlemen, I understand the origin and purpose of the 'endless chain,' and if it makes another revolution the treasury will avail itself of its legal right to redeem in silver!"—if he had done that, there would have been no "endless chain" and no bonds. The Wall street rascals would have lost their right hand, would almost have pawned their cunning, rather than have had silver offered in redemption of greenbacks and silver notes at that time. They alone would have suffered from any depreciation of silver and paper currency, and for that reason they would have shrunk from inviting such depreciation.

We are not inclined to suspect Cleveland's virtue, so much as his susceptibility to the influences of environment, for the bond issue episode of his second administration. That he went into office poor and came out rich, is a fact that impresses many, and it cannot be lightly disregarded. But in so far as his actions may be explained upon a more charitable hypothesis we are disposed to accept the charitable view; and with reference to those bond issues we know that absolutely honest men regard the matter as Mr. Cleveland does, a fact which gives color at least to his assumptions of sincerity. Yet, what reply is to be made to the New York World, a Democratic paper which is far from unfriendly to Cleveland and which in its issue of May 6, 1904, claims credit for having frightened him out of plans to make a second secret contract with Morgan? In proof of this the World reproduces its editorial of January 3, 1896, which it points to as having broken up the "deal." We reprint it:

To you, Mr. Cleveland, the World appeals. It asks you to save the country from the mischief, the wrong and the scandal of the pending bond deal with the Morgan syndicate. It is not yet too late to repudiate the whole transaction, and its rejection will be the greatest act of your life. It will give you more of prestige than any other, more of honor and more of the gratitude of your countrymen. The needless waste of \$10,000,-

000 or \$15,000,000 in this transaction is not the only or even the chief objection to it. It involves something of immeasurably greater worth than any number of millions. It involves popular confidence in the integrity of the Government, that faith of the people in their rulers, which is the life-blood of free institutions. The manner of this thing is more vitally important than its matter. In all kindness the World asks you to look at the facts as they present themselves to the popular mind. This bargain has been made with a suspicious secrecy which has been guarded by a picket line of falsehoods put forth for the misleading of the people. It is a bargain between yourself in your official capacity and your near friends. It promises to give princely millions of the people's money to those friends, and that without any need, as we shall presently show. You have not asked advice of the party leaders in Congress or out. The only person you are known to have counseled with is the contractor with whom you have been bargaining, and he had millions to make by inducing you to accept his advice. His lawyer, who was formerly your law partner, has been in Washington helping the negotiation. James T. Woodward, president of the Hanover bank, has also been in Washington, and he is publicly known to have accumulated \$4,000,000 of gold in preparation for the deal. Mr. Stillman, of the National City bank, who has also been at the capital, has a hoard of \$8,000,000 to invest in the speculation. You must see, Mr. Cleveland, that secrecy of negotiation under such circumstances is bound to excite suspicion. You must realize that men are already saying things which the newspapers as yet hesitate to print. You must be alive to the fact that these suspicions, directed against the conduct of the Government itself, are more threatening to the stability of our institutions than the enmity of any foreign foe could be. The most damaging thing that could happen to the Republic would be the lodgment of a conviction in the people's minds that our Government had become one of syndicates and bargains for the public moneys.

As a result of that editorial the World now claims that Mr. Cleveland abandoned the second secret "deal;" offered this issue of bonds to the public; and thereby received 112 instead of 104½, the latter being the price for the previous issue actually disposed of by the secret "deal" to Morgan and Belmont, which Mr. Cleveland tells of as occurring at the White House, and of which he unblushingly boasts as if it had been patriotic.

"Nothing is better established," says the World now, "than

the fact, of which the World had and published documentary evidence, that the Morgan syndicate had a 'thorough understanding' with the Administration that it was to have the 1896 issue of \$100,000,000 in bonds on substantially the same terms as those which Mr. Cleveland describes as a 'favorable bargain'—namely, about 104½ for bonds worth at that time 117!" If the World is justified in making its assertions, one cannot altogether condemn whoever harbors the suspicions which such facts naturally arouse against all but the sacrosanct. Moreover, if the World's assertions are true, Mr. Cleveland's article in the Saturday Evening Post is lacking in candor to a degree which approximates the level of deliberate deception.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

IOWA.

Sioux City, Iowa, April 8.—Without Hearst's candidacy, we should have been snowed under by the Parker crowd, with all its plentiful lack of principle and its abounding thirst for post offices. The alignment in Iowa was practically that of 1896 and every year since, except that we have now regained all the ground lost since 1896. I know of only two prominent Bryan Democrats who were not in line for Hearst; and to offset these there were several prominent gold Democrats of radical leanings. Moreover, the men selected to go to the St. Louis convention are full of the principle of democracy. Once convince them that Mr. Hearst is not true to this principle, and he can not hold them a minute. His following is determined by principle and not personality or any other ulterior consideration. I feel sure that this is the case all over the country, and that wherever a State is carried for Hearst it is a victory for democratic Democracy. I know that it is so in Iowa.

This fact appears as strongly in the men who were against Hearst as in those who were for him. Every railway lawyer, every corporation tool, every professional touter for plutocracy in the State was against him. A member of the Interstate Commerce Commission came out from Washington to tell us what fools we were making of ourselves in the face of the fact that Parker was sure of the nomination. The men who were against us in 1896 and have been fighting us in every convention since, and gradually gaining ground until Iowa last year went into the ranks of the "reorganized," came to the convention using the same bitter arguments against Hearst that they used against Bryan, although the silver question was out of the con-

test, and such men as Weaver, Rhinehart, Evans, Walsh and myself insisted that no reference be made to reaffirmation. The atmosphere is wonderfully cleared. We see now—all of us—that it was not 16 to 1 which they were fighting, but democratic Democracy. The split in our ranks is encouragingly increased in definiteness.

J. H. QUICK.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, May 12.

Last week's rumors of the fall of Newchwang (p. 71) in the progress of the Russo-Japanese war, appear to have been premature in point of time and mistaken as to manner. But the Japanese have followed up their victory at the Yalu by a succession of further victorious movements, of which the evacuation of Newchwang by the Russians is reported to be one of the results. A landing of a Japanese force has been made at Pitsewo, on the east coast of the Liaotung peninsula, northeast of Port Arthur, and another is reported on the west coast of the same peninsula near Port Adams, or Kinchow, stations on the Russian railroad. A third Japanese force is reported to have disappeared and the war correspondents are speculating as to its whereabouts and the part it is to play. The capture of Dalny, the commercial terminus of the Russian railway a few miles north of Port Arthur, is also reported. Notwithstanding these reports, which imply that the Japanese have completely invested Port Arthur and are in control of the railroad southward from Port Adams or thereabouts, the Russian viceroy, Alexieff, telegraphed the Czar on the 10th that Russian communication with Port Arthur by rail had been restored on the 9th and 10th and that the telegraph line was being repaired. On the 6th, without a battle, the Russians abandoned their second line of defense west of the Yalu, at Fenghuangcheng (p. 71), and the Japanese took possession. The Russians in their retreat were closely pursued. This retreat is believed to have given the Japanese a great advantage in future operations by yielding to them a large strip of Manchurian territory.

