

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1898.

Number 31.

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.

What shall it profit a nation if it gain the whole world and lose its own liberties?

When men like Senator Hoar protest against the imperial policy of the Hanna-McKinley-Elkins republicans, there is encouragement to hope that the conspiracy may break down. These words of Mr. Hoar are worthy the best days of the republic: "I believe that the highest service the American people can render to mankind and to liberty is to preserve unstained and unchanged the republic as it came to us from the fathers. It is by example and not by guns or by bayonets that the great work of America for humanity is to be accomplished. . . . It is said the Philippine islands are already ours by the right of conquest. For one I deny this alleged right of conquest. Human beings—men, women, children, peoples—are not to be won as spoils of war or prizes in battle. It may be that such a doctrine finds a place in the ancient and barbarous laws of war, but it has no place under the American constitution. It has no place in the code of morals of the people of the United States."

While the Key West cigar makers and the Cuban tobacco growers are disputing over their claims to tariff "encouragement" of their respective industries, somebody notes the fact that a third party in interest, the man who wants a good cigar at a reasonable price, has not been heard from. He seldom is heard from. Our protectionist guardians never ask him to let himself be heard. It is his func-

tion to foot bills for all legislation that "encourages" the tobacco industries. For he is only a consumer, and consumers have no rights that tariff fiends are bound to respect.

Col. Roosevelt's wild west show in New York exhibits a freak named "Buck" Taylor. "Buck" Taylor makes eloquent speeches, all in the uniform of the show. But sometimes his eloquence runs away with him. It did last a week at Port Jervis. Here was his peroration: "We followed Col. Roosevelt up San Juan hill like lambs to the slaughter, and we hope you will do the same on election day."

Ex-Gov. Altgeld has undertaken in the Chicago Record the job of exposing the iniquities of the McCleary bank monopoly bill, and incidentally of reducing the swelling of Prof. Laughlin's head. He has succeeded admirably in both.

"The advance agent of prosperity" is preparing once more to postpone his show. Foreign affairs make it necessary. According to Dun's Review of this week, "business has been more affected by foreign affairs than many realize." That is a peculiarity about this thing they call "business." It is so secret in its manifestations. At one time it rides magnificently upon a bounding wave of prosperity, yet so secretly that few are aware of it; and then without warning the wave recedes while few realize it. If one would know whether prosperity—Mr. McKinley's kind—is with us or away from us, he must keep a detective, and a shrewd one, too.

Dun's Review finds that there are "much larger supplies of wheat" than a year ago, accompanied by "greater readiness to part with" it; which being interpreted means that Ameri-

can farmers are not so prosperous as when famine stalked abroad in Europe and Asia. And it finds as to cotton that "there has been some closing of mills at the south, and also some reduction of wages." Wool is stubborn, too. Wool dealers, Dun's says, "have reached the conclusion that, with the heavy stocks on hand, it is no longer a question of profit, but of avoiding losses." Yet Dun's finds comfort in the increase of exports over imports. So long as we send more wealth out of the country than we get back, your prosperity touter is happy.

There has been a great deal of plutocratic fretting over the neglect of President McKinley to override Gov. Tanner in Illinois, and send federal troops to Virden to protect the mine owners in their efforts to import negroes by wholesale from Alabama to displace local workmen. But we listen in vain for a suggestion that McKinley should send troops to North Carolina to protect the negroes there in their indisputable home rights.

In North Carolina open declarations are made by responsible whites that they will stamp out the negro majority by force. T. M. Emerson, traffic manager of the Atlantic lines at Wilmington, is reported as saying: "The negroes outnumber us, but I am frank to say they will not win in the coming election. The white men have decided to take charge of the affairs of the city. We do so peaceably if we can, but forcibly if we must. This is the sentiment of the white community. We are all armed and prepared for trouble if it must come." That is plain enough, and it has been made vital by whipping, shooting, bloodhounding and rioting. And behind this lawlessness we are told are merchants, manufacturers and bank-

ers, who have given freely to carry on the fight. The same conditions prevail, we are also informed, throughout nearly all of eastern North Carolina where the negroes are in a majority. The whites there have determined to deprive the negro of suffrage, and to do so by violence. Yet no plutocrat urges McKinley to send federal troops into North Carolina, though the act of congress under which he is asked to send troops into Illinois is more distinctly applicable, and historically it was intended, for insurrections like that in North Carolina and not for such a condition as that at Virden in Illinois.

The very evident truth is that it is "property" in preference to people that your plutocrat wants to protect. "Property" at Virden imports negroes to drive out settled white laborers, and a cry goes up for the assistance of federal troops to protect the poor negro! "Property" in North Carolina rises in revolt against both state and federal law, including the United States constitution, to deprive local negroes of their right to vote, and your plutocrat has no interest in these negroes. In the yellow glimmer of a gold dollar the propertied classes lose all sense of personal rights.

If the negroes of Wilmington do assert the political rights of their race, though at the cost of their lives, as they say they will, he must be false to democracy who does not pay them that respect which brave defenders of popular rights have always commanded.

Serious disappointment is in store for some of our patriots who have expected to exploit Puerto Rico. Reports are coming in from that newly conquered territory to the effect that Uncle Sam will be able to get nothing out of it except through the custom house. The country, it appears, is nearly all owned by landlords who live in Spain. They hold it in 10,000 acre tracts, and will not sell at any price.

Now, let us think a moment. Under Spanish sovereignty, these Spanish landlords owned the island. Under American sovereignty they will continue to own it. The change of sovereignty makes no fundamental difference to them. And yet it may make a substantial difference. If the United States improves the island government, Puerto Rico will be a more desirable place to live in, and locations there will be more eagerly sought after. That will make them more valuable. Examples of this phenomenon can be found in any growing town. But as the Spanish landlords refuse to sell land at any price, people seeking opportunities in Puerto Rico will have to rent of them; and under the brisk demand ground rents will rise. Thus American sovereignty in Puerto Rico, if it leads to desirable reforms in government there, will result ultimately in enriching Spanish landlords. Puerto Rico will become a tropical Ireland, in which the people will suffer want while shiploads of products cross the sea to pay rack rents to Spain.

It is often said that Henry George's single tax ought to be tried somewhere as an experiment. What better place for that purpose can be found than Puerto Rico. Since we have taken the sovereignty of the island from the Spanish government, there can be no consistent objection to our taking its ownership away from Spanish landlords. Why not do so? Inasmuch as nothing is required to accomplish this, in effect, but to abolish tariffs and all other commercial and industrial imposts, and obtain revenue from an advalorem land tax, why not take advantage of this exceptionally inviting opportunity, and make the experiment?

Judging from some of the things he says, Gov. Tanner hears the liberty bell a-ringing, but doesn't know where the clapper is. Because coal is a necessity to everybody, he concludes that coal mines are public property, and that the citizens of the state must

not be deprived of their coal supply by differences between men who own the mines and those who work them. This is all sound enough in a general way, but Gov. Tanner shows his weakness when he proposes to control the matter by some new fangled state board for the regulation of the relations of mine owners and mine workers. That would only add one more to the miscellaneous collection of socialistic boards with which the state is already cursed. If Gov. Tanner is sincere in his present policy, let him think out to its logical conclusion his idea about the absurdity of private property in coal mines, and he will encounter no difficulty in finding a remedy that would put an end to the coal mine monopoly, and yet leave mine owners, if they choose to call themselves such, and mine workers, absolutely free to make their own contracts in their own way with entire satisfaction not only to both but also to the public at large.

A wholesome exposure of fiscal lawlessness has been made by the Missouri single tax league, both in the state and in St. Louis. That organization having appointed a committee to promote equal taxation, the committee has made a report of its work thus far, which the league has published. Copies of the report may be had upon application to H. Martin Williams, 1023 Century building, St. Louis. Among the revelations of this report, is a demonstration of the deliberate indifference which the taxing authorities manifest for the law, when engaged in protecting the rich from equal taxation. It appears that the state board of equalization of Missouri has a "theory" that in spite of the constitution and the laws, which require property to be assessed for taxation at its true value, it should be assessed at some low percentage of true value. And this lawless theory is carried into practice. When assessors obey the law by assessing property at its true value, the board reduces their assessments for the expressed purpose of making them conform to the un-

der-assessments of other assessors. The taxing authorities of St. Louis take their official ethics from the state officers. They ignore the law, in order to serve rich corporations and landlords. To enforce the law, they have officially declared, would be impracticable. What that means may be inferred from the fact that one corporation which earns 5 per cent. net on \$20,000,000, is assessed for taxation at only \$1,439,103. Another having property in the city worth \$15,000,000, is assessed at \$858,000. The total real estate values that thus escape taxation in St. Louis are estimated at \$300,000,000. The Single tax league has thus far succeeded, through the courts, in forcing increases of assessment to such an extent as to augment the public income in St. Louis by \$25,000 a year, that of the school fund by \$7,000, and that of the state by \$4,500. The league is still fighting.

A desperate problem confronts the Boston Globe. It sees that machinery has come to stay, that we could not abolish it if we would. But what baffles it is the difficulty of so adjusting things that machinery "shall not cheapen wages at the same time it is cheapening products." This is the great unsolved problem, says the Globe. Oh, no; that is not the unsolved problem. An intelligent child could solve that problem. In fact, it solves itself. If machinery cheapens products, it would thereby increase wages if nothing interfered. Other things being the same, cheapened products inevitably mean increased wages. For a man's wages are in the last analysis the products he acquires. Money is only a medium. Hence, if all products go to the earners in proportion to their earnings, cheaper products must mean higher wages. Anyone can see that. The problem which confronts the Boston Globe is not how to cheapen products without cheapening wages; it is how to cheapen products without cheapening wages, while allowing non-earning monopolists to appropriate

an increasing share of products. The last condition makes the problem. Abolish monopoly and there would be no problem. But there's the rub.

