

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1898.

Number 33.

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.

The latest proposition of the Spanish peace commissioners is to arbitrate a dispute over the scope of the Philippine clause in the protocol. There is nothing to arbitrate. The protocol is quite plain, and the Spanish government along with all the rest of the world well knows it. If the United States choose to go into a land-garbing speculation in the Philippines, there is nothing in the protocol to prevent. It is only a question of physical force. Throughout this whole Spanish-American affair, from the beginning to the absurd suggestion of arbitration, Spanish diplomats have shown themselves to be mere pettifoggers.

Gov.-elect Roosevelt, of New York, who posed so long as an independent in politics, and fooled so many simple people thereby, has done one thing more to convince the observant that he is Boss Platt's man for good. There was little room to doubt this, when he took so kindly to Platt's machine nomination; but he has now appointed as private secretary to the governor, the governor's confidential man, no other than one of Platt's most loyal lieutenants.

Doubtless there are still some confiding people in New York who believe that Roosevelt is not under Platt's control. For Roosevelt has blue blood, and he doesn't pick pockets by moonlight. But that only goes to show how acute Abraham Lincoln was when he said that "you can fool some of the people all of the time."

One of the interesting features of the alliance between Platt the "boss"

and Roosevelt the "independent," is the promise it gives of a battle royal at the next republican national convention between William the Unco-Guid and Teddy the Terrible Terrier, with Hanna and Platt for stake-holders.

The results at the late elections, though disappointing to the democrats, were better for them than a victory. A democratic victory this year would almost have insured a republican land-slide two years hence. That is evident from one consideration alone. Had the republicans been defeated, the democrats would have been charged with responsibility for the ensuing hard times.

To the great mass of the American people, the times are no better now than they were three years ago. The papers are full of advertisements for situations, and empty of advertisements for workers in legitimate occupations at remunerative pay. Storekeepers feel the pressure intensely. Small manufacturers are barely able to keep going. Failures continue in large numbers. Business houses are overrun with applications for work. Wages are falling. Commercial profits are receding. All classes are suffering, except monopolists who have secured privileges through paternalistic legislation. Yet with preconcerted and persistent cries of "prosperity!" a vague impression has been created that times are better than they were and are steadily improving. It is no uncommon experience to be approached by hungry men who in the same breath in which they ask you for God's sake to give them work, speak enthusiastically and honestly of the return of prosperity! Even better balanced men, who know that prosperity has not returned, have been so far affected by

all this prosperity touting as to believe that it is almost here. Now, in fact, general prosperity has not come nor will it come within the next two years or more, if indeed it ever comes again. Everybody would realize this if the parrot cry of "prosperity!" were to cease. How easy then it would have been, had the democrats carried the recent elections, for the plutocrats to have thrown up their hands despairingly and announced that the good times, so near at hand if not actually here, had been "shoo"-ed off by a democratic hoo-doo.

As it is, the republicans must keep up their prosperity touting for two years yet to come, in spite of persistent depression. Before long that will be very fatiguing. Whistling up the wind is exhilarating exercise, but it becomes debilitating when prolonged. And many a moon before the next presidential election, even the simplest and most be-fooled of the hungry masses will realize the trick that has been played upon them. Inflated imaginations cannot forever satisfy the craving of empty stomachs. And when the trick does finally expose itself, the republicans instead of the democrats will be held responsible for the hard times, by the unthinking to whom republicans now appeal and upon whose votes they now depend. Then it will be seen that the recent elections were not such an ill-wind to the democrats.

While the republicans have retained a congressional majority, and so been burdened with responsibility, as they ought to be, in accordance with their own teachings, for everything that may cause or contribute to hard times, their majority in the next house is not large enough to be reassuring. In the present house it is 47, and an equal majority was expect-

ed by the republican prophets in the next; but while the majority in the next house is not yet determined, it will be less than 20 and probably not more than 13.

To one class of voters, the elections were unalloyed disappointments. We refer to single taxers. In Delaware, where there is a single tax party, probably the only one in the world, the single tax vote of two years ago was not increased. In fact there was a falling off. But as that was about in the proportion of the falling off in the total vote, the single tax party may be said to have held its own. In 1896 its vote was 1,146 in a total of 38,520; in 1898 it was about 900 in a total of about 30,000. But the managers of the little party claim to have defeated the democrats in Delaware and to have made the state republican.

In Washington and California the single tax question was at least a more sensational feature of the elections than in Delaware. The republicans of Washington fought a "local option in taxation" amendment to the constitution, which the democrats, populists and silver republicans had indorsed, doing so upon the ground that this amendment would be an entering wedge for the single tax; and in California they fought Maguire, the nominee for governor, of the democrats, populists and silver republicans, upon the ground that he is a well known single tax advocate. In both states the attack upon the single tax was virulent. In both the issue was refused, nominally because it was not an issue of the campaign, but really because the fusion managers were in sympathy with the republicans regarding this question. The constitutional amendment was defeated in Washington and Maguire was defeated in California.

A correspondent, Alfred Cridge, of San Francisco, writes vigorously in condemnation of the fusion managers in California. Among other things he says:

Somebody has said that "God hates a coward." I don't know; but I know

that men do. And it is largely because men hate cowards that Maguire, who could have been elected governor by 40,000 majority, was defeated by a non-entity by 17,000. At least 30,000 voters hated even the appearance of cowardice. In speaking of cowardice I do not refer to the candidate, but to the fusion state campaign committee.

For some two months past two morning papers of San Francisco have averaged two columns of mud-slinging at the single tax in each issue. They asserted that under the single tax, taxes upon working farmers and small city home owners would be more than tripled. In fact, as I could easily prove by statistics in abundance, the single tax would reduce the taxes on those classes in this state by from 25 to 75 per cent. But the fusion state campaign committee, acting just as it would had it been bribed, would not allow the subject to be discussed. Any well informed single taxer could have refuted the enemy's proposition in this instance inside of 10 minutes on the platform or a column of a daily paper. I had the figures to do it, and did it, in type, so that any farmer could comprehend it. But the orders were silence. Nothing could be said of the single tax except that it was not an issue.

When small farmers and home owners are thus made to believe, or even to suspect, that a candidate for any office whatever is fundamentally determined, whenever opportunity permits, to confiscate the farm or home by taxation, what else is to be expected but that they will vote to keep such a candidate out of office? That he might have no power to enact such a law in such an office would count for little with them. That a tiger might be securely fastened in a cage would not reconcile a farmer to having it on his premises. The farmers were taught, without contradiction, to regard Maguire as a confiscator of farms and homes. Can it be wondered at that enough of them, who would have been favorably disposed had they known either the candidate or his doctrine, accepted the uncontradicted assertions of their enemy, when their friends, with abundant opportunity, failed to show them that the single tax instead of confiscating their homes would make them more secure and lessen their taxes?

Mr. Cridge believes that the fusion committee was bribed, and that a bolder campaign would have won the fight. We should hesitate to accuse the fusion committee of venality. On the face of things, its attitude is fully and fairly explained by the fact that none of the organizations it represented was favorable as an organization to the single tax. Probably a

large majority in every one of those organizations would, after a two months' campaign, have voted against the single tax. To have made the campaign upon that issue, therefore, would have insured defeat unless enough republicans could have been won over to make up to Maguire for the loss of his own supporters. Moreover, the question was really not an issue in the campaign. What Maguire believed as to the principles of taxation had nothing more to do with the real questions at issue than what he believed as to religion. That a bolder campaign would have given more luster to his name, whether he won or lost, and that it would have been better for single tax propaganda, is doubtless true. But then the question arises, whether a political committee or a candidate would have the moral right to make a campaign in advocacy of a radical doctrine held by the candidate, which the party had not only not adopted but to which as a party it was opposed.

Single tax men will have to learn patience. Their reform will not be accepted in a day. Its very simplicity, justice and perfection, will delay the time of its acceptance. While superficial reforms are quickly taken up by the multitude and as quickly cast aside, fundamental reforms are but slowly apprehended by the many whom they would benefit, and are most easily fought off by the few whom they would divest of unholy power. Those were not idle words of Henry George when he wrote:

The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be it would never have been obscured.

Nor when he predicted that—

for the man who seeing the want and misery, the ignorance and brutishness caused by unjust social institutions, sets himself, in so far as he has strength to right them, there is disappointment and bitterness.

Disciples of Henry George who ponder those words will lose no heart in the fight because an election or two goes against them. They will rather

take on new hope because their adversary has been drawn into the open struggle.

The election in North Carolina forcibly recalled the days when it was part of the democratic faith that white men have an inalienable moral right to wallop niggers. The negroes of the coast counties were terrorized by armed white mobs, who forbade them to exercise their suffrage rights, openly proclaiming that the negro who dared to be a candidate for office should suffer death, and as openly intimating that negroes who valued their lives must stay away from the polls. In this way a republican county was made democratic in the wink of an eye; and to celebrate the despicable victory, the office of the colored paper at Wilmington was gutted and its editor driven out of the state.

The men who engaged in this series of outrages for the purpose of denying equal rights before the law to their neighbors, have the effrontery to call themselves democrats. Among them, too, were professed ministers of Christ, idolators who, because with wooden literalness they believe in the allegory of Jonah and the whale, suppose that they may disregard the two great commandments and ignore the golden rule. And all these rioters, these pulpit defilers, these hypocritical democrats, these murderers, these cowards, claim to belong to the respectable classes, and to be of a superior race!

In what are they superior? Certainly not in respect for the law. Not in peaceableness. Not in neighborliness. Not in Christian forbearance. Not in anything except that which by certain standards makes the cut-throat superior to the gentleman. And what is their title to respectability? They themselves lay stress upon the false pretense that they are the taxpayers. Of all the taxes of Wilmington these lawless white mobs pretend to pay 96 per cent.; and therefore they claim the Christian right to disfranchise the negroes.