Another fight has occurred in

connection with the British invasion of Thibet (p. 25), an obstructive Thibetan force having been attacked by the British expedition near Gyantse at a point about 16,000 feet above sea level. The attack was made on the 6th, and the fight lasted two hours. The Thibetans were dislodged from their entrenchments with a loss of about 75, the British loss in killed being 5, including Captain Bethune, who led the attack. Subsequent reports indicate that the Thibetans are opposing greater resistance to the British advance.

The pacification of the Moros in the Philippines by the United States does not appear to have been as complete as announced (vol. vi, p. 808) by Gen. Wood two months ago. News dispatches of the 11th from Manila report that Lieut. Winfield Harper and 39 men of Company F of the Seventeenth United States infantry, were caught in ambush May 8, by several hundred Moros. Two American officers and 15 men were killed and 5 men were wounded. The ambush occurred at Simpatem, on the east shore of Lake Liguasan, Island of Mindanao.

Meagre reports of probable war between Brazil and Peru are at hand. The difficulty grows out of conflicting claims to parts of the so-called Acre country regarding which Brazil and Bolivia came near engaging in war some 15 months ago. The Acre country comprises 80,000 square miles. Its resources for rubber production are said to have been discovered by the celebrated mountain climber, Sir Martin Conway, an Englishman, who procured from Bolivia a grant of the land, with vast powers of government, in which American capitalists are now deeply interested. The region is described as lying far inland, 2,500 miles or more from the mouth of the Amazon, a wild section of South America, untraversed by any railroad, without telegraph lines, and a three weeks' journey by the uncertain river boats from Para. It is watered by three great tributaries of the Amazon—the Javary, Jurua and Purus—and their affluents, deriving its name from one of the latter, the river "Aquiry" or "Acre." It is bounded on the north and east by

the Brazilian states of Amazonas and Matto Grosso, on the south by Bolivia and on the west by Peru. When the original boundary treaty between Brazil and Bolivia was signed, in 1867, the population consisted entirely of nomadic and hostile Indians, and the dangers of exploration were augmented by the prevalence of fevers and reptiles and insects of the most deadly description. Not until the rubber industry at Manaos and Para became of value and the prospectors pushed westward into the wilderness to locate new lands suitable for this tree did the district receive special attention. It had been in undisputed possession of Brazil, and only in 1894 did Brazil and Bolivia realize the necessity for a more definite boundary line at this point. In 1895 a joint commission of those two governments agreed to adopt a provisional line, but disputes afterward arose, and in the winter of 1903 the rubber interests in the Acre country claimed by Bolivia rose in successful revolt against that country (vol. v, pp. 711, 712), following which Brazil sent an ultimatum giving notice to Bolivia that if she should attempt to re-occupy the disputed territory, Brazil would pacify and administer it by military force until a settlement of the whole dispute had been reached. Bolivia thereupon agreed to Brazilian military occupation and administration of all the disputed country to the west of the Yaco river, at the same time advising Brazil that she was sending to Rio Janeiro a minister specially authorized to negotiate a satisfactory agreement, or failing that to arrange for arbitration. No further reports of the difficulty between Brazil and Bolivia have been published in this country. But on the 3d came reports of rumors in Rio Janeiro to the effect that orders had been issued for concentration of all the Brazilian forces in the first military district at points on the frontier of Peru where Peruvian troops were reported to have crossed into the territory. These rumors were confirmed by dispatches of the 4th from Rio, which also stated that naval as well as military preparations were under way looking to war with Peru.

It seems that Peru had asserted

claims in the Acre country by occupying the Jurua and the Perus valleys with troops, and that Brazil had notified her to evacuate. No reply to this notice having been received, Brazil proceeded with her military and naval preparations. From Lima, Peru, also on the 4th, the Peruvian minister for foreign affairs was reported as saying that his government was preparing to resist the "unjust aggression" of Brazil. He was further reported as asserting that it is a political whim of Brazil's foreign minister to annex the territories of Alto Jurua and Alto Perus, inventing as a basis for such action stories of Peruvian invasions, and that Brazil had now sent troops to occupy the coveted region.

Five days later a dispatch from Manaos announced that an important battle had been fought between the Brazilian forces and the Peruvians near the river Chandles, and that the Peruvians were completely routed. It is said to be the general opinion, however, that there will not be a war, the Peruvian minister to Brazil having delivered a note proposing an examination of the property rights of both countries in the disputed Acre territory, without taking into account the actual occupation of the district.

In American politics there have been during the week six Republican State conventions. The Colorado convention on the 6th gave instructions for Roosevelt; that of New Jersey on the 10th endorsed his administration, but gave no instructions; those of Connecticut, Maryland and Alabama, on the 11th, endorsed but did not instruct; and that of Washington, also on the 11th, both endorsed and instructed.

The week's record of Democratic State conventions comprises those of Connecticut and Washington. In Connecticut the delegates were subjected to the unit rule and were instructed for Parker. This was done by a vote of 366 to 186, the minority being supporters of Hearst. In Washington on the 5th no instructions for anyone were made, but the unit rule was adopted and of the 10 national delegates

7 are reported to be strong Hearst men.

Some inferences regarding the approaching Presidential convention of the Democratic party may be drawn from dispatches of the 8th from St. Louis of the results of Democratic primaries with reference to the governorship of Missouri. They report that Joseph W. Folk, the circuit attorney of St. Louis, who has come into national prominence through his prosecutions of the local political ring and its "business man" confederates, has won his fight for the nomination. In the primaries of the 7th in eleven counties Mr. Folk is reported to have had sweeping victories in every precinct in every county save one, Lafayette county, which was carried by ex-Mayor James Reed, of Kansas City, by small majorities. Folk is now reported to have 286 uncontested delegates out of 356 necessary to nominate, while Reed has only 61. Harry B. Hawes had 111 votes, which he secured in St. Louis, but he has retired from the race. Judge James Gantt, of the Supreme Court, the only other candidate, has not a single delegate.