Attention is called by the Duluth Evening Herald to the dangerously anarchistic disposition of the Joint Traffic Association, which has just been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to be illegal. One of the officers of the association, an anarchist of the name of Blanchard, announces that this decision "forcibly illustrates the power which might be exercised by one mind which becomes a majority in the paramount court of the land." That is precisely the point that was made by the Chicago convention of 1896. One man had not only exercised the power to which Blanchard alludes, but he had done so by turning the decision of the court squarely against its own precedents of a century, and to illustrate the suppleness of his power had swung the decision in an unexpected direction by changing his mind over night. The Supreme Court, with its power to nullify legislation by a majority of one, is indeed a dangerous institution. The income tax decision proved that, and the Joint Traffic decision, righteous though it happens to be, does not disprove it.

Chauncey Depew's program for a law authorizing railroad pooling, is as impudent a proposition as even that colossal specimen of impudence incarnate ever put forth. He predicts that "the weaker roads will be bankrupted and ultimately absorbed by the stronger lines, and the business of the country will be in the hands of the latter;" and he urges a pooling law under which "large freedom for agreement may be granted to the railways among themselves under the strict supervision and rigid control of the government of the United States." What Mr. Depew here proposes is either that the government shall go into the railroad business, or that a few big railroads shall go into the governing business. Very likely he contemplates both.

Impudent as Depew's proposition is, it has at least one merit. It brings the railroad question to a head. If railroading is a private business, then let the government keep its hands off. That is the way government should treat all private business. But if railroading is a public business, a government business, then let the government attend to it upon its own account and its own responsibility. Let us have an end to the practice of allowing government to run private businesses and private businesses to run the government.

Charges are publicly made in New York that Abner McKinley, brother of the president, has been making large fees and plenty of them, by securing department decisions and contracts which could not be secured except through his mediation. The authority for the accusation is William Astor Chanler, who gives details. This is no doubt very scandalous, but it is not at all unexpected to those who have followed the public career of Mark Hanna's great and good friend. Abner McKinley knew what it meant to have a presidency in the family, when, soon after the election of 1896, he moved his law office from the little village of Canton, Ohio, to the metropolitan city of New York. And that he has been the most successful practitioner before the departments at Washington for a year past, is common knowledge at the national capital. Even the president may have heard of it.

One of Prof. Herron's addresses in Chicago is criticized by the Chronicle because he denounced stock watering as "a method of high treason by which corporations forcibly tax the nation for private profit, and by which they annually extort millions from American toilers and producers." The Chronicle objects that if corporations practice extortion it is not because their stock is watered, but because they enjoy some legal monopoly, or through combination throttle competition.

This criticism upon Prof. Herron

is sound, but it is hardly worth while. Prof. Herron does not set up for an analytical economist, and is therefore not to be judged in his exceedingly useful work, by his indifference to exactitude of expression in tracing to their cause the industrial and social evils which he so vividly describes and so righteously condemns. He is frequently and excusably indefinite in his use of terms. Thus he often denounces "competition," when the real object of his just wrath is not competition at all, but its antithesis—monopoly. That would be reprehensible if he were directly and philosophically discussing competition versus monopoly; but as an incidental expression it is entirely pardonable, especially as the word "competition" has unfortunately come to connote in common speech the methods of all kinds of "business," including monopoly.

The same thing may be said of Prof. Herron's condemnation of profits. Were he analyzing the idea of profits, he would doubtless find it to comprehend earnings. If, for example, a newsman buy a paper for one cent and deliver it at your house for two cents, Prof. Herron would certainly not speak of that profit of one cent in terms of condemnation; he would say that the newsman had earned at least some part of that cent, it not all of it, by the service he had rendered you. It is only when Prof. Herron uses the word "profit" incidentally, that he does so in denunciatory terms; and that doubtless is because, without analyzing it, he has come to think of the word vaguely as describing something that is got for nothing, which to a degree it truly, does. If he were directly and philosophically discussing the subject of profit, he would be open to criticism for neglecting to analyze the idea; but to criticize him under the circumstances is to disturb his vision unnecessarily by picking motes out of his eye.

The Chronicle's criticism of Prof. Herron's condemnation of stock

watering is open to that objection. It can only serve to divert attention from the main point. While it is true that stock watering gives no power of extortion, and that monopoly does, it is also true, as the Chronicle admits, that stockwatering serves to conceal monopoly plunder. If, for example, the street car systems of Chicago did not by stock watering hide the proportion which their incomes bear to the actual capital devoted to street car service, their dividends would be so enormous, so high up in percentage, that public opinion would be instinctively and universally outraged. But by watering the stock, dividends are made to appear very moderate; and, though the Chronicle sees through the fraud, great masses of the people do not.

Watering stick is a mask in which monopoly masquerades as "business;" and if Prof. Herron, in a general attack, incidentally calls monopoly by the name of its mask, he is not very far out of the way. The Chronicle, at any rate, is in no first-class position to criticize. When it shall have entered heartily and unflaggingly into the fight against the deadly power behind the mask, it may with better grace criticize a devoted man for mixing up the two in his rhetoric.

Of all the so-called comic papers of America, Life alone commands respect for the keenness of its wit, the dignity of its humor, and the genuineness of its sentiment. It is superior, besides, both in its artistic and its literary qualities. Because Life's sentiment is genuine, one may discuss its opinions without that awkward feeling of arguing with a joke; and we find in its issue of last week an opinion which demands serious attention. In its light and airy way Life chats with John Jacob Astor about his fortune. "You have not yet atoned," says Life. "Atoned! For what?" asks Astor. "For being a millionaire," Life replies. Then Life explains that this is a sin against all who are not millionaires; and, asked the cause, ex-

claims: "Envy, my dear boy. There is nothing more unforgiving than envy." In a very gentle way Life here gives voice to a very common and often very exasperating sneer. Doubtless some of the feeling regarding millionaires is explained by envy. But on the whole it is not the feeling to which Life alludes. If you want to find those who are actuated by envy, don't look among the denunciators of the rich; look among the lickspittals.

It is Col. Astor's flatterers who envy him, not those who declaim against millionaireism. The reason lies deep down at the heart of things. All realize that Col. Astor's splendid income consists not of past accumulations, but of things that are being made now—daily, hourly—of food, clothing, shelter, besides various kinds of personal service. All realize, too, that Astor gives little or no service in return for these things. And then, rightly or wrongly, intelligently or foolishly, they jump to the conclusion that his fortune consists somehow in an unjust power of appropriating to himself a share of the current earnings of others. That is the explanation of popular dislike of the millionaire. It is not envy.

Envy of the millionaire is monopolized by those who want to keep up the same old game, with the same old rules, in the hope of sometime drawing a winning hand themselves. They pretend to respect the winner, pretend even to love him. The spirit of the game demands that. But in their hearts they envy him.

Carroll D. Wright's figure factory, the department of labor at Washington, has turned out another cargo of cooked statistics in support of Wright's fad that wages are rising. These statistics appear in the September bulletin of the department, and purport to be a comparison of wages in the United States and Europe from 1870 to 1898. But according to an accompanying explanation the figures are not to be trusted for

purposes of comparison. They can be safely used, says their sponsor, "only in tracing the course of wages from year to year," and "comparisons should not be instituted between the wages shown here for the different countries represented." What the purpose of publishing them together could have been, since they do not admit of comparison, perhaps Mr. Wright could explain. None is very obvious, unless it be the new opportunity that the appearance of comparison affords to juggle with statistics of American wages so as to make it seem, contrary to all rational observation, that the condition of American workmen is improving.

The collection of statistics referred to above is printed in the September bulletin of the department of labor, under the title "Wages in the United States and Europe, 1870 to 1898." It purports to give the average wages in 25 occupations in 12 American cities; and in tabular comparison with the American data, it brings data, more or less complete, from nearly the same occupations in five European cities. As the foreign data are confessedly untrustworthy for comparison, and obviously very incomplete, they may be disregarded, and our attention centered exclusively upon the American data, which, as already stated, are put forth for the evident purpose of making it appear that American wages are rising.

According to this collection of statistics, the average of wages in the 25 employments in 12 American cities, rose  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in the year 1871 in comparison with the wages of 1870; and also in comparison with 1870, they rose as much as 11.1 per cent. in 1872; but only 6.8 in 1873, 4.4 in 1874, 1.7 in 1875; and in 1876 they were 1.1 per cent. less than in 1870. From 1876 they began regularly to rise again, being 1.8 per cent. higher in 1877 than in 1870, and reaching to an increase over 1870 of 16.1 per cent. in 1892. Then they as regularly declined, until in 1898 they

were only 10.3 per cent. higher than in 1870. Thus, wages in 25 occupations in 12 American cities, appear upon the face of these figures to have risen so that a workman who received \$3.50 a day in 1870 would now receive \$3.86. At the same rate of increase it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of the year of Our Lord 2000, before the \$3.50 man of 1870 could command \$5 a day for his work. Mr. Wright, delightful optimist that he is with four or five times that income, regards the prospect as decidedly hopeful for the working classes!

But Mr. Wright's wages statistics cannot be taken upon their face. It is necessary to go behind the returns. He assumes for instance that prices have decreased, and therefore that an increase of wages means that the wage-worker's condition has improved. To quote him from the September bulletin article under consideration: "If prices on the whole are stationary and wages have increased, every such increase means greater purchasing power of a day's work. If at the same time there is a decrease in prices, the increase in the purchasing power of a day's work is so much the greater." And Mr. Wright infers that "probably since 1892 the tendency has been slightly downward" as to prices, wherefore it is not necessary for him to discuss prices in connection with the rates of wages. Wages having slightly risen and prices having slightly fallen, the wage-worker is evidently better off. That is Mr. Wright's inference. It takes a plutocratic statistician to draw an inference so absurd.

The absurdity of that inference becomes apparent upon a suggestion or two. The fact is notorious that on the whole, ground values have risen enormously since 1870, and that workmen are forced either to pay higher rents or to live in poorer neighborhoods. When this item of increased rent is set off against the "slightly downward" tendency of prices, it is

not so certain that the increase in wages that Mr. Wright sets forth in his September bulletin — 10.3 per cent. from 1870 to 1898, or about 37-100ths of one per cent. a year—would be enough to enhance the purchasing power of a day's work.

