

to be announced in these pipingly prosperous times. The other was proclaimed by some of the steel mills eastward of Chicago. In that case, as in the case of the cotton mill operatives, wages had been reduced after the presidential election, before being increased; but whereas the cotton mill operatives are to get their former rates of pay with the first increase, it will take yet another increase by those steel mills to put their workers in that position. Mysterious are the ways of McKinley's prosperity! A third wages increase was announced on the 1st of March. It was to take place in the steel mills of Illinois and Wisconsin. By this increase the wages of the common laborers are to be advanced one whole cent an hour—ten cents a day!

How absurd to assert upon the basis of such facts, that the working people of this country are prospering. It is a bald pretense. If further proof were required, it is to be found in the interest rates. "Never in the history of the country," begins a financial report in the Chicago Tribune, "was there so much money to loan as now, and never before were the rates of interest so low." And then the report specifies prevailing interest in the leading cities from New York to San Francisco, varying from 4 per cent. in the former city to 7 in the latter. These are low rates. But so far from proving that the country is prosperous, they go to prove the reverse. When interest is low, and capital—for it is not money, but capital that is offered—is begging for borrowers, the situation can have but one meaning, and that is that it does not pay to borrow capital and put it to use. To say that wages are low and laborers are hunting for work, would be an indication of hard times. To say that interest is low and capital is hunting for borrowers, is indicative of the same thing. Both conditions, in fact, exist. Labor, like capital, is plentiful and hunting for employment; while wages, like interest, are low. And

that is what Mr. McKinley and the parasitic monopolists call prosperity!

Horrible stories are reported from Europe of a recently discovered traffic in human skin. Jewelers who serve the rich leisure classes admit that they have made ladies' belts and card-cases from this material, and tanners say that they have recently prepared quantities of it after the fashion of alligators' and monkeys' skins, while women boast of the possession of articles manufactured from it. One sensational London correspondent cables a report that "nicely tanned human skin recently formed a novel though considerable portion of the trousseau of a fashionable bride." The skin is procured from bodies of the unclaimed poor, which have been turned over to scientific institutions for dissection; and to own articles made of it is a fad. A horrible story, indeed; not so much, however, on account of any injury to the poor which it suggests, as of the degradation of the rich which it implies.

To work up the skin of the dead poor into belts and card cases for the morbid rich, cannot hurt those whose bodies have supplied the material. Neither their nerves nor their emotions are any longer sensitive. What does hurt, is the working up, while they live, of their sinews and blood and sweat into comforts and luxuries for the rich who do nothing in return. We are told that there is great anxiety among the American rich to establish a titled aristocracy in the United States. Not one with empty titles, like the French; but one like the English, with titles that are united to power and wealth. And it is certain that the growing custom among the rich of leaving most of their property to the oldest son, has this ambition for its impulse. The rich are striving to strap themselves tighter to the backs of the living poor; and if, incidentally, they find amusement in owning curios made of the skins of the dead poor, that only goes to show the contempt as well as indifference which they cultivate toward the

classes that support them. But if the living poor are forced to give their lives to the idle rich, what harm can it do them if, after they die, their skins be taken also?

It is remarkable, the increasing resemblance between the tory party of England and the tory faction of the republican party of the United States. Not only is each at work with fire and sword conquering the dark peoples of the world "for their own good," but even in the matter of making national deficits each is running a race with the other. With a war revenue law, in addition to nearly enough proceeds from war bonds to pay for the war, the United States is nevertheless spending more than its income, and will soon have a magnificent deficit of a hundred millions or so in dollars. This deficit is to be modestly rivaled by the English tories. It is now considered as tolerably certain that there will be a deficit in the English accounts for the year of a million and a half in pounds. Small though that is, by comparison, yet the English tories may take heart of hope. If McKinley with increased revenues can run his government behind a hundred million dollars in two years, Salisbury may yet largely lessen the difference between that and only seven millions.

As to the proposed methods of making up their deficits the English and the American tories are again congenial spirits. In England as in the United States, the consumption of the poor, not the accumulations of the rich, is to be made to shoulder this "white man's burden." The old thunderer, the London Times, tory through and through, looks to a tax on grain and sugar. And of such are the taxes which our own tories impose. Taxation of the masses by the classes and for the classes is the principle of government upon which American McKinleyism and English toryism meet as upon common ground.