But in fact the negroes of Wilmington pay as much in taxes as the whites, if not more. What the whites mean when they say that they are the taxpayers is that they deliver most of the tax money to the tax collector. But they get a large proportion of this money from the negroes. They make the negroes pay that much more for almost everything they consume. Negroes rent houses if they don't own them, and the white landlord adds his house tax to the rent. Storekeepers do the same as to the taxes they have paid; when they sell the negroes goods, they add the tax to the price. And while each white man in Wilmington probably pays more taxes than each negro, because he consumes more goods and lives in a better house, yet as the negroes largely outnumber the whites, it is reasonably probable that the burden of the largest proportion of the taxes of Wilmington is borne not by the whites but by the negroes. The talk about the whites paying 96 per cent. of the taxes is empty talk. As to the largest part of this per centage the whites are not taxpayers at all; they are only tax collectors. They have as much reason, and no more, for saying that they pay 96 per cent. of the Wilmington taxes, as the county collector would have for saying that he pays all the state taxes. It is one of the infamies of indirect taxation, that it enables mere tax collectors to pose as taxpayers.

By way of excuse for such outrages upon the legal and moral rights of negroes as that of last week at Wilmington, it is often urged that the presence of the two races in large numbers in the same community makes an irrepressible race conflict. But it is not a race conflict. That is only the surface appearance. It is a labor conflict. The whites want to make the blacks their virtual slaves.

If the negro question were a race question, the whites would be glad to have the negroes leave, just as the whites of the Pacific would be glad

to have the Chinese leave. But that is something they bitterly oppose. When a negro exodus set in some years ago from some of the southern states, the whites opposed it in the same lawless way in which they had opposed the enjoyment by the blacks of civil and political rights. The exodus would have deprived them of their laboring class! The whites don't want the negro to leave; neither do they want him to have the rights of an equal before the law while he remains. Those whites who own the land of the south want the negro to work it for a bare living, giving the rest of their produce to them in ground rent or its equivalent; and the whites who don't own land are assinine enough to play into the hands of those who do. That is what makes the race question.

The essential character of the race question at the south is illustrated by the disposition shown by the whites towards negroes in respect of common social rights. A bill is now pending before the Georgia legislature, which requires separate sleeping cars for whites and blacks. It was the outcome of a railroad episode in which two state senators figured. These senators had engaged berths at one end of a Pullman. They afterwards found that a negro and his wife had a berth at the other end; whereupon with characteristic good feeling and chivalry they demanded that the negro and his wife be ejected. Their demand being ignored, they introduced in the legislature the bill for separate sleeping cars. Now does any one suppose that it was mere race feeling that prompted the ruffianly demand of those two senators? It was nothing of the sort. At any rate, it was only that kind of race feeling which yearns to make servants of people of weaker races. Had that negro and his wife been servants, and had they been sleeping in the car on chairs or on a bench, they might have gone on breathing the same air and snoring in the same key with the highbred Georgia senators without evoking a protest. It was not their presence in

the car, but their presence there as equals, with equal accommodations, that the senators objected to. During the very night when these white men demanded the ejection from their sleeper of the negro passengers, they no doubt endured without a murmur the presence, and the sleeping presence too, of the negro porter. But he was a servile porter, not an equal passenger, and in that distinction lay the whole difference.

This difference is illustrated in the rules governing day cars in the south. Negro cars are provided and no negro is admitted to the white cars. That is the rule. And against independent negro passengers the rule is strictly enforced. But negro servants traveling with white masters or mistresses, are freely admitted to the white cars. The question is not one of race, but of servitude. It is not a question of disagreeable race characteristics; it is a question of democracy. The attitude of the whites toward the negroes at this late day in the nineteenth century, is precisely the same in motive and principle as the attitude of French seigneurs towards French peasants in the middle of the eighteenth.

It would be an oversight to dismiss the elections and the events connected with them, without considering the effect of the returns upon business. Immediately after election it was proclaimed by the whole prosperity chorus, that business had responded briskly to the republican victory. Investigation revealed, however, that the kind of business which responded was Wall street business. According to one rather frank republican report, the election returns which made the control of the next house at Washington by the republicans fairly certain, "struck Wall street as positive forces" and "the strongest market seen in many days resulted." Further examination disclosed the interesting fact that this strong market related to watered stocks. That is to say, the republican success in the elections had inspired

confidence in the ability of overstocked corporations to squeeze enough unearned profits out of the public to make their water yield dividends. But the search for prosperous markets for other things was vain. Farm products fell, as watered stock rose. Verily, of such is the kingdom of Hanna.

What this prosperity for watered stocks means to the public may be inferred, though only in slight degree, by some figures which the United States Investor recently published. That periodical named seven industrial trusts which have outstanding common stock to the amount of \$145,295,000, representing not one dollar of tangible property. This vast amount depends for such dividend paying power as it may ever acquire, upon the strength of the monopolistic privileges of the corporations that have issued it. Should monopolies be fostered by government, it will yield dividends; should monopolies be broken down, it will be blank paper. Such watered stock is bought and sold on the stock exchange as "pure gamble," to borrow a phrase from the Investor. When the prospects for monopoly look bright, the stock rises; when the prospects for monopoly look dull, it falls. Its price, therefore, indicates the views of the stock gamblers as to which political party is most friendly to monopoly. When the first election returns showed a democratic tinge, watered stocks on the exchanges were dull; when the success of the republicans became certain, watered stocks strengthened. The inference is plain. Draw it.

According to an estimate just given out by the war department the number of officers and men who were killed or died of wounds in the war with Spain, up to September 30, was 345. The number that died of disease up to the same date was 2,565. From this the war department argues that as these losses were out of a total military force of 275,717, the number to the thousand, 10.5, is exceedingly

small. But that is not the way to estimate the percentage of loss. Much the larger proportion of those 275,717 men never went where, with decent care, they would have run any risk of death, either from wounds or disease. The number of men in the army who got to the seat of war was little if any more than 50,000. The deaths, therefore, relatively to those who saw actual service, were more than 55 in the thousand.

At last the failure of the Dingley bill as a revenue raiser is conceded. Chairman Dingley himself has given out an interview in which he says that the war revenue bill will be retained in force without material alteration, and that the tariff bill will not be revised. Thus the war revenue bill is to be used as a supplementary revenue raiser. It is intimated, of course, that this is made necessary by war expenses. But that is not true. The cost of the war up to date is less by several millions than the \$200,000,000 which Secretary Gage borrowed for war purposes. Not a dollar of the war revenue is needed, therefore, for war purposes. But the war revenue law is to be retained in force. The only reasonable inference, which does not imply a corrupt purpose, is that it is needed to eke out the income of the ineffective Dingley bill.

Mr. Hanna does not leave the public to draw this inference. In an interview telegraphed from Cleveland on the 13th by the Associated Press, he states it as a fact. Under the Dingley bill, he says, "we are not getting very much revenue, because we are exporting instead of importing; and something must be done to meet these new conditions." For one thing, he proposes a duty on tea and coffee; but he thinks "it will be necessary to retain some of the features of the war revenue measure" also. It is quite apparent that both Mr. Hanna and Mr. Dingley realize that but for the war, with its war bonds and war revenue, and with only the Dingley bill to depend upon, the treasury would be already running low.

In the interview put out by Mr. Hanna, and from which we quote above, that distinguished keeper of the presidential conscience indulges in a breezy remark on the general subject of taxation, which is truly refreshing. After profoundly observing that "the revenues for the support of the government must be raised in some way," he announces that according to his idea, "the indirect is the best way." The indirect way of raising revenues, let us explain, is what Thomas G. Shearman calls the "crooked" way. It is not remarkable, therefore, that Mr. Hanna should prefer it. It is remarkable though that he should state his reasons so frankly. He thinks the indirect way of raising public revenues is the best way, because, to quote his own words, "when the people do not realize that they are paying a tax, there is no complaint"!

Many statesmen, not only of the Tweed and Hanna type but of other types, have advocated indirect taxation before; but seldom have they been candid enough to admit that they prefer it because it makes it possible to tax the people without their knowing it. A Frenchman once described indirect taxation as a method for "plucking geese so as to get the most feathers with the least squawking;" but he was opposed to indirect taxation. Mr. Hanna is probably the first among its supporters to advocate it for the very reason which the Frenchman urged against it.

If we consider Mr. Hanna's reason for supporting the indirect method of taxation, we may find that such as he have personal motives for liking that method. If people can be taxed without knowing it, as Mr. Hanna truly asserts that under indirect taxation they can be, they can, of course, be taxed unfairly, also without knowing it. Consequently, by means of indirect taxation, men like Hanna may avoid pretty much all taxation, while the masses bear taxation in burdensome degree; and yet, not knowing that they are taxed at all, the

masses will not realize that they are paying the taxes of millionaires like Hanna as well as their own. Is it uncharitable to infer that we have here the true reason for the preference of rich plutocrats for indirect taxation?

While speaking of Hanna, it may be worth while to call attention to his disappointment over the reelection of Congressman Lentz, from the Columbus district in Ohio. Lentz had made himself especially obnoxious to the administration, by reason of his candor and vigor, and Hanna set out to prevent his return to congress. The district was close, Lentz having carried it two years ago by something like 100. So Hanna hurried home from Puerto Rico the Ohio regiment whose members belonged in that district. They were rushed through quarantine, yellow fever or no yellow fever, and straight on to Columbus, just in time to vote. But Lentz increased his majority by some 700. That regiment must have voted for him.

A convict recently released from a Swiss penitentiary, where he had been confined for three years under a life sentence for murder, but whose innocence has just been discovered, is not only released but will receive a compensation in money for the wrong done him by the public. That is an approximation to justice. In this country, under similar circumstances, the prisoner would have been gravely pardoned for the crime he had never committed, and with the brand of a convict upon him and robbed of three years of his life, would have been left to make his way in the world, a penniless man, as best he might.