Then there is another consideration which statisticians of the Wright variety disregard. It requires much charity to believe that Wright himself does not disregard it with malice aforethought. We refer to the fact that workmen, though they may belong to the "lower orders," are not properly classified with the lower animals. If Mr. Wright were gathering statistics about cats, he might properly assume that a given sum of money applied to their support, per day or year, would either improve their condition or overload their stomachs, if prices declined. The reason would be that the wants of cats are fixed. Their standard of living is invariable from generation to generation. A pound of meat is the same to a cat in 1898 as in 1870. As Charlotte Perkins Stetson says: "A cat can only hold a cat-full." But men are different. The workingman's family that lives in 1898 precisely as it did in 1870, is living on a lower plane of life. Things that were luxuries then are necessities now. Things that were unknown then are part now of daily needs. Take, for illustration, the bicycle. In 1870 its cost did not enter into the expense of life; but to-day the man who cannot afford to give his half-grown boy or girl a bicycle is as poor as he who in 1870 could not afford to buy his children a coasting sled. The bicycle is a new necessity, which tends to increase expenses even though prices fall. Nor is it the only new necessity. Every year brings new things into common use. That is of the nature of advancing civilization, and he who cannot participate in the enjoyment of these new things of common use is deprived of a share in the benefits of advancing civilization. His necessary wants in the present cannot be

fairly measured by price lists of the past. Yet statisticians like Wright proceed upon the assumption that the common wants of 1870 are the same as those of 1898, and therefore that lower prices with higher wages imply an improved condition of the working classes. Why, Mr. Wright, the working classes are men and women, not cats!

We must go still further beneath Mr. Wright's statistics of rising wages before dropping them. Even in themselves they are as worthless as the weather predictions of an old-fashioned almanac. Though they purport to have been taken from the pay rolls of business firms, the firms are not named. Consequently, the figures can neither be verified nor any inferences as to their value be drawn from the character of the firms that furnish them. Moreover, in 1870, trade unions in the occupations named were weaker than now, so that, for all that appears, the wages of 1870 may have been "scab" wages, while those of 1898 were "union" wages. Another consideration is the fact that the wages given in the data are "day" wages, and "day" wages might increase without increasing the annual income of the workers. Steadiness of employment is a vital factor in the problem, but Mr. Wright furnishes his readers with no means of giving due weight to that factor.

Finally the averages in Mr. Wright's latest statistical production are so obtained as to make valid conclusions from the published data utterly impossible. Instead of dividing the aggregate of wages by the aggregate of employes, in order to ascertain the average wages, or adopting some equivalent of that method, he ascertains the average in each city and then divides the sum of all the averages by the aggregate number of cities! The average wages of blacksmiths, for example, as he ascertains them, vary in 1870 from \$1.86 in Philadelphia to \$3.80 $\frac{1}{2}$  in San Francisco, the aggregate of all the aver-

ages being \$29.14 $\frac{1}{2}$ . This sum Mr. Wright divides by 12, the total number of cities, and gives \$2.43 as the average wages in 1870 of blacksmiths in those cities. Every schoolboy knows that an average so ascertained can be right only by accident.

Suppose a schoolboy were given the following problem: John owns 1 cow worth \$15, 10 cows worth \$10 each and 1 cow worth \$20; James owns 1 cow worth \$500, 1 cow worth \$12 and 1 cow worth \$16; what is the average value of the cows that John and James own? The school boy would find that John's cows were worth \$135, and that James's were worth \$528. Then adding these two sums together, he would say that the aggregate value of all the cows was \$663, and dividing by 15, the total number of cows, that the average value was \$44.20. But not so Mr. Wright, the eminent commissioner of labor of the United States. Mr. Wright would find that John's cows were worth \$135, which sum he would divide by 12, their number, and say that the average value of John's cows was \$11.25. Then he would find that James's cows were worth \$663, which sum he would divide by 3, their number, and say that the average value of James's cows was \$221. Finally he would add the average value of John's cows to the average value of James's, making a—may be he would call it "a total average"—of \$232.25, which he would divide by 2, the number of averages in the "total average," and produce the astonishing sum of \$116.12 $\frac{1}{2}$  as the average value of those 15 cows!

This example is very ridiculous, but it illustrates the way in which Mr. Wright, in his latest statistical exploit, has arrived at the average wages in 25 occupations in 12 cities of the Union. Whether he has followed the same method in arriving at the average wages in each city, his report does not divulge; but it is by no means unlikely. These plutocratic statisticians have so completely mud-

dled their minds with metaphysical delusions in "economics," that they appear to have lost their faculty of dealing with elementary problems even in simple arithmetic.

### THIRD PARTY POLITICS.

When men are stirred by new political ideas of the radical sort, temptations are strong to set about organizing new political parties for the purpose of carrying the new ideas into practical politics and establishing them in legislation. It is assumed that such a party may be built up from the day of small things, until pushing aside the older parties one after the other, it forges ahead, and gaining control of the government, embodies in the law of the land the ideas in behalf of which it was formed.

But there is reason to believe that this assumption is poorly grounded. A third party that does not come to maturity at a bound, is never likely to come to maturity at all. It may do valuable educational work, and be the forerunner of some triumphant party of the future; but it can hardly hope to accomplish political results itself.

This view of the third party question finds ample confirmation in the history of American politics, a field that has been the happy hunting ground of third parties ever since the middle twenties, when there was but one political party in the country.

Most of these third parties, it is true, were merely factions of old parties; but the Liberty party of the forties was a veritable third party. So was the Free soil party, which swallowed up the Liberty party. So too was the present Republican party, which followed the free soilers.

It is often argued by third party advocates that the present Republican party is the Liberty party and the Free soil party under another name, and is therefore a standing confutation of the theory that third parties cannot gradually grow. That, however, is a mistake. While the Republican party doubtless owes its existence to the anti-slavery agitation to which the Liberty party and the Free soil party contributed, it is neither of these parties in any political sense, nor is it their political heir. It is a different

party, as a brief historical summary will show.

The Liberty party ran Gen. Birney for the presidency in 1840, polling 7,609 votes. Four years later it nominated John P. Hale, but withdrew him upon the calling of the Free soil convention, and participated in that, thus putting an end to its own party organization. The Free soil party was not a continuation of the Liberty party. It was formed by the Martin Van Buren faction of the Democratic party. This faction having failed to secure full representation in the Democratic national convention, from New York, called a convention of the opponents of slave extension—not of slavery, but of the extension of slavery into the territories—and for the purpose of joining that movement, the abolitionists disbanded the Liberty party. It had lasted four years and contested one election, and as a party that was the end of it.

The Free soil party lasted but little longer. Its candidate for president in 1848 was Martin Van Buren, who polled 291,263 votes. In 1852, with John P. Hale for its candidate, the party polled only 156,149. It was not heard of in politics again.

Immediately afterward, the Republican party was formed without the slightest reference or political relationship, as a party, to the Free soil party.

Like the others, the Republican party was indeed a third party; but it differed from all previous and subsequent third parties in the particular, the vital particular, that it sprang instantly into the position of a second party.

The Republican party was formed locally in the early fifties—about 1854. It held its first national convention in 1856, in which year it polled for Fremont 1,341,264—scarcely half a million less than the Democrats polled for Buchanan—and left the Whigs in the rear. Ever since then the Republican party has held its place, either as first or second among American parties.

The third parties of note subsequently organized, apart from the liberal republicans and the straight democrats of 1872, which were only fac-

tions, have been: the Greenback, the Prohibition, the Union-Labor, the Populist, and the Socialist-Labor parties. Two of these have gone the way of the Liberty and the Free soil parties, leaving, as they did, an influence which has found expression in other organizations, but also like them ceasing to be, as parties. The others are still in politics, and are doubtless doing educational work, but as political parties they make no progress.

The Greenback vote in 1876 was 81,740 for Peter Cooper. In 1880 it rose for Jas. B. Weaver to 307,206. But in 1884 it fell again for Benj. F. Butler to 133,825, and with that election the party died. In 1888 the Union-labor party, at its first and last presidential election, gave Streeter 148,105. Then the Populist party came. The Populist party is thought to be a continuation of the Greenback party, but in reality it is not. Greenbackers helped organize it, but they organized it as an entirely new party. That, however, is of little importance, for the populists polled only 1,041,028 for Weaver in 1892, a lower percentage of the total vote than was cast in 1848 by the freesoilers for Van Buren; and in 1896 they were swallowed up by the new democracy as completely as the Liberty party had been by the free soilers.

In the experience of the Socialist-labor party there is an indication of steady growth, but it is too slight for any valid inference. This party made its first presidential record in 1892, when it polled 21,164 votes, and in 1896 its vote rose to 36,274. That was an increase not only in the vote but also in percentage. But any favorable inference that might be drawn from the limited experience of the Socialists, is discredited by the Prohibition party, which has passed through the largest experience of all in an effort to gradually build up a third party in American politics. The Prohibition party began its career in 1876, when it polled 9,522. In 1880 it polled 10,305; in 1884, 151,809; in 1888, 249,907; and in 1892, 264,133. Here is a record of steady increase in the vote, though the percentage to the total vote fluctuates, being 0.113 in 1876, 0.111 in 1880, 1.511 in 1884, 2.196 in 1888, and 2.19 in 1892. With the strong and widespread pro-

hibition sentiment that prevails among the churches the Prohibition party ought by this time to have become an important party, if the principle of gradual growth is applicable to the establishment of political parties. But in 1892 the party had made only a slight advance either in vote or percentage, after five presidential elections, as the foregoing figures show; and in 1896, it fell in popular vote from 264,133 to 145,976, and in percentage from 2.19 to 1.048. Though it still has formal existence, its futile political career is evidently drawing to a close.

So far, then, as the political history of this country throws light upon the question, it is evident that third parties cannot be coddled into power. The only successful third party is the Republican, and that came to the front with a leap.

But the experience of other countries is pointed to as evidence of the possibility of slowly and laboriously, with devotion and sacrifice, building up a political party. This experience, however, will not bear examination.

