

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1898.

Number 14.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Spain is dead at the top. No other theory can fully account for the destruction of her fleets at Manila and Santiago, one without the loss to her enemy of a life, and the other with the loss of but one man, though her own loss of life as well as property was phenomenal.

Spain is dead at the top, because her purposes as a nation are mouldy. She lives not in the present nor for the future, but in her history. She is dead at the top, because as a nation her intelligence is warped and stunted. The march of democracy, though it has inspired some Spaniards, has made no impression upon the Spanish mind.

This death of Spain at the very top, in national purpose and national mind, has found analogical expression in her war with the United States. It was by no accident nor through mere good luck, that Dewey harmlessly sailed into Manila bay and annihilated Montojo's fleet. Nor are we indebted to accident or good luck for the destruction of Cervera's fleet at Santiago. Over no live nation could we have achieved such victories. Spain has lost her two fleets without loss to her enemy because she is dead at the top.

Spain's soldiers and sailors have proved themselves as brave as the bravest. It was not their fault that her ships went to pieces under bombardments to which there was no effective reply. It was the fault of their government, the fault of their leaders, who, lacking vital purpose and acute

judgment, drove them on to defeat and death. In this they truly typified the degenerate national character.

Spain is so dead at the top, that it is doubtful if her government even now will be willing to release its grasp upon Cuba and ask for peace. Any other government would realize that with two-thirds of her navy at the bottom of the sea, with the other third drifting aimlessly through the Suez canal, with her home ports exposed, with her commerce destroyed, with her armies everywhere hemmed in and starving, and the enemy with almost unscathed and growing stronger every day—in this dilemma, any nineteenth-century nation would know and concede it to be criminal folly to prolong the war, even for a good cause. But Spain is dead at the top. Her governing powers are mentally incapable of measuring the hopelessness of her plight, and the national deadness of purpose prevents their appreciating the badness of her cause. It may be, therefore, that like their military subordinates, the Spanish government will court "honorable" destruction rather than a just peace. But certain it is that nothing could be more effective than such a peace after such a war in giving new life to Spain where she needs it the most—at the top.

Is it not curious, the subordinate part which West Point has thus far played in the war? Young Capron, who died at La Quasina, and was regarded as one of the most promising officers in the army, could not get an appointment to West Point, so he enlisted as a private in the regular army, and after several years' service won a commission. Gen. Lawton, whose name has been so prominent in connection with the hot fighting about El Gauey,

came up from the position of sergeant in a volunteer regiment during the civil war. Shafter himself is not a West Pointer. And as everybody knows, Gen. Miles, who is at the head of the army, left a mercantile position at the age of 22 to begin his military career as a lieutenant of volunteers.

In the whole history of journalism there is probably nothing to parallel the suspension last week of the Chicago newspapers. For weeks they had professed the utmost anxiety to serve the Chicago public promptly with all the news of the war; and to that end they incurred almost fabulous expense. Special correspondents at high salaries and liberal allowances, long telegraphic messages from the front at so much a word, even dispatch boats, which are worse than horses for "eating their heads off," were paid for, not only patiently but enthusiastically, so that the Chicago public might be promptly and generously served with the latest war news. Nor did these public-spirited newspapers stop there. They erected large blackboards before their several publication offices, and as war news came in they gave it out freely, so anxious were they to inform the public of the progress of the war, without so much as a moment's unnecessary delay. Yet on Saturday last, one week ago, when an important and bloody battle was in progress, when brave American soldiers were going down to death under the fire of Spanish artillery, when the public was more concerned about war news than ever before, when common patriotism, apart from other motives, should have been a sufficient incentive to all who had a scrap of news from the front to spread it broadcast,—in these circumstances, when as newspapers they must have owed a public duty if ever, every Chicago newspaper suddenly and by pre-con-

cert suspended publication. For four days, not a word of war news did these self-styled public servants deign to give the public. The first day's battle before Santiago, the second day's battle there and the capture of Gauey and San Juan, the terrific bombardment of the sea defenses, the advance of Shafter's troops over three miles of ground in the face of death, Sampson's demand for the surrender of Santiago, the Spanish commandant's reply, Cervera's attempted escape and the annihilation of his fleet by Schley,—these historic events, with their dramatic and dreadful incidents, occurred while the Chicago papers were under suspension. No word of it all did they publish. Even the bulletin boards were bare of news. They contained nothing but a private complaint as to the action of a few employes, a complaint of only tuppenny interest to the newspapers themselves, and to the public at large of no interest at all. The publishers of the newspapers had formed a union, and declared a strike against the people of Chicago. Nothing like it ever occurred before in a metropolitan city and a free country.

An attempt was made by the papers to shift the responsibility for their suspension to the stereotypers whom they had employed. But this imposed upon no one. The stereotypers, over a month before, had demanded an increase of pay to \$4 a day and a reduction of hours from eight to seven. This demand the papers refused to concede, and rather than do so they suspended publication. When the work of stereotypers on a daily paper is considered, the demand was not extravagant, even as wages go. Four dollars a day for them is not high wages, nor is a seven-hour day a short one. The work calls for a high degree of skill, if well done, and it requires muscle and great speed in a high temperature. It is only a few years since the work day of the stereotypers on daily newspapers was less than four hours. Even with these

short hours the work was exhausting. But if the demand of the Chicago stereotypers had been extravagant, it would nevertheless have been childish folly in the papers to suspend publication. The pecuniary difference to them was less than they would have freely spent to "run down" a murder case. It would hardly supply the publishers with cigars. Yet to save this trifling sum, the newspapers of a great city suspended publication for days, at a time when of all other times the public desired the service they profess to render. Could there be greater folly?

At bottom, however, there was in this strike of the Chicago newspapers less folly than malice. That was demonstrated by their action regarding their bulletin boards. Had they continued to display war bulletins, they would at least have been in position to pretend with some plausibility that they had suspended publication because their stereotypers refused to work for low pay. This would, indeed, have been a poor excuse for a newspaper for failing to give the news. Any man with the editorial instinct would bear all manner of expense within his means, rather than neglect to publish news in his possession. Still, such an excuse, with all its folly, would at any rate have shown that the papers were not acting with malice toward the public, provided they had continued to give the news upon their bulletin boards. But the display of bulletins, with the preparation of which the stereotypers had nothing to do, was suspended during all the time of the suspension of publication. That was part of the agreement. And not that alone, but the Chicago publishers used their influence to keep away newspapers from other cities. They even refused a supply of out-of-town papers courteously offered them for the accommodation of their regular customers. It was part of their purpose to make the public of Chicago suffer. This malicious intent they took no pains to conceal. Whatever

their motive may have been—and the conceded motive was to excite hostility to the stereotypers—the fact showed a contempt for the Chicago public, and a disregard of a public duty voluntarily assumed, which the people of Chicago are not likely to forget.

The folly and malice of the Chicago publishers, as a whole, is matched by the silliness of one of them, the publisher of the Evening Post, who has felt it necessary to explain editorially why war bulletins were not posted during the Chicago publishers' strike. This was not in order to keep the public in the dark, he expressly protests, but to prevent riots! It was feared, he explains, that the posting of bulletins as the only method of disseminating war news would "lead to the assemblage of large and uncontrollable multitudes in front of the newspaper offices, or wherever such bulletins were posted," which would have made it an "easy matter for some fanatical or evil disposed striker to precipitate a riot." Such an insult to the intelligence and good order of the Chicago public is idiotic.

Moreover, the Evening Post's explanation is deliberately false. This is proved by the publishers' agreement, signed by Mr. Kohlhaas himself, and published on the same page with his idiotic editorial. By that agreement the publishers bound themselves as follows:

We will not post in or about our offices or anywhere else or furnish to anyone else, news or advertising bulletins of any kind whatever during the days of such non-publication of our papers.

The obvious purpose of that agreement was not to prevent a riot. It was to discredit the stereotypers by irritating the public. If that was not the purpose, why suppress bulletins altogether? If that was not the purpose, why endeavor to keep out-of-town papers away from Chicago? The Evening Post says that the publishers encouraged "neighboring cities to send in outside papers." But the publishers of neighboring cities have

testified that they were warned by the Chicago publishers to keep away, and that offers to supply the patrons of Chicago papers with outside papers were rejected. Is that testimony true? The New York Journal of the 5th in a Chicago dispatch of the 4th reported that—

The request made by the Chicago publishers to the out-of-town papers on Saturday not to send any extra supplies of papers into Chicago was withdrawn last night.

Dare the Evening Post deny that such a request was made? We think not. Yet if it was made, the falsity of the Post's editorial explanation is proved, not only in one particular, but in two.

Still there is something gratifying in the Evening Post editorial. When a little boy lies about what he has done, he is either ashamed of it or afraid of the consequences; and in some respects publishers are not unlike little boys.

A significant story is told by Curtis, the Washington correspondent. It revolves about young Stephen B. Elkins. Having called at the white house and being asked by the president what he intended doing in connection with the war, Elkins promptly replied: "I have already enlisted as a private, and am the only son of a United States senator who has that honor." That was good for young Elkins. But the president did not lose this opportunity to prove the genuineness of his reputation for "taking care of his friends." He said: "Well, I will take good care of you." Thus one more staff vacancy was provided for.

An amusing instance of the way in which protection, even the reciprocity of protection, helps nobody without hurting somebody, is afforded by the reciprocity treaty with France. When that treaty was proclaimed, and it was seen that France had agreed to welcome American meats on condition that America would welcome French wines, the Chicago meat packers were

jubilant. Here was a new market for American goods, and great was the god Protection and his angel of mercy yecept Reciprocity! But behold you! No sooner had the noise of this Chicago jubilation echoed through the passes of the Rocky Mountains than the grape growers and wine-makers of California, in great excitement, notified their senator to protest at once against the president's reciprocity proclamation reducing the tariff on French wines. We begin to suspect that the industries of this country are too multifarious for reciprocity treaties. What we need is a protection system that will let no foreign goods into our markets under any circumstances. Then we can live unto ourselves, importing nothing and of course exporting nothing, but in the expressive language of commerce eating up one another.

