The Public

Third Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1900. Number 140.

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.

Truth loses her battles but wins her wars.

A "Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln league" has been formed at Columbus, O. It is composed of democratic democrats and is intended to enable them to gain control of the local machinery of the democratic party for the purpose of holding it to democratic principles. This is a movement that should be taken up throughout the country. By such means alone can the efforts of reactionary reorganizers be frustrated.

One of the sweet morsels with which the anti-Bryan press of both parties have regaled their readers since election has been the assertion that Bryan ran behind his ticket in his own state. But such satisfaction as they may have derived from their inference that he is unpopular at home they must henceforth forego. The official vote of Nebraska gives Bryan 114,013 and the candidate for governor 113,018. Instead, therefore, of running behind his ticket in Nebraska, Bryan ran ahead of it by 995 votes.

Dun's Review reports 850 failures for November, with liabilities aggregating $12,300,316. This is 36 less than were reported for November of last year, when, however, liabilities were only $8,046,848; but it is 68 more, and the liabilities are $4,253,468 greater, than for October of the present year. That does not look like increasing prosperity. But there is a brighter side to the picture. Standard Oil stock has risen during the year from $475 a share to $810, thus adding to the wealth of John D. Rockefeller, in this item alone, $144,050,000.

When the "white earth" lands, of Minnesota, recently acquired by the government from the Indians, were opened for settlement at Crookston on the 4th, there was a pell mell rush of applicants—one of those disgraceful scrambles which occur at every opening for settlement of public lands. On the first day 160 persons filed applications. These exhibitions indicate an intense land hunger. They also indicate a great land scarcity. Yet it is notorious that unused land in the United States is abundant. Is not the anomaly worthy of conscientious consideration? Why this ravenous land hunger when there is so much unused land?

Great Britain is beginning to gather the fruit of her rashly unrighteous war in South Africa. It is of many kinds, but the most unpalatable must be the realization that her military prestige is gone. Gen. Mercier would not have said prior to the Transvaal war what he said this week in the French senate. He would not have contemplated the possibility of invading England with a French army. But that possibility he dared defend without reserve when able to say as he did that "the Transvaal war has shown that the British army, although brave, is not equal to the task which England expected it to perform."

The French chamber of deputies threw aside a great opportunity when in expressing sympathy for the Transvaal it rejected the resolution proposed by the socialist deputy Fourniere and adopted that of Cochin. The Cochin resolution has created an impression that the animus of the chamber was not so much friendliness toward the Transvaal as hostility to England. Fourniere's would have left no such impression. It was directed not against Englishmen indiscriminately, but against those anti-democratic Englishmen who have driven England headlong into her career of conquest and subjugation. This resolution, while applauding "the brave defenders of the South African republics," expressed "sympathy for the English democracy." That is the true attitude. The English democracy have exhibited a moral courage in this crisis of British history which is not even second to the physical courage displayed by the Boers.

President McKinley's message to the expiring congress, which is to see the old century out and the new one in, is characteristic in all respects but one. Its story of the Chinese complications is clear and concise, orderly in arrangement, forcible in expression, and polished in form. No more direct and interesting account of the matter has appeared in print. But the remainder of the message, like all preceding state papers from Mr. McKinley's pen, is a jumble of unarranged material. If any art at all has been used in massing this material, it is the art of minimizing important things and emphasizing trifles so as to confuse and mislead.