No one has yet been able to interpret the mystery of Dewey's urgent

request that the Oregon be sent to Manila at once, "for political reasons." The most plausible guesses, and they are not very plausible, are to the effect that Germany was indulging among the Filipinos in what American politicians call "mixing," and that Dewey wanted to impress her naval commander with the sight of a big American battleship. One report had it that Germany was planning the defeat of the American policy of expansion in the Philippines. For the honor—the real, and not the pinchbeck honor—of the United States, we should hope that this might prove to be true, and that Germany would succeed in that design. But it appears that whatever her original intentions may have been, Germany has concluded to leave the Filipinos to their fate.

Irrespective of the shame of our bloody attack upon Filipino liberties, of our sordid reaching out for real estate and "markets," the costliness of the enterprise is becoming apparent. There are now in the Philippines or on the way, nearly twice as many American troops as set foot in Cuba during the war; and with nearly 100 men killed and 300 wounded, besides suffering and death from disease, the campaign appears, nevertheless, to have only begun. Army officers say they expect a series of small battles throughout the summer, and believe that all the troops now in the Philippines will have to be relieved by fresh men before fall. On the mere question of profit, a "market" thus secured, after a first cost of \$20,000,000 purchase money, will be unprofitable enough. As William Lloyd Garrison says:

A gold brick swindle is economical in comparison. You can throw away a brick.

The recent lecture by Prof. David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford university, and a republican, in which he described the McKinley administration as conspicuous in its "inaptitude for divorcing politics from statesmanship," and characterized Mc-

Kinley himself as a president "with many virtues who never had an idea of his own," has been supplemented by the speech of Congressman Johnson, also a republican, upon the floor of the house, in which McKinley was condemned as no president ever was before officially by a member of his own party. Mr. Johnson denounced the president for having engaged in the prosecution of a bloody war against a poor and defenseless people in the Orient, engaged in the unsavory task of Christianizing them with the sword and civilizing them at the mouths of cannon.

He characterized the president's Boston speech as "the most disingenuous address that ever fell from the lips of an American president," an address which,

divested of its verbiage, considered apart from its platitudes and the ostentatious professions of virtue with which it was interlarded, was nothing more nor less than a carefully devised and studious misstatement of the issue between the chief executive and those of his own party who are opposed to his wretched policy in the Philippines. It was an effort to befog the subject, and to mislead the public judgment;

and which, "when read in cold print, in the light of the indefensible tragedy now being enacted near the shores of Asia," suggests

that creation of Charles Dickens, who was accustomed to roll his eyes piously to heaven and exclaim with great ostentation to those about him: "My friends, let us be moral," and who was the father of two daughters, one of whom he named Charity and the other Mercy.

Continuing, Mr. Johnson said:

I am determined that the president shall neither befog the issue between himself and those of the republican party who oppose his Philippine policy, nor mislead the public judgment, nor shirk the responsibility for the gross official blunders which he has committed in connection with this great problem. I insist that the whole policy is not simply an error, but that it is a crime, and that the chief executive of this nation is the one who has precipitated upon us the embarrassments and the difficulties by which we are now confronted. I insist that he did not simply hold the Philippines as commander-in-chief, leaving the question of the disposition and control of them to congress, but that he formulated and put into execution an affirmative and aggressive policy, that of their permanent annexation to this country, and

forced it through the senate with all the power and influence which his high office enabled him to employ.

The worst of this speech is not that it was made, as administration sycophants insist, but that it is true.

Chauncey M. Depew, whom Prof. Herron well describes as a "puerile mountebank," has been at Chicago speaking to a society of railroad employes which railroad bosses have organized to act as a buffer between railroad monopolies and anti-monopoly legislation. Mr. Depew took advantage of this opportunity to explain why he withdrew from the contest for the republican presidential nomination in 1888. It was

because the delegates from the so-called granger states told me that the feeling in their states against railway men in every branch of the service was so intense that a station agent or a locomotive engineer or a conductor could not be elected as trustee of any village on their line, and that the nomination of a railway official for president would disintegrate the party in their states.

Those delegates certainly understood the situation, and their constituents appreciated the power of railway monopoly. Nothing could be more dangerous to any community than to elect railroad employes to political office, and few things could be more disastrous to honest but dependent railroad employes than to accept such office. Railroad corporations expect their employes to be loyal to their interests, just or unjust, and in all relations, no matter what intervenes; and they make no exceptions of employes who also hold public office.

After eleven years' experience with the great railroad octopus, the interstate commerce commission virtually "gives it up." It reports that "the present law is wholly inadequate to deal with the situation." Yet the commission offers no specific remedy. It does not even suggest one, because none occurs to it that "would not involve resort to measures of so radical a nature as would doubtless preclude their adoption." This is an allusion, probably, to public ownership. Not courageous enough to propose the