The most impressive European instance is that of the Social democratic party of Germany, which, from a minor party has risen to command a larger popular vote than any other party in the empire. But in connection with the growth of this party there are several overlooked considerations. In the first place, even if it had been a party of slow growth, that would have proved nothing for this country, so different are the political conditions and so differently do the aggregate German and the aggregate American minds act. But it has not been a party of slow growth. It sprang well to the front at its first parliamentary election, 1877, with nearly half a million votes. Then again, the socialist part of Germany was proscribed by law for 12 years, a fact which drew toward it naturally a large body of voters who had little or no interest in the party program but were bitterly opposed to political proscription. For this and other reasons the party long since ceased to be a third party with a socialist program, and became distinctively the party of opposition—what in our country

would be called the second as distinguished from a third party.

In his article on "Political Germany," in the Review of Reviews for April last, Dr. Barth, the liberal parliamentary leader, said: "The greater number of voters for the social democratic candidates, do not trouble themselves about the socialistic program, but they wish to express their feeling of political discontent with things as they exist, by voting for the most violent opposition." This opinion of Dr. Barth's has recently been confirmed by the socialists themselves. At the socialist convention held last month at Stuttgart, the opportunists exhibited such overwhelming strength that the old leaders, Liebnicht and Bebel, expressed their fears that socialism in Germany would get away from its original revolutionary plan. It has in fact long since done so. This convention only made it evident that the masses of the Socialist party in Germany have themselves come to realize what has for years been apparent to observers, that the party, instead of being a slowly developed third party with an affirmative program, is the popular party in opposition. Like the Republican party of the United States, it leaped almost at a bound into the place of an influential factor in practical politics.

Not only does experience testify against the possibility of slowly building up a third party and finally raising it to power in politics, but all the probabilities are against such a thing. Any third party must, in the nature of things, soon become the second or first party, or drop out of politics. There can never be for long more than two great parties. The simple reason is that broadly speaking there are two and only two kinds of political thought. Every live man is instinctively in his political thought either aristocratic or democratic. Hence political activity naturally generates two parties, the tendency of one being away from popular government and that of the other toward popular government. "Hamiltonism" and "Jeffersonism" are terms that describe a conflict which is inseparable from political growth. Consequently a third party, to live, must speedily be-

come the exponent of one of these two political tendencies. That is, it must speedily pass from the position of a third party to that of the first or the second party.

Yet it is clear that the two leading parties of a country often fail to represent between them the two great conflicting tendencies in political sentiment. They fall under the control of machines and bosses who use them as instruments for selfish ends. And how shall this evil be remedied, if third parties are to be condemned? We have not said, let it be noted, that third parties are to be condemned. What we insist upon is not that they cannot be successful but that they cannot be slowly coaxed up to success. When that one of the two leading parties which stands for democracy, becomes a mere echo of the other party, when its vitality is gone and it is indeed but the tool or plaything of bosses and rings, then there may be an opportunity for a third party. And in those circumstances, if the third party strikes the right breezes in public sentiment it will sail into power.

That was the case in 1856. The Whig party had fallen as completely under the dominion of the slave power as had the so-called Democratic party. It was a dead party. The democratic sentiment of the time had no exponent in politics. Then the Republican party rose up. It embodied the leading principle of the declaration of independence in its platform—the equality of men—and resting upon that principle denied the constitutional power of congress to give legal existence to slavery in any territory. That struck the keynote, and at the very first election which this new third party contested, the moribund Whig party fell to the rear. The new third party became the second, and the old devitalized second became the third.

We have now reached another period when the devitalized condition of the party upon which democratic sentiment depends may have opened the way for a third party. The Republican party has so completely changed that, no longer the exponent of democracy, it has become to plu-

cracy what in 1856 the then Democratic party had become to the slave power. It now represents opposition to popular government and equality. And the democratic side, now as then, is represented unsatisfactorily.

Here may possibly be an opportunity for a third party to spring into the place of the Democratic party as did the republicans into that of the whigs in 1856. Such an opportunity there doubtless would have been two years ago had the plutocratic leaders not lost their grip. Such an opportunity there doubtless will be two years hence if they recover their grip. But should the Democratic party turn upon plutocracy in 1900, as it did in 1896, the lesson of history is that there will be no opportunity for a successful third party.

In that event, and even in expectation of that event, the effective thing to do is not to waste effort in third party politics, but to take a hint from the radicals of England, and organize a party within the Democratic party, to keep the face of the latter turned constantly toward the shining sun of democracy.

---

## NEWS

---

The turmoil in France has subsided. At our last report it had reached a state which had forced the radical cabinet of M. Brisson to resign. This crisis was precipitated by the resignation of the minister of war, and the refusal of the president to make a new appointment at once, which gave the opposition an advantage that expressed itself promptly in a vote of want of confidence. The cabinet resigned on the 25th, and on the 27th the president asked M. Charles Dupuy to form a new cabinet. M. Dupuy was premier in 1894, when Dreyfus was degraded and transported, and President Faure was then associated with him in the cabinet as minister of marine. The selection of Dupuy, therefore, created a popular impression that it had been made in hostility to Dreyfus. M. Dupuy acceded to the president's request, and on the 31st succeeded in forming the following cabinet: M. Leuret, Minister of Justice; M. Dupuy, Premier and Minister of the Interior; M. de Freycinet, Minister of War; M. Lockroy, Minister of Marine; M. Delcasse, Minister of Foreign Affairs; M. Peytral, Minister of Finance;

M. Leygus, Minister of Public Instruction; M. Deioncle, Minister of Commerce; M. Guillaime, Minister of the Colonies; M. Vigier, Minister of Agriculture; and M. Krantz, Minister of Public Works. The cabinet so composed was duly constituted on the 1st by presidential decree.

The new French cabinet has not yet revealed its policy as to the Dreyfus case, but a decision has been made by the Court of Cassation, which may lead to a final and satisfactory disposition of the matter. As reported in these columns on the 1st of October, the old cabinet had decided on the 20th of the preceding month in favor of opening the Dreyfus case, and to that end had ordered the minister of justice to submit the petition of Mme. Dreyfus for a rehearing, to the Court of Cassation. Formal proceedings were accordingly instituted, and on the 27th of October an application for a rehearing for Drefus was made in open court. A crowd of people filled the courtroom. The history of the case was orally reported to the court with an explanation that the petition rested upon the theory that Maj. Esterhazy had forged the document which was relied upon to convict Dreyfus. On the second day of the hearing, Oct. 28, the public prosecutor addressed the court, urging that the sentence against Dreyfus must not be annulled without a retrial. "You must fix the responsibility," he said; "if Dreyfus is innocent, the culprit must not go unpunished." To reach the culprit the secret record in the Dreyfus case, called the secret "dosier," which is in the custody of the war department, would have to be produced, a consummation that army interests have been opposing with all their might, apparently because an examination of that record would not only acquit Dreyfus but expose corruption in high places. But the production of this record now seems inevitable. For though the court, which made a decision on the 29th, did not annul the Dreyfus sentence nor order a retrial, it did order the institution of a supplementary inquiry. News dispatches from Paris describe the decision as one giving to the Court of Cassation absolute control over the Dreyfus case, and enabling it to examine any witness and demand any document bearing upon the matter. It can also order the production of Dreyfus in person. On the whole, the

decision appears to be more favorable to Dreyfus than if it had annulled his conviction and ordered a new trial before a court martial.

Counselors were appointed by the Court of Cassation, on the 31st, to proceed with the supplementary inquiry. On the same day the Dreyfus lawyer applied to the war department for an inspection of the secret documents; but the acting minister (M. Freycinet not having yet taken the office) raised difficulties and allowed the lawyer to inspect some of the documents only.

With the change of ministry and the opening of the Dreyfus case, which have had an unexpectedly quieting effect upon public opinion in Paris, the French appear also to have abandoned their quarrel with England over the possession of Fashoda. Maj. Marchand, commanding the French detachment at Fashoda, came down the Nile to Khartoum on the 28th, with the apparent intention of proceeding to Cairo; but Capt. Baratier, his subordinate who recently arrived in Paris with dispatches from him, was sent back with instructions to Marchand to return to Fashoda and evacuate it. The dispatch containing this information says that the French are disposed to recognize that the capture of Omdurman changes the situation as it existed when Maj. Marchand was instructed to proceed to the Nile. It appears that the French had expected to take possession of Fashoda while the mahdi's empire lay between that point and the Egyptian frontier, intending thereby to establish a claim; but the defeat and destruction of the mahdists at Khartoum changed the situation by extending the Egyptian frontier to the southern limits of the mahdi's empire. It is probable that the French would not have advanced to the Nile at all, had they known of the advance of the Anglo-Egyptian army upon Khartoum. Later dispatches reported that Marchand, accompanied by Capt. Fitton, of the Egyptian army, was due at Cairo on the 3d.

Although the French difficulty with Great Britain is evidently at an end, Great Britain has in no wise relaxed her warlike preparations. Quite the contrary. It is now suspected that the enemy for whom she has been preparing is not France but Russia, the Fashoda incident having been used as a pretext. From Weihaiwei,

China, on the 2d, it was reported that the British naval force there had cleared for action, and that a large Russian fleet had assembled at Port Arthur, across the gulf. Russia appears to have taken virtual possession of the entire province of Manchuria. A Russian regiment entered New Chwang on the 20th, the Chinese troops withdrawing without resistance, and it is regarded as significant that the intense activity on the part of the British began on the following day. All the news from this quarter, however, is vague. Only one fact is both significant and definite, and that is that the British squadron at Weihaiwei has cleared for action and is ready for sea at an hour's notice.

The Spanish-American commissioners now in session at Paris, have reached the question of the disposition of the Philippines. At the last joint meeting we reported, that of Oct. 25, the commissioners were still considering the question of responsibility for the Spanish-Cuban debt, the Spanish commissioners urging that the United States assume it, and the American commissioners firmly declining. Meetings were held on the 26th and 27th. At the former the Spanish acceded to the requirement of the United States, that Spain relinquish sovereignty over Cuba unconditionally; and at the latter the details as to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Guam, of the Carolines, were arranged. So it is reported. But all the meetings are secret, and reports must be taken with some allowance for error.