In respect to its recommendations, the message throughout has the peculiar quality of seeming upon cursory reading to be positive but of proving upon examination to be ambiguous and slippery. An example of this characteristic quality is furnished in that part of the message which deals with lynching. Here is a strong denunciation of lynching,

in general terms, to which Mr. McKinley's negro supporters may point with satisfaction, as if it were written in behalf of their race. But as its context is an international matter growing out of the lynching of Italian subjects, those of Mr. McKinley's white supporters who believe in lynching negroes may reasonably assume that the president's condemnation of lynching has only a remote and altogether academic bearing upon negro lynchings. If they do, they cannot be confronted with any more pointed passage. Except for this ambiguous allusion there is not in the whole message the slightest recognition of the appeals of American negroes to the president to exert a moral influence in their behalf by condemning in his message the horrible lynchings of negroes accused of crime. The subject has been so deftly arranged in the message as to make it appear to careless readers that the president boldly condemns negro lynchings, when in fact he does not touch that question at all. A similar instance of slipperiness is afforded by the passage on trusts. His friends who are opposed to trusts may be comforted by it. Those who favor them will certainly not be disturbed. He is on both sides or either, according to the point of view. But bolder than these instances is his solemn indorsement of both bimetallism and the gold standard. "It will be the duty," he says, "as I am sure it will be the disposition of the congress, to provide whatever further legislation is needed to insure the continued parity, under all conditions, between our two forms of metallic money, silver and gold." This solicitude for "two forms of metallic money" is calculated to commend Mr. McKinley to the Rocky mountain miners as a possible friend, while the reference to further legislation in support of the "parity under all conditions" is enough under the circumstances to retain the confidence of gold standard men. Yet the paragraph affords no basis whatever for the confidence of either. Like so much else in Mr. McKinley's message, it seems, upon cursory reading, to have a meaning one way or another according to the reader's predilection, but upon careful reading in connection with the context and circumstances, it has no meaning at all. To believe that it was intended to have puts a strain upon credulity.

It has been suggested that the message might be summarized as a proposition, with reference to China, "to fall in with the wishes of the European powers and hope for the best," and with reference to the Philippines, "to establish between this country and them the relation that exists between Great Britain and India." That summary would not be quite comprehensive, but allowance being made for the fact that the Chinese question is still involved in diplomacy, neither would it be far out of the way. Mr. McKinley may have been constrained for diplomatic reasons to assume a willingness to defer to the other powers. This would justify the spirit of the message, which is certainly one of deference to them. But no question of diplomacy has constrained him in his attitude toward the Philippine situation, and it is a perfectly fair interpretation of his message to say that he wants this country to be to the Philippines what Great Britain is to India. It is true that he gives to his message an air of deference to the wishes of congress, as if the Philippine matter were their affair and he only their agent, but the history of the negotiation of the Philippine treaty makes that air appear like an absurd affectation. It was Mr. McKinley who negotiated the treaty. It was he who insisted upon purchasing the Philippines. It was he who required that they should be not "relinquished" like Cuba, but "ceded" as property. It was he who used all the power and influence of his office to secure the ratification of the treaty as he had made it. Congress has been subject to him, not he to congress, throughout the whole affair. The Philippine policy is his policy. And more plainly than ever before does it appear from this message that his policy is being modeled upon the colonial policy of Great Britain. He would make of the Philippines an India for the United States.

In calling the Filipinos "wards of the nation," Mr. McKinley drops into one of those striking phrases of which a considerable collection are now unpleasantly associated with the history of his administration. To "criminal aggression," "plain duty," and "benevolent assimilation," is now to be added "wards of the nation." The phrase does not recall happy recollections. It was applied originally to the Indian tribes. They were the first wards of our nation, and in consequence they are now almost extinct. Is that to be the fate of our new wards? Or have we gained experience in guardianship, from which the Filipinos are to profit?