After a session of several days in Chicago (p. 72) the Socialist convention has adopted a national platform and nominated Presidential candidates. It is too long for complete quotation here, but we reproduce all the essential features:

We, the Socialist Party, in convention assembled, make our appeal to the American people as the defender and preserver of the idea of liberty and self-government, in which the nation was born. . . . To this idea of liberty the Republican and Democratic parties are equally false. . . . Our American institutions came into the world in the name of freedom. They have been seized upon by the capitalist class as the means of rooting out the idea of freedom from among the people. . . . By controlling all the sources of social revenue, the possessing class is able to silence what might be the voice of protest against the passing of liberty and the coming of tyranny. It completely controls the university and public school, the pulpit and the press, and the arts and literatures. . . . Our political institutions are also being used as the destroyers of that individual property upon which all liberty and opportunity

depend. The promise of economic independence to each man was one of the faiths upon which our institutions were founded. But, under the guise of defending private property, capitalism is using our political institutions to make it impossible for the vast majority of human beings ever to become possessors of private property in the means of life. Capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property. Its development is through the legalized confiscation of all that the labor of the working class produces, above its subsistence-wage. . . . Socialism comes to rescue the people from the fast increasing and successful assault of capitalism upon the liberty of the individual. As an American socialist party, we pledge our fidelity to the principles of international socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the socialists of all nations. . . . The tendency of the competitive wage system is to make labor's lowest condition the measure or rule of its universal condition. Industry and finance are no longer national but international, in both organization and results. . . . The socialist movement therefore is a world-movement. It knows of no conflicts of interest between the workers of one nation and the workers of another. . . . The socialist movement owes its birth and growth to that economic development or world-process which is rapidly separating a working or producing class from a possessing or capitalist class.

. . . . The fact that these two classes have not yet become fully conscious of their distinction from each other, the fact that the lines of division and interest may not yet be clearly drawn, does not change the fact of the class conflict. This class struggle is due to the private ownership of the means of employment, or the tools of production. Wherever and whenever man owned his own land and tools, and by them produced only the things which he used, economic independence was possible. But production, or the making of goods, has long ceased to be individual. The labor of scores, or even thousands, enters into almost every article produced. Production is now social or collective. . . . But this co-operation in production is not for the direct use of the things made by the workers who make them, but for the profit of the owners of the tools and means of production; and to this is due the present division of society into two classes. . . . A society based upon this class division carries in itself the seeds of its own destruction. Such a society is founded in fundamental injustice. There can be no possible basis for social peace, for individual freedom, for mental and moral harmony, except in the conscious and complete triumph of the working class as the only class that has the right or power to be. The socialist

program is not a theory imposed upon society for its acceptance or rejection. It is but the interpretation of what is, sooner or later, inevitable. . . . if the world is to be saved from chaos, from universal disorder and misery, it must be by the union of the workers of all nations in the socialist movement. The socialist party comes with the only proposition or program for intelligently and deliberately organizing the nation for the common good of all its citizens. . . . Socialism means that all those things upon which the people in common depend shall be by the people in common be owned and administered. It means that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users; that all production shall be for the direct use of the producers; that the making of goods for profit shall come to an end; that we shall all be workers together; and that all opportunities shall be open and equal to all men. To the end that the workers may seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the co-operative commonwealth, the Socialist party pledges itself to watch and work in both the economic and the political struggle for each successive immediate interest of the working class; for shortened days of labor and increases of wages; for the insurance of the workers against accident, sickness and lack of employment; for pensions for aged and exhausted workers; for the public ownership of the means of transportation, communication and exchange; for the graduated taxation of incomes, inheritances, franchises and land values, the proceeds to be applied to the public employment and improvement of the conditions of the workers; for the complete education of children, and their freedom from the workshop; for the equal suffrage of men and women; for the prevention of the use of the military against labor in the settlement of strikes; for the free administration of justice; for popular government, including initiative, referendum, proportional representation, equal suffrage and municipal home rule, and the recall of officers by their constituents; and for every gain or advantage for the workers that may be wrested from the capitalist system, and that may relieve the suffering and strengthen the hands of labor. We lay upon every man elected to any executive or legislative office the first duty of striving to procure whatever is for the workers' most immediate interest, and for whatever will lessen the economic and political powers of the capitalist, and increase the like powers of the worker. But, in so doing, we are using these remedial measures as means to the one great end of the co-operative commonwealth.

The chairman of the committee

which reported the foregoing platform was George D. Herron, of New York, the secretary was Thomas E. Will, of Kansas, and the other members were G. H. Strobell, M. W. Wilkins, Ben Hanford, Eugene V. Debs, Victor L. Berger, William Mailly and H. T. Titus. As candidate for President of the United States the convention on the 5th nominated Eugene V. Debs, of Indiana, and for Vice President Benjamin Hanford, of New York.

NEWS NOTES.

—Sir Henry M. Stanley, the explorer of Africa, died in London on the 10th at the age of 64.

—Maurus Jokai, the Hungarian novelist and journalist, died at Budapest on the 5th at the age of 79.

—At the election in Bolivia on the 1st the Liberal candidate, Col. Montes, was elected president of the Republic.

—The total admissions to the St. Louis exposition from the 2d to the 7th, both inclusive, were 137,708, of which 65,487 were paid admissions and 72,221 were free.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 41) for April shows on hand April 30, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash.....	220,919,188.34
Total.....	\$370,919,188.34
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	\$384,394,275.55
Decrease.....	\$13,475,087.21

—The Chicago celebration of the 25th year of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" announced last week as being under the auspices of the Chicago Woman's Single Tax League (p. 73) is to be under the auspices of the Henry George association. It takes place on the 14th at 8. p. m., at the Northwestern Social settlement, corner of Noble and Augusta streets. George a Schilling is to preside, and Louis F. Post, Leonora Beck, Judge E. O. Brown and Raymond Robins are to speak.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 41) for the ten months ending April 30, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff.....	\$220,570,957.42
Internal revenue.....	123,115,879.05
Miscellaneous.....	37,525,332.58
Total.....	\$451,612,170.05
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.....	\$118,825,028.05
War.....	96,922,857.14
Navy.....	84,403,600.93
Indians.....	8,727,955.81
Pensions.....	18,119,487.88
Interest.....	22,102,659.17
Total.....	\$419,153,598.98
Surplus.....	\$2,458,571.07

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE PRESIDENCY.

The Commoner (Dem.), May 6.—The Belmontification of the Parker boom was sudden and complete.

Emporia (Kan.) Times (Dem.), May 6.—But if Bryan is dead and buried why does the plutocratic press and all the corrupt and calcused interests of wealth of the country devote more space and attention to him than they do to any living man.

Goodhue County (Minn.) News (Dem.), May 7.—If the Brooklyn Eagle will kindly refrain from saying aught in praise of Williams, Towne, Shepard, Garvin, Folk, Miles and some twenty others who might be named, the Democratic party may be able at St. Louis to pick a satisfactory candidate.