The next joint meeting of the peace commissioners took place on the 31st, when the Philippine question was for the first time considered. The American commissioners demanded the cession of the whole archipelago, the United States to assume only such portion of the Spanish-Philippine debt as has been incurred for useful purposes in the islands. This proposition was not put forward as an ultimatum, though it is regarded in Paris as virtually one. At the request of the Spanish commissioners an adjournment was taken until the 4th to enable them to prepare their reply.

For the final surrender of Cuba, the American commissioners have proposed the 1st of January. The Spanish authorities at Havana protest that this date would not give them time to

embark their troops. The date of evacuation therefore remains in abeyance.

Meanwhile the American commissioners are trying to Anglicize the island by requiring all railroad business to be done in the English language. This proceeding might well excite suspicions among the Cubans as to the intentions of the United States regarding the future government of Cuba. Whether under the influence of such a suspicion or not, President Maso, of the Cuban provisional administrative council, has issued an address to the delegates assembled in the Cuban Congress, in which he says: "We have now reached a time when, even more than in the days of fighting, it is incumbent upon all Cubans to show true patriotism, and, while making every expression of gratitude to America for having given Cuba freedom and independence, to make prompt arrangements for paying off the Cubans now in arms and for getting the country into working order."

While the presidential committee for investigating the mismanagement of the war is taking evidence at the different camps, further instances of mismanagement occur. On the 2d, just before the transport Port Victor was to have left Santiago for the United States with sick soldiers, Gen. Wood went on board, and to his amazement found an utter lack of provisions suitable for sick persons and an insufficiency of medical supplies. This negligence was corrected, the transport being held back by Gen. Wood for the purpose. But on the same day came the report of an actual calamity from negligence. The transport Panama, which had sailed from Santiago on the 1st with 320 passengers, most of them returning soldiers, was reported wrecked off Cape Maysi, Cuba, with the loss of all on board. The Panama was in such bad condition when she left Santiago that the American postmaster there refused to entrust the mails to her.

In Puerto Rico a considerable advance has been made toward the establishment of an American postal system. During the war, a postal commission followed the American army in Puerto Rico, and set up American post offices, with money order and registered letter systems, in every town as soon as captured. There are now about 80 post offices

with all modern improvements in full operation in the island. Most of the postmasters are Americans.

The people of Puerto Rico are looking forward to the acquisition of territorial rights and ultimate statehood. In this view a delegate convention from the chief towns of the island was held on the 30th at San Juan, for the purpose of drafting recommendations for the administrative system to be settled at Washington. The convention is reported to have been fairly representative, and it adopted with great enthusiasm a series of resolutions demanding the cessation of military rule and the establishment of territorial rights.

The insurrection of whites against blacks, in North Carolina, which we reported as imminent last week, has broken out in earnest. The whites are determined to murder the negroes rather than allow them to vote in freedom, and the blacks appear to be equally determined to defend their voting rights even with their lives. In the county in which Wilmington lies, the negroes are largely in the majority. They consequently hold a large proportion of the local offices. This the whites have set out to put an end to, and they ostracize, both socially and in business, everyone who refuses to join them. They also go about heavily armed, threatening death. The governor, a white republican, proposed as a compromise that the democratic legislative ticket be withdrawn and a business man's ticket substituted in consideration of the republicans making no nominations for local offices. This compromise was accepted by the democrats. As may be seen it involved the abandonment of their rights by the negroes, who are mostly republicans, and they are arranging to nominate a county ticket of their own in spite of the governor's wishes. Looking upon the compromise as a trick to disfranchise them, they regard the governor as a traitor. Threats are made by the whites that if the negroes carry out their program, of making nominations of their own, the whites will slaughter them in open battle on election day. In their efforts to make up a ticket, the negroes have solicited white men to accept places upon it. But every white man approached has declined. The whites openly proclaim that any white man who dares to go upon the negro ticket must die.

Saturday, the 5th, has been set apart by the negroes as a day of fasting and prayer, when they intend to consecrate their lives to the defense of the political rights of their race. No steps have been taken by either the state or the national government to protect the negroes in their citizenship. But upon the application of a negro, the supreme court of the state issued warrants on the 2d for some of the leaders of the white men's party upon a charge of having forced the negro to withdraw as a candidate for registrar of Halifax county, by breaking into his house in an armed body and threatening to kill him and his wife.

The full text of the annual message of Mayor S. M. Jones, to the Toledo city council has been published. It is a unique document, and especially noteworthy for its sound business sense and the spirit of democracy that pervades it. Mayor Jones recommends that the natural gas plant of the city be so improved as to furnish light and heat to the people at cost. He also urges the council to promote, as far as possible, the Ohio movement for home rule in cities, and advocates the merit system of civil service. Grants and extensions of franchises, except when approved by the people at a general election, he opposes, as he does also the contract system for city work. Among the facilities which Mayor Jones thinks the city ought to provide for its inhabitants is a directory, frequently corrected with the aid of policemen and letter carriers; the use of school buildings for civic meetings; clean streets; street sprinkling at public expense; music in the parks; public playgrounds for children; public baths; and free employment agencies. On the question of taxation he says: "While the present system, or more correctly speaking lack of system of taxing property remains, and until a system of taxation having its basis in a scientific conception of justice shall be adopted, I do not see as there is anything left for us to do but to appeal to those upon whom rest the obligations of wealth to be honest, to pay their full share of the cost of the government."

Thomas I. Kidd and his associates who have been on trial for two weeks at Oshkosk, Wis., charged with labor crimes, were acquitted on the 2d. The prosecution was instituted by the Paine Lumber Co., and grew out of the woodworkers' strike at Oshkosk

last summer. It turned chiefly upon the legality of "picketing" factories with strikers charged with the duty of urging workmen to refuse employment there. The specific charge was conspiracy. Mr. Kidd, who lives in Chicago, is secretary of the International Woodworkers' union, and was brought into relation with the strike in his official capacity. The trial has been followed with interest in labor circles in the United States and Canada, and its result is regarded as a triumphant vindication of the lawfulness of "picketing."

NEWS NOTES.

—Gen. Kitchener arrived at London on the 27th from Egypt by way of Paris.

—Salvador, Nicaragua, and Honduras became the United States of Central America on the 1st.

—The anti-anarchist conference of the European powers is to meet at Rome on the 24th.

—S. S. Packard died at New York on the 27th. He was the founder and head of Packard's business college.

—Since the return of the empress dowager of China to power, all Chinese newspapers have been suppressed.

—St. Louis is to have a world's fair in 1903 in commemoration of the first century of the purchase of the Louisiana territory.

—It is announced from St. Petersburg that all the powers have accepted the Czar's invitation to be represented at the disarmament congress.

—The Japanese cabinet has resigned. It was unable to agree upon a minister of education. This cabinet was the first in an attempt to introduce party government in Japan.

—The coroner's jury in the Virden, Ill., riot cases has found that the victims of the shooting came to their deaths by wounds inflicted by weapons "in the hands of parties unknown to us."

—Gen. Merriam, commanding the department of the Pacific, U. S. A., reports that the natural facilities for a military camp at Honolulu are poor, and advises that as few troops as possible be sent there.

—James N. Allen, a student at Trinity college, Hartford, Conn., of the class of 1902, died on the 27th, of starvation. He was working his way through college, and had tried to live upon but little more than \$1 a week.

—Under a law of New York, the soldiers of that state in the field are voting. Their ballots go under seal to the secretary of state, and thence to the various counties, where they will be can-

vassed with the votes cast in the state next week.

—The Omaha exposition closed on the 31st. The profits to be divided among shareholders amount to more than \$400,000, the receipts having been about \$2,000,000 and the expenses about \$1,500,000. The total number of admissions of people to the grounds was 2,613,374.

—The men of the Fifteenth Minnesota, in camp at Camp Meade, Pennsylvania, having refused to be vaccinated, Gen. Graham issued an order commanding the regimental surgeons to proceed with vaccinating and warning the men that they would be punished if they refused to submit.

—Prof. Herron's lecture on "Public Resources and Spiritual Liberty," which he delivered before the National Christian Citizenship League at Willard hall, Chicago, on the 31st at noon, was listened to by a packed audience. His subject for the 7th at noon at the same place will be "The Democracy of Power."

—Col. George E. Waring, Jr., formerly street cleaning commissioner of New York, died on the 29th at his home in that city, of yellow fever. He had contracted the disease in Cuba while making observations there as a sanitary engineer, for the purpose of devising a plan for freeing Cuba and Puerto Rico of the yellow fever scourge.

—Emperor William of Germany arrived at Jaffa, Palestine, on the 27th, and at Jerusalem on the 29th. At Jerusalem he hoisted the German and Turkish flags over a piece of ground said to have been the site of the dwelling of the Virgin Mary. The ground was presented to the emperor by the sultan, and the emperor has in turn presented it to his own Catholic subjects.

MISCELLANY

OUT OF THE GATE.

Out of the glorious city gate  
A great throng came;  
A mighty throng that swelled and grew  
Around a face that all men knew—  
A man who bore a noted name—  
Gathered to listen to his fate.

The judge sat high. Unbroken black  
Around, above and at his back  
The people pressed for nearer place,  
Longing, yet shamed, to watch that face;  
And in a space before the throne  
The prisoner stood, unbound, alone;  
So thick they rose on every side,  
There was no spot his face to hide.

Then came the herald, crying clear,  
That all the listening crowd should hear;  
Crying aloud before the sun  
What thing this fallen man had done.  
He—who had held a ruler's place  
Among them by their choice and grace—  
He—fallen lower than the dust—  
Had sinned against the public trust.