One of the leading clergymen of Cleveland, Dr. Louis Albert Bangs, is a very estimable gentleman, who, since he has much to say about many things, sometimes talks serious nonsense concerning things which he knows nothing about. He did this not long ago in answer to a question as to taxing land values to the exclusion of everything else. Dr. Bangs thought

that such a tax would enhance the cost of living, by increasing the value of land. That answer proves that he had neither read upon the subject nor thought upon it. Had he read he would have learned that however much economists may differ on other things, they agree that the abolition of taxes on goods would cheapen them, and that the imposition of higher ad valorem taxes on land would cheapen that. Had he thought upon the subject he would have realized that a heavy tax on land values would drive vast quantities of unused land, both in city and country, into the market; and his own common sense would have told him that with the land market glutted land cannot rise in value.

The Insurance Monitor, of New York, one of the oldest and best of American insurance journals, takes positive ground, in its November issue, against the attempt, of which ex-Comptroller Eckels, the Chicago banker, has made himself spokesman, to identify the legitimate interests of insurance companies with the plundering interests of monopoly corporations. It does so in connection with an able and peculiarly interesting article which it publishes from the pen of Franklin H. Wentworth. Mr. Wentworth in his article insists that fire insurance companies are competitive business enterprises, without monopoly characteristics, and that they have nothing in common with monopoly corporations; for which reason he urges them to identify themselves with the people in the fight against monopoly. By way of introduction of Wentworth's article, the Insurance Monitor says editorially:

Mr. Wentworth is among the first to point out a stupendous blunder that has been persistently made in attempts to defend insurance as a corporate interest, allied with railroads and other natural monopolies. It has suffered from the society in which it has been forced, and with which it has nothing in common but its corporate form. Let future defenders of insurance note the distinction drawn below and not fall into the error of the well-known banker at Chicago.

DECEPTIVE STATISTICS.

In a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune, an attempt was made editorially, upon the basis of the Aldrich report on wages and prices, to show that the gold standard has increased wages. I agree with the Tribune that the free coinage of gold and silver, instead of benefiting, would injure our industrial classes. But I take exception to the Tribune's method of opposing free coinage—a method which is unfortunately common with gold standard advocates.

The strength of the free silver movement lies in the fact that it is a protest against existing economic conditions, and it cannot be met by an array of fallacious statistics intended to demonstrate that the deplorable conditions complained of do not exist. These statistics fill no empty stomachs, and they deceive but very few wage-earners. Workingmen know from observation and personal experience that facts differ from the figures.

While such statistics as those from which the Tribune's anti-silver argument is made may soothe people in comfortable circumstances, whose opportunities for observation are limited, they only excite the animosity of wage-earners against men who either ignorantly or willfully thus misrepresent their condition. By so discrediting the cause they advocate, opponents of free silver have done more to confirm wage-earners in the opinion that free coinage is desirable, than have the avowed advocates of that policy. Knowing the fallacy of the statistics from their own observation and experience, wage-workers very naturally conclude that a cause which is generally supported in that manner must necessarily be a bad one.

The Tribune editorial referred to above, assumed \$500 as the average annual earnings of all classes in 1878, and claimed an increase in 1890 to \$680—a sum more than double the probable average earnings of wage-earners in that year. The probabilities in this respect are confirmed by the census report on the subject of agriculture.

Agriculturists are our largest industrial class. Theirs is a class which

comprises about 40 per cent. of all persons having gainful occupations. Yet the average earnings of this class amounted in 1890 to but little more than one-fourth the sum set up by the Tribune as the average earnings of all classes of wage-workers.

Let us examine the census figures on the subject. The value of farm products in the census year, 1890, was \$2,460,107,454. Dividing this amount by the number of persons reported as engaged in agriculture, 8,565,926, we have as the gross value of the product per worker, \$286. Now, the value of the agricultural investment—land, improvements, live stock and implements—is reported at \$15,982,267,689. Computing interest on this amount at five per cent., and allowing ten per cent. of the value of machinery and implements (\$151,587,638) for renewal and repairs, and then deducting these amounts from the value of the agricultural product, there remains as the earnings of 8,565,926 agricultural workers, the average annual sum of only \$188.

This is without making any deduction whatever for repair of buildings, fences and other fixed improvements. And while it is true that some small agricultural earnings are not included in the census, it is also true that a large body of labor (1,913,373), returned as not specified, is partly accounted for by this foot note: "In agricultural districts agricultural laborers are often reported simply as laborers." The agricultural laborers thus included in the unspecified class, but not considered in the above computation, would more than correct the influence in the same computation of the omission of any small agricultural earnings. It is a safe conclusion, therefore, that according to the eleventh census, the earnings of farm workers, comprising about 40 per cent. of the industrial class, did not exceed in 1889 an average of \$188. That sum is very far short of the \$680 which the Tribune assures its readers was the average earnings of all classes of workers in that year.

Turning from the census report regarding all farmers to the statistician of the department of agriculture (see report No. 4, Misc. Series, Dep't of Agriculture), regarding farm labor-

ers, we find that average farm wages in 1890, without board, were \$18.33 per month. This was the average only while the laborers were employed. If we assume constant employment the year around—and it is well known that in fact employment was not constant—the average annual earnings of this numerous class of wage-earners in 1890, as found by a republican statistician after careful and extended investigation, were only \$219.96 per year, or less than one-third the amount set forth by the Tribune as the average earnings of wage-earners in all occupations.

The same agricultural statistician further shows that, instead of a gradual advance of three per cent. a year, the amount the Tribune claims for all wages, farm wages fell from \$19.87 a month in 1875 to \$16.42 in 1889. They rose to \$18.94 in 1882, but after that there was no increase down to 1892, and in 1892 they had fallen to \$18.60.

In the face of the statistical data regarding agricultural earnings and farm wages, showing that instead of having risen they have fallen, it could hardly be expected that other wages would have risen. There is no reason why the course of wages should greatly differ in other industries from the course of wages in agriculture. And an investigation of the data of the Aldrich report shows that no such advance in general wages has been made as the summaries of that report indicate and the Tribune claims.

In the Aldrich report the data are juggled for the purpose of concealing a decrease in the rate of wages in recent years. But even the juggled summary which the Tribune cites as its authority indicates an increase of less than six per cent. from 1872 to 1891, by simple average; and it is only ten per cent. even when averaged according to the statistician's fallacious estimate of relative importance. Either increase is very much less than an average increase of three per cent. a year, the increase claimed by the Tribune.

But the data of the Aldrich report are astonishingly inadequate. Table 45, which may be found on page 176, Part I., of that report, professes to

show "relative wages in gold in all occupations." Yet for agriculture, our most important industry, there is not a solitary wage quotation. The figures of the table for three periods are as follows, the year 1860 being taken as the base with an average of 100:

Year.	Simple Average.	Average According to Importance.
1872	152.2	153.2
1879	139.9	139.4
1891	160.7	168.6

According to the statistician's estimate of relative importance, the increase shown for 11 years is only 20.9 per cent., or less than 2 per cent. annually; while by simple average the total increase is but 14.9 per cent.

It is out of these figures that the Tribune computes an average increase of three per cent. a year. It does so by finding the difference between 1879 and 1891 to be, according to the statistician's average, 29.2—or, roughly, 30—and dividing by the number of years, thus producing as a rough result the average increase of three per cent. a year. But per centum means per hundred, and an increase from 139.4 to 168.6 per cent., though it is nearly 30 in amount, is nowhere near 30 per cent., as the Tribune makes it out to be. To get the increase of percentage, we do not subtract the lower from the higher percentage, as the Tribune has done; we must divide the amount of increase by the amount on which the increase is reckoned. Neglecting to compute percentage correctly, it is not strange that the Tribune's editorial writer failed to discover the true character of the summary of the data of the Aldrich report.

But the figures of this report themselves are deceptive. They do not represent, as they purport to do, either the increase in the average rates of wages in all industries or in any industry.

A little intelligent examination will reveal this fact.

If the wages of the foreman of an establishment increase during a given period 100 per cent., and the wages of the other employes increase during the same period ten per cent., there has not been an increase in wages for the establishment equal to the av-

erage of these two percentages of increase—namely, 55 per cent. Or, if the foreman's wages have increased 100 per cent. and those of the other employes, say 100 in number, have decreased ten per cent., there is not an increase for the establishment of 45 per cent. To argue the contrary would be absurd. Yet it is by means of precisely such a method of computation that the statistician of the Aldrich report has shown an increase in wages since 1872.

He puts the foremen and overseers of departments each in a class by themselves, and gives to their increased wages—which represent not increased pay for the same service, but increased pay for increased skill and responsibilities—the same weight as the increase or decrease in the rates of wages of classes embracing a large number of employes. The rates of wages for each class in 1860 being taken as the basis, and represented by 100, the ratio of wages to 1860 of each class is computed separately for each year. The ratios of each separate class are then equated or averaged, and the amount thus obtained is taken as the average wages of the industry. And thereupon the averages so obtained for each industry are equated or averaged, and the result adopted as the average wages for all industries!

In one brewery establishment, which may serve for illustration, the wages paid to the brewer increased from 1855 to 1891, 650 per cent. This brewer being put in a class by himself, his increase of wages is given equal weight with the wages of each of four other classes which in 1891 embraced 70 employes. In consequence of this deceptive method of computation, there is an apparent increase of wages for the whole establishment of 165.9 per cent.; whereas if we omit from the calculation the class comprising but the one brewer, the averages for the remaining classes show an increase for the same period of only 90 per cent. Thus, the increase in the wages of but one man—an increase which does not indicate that he is getting better pay for the same work, but only that he is getting better pay for a position of increased responsibility requiring greater skill and efficiency—is made to nearly double the apparent

average increased wages for the entire brewing industry, an industry for which this one establishment stands as the sole representative in the Aldrich report.

The brewer in the illustration, who received \$23.96 per day in 1891, was evidently a salaried official, and probably the principal owner of the stock of the concern; yet he was included as a wage-earner, just as in the manufacturing statistics of the last census the salaried officials of the corporations and the estimated value of the services of employers are included in the wage account for the purpose of making in annual earnings an apparent increase for which in fact there is no foundation.