The Commoner (Dem.), May 6.—The St. Paul Globe quotes a paragraph from a letter written by Mr. Bryan to the Iroquois club of Chicago and construes it to be an attack upon Mr. Hearst. The Globe editorial was not written in good faith. It is owned by one of the money magnates referred to, and the editor knows that Mr. Bryan was referring to the attempt now being made by representatives of the great corporations to commit the Democratic party to a platform similar to the New York platform and to a candidate like Judge Parker. Nothing was said in the letter that could be construed for or against Mr. Hearst. Mr. Bryan has observed strict neutrality as to the men who were favorable to the Kansas City platform.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.), May 6 (weekly ed.).—It was tragic, after the welcome which Mr. Williams gave to Hearst's American in his Faneuil hall speech, to see how entirely that newspaper failed to serve to any good effect the candidacy of its owner and the efforts of Mr. Williams. In the eloquent vision of Mr. Williams, who held that radicalism had not been given a fair show in the newspapers, the new organ was to set forth its cause with fulness, sympathy and power. As a matter of fact, the Hearst paper in Boston entirely failed to do this. Important manifestos of the campaign which Mr. Williams made were not used, or appeared, after an appeal had been made to Mr. Hearst, in a way that robbed them of all potency; while Hearst meetings were minimized in the American's columns by men whose knowledge of Democratic politics was slight, and whose handling of these things maddened the Hearst people. It is not too much to say that there was profound disappointment and disgust with their organ in the Williams headquarters. As an effective agency it had amounted to nothing, and so early hopes were dashed.

Solon (Ia.) Economy (Ind.), May 5.—When a political party grows so old that it loses sight of the principles that brought it into life, it is very apt to concentrate its whole power upon a few persons as leaders. Instead of regarding the rank and file of the party as capable of thinking and acting from principles, they are regarded much as a flock or herd of cattle to be held subject to the will of a few leaders who plan and manage the campaign in their own interest. Time was when both the Republican and Democratic parties were moved by principles of truth which were reiterated in platforms from the national convention down to the county assemblage of the people's delegates. But that time seems to have passed by and the rule now with the politicians is to say as little as possible about principles and instead do as much blowing about persons as possible. This is a species of idolatry that we have no use for under a real republican form of government. Men are essential to carry principles into practice, but they are only to be found by observing the principles that govern their lives either as private citizens or in public

life. It is well to commend a public servant for doing his duty well, but when a lot of resolutions are strung out in praise of a few men and not a word said of the principles that the party stands for, there is pretty good evidence that the party is in its dotage and no longer fit to serve the entire people.

THE CONSERVATIVE.

(Cedar Rapids, Ia.) Why (s. t.), February.—The good old word "conservative" is once more being appropriated by the enemies of organized society and progress. We say once more, because the Tory party of Great Britain has called itself "Conservative" for generations and Americans—even those who belong to the Republican party—should be able to know what that kind of conservatism means. For centuries it has stood for class privilege as opposed to all movements for equality before the law. It was the "Conservative" party which imposed all of the tyrannies upon the American colonists, and goaded them to revolt and to strike for freedom. Essentially, the "Conservative" party has been the monarchist party with all of its superstitions and hatred of human rights. And now we are beginning to hear the word "conservative" used more in American politics than at any other time in our history. We hear it especially among that crowd of insurgent Democrats who refused to support Mr. Bryan in 1896 and 1900. "With a safe, conservative candidate for the presidency we can win," is one of their favorite phrases. The "safety" has reference entirely to the robbing privileges of the few and the earnest desire to conserve American torism. Can the people of the United States be bamboozled by this tricky misuse of terms as have the masses of Europe for centuries?

THE MORMON QUESTION.

(Solon, Ia.) Economy (Ind.), March 24.—From the amount of time taken up in the investigation of the Smoot case by the United States senate and the space taken in the daily papers, we may infer that this twin relic of barbarism—polygamy—is still likely to cut a swath in our national affairs. . . . Insert the word "polygamy" immediately after the word "slavery" in the first section of Article XIII, and the business of amending is done. But getting rid of the effects of polygamy would be quite as difficult as getting rid of the effects of slavery. Nevertheless, the only way to rid our country of the evils of polygamy is to cut off the thing by the same method that was used upon slavery.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 38 of that publication.

Record Notes.—Speech of Representative Cockran on ship subsidies (p. 6157). Speech on Military Academy appropriations by Representative Sulzer (p. 6169).

For there is no employment that gives so keen and quick a relish for peace as husbandry and a country life, which leave in men all that kind of courage that makes them ready to fight in defense of their own, while it destroys the license that breaks out into acts of violence and rapacity.—Plutarch (Life of Numa Pompilius).

MISCELLANY

HE HAS HIS CHOICE.

For The Public.

Who loves the company of those "well born,"
 And holds that nothing can the grossness
 leave
 Of these, the lowly, may regret his scorn;
 He'll find few "fit associates" in Heaven.
 But if he chooses elsewhere to reside,
 When Death shall summon—he may hope
 to find
 Enough of "fashion" and of "family pride,"
 And all the "elegance" he leaves behind.
 JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

AN EARLY VIEW OF LAND MONOPOLY.

An extract from William Godwin's "Political Justice," published in 1793.

The population of any country is measured by its cultivation. If, therefore, sufficient motives can be furnished to excite men to agriculture, there is no doubt that population may be carried on to any extent that the land can be made to maintain. But agriculture, when once begun, is never found to stop in its career, but from positive discountenance. It is territorial monopoly that obliges men unwillingly to see vast tracts of land lying waste, or negligently and imperfectly cultivated, while they are subject to the miseries of want. If land were perpetually open to him who was willing to cultivate it, it is not to be believed but that it would be cultivated in proportion to the wants of the community, nor by the same reason would there be any effectual check to the increase of population.

A COLORED HOME ESTABLISHED BY A COLORED WOMAN.

For The Public.

The Frances Joseph Colored Industrial Home, is one of the most useful institutions in the city of New Orleans. Frances Joseph, an estimable colored woman, in 1902 purchased an old homestead of 105 acres as a permanent location for the Home. Mrs. Joseph trains the children in cooking, sewing, laundry work, gardening, truck farming, etc. The primary branches are taught to both boys and girls, and much attention is given to teaching habits of personal cleanliness and good morals. The Home has an income of \$350 per annum from the city. One hundred and seven children have been cared for within the year. These children come from the streets, the hovels, the very gutters. A mortgage of \$2,000 rests on the Home, and could this be speedily paid, the usefulness of the institution would be largely increased and its permanence

assured. The leading newspapers of New Orleans and the Protestant Ministers' Alliance have indorsed Mrs. Joseph's urgent appeal for contributions to pay off this mortgage, to be sent to Mrs. James M. Ferguson, 852 Camp street, New Orleans, La., for whose fidelity Miss Kate M. Gordon, corresponding secretary of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, vouches.