What is of most serious concern in this connection, however, is the assurance with which Mr. McKinley proclaims that some of the great principles which we have found essential to liberty are to be transplanted to the Philippines. He quotes them from our constitution. But he does not quote all, nor does he apply them to the Philippines because they are in the constitution. He quotes and applies at his own discretion. He expects congress to quote and apply at its discretion. He acknowledges no binding law in the matter. But if he can do this, if the present congress or the next can do it, if they can at their discretion pick and choose from the constitution, utterly ignoring its authority as the organic law, then another president and another congress can pick and choose in their discretion. And if they choose to put aside as fantastic the principles of liberty which Mr. McKinley thinks essential, they will have as much right to their view

in the matter as he has to his. If the constitution does not bind him and this congress with reference to the Philippines, it cannot bind his successors and subsequent congresses. And there is the danger. Imperialism does not consist in tyranny. It consists in unrestrained power. And unrestrained power, for congress and the president in the Philippines, is what the McKinley policy represents, according to Mr. McKinley himself. He asserts his intention to use it benevolently. But despotism is none the less despotic for being benevolent; and it is in benevolent despotism that malignant tyranny always takes root. If this policy be maintained, we depart from the safe theory of our government that none of its departments can legally pursue any policy or do any act, good or bad, without the authority of the written constitution.

It is only within a few days that the American public has been informed of the barbarous conduct of the British government in South Africa. Even now the information is general and vague. But of the diabolical character of this conduct there is no longer room for question. The cruel treatment of the American patriots by George III. in the last century was almost benevolent in comparison with the treatment of the Boers by the tory government of Great Britain to-day.

It began with the demand of Lord Salisbury for unconditional surrender. Not willing to make terms of peace when the Boers offered the olive branch, he insisted upon the extinction of their republics. And when they refused submission to this imperious demand, declaring that they would fight till the last man had gone down, he copied the methods of Spain in Cuba and turned the war into one of extermination. In February Lord Roberts, commanding in South Africa, had issued a proclamation announcing the entry of the British into the Orange Free State, warning the inhabitants to desist from further hostility towards Great Britain, promising immunity to those who had taken up arms pursuant to the orders of their government, provided they resumed their ordinary occupations, and threatening all who might oppose his command or give aid or encouragement to their own people with military punishment. His next step was to offer to all who had not taken a prominent part against the British, safe conduct to their homes provided they would lay down their arms and take the British oath of allegiance. That was in March. Thus far Lord Roberts had done no more, possibly, than by a stretch of military authority he might have done in any country he had invaded; though it is safe to assume that if he had invaded France or Germany he would not have intimated a purpose to punish Frenchmen or Germans for having fought under their own flag or for refusing to take an oath of allegiance to Great Britain. But in May he took a long stride in the direction of that policy which justifies President Kruger in describing the British as barbarians. Under orders from the home government he proclaimed to the inhabitants of the Transvaal that if wanton damage were done to property, not only would the actual perpetrators of such acts, and all directly or indirectly implicated in them, be liable to the most severe punishment in person and property, but—

> the property of all persons, whether in authority or otherwise, who have permitted, or who have not done their utmost to prevent, such wanton damage, will be liable to be confiscated and destroyed.

In June still more drastic measures were taken. Lord Roberts then issued a proclamation making what he called "principal residents" personally liable for all damage to railways, telegraphs and public buildings in their respective towns and districts. He also authorized the selection from time to time from each district of a "principal resident" to ride upon railroad trains through districts where attacks were anticipated upon the railroad by Boer raiders, thus compelling unoffending noncombatants to expose themselves to death. Moreover, wherever Boer raiders did damage, the houses and farms in the vicinity were to be destroyed and neighboring residents to be dealt with under martial law. Pursuant to those proclamations business men who have never taken part in the war, directly or indirectly, have been forced by British military officers to ride back and forth upon endangered railway trains, and the families of farmers in the region of De Wet's attacks upon British lines of communication —people who were not responsible for his raids and could not have stopped them if they would—have been driven off their farms, their homes being given to the flames.