If a political Sherlock Holmes were to go upon the trail of public men who are trying to break into the next democratic nomination for the presidency, he would have no difficulty in finding here a clue and there a clue leading straight up to the front door of Grover Cleveland's mansion. That Cleveland's friends have him in training for another presidential venture, is as clear as a Kansas day. Congressman Livingston, of Georgia, may have intended to be humorous, but his humor rested upon a substratum of inside knowledge, when he said that if the democratic party in 1900 abandons the issue of the last election and looks for new issues, Grover Cleveland is the logical candidate. The play for Cleveland's friends is to bring back into the party its malcontents and deserters of 1896, and, upon the plea of getting together, to turn away from the issues of that year. But the issues of that year cannot be abandoned. Leaders did not make them, and leaders cannot toss them aside. It may be crudely, but crudely or not, they represent the sentiment for which the democratic party stands, when it stands for anything except getting "some on 'em office and some

on 'em votes;" and the masses of the party will tolerate no backwater movement. They learned in 1896 that bolting a platform and nomination is not the heinous offense they had been taught to believe it; and if by any chance the democratic convention two years hence should fall into the hands of Cleveland's friends, they would "put up" a bolt that would make the bolters of 1896 turn green.

The silver men would not be the only bolters from Cleveland.* He could carry nothing with him but the thick and thin democratic vote, and the gold democrats who joined him in bolting two years ago. Free traders who care neither for the silver nor the gold theory, would vote against him because they wouldn't trust him. They did trust him once—six years ago—and when their votes had elected him, on tariff issues exclusively, for the money question was not an issue, he turned his back upon the tariff issue, allowing protectionists in the party to make ducks and drakes of the tariff bill, while he brought all the power of his office up to the support of a bill which pushed the tariff issue in the background and brought the money question to the fore. Free traders have had all of Grover Cleveland that is good for them, and more than they have enjoyed. And though he opposes imperialism, anti-imperialists would be fools to trust him. They have the experience of free traders before them as a warning.

The treasury statement of receipts and expenditures for June will bring little consolation to those sanguine souls who have looked confidently to the Dingley tariff law to increase national revenues. The receipts for customs during the month of June, 1898, were only \$14,555,729.11; which falls more than \$7,000,000 short of customs receipts for June, 1897, when the Wilson tariff law was in force. There might be something consoling in the fact that customs receipts for June, of this year, exceed those receipts for May by a trifle over

\$1,000,000, were it not for the other fact that the customs receipts for June one year ago were in excess of those receipts for the preceding May by much more than \$1,000,000—by nearly \$5,000,000.

Here is a comparative statement, taken from the treasury reports, of customs receipts for the four months ending with June in both years—1897 and 1898:

	1897.	1898.
March....	\$22,833,856 46	\$15,450,431 94
April	24,454,351 74	14,193,976 99
May	16,885,011 55	13,466,534 17
June	21,560,152 36	14,555,729 11

This comparison is full of food for thought to Mr. Dingley's dupes. In 1897 the Wilson law was in force until the latter part of July. Consequently the table to the left, above, records Wilson law receipts from tariff duties; and as the Dingley law had been in operation seven months when the first item of the table to the right, above, was originally recorded, that table gives a fairly good idea of the qualities of the Dingley law as a customs revenue raiser. It will be seen from these tables that the Wilson law realized in March, over \$7,000,000 more than the Dingley law; in April, over \$10,000,000 more; in May, between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 more, and in June, over \$7,000,000 more. There was a tremendous miscalculation on the part of Mr. Dingley.

But wretchedly as the Dingley law has failed as a revenue raiser, its failure as a prosperity breeder is worse. A great hue and cry about prosperity is made by the organs of monopoly, but everybody knows that there is no prosperity. Times are as hard to-day as they were a year ago; and a year ago they were as hard as the year before. There has been no substantial improvement since McKinley's election, though good times were due on the following day, according to the "advance agent's" posters. Wages have not been raised, though strikes against reductions have been frequent. Failures in business have been less, but failures had already reached the max-

imum. Some lines of business, those that are affected by the war, have experienced improvement, but business on the whole is still depressed. It is no easier to get employment, nor are the opportunities for investing capital profitably at all improved. Would capital be rushing to Washington for three per cent. bonds if opportunities for profitable investment were inviting? Prosperity, indeed; it is to most men the kind of prosperity that the hen enjoyed upon the invitation of the fox.

In opposing subsidies to private charities, the secretary of the Illinois board of public charities has made a sensible observation. "Private charity," he said, "is a favor. Public charity is properly not charity at all, but the demand of a right on one side and the recognition of that right on the other." This is strictly true. What the public does for the unfortunate is something to which as members of society they are entitled. The public poorhouse or hospital is no more a charity than the public school. In maintaining it, the public are no more favoring the inmates than they are favoring householders, when they maintain a police force. On the contrary, they are performing a duty. And if they perform that duty grudgingly, or so as to make it appear like a favor, or in such a spirit as to degrade or humiliate the inmates, they are derelict. It is equally true, on the other hand, that private charity, of the organized sort, is a favor. For that reason it has no legitimate place where obligations are reciprocal. It serves only to pauperize the poor and make pharisees of the rich. It is utterly devoid of reciprocity. The secretary of the Illinois board, whose name, by the way, is Frederick Howard Wines, was entirely right in opposing public subsidies to private charities. If individuals wish to maintain charities, that is their affair; but public funds are for public, not private use, and every diversion of such funds to the support of private charity shops is a misappropriation.

Ohio and Pennsylvania coal operators complain that West Virginia coal is driving the Ohio and Pennsylvania product out of its natural market. Even Columbus, the capital of Ohio, is said to be receiving West Virginia coal. This anomalous condition of the coal market is attributed to discrimination in railroad rates. Col. Rend, of Chicago, who is at the head of one of the largest firms in the Ohio and Pennsylvania districts, says that certain railway officials "are interested in West Virginia mines, and are enriching themselves and ruining the roads they control." This, being interpreted, means that these railroad officials have diverted coal traffic from its natural course by making losing rates to coal mines in which they themselves are interested. Though their own railroad interests may suffer thereby, their coal interests more than make up the loss. But their associate stockholders in the railroads are defrauded without recompense, and their coal mining competitors are unfairly deprived of natural markets for their product. This is an old trick of railroad officials. They often make fortunes by running their roads for the purpose of crowding competitors in side businesses of their own. It is one of the great facts which tell against private ownership of railroads. Railroads are highways, and highway rights should be equal. But they cannot be equal under private ownership. Discriminating rates are characteristic of such ownership. Only by public ownership of the roadbeds and competitive operation of trains can discrimination be prevented.

Amendments to the city charter of St. Louis are to be voted upon on the 12th. We find among these proposed amendments certain provisions for paying for street improvements which are of interest to taxpayers everywhere, and which the small property owners of St. Louis will be wise to consider carefully before approving. It may be that the present system of paying for street improvements in St.

Louis is more inequitable than the one proposed, but it is doubtful. For the streets proper, the plan proposed, is to charge one-fourth of the total cost to the land fronting the street, each parcel of land to pay in the proportion of its frontage to the aggregate frontage; and three-fourths upon all the property in the improved district, each parcel to pay in the proportion of its area to the aggregate area. For sidewalks, the whole cost is to be charged to the abutting land, each lot paying in the proportion of its frontage to the total frontage.

Such a system of meeting the expense of street improvements would discriminate against owners who were least benefited. It might happen, of course, that a street improvement would increase or maintain the value of all abutting land at the same rate per front foot and the same rate per square foot, in which case this system would not be inequitable as between abutting owners; but the probability is that land would be affected in value by street improvements out of proportion to its size. A corner lot, for instance, might be very much increased in value by a street improvement, or diminished in value by neglect to improve, whereas an inside lot might not be much affected, comparatively, by either. Yet, under the St. Louis proposition, each would pay very nearly the same assessment, if of the same size. Such a system, though not so bad as some others, is nevertheless vicious.

The ideal system for paying the cost of street improvements is to assess all the land of the community, whether it abuts the improvement or not, in proportion to its value. Then the assessment falls wholly upon land whose value is increased by the improvement, and in proportion to the increase. Land which is not benefited pays nothing. This system is simpler, as well as more equitable, than any other. The only objection to it is that it would hurt land monopolists.

At the national convention of women's clubs at Denver, Mrs. A. P. Stevens, of Chicago, advocated plans for the prohibition of night work by women and children, and of the employment of children of tender years, besides propositions for the limitation of hours of women's and children's labor. The temptation to legislate for the regulation of private conduct is very great, when so much misery is produced by a condition which is thoughtlessly spoken of as competitive. But this condition is not in truth competitive. It is monopolistic, the very reverse of competitive; and restrictive laws, such as Mrs. Stevens proposes, though they may bring temporary relief, will in the end intensify monopolistic conditions and introduce worse suffering than they relieve. Women and children would need no such legislative protection, if husbands and fathers were free to enjoy their natural and social rights in the community. The energies of those who see the oppression of women and children, need to be concentrated upon securing natural and social rights, not upon applying soothing lotions. This is not to say that soothing lotions are useless if they harmonize with radical remedies. But restrictive legislation is not a soothing lotion of that kind. It is in conflict with radical remedies. Restriction is not a cure for restriction. The famous homeopathic principle has no application to social sickness. What is required to secure human rights and so distribute comforts, is not more restrictive legislation, but less—much less. The less of it we have, the less monopoly there will be. The more real competition, the more freedom.