ELIZABETH J. HAUSER.

SUCCESS IN LIFE.

President John Finley, of the College of the City of New York, estimates that the college graduate has one chance in 40 of "succeeding in life," whereas the man who hasn't been to college has only one chance in 10,000.

It is unfortunate that President Finley has not made clear what he means by the phrase "succeeding in life." Until that foundation is definitely fixed, any such figures as he presents can be nothing more than mere speculation.

Success in life is relative. To no two minds does it mean the same. To no two conditions can it be alike applicable.

The success of the farmer, for instance, who adds to his lands, rears his family in righteousness and passes his days in peace and content, far from the turmoil and triumphs of more swiftly-moving life, would not seem to the lawyer, the politician or the city merchant to be a success at all.

The crossroads storekeeper may be a success in life in his own estimation and that of his neighborhood, though his brother of the city, who thinks in chunks of millions, cannot help looking down upon him in scorn.

There can be no material standard of success, for the reason that the outlook, the aspiration and the attainment of any man are his alone. No two can occupy the same viewpoint. No two can regard success from the same mind and heart.

The school-teacher, who ever gives, may cut a sorry figure in a biographical dictionary beside the millionaire who ever gets. But in the real building up of the intellect and morality and happiness of the world it is she who is the giant and he the pigmy.

The poor underpaid preacher whose congregation is small because he preaches religion undefiled may in the common estimate be a failure. But who can foretell the harvest to come from the pregnant seed thus sown in good ground? Another generation may see a mighty church arise, that some

rich man puts a gorgeous window in and calls his monument.

Which is the more successful life—the one that builds a great window or the one that stimulates the spirit which makes a church?

Possibly nine-tenths of us have no other serious purpose in life than to get the best living we can. We are absorbed in our own little affairs—our wants and enjoyments, ailments and ease, jealousies and envies and hatreds and loves. The greater the degree to which we satisfy our wants and triumph over our enemies, the greater our success—we think.

But to gratify our wants is only to create new ones. Human longing is like a sea—the more we pour into it the more it spreads. The millionaire longs for more as eagerly as does the poor man. Content does not lie in the direction of acquisition or indulgence.

Success in life consists in fitting oneself to one's environment, and one thing more—elevating the environment.

Whether college education helps or hinders depends upon the man and the environment. Higher education would not help a digger of ditches or a mere grubber after money. But it is indispensable to men whose interests and pursuits extend beyond themselves.

If education were what it ought to be—character development—it would make every man more successful in life. But, unfortunately, it is not always that.—Editorial in Nashville (Tenn.) Daily News of March 17, 1904.

A WORD FOR "JOHN."

Many years ago, at Ballarat, I found myself amid great mounds of "tailings" in the outskirts of that golden city. "Tailings" are the worked-out refuse of the mines and abandoned as worthless, out of which, nevertheless, the thrifty and laborious Chinese, by extracting gold in most minute quantities, managed to make a not unsubstantial livelihood. Playing around a shanty close by were some six little boys and girls of various ages, clean and neatly dressed, who struck me with their rosy cheeks, jet black hair and slant eyes that gave a peculiar piquancy to their pretty, chubby countenances. Presently a portly woman, who turned out to be a daughter of Erin, came to the door. I asked her if she was the mother of those nice-looking children. She told me she was; and, when I proceeded further to praise their eyes, said: "I married a 'John,' their father is a Chinaman," volunteering, in addition, that

she was very happy, and that he made a most excellent husband and father. "He never gets drunk, is always at work, and brings me home all his earnings, so that the children are well-clad and cared for, as you can see, whereas, if I had married a white, he quite likely would have spent his wages in drink, and knocked about and starved me and the children." I replied that she appeared to have made a wise choice and wished her and her little ones every happiness.

Subsequently, all along the coast of Queensland, at every port we touched, the tale was that the Chinese were getting the whole trade of the place into their hands, and that owing to their thrift, sobriety and assiduity. At Singapore and Hongkong the same story was repeated. In the rice-swamps by the great rivers the coolies were diligently toiling under burning skies. Going down into the saloon of the steamer that carried me to Canton or Macao, I forget which, I found it filled with Chinamen of evidently a very high caste, attired in sky-blue tunics and taking short whiffs from their opium-pipes. Tall and slight of figure, with smooth, hairless faces, save for their long mustaches, there was such an air of Confucian serenity and intellectuality about them that I felt somewhat uncomfortable in their presence, and did not regain my self-composure till I had rejoined my more commonplace compatriots on deck. In Japan, as in China, in all the mercantile houses, whether native or European, the compradores, the men who cash your circular notes, and figure out the exchanges, were Chinamen to a man. The universal testimony was that the Chinaman was a born merchant, ready to stake the largest sums to procure the smallest returns, hard in driving a bargain, but inflexible in carrying it out, whether it resulted for or against him.

It was impossible to withhold moral approbation of, if one could not accord intellectual assent to, their proud confidence in the superiority of their own civilization, the most ancient in existence and that by centuries anticipated the west in many of the highest inventions; and not to recognize that when at length the conservatism of China awakes from its sleep of ages, it is almost impossible to set limits to the role that she will play in the development of the world.

When I landed at San Francisco the air was full of the "yellow peril," the dirtiness and the vices of the Chinese; but at the same time everyone admit-

ted that the best washermen, the best gardeners, the best servants, were all Chinamen, and that, but for them, many of the railways, if made at all, would have had indefinitely to be postponed. It is easy enough and common enough to adopt the vices of the Chinese. It is more difficult, and rarer, to imitate their virtues. The outcry is against their vices, the real objection to them is to their virtues.—The London New Age for March 17, 1904.

THE PUNISHMENT OF THE CAT.

"I regret it extremely," said Aunt Isobel, and she might well regret it, for she was in part responsible; she was the actual owner of the cat Isolde, who had done this terrible thing.

"And it is not the first time," said Aunt Herminia, severely. It is impossible to speak of these two good ladies without the auntly prefix; they had been congenital aunts; they were now both unmarried and both over 50, and auntiness was their portion forever. They lived together and had written treaties and agreements regulating their respective positions in the house, and the small things of life were of very serious importance to them.

"It is not the first time," Aunt Herminia repeated. "I find on referring to my diary that no further back than November 16 last year I also found the cat asleep on my bed in the afternoon. This kind of thing cannot possibly go on. I say nothing about the extreme laziness of sleeping in the day, whether the sleeper be a cat or any other animal."