This cruel policy became more cruel still as the hope of conquering the Boers died down; and for months the floodgates of British barbarity have been opened wide. On the 9th of July a British army captain, acting as district superintendent of police for the district of Krugersdorp, gave official notice that unless the men then serving in the Boer ranks, who belonged to families in that district, would "surrender themselves and hand in their arms to the imperial authorities by the 20th of July, the whole of their property will be confiscated and their families turned out destitute and homeless." A week later this notice was so far modified as to make the penalty confiscation of stock and supplies instead of destitution and homelessness, words which had too ugly a sound. That was followed on the 11th of August by a proclamation revoking previous promises of protection to noncombatants and declaring that—

> all burghers in districts occupied by British forces, except those who have sworn the oath, will be regarded as prisoners of war and transported; and all buildings, structures, and farms where the enemy's scouts are harbored will be liable to be razed to the ground.

Then we have a letter of September 2 from Lord Roberts to the Boer Gen.

Botha, in which the writer tells of having given orders for the burning of all farm houses near where any attempt had been made to injure trains or railways, and threatening that for ten miles around every farm should be denuded of provisions, cattle, etc. Gen. Botha in replying wrote:

> Wherever your troops were, not only are houses burnt down or blown up with dynamite, but defenseless women and children are ejected and robbed of all food and cover.

This terrible indictment of British civilization is sustained by numerous reports in British newspapers of all shades of politics. A correspondent of the St. James Gazette reports the British Gen. Campbell as having told him of "orders to 'sweep' the country"; and continuing, says:

> A view of his following soon made it obvious that he had not failed to carry out his orders. All farms on the line of march were cleared of horses, cattle, sheep, wagons, carts, etc., the forage being burnt, and the owners bidden to join the ranks of the prisoners, of whom there were already a goodly number.

This is no exceptional instance. All the Boer houses from Vryheid to Dundee, a distance of 50 miles, have been burned. Bothaville and Ventersburg have been completely destroyed. In other places, too, whole districts have been laid bare. And so reckless are the British in burning the farms of absent Boers who are supposed to be in the Boer military service that it often happens that those whose farms have been burned are absent because they are prisoners of war in the custody of the British. A correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette, one who is entirely in sympathy with this tory policy of merciless destruction, says that "prisoners of war on their return will find in nine cases out of ten"—think of it! "in nine cases out of ten"—"that their homesteads have been burned down." He says this in connection with a cold blooded proposition to organize a British company for the purchase of these farms for a song.

In magnificent contrast with this inglorious British war of extermination against noncombatants of all ages and both sexes, is the defiance that Gen. Botha sends out to Lord Roberts. "I desire to give you the assurance," he writes, in answer to a letter from Roberts threatening a continuance of the barbaric policy, "that nothing you may do to our women and children will deter us in continuing the struggle for our independence." Here is a situation that should make American blood flow faster. Have we forgotten that they were British tories who made the British name a synonym for savage cruelty throughout the revolting colonies on this continent when our fathers were fighting for independence? The same tory instinct is now devastating the homes of the Boers. Have we forgotten the stubborn courage of the founders of our government, who devoted their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the liberation of this land from tory dominion? Can we see no parallel? Are our mouths indeed so full of Filipino blood that we can articulate no word of sympathy for the Boers? The question of the original merits of the war is no longer important. That question was eliminated when Salisbury, refusing arbitration, demanded the extinction of Boer independence. Having declared his purpose to extinguish two nations, and followed that with a policy of extermination more relentless and cruel than any nation claiming to be civilized has ever before pursued toward a civilized people, he raised another issue: Shall that barbarous policy be acquiesced in by the nations of Christendom? Shall the appeal for arbitration which the Boers of South Africa are making and the civilized people of England are seconding—shall that just appeal be ignored? The nation that is silent at such a crisis brings its own civilization into question. Yet France alone thus far has spoken.