The census computations which purport to show annual average wage earning in the manufacturing industries are obtained by dividing the total amount paid as wages by the average number of employes. But, inasmuch as the total wages are the earnings of the whole number of employes, the true average annual earnings can be obtained only by dividing the total wages, not by the average number of employes, but by the total number.

Nevertheless, these census statistics, juggled though they are for the purpose of indicating an increase of wages, show no such annual earnings as the Tribune assumes to be the average for all occupations. The average annual earnings of operators proper—that is, omitting officers, firm members and clerks—were \$444.90. As this amount was obtained by dividing the total wages by the average instead of the total number of employes, it in fact represents the average earnings only of the few who had constant employment. A consideration of the partially employed would very much reduce that average. If we assume that there was only 25 per cent. of unemployment, that is that wage-earners were employed three-fourths of the time, the average annual earnings would be reduced to \$333.30, which is probably not far from the mark.

The fallacious character of the census computations of annual earnings in manufacturing industries I have irrefutably demonstrated in the Jour-

nal of Sociology and the Journal of Political Economy, publications of the University of Chicago, and to my articles in those magazines I respectfully refer the Tribune editor and all other persons who may need or desire information upon the subject.

In the mining industries, the census presents no summary of wages; but in the volume devoted to those industries we may find that in the three principal ones, wages, including superintendence and office force, were as follows:

	Total Average Number of Employes.	Total Wages.
Coal	299,552	\$112,286,099
Iron ore.....	38,227	14,409,151
Stone	82,374	30,555,877
	420,153	\$157,251,127

The apparent average earnings, therefore, in those three mining industries, were only \$374.27. This average is too large, since it is obtained by taking the average number of operators instead of the total number, as the divisor. But that vice enters into all the estimates of wages, and the result corresponds substantially with the result in the other industries. Allowing for unemployment and the fact that the salaries of superintendents and of the office force are here included in the data, the wages thus shown agree fairly well with those in the agricultural and manufacturing industries.

Instead, then, of an increase in wages from \$500 in 1878 to \$680 in 1890, wages in 1890, even according to the data of the census and the Aldrich report were considerably below \$374.

To this I might add that in the Bulletin of the Department of Labor for September, 1898, at page 669, Col. Wright shows that wages were higher in 1892 than they have been since. Upon his authority they rose slightly from 1890 to 1892, but ever since then have steadily declined, and were lower in 1898 than in 1872, measured both years in gold.

The statistical pretense that wages have been increasing is supplemented by the equally false pretense that the purchasing power of wages has also increased, and the deceptive compu-

tation of the Aldrich report and of the census bureau are responsible for both deceptions.

It is true that the prices of many commodities have decreased, as the result of improved methods of production. But it is also true that many things have become necessities of life that were not necessities formerly, notably car fares; and that the wage-earner has been obliged to increase his outgo in many other ways, notably for rent.

To sum up the whole matter: Better than any statistics for the purpose of showing the condition of the laborer, is the fact, patent to every intelligent observer, that it is no longer possible, as it formerly was, for the wage-earner to rear a large family respectably. To eke out his scant earnings he is compelled to send his little ones to the factory or the department store when they should be at school. Improved methods of production, which should naturally result in increased wages, notoriously have the contrary effect. By depriving the laborer of employment, labor-saving machinery increases the competition of the labor market.

The data of the Aldrich report, which show a large increase of wages prior to 1872, show a decrease, measured in gold, since that date. Badly juggled as these data are, it is only by ignoring 1872 as the date of highest wages, and mingling the decrease since then with the increase before, that an average increase is made to appear at all. But worse than the decrease of wages since 1872 is the lack of employment since that year, at any wages at all. Wage-earners at Virden but recently engaged in a sanguinary struggle for an opportunity to work at wages scarcely above the starvation point; and the Virden case is not exceptional.

The advocates of free silver coinage offer that policy as a panacea for the bad condition of wage-workers. What has the Chicago Tribune to offer? Nothing at all, but a lot of statistics doctored for the purpose of making it appear, in the face of what every intelligent man knows to be the truth, that the condition of wage workers is improving. Is it any won-

der that such advocates of the gold standard drive away more working people than they convert? that they make more free silver men among the working classes than free silver advocates do?

H. L. BLISS.

NEWS

Later returns from the recent elections do not to any important extent alter the results as we reported them last week. Nevada, which was for some days in doubt, remains in the fusion group where we placed it, and William M. Stewart is confident of reelection as a senator in congress. The fusion governor was elected. West Virginia, which we placed in the democratic group, though very close, is likely to remain in that group. Gov. Atkinson, a republican, has conceded the legislature to the democrats. The democrats also elect a congressman in one of the four districts, thus displacing a republican. But Nebraska, which we gave to the republicans last week, has been carried by the fusionists by a small majority in a reduced vote. The republican candidate for governor received 83,569 votes, being 13,735 less than were cast for McKinley in 1896, and 440 less than the republican candidate for supreme court judge received in 1897. On the other side, the fusion candidate for governor received 91,108 votes, which is less by 24,772 than Bryan received in 1896, and by 11,720 than the fusion candidate for supreme court judge received in 1897. As compared with 1896, the percentage of loss is 21 to the fusionists and 13 to the republicans. The fusion plurality, which was 13,576 in 1896, is this year 2,539. Both parties claim the legislature, and therefore the United States senator.

The political complexion of the states as indicated by the latest returns is as follows:

REPUBLICAN STATES.

California.	New Hampshire.
Connecticut.	New Jersey.
Delaware.	New York.
Illinois.	North Dakota.
Indiana.	Ohio.
Iowa.	Pennsylvania.
Kansas.	Rhode Island.
Massachusetts.	Wyoming.
Michigan.	Washington.
Maryland.	Wisconsin.

DEMOCRATIC STATES.

Alabama.	Montana.
Arkansas.	North Carolina.

Florida.	South Carolina.
Georgia.	Tennessee.
Kentucky.	Texas.
Louisiana.	Utah.
Minnesota.	Virginia.
Mississippi.	West Virginia.
Missouri.	

FUSION STATES.

Colorado.	Nevada.
Idaho.	Nebraska.
South Dakota.	

The result of the elections has induced Col. Bryan to express his views on public affairs for the first time since his enlistment in the army. On the 15th he gave out an interview through the Associated Press. Noting that the result was not a sweeping republican victory, but a modified response to the argument used in the campaign, "that a republican defeat would discredit the president in the eyes of foreign nations while his commissioners were engaged in making a treaty," Col. Bryan says of the election that—

It was not a trial upon the issues now before the people, but a successful plea for a continuance of the case. The people have not accepted the gold standard; they have not fallen in love with the plan to give the banks a monopoly of the issue of paper money; they have not decided to retire the greenbacks; they have not surrendered to the trusts.

These questions were forced into the background by the declaration of war, but they must be faced again as soon as peace is restored. The Chicago platform presents for public consideration certain vital, economic questions. That platform has not been abandoned by those who indorsed it in 1896. It will be reaffirmed in 1900, because it gives expression to the hopes and aspirations of a large majority of the party.

When the democrats, populists and silver republicans favored Cuban independence they understood that war would give a temporary advantage to the party in power, but they were willing to risk defeat in order to aid the people fighting to be free.

In Idaho, where women voted at the recent elections for the first time, several women were elected to office. Mrs. Clara Campbell, a republican, of Ada county, and Mrs. Hattie Noble, a democrat, of Boise county, were elected to the legislature, while Miss Permeal French was elected state superintendent of public instruction, and nearly all the county superintendents of schools chosen were women. We referred last week to the good effect the presence of women at the polls had produced in restraining disorder and crime.

These elections have given the country another woman suffrage state. South Dakota voted to extend the voting right to women.

In connection with the political rights of women, one of the interesting results of the elections is the election in Michigan, where woman suffrage does not prevail, of a woman to an important public office. Mrs. Merrie L. Abbott, of West Branch, was chosen by popular vote to fill the office of prosecuting attorney. She ran on the democratic ticket. An attempt had been made to keep her name off the ticket by legal process, but the attorney general refused to interfere, holding that the question of her eligibility could be determined only by the courts, in case of her election. That question will now come up. Women have heretofore been held eligible to public office by the courts in states where they are not allowed to vote, notably in New York, where several women hold the office of notary public under the sanction of court decisions.

We were able to report last week that the expected race conflict in North Carolina on election day had not broken out, but that the terrorized negroes had remained away from the polls in such numbers as to enable the democrats to carry the strong republican coast counties of the state. Two days after election, however, the whites of Wilmington attacked the negroes there, killing at least 9 and wounding others.

The immediate cause of the outbreak at Wilmington appears to have been the publication by the negro newspaper, the Record, of an editorial which gave offense to the whites. In what way it gave offense is only vaguely reported. It is said to have been an attack upon the white women of the south, but the only part of the offensive editorial that has been definitely reported indicates it to have been not only a just but a conservative consideration of the situation. The reported extract is as follows:

The editors pour forth volleys of aspersions against all negroes because of the few who may be guilty. If the papers and speakers of the other race would condemn the commission of crime because it is crime and not try to make it appear that the negroes were the only criminals, they would find their strongest allies in the intelligent negroes themselves, and together the

whites and blacks would root the evil out of both races.

From this it may be inferred that instances of condoned crime among the whites—possibly on the part of white women—were given, which caused the resentment of the white mob. Whatever the cause, a mass meeting of whites notified the negroes that the editor of the Record must leave by a given hour or his office would be attacked and he, if found, summarily dealt with. No reply having been received by the appointed time, an armed mob, under the leadership of A. M. Waddell, formerly a member of congress, gutted the Record office and set it on fire, meantime firing guns and pistols at random and yelling and howling. The burning of the Record office frightened the negroes of the town. Rumors spread among them that the negro quarter was to be sacked and burned; and they gathered in groups upon the street, terror-stricken. One of these groups in the negro quarter was ordered by the white mob to disperse, and either refusing or neglecting to do so, it was fired upon by volleys. After this, other shooting was done, some of the negroes engaging in it and slightly wounding, all told, two or three whites. In each instance the offensive negro was riddled with bullets. During the afternoon following this outbreak, the republican board of aldermen, intimidated by the violence of the morning and influenced by demands for its resignation, resigned. As each member in turn resigned, his place was filled by the rest of the board with a candidate named by the mob of the morning, until the whole board had been changed. Then the mayor resigned. Thereupon the leader of the mob, Waddell, was elected mayor in his place, members of the mob were appointed special policemen, and by night order reigned in Wilmington.