Aunt Isobel looked slightly confused. She had herself once or twice been guilty of closing her eyes for a few minutes after luncheon and the more energetic Herminia had caught her at it.

"I am prepared," said Aunt Herminia, "to take it on the very lowest grounds and will merely say that if the cat wished to sleep there is a place provided for it. It is not as if it had no proper basket."

"No, indeed," said Aunt Isobel, weakly.

"Very well, then. You know the agreement between us. Either the cat will be punished with your consent or you will get rid of her."

"Yes, of course, she must be punished. I'll go down now and give her a good scolding."

"That will not do," said Aunt Herminia, sternly. "I am by no means certain that she has the delicate sensibilities that would make a scolding a punishment."

"I always think," said Aunt Isobel, "that she understands and feels every

word I say, and you couldn't strike her or keep her without food."

"I should consider it quite unwomanly to strike anything in any case. It might be a kindness to her to keep her without food for a day, but with servants as criminally indulgent toward cats as ours are and with so many young birds in the garden it would be impossible without an irksome surveillance."

"Then you think a good scolding would do?" said Aunt Isobel. "You might even talk to her yourself." It was with agony that she wrenched out this concession.

"I think nothing of the kind. My mind is made up. The best way to repel undue familiarity is by a calculated snub. The cat has taken the liberty of sleeping on my bed, the very bed where I am expected to sleep to-night. Very well, then, for the whole of to-morrow that cat will be sent to Coventry. You understand? To Coventry. Neither of us will speak to it, stroke it, permit it to jump or take any notice of it whatever. It will not be allowed to enter the dining-room or the drawing-room. Then, perhaps, it may learn its place."

"But think of her feelings!" cried Aunt Isobel.

"That," said Aunt Herminia, sardonically, "is precisely what I am thinking about. And either you will join me joyfully and exactly in this line of treatment or our agreement will be put in force and Isolde will go."

Aunt Isobel gave way at once and promised the most faithful collaboration. But in her diary that night she wrote: "Herminia is not cruel, of course, but I fear that she errs, if at all, on the side of severity." Only blind agony could have driven her to such abuse.

A gloom hung over the house next day. Both the sisters were doing their duty and keeping their word, and hated it.

Aunt Isobel was set firm; the chill of Herminia's ultimatum had done it. She passed her beloved Isolde in the garden and spoke no word and made no sign. Only her torn heart cried "Isolde!" and the cat could not hear it. Besides, the cat was pretty busy at the time on the chance of a mole coming out and quite ready to pounce. Aunt Isobel was wretched that evening; she had grown so accustomed to bestowing certain attentions on Isolde and it was impossible for her to believe that the cat did not miss them. "I only hope," she said at last, "that the servants have remembered to give Isolde her supper."

"Personally," said Aunt Herminia, "I can only hope, in the interests of the beast and knowing what indigestion is

myself, that they have not given her three suppers. People with pets are far too prone to forget that the pleasure of giving may be as nothing to the pain of having accepted."

Aunt Isobel could not sleep. She saw before her eyes pictures of an Isolde thinking that nobody loved her and all was over. A clock struck 12. Aunt Isobel crept out of her bed into a dressing gown. The day of Coventry was over. She had a legal right to go and comfort her cat and explain things.

She had also a fear of black beetles—though in that immaculate house there were no black beetles. Her slipped feet reached the kitchen—so strong is love—and the cat's basket. She scratched the animal tenderly behind the right ear and said: "Poor Isolde! It was all for your good."

The cat, which had been asleep, hunched its back, swore, turned round twice and went to sleep again.

"It must have felt it!" said Aunt Isobel, convinced.

Now, the cat, Isolde, kept a diary. Do not ask me how or where or why, but simply take my word for it. And the entry on the day she was sent to Coventry consisted of two words only, but they were not "In Coventry;" they were: "Whole holiday."—Barry Pain, in Chicago Chronicle.

BAKER, THE IRREPRESSIBLE.

From the New York Evening Post of May 4.

Of the half hundred new Congressmen who took the oath of office last November there was but one at the close of the long session whom every frequenter of the national capitol could point out and call by name. New York city, which has sent to Washington some of the most consistent absentees and most nearly voiceless statesmen in the entire House of Representatives, supplied an effective contrast when it elected Robert Baker.

The longest biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory is his; no other member of equally short service has to his credit so many printed speeches, delivered or undelivered, in the Record; and no one, certainly, has got himself talked about so much in a body ordinarily disposed to ignore entirely the efforts of a new member.

In six months he has contrived to do enough curious and unexpected things to furnish a ten-year programme of incidents to the ordinary public man.

The humdrum, work-a-day Congressman resembles in some particulars the frog of the physiological text-books whose cerebrum has been carefully re-

moved—the spectator can predict with absolute certainty his actions at any given time, the votes which he casts with his party, and the remarks which he puts forth when the floor is yielded to him in due form. Baker is one of the very few indeterminate factors.

The phenomenon which has attracted the notice of the galleries to him is the instantaneous transformation of a slender, spectacled member of quiet mien and amiable countenance into an avenging fury, palpitating with emotion.

One moment he is in his seat listening as placidly as any of his colleagues to some speaker on the other side of the aisle; the next, he is on his feet, his eyes snapping, his blond hair bristling, his long minatory forefinger upraised and shaking with righteous wrath.

Debaters more experienced than he listen tolerantly to the theories of their opponents. If they interrupt, it is because they see some point that can be deftly turned. To Baker an economic heresy is what the Moslem crescent was to a crusader. He is ready to give battle on the instant. A slurring allusion to his political faith arouses him as would an attack on his personal honor. Your correspondent had occasion not long ago to comment on the patient and modest way in which Tim Sullivan the great had taken his place at the foot of the political line at Washington. That is a thing which Baker cannot bring himself to do. He would covet above all things the chance to join in mortal combat with the most astute and powerful speakers of the whole Republican party.

On one day when the heavy artillery of both sides had been brought into action and the House was listening to one of the great debates of the year, there occurred a momentary hush. Robert Baker could not resist the impulse to fill it. "You fellows are afraid," he shouted. A supremely great orator with a voice of thunder and a majestic and commanding presence might have done it and been taken seriously. Anyone might have shouted it half jocosely to get a good-natured laugh on both sides. Baker shouted it in dead earnest, and the House laughed, because that was not its accustomed way of uttering a defiance.

"I don't think anyone disputes," a Republican speaker was saying, "that the protective tariff brings about high wages." "I do," interposed Baker.