It is not often that fundamental and far-reaching distinctions are happily phrased. But the San Francisco Star, the ablest weekly paper of the Pacific coast and the only honest one of large circulation, is entitled to the credit of having done this in at least one instance. "The trouble with socialists of all grades," it says, "is that

they advocate 'get them work,' instead of 'let them work.'" By "socialists of all grades" is meant not only socialist agitators and socialist professors, but also that miscellaneous lot of well-meaning people whose idea of solving the labor question is to "get men work." That idea is, indeed, the core of pretty much all socialistic fallacies. Working men are assumed to be helpless mortals, who cannot live without work and cannot get work for themselves. Therefore, we must "get them work." Such is the burden of the socialistic song; and the thorough-going socialist, who is "not afraid of his horses," proposes to have us "get them work" through the government. The thorough-going socialist would be right if his premises were true. If we concede the principle that the workingman must have work got for him, we must admit that the government ought to get it. If it cannot get work for its workingmen it ought to make work for them. Better by far that the government should make work for its workingmen than that they should starve upon its hands, or, driven to desperation, should make work, and hot work at that, for the government. But the principle itself is false. Workingmen need no one to "get them work." All they need is that we shall "let them work." Take down the legal barriers which shut labor out from natural opportunities—from the closed mine, the fallow farm, the virgin forest, the monopolized railway line, the vacant building lot—abolish these obstacles, and no one need ever "get men work." When in that way we "let men work," they will get work for themselves.

The black wife of the black president of the black republic of Hayti, who is described as a dignified and intelligent woman, gives a different account of her country from the sneering ones which we so often hear of Hayti. At the same time she makes a comparison which is worth thinking about. She insists that "no matter what people may say to the con-

trary, the Republic of Hayti steadily advances." "Take our educational standing," she says, "for example; the great majority of our people are educated, whereas the vast majority of the population of Spain cannot read nor write." If Americans could hear more from Hayti through sympathetic channels, they would doubtless have cause to think better of this republic of blacks, about which they now know so little except what flip-pant reporters tell them.

THE HAWAIIAN QUESTION.

American imperialism makes its first advance with a proposition to take possession of the Hawaiian republic and transform it into a subject province in perpetuity. This is the initial step in an imperialistic policy which contemplates not the annexation, but the appropriation, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico, of the Philippines, and—notwithstanding our pledge—of Cuba, also, as outlying provinces, belonging to, but neither forming nor intended to form a part of the American republic. The policy is hostile not only to American ideals, but to the American constitution itself.

That the method proposed, if not the policy to be served, is hostile to the constitution, imperialists concede. But, enthusiastic for territorial expansion, they urge that constitutional technicalities must be ignored. "What is the constitution among friends?" asked a good-natured imperialist, who only put in jocular form a sentiment which imperialists in general freely express in dignified phrase. But even among friends the constitution may wisely be considered. If we are to make a new departure, that instrument is a good point from which to take our bearings before trusting the ship of state wholly to imperialistic navigators.

Let the idea be firmly grasped at the outset, then, and be clung to throughout, that the United States government exists solely by virtue of the constitution. This is the breath of life which the people have breathed into it, and without which it would die. But for the constitution, the national government has no life at all; and beyond the constitution its func-

tions cannot extend. The nation does not create the states; the states create the nation. It has no other powers than those which the states have invested it with, and the only evidence of that investiture is the constitution. That instrument is the deed of trust which at once delegates power and limits it. And in delegating, it also limits; for every power not delegated is by the tenth amendment expressly withheld. To the constitution, therefore, we must look for all national authority. National authority which cannot be found there can be found nowhere. It is non-existent.

Now, there are but few provisions in the constitution to which any sort of appeal can be made for authority to appropriate territory, and they can be briefly reviewed.

It has been said that this authority may be spelled out of the preamble of the constitution, which declares one of its objects to be to "promote the general welfare." But another of the objects there enumerated is to "establish justice." Another is to "insure domestic tranquillity." Another is to "secure the blessings of liberty." It follows, if the United States may appropriate territory without other authority than such as is implied by this "general welfare" clause, that it may override unjust state laws so as to "establish justice;" that it may invade the states with a national constabulary or a standing army to "insure domestic tranquillity" by suppressing local riots; that it may annul local laws which appear to be illiberal, in order to "secure the blessings of liberty." If territory may be appropriated without other authority than the "general welfare" clause, then the tenth amendment is a nullity and all the reserved powers of the states may be abrogated.

But it is clear that no power is conveyed to the United States government by any of the clauses of the preamble. Though they outline purposes and illuminate powers, they do not create powers. And the purposes they outline are to be effected not by any power whatever, but only by the powers delegated in the body of the instrument. It is in order to "establish justice," to "insure domestic tranquillity," to "secure liberty," and so

on, not by some means, but by the specified means, that the constitution was adopted. So the "general welfare" clause implies no more than that the general welfare is intended to be promoted, not by the exercise of any power which may appear to be appropriate, but by the judicious exercise, with that end in view, of the powers specifically delegated. Consequently, unless express power to appropriate territory can be found in the body of the constitution, no suggestion of such power can be inferred from the "general welfare" clause of the preamble.

Turning, then, to the body of the instrument, the first clause we encounter is paragraph 11 of section 8, article I, which empowers congress to declare war. The right to make war implies the right to conquer territory. But the right to acquire territory by conquest is not involved in the Hawaiian issue, and therefore need not at this time be discussed.

The next clause which might possibly be cited, is paragraph 17, of section 3, article I, which empowers congress to exercise exclusive legislation over such district of ten miles square or less as particular states may cede for a national capital, and also over all other places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards and other needful buildings. This clause refers so obviously to land within the United States and solely for government use, that it can have only a secondary application to the Hawaiian question, which contemplates expansion of national territory and not acquisition of sites for government buildings merely.

But a clause now appears which does bear upon the point really and vitally. It is the treaty-making clause. Before considering that, however, let us pass on to the only other clause that has any bearing at all.

In paragraph 1 of section 3, article IV., it is provided that "new states may be admitted by the congress into this union." That power is unlimited. Hence, if it were proposed to annex Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Philippine archipelago, a slice of China, or a chunk out of Africa, by admitting it as a state into the union, guar-

anteeing it a republican form of government as required in paragraph 3 of the same section, there could be no constitutional objection. It was in this way that we annexed Texas. But that is not the proposition with reference to Hawaii. Not only is it not proposed to admit that country into the union as a state, but it is proposed that when acquired Hawaii shall never be advanced to statehood at all. It is always to be to the United States what Cuba has been to Spain—a subject province. The clause for the admission of new states, therefore, has no application to the Hawaiian question.

Reverting, now, to the treaty-making clause—article II, section 2, paragraph 2—we find the president invested with “power, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur.” And by article I, section 10, paragraph 1, all power to make treaties is withdrawn from the states. Thus the treaty-making power of the United States is unlimited. To the extent that a state might enter into treaties if there were no constitution, to that extent the United States may do so under the constitution. Great Britain has no more extensive treaty-making power. It follows that the United States, in addition to acquiring outlying territory by the admission of new states, may do so without at once admitting the territory to statehood, if it acts by treaty. It was in this way that the vast territory of Louisiana was acquired from France, the Florida peninsula from Spain, the Mexican cession from Mexico, and Alaska from Russia.

But the pending Hawaiian proposition no more contemplates an acquisition by treaty than by admission to statehood. A treaty requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the senators to whom it is submitted by the president, and this concurrence the imperialists have not been able to obtain. More than one-third of the senate has been opposed to the Hawaiian annexation treaty which has for months been before it. To avoid this dilemma, the imperialists have resorted to a joint resolution which the house and the senate have just adopted.

The resolution in question is clearly and concededly unconstitutional.

It does not provide for the acquisition of territory within the United States for a capital or for other government use, under article I, section 8; neither does it provide for the admission of Hawaii as a new state, under article IV, section 3. There is no other clause which authorizes the acquisition of territory by joint resolution, the only method by which territory can be constitutionally acquired, except for government uses or through admission as a state, being, as already explained, by treaty. And, though it is true, as we have said, that the treaty-making power of the United States is as extensive as that of Great Britain, it does not follow that the United States may acquire outlying territory, even by treaty, for the same purposes that Great Britain might do so. There are no constitutional limitations upon the parliament of Great Britain, whereas the government of the United States is strictly limited. While it may make treaties, it may not make treaties in conflict with its other powers. For example, the United States could not constitutionally make a treaty depriving the states or any of them of a republican form of government, or of any other reserved right. The treaty-making power, while unlimited in character, is strictly limited as to the purposes for which it may be exercised. One of these limitations in respect to acquiring outlying territory, is that such territory may not be acquired, even by treaty, for any other purpose than to provide land for government uses, a purpose implied by article I, section 8, paragraph 17; or with a view to ultimate admission into the union as a state, a purpose implied by article IV, section 3, paragraph 1.

To sum up this matter: States may be admitted into the union by joint resolution, adopted by a majority vote of each house and signed by the president. Domestic territory may be acquired for government uses, in the same way. But foreign territory cannot be acquired by joint resolution. It can be acquired only by treaties concurred in by a two-thirds vote of the senate. And when foreign territory is acquired by treaty, it must be acquired with a view either to ultimate admission to statehood, or for govern-

ment uses. The constitution contemplates no such anomaly as a republican government with subject provinces attached in perpetuity.

This conclusion is justified by our territorial history. The first outlying land to come within the jurisdiction of the United States was known as the Northwest Territory. It comprised all the land between the Ohio, the Mississippi and the great lakes, and was an inheritance from the Confederation. Originally claimed by seven of the 13 states, it had been ceded to congress by them in trust to be laid out “into separate and independent states,” from time to time, as the number and circumstances of the people thereof might require. The congress of the Confederation executed this trust by adopting the Ordinance of 1787, which the congress of the United States thereafter observed in admitting Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin into the Union. This was the beginning of our territorial policy; and of its very essence, as the language of the Ordinance of 1787 implies, is the principle of the ultimate admission of territories as independent states.