The Chicago school teachers have won a victory against the monopoly corporations of Chicago before the state board of equalization. It is about such a victory as they might have expected to win before a body which is probably more completely at the beck and call of the great corporations than any other official body in the state. The board has decided to increase the assessment of capital stock from about $26,500,000 to about $55,000,000—a gain of something like $28,000,000. To illustrate how gross this undervaluation must be, let us refer to its effect on one of the Chicago corporations—the Chicago City Railway company. The stock of this company is 190,000 shares, of the par value of $100 each, making the capitalization $19,000,000. It is worth in the market $250 a share—an aggregate capital stock valuation of $47,500,000. The tangible property of the company is assessed at $1,122,499, which, deducted from the market value of the stock, leaves a taxable stock valuation of $46,377,501. Yet the compliant board of equalization assesses this stock at only $700,000! The underassessment is so gross that no explanation of it, consistent with honesty, seems possible.

It is because these great corporations with their rich franchise holdings are thus favored, that the schools of Chicago suffer. Salaries are cut down, building accommodations are contracted, terms are shortened, and in many other ways the efficiency of the service is minimized. For that reason the teachers have organized to secure a due execution of the tax laws against these parasitical, tax-dodging corporations. They have had a hard fight, and in degree they have won the fight. Though the board of equalization has done but little for them, it has been forced to do something; and public attention has been directed by the fight to one of the main causes of a deficient school fund. But now a voice is raised to the public against this commendable action of the school teachers. It is the voice of the president of the State university. In a public address, he declares that

"movements to regulate the taxing machinery of the city are foreign to the functions of the teacher." Although he concedes that upon rare occasions such movements might find temporary justification, when the city failed to provide for the proper support of schools, his declaration is regarded, as it was probably intended to be, as a rebuke to the Chicago teachers. At any rate, it sounds much like an echo of those newspapers of Chicago which, representing the corporate tax-dodging interests, have openly condemned the teachers as tax-eaters who have no business to meddle with the affairs of taxpayers. Doubtless there is wisdom in President Draper's recommendation that teachers, as a general rule, avoid associations which are not for their professional improvement. But it savors more of worldly wisdom than of civic virtue.

Several weeks ago we commented (page 437) upon a criticism by the Fairhope (Ala.) Courier of Gov. Roosevelt as a landlord. The Courier insisted, against a contention we had previously made apropos of Roosevelt, that he is personally to blame for availing himself of the benefits of the "unearned increment" of the land he owns. In response we challenged the Courier to state what Mr. Roosevelt could or ought to do, not as a citizen, but as a landlord, to divest himself of these benefits—what he could do simply as a matter of justice and not of philanthropy. Accepting this challenge, the Courier suggests two courses that Roosevelt might pursue. For one thing, it says, he might turn his unearned income over to the people of New York, either by administering it as a trustee for their benefit or by putting it into the public treasury. An all sufficient objection to this course is anticipated by the Courier itself. It foresees that as a net result Roosevelt would only benefit other landlords without at all benefitting the people. But to its own objection it replies that Roosevelt is bound in honesty to follow this course whatever the result. That is something we cannot concede. Roosevelt is at liberty to do so, but he is not bound to. The reply assumes that Roosevelt himself has no right in justice to land values. But he has such a right; an equal right with his fellow citizens—not only in the values of his own land, but in those of all other land in the same community. And that right he would abandon by complying with the Courier's demand. Since there is no way, short of communal action, of distinguishing his right to land values from the right of others, and the community insists upon a policy which confuses those rights, no principle of honesty requires him to give up to others his own in order to rid himself of what is not his. To do so would be an act of personal generosity and not an act of justice.

The other course which the Courier suggests to Gov. Roosevelt is that he appoint himself "a trustee to administer the unearned increment, which has come or shall come to the lands under his control, for the benefit of those whose presence and enterprise have given rise to it." But this suggestion, besides being impracticable, and open to the objection to the first suggestion, begs the question. No one has any right to demand that Roosevelt or any other individual become a trustee. Roosevelt might try it or not as he pleased; and if he pleased not to, his refusal would violate no principle of justice. He would simply decline to be a paternal philanthropist. So the whole matter comes back to the point at which we started, namely, that while it is within no one's right to criticise any landlord for appropriating unearned increment which society insists upon treating as private property, it is everyone's right to criticise anybody who uses his civil power and influence to perpetuate that unjust policy.