Similar lawlessness occurred at Phoenix, Greenwood county, S. C. But this was an election riot and it occurred on election day. A man named Tolbert was the republican candidate for congress. To gather evidence as to the disfranchisement of negro voters, for use before congress in a contested election case, he provided boxes in which disfranchised negroes could deposit affidavits of their intention to vote for him and of their disfranchisement. The whites made a violent attack upon the men at this box, who resisted, and in the fight several were killed. After the fight, a band of

whites scoured the country and killed all the negroes they could find who had taken part in the fight. With only three or four exceptions all the victims of this murderous episode were negroes, and with only one exception the injured whites were acting with the negroes.

From the elections and their results and incidents, American interest reverts to the closing up of the war with Spain. Gen. Miles's report as commanding general of the army, the filing of which was noted last week, has since been given out for publication. It is a lengthy document, full of detail. Another important report has been delivered at Washington. It is the report of the commission for the surrender of Puerto Rico to the United States. The work of that commission is now complete.

No joint meeting of the peace commission at Paris was held on the 12th, pursuant to the adjournment noted last week. At the request of the Spanish commissioners the date was changed from the 12th to the 15th; and on the 15th, also at the request of the Spanish commissioners, the date was again changed, this time to the 16th. A brief meeting was held on the 16th, at which the Spanish commissioners submitted their argument against the American claim to Philippine territory. The argument was delivered in manuscript and was not read, but it is reported to be a denial of any authority for the commission to act upon the Philippine matter under the protocol. The Spaniards are said to insist that the words of the protocol, empowering the commission to "determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines," do not warrant any reference to Spain's withdrawal from the Philippines, except on her own terms. They, therefore, propose arbitration as to the construction to be placed on the words "the control, disposition and government." The joint meeting of the 16th adjourned until the 19th, when the American reply to the Spanish argument is expected.

While the fate of the Philippines hangs in the balance before the peace commission, the Filipino junta at Hong-Kong, representing Aguinaldo's government, sends a memorial to President McKinley complaining of unjust treatment of the Filipinos by officers of the American army and

navy. This memorial charges that false reports against the Filipinos are being spread, and that the tension is such that a shot fired by an irresponsible Filipino or American soldier might lead to great bloodshed. It therefore begs President McKinley to help the junta to control its own people "by directing American officials at Manila to temper their actions with friendship, justice and fairness." One of the clauses in the memorial is as follows:

From the commencement of hostilities, the Filipinos acceded to all the American requests; but after bottling up the Spaniards in Manila the Filipinos were completely ignored when the Americans advanced, and thus deprived of the fruits of victory. Now, after months of campaigning, the Filipino troops have been ordered beyond the suburbs, where they have no quarters and where supplies are difficult to obtain. All our launches have been seized because of foolish rumors that we would attack the Americans, and when we asked explanations we were not even answered. The Spaniards, of late the enemies of the Americans, have been shown every consideration, while the Filipinos, their friends and allies, are often treated as enemies.

Cuban evacuation proceeds slowly but steadily. Gen. Wade reported officially on the 10th that the Spanish have been carrying out the terms of evacuation to the best of their ability. He says that ships arriving from Spain have been promptly and fully loaded and dispatched, and that about 20,000 men have already gone. Serious trouble is being caused by lack of transportation and also by lack of money with which to pay off the Spanish soldiers; but Gen. Wade appears confident of Gov.-Gen. Blanco's ability to deal with the condition.

Of the concerns of other nations than our own, those of France still attract most general attention, though the two subjects which have given peculiar interest to French politics, the Dreyfus case and the occupation of Fashoda, are apparently well in the way of being finally disposed of.

The court of cassation, having the Dreyfus case before it, has notified the minister for the colonies that it has decided that Dreyfus shall be informed by telegraph of the commencement of revision proceedings, and be afforded opportunity to prepare his defense. Only three days before, the ministers had refused either

to permit Mme. Dreyfus to communicate the news of the revision of his case to her husband, or to communicate it themselves. It was upon this refusal that she appealed to the court of cassation, which has decided in her favor. Opinion is growing in Paris that Dreyfus is to have a fair trial.

As to the occupation of Fashoda, France seems to have abandoned all claims. Major Marchand, accompanied by Capt. Baratier, who had brought Marchand's report to Paris and returned with the reply of the French government, is now on his way back up the Nile to Fashoda; and it is reported that upon his arrival his expedition will immediately withdraw, leaving the Anglo-Egyptian authorities in full control.

With the Dreyfus case and the Fashoda question thus in hand for a safe disposition, each minister of the French cabinet is able to devote his attention to his own department, and the minister of finance is reported as preparing to push through what in France is regarded as the leading measure of socialism—a progressive income tax. He relies for success upon the budget committee, just elected by the chamber of deputies, which for the first time in the history of this republic is composed with a radical majority. Of its 33 members 18 are thorough-going radicals.

Crete has at last been rescued from Turkish government. Chakir Pasha, the last Turkish commander in Crete, sailed away on the 15th, and on the same day, Prince George of Greece, the newly appointed high commissioner in Crete, for Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy, sailed for Crete from Austria.

Labor affairs in the United States during the week have been marked by a shoe strike in Massachusetts, a Michigan decision against coercive boycotting, the annual convention of the Knights of Labor at Chicago, and the settlement of the Virden strike.

The Massachusetts strike involves seven factories and 2,500 employes. It began on the 14th at Marlboro, and its cause was the refusal of the employers to recognize the shoe workers' organization.

The anti-boycott decision in Michigan was rendered by the supreme

court of that state. It reverses the lower court, which had refused an injunction against boycotting without violence, but with threats to ruin an employer's business by diverting custom.

No such settlement of the Virden lockout as that which has just been made was expected. This is the place of the bloody riot over the importation of negro miners from Alabama, which occurred a few weeks ago. The lockout had lasted since April, the operators refusing to pay not only the wage scale, but a very considerable reduction from the scale, and holding out stubbornly even against arbitration. But they have at last agreed to pay the scale of 40 cents a ton for hand mining and 30 cents for machine mining, to reduce their charge to miners for powder from \$2.25 to \$1.75 a keg, and to make other concessions. The lockout is therefore at an end and the troops have been withdrawn. The locked-out miners returned to work on the 16th.

NEWS NOTES.

—The sixth annual horse show was opened on the 15th at New York.

—The Belgians are reported to have captured Bohr, a dervish post 90 miles north of Rejaf, on the White Nile.

—The sugar trust, on the 14th advanced all grades of domestic refined sugars one-eighth of a cent a pound.

—The winter session of the Italian parliament opened at Rome on the 16th, with the delivery of the speech of King Humbert from the throne.

—The annual convention of the equal suffragists of Illinois was held on the 15th and 16th at Springfield. Mrs. Julia Mills Dunn was elected president.

—A snake show, the first ever held, was opened on the 14th at Grand Central Palace, New York city. More than 1,000 varieties of snakes are on exhibition.

—A semi-monthly winter mail service for the Yukon region, via Juneau and over the regular route through Dawson to Circle City, has been established by the United States.

—The emperor of Germany left Darmstadt on the 10th, and at Beirut boarded his yacht, which was reported in Cretan waters with the emperor on board, on the 14th.

—On the 13th all Switzerland voted, under the referendum, in favor of making the civil and criminal laws of the different cantons uniform throughout the republic. The plurality was 170,000.

—Campos Salles, the new president of Brazil, was inaugurated on the 15th

at Petropolis, 25 miles north of Rio Janeiro. The officers of the Iowa and the Oregon participated in the ceremonies.

—A brief meeting of the Anglo-American commission for the adjustment of questions between the United States and Canada, which has heretofore been held at Quebec, was held on the 15th at Washington.

—For unknown reasons numerous expulsions of Danes from northern Schleswig, Austrian Slavs and Polish Jews from Breslau, and Dutchmen from Gronau, Westphalia, have taken place within the past two or three weeks.

—The Boers of South Africa have captured the mountain stronghold of the hostile natives whom they had previously driven into the mountains, as noted here two or three weeks ago. The cause of the war was the massacre of a missionary and his family by the natives.

—Li Hung Chang has been degraded by an order requiring him to concert measures with the viceroy of the province of Shantung to prevent future inundations of the Hoang-ho. He pleaded age and infirmity, begging to be excused from the mission, but the Dowager Empress was unyielding.

—The street car question in Milwaukee has been settled. The street car company is guaranteed freedom from competition until 1924, upon the payment to the city, over and above taxes, of an annual sum which in the aggregate will not be less than about \$2,000,000. At the expiration of the period specified, 1924, the city is to be at liberty to purchase the roads.

—On Oct. 16 Dawson City was for a second time swept by fire. Forty of the principal buildings were burned and \$500,000 worth of property destroyed. The fire was caused by a drunken woman who threw a lighted lamp at another woman. The previous fire, which occurred a year ago, was caused by the same woman, who then threw a lighted lamp at a man.

—Luccheni, the assassin of the empress of Austria, was tried at Geneva, Switzerland, on the 10th for her murder, and on the same day was convicted and sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for life, the extreme penalty. He was taken on the following day to Eveche prison, and on the 14th gave formal notice of appeal. His counsel, assigned by the court, made the plea of insanity.

—At one of the Hooley bankruptcy hearings in London this week, Sir Wm. Marriott, a queen's counsel and a leader in the conservative party, admitted that Hooley had paid him £1,000 for his introduction into the aristocratic Carleton club, and £50,000 for a baronetcy to be procured from the conservative ministry, the latter sum

having been returned upon failure to procure the baronetcy.