The herald ceased. The poet arose,  
The poet, whose awful art now shows

To this poor heart, and heart of everyone  
The horror of the thing that he had done.  
"O, citizen! Dweller in this high place!  
Son of the city! Sharer in its pride!  
Born in the light of its fair face!  
By it fed, sheltered, taught, and glorified!  
Raised to pure manhood by thy city's care!  
Made strong and beautiful and happy  
there;  
Loving thy mother and thy father more  
For the fair town which made them glad  
before;  
Finding among its maidens thy sweet wife;  
Owing to it thy power and place in life;  
Raised by its people to the lofty stand  
Where thou couldst execute their high  
command;  
Trusted and honored, lifted over all—  
So honored and so trusted, didst thou fall!  
Against the people—who gave thee the  
power—  
Thou hast misused it in an evil hour!  
Against the city where thou owest all—  
Thy city, man, within whose guarding  
wall  
Lie all our life's young glories—ay, the  
whole!  
The home and cradle of the human soul!  
Against thy city, beautiful and strong,  
Thou, with the power it gave, hast done  
this wrong!"

Then rose the judge. "Prisoner, thy case  
was tried  
Fairly and fully in the courts inside.  
Thy guilt was proven, and thou hast con-  
fessed,  
And now the people's voice must do the  
rest.  
I speak the sentence which the people give:  
It is permitted thee to freely live,  
Redeem thy sin by service to the state,  
But nevermore within this city's gate!"

Back rolled the long procession, sad and  
slow,  
Back where the city's thousand banners  
blow.  
The solemn music rises glad and clear  
When the great gates before them open  
near;  
Rises in triumph, sinks to sweet repose,  
When the great gates behind them swing  
and close.  
Free stands the prisoner, with a heart of  
stone.  
The city gate is shut. He is alone.  
—Charlotte Perkins Stetson, in the Com-  
monwealth.

THE CHICAGO RIVER AS A TYPE.

The last picnic of the season was on its way to Lincoln park. It was a party of settlement children, members of a girls' club known as the Pansy Verein. All summer the club director, who was a resident at the settlement home, had promised her girls an outing. It had been postponed on many occasions for reasons which the director thought worthy of consideration. The girls thought it was a shame to wait so long that the flowers would be all withered.

"We want ter pick flowers," said one little girl who had never been out of her ward. A Jewess who had made two separate journeys across the city assured her: "They won't leave ye, no how."

The all-eventful day had come at last and the party was well on its way

to the happy hunting ground. Already one crossing of the Chicago river had been made and a remarkable amount of geographical lore had been called forth. A river had been defined as to its source, its flow and outlet. When other things equally wonderful came into view the river was forgotten and it was not until a second crossing was made that the excitement broke forth afresh.

After the ohs! and ahs! had subsided and all experiences had been rehearsed, a little girl who until then had said nothing spoke:

"I don't like rivers, do you?"

Her appeal was addressed to the girl next her, but her eyes followed the line of the river as she continued: "They are such a funny color."—Chicago Chronicle.

#### THAT MISCHIEVOUS PROSPERITY.

We are sorry to see that prosperity is at its old tricks again. It is making a careless and happy people forget their political duties. So Postmaster-General Smith informs us. He saw the thing distinctly working that way on his western trip. Everywhere big crops, good prices, a prosperous and contented people, but "no time for politics"—that is, no time for republican politics. The democrats are taking artful advantage of prosperity to "work desperately for success." How they get time for politics is not explained. Perhaps prosperity is distributed on a strictly partisan basis, and no democrat need apply. It may be that no Kansas farmer is allowed to have any prosperity at all except on the recommendation of the county committee, vided by "the old man." This would naturally leave the democrats with time just hanging heavy on their hands, and they would put it all in working desperately for success, while the unconscious republicans were counting up their gains and making bonfires of cancelled mortgages. This, however, shows what a mistake it is to draw party lines in prosperity. If we were "prosperity's advance agent," we would be just sly enough to make the democratic wheel-horses so rich and prosperous that they, too, would have no time for politics. Or else we would instantly take away prosperity from the people whom it only made apathetic and thankless. Evidently the present system is wrong. We saw how it worked in 1890 and 1892. McKinley and Harrison made the country roll in wealth, and the only political result was that the republicans forgot to vote. The postmaster-general plainly fears that the same thing will occur this year. He proposes to change all this, however, by making one speech in Cin-

cinnati on the Saturday before election. But will not such a living picture as he is of the prosperity resulting from McKinley's election make even more voters declare that they have no time for politics?—Editorial in New York Evening Post.

#### INDIANS WERE WRONGED.

The story of the Chippewa chief who went from his reservation to Duluth as a witness and had to walk home because he was not paid his fee or mileage is not to be rejected as an invention of a sensational reporter. It is officially confirmed, and more, by Indian Commissioner Jones, who without making particular mention of any one Indian generalizes and adds to the story.

Mr. Jones, who went from Washington to Minnesota to negotiate with the revolted Chippewas, made a careful investigation and found that the recent outbreak was not without provocation. He has made a verbal report of the facts to the secretary of the interior.

In an interview he says: "The origin of the whole trouble was dissatisfaction with the handling of the Indians' timber, but the immediate cause was irritation at the frequent arrests of Indians on trivial causes, often for no cause at all, taking them down to Duluth and Minneapolis for trial, 100 miles away from their agency, and then turning them adrift without means of returning home. I have information that there is a definite arrangement between the United States marshal and some boarding houses where the courts are located by which the deputies are to bring down delegations of Indians as witnesses in whisky and other cases. This secures fees for the deputies and money for the boarding places."

This is far worse than the newspaper story. The latter had to do with only one Indian who was turned adrift in the manner stated after serving as a witness. But the head of the Indian bureau states that this, so far from being an isolated case, was merely an incident in a systematic scheme, with a United States marshal is a principal figure, for "working" the United States treasury for fees, mileage and board and inflicting gross wrong upon the Indians. . . .

If we cannot carry on the work of lifting to a higher plane inferior races in Minnesota any better than we seem to be doing we can hardly expect to prosecute it more successfully on the other side of the planet. If a little band of Chippewas in our very midst are goaded to revolt by the wrongs inflicted upon them by our chosen agents of civilization we cannot expect seven

or eight millions of Filipinos to submit tamely to exploitation by the creatures of our political bosses.

It may not be amiss for us to bear in mind also that these creatures of the bosses will be better able to cover their tracks in the distant Philippines than in Minnesota. It is more than possible that if we have to deal with insurrections as Spain has done our people will be kept in ignorance of the causes of revolt just as the people of Spain have been. And they may at least be subjected to no less humiliation.—Editorial in Chicago Chronicle.

#### MR. DOOLEY'S REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S JUBILEE SPEECH.

Mack r-rose up in a perfect hurcane iv applause an' says he: 'Gintlemen,' he says, 'an' fellow heroes,' he says. 'Ye do me too much honor,' he says, 'I alone shud not have th' credit iv this glorious victhry. They ar-re others.' (A voice: 'Shafter.' Another voice: 'Gage.' Another voice: 'Dooley.') 'But I pass to a more congenial line iv thought,' he says. 'We have just emerged fr'm a turrible war,' he says. 'Again,' he says, 'wear-re a united union,' he says. 'No north,' he says, 'no south, no east,' he says, 'no west. No north east a point east,' he says. 'Th' inimies iv our country has been cr-rushed,' he says, 'or is stuck down in Floridy with his rigmint talkin',' he says, 'his hellish dochtrines to th' allygotars,' he says. 'Th' nation is wanst more at peace undher th' gran' gol' standard,' he says. 'Now,' he says, 'th' question is what shall we do with th' fruits iv victhry?' he says. (A voice: 'Can thim.') Our duty to civilization commands us to be up an' doin',' he says. 'We ar-re bound,' he says, 'to—to realize our destiny, whatever it may be,' he says. 'We cannot tur-rn back,' he says, 'th' hands iv th' clock that, even as I speak,' he says, 'is r-rushin' through th' hear-rts iv men,' he says, 'dashin' its spray against th' star iv liberty, an' hope, an' no north, no south, no east, no west, but a steady purpose to do th' best we can, considerin' all th' circumstances iv the case,' he says. 'I hope I have made th' matther clear to ye,' he says, 'an', with these few remarks,' he says, 'I will tur-rn th' job over to des-tiny,' he says, 'which is sure to lead us iver on an' on, an' back an' forth, a united an' happy people, livin',' he says, 'undher an administration that, thanks to our worthy prisidint an' his cap-ble an' earnest advisers, is second to none,' he says."

"What do you think ought to be done with th' fruits iv victhry?" Mr. Hennessy asked.

"Well," said Mr. Dooley, "if 'twas up to me, I'd eat what was r-ripe an' give what wasn't r-ripe to me inimy. An' I guess that's what Mack means."—Chicago Journal.

#### A BRAHMIN TURNS THE TABLES ON MR. KIDD.

If a learned Brahmin could be found to review Benjamin Kidd's "The Control of the Tropics" (Macmillan), the result would undoubtedly be a most amusing production. The humor of the situation ought to upset the dignity even of a Brahmin. He could easily apprehend the policy of taking everything in sight because you want it and happen to be stronger. That is the law of the survival of the fittest as the Brahmin comprehended it ages ago. But to take everything in sight and call it "holding the tropics as a trust for civilization" ought to excite mirth in the Orient. . . .

Suppose that the humorous Brahmin who reviews Mr. Kidd's book should be moved by its enticing sophistry to stir up his own people to apply its fine principles? It's a poor rule that won't work both ways. The Brahmin might be inspired to discourse as follows:

"Dearly Beloved Brethren! A famous English pundit named Kidd has discovered a great law of the universe, and I am incited to call upon you to try a practical application of it. The world is rapidly growing very small and over-populated. We people of the tropics send millions of rupees of products to England. These things we raise very cheap and sell very cheap. I'm told that over there in England they sell these things at a great profit, and certain of their wise men are enabled to live luxuriously upon this profit. Would it not be better for the half-starved millions of India if we could keep this extra profit for ourselves? We are strong in numbers; let us invade the country of the Englishman and seize it, and force the people to do things our way, and pay us our own price for the products of our soil and industry which they need. Thus shall we prosper abundantly at home. The astute pundit Kidd proves that this is the right course of action. For, by seizing England and governing it according to our own ideas, we shall be able to raise the standard of living here at home. The world is growing so small that there isn't enough to go 'round, and we must get all that we can while yet there is a chance. This is the great law of social evolution. It is not robbery or aggression or national bullying—it is simply seizing a weaker nation and holding it as 'a trust for civilization.' The tropics where we live are,

as Mr. Kidd well says, the hope of the world for material things. Eventually we must feed and clothe most of their surplus population. If that is the case, do not we, brethren, hold the trumps? And if we are strong enough we certainly ought to play them for our own good. Mr. Kidd thinks that England and the United States can play them better for us. But we know a thing or two. We have watched our English brethren play the game out here in India, and we have learned a few things that are not printed in this lovely essay by the facile pundit. Blessed are the strong, for they shall inherit the earth!"—Droch, in Life.