That has been the recognized principle of American territorial expansion ever since. The Louisiana purchase, like the Northwest Territory, was, from time to time, laid out into separate and independent states which were admitted into the Union. When we bought Florida we organized that peninsula as a territory, and in due time admitted the territory as a state. The same policy was followed with reference to the Mexican cession. Though two territories in that cession have not yet been admitted to statehood, their admission is contemplated, and the preliminary territorial organizations have been established with that end in view. Nor is Alaska an exception. Though as yet only partially organized as a territory, it is nevertheless not a subject colony, but is advancing toward a complete territorial organization and ultimate statehood.

From the beginning, then, our territorial expansion has been republican in character. Never until now has it been proposed to reverse that policy and enter upon a career of conquest, dominion, empire. But now we are

asked to acquire foreign land, and to exercise authority over its inhabitants, without any intention of ever laying it out into separate and independent states—nay, with the distinct and express intention of holding it and its inhabitants in perpetual subjection to laws which they are to have no voice in making. That was the Roman theory of government. It is the opposite of ours. Even by treaty, the United States cannot—consistently with our established principle as to territorial expansion, with our theory of self-government, or with the spirit of the federal constitution—acquire the Hawaiian islands except for the purpose of admitting them to all the rights and privileges of states in the American Union.

For no purpose whatever can the United States constitutionally acquire Hawaii by joint resolution of congress. Of the soundness of this proposition there is no room for reasonable doubt. Yet the imperialists, unable to secure a two-thirds vote in the senate in favor of accepting the cession of Hawaii by treaty, have set out to accomplish their ends by means of a joint resolution, the passage of which requires only a majority vote. Shall this bald usurpation, this unconcealed contempt for the highest law of the land, be allowed to succeed? That is the present and only immediate issue in connection with the Hawaiian question.

WAR BURDENS.

To carry on a war the people must bear the burdens. They must fight, as soldiers; and they must furnish supplies and munitions, as tax payers. Of necessity the first burden falls with greatest weight upon the poor and middle classes. An occasional representative of the rich may go to the front, but the number is few. Most rich men have important business interests at home, which must not be sacrificed so long as the other classes are numerous—so numerous that many of them are without employment and can just as well as not be spared to relieve the rich of the hardships and dangers of fighting. Count over our soldiers to-day and you will find it no exaggeration to say that they are mostly of the lower and middle classes.

But the same classes are doing the tax paying, too. Look for the war tax burdens and you will find them, like the soldier burden, resting upon the broad but overweighted shoulders of the middle class and the poor. With exquisite discrimination, the war revenue law has in the main been so drawn as to increase in severity as it descends in the social scale.

The small banker, with \$5,000 or \$10,000 capital—and there are many such in the West—must pay as high a special tax as the banker with a capital of \$25,000. Brokers doing a business of \$500 or \$1,000 a year, or those who carry through only an occasional transaction by way of eking out other earnings, are required to pay as high a license fee in support of the war as rich brokers whose transactions aggregate millions a year.

Besides paying this unfairly apportioned license fee, the struggling broker must also pay the same stamp tax on his memoranda of sales that his rich competitor pays. Among the poorer brokers fighting for a living, transactions yielding a commission of a few cents are not uncommon; yet the broker must either deduct ten cents from his commission for the stamp tax, or risk losing the job by increasing his commission enough to cover the tax. And if he does increase his commission, the person finally paying it is as poor as himself, so that in either event this tax falls upon poor men. But the broker who wears broadcloth and fares sumptuously every day, each of whose transactions yields commissions so large that the cost of a ten-cent stamp cuts no figure, is required to pay no higher war tax than his poor and struggling competitor. The war tax on brokers, both for permission to do a brokerage business and upon each transaction, unjustly discriminates against the poorer brokers—or his poor customers, if you please—and in favor of rich brokers or their rich customers.

A similar discrimination is made with reference to bank checks. Within the past decade, bank checks have come to be used more and more, by the middle and poorer classes, as a substitute for currency. Rich men use bank checks, it is true; but, in proportion to the sums represented, the number of checks they use is very small as

compared with the number used by their poorer neighbors. Yet every check, whether \$1 or \$1,000, must bear a two-cent stamp, neither more nor less—as much for the poor man's little check as for the rich man's big one. This is, consequently, a grossly discriminating tax against the poor.

In still another way the check tax tells against the poorer classes. By far the largest amount of checking is done in carrying on the businesses of which the poorer classes are the largest customers. So far as the check tax falls upon this checking, it is part of the cost of doing those businesses, and must somehow be recouped in higher prices by the manufacturers and merchants who first pay it. The poorer classes, therefore, even those who keep no bank account and never draw or handle a check, will pay a large proportion of the check tax in higher prices for the goods they consume.

This latter consideration holds good, too, in respect to a large share of the tax on telephoning, telegraphing, bills of exchange, bills of lading, receipts, charter parties, express and freight receipts, custom house entries, and warehouse receipts. In the distribution of the cost of producing and delivering goods to consumers, which is accomplished through the price of goods, the poorer classes will be obliged to bear much the larger proportion of all these taxes.

And of the tax of ten cents a pound on tea, it is obvious that the poor must pay most of it. Tea dealers cannot continue to import tea, paying this tax, and yet sell it at the old prices. They must and they soon will add the tax to the price of the tea. Either that, or they will sell a poorer quality of tea at the old price, which would come to the same thing. In the first place, then, the poor will pay a large proportion of the tea tax because they are the great consumers of tea.

But it is not for that reason alone that the poor will bear the brunt of the tea tax. They will bear it also because the tax is levied in proportion to quantity instead of value. It is what is called a "specific" as distinguished from an "ad valorem" tax; and "specific" taxes press most heavily upon the poor. Whether the tea be worth 30 cents a pound or \$1 a

pound, the tax per pound is the same—ten cents. Consequently the poor must pay 40 cents a pound for 30-cent tea, while the rich pay \$1.10 for \$1 tea, a tax of 33 per cent. on the poor man's tea, and only ten per cent. on the rich man's.

The same principle of taxing the rich at a lower percentage than the poor—this principle of "specific" taxes—is applied to cigars and alcoholic beverages. Upon the poor man's five-cent cigars and the rich man's 25-cent cigars, the tax is the same. If a rich man and a poor man were to smoke the same number of cigars, each would pay the same war tax, though the former smoked five times as much tobacco, in value, as the latter. Common beer is distinctively a poor man's beverage. Whether he ought to drink it or not is aside from the question. He does drink it. But his war tax upon it is the same as the war tax upon expensive beer, ale or porter. Let the value be five cents a schooner, or 25 cents a pint, there is no difference in the tax. The same species of discrimination in favor of the rich creeps up among the wine drinkers. Your rich man with his \$2 pint of champagne at dinner, and your poor man with his pint of vinegar Rhenish, or claret at a cheap table d'hote, pays, for pint, the same tax in support of the war.

Even in amusements the discrimination persists. Theaters of large capital, and ambitious little theatrical ventures, are taxed alike. To the one this tax is a trifling incident; to the other it is large enough to turn the scale between success and failure. Barnum & Bailey's great three-ringed circus, and the little old-fashioned, one-ring affair which survives in the back country, are taxed the same amount—an even \$100 for each. And the cheap second-hand billiard table of the small proprietor, is for purposes of taxation raised to complete equality with the expensive affair of the proprietor who caters to a rich trade. Five dollars is the invariable and undiscriminating tax.

A careful examination of the war revenue law strengthens the impression that Thomas G. Shearman's estimate regarding it is close to the truth. According to his estimate, only ten per cent. of the war tax falls upon the

class which lives exclusively upon accumulated wealth. Of the remaining 90 per cent., 30 falls upon people who live partly upon their labor and partly upon accumulated wealth; while 60 falls upon people who are dependent solely upon their daily labor.

That a more equitable system of raising war funds could have been adopted, no one can intelligently deny. Direct taxation, especially if it were levied upon land monopoly, would raise an abundant war revenue, without either placing the burden upon the poor or taking anything from the rich that belongs to them. But whether greater equity could be secured or not, the fact remains that under the existing law for raising war revenues, the burden of supporting the war, like the burden of fighting in it, falls chiefly upon the poorer classes.

NEWS

Two days of bloody land fighting and heavy sea bombardments before Santiago, culminating in the attempted escape of the Spanish fleet under Admiral Cervera, and its total destruction by Com. Schley, are the great war events of the week.

When last week's issue of The Public went to press, the front of the American army in Cuba, under Gen. Shafter, occupied an elevation to the west of the Guama river, about three miles east of the city of Santiago and some seven miles northeast of Morro Castle. This position had been carried, as narrated last week, by the advance from Sevilla beginning on the 24th of June and ending on the 26th, in connection with which the La Quasina skirmish occurred on the 24th, when the first American blood of the war was shed in battle. When our last issue appeared, no further movement was contemplated immediately, Gen. Shafter being anxious first to bring up his artillery, which was then on the way from Baiquiri; nor was any movement made in force until the morning of July 1st. Then the serious fighting began.

It is very difficult if not quite impossible to describe the battle with accuracy, owing to the hysterical character of the accounts as yet received. The efforts of the war correspondents seem to have been directed more to-

ward exciting emotion than to giving connected information. In this respect the reports from Santiago are in notable contrast with McCutcheon's luminous report of the battle of Manila bay. Nevertheless, the general features of the Santiago fight may be picked out.

Full preparations for the first day's battle were made on the night of the 30th, and at 3 o'clock on the morning of the 1st, Gen. Lawton, who commanded the right flank, moved toward El Gauy—mis-called El Caney in the newspaper reports,—an aristocratic suburb about three miles northeast of Santiago; while Gen. Duffield, in command of the extreme left advanced by rail toward Aguadores, on the coast to the east of Morro Castle. Gen. Wheeler commanded the center, with San Juan, to the southeast of Santiago, as its objective.