—The oldest actress in the world, Clara Fisher Maeder, died on the 12th at Metuchen, N. J. Mrs. Maeder began her career upon the stage 81 years ago, at Drury Lane theater, London. She was then 6 years old. Her last appearance upon the stage was at Baltimore in 1889. She had played Desdemona to Forrest's Othello, and Juliet to Kean's Romeo; and among the other famous men with whom she had performed were the elder Wallack, in a long past generation of actors, and Richard Mansfield of the present generation.

MISCELLANY

THE AVERAGE MAN.

For the Public.

A ring, wanting workers to fill
The private political bellows
That further some simmering plan,
Choose, instead of the one with will
And merit beyond his fellows,
A nondescript average man.

At sight of a bone or a crust,
Doglike, he follows his betters;
Does such windy work as he can,
And cheerfully lies when he must,
Forging the while his own fetters—
This pliable average man.

Is he of the laboring force,
His shreds of unformed convictions
Lying under his boss's ban?
It's only a matter of course—
These little entailed restrictions—
To the abject average man.

Higher up he is still the same,
Still ready to fawn, and follow
The wake of the prosperous clan:
Our magnates are never to blame
With this echo, weak and hollow—
The politic average man.

The thing he will fiercely resist
Is a righteous innovation;
In the martyr who leads the van
He finds only an anarchist
Just ready to wreck the nation—
This peaceable average man.

When our race has made forward move,
He has stood through all the ages
Since ever a cycle began,
Firm fixed in his narrowing groove,
Mumbling the backward pages—
The negative average man.

Whatever of high or brave
In this age of disillusion,
What remnant of honor we scan,
May the heaven of mercy save
From mental and moral confusion—
That blight of the average man.

D. H. INGHAM.

A CELESTIAL CONVERSATION.

Said Zeus to Minerva: "Minnie, I wish you'd go and see what's the matter with those mortals. They complain that they are short of all the things they need."

So Minerva opened the windows of heaven and looked out.

She reported to Zeus that men were crowded together in the towns, and

wanted to know if they couldn't have a new continent to discover.

So Zeus said: "Well, mortals don't get any of the things they need off that unused land; just scoop it all out and make a new continent of it, and set it down in the middle of the sea."

"All right," said Minerva; "but the new continent will produce more things, and the merchants and farmers—from whom we get the most of our offerings—say they can't sell what is produced now."

"Do what I tell you," said Zeus; "they can't sell anything to the vacant lots, anyhow."

"Well," said Minerva, rather sulkily, "I suppose that will do; but why not let the oracle tell them to fine everybody that keeps one of those patches of earth vacant; the land would be where they could get at it and would be used?"

"You're not so stupid as you look," Minerva," said Zeus; "but I'm afraid they wouldn't do it."

Said Minerva: "Oh, yes, they would. They're always fining each other for all sorts of things—for going into business and for not doing anything, and for making drink and for drinking it, and building houses and buying goods and selling them."

"You make me giddy, Minerva, with your imagination. You shouldn't invent such things."

"They do; it's truth I'm telling you," said Minerva; "they call them 'duties,' and 'taxes,' and 'imposts,' and 'licenses,' and 'tariffs,' and I don't know what besides, and think they do them all a lot of good."

"Well," said Zeus, "if they are so foolish as that, how are they to know how much to charge for each lot that people keep vacant?"

Minerva turned away to hide a smile. She said: "I am the goddess of wisdom, and I will tell them to charge each for every piece just what it's worth."

Zeus said: "Minn, you're always springing some new-fangled far-off scheme on me, and I've no time to discuss panaceas for the woes of men. What I want to do is to really help those people out of their troubles, so you just start them a Sunday school to teach them common sense."—Bolton Hall, in *The Coming Nation*.

IN THE MATTER OF PROTECTION.

The Republican party is clearly committed to Expansion. It is eager for the annexation of the Philippines with their 8,000,000 savages. Then why should it not be many times as eager for the annexation of Canada with its 5,000,000 prosperous, hard-working, civ-

ilized members of its own race? "Trade follows the flag," it says of the Philippines, thereby implying that the Republican party is out for trade. But trade—a thousand-fold more—would follow the flag in Canada; whereupon it is discovered that the Republican party is not only not out for trade but is positively afraid of it. It is anxious to spend millions of dollars for the little trade of the Philippines, but it wouldn't take the incomparably greater trade of Canada as a gift.

You hadn't heard of any proposition to annex Canada? And you really thought the Republican party would consider it a valuable possession if we could get it honestly? Then you have been misled by a note in Republican utterances which we think is described by the word "guff." We have had a number of statesmen representing us in a Joint High Commission at Quebec, for the purpose of considering this proposition, among others. Not actual annexation, it is true, but a substitute with all its advantages and none of its disadvantages. There was a rich land, humming with people that buy a thousand dollars' worth of goods where the Philippine Tagal buys ten; no battles to be fought to gain an entrance, no standing army to be kept there and no expenses of government—but we didn't want the trade. "American industry must be protected," that is, except where we can take a country by force of arms.

And why, you ask, should not American industry be protected from the competition of the Tagals? or, if that doesn't amount to much, as yet, why should it not be protected from Hawaii with its Chinese labor and from the closely cultivated islands of Cuba and Porto Rico? Well, if you discover why, you must worm much deeper into the Republican intellect than Puck has been able to do. The Protectionist has heretofore fanned the fear of foreign competition by depicting the low estate of foreign labor. The "pauper" labor of Europe was bad enough; but infinitely worse was the Asiatic with his wage of ten cents a day, his wardrobe a pair of cotton trousers and his daily allowance of food a pint of rice? Yet here are the preachers of this gospel welcoming the "yellow peril" in Hawaii, and its twin in the West Indies, with open arms, and getting up on their dignity about it too. They swallow the camel, but when it comes to the gnat—the civilized North American living the other side of a certain line, wearing underclothes, boots, a hat, an overcoat and plenty of other garments, demanding and securing a fair wage for his labor and spending it for manufactured products of all

kinds, they strain. Truly there is a great deal of politics in Politics.—Editorial in Puck.

THE MOVEMENT FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES IN BRITAIN.

The tory party, which is the landlord's party, stands as a rock for "vested rights," and it is likely to be joined by the old whig element in the liberal party in parliament the moment that any general attack is made on land values.

It is to the radicals and the mass of the liberal party—to such men as those who forced the repeal of the corn laws, the extension of the suffrage, and the establishment of public schools—that those who favor the taxation of land values now look.

And the liberal party, bending to popular will, has in many ways committed itself to the principle. In its party platform, known here as the Newcastle programme, it declares for a "reform in the land laws such as will secure . . . the just taxation of land values and ground rents." And at the conference last November of the Scottish liberal association, composed of representatives of all the liberal associations in Scotland, it was unanimously declared:

"That, whereas the land question lies at the root of the social problem; that land monopoly, which is directly caused by the value of land being exempt from taxation, forces labor into involuntary idleness, and thus creates an unemployed class; and, whereas, the values of land are created by the presence, industry and growth of the people, this conference is of opinion that the taxation of land values should occupy a foremost place in the programme of the liberal party, to be dealt with at the earliest possible moment by—

"First, the abolition of the breakfast table duties—the duties on tea, coffee, cocoa, dried fruits, etc.

"Second, the substitution of a direct tax on the value of land, apart from improvements.

"Third, the reform of the valuation acts to provide for the separate scheduling in the valuation returns of the values of land and the values of improvement, with a view to separate assessment, etc."

This showing that the liberal party is pretty well committed to the principle of taxing land values, the question arises how do the liberal party leaders stand? Sir William Harcourt, the party leader in the house of commons, stands on record as saying that "the question of ground values affects the whole country, local and imperial,

and ought to be considered in any plan of local taxation." Ex-Premier Rosebery says: "The taxation of ground values is a principle which will not be allowed to die until it has been carried into effect. It is a principle which is becoming universally established, because it has been acknowledged to be both just and sound." John Morley says: "I cannot doubt that the principle involved in what is called the question of ground values is one which must make quicker and quicker way into the minds and opinions of the people. It will be thought an intolerable thing that men should derive enormous increments of income from the growth of towns to which they have contributed nothing . . . that they shall be able to go on throttling towns, as they are well known to do. It is impossible to suppose that the system will not be vigorously, persistently and successfully attacked."

This much for the liberal party principles and the liberal party leaders. What of the followers in parliament? There is nothing that shows just how the present members stand, as the question has not been raised in any formal way, and has not even been brought to a vote, except when, on March 8, 1895, even the Tories not daring to challenge a division, it was unanimously resolved by the house, on Mr. Provand's proposal: "That no system of taxation can be equitable unless it includes the direct assessment of the enhanced value of land due to the increase of population and wealth and the growth of towns."—Daily Whig, of Kingston, Ont.

PRINCE KRAPOTKIN ON THE ASSASSINATION OF THE EMPRESS OF AUSTRIA.

Extract from a letter from Prince Krapotkin to Dr. George Brandes, as published in the Chicago Tribune.

As you did, as the whole world did, I felt my heart contract with pain on hearing of this murder—of this fresh issue of the social struggle. An elderly woman, unhappy even long before the catastrophe of her son's death, could she awake anything but pity in those who knew intimately the story of her private life? Women and children, at least, ought to be spared in the terrible strife that now holds our attention—and in the still more frightful battles which are in preparation.

If, by the sacrifice of my own life, at least some of the victims who have fallen in this struggle during the last 30 years, in the streets and on the scaffolds, could have been spared, I should not hesitate to offer myself. But even that would be far from suffi-

cient. What goes before everything else is to teach mankind the great art of thinking.

Analyze Lucheni. He saw the light on a bench in one of the Paris boulevards and never knew his parents. The orphans' homes of Paris and Parma took care of his education in the manner that is peculiar to such institutions. When only ten years of age he was thrown out in the streets to shift for himself without the aid of relations or friends, to find shelter and food without help. My heart nearly ceases to beat when I think of this child—and of many, many others.