#### THE COMING FREEDOM.

An extract from a commencement oration, given at the Kansas state agricultural college, June 9, 1898, by Prof. George D. Herron.

Did God create our world and race in order that the strong might heap up wealth out of the forced labor of the millions, and is such an order of things the destiny that man must accept? By what device and by what right do the sons and daughters of God go daily to the task of creating supplies out of nature, whilst their needs of body and spirit go unsupplied, and they have only toil and bare existence for their portion? Who gave this earth to the profit-makers, and by what authority do they set the children of the earth to making gain for them? By what process of alchemy have the resources of nature passed into the hands of the strong, and how comes it that human life is practically treated as mere grist for the capitalist mill? Is it the end of our civilization that industry should develop into a monstrous, universal, profit-making machine, into which the multitudes are fed to be ground out as increased capital for private owners? Every nation, every conscience that has a right to be called Christian, searches for the answer, and every reform waits for it. "Now at last," says Prof. Marshall, "we are setting ourselves seriously to inquire whether there should be any so-called lower classes at all; that is, whether there need be large numbers of people doomed from their birth to hard work in order to provide for others the requisites of a refined and cultured life, while they themselves are prevented by their poverty and toil from having any share or part in that life." It is thus that the social problem is the problem of human destiny.

Some of us believe that the public ownership of the resources and means of production is the sole answer to

the social question. In order that each may have according to his needs, and be secure in the private property wherewith to express his individuality, the resources upon which the people in common depend must by the people in common be owned and administered. The common ownership of the earth, with industrial democracy in production, is the only ground upon which personal property and liberty can be built, the only soil in which individuality can take root.

In freedom alone does the soul thrive and blossom. Every sort of freedom, religious and intellectual, political and social, rests back upon economic freedom. Private ownership of public resources is private ownership of human beings. He who sells his labor-power under the compulsion of necessity sells his life for the mere means of existence. So long as the resources of the people are privately owned, so that people are obliged to sell their labor-power to the owners for sustenance, they are not free members of society or the state; they are not even free to worship God according to their own light and intuitions. "He who owns my sustenance," says Alexander Hamilton, "owns my moral being." A system which makes one human being dependent upon another for the opportunity to earn his bread and develop his life is a system, which enslaves bodies and souls; it is inherently immoral, destructive of life, wasteful of spiritual and material forces. Faith and love as social forces, with liberty a social fact, mean communism in natural resources, democracy in production, equality in use, private property in consumption, social responsibility in all relations and things. A civilization in which all shall work for the common good, and each receive according to every sort of need, is the practical realization of the idea of the kingdom of heaven on earth; it is the organized love which is the manifest destiny and liberty of man.

#### THE MAROONS OF JAMAICA.

When England, in 1655, took Jamaica from the Spaniards, there were some two thousand slaves on the island, most of them pure Africans, but a few the hybrid offsprings of negroes and the aboriginal Arawak Indians, whom the Spaniards had found in possession of the island, and, in the course of a century, had managed to exterminate. These slaves—known in history as Koromantyns, or, more commonly, "Maroons"—sided with their masters,

and on the flight of the Spanish forces from Jamaica they took to the mountains, and for a century and a half maintained a harassing and, on the whole, a successful guerilla war against the English. But in 1795 the Jamaican government imported from Cuba a great number of mastiffs, trained like the blood hound to track human beings by scent, but, unlike the blood hound, to attack the victim of their ruthless quest with horrible ferocity. The knowledge that these animals were arrayed against them paralyzed the the Maroons, and, rather than meet them in fight, they surrendered to the troops whom until then they had held in very scant respect. Not a shot was fired after the "blood-hounds" reached the English camp. The rebels capitulated on the single condition that their lives should be spared.

Thus ended the troubles with the Maroons. Their leaders were eventually shipped off to Sierra Leone, and the rank and file, being confirmed in certain privileges which, after a previous "peace," had been granted to them, retired to their villages, and thenceforth not only lived in peace with the English, but during the negro insurrection, quelled with such merciful severity in 1865 by Gov. Eyre, they fought on the side of the whites. The privileges referred to above were the grant of certain lands in perpetual freehold and exemption from all taxation, and modified "home-rule"—*quamdiu se bene gesserint*. On these terms the descendants of the Spaniards' slaves, still known as Maroons, live in the island, and one of their locations is Moore Town, about ten miles from Port Antonio, on the northern shore of the island.

Their lines have certainly been cast, from a negro point of view, in very pleasant places. Well above sea level, in the midst of superb scenery, this interesting human fragment of old-world history lives a life very much its own and in some respects quite isolated, but year by year assimilating more and more with its surroundings.

Ever since the suppression of Gordon's insurrection in 1865 the Maroons have been gradually ridding themselves of their "caste" prejudice, which held them aloof from the freed negroes and the half-casts, so that to-day the inhabitants of Moore Town possess scarcely any special characteristics of feature and suggest no special type. Here and there, frequently enough to arrest attention, one sees fine features, thin lips, oval faces, with a lithe and dignified bearing—a combination absolutely unknown among the negroes, and point-

ing back to a strong strain of blood other than African—probably that of the aboriginal Arawak Indians, who are recorded to have been a comely and graceful race. But the majority of the Maroons are as mongrel looking a collection as could be picked up at the corner of any Port Antonio street, and though suggesting in appearance, strange to say, less of the negro than the coolie, are in gesture, temperament, and mental traits unmistakable Africans. They are very light hearted and excitable, exceedingly simple, and surprisingly shrewd; a community which would follow and desert a leader with equal alacrity; impulsive but not purposeful, and morbidly superstitious.

I confess I was greatly disappointed to find them becoming so "civilized"—to see roofs of corrugated zinc instead of palm-leaf thatch, Bass and Tennant their beers instead of pombe and cassava, and canned meats their delicacies instead of ubonni.

"What is your religion?" I asked a hoary old heathenish-looking person.

"Church of England," was the shocking reply; and later, when I expressed a wish to see his fetich, he flattened me out by asking: "Fetich—what is fetich?"—Phil Robinson, in *Harper's Weekly*.

#### THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN FRANCE.

In France there is one law for private citizens and one court for the trial of questions arising between them. This is the court of law. For the officials there is the administrative court; for, as Prof. Lowell has shown in his *Government and Parties in Continental Europe*, the results of French development has been to strengthen the administrative branch of the government, while English development has made the judicial branch of the government the safeguard of personal liberty. Under our system law reigns, while under the French system, when there is a question between the individual and the government, discretion rules. In other words, the law is not permitted to interfere with the exigencies of the government, or with what the administrative courts think those exigencies may be. Therefore, in contemplating the attitude of the French people towards the Dreyfus case, it is not fair to judge them by our own standards.

. . . The rights of the individual, however, suffer, and the doing of justice is not an ideal in a government whose powers are bent towards absolute efficiency. Efficiency is primarily the attribute of a wise and benevolent despotism, and France is therefore a democracy with some of the attributes

of absolutism. This puts the government of the moment higher than human liberty. And if an act of justice to an individual, whether the individual be Captain Dreyfus or an unfortunate citizen who has been run over by a Paris coachman, is likely to create distrust in the army or in the administrative branch of the government, the individual must go under. . . .

The weakness of the French political mind is that it is under the control of domineering logic. It has come to a sentimental recognition of the right of the people to govern themselves; but when Louis XIV. said: "L'etat, c'est moi!" he laid down the hypothesis on which his republican successors are still reasoning. The state would be really now the people if France were a true republic; that is, the people would have the ultimate power, and the government which they have set up would exist for their benefit. Louis XIV. really was both the state and the government, and the French people have never been able to separate the two. Therefore now, as two hundred years ago, the government is the state, and is sacred. It must be maintained at all hazards, even at the cost of injustice, even at the serious cost of personal liberty.

How many Englishmen or Americans know of the true relations between the French citizen and the gendarme or the sergeant de ville? How many of our traveling pleasure seekers, sojourning for a gala day in Paris, realize that an enemy or a policeman, especially sensitive to what our own guardians call "back talk," might easily divert their visit from one of gayety to one of penalty? An arrest is an easy matter. It is easy here and in London, but practically it is not so common an indulgence of the Anglo-Saxon as of the French police. But once the accused is behind the cell door the matter takes on a different aspect in France from that to which we are accustomed, thanks to the blessing of the Great Charter. There is no reason known to the French law for informing the accused of the nature of the charge which has led to his incarceration. All that is necessary to keep him in prison for an indefinite time is an understanding between the policeman and the magistrate—the *juge d'instruction*. It is for this embodiment of French law and French justice to discover some reason for depriving the victim of his liberty, and in the meantime the victim must remain in ignorance. He is not to know the charge that is made against him; but from time to time he is haled before the *juge d'instruction* and examined as to his life, his secret thoughts, his

relations to society—in short, he is probed for hidden crime, or for evidence of the truth of the charge which some policeman may have lodged against him. . . .