In the same way he was eager to get in a word in reply to Mr. Littlefield's tariff argument on the closing day of the session. As a last resort he used the terrible weapon which the rules put in the

hands of even the humblest member—objection to unanimous consent. In retaliation for what he considered a slight, he would not allow the gentleman from Maine to have the additional 15 minutes which he wanted. It would have been a more impressive rebuke, but for the triumphant crescendo, "There!" with which Baker plumped into his seat. Littlefield sat down in a puzzled way as if he did not know what to do next, and the House buzzed with excitement. By and by Champ Clark strolled in a leisurely way down the aisle and talked it over with Baker. Then he repeated himself the request for unanimous consent to continue debate, and, in the words of the official reporter, "there was no objection."

This is only one aspect of the Brooklyn single-taxer, and unfortunately it is one that has invited snap judgment. "That young man is fresh," was the complete and final estimate of a Republican Representative, portly, pompous, exaggerated in his dignity, as far as possible removed from the man he was criticising.

In the same intolerant way, a knot of Republican leaders rode roughshod over him when they expunged from the Record, good, bad, and indifferent, the whole of his postal speech, of which a part was an attack made on a fellow member through ignorance of usage and excess of zeal.

Excess of zeal, after all, is at the bottom of all the troubles he has had in Washington. Representing in the Radical Democracy of Brooklyn one of the most aggressive and individually militant constituencies in the country, and himself a fighter by training and by inclination, the enforced idleness of the new member, always a heartbreaking ordeal, was doubly galling to him. Of course he failed to accomplish what he wanted. Yet in the limited time for which he managed to secure the floor he contrived to make some very creditable speeches. He thoroughly stirred up Ohio's Republican delegation with a pointed arraignment of Boss Cox's school of politics. He spoke pointedly and well against the overpayment of the railroads for carrying mail; and later in a carefully-prepared and temperate speech outlined the theories of his single-tax brethren as they related to taxation in the District of Columbia. If nothing else, he deserves thanks for having called attention to the Congressional free-pass evil, in a way that started people talking and wondering how it could be abated.

"You are not the only man in Congress who sends back passes," remarked

a friend to him one day. "There are a good many who are just as conscientious as yourself. They send them back, but they do it privately, quietly, without making a public furore. There is McCall, of Massachusetts, for one."

"I know it," said Baker, "but if Mr. McCall held the railroads responsible as I do for the evils of our political life, I think he would do what I have done."

Beating about the bush is an occupation unknown to the young radical's working hours. The New York Board of Trade and Transportation telegraphed him to use his influence for the bill providing a commission to investigate the merchant marine. He replied in two minutes as curtly as possible: "Shall oppose ship-subsidy schemes as I shall all special privilege legislation."

In the Congressional pharmacopoeia some men may be likened to tonics, some to stimulants, some to healing lotions, some to powerful opiates. Baker is a mustard plaster, which makes the patient uncomfortable and starts the circulation, though it occasionally slips and blisters the wrong spot.

TAFT A BIASED JUDGE.

Prof. William James, in the Boston Transcript, as republished in the New York Evening Post.

May a humble citizen add his word to the discussion between the Secretary of War and those who are asking the coming Presidential conventions to put planks promising eventual independence to the Filipinos into their platforms? Secretary Taft thinks that any such promise will unsettle the Filipino mind, now in a fair way of being "educated" politically. It will start all the native politicians to intriguing for position in anticipation of the promised day, and if that day be less than a hundred years off, Mr. Taft thinks it will find the natives still untrained, still unfit, and prove to be more of a calamity than a blessing to them.

Now, I yield to no one in esteem for Secretary Taft, whom I believe to be one of the finest characters now in public life anywhere. The candor of his speeches on this question wins my especial admiration. Unlike the simple, brazen official utterances to which we have grown accustomed in Filipino affairs, what he says is really instructive. Assuming that we are something more than partisan rooters, to whom he must supply phrases, he seeks to persuade our intellects by the very reasons which persuade his own, and he conceals no facts. It would greatly raise the tone of political discussion everywhere if his example could be followed.

On all these accounts, and because he has been there, and knows the places where the shoe pinches, Mr. Taft's prestige is naturally enormous. His knowledge is concrete and solid, men say, while that of the bishops and college presidents who have signed the petition for independence is vague and remote. It would be no wonder if at the conventions his advice should carry the day against all the voices that urge an independence plank. "In the very nature of things," the delegates will think, "his opinion must be wiser than that of all these people at this distance."

I wish now to give some reasons why the opinion of a man who has played Gov. Taft's position in the islands does not deserve to carry this preeminent authority, and why the remoter view of long-range judges may well on the whole be wiser. I believe that his close personal relations to the struggle, so far from strengthening the prestige of any general views of policy which he may utter, ought, on the contrary, to be allowed for and discounted. It seems to me emphatically a case for applying the "personal equation."

Secretary Taft is himself the creator of the present regime in the Philippines. He was sent there to repair the work of mere destruction which President McKinley's administration had with such a light heart originally blundered into, and to turn, if possible, a purely military conquest into a genuine assimilation. He accepted the mission in good faith, and organized a government, of which the sole animating principle is the permanent welfare of the natives—as we are able to conceive that welfare. He started this work under incredible difficulties, in the midst of war, with American army opinion dead against him, with all the riff-raff of American exploiters and editors in Manila down upon him, with native support inefficient and suspicious when not actively treacherous, and with no help save that of his few official coadjutors and of his conscience. The hard beginnings of the task are over, and the infant administration toddles on two legs successfully. Evolution on the lines attempted seems possible; one by one the later features of the programme may be realized.

Is it humanly conceivable that the creator of such an unfinished state of things should willingly suffer its evolution to be interrupted? It is the child of his loins and he must insist upon its growing to maturity. The good of the islands, as he is able to imagine it, is identified with that programme exclusively. Other good, as other people may imagine it, is not that good, is but

that good's destruction. Secretary Taft is in the very nature of the case bound, even though there were a flagrantly better possible alternative, to remain a passionate advocate of the system of which he is himself the author. He is morally unable to be an impartial witness.

As regards the system's prosperous evolution, his hopefulness ought also to be taken with a large discount by the American delegate and voter. The governor general of an Oriental dependency cannot possibly see into the full rottenness. The information he goes by is certain to be accommodated and predigested for his reception. Hardly a native meets him sincerely; and his official family, laboring under identical drawbacks, cannot restore the balance to his sense of reality.

Mr. Taft, in short, is too close to the Philippine job to estimate its general historical bearings. These general bearings are, it seems to me, probably more justly apprehended by such educated men at home as those who have signed the petition to the conventions.

To myself, as one of the signers, the great historical objection to Secretary Taft's scheme is that it is so desperately Utopian. "The Philippines for the Filipinos" is an admirable watchword, but that it actually should be a watchword reveals the whole priggishness and spuriousness of the situation. Countries that really are for their inhabitants have no such watchwords; the fact that they are for them is obvious. The watchword in this case is to remind us conquerors of our duty. We are to "give" the Filipino true liberty instead of the false liberty he aspires to; we are to reveal his better self to him, to be his savior against his own weakness.