At the age of 21 this man drifts into a society of persons who teach him the art of killing—killing his fellow beings right and left, without regard to youth or old age, whenever he is ordered to shoot for the so-called salvation of the community. Somebody has told him that this consideration outweighs all others, even that of human lives. And then his comrades send him to Africa on the mission of committing murder!

He has held the position of valet to a cavalry officer. This would not tend to make him respect the human family.

He was among the fugitives who invaded Switzerland after those revolts which were induced by sheer hunger and the mass murders to which they led.

What could he learn from this?

He learned that both in the north and in the south hungry peasants were massacred; that in Milan the authorities fired at the people for three days in succession, killing workmen by hundreds; that grape shots were poured into the streets, while no one stopped to think if the children whose bodies became pierced by bullets were responsible for the revolt or to consider how the many fatherless and motherless little ones managed to exist. He learned that fashionable women in Milan offered flowers to the soldiers and told them to rid society of the rioters—to knock them down and to aim well!

Well, my dear George Brandes, what if our own children had been surrounded throughout life by such things: Consider for yourself if not most likely their instinct of pity would have been extinguished, and if there would not in their minds have been inspired hatred toward all those who cultivate their own inclinations without considering for a moment that misery for which their wealth was bought.

People often say in a thoughtless manner that modern society is dancing upon a volcano. This is dire truth. One cannot easily imagine what hatred the hearts of poverty-stricken people

really harbors, but I know it. This hatred is something fearful. And yet, do not the actions of our courts as well as the results of militarism impress them with this idea: Human lives count little; away with sentimentality? If it becomes necessary for the preservation of society to take the lives of sundry workmen and peasants, it must by all means be done.

And then we are wondering at such people as reverse the conclusion and think that it might be equally necessary for the maintenance of order to assassinate a few hundred prominent men and women!

The magical power of an execution is at present the first article of an average man's faith. Most politicians, some ministers and certain philosophers recognize it. What higher view, then, could be fostered by the poor classes? Can we reasonably expect them to arrive at any other conclusion than that expressed by Lucheni in the following words:

"We must kill among the wealthy classes, regardless of names or persons; this is the only way in which others can be brought to realize what wrong society does."

It would be absurd to expect any other conclusion than this.

In those days when everyone talked of the deplorable fate of Queen Elizabeth, there were made four attempts of derailing railroad trains in the vicinity of Northampton. Huge stones and heavy beams have been heaped upon the tracks of different lines, with the view of demolishing the express trains. Now, if this end had been accomplished, which would have been far more terrible than the murder of any one person, who would be responsible for it? Certainly neither socialists nor anarchists. No doubt the crime would have been done by some individual in whose mind misery would have created implacable hatred toward mankind in general.

This, then, is the volcano upon which man is dancing.

Stabbing a woman in the heart solely because some may suppose that this heart has never harbored a feeling of pity toward the sufferers among men—surely, this is awful.

But as long as one carnage after another—such as those in Italy—is inflicted upon those who cry out for sheer want of bread, and as long as mankind continues to foster the idea that human lives count nothing in view of what is termed the common welfare, one victim will fall after another, and will continue to fall, even if everyone who sympathizes with the poor classes and pon-

ders over the psychology of misery be condemned and executed for telling his thoughts.

THE DOUKHOBORTSI IN SIBERIA.

The Public has recently stated that William Dean Howells, Bolton Hall, Ernest H. Crosby and Isaac N. Selligman, of New York; Jane Addams, of Chicago; William Lloyd Garrison, of Boston; Rev. George D. Boardman, of Philadelphia, and N. O. Nelson, of St. Louis, are assisting Tolstol in locating in this country a Russian sect known as Doukhobortsi, or spirit wrestlers. This sect, founded in 1750, has suffered Russian persecution for 100 years. The following account of the recent sufferings of some of these brave people in Siberia is taken from the Manchester (England) Guardian, being written by "a Russian correspondent."

That the remains of the Doukhobortsi have been allowed to emigrate from Russia, and that 1,126 of them had actually reached Cyprus, was stated in the press some time ago. Those who knew the story of these Quaker-like people and their sufferings (through which in three years one out of four have died) for their adherence to the Christian principles, hailed this news as indicating the complete delivery of the martyrs. But they hardly knew that all the Doukhobortsi of the conscription age were carefully excluded from the permission to leave the country. They had to go into exile to the remotest wilderness in the extreme north of Siberia for the period of 18 years, i. e., the terms of Russian military service (both actual and in the reserve). In 1897 the first party of them, 35 in number, was sent under escort from Tiflis (in the Caucasus) to the Yakoutsk province. Their families were not allowed to join them. News from Yakoutsk, which is the chief town of the province, travels very slowly. But the province itself covers an area nearly 13 times larger than Great Britain and Ireland, and the Doukhobortsi were exiled to a region hundreds of miles distant from that town, with which it has but casual and rare communication. No wonder that information concerning the journey and settlement of the exiles reached us only recently.

Of the 35 who originally left Tiflis four died before they reached Yakoutsk, a fifth being not able to proceed further, as he was in the last stage of consumption. This is not to be wondered at, notwithstanding the splendid build of the Doukhobortsi, as they were regularly tortured by hunger, flogging and beating day after day in the "disciplinary battalion" to which they were confined before their exile. One of them thus came to his death in the battalion. On September 3-15, 1897, the party, consisting of 30 prisoners,

left Yakoutsk. They possessed about three pounds each of their own money. At Yakoutsk they were told they would be allowed three pence a day per man, but that with the New Year that allowance would be stopped, and that they must not expect a farthing more from the government. It must be understood that they were on their way to a mere desert, so that all necessaries had to be bought in Yakoutsk before starting. Thus the miserable pittance allowed to them, to have any real value, should have been paid them then and there in full. As a matter of fact they received (altogether) an advance of ten pounds only. It was with the greatest difficulty that they contrived to get from the government the gray cloth suits to which every prisoner in Russia has the unquestioned right. It is refreshing to notice that the local merchants, though far from being very soft-hearted people, proved to be kindness itself compared with that soulless machinery the ruling imperial officialdom; they sold their goods to the Doukhobortsi at 50 per cent. below their usual prices. With this beggarly equipment this knot of courageous people started for the river Notora, a tributary of the Aldan. * * * All their supply of food consisted of ryebread, salt, and a small quantity of "lapsha," a kind of home-made vermicelli. This boiled in water constituted their only warm meal during the day. At midday they had another meal, consisting of ryebread, salt and water only. They had no breakfast at all. * * * Only the invalids were permitted by the local police officer to pass the nights in the station-houses, the rest of the exiles having to sleep practically in the open air. Yet these men marched on, singing hymns to keep their courage up, and exhibiting such untiring endurance and manliness that the superstitious drivers (Yakouts) explained it by the presence of some "great wizard" among them. * * *

Finally, while some three miles from their destination at the mouth of the Notora, sailing became altogether impossible because of the ice. Fortunately some Toungouzs (natives of another pagan tribe, and far more generous in disposition than the Yakouts) came to their rescue and removed the luggage of the exiles to their place of settlement. This is a regular wilderness. The nearest Russian habitation is at a distance of over 60 miles; even the semi-nomadic natives cannot be found nearer than 20 miles. Tired, half-starved, but not heartbroken, the Doukhobortsi set to work at once. The Toungouzs had in that place an old

abandoned hut. This was repaired, and in three or four days the newcomers had already added a new room to it and made an oven, and in a week they ate new bread of their own baking. This was only made possible by the splendid physique of the exiles, their unswerving spirit and their habit of co-operation.

The old Toungouz who afterwards related his impressions of what he saw of their work, thus expressed himself: "Now I have at last seen regular Russians; I understand now why Russia is wealthy!" What a bitter irony! If he had only known that the rulers of Russia exert themselves to deprive their country of these Russians!

Seeing that the Doukhobortsi had to carry everything themselves, the Toungouzs protested, and made them a present of a bull with a sufficient store of hay to keep him alive over the winter. "Why, it is not proper," they said, "that man should have to carry logs and stones; God created bulls and horses for that."

All this information dates nearly a year back. How they contrived to live through the winter we do not know yet. We know only that another company of the Doukhobortsi, 50 in number, was wintering in the province of Irkoutsk, waiting to be sent to join the first party as soon as the authorities would decide the point. More exiles will follow, no doubt. The latest news of the original 29 settlers was that they complained of the inadequacy of their store of food and of the scarcity of books, and that they longed to be able to bring their families over.

LIFE ON SIX DOLLARS A WEEK.

This is the true story of how one girl in Chicago lives on six dollars a week. She stands behind the glove counter in a State street retail store and I had had a customer's acquaintance with her many months before she told me how she manages to make both ends meet so neatly. An article in a paper describing the luxury a young woman might enjoy on \$30 a month had attracted my attention and I plucked up courage to show it to her and ask her opinion. She read the clipping in the slack time at noon and handed it back to me with a smile. "I don't believe the person who wrote that piece ever tried living on less than \$15 a week," she said. "I could write a true article about how to live on six dollars a week, but it wouldn't sound so good as that does, and there isn't any money left for concerts or books. It is funny, but all those articles speak about laying aside money to improve the mind, while we real

people generally have to get along with an evening paper and a vaudeville show once in awhile."

She was neither flippant nor cynical in her observations and I asked her if she would mind telling me just how she did make ends meet.

"You won't use my name?" she asked, with the laywoman's usual suspicion of a newspaper person. When she was assured that nothing but her facts would be used she said that she was perfectly willing to tell "how she did it."