The accused is kept in close confinement. His house is searched. His desk is broken open. His private papers are carried to the magistrate, to whom the post office authorities also deliver his mail. If he were an American or an Englishman in his own land, he would be before the open courts, as soon as he applied, on a writ of habeas corpus, and the government would be compelled to state the charge against him. In France he is in the power of a practically irresponsible despot. This is the criminal law of France, which is not administered by the administrative courts, but which not only bears a strong—a family—resemblance to the law as practiced before the political tribunals, but is intimately connected with it; for if the officials who pursue the private citizen are governed by malice or by personal enmity, or by a desire to put away temporarily a dangerous or troublesome political opponent, there is no punishment awaiting them for false imprisonment. Often, it is true, justice is done—more often than otherwise; but the great danger of any human institution lies in its possibilities. — Harper's Weekly.

#### THE STORY OF A BRAVE WOMAN.

The schooner Olive Jeannette left South Chicago for Midland, Ont., in tow of the steamer L. R. Doty, Monday afternoon, October 24. She barely weathered the terrific and memorable storm of the next two days, in which the steamer was lost, with, as far as can now be known, her crew of about fifteen men. On Friday morning, October 28, the schooner was towed back into port at Chicago. The following thrilling story is made up of extracts from the account of the affair given by the Chicago Chronicle:

Acres of wreckage are all that has been seen of the steamer L. R. Doty, but its tow, the schooner Olive Jeannette, with its sails in tatters, its forward cabin smashed to splinters, its spars broken, its davits bent, its life-boat gone, its rudder broken and its crew half dead, came into port yesterday morning, after having wallowed two days and nights in the trough of the sea, with its captain lashed to the wheel.

These formed the crew of the schooner: David B. Cadotte, captain; Hiram Combs, mate; Herbert Mills, seaman; James Meiscner, seaman; John McQuarry, seaman; William McCormick, seaman; Miss Frances Browne, cook. . . .

The wind blew sixty miles an hour and the waves ran thirty-five feet high, and when the rudder was broken the

ship rolled into the trough of the terrific sea. Solid masses of water fell on the ship as if it had been a cigar box under the iron wheel of a truck wagon. . . .

It was not yet daylight Tuesday morning when the engine was broken and the steam pump put out of service. All that day the men worked the hand pump, just forward of the after cabin. Sometimes the seas would fall on them and completely submerge them. They would hold to the iron braces to keep themselves from being swept overboard and resume their work at the pump. Two days and two nights the five men worked at the pump, but all the time the water was gaining on them and the ship was slowly settling.

Of the heroic crew none was greater in heroism than a thin little pale-faced woman who was the cook. This was Miss Frances Browne, who had been in charge of the galley of the Olive Jeannette for three years. For ten years she has been a ship's cook on the lakes. She tied on a life preserver when the water got ankle deep in the galley, fastened herself to a stanchion with a bowline and made coffee for the half-dozen and drenched men. The water ran through the galley at times as it runs through a mill-race. Everything that was not fastened down was carried away. The carpet was ripped off the saloon floor and the oil cloth was torn from the floor of the galley.

Once the water got high enough to put out the fire in the galley stove, but she managed to start it again so she could make another pot of hot coffee. It would have been useless for her to have tried to cook anything else, and she didn't try. She held the pot on the stove and sometimes when the vessel heeled over sharply and the coffee was spilled she filled the pot again and held it to the top of the stove until it was ready to make a stimulating drink for the wetted and half-drowned men at the pump and the captain, who was still resolutely at the wheel. She said afterward she hadn't done anything worth mentioning. She told a story of the storm that was dramatic.

"We hadn't any business going out into that weather last Monday," she said. "I saw the sky looked bad and the storm signals were out, but Capt. Smith, of the Doty, was a daring man and as our boat was only the tow we went along. When we got out into the storm it was too late to put back. Things got to looking bad mighty soon too. When the line parted and the Doty began to leave us I could see her stern sinking and the waves washing over her smokestack. I knew she would never

see land then. I thought I knew that we would never see land either. There wasn't anybody on this boat who ever expected to get into port and everybody began to say his prayers. We didn't have anything else to do but to pray and work the pump after the rudder broke.

"None of the men would put on a life preserver. They said they would not hold them up. I put on one, though, and I kept it on until I could see the tops of the tall buildings as we were being towed in here this morning. Nobody slept. There wasn't any place to sleep and there wasn't any time to sleep. The forward cabin was gone and this cabin was flooded with water all the time. There are two cats here, and they seemed to know the danger. When the first sea broke into the cabin they sprang out of the bed where they were and came bouncing in here and right upon the back of the mate, who was standing at the stove drinking a cup of coffee. There wasn't any swearing, because there never is any swearing on this ship. The captain won't allow it.

"The captain is a nery man. He stayed at the wheel without leaving it for an instant from the time the storm began until it was over. When the rudder broke he still stayed there, because he said he could watch the motion of the ship better. I would crawl out there and hand him a cup of coffee. Twice when I got out of the little companionway a wave knocked me back into the cabin and spilled the coffee. I couldn't cook anything warm, but made sandwiches and took them to the men, so they wouldn't have to leave the pump on account of weakness from hunger. They didn't eat much, of course—just about one sandwich apiece in two days—but they drank all the coffee I could make. The coffee was what kept them going.

"It felt good, I tell you, to see that steamer come to take a line from us. It was the City of Grand Rapids. It didn't make much headway, but the two tugs, the Morford and the Hackley, soon came and they brought us into port safe.

"These men haven't had a change of clothes since they left South Chicago last Monday. The seamen had all their things in the forecabin, which was carried away, and when they found time this morning to put on some dry clothes they didn't have any. They were wet to the skin in the cold water from Monday evening until Friday morning. The captain is wearing the same clothes that he wore while he stood at the wheel, half the time covered up in the

seas that were coming over. I haven't had a change of clothes, either, for that matter. I haven't had time to think of clothes."

#### SLEEPING ON "THE ROOF OF THE WORLD."

After the conversation had ended from weariness, we wrapped ourselves up in our sheepskin coats, and crept together in the Kirghiz manner, that is, on the knees, face down, with the forehead toward the ground, and the heels to the windward side. One must be a Kirghiz in order to be able to sleep in this position. My servant even snored. As I, however, did not get a wink of sleep, I tried a more European position; but, pierced through by the cold of the night, I was obliged to get up and move about.—Dr. Sven Hedin, in Harper's Magazine.

We should acquire no territory which may not within a reasonable time be converted into states and share with us the full blessings of free government. A nation which is committed to the proposition that all men are of inalienable right equal before the law can make no provision beneath its flag for subject peoples. Taxation without representation is still tyranny. Government by arbitrary power is still despotism. Force, even when touched with philanthropy, cannot be employed as a chief instrument of free government.—Edwin Burritt Smith, before the Sunset Club of Chicago, as Reported in Chicago Record.

Whenever there is an Indian war nowadays we can reasonably expect to be told that the particular Indians involved in it are the most worthless and desperate of their race. This is the regulation plea put up by the philanthropists who want the Indian's land, his money, his provisions or his whisky. Whenever the Indians are to be robbed it will be observed that there is a desperate uprising, in which, however, the redskins are invariably worsted and driven back, and their goods and chattels are stolen in the interest of civilization.—Memphis Commercial-Tribune.

The ten public iced water fountains in Boston cost the city during the summer 40 cents apiece per day. Water Commissioner Murphy is now making arrangements whereby ice will be cut this winter from reservoirs belonging to the department, thereby making the cost of the free iced water next summer merely nominal.—Chicago Chronicle.

If there is any religious dogma which more than another is incapable of proof by logic apart from life it

is immortality. What we mean by this is, that the doctrine is within the horizon of those who have lived through certain experiences, and it is not clearly discernible by those who have not. Those to whom the relation of man to God is a reality, who have that sense of the "abysmal depths of personality" which a religious life gives, to whom experience has shown—even in the depths of human love—glimpses of indefinite capacities in the soul which are never exercised or fully exhibited in this life, come to have a conviction of the worth of the individual human soul which is the strongest a priori argument for the doctrine. But the argument comes more from life than from logic; more from the living apprehension of Theism and of the capacity and dignity of human nature, than from any speculative proof. . . . We have here the answer to Huxley's objection against arguing from our desire for immortality to the truth of the doctrine. Apart from the idea of God we have no such desire.—The London Spectator.

Pat (who has been acting as guide and has been pointing out the Devil's This and the Devil's That for the last two hours)—An' that's the Devil's Punch-Bowl, yer anner.

Tourist—The devil seems to own a good deal of property about here, Pat!

Pat—Ye're roight, yer anner. But, loike most av the ither landfords, he spins most av his toime in London!" —Punch.

Waiter McKinley—Fried eggs! Fried eggs! Fried eggs!

Sagasta—But, my dear sir, when there is nothing but fried eggs on the menu, what choice have I?

Waiter—Well, sir, you have the choice of eating fried eggs or refusing them.—Nuevo Mondo, of Barcelona, Spain.

"Mister, won't you please buy a ticket?"

"Ticket to what?"

"To our church entertainment."

"What's the entertainment for?"

"To pay the expenses of a entertainment we had last week!"—Puck.

Drunken men have been appointed to keep the Indians from drinking; lazy men to teach them industry; and corrupt men to teach them morals.—Said at the Lake Mohonk Indian Conference.

The great cause of revolutions is this—that while nations move onward constitutions stand still.—Macauley.

Miss Estelle Reel, as Wyoming's superintendent of public instruction, has charge of all the buying and selling of school lands and has increased in this line the state's income from \$100 to \$1,000 a week.—Chicago Chronicle.

"Uncle, what is a dyspeptic?"

"A dyspeptic is a person with an optimistic appetite and a pessimistic digestion."—Puck.

God speed the hour, the glorious hour,  
When none on earth  
Shall exercise a lordly power;  
Nor in tyrant's presence cower,  
But all to manhood's stature tower,  
By equal birth!—  
That hour will come, to each, to all,  
And from his prison-house the thrall  
Go forth.  
—William Lloyd Garrison.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT.

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

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

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. A Business Tendency (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. What Favorable Balance of Trade (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).

#### FRIENDS

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

#### THE PUBLIC

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

#### Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by  
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,  
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:  
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

#### SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 140  
Wason Street, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St  
West.