At sunrise on the 1st, Capt. Capron, father of the young officer who had been killed at La Quasina a week before, opened fire with his battery, which occupied a steep bluff about a mile and a half from El Gauy; and by 6 o'clock the battle at this point was raging. A retreat of the Spaniards from El Gauy was cut off by Cubans under Garcia and Castillo, in a short but hot fight, the Spaniards falling back again upon Gauy and renewing their resistance to the American advance. Meanwhile Gen. Lawton had been moving rapidly upon Gauy. Coming within range he was met by a fierce rifle fire from the intrenchments. His men spread out to the extreme right, taking advantage of every tree and bush for shelter, and firing whenever a mark appeared. But every move was forward, and by the time that Capron had battered down the stone fort at the edge of El Gauy, the infantry had reached the outskirts of the village. Here they divided and advanced in two directions, firing as they maneuvered. Showers of bullets met them from every side, but they pressed on until the defenses were cleared and the town captured.

While Gauy was being fought for at the right, Gen. Duffield, supported by the navy, made a feint upon Aguadores at the left, and then retired. The bombardment from the ships in connection with this feint was terrific.

It was at the centre, however, that the bloodiest fighting occurred.

Grimes's battery, planted at El Paso, on the eastern side of the San Juan river, opened fire early upon San Juan. The enemy answered sharply but his batteries were soon silenced, and a detachment was ordered to take the position. This detachment consisted of the "rough riders," the 10th regulars, which is a colored regiment, and the 1st cavalry. Their advance brought on the bloodiest fight of the day. The men were received with a destructive fire. They charged into the open and up a hill in the face of sheets of bullet-laden flame. Soldiers were dropping everywhere, but the ranks closed up and marched on. Roosevelt's horse was shot under him. The troops fired as they marched. The shooting of the negroes of the 10th is described as the best ever done in such conditions. More than half of the "rough riders" were wounded. As the Americans advanced the Spanish retreated, and their block house was taken. The Americans pushed after them.

At the center, also, the 71st New York volunteers, and the 6th and 16th regulars, were hotly engaged. These regiments made a charge,—with Co. F, Capt. Rafferty, of the 71st New York, in the lead,—which drew a disastrous fire from the enemy's breastworks. But they charged through it, across an open and up a hill, until coming in sight of the enemy they returned his fire with deadly interest, and drove him from the trenches. Then the Americans charged farther up the hill in the face of another withering fire, and at the summit cleared the trenches, captured the Spanish colors and made many prisoners. But the retreating Spaniards reformed in other trenches, until driven in turn from them, and so on for hours. The loss was heavy. Nearly every man of Co. F, 71st New York, was hit.

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon the "rough riders" and the colored 10th came up, along with other regiments which had been operating at different points on the field, and every Spanish position in front of the American center was carried but one—San Juan itself, the key to the whole Spanish position at Santiago. An hour later a general assault was made upon that point, up the steepest and best defended hill of all. Here the slaughter of the advancing force was paralyzing. The firing came from both sides and the front. But the American troops

moved on, decimating the Spanish ranks as they advanced, until San Juan was in their possession.

At the close of the first day, July 1st, the American battle line extended from San Juan at the south to Gauey at the north, and within half a mile of Santiago. Behind it lay a bloody field of hills and valleys, two miles and a half in width, which had been painfully won.

The battle of Santiago did not end with the first day's fighting. On the morning of the 2d of July, an American battery advanced to within 400 yards of the Spanish lines and began shelling the city, but was driven back by Spanish infantry fire. Fighting continued throughout the day, though intermittently and with less fury and loss of life than on the day before. The Spanish made repeated attempts to recover San Juan but were repulsed each time. The Americans were chiefly engaged in strengthening their entrenchments and securing the positions they had already gained.

Gen. Shafter was now master of the situation at Santiago, and on the 3d, in the morning, he demanded its unconditional surrender, at the same time giving warning that in case of refusal he would begin a bombardment on the 4th at 10 o'clock in the morning. The demand was curtly refused by the Spanish commandant. The bombardment did not take place, however, for the foreign consuls at Santiago appealed to Shafter for time to get women and children out of range, and Shafter granted a delay of 24 hours on condition that no military operations on the part of the Spanish continue meantime. The bombardment was afterwards still further postponed, in consequence of the destruction of the Spanish fleet, which gave a different, though not less satisfactory, phase to the situation.

The Spanish fleet under Admiral Cervera was destroyed on Sunday, the 3d, just nine weeks after the destruction of the other Spanish fleet under Admiral Mantejo, in Manila bay. Cervera's fleet, it will be remembered, appeared off Martinique while Sampson was bombarding San Juan at Puerto Rico, and was chased through the Carribean sea by Com. Schley from whom it took refuge in Santiago harbor. It was this fact that made Santiago important as a point of

attack. To securely confine Cervera's fleet in the harbor, Lieut. Hobson and his men, at the risk of almost certain death, sank the Merrimac across the channel, though not in a position, as now appears, to completely close the harbor. On the first day of the battle of Santiago, the fleet did effective work in resisting the American attack upon Santiago by land, but on the second day it was hardly heard from. The reason, doubtless, was because Cervera, hopeless of the city and dreading either the surrender or destruction of his ships in the harbor, was preparing to escape. He attempted to execute his intentions on the following day, the 3d.

The American fleet had no intimation or suspicion of Cervera's purpose. They were lying apparently at ease on the 3d, far out toward the horizon, and Admiral Sampson had gone ashore to hold a conference with Gen. Shafter. About half past nine Cervera's flagship the Cristobal Colon, passed the sunken Merrimac and at full speed made for the open sea. She was followed by the Almirante Oquendo, the Vizcaya, the Infanta Maria Teresa, and the torpedo boat destroyers Furor and Pluton. But Com. Schley was alert. His vessel alone, the Brooklyn, was in position to attack the Spaniards as they left the harbor, and steaming directly toward them he engaged them all. The Oregon, the Iowa, the Indiana, the Texas, the Vixen, and the transformed yacht Gloucester, quickly joined the Brooklyn. They closed around Cervera's ships and rained shells upon them. In Sampson's absence the fleet took orders from Schley. Cervera with his flagship, the Cristobal Colon, made a dash through the American squadron. He was followed by Schley's flagship, the Brooklyn, with the Oregon in her wake. While these vessels were chasing the Cristobal Colon, the Indiana attacked the Oquendo, driving her upon the beach in flames. The Infanta Maria Teresa was struck at the water line and sunk near the shore. Meantime the Furor and the Pluton had been wrecked by the transformed yacht Gloucester, and the Vizcaya had hoisted a white flag. Only the Colon remained, and the Oregon and the Brooklyn were chasing her, followed by the Massachusetts and the Texas after they had participated in destroying the rest of the Spanish fleet. The chase was a long one, but it ended at 2 in the afternoon. Cervera's ship

caught fire from the shells that struck her, and running her upon the rocks, he and his crew surrendered. In less than five hours from the appearance of the Colon at the mouth of Santiago harbor, the Spanish fleet had been annihilated and the admiral with 1,300 of his officers and men were prisoners. His loss in killed and wounded was large. The American loss was one man killed and two wounded.

The disasters to the Spanish navy last week were not confined to the destruction of Cervera's fleet. A conflict occurred on the 2d off the southern coast of Cuba, which would have been accounted an important action, but for the greater one near Santiago harbor. Three boats of the American mosquito fleet—the Fish, the Hornet and the Wampatuck—destroyed a Spanish gunboat near Cape Cruz in the morning, a Spanish war vessel off Manzanillo in the afternoon, and worried through an engagement meanwhile near Manzanillo with nine Spanish vessels supported by land batteries, destroying one, injuring three others and sinking another. The only casualties to the mosquito boats was a temporary injury to the Hornet. An unconfirmed report is also at hand that the Spanish warship Alfonso XII., while trying to run the blockade from Havana, had been destroyed by an American cruiser.

The only remaining Spanish fleet, Camara's, which was last week at Port Said awaiting admission to the Suez Canal for an ostensible expedition to the Philippines, was reported on the 5th as having at last entered the canal. The Pelayo, Carlos V., Patriota, Rapido, Buenos Ayres, Isla de Panay, San Francisco, Isla de Luzon, San Augustin and San Ignacio de Loyola were the ships reported as having done so. Two Spanish colliers, which went into the canal at Port Said on the 1st, were reported at Suez, the southern terminus, on the 2d.

From Admiral Dewey in the Philippines, it is learned that the American transports City of Sydney, City of Peking and Australia, convoyed by the Charleston, arrived at Cavite June 30. The Charleston had taken Guam, in the Ladrone islands on the 21st, and left a garrison there. She had captured the Spanish officers and men, 6 of the one and 54 of the other, and brought them to Cavite. The Ladrone or Marianne islands are a group

of about 20 islands some 700 miles east of the Philippines, and of an area of 1,254 square miles. The Spaniards there did not know, until they were captured, that Spain was at war with the United States. In addition to this bloodless capture, the Spanish gunboat Leyte, which has been wandering among the Philippine group, has surrendered to Dewey. She had exhausted her ammunition and food in fighting the insurgents. Her crew comprised 52 officers and 94 men.

It was with no little difficulty that the people of Chicago learned of the stirring events narrated above. Such information as they obtained, came through papers from other cities and private dispatches. The regular dailies of Chicago, morning and afternoon, suddenly suspended publication on the 1st and did not resume until the 6th. The immediate cause of the suspension was a dispute with the local stereotypers' union. Stereotypers had been receiving \$3.25 for a day of 8 hours, with 50 cents an hour for overtime. They had been hard-worked getting out extras, after the war broke out, and in conformity with their contract, they gave 30 days' notice of an intention to demand \$4 for a day of 7 hours, with 75 cents an hour for overtime. The publishers refused on the 30th to consider the proposition. One day more was granted by the stereotypers, but without effect. The publishers of the city united in an agreement to meet the demand of the stereotypers by suspending publication until non-union stereotypers could be employed. Part of their agreement bound them to refrain from putting out war bulletins, as they had been doing for two months, and in all other ways to withhold from public knowledge such news as they received. They refused offers to supply their patrons with papers from other cities, and used their influence to keep papers from other cities out of Chicago. But Chicago was soon supplied with out-of-town papers, though at prices ranging from five cents to 20, and on the 6th the Chicago papers resumed the display of bulletins and began the publication of four-page papers, all printed in the same establishment. The total increased expense to all the papers of Chicago, had they conceded the stereotypers' demand, would have been about \$40 a day.