"I guess you'll have to give me some paper, for I can't very well use my checkbook," she said. "Of course, weeks vary and if I am going to buy anything like shoes or a new dress I calculate a long ways ahead. Now, first is my room. Another girl—she's in the underwear department—rooms with me, and we get a real good room for \$2.50 a week, that makes my share \$1.25. It is in a real nice good neighborhood on the West side, only a block from the cars. By going into a poorer neighborhood perhaps we would save a little on room rent, but if you don't live on a decent street you get a bad name for yourself. In our room we've got a good bed, a washstand, bureau, two rocking chairs, a table and a gasoline stove with two burners, for we cook our own breakfasts and dinners. We've got quite a large closet, for our room is the big back one in an old-fashioned basement house, and we can keep all our groceries out of sight. But I'll tell about our cooking after awhile.

"First, I'll tell you about the regular expenses that I have every week of my life and always have to count on, for neither me nor Milly—she's my roommate—has any folks that help us at all. There is always the 60 cents for my car fare, for when you stand all day in a store you can't ever walk home. Then, as we can't cook things that we can carry for lunches, we have to allow ten cents a day for lunching at some cheap place. This makes my expenses \$2.45 now, doesn't it?" she said, putting down the car fare and lunch items below the room rent.

"Now, we use about ten cents' worth of gasoline a week, buy one five-cent loaf of bread a day and for 15 cents a week the woman who rents us the room lets us have about half a pint of milk every morning for our coffee. Half of these expenses for me makes 30 cents, and we try never to allow the rest of our things to cost more than 95 cents apiece each week. Of course, sometimes we get kind o' reckless and spend more than we ought to on a meal, but we generally get scared and save some-

where else before the week is out. Now, just last night, Milly bought 15 cents' worth of ham for dinner, when we really didn't need it. Eggs are about the cheapest and most filling things to eat, and we know about 25 ways to fix them—still they always taste like eggs.

"If we had more time we could do better with our cooking, but we have to hurry around to get downtown by half-past eight at least, and lots of times we are too tired to care much at night. We drink a good deal of coffee and sometimes we have cocoa. Liver and sausage are the cheapest kinds of meats, for there isn't any waste to them, and we don't buy many vegetables except potatoes. Sometime we get five cents' worth of grapes or plums from a peddler in fruit season, but we feel that we can't afford to spend much money on eating things that aren't more filling. That word doesn't sound very nice, but you know what it means. Laundry is awfully expensive here in Chicago. We wash our own handkerchiefs and stockings and such things, but when we wear shirts and waists and linen collars you can't keep your laundry bill much under 25 cents a week, and sometimes it runs up quite a good deal higher. Let's see, adding \$1.25 a week for our board at home and 25 cents for laundry brings my expenses up to \$4 a week."

"That leaves you \$2 for clothes and incidentals," I said. "That is \$104 a year."

The saleswoman laughed. "It sounds pretty well when you count it that way," she answered. "But when it dribbles along and you have to spend it in small bunches it doesn't seem so much. We girls who clerk in the stores have to be much better dressed than the girls who work in shops and factories. The managers would very soon let us out if we got too shabby.

"I always wear black clothes. Sometimes I get awfully tired of the dark old things," she continued, looking down in some disgust at her somber gown and black apron, "but you can piece out and put different skirts and waists together better if they are all black. Right in the middle of the summer I wear dark shirt waists that have some color, like dark blue or gray, but now I have gone into my winter uniform. I generally buy clothes ready made. It is cheaper than having a dressmaker and I haven't time to fuss with them. Once I tried to make a skirt at nights and I was so cross to the customers from want of sleep that I pretty near got discharged.

"This black woolen shirt waist is just new; it cost me \$2.10, and I expect it

will last me until Christmas, then I'll have to get something else, for we rub through clothes here behind the counters. My skirt I wore all summer, but I had to rebind it the other day, and that cost 35 cents. I never pay more than \$2 for my shoes, but I can't get them much cheaper, for I have to have them comfortable when I am on my feet all day. Then lately I got me a new felt hat. Thank fortune, that was only 75 cents at a sale. I buy the cheapest kind of stockings, and a good many times they are more hole than stocking. I have got to get a new cloak this winter, and that will be a pull. Still I have saved almost \$5 toward it and it must not cost over \$7. But it's the little things that count up against me—collars and gloves and umbrellas and rubbers and hairpins. I go without veils and I don't have a new necktie more than once in three months, but it seems like something is always breaking or wearing out that I must replace."

"But when you are sick?" I suggested.

The face of the girl clouded. "That is the worst of it all," she exclaimed. "I don't dare to get sick. Why, last winter I had an awful cold, and just two little bottles of medicine cost me \$1. And then the dentist scares me almost as bad. People are always talking about saving for a rainy day, but it's awful to go without things you need for fear you'll need them worse some other time. I always think that I'll begin to save \$1 a month or something like that, but somehow it always slips out of my fingers."

"But what do you do to amuse yourself?" I asked.

"Well, on Sundays we generally spend the morning patching and mending our old duds, and sometimes in the afternoon we go out to Garfield park in the summer. Neither me nor Milly have anybody who takes us out, so we go together. About once a month we go to a vaudeville show, in the 20-cent seats, but we don't feel that we can afford it very often. Then we each of us buy an evening paper and read that at night. Once in awhile we get a book out of the public library, but we haven't much time for reading.

"That's where my \$6 a week goes," she said, handing me the paper on which she had jotted her standing expenses. "But there are a lot of girls that aren't near so comfortable as Milly and me."—Raymond Maxwell, in Chicago Chronicle.

Great Britain has accepted an invitation to take part in a conference with European powers to consider measures

for the suppression of anarchy, but Lord Salisbury confesses that he has no great hope of a successful outcome. There is no such hope in sight. Anarchy is a product of the conditions existing in Europe, and until these conditions change it will continue to flourish. The statesmen who will be called to consider it will, perhaps, note that it is most rampant in those countries where the most despotic conditions prevail. There is comparatively little of it in England, where it is never dangerous, but a great deal in Germany, Italy and Russia.—Philadelphia Ledger.

The confusion into which the political mind of the country has fallen is due to non-observance of the fact that both religion and militarism as nation creators have done their work. The national must now give place to the international ideal. . . . This will seem sheer drivel to those who maintain that in trade national interests are naturally antagonistic. But once the mind rubs off this superstition bred by our antiquated education, and rises to the view that free trade is not synonymous with a clash of interests, but in essence means mutually advantageous exchange of services. Once this view is reached there flashes on the mind the vision of a time when the whole world will be bound together by the golden chain of enlightened self-interest—a self-interest which recognizes the truth that, given the conditions of liberty and justice, the gain of one is the gain of all. Free trade thus appears in its true light as from the economic side the application of Christian ethics to the international sphere. Nations, instead of being hated rivals, each armed to the teeth lying in wait for the other, are seen to be members of a great federation, each developing its resources to the utmost, and exchanging its products in harmony and with mutual profit.—Edinburgh (Scot.) Evening News.

"What do you think of the proposition to sell the government of the Philippines to a corporation?" asked the junior alderman.

"It would never do," said the senior alderman.

"Why not? Isn't that pretty near what you've been hammering into me right along?"

"Why, naw. What would it grab its franchises from? Itself? How long would that sort of work pay? No, my boy; there's a limit even to a good thing."—Chicago Chronicle.

Joseph Jefferson, at a recent dinner in New York, said that when called upon for a curtain speech in New

Haven Billy Florence once delivered himself thus: "It is here, and to you, ladies and gentlemen, that I owe my present success in my profession. We knew each other when boys and girls. We played marbles together under the shadow of the old church, and now to receive this warm welcome from old friends—what can I say? Simply that I never can forget the people of Hartford." A man in the front row said: "This is New Haven, Mr. Florence." "I mean New Haven, of course," said Florence, gravely.

A fresh milch Cow was hard at work in a pasture when she attracted the attention of a Foreign Syndicate of Flies, who were traveling through the country in search of investments. "This is a sure thing," said the head of the Syndicate, who was a model merchant. "There are no flies on this Cow. Let us put our Trust in Her and put Her in our Trust, for it is a poor rule that will not work both ways." The Cow gave her consent by silence, as is usual in such cases. Harmony being thus restored, the Flies settled themselves on her neck and drew their Dividends from her Circulating Medium. — Henry D. Lloyd, before the Chicago Sun-Set Club.

"Does Fashoda really belong to England or to France?"

"I'm not posted; but, judging from the history of similar squabbles, it belongs to somebody else."—Puck.

"Swiggs has quit bragging."

"Why?"

"He says our country is so superior to all others that we ought to be ashamed to mention it."—Puck.

Lady—You say, professor, that tobacco is an aid to thought, and a stimulant to the reasoning faculties; but Professor Greathead says that tobacco is in every way injurious. How do you account for that difference?

The Professor—Easily enough, Madam. Professor Greathead does not smoke, and consequently he can neither

think straight, nor reason correctly.—New York Weekly.

I cannot sing the glad free songs
That the world around me sings,
While my fellows move in crying throngs
At the back of the golden kings.
—Joaquin Miller.

WANTED FOR DONATION TO LIBRARIES:

Henry George's Standards: 1887; Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26. Vol. 2, Nos. 1, 4, 5. Mail what you can, no matter how mutilated; they are very hard to obtain. 1888: 56, 68, 79, 81. 1889: 106-7-8, 12, 19-20, 3, 5, 7, 36, 7, 8, 42, 4, 52, 4. 1890: 181, 5, 6, 9, 91, 9, 202. 1891-2: 215-6, 262. Couriers: Any of the first 119 numbers, and No. 149. If sender's address appears on the package, postage will be returned—4 cts. a lb. Will anyone knowing of any portion of an index, please inform me. Ellery Ware Ellis, 26 Morris St., Everett, Mass. tf

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. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
 3. **Nero-Thea**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
 4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

FRIENDS

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

THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Published weekly by
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.**

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

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

God Winning Us.

BY

REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:
GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US.....(Incarnation)
GOD WINNING US.....(Atonement)
GOD OPENING OUR EYES.....(Faith)
GOD GROWING IN US.....(Regeneration)
GOD ACTING THROUGH US.....(Religion)
GOD CARING FOR US.....(Providence)

**SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
GERMANTOWN, PA** tf