The officials entrusted with the carrying out of such a policy ought to be the offspring of a marriage between angels and steam engines. They ought, at least, to be an apostolic succession of missionaries. Secretary Taft himself and a few of his colleagues have the best missionary spirit. But the frankness with which he admits his moral isolation is pathetic. If the natives are ever to do the American character justice, he thinks, the Americans who go to the Philippines must, first of all, change their character and manners. Even the teachers, if reports can be trusted, have become rowdies, and scores of them deserve to be deported.

Mr. Taft says: "Give us a hundred years and we may outgrow these difficulties. Let the question of independence then be broached, if need be, but not sooner." But is this anything but the

enthusiasm of an initiator over his own work, and does not all history speak loudly against it? Is it likely that a succession of Tafts can be provided? And if we turn from official life to private life, can the leopard change his spots, or the Anglo-Saxon his unsociability? And can Americans of the sort that go to try their fortunes in the tropics ever be expected to succeed in the role of sympathetic friends and helpful elder brothers?

The trouble is that every step in the success of the Taft programme will breed new kinds of trouble. Suppose the Filipinos take all the education we give them—that will only make them the more frantic for independence—it is the "educated" natives of India who are the really troublesome enemies of British rule there, and if independence is out of reach there will be endless agitation for Statehood, as even now in Porto Rico it is beginning.

It is impossible seriously to believe that 100 years or 200 years will be different from 20. They will still show a terrier-and-rat relation. History shows that no force endures like hatred of the alien ruler. The Filipinos had it when we arrived there, and they have national ideals which no yellow race except the Japanese has ever possessed. We have immensely deepened this side of their nature, enriching their history with imperishable legends and traditions and with a procession of heroes and martyrs. Two hundred years will alter this no more than 20.

Secretary Taft is too good a liberal to say the word "never" when independence is suggested. He simply says: "For God's sake, don't mention such a thing just now. Let things drift along as they are indefinitely." Does he forget that it was through the McKinley policy of drift that we lost our hold on the original situation? Benevolent drifting can hardly be much more satisfactory than crafty drifting. People's minds are settled, not unsettled by a certainty, and when Secretary Taft affirms the contrary I can only suspect his interest in his own schemes of government to be growing a little convulsive.

The real obstacle to a promise of independence by our Congress is the old human aversion to abdicating any power once held. When love of power and the desire to do good run in double harness the team is indeed a difficult one to stop. Cant and sophistry then celebrate their golden wedding. It is then that we have to kill thousands in order to avert the killing of tens or hundreds by one another. It is then that the boss-ruléd Yankee finds the sacred duty laid

upon him of preserving alien races from being exploited by their own politicians.

If after 20 years or so we let the Filipinos part in peace, it is likely that some American commandments will be broken. But the situation will have this much of good about it, that it will then have become endogenous and spontaneous. It will express native ideals, and natives will be able to understand it. Continuity is essential to healthy growth. Let the Filipino leaders try their own system—no people learns to live except by trying. We can easily protect them against foreign interference; and if they fail to be good exactly according to our notions, is not the world full even now of other people of whom the same can be said, and for whose bad conduct towards one another we agree that it would be folly to make ourselves responsible?

Any national life, however turbulent, should be respected which exhibits ferments of progress, human individualities, even small ones, struggling in the direction of enlightenment. We know to our cost how strong these forces have been in the islands. Let them work out their own issues. We Americans surely do not monopolize all the possible forms of goodness.

It is for such reasons as these that, with all respect for Secretary Taft, I am not in the least degree converted by his pronouncements against promising the Filipinos independence.

I repeat so that all men may hear, that I am a free trader, and proudly take my stand with Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright and Henry George. I may be an humble member of that illustrious company, but it is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of honest free traders than to dwell in the tents of wicked protectionists.—Hon. Champ Clark.

He who consents to special privilege, is logically estopped from criticism of any proposed plan for amelioration to the unprivileged.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

Curse me, O Lord, with want and ill,
But make my spirit strong, and still;
Give me, whate'er Thy hand denies,
A soul no swine-trough satisfies.
—A. St. John Adcock.

BOOKS

LAND MARKS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Ably assisted by W. D. P. Bliss, editor of "The Encyclopedia of Reforms," Dr. Josiah Strong has edited a new year-book (Social Progress. New York: The

Baker & Taylor Co., Union Square, North), the first number of which, that for 1904 (\$1 net), has just appeared. This American annual undertakes to furnish statistics and other information relative to the economic, industrial, social and religious activities of the world; and on the whole it appears by the initial number to have made more than a fair beginning.

Defects in the first number of such a publication are inevitable. It is not altogether surprising, therefore, to find such omissions as Shearman's "Natural Taxation" from a bibliography of the "land question and the single tax," in which Seligman's tax essays appear, nor such another as George's "Protection or Free Trade" from the bibliography of "tariff and taxation," in which Seligman's essays again appear. These omissions are somewhat conspicuous, inasmuch as Shearman's book is widely known and contains the antidote to Seligman's essays, and George's is the best known as well as the most radical discussion of the tariff question. However, such omissions are doubtless due to oversight and can easily be remedied in future numbers of the Annual.

One other defect of the book is illustrated by the reference at page 128 to the popular defeat of local option in taxation at the Colorado election a year and a half ago. That defeat, due to a multiplicity of causes, is accounted for, as matter of opinion, by one cause. The fact that this was probably one of the minor causes is less important than the expression of a mere opinion as explanatory of facts in a work that ought to be absolutely colorless, and must be so if it is to acquire the kind of reputation without which no such periodical can command unquestioned confidence.

But after all is said that can be said about its shortcomings, Dr. Strong's "Social Progress" annual remains a book for ready reference which men interested in the public activities of the time can ill afford to be without. There are few if any subjects of vital public interest regarding which the book does not furnish at least a pointer for investigation, and on many it supplies all the information the ordinary citizen needs. Its scope has been thoughtfully outlined and the work has evidently been done with skill and patient care. The contributions on the progress of socialism are by H. Gaylord Wilshire and A. M. Simons, and that on the progress of the single tax is by Henry George, Jr.

PAMPHLETS.

The Federal Single Tax Council of Australia, which may be reached by addressing

Mr. John Z. White Writes for "Why."

Mr. White will have an interesting letter in April "Why" and each month thereafter, until further notice, describing his lecture tours and the work of the Henry George Lecture Association. You should not miss any of these issues. Send twenty-five cents in stamps or coin to FRANK VIERTH, Editor "Why," Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This pays for yearly subscription.