The exciting events of the American war have made other news tame.

This is especially the case with foreign news. So important a matter as the program of the new French ministry the appointment of which we chronicled on page 10 last week, has passed almost without notice. Yet it is so revolutionary as to indicate that the socialists are virtually at the head of government in France.

M. Brisson, the French premier, outlined this program to the chamber of deputies on the 30th. After expressing in general terms the intention of the cabinet to carry out the democratic desires of the people as expressed in the recent elections, he proposed two principal reforms, namely: (1) The substitution of a graduated income tax for the present taxes on personal and real property; and (2) the establishment of a system of pensions for working men. Other reforms were mentioned, and the ministry pledged to them. Upon the presentation of the program a vote of confidence in the new ministry prevailed—316 to 230. An amendment excluding the graduated income tax from the program was defeated—271 to 314. The great significance of this program and the vote of confidence it secured, lies in the fact that in France the graduated income tax is regarded as a socialistic assault upon property. The spirit of the program rather than its specific propositions, makes it revolutionary.

Uruguay has just passed through a revolution of the more violent order. It broke out on the 4th in the capital of Uruguay, Montevideo. The only indications of its character are given by the report that the 4th regiment of light artillery mutinied, and that the revolution was a military revolt against the government. The city was put under martial law, and citizens were called to the government's defense. The fighting was severe while the revolt lasted, sixty persons being killed and 300 wounded. But it lasted less than two days; on the 5th the revolutionists capitulated.

An awful disaster occurred on the 4th to the French line steamer La Bourgogne. She was run into by the British ship Cromartyshire, in a thick fog, 60 miles south of the Sable islands. Of the 716 persons on board, 553 were lost. All the women were lost but one. Among the persons saved, 110 were of the crew. Only 53 were passengers. Stories of extraordinary and cruel selfishness are reported, but the

captain remained at his post and went down with the ship.

IN CONGRESS.

Week Ending July 6, 1898.

The debate on the Hawaiian question ended on the 6th and a vote was taken. This resulted in the adoption of the house joint resolution for the annexation of the Hawaiian islands as a dependency, by a vote of 42 to 21. The vote was as follows: For the resolutions—republicans, 33; democrats, 6; independent, 1; silver republicans, 2. Against the resolutions—democrats, 18; silver republican, 1; populist, 1.

No business of general interest has been done.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Minnesota republicans, the New York prohibitionists and the Maine democrats made their state nominations on the 30th.

—Wheat on the 6th in Chicago brought for July delivery 77 cents, for September delivery 69 cents, and for December delivery 69 cents.

—About 50 of the 400 Spanish prisoners on the Harvard secured guns and on the 6th attempted to escape. They were fired upon and 6 were killed and 15 wounded.

—Four people were killed and 100 wounded in the collapse of a bridge at Shelby, O., on the 4th. Over 1,000 people were on the bridge, witnessing a marriage ceremony, when it gave way and let them fall 18 feet to the water below.

—It was reported from Washington on the 30th that preparations for a revolution in Puerto Rico had been discovered by the Spanish captain general in time to prevent an outbreak, and that two of the leaders had been tried by court-martial and shot.

—On the 6th 325 American soldiers wounded at Santiago were landed at Key West from the Iroquois. They were the men who had strength enough left to get back from the front to Siboney, a distance of 12 miles. Cruel treatment upon their arrival at Key West is reported.

—Gov. Pingree complains of the transfer of Michigan privates from the regiments in which they have enlisted to be with friends, to the hospital corps of the regular army against their will, and of the shifting of hospital stewards and surgeons from the volunteers to the regular army.

—Seven merchants and farmers of Lake City, S. C., were arraigned before a United States commission at Charles-

ton on the 1st, charged under federal law with the murder on the 21st of last February of the colored postmaster at Lake City. They were held for the action of the federal grand jury.

—Prof. E. D. Preston, of the United States coast and geodetic survey, declares that the earth, instead of being a globe, is shaped like a top, with the peg toward the south pole. He draws his inference from a measurement the coast survey has made of two great arcs on the surface of the planet, which prove to be less like arcs of a sphere than portions of an ellipse.

—A monument to Henry George, designed and executed by his son, Richard F. George, the sculptor, was dedicated at the grave in Greenwood cemetery, New York, on the 3d. The monument consists of a slab of Quincy granite 9 feet high, 6 feet wide and 16 inches thick, in a cavity in the face of which is placed a life-size bronze bust of Mr. George, modeled from life by his son. On the reverse of the slab, is this extract from "Progress and Poverty": "The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be it would have been accepted long ago; if that could be it would never have been denied. But it will find friends, those who will toil for it, suffer for it; if need be, die for it. This is the power of truth."

MISCELLANY

IN HIS OWN LIGHT.

For the Public.

The critics said: He stands in his own light—
The visionary fool!
He toils and strives for issues out of sight,
He prates about the Right,
And makes himself the tool
Of strange illusions that he calls the Truth,
And follows with the ardor of a youth.

So all the while the power that he might
win
Slides from his grip;
And all the gains that he might gather in
He spurns as shame and sin,
Letting his chances slip.
Fool-wise he dwells with Poverty alone,
And when he asks for bread receives a
stone.

Answers the Fool: I stand in my own light
Wherein I plainly see
The foes to human good that I will fight
And vanquish in the might
Of God who moveth me.
What care I for the power that you pursue,
With lies that cheat and eat you through
and through?

Beware the light which with infernal glow
Reveals the subtle plan
By which, with hand that makes a seemly
show
Of bounty to bestow,
Plucks joy and hope from man.
The light that lighteth up the world must
give
To each his place, with work and power
to live!

ANNIE L. MUZZEY.

WATCH THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROW.

I venture upon an anecdote which will serve to show how completely sometimes the newer meaning of a word substitutes itself for the older. Two friends of mine were in a train of the elevated railroad passing through that formerly craggy part of upper New York which was once called Shantytown, and which now prefers to be known as Harlem. One of them drew the attention of the other to the capering young capricorns that sported over the blasted rocks by the side of the lofty track. "Just look at those kids!" were the words he used. He was overheard by a boy of the street sitting in the next seat, who glanced out of the window at once, but failed to discover the children he expected to behold. Whereupon he promptly looked up and corrected my friend. "Them's not kids," declared the urchin of Manhattan; "them's little goats!"—Brander Matthews, in Harper's Magazine.

WITHOUT BIAS AND WITHOUT BASIS.

A lady told me that she was trying to bring up her children unprejudiced, unbiased. One of the children came home from school, and asked her if such a thing were true. She said: "Well, some people believe that it is, and some believe that it is not. You can believe whatever you please about it." This was her idea of bringing up a child unbiased, so that he would accept the truth when he saw it.

I said, in criticism of this idea, that it seemed to me that, if there were anything which I believed myself, and considered worth believing, I would try to teach it to my child. It will be likely to find out, if it is a bright child, that I am not infallible; and I would confess that I do not claim to be. I would try to bias my child in favor of the truth, and not permit it to be biased by somebody else in favor of that which I had come to disbelieve and regard as untrue.—Rev. Minot J. Savage.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF OUR BIRDS.

The New York Zoological society, according to The Outlook, has been making an investigation into the destruction of birds and animal life in the United States. These investigations have revealed the fact that in four-fifths of the area, exclusive of Alaska, bird life in the United States is being annihilated. Plume birds are practically extinct.

Mr. William T. Hornaday, director of the New York Zoological park, states that there are only about a quarter as many game birds in this country as existed 15 years ago. And that the hunters for plumes have caused the extinction of the plume-bearing birds on the entire Atlantic coast, and are now invading Lower California, Mexico, Central America and the headwaters of the Amazon.

In summing up, Prof. Hornaday declares that in New York state bird life in 15 years has decreased 48 per cent., in Florida 90 per cent., in Nebraska 10 per cent. In North Carolina, Oregon and California bird life has not decreased in 15 years. It has increased in Kansas, Wyoming, Utah and Washington, and in these states excellent game laws prevail and are maintained. In Maine the decrease has been 52 per cent., in Connecticut 75 per cent., in Indiana 60 per cent.

IS WAR HELL?

If we want to see "hell let loose" we do not need to study war, let us analyze the commercial and political and judicial methods which any man may find within the range of his personal observation. The day might well come when war would imply a healthier condition than the toleration of social tyrannies that are entirely opposed to the American genius and temper. The strife of the civil war was more wholesome than the political conditions that preceded it. The way to avoid the un-aesthetic explosion of gunpowder is to go to war in constitutional ways to destroy evils before they are beyond the reach of reason and moral suasion. War in the ordinary sense is simply a crude way of getting the good and true triumphant over the evil and false, and it is to the discredit of the world at large that it has not outgrown this method. But the clash of arms is no more hell than the clash of tongues or the clash of wits. The typical American soldier goes into battle to do his duty, and he does it with that same spirit that makes him so capable in piloting a locomotive across the prairies or rescuing a crop from the soil or throwing a bridge across a river. He has no need of snorting brimstone; he does the work in hand against an enemy who personifies an idea he opposes, just as he would get down to business in overcoming the obstacles of nature. The angel in Heaven is emphatically a man of peace, but if the good of Heaven were put in jeopardy he would forthwith become a mighty man of war, and in contending with evil spirits, however terribly he might

fight, he would be no less a form of charity than when his customary smile of peace gladdened the heart of his nearest companions in blessedness.—Rev. S. C. Eby, in New Church Messenger.

CHICAGO DEAD TO THE WORLD.

Chicago yesterday was wholly without the news of the day, except such as could be obtained from the Milwaukee papers and, more belatedly, from the St. Louis journals.

The merits of the controversy with their employes which led the Chicago newspaper publishers to suspend publication the Journal is not in a position to judge. We find it, however, difficult to believe that any issue could arise which would justify denial to the people of a great city of the war news at such a critical time as this.

Chicago gave freely of her best manhood to the armies of the United States. The very flower of her youth, the very best young blood of Illinois and neighboring states is now following the flag in Cuba. Battles are being fought. Men are being killed or grievously hurt. But the Chicago newspaper publishers banded together in one phalanx say to the people of a great city: "You shall have no news of your sons and your brothers because we have quarreled with our workmen. You have bought our papers in dull times. You have paid us long for perfunctory news told in perfunctory style. But we deny that that imposes on us any duties. We repudiate any moral obligation to furnish you with news of the war to-day. Our fight is with our men, and in our minds that takes precedence over the mere killing and maiming of your loved ones at the front."

This position of the Chicago editors is repugnant to every moral sense. Journalism has its duties as well as its rewards. It must not be pursued for money only, and when the editor is animated by so ignoble a purpose he will surely fail. It is unfortunate for Chicago that the spirit of commercialism should so thoroughly pervade its newspapers. It is deplorable, too, that, animated by this commercialism, they should have adopted all the methods of a trust, sacrificing individual liberty and even the right to individual free speech to what they mistakenly consider their common good.—N. Y. Journal of July 3rd.

IN A CHICAGO SWEAT-SHOP.

It was ladies' cloaks that the sewers were making; of course, they worked by the piece, and the best among them could earn a dollar in the day, and

sometimes more by working overtime. They were very smart-looking garments, and their air of jaunty stylishness was a most incongruous intrusion upon their surroundings. When I asked the unionist for whose trade they were being made, he seemed to think nothing of the fact that he mentioned, in answer, one of the foremost merchant-citizens of the town.

We were on the point of leaving, when a heavy footfall sounded on the wooden steps, and the door opened to the touch of an inspecting officer, whose glowing health and neat, warm uniform were as though a prosperous breeze were sweeping the stagnant room. The work, however, was unaffected by his coming as it had been by ours. Not a sewer noticed him, and the stitching of machines went racing on with unabated swiftness. Only "the old man" watched nervously the movements of the officer, as he walked about the shop, making note of the bad air, and the filth upon the floors, and the group of little girls, and the dark, unventilated chamber beyond.

The unionist had caught me by the arm.

"We'll wait," he said; and we stood together in the shadow of the open door.

Returning finally to the side of the old sweater, the officer handed him a printed form.

"You must make out this blank," he said, "and have it ready for me when I call again." And without another word he started for the stairs. But on the way some evidence of unsanitary condition more shocking than any met with yet—a heap of offal on the floor, or a fouler gust of poisoned air—checked him, and he turned indignantly, to the nearest worker.

"Look here," I could hear him say, "you've got to clean up here, and right away. The first thing you know you'll start a fever that will sweep the city before we can stop it."

The young Hebrew had stopped his work and turned half round in his chair until he faced the officer. There were deep lines in his haggard, beardless face, and his wolfish eyes were ablaze with the sense of sharp injustice.

"You tell us we've got to keep clean," he answered, in broken English, lifting his voice to a shout above the clatter of machines. "What time have we to keep clean when it's all we can do to get bread? Don't talk to us about disease; it's bread we're after, bread!" And there sounded in the voice of the boy the cry of the hungry for food,

which no man hears and can ever forget.

The officer passed, speechless, up the steps, and we followed into the clean, pure air, under the boundless blue of smiling skies.—Walter A. Wycokoff, in *Scribner's* for July.

AN ANGEL, AND HOW TO POSSESS ONE.

An airy little elf about two or three years old, with a face where smiles and dimples play, and earnest longings, and eager questions, and big blue eyes wide open with surprise and delight and ruby lips brimming full of kisses, all crowned with a golden glory of curly hair—this is the thought of many eager applicants for children who apply to the Children's Home society.

Somewhere they have seen an ideal picture of just such an angelic being, they have caught a glimpse of one on a journey or there is one in the town, and this fond dream has haunted them ever since and they long to have it realized in a little treasure that they can clasp to their bosoms as all their own; and so they come to the society with great enthusiasm to offer to be the beneficent benefactors to give such a little angel a home. They soon find that the society has no such rare ones, but only some older children, not angels, and some babies—babies that have scarcely any hair on their heads, babies that want their food and cry if they don't have it, just common, unromantic babies—anything but angelic.

But the agents of the society can take them to many a home in the state where there are these little idols of the heart that they would gladly give a fortune to possess, and they are all the world to their happy possessors. How did they get them? They took just such a bald-headed unromantic baby from the society. Patiently they watched over it and fed and cared for it till the months passed by and the angel in embryo gradually came forth to its present charming self, a real little angel, human it is true, not quite perfection, but just the dearest little thing in all the world, as the proud foster parents will tell you.

Another thing, it seems to be taken for granted that all the little angels are girls, and so about nine out of ten apply for a girl, while as a matter of fact there are many more little baby boys that need homes than baby girls. Poor little baby boys!

Our nursery is filled with them now, but scarcely anybody wants them. But while baby boys don't make ideal angels, they are the stuff that noble men may be made of.

Lincoln was once a boy, and so was Washington, or Luther or Moses. Who can measure the debt of gratitude that our country owes to that noble woman who, as a stepmother, stamped upon the mind and heart of that motherless boy, uncouth and awkward though he was, those lessons of integrity and truth that in later years made Honest Old Abe the tower of strength for the right that he was.

The baby boys need the same love and watchful care that the baby girls do. Who will be a benefactor to mankind and take one of these needy little boys and train him up for God and humanity?

The Children's Home society always has from a dozen to a score of them—rolly-polly, jolly little fellows, who will coo and crow and laugh and make sunshine in many a home now so empty without one. Who will have one. Address Rev. E. P. Savage, 802 New York Life building, St. Paul, or 937 Guaranty Loan, Minneapolis.—*The Kingdom*.

"LEARN TO DO WELL."

Keep yourself unspotted from the world is important, but it is valuable only as a preparation. Innocence is our starting point, not our goal. A cabbage is innocent; an oyster makes no mistakes; a squash was never known to sin. But virtue, character, is the holy grail of our search and we must wade through sorrows and sins and blunders before we find it.

Yet there are numbers of people in the world to-day whose one aim in life is to obey all those rules—hygienic, social, civil and religious—which they believe will insure their success in this world and in the world to come. They forget that Divine principle laid down by Jesus, that only he that loseth his life shall gain it. They live and strive, not that they may do something good and useful, but that they may keep from doing anything bad, from making any mistakes. God pity the man who has no claim upon the love and gratitude of his fellows except for the things which he has not done.

"Commit no sins" or "make no mistakes" is a motto unworthy a being with a spinal column. A man who never made a mistake certainly never made anything. A man who has never done anything wrong has never done anything right. For to finite human beings mistakes and sins are the inevitable results of activity. There are many holy, prayerful men who so fear getting a spot on the whiteness of their phylacteries that they sit idly by while a sinful world wallows in the

mire of political corruption, too cowardly to lend a helping hand.—Carl Vrooman, in *The Washingtonian*.

GREENLAND AS A SUMMER RESORT.

Upon the map Greenland looks very remote, but even the slow arctic sealers can reach it in three weeks from New York, and, into the bargain, put in at St. John's, Newfoundland, a picturesque old town, well worth a visit. A week out from St. John's you enter the world of marvels. By this time night is but a twilight that, with its mystery, holds you on deck far into sleeping hours. . . .

Within a few hours your vessel is among the floes, and the wonder has begun. For in its long voyage the ice has been water-carved into the most bizarre shapes. Some are grotesque beyond imagination; others might have been turned out by a skillful sculptor to represent men, animals or buildings that he knew. I have seen a cave three feet high, with an entrance of three arches supported upon slender pillars. Phidias himself could not have designed the proportions more justly, nor could he have executed his design more artfully. The roof of the cave, where the sun had beaten the surface of the floe into a crust, was dead white; but the interior was a harmony in blues, shading by imperceptible gradations from the faintest tinge at the opening to deep cobalt in the furthest recesses. The floor, submerged, was of that tone of malachite which all ice takes on under water, and which harmonizes with every tone above the surface.

A thousand bits as exquisite as this pass you before morning. At day-break, when the sunlight flashes from the little pinnacles and spires, you find yourself in an Aladdin's treasury of diamonds, sapphires, emeralds, amethysts and opals. For two months thereafter ice is ever present. Sometimes it is a single berg, majestically motionless amid waves over which the ship rocks like a cradle; sometimes it is a stately procession of bergs floating in Indian file away from the parent glacier; sometimes it is only light "trash," like that in the first stream; oftentime it is a thousand bergs of all sizes, as varied in shapes as masses of cloud. The spectacle never loses its fascination; after you have admired 5,000 bergs, you find new delight in the 5,000 and first.

For one who is not content merely to admire scenery, Greenland is rich in entertainment. Sportsmen will find ptarmigan, elderduck, little auks, all excellent shooting and succulent eat-

ing; blue foxes and arctic hares, with beautiful furs; and, for big game, reindeer, polar bears and walrus. No sport is more exciting than walrus hunting. You cannot bring off a trophy without fighting the whole herd, and the attack of a score of enraged animals, each weighing half a ton, each armed with tusks two feet long, sets a-tingle the nerves of the most jaded big-game hunter.

If you care for botany, there are rare arctic plants to be collected; beautiful, too, and brave enough to send a thrill to the sentimental heart. Everywhere along the edge of the "ice cap" you will find poppies that have thrust their little yellow heads up through the snow to the sunlight. If you care for geology, there are many disputed problems to be solved; glaciers from a mile to sixty miles wide to be inspected; fossils of semi-tropical trees to be unearthed among the never-melting snows. If you care for strange peoples, there is in Danish Greenland—which extends as far north as Upernavik—a tribe of half-civilized Eskimos whose quaint customs would furnish you with entertainment for the whole season. . . .

Beyond Melville bay there is another tribe of Eskimos, 250 people, cut off from the world by ice impassable for them. Before Lieut. Peary visited them in '91 few members of the tribe had seen a stranger. They are barely emerged from the stone age, eaters of meat without salt. They, too, dance, swaying their bodies to and fro to the ta-ta-ta, ta-ta-ta of a tambourine made of sealskin and reindeer ribs. Their food is not always plenty, and during the long, sunless winter they must hide from the cold in cramped huts; yet they are the lightest-hearted of peoples, and the most fascinating of companions. For an ethnologist a visit to them would amply repay a hard voyage—if the voyage to Greenland were hard—for they are the most primitive of known peoples.

Like all ancient countries, Greenland has ruins to be explored. The ancient settlements of Erik the Red and his descendants lie among the fords in the south. The settlers were probably done to death by the "Skraelings;" at all events, nothing was heard of them during the two centuries when Greenland was a lost country; and even now the mounds that were their old villages have never been thoroughly investigated.

Apparently, then, there is no lack of amusement in Greenland; every day brings some fresh adventure. And amid the salt breezes one has an ever-

increasing gusto in new experiences.

It is said that in response to the usual question: "Wherein lies the fascination of the arctic regions?" Dr. Nansen replied: "In its healthfulness, my dear sir. Sickness and lassitude never pass beyond the arctic circle."

I venture to believe that the arctic glamour depends upon other things in addition to healthfulness; nevertheless it is certain that the vigor of one's nerves and one's blood in the far north are great aids to enjoyment. The air is a tonic. It bears no dust, and neither air nor land nor water harbors a germ hostile to mankind. The member of the Peary relief expedition of '92 who gained least in weight was 15 pounds heavier after two months of Greenland travel. Nor is the temperature severe. The mercury rarely falls below freezing point; usually it marks from 40 to 50 degrees.—Albert White Vorse, in *The Independent*.

WHAT THE TRANS-SIBERIAN RAILWAY WILL ACCOMPLISH.

An extract from an article on "Eastern Siberia," by Stephen Bonsal, published in *Harper's Magazine* for July.

I came in contact, during my stay in Siberia, with many of the responsible officers in the management of the road, and I know how very modest their expectations are of its financial features. It is hoped by them that when the road is completed three express trains a week will run from St. Petersburg to the Pacific, and vice versa, in nine or ten days. They hope that when travelers from London to China and Japan find that by taking the Russian railway they would save two weeks, they cannot fail to obtain a large share of this passenger traffic. During certain seasons of the year, when the heat of the Suez loup is unbearable, they think that the real overland route will nearly monopolize all travelers bound for places east and north of Singapore. This preference for the northern railway, they claim, would be increased by the outbreaks of plague and cholera, which would seem to have become almost endemic in some of the ports, such as Bombay, Penang, Singapore, Saigon, and Hong-Kong, where the steamers touch. They further expect to monopolize the carrying trade to Europe of all those products of the east which are not large in bulk and are costly in proportion to their weight, upon which, in consequence, the insurance is dear. Under these circumstances the quickness of the railroad journey would prove so great an advantage as to overcome the disparity between the freight rates by sea and land, the latter of necessity

having to be the more costly. The present rate for passenger traffic in Siberia is very low, but by the tariff which is already drawn up, and is to be put into force when the railway is completed, promises the cheapest traveling known to the world. First class from St. Petersburg to the Pacific will be 90 rubles; second class at 56 rubles, and third class at 35 rubles. Over each division of the road in operation one local and freight train is run daily in each direction, and an express train every other day also in both directions. Of course the through traffic, in passengers as well as freight, over the still uncompleted road, is at present very small; but, with only the local patronage, it has been found profitable to work the road upon this schedule at least, not only without loss, but with a small margin to profit. The section from Tcheliabinsk to Omsk, which has been the longest in operation, is already paying handsomely, and carried for the last four months of 1896 231,000 passengers.

While the Russians know that commerce follows the flag by land as well as by sea, and while they foresee the revolution in commerce and trade which the completion of the Trans-Siberian cannot fail to bring about, the purpose of the construction is quite different. The primary object of this colossal enterprise was to secure a highway for the rapid and unimpeded transport of soldiers and materials from European Russia to Vladivostok, all the way in Russian territory, and safe and secure from the attack of enemies. Vladivostok, or the more southern port that may supplant it in the near future, was destined by Russian statecraft to become not only the terminus of the great railroad, but an impregnable base and a harbor of refuge for the Russian fleet in the Pacific. Such having been the project, it is not surprising that the curiosity of the world at large, and more particularly of those countries having direct interests in the politics of the far east, is more aroused by the military than the other aspects of this part of the world, so completely changed by this great construction. On my return from Siberia, it was my experience that nine out of every ten questions that were addressed me had reference to the changes which the completion of the great road would bring about in Russia's military capacity and efficiency. In summer, I believe, Russia could mobilize an army of 200,000 men within two weeks upon any given point of the frontier of China or Korea.

The Siberian railway having now be-

come an accomplished fact, public attention in Russia and throughout the east is very much preoccupied with the proposed Chinese Eastern railway, which, running across Manchuria, is to connect the Trans-Siberian system with the great markets of Manchuria, and probably terminate at Ta-lien-wan, or at some other point upon the open waters of the Yellow sea. The ground has already been broken for this railway at Stanitza Paltanskaya, in Russian territory, and the sharp wedge that is soon to awaken the sleeping oyster and pry open the shell of China is being rapidly pushed forward.

Russia has now in fact, if not in style, the virtual position of suzerain over China, and in many of the northern provinces she openly exercises the rights and duties of sovereignty. Whatever the fate of the Russian fleet in the Pacific may be, in the event of the long-expected conflict breaking out, and in view of the probable alliance of the fleets of Japan and England, it can be said, without fear of contradiction from anyone at all conversant with the existing condition, that there is no military force from the frozen Arctic to the frontier of Siam and the Himalayas which could stand for a moment before the armies which Russia now holds in a state of constant readiness upon the frontier of China, nor is there any European power able or willing to place on the east coast of Asia an army that could cope with Russia. In this part of the world she to-day occupies a position of absolute military supremacy. The frank recognition of this fact is a necessary preliminary to a comprehension of the situation.

"BRIGANDS," OR PATRIOTS?

Two thousand insurgents from Gen. Calixto Garcia's command were embarked on the transport *Leona* at Acerraderos this morning, and arrived here this afternoon. They are under the command of Brig. Gen. Sanchez. They landed through the heavy surf and lined up emaciated, half-naked, and in some instances entirely nude. Weak as they were, they stood up proudly and shouted "Cuba Libre." They were viewed with astonishment by the military representatives of Russia, Germany, Japan and Sweden, who were utterly at a loss to understand the enthusiasm of men in their miserable condition.

The famished men, nearly all of whom have been macheteras under Maceo and Garcia during the three years' war, and some of whom are vet-

erans of the ten years' war, were overjoyed to meet the American troops, and at the sight of food they fell to like starving men. With swollen feet and every evidence of long suffering, they cheerfully got themselves in readiness to march to-night in advance of the regulars, toward Santiago.—Cable to Chicago Inter Ocean, from Siboney, June 29.

I don't believe in charity. It is merely another drink to a shaky man. What the world needs is justice and not benevolence. I shall continue to decline to give checks to the eleemosynary institutions and I shall leave no money to build churches and found libraries. My family will be well provided for, but the rest of my fortune, after my death, as well as before, will be spent in trying to teach people how to stop me, and men like me, from robbing them. So long as it is permitted to any man to take what doesn't belong to him through monopolizing nature's resources, and the private ownership of public utilities, plenty of men of my kind will always be ready to jump in and do the stealing. My mission is to show the people how it is done, to take what they are stupid enough to let me take, and to show them how they can put an end to the system which enriches me and impoverishes them.—Hon. Tom L. Johnson.

History will vindicate the position taken by the United States in the war with Spain. In saying this I assume that the principles which were invoked in the inauguration of the war will be observed in its prosecution and conclusion. If a contest undertaken for the sake of humanity degenerates into a war of conquest we shall find it difficult to meet the charge of having added hypocrisy to greed. Is our national character so weak that we cannot withstand the temptation to appropriate the first piece of land that comes within our reach? To inflict upon the enemy all possible harm is legitimate warfare, but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the orient merely because our fleet won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila? Our guns destroyed a Spanish fleet, but can they destroy that self-evident truth, that governments derive their just powers, not from superior force but from the consent of the governed?—William Jennings Bryan.

That a great city need not be a noisy one is proved in Berlin, which is said to be the least noisy city in Europe. Railway engines are not allowed to blow their whistles within the city lim-

its. There is no loud bawling by hucksters, and a man whose wagon gearing is loose and rattling is subject to a fine. The courts have a large discretion as to fines for noise-making. Strangest of all, piano playing is regulated in Berlin. Before a certain hour in the day and after a certain hour in the night the piano must be silent in that musical city. Even during playing hours a fine is imposed for mere pounding on the piano. In this way the nerves of the inhabitants are less strained and nervous breakdowns ought to be less common.—Journal of Hygiene.

It is the difference between the patriotism of the Englishman and the Frenchman which enables the one nation to plant colonies and makes it impossible for the other nation to do so. The Englishman is attached to his ideas, his habits, and his civilization, and carries them with him wherever he goes; thus he makes himself at home in India, China or Australia. The Frenchman is attached to his soil, longs to get back to his native land, counts himself an exile whenever he is away from it, regards all colonial residence as temporary and disadvantageous. The Frenchman is a Frenchman only in France, but England is wherever the Englishman lives.—The Outlook.

In a society that has lost sight of the individual, the few live, while the many only exist; and the few live, and live as they live, because the many only exist.—President James H. Canfield.

THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

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

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO FRIESTER, 316
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.