The results of the municipal ownership and operation of the public lighting plant in Detroit, to which we referred at page 497, are even more satisfactory than we there indicated. We spoke of the reduction in the expense of public lighting as 13 per cent. since the establishment of the municipal system. In fact, however, there has been an annual reduction, that of last year being 13 per cent. as compared with the expense of the previous year. The price per arc light of 2,000 candle power, paid for the last year under private contract, 1896, was $133.80; but in 1897, the first year of public lighting under municipal ownership and operation, the operating expense per arc light of 2,000 candle power was only $51.85, making a gross expense, after allowing for fixed charges (interest at four per cent., depreciation at three per cent. and loss of taxes on the investment), of only $83.50—a clear saving of over $50. Since 1897 this gross expense has been reduced annually, until in 1899 it was down to $66.45. Deducting incomes from that amount—such as rentals for poles, conduits, etc.—the gross cost was only $61.76, while the cash cost to the taxpayer was but $37.13. Moreover, a better service has been secured than under private contract; and in the opinion of the president of the Detroit public lighting commission, the expense would be very much further reduced and the public very much better served, if the commission were allowed to do commercial lighting in competition with the private companies.

In view of the troubles in the anthracite coal region which are certain to recur in the no distant future it will be well to remember that the recent strike was settled under political compulsion. The monopolists dared not allow it to go on during the presidential campaign. They feared its effect upon their candidate—McKinley. We have this upon the authority of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, a leading Wall street organ of finance and plutocracy which supported McKinley and his plutocratic managers with vigilance and vigor.

In its issue of November 3 it claimed editorially that—

> if there ever was a case where the consent to terms of settlement was secured by duress, the coal strike settlement is such an occurrence. The miners' union very shrewdly selected the occasion of a presidential election involving questions seriously affecting all industrial interests to push their scheme.

The same paper, in the same article, confessed that the condition of settlement imposed by the strikers, that the increased wages should continue for six months, was also forced upon the monopolists by the political situation, and that if it had not been demanded, the increase of wages would have been reversed after election, and the strikers made fools of. Premising that the fact already stated that the settlement was forced by the political conditions is also seen from the fact that the directors of the strike required the mine owners to pledge themselves to maintain the increased pay until the 1st of April, 1901, it proceeds:

> That is to say, the strikers knew the arrangement was forced and was not an acknowledgment on the part of the operators that what they had been receiving was less than their proportionate share of the market price of the product. They feared that when the force was removed and the election passed the advance would be quickly rescinded. Hence, understanding the situation fully, they appended the time limit.

That is an interesting disclosure of the frustrated intention of the coal monopolists to outwit the strikers, and it is candid.

THE NEXT CAMPAIGN.

Since the presidential election the daily press has voiced once more the sentiment of many people, often expressed before, to the effect that our national campaigns are altogether too long. It is said that they interfere with trade and disturb business. They ought, it is declared, to be cut down to 30 days or even less. Why cannot we in this regard pattern after our English cousins?

Yes, there is no doubt about it, our presidential campaigns do, to a certain extent, disturb business and interfere with trade. So do our Sundays. So, also, do our holidays. So does sleep. All purely educational movements, as well as all pure forms of recreation, disassociated from professionalism, interfere somewhat with business and disturb or interrupt the onward sweep of trade. Why not abolish all these things? What do we live for, if not to engage in trade? Is not life for business, and not business for life? Away, then, with all such trade disturbances and interferences with business as our Sabbaths and the few holidays we have! Down with Thanksgiving day, Christmas, Washington's birthday and the Fourth of July! What can the paramount representatives of "the strenuous life" want with holidays? Instead of any longer saying, with Sancho Panza, "God bless the man who first invented sleep," let us offer a large reward for the invention or discovery of some machine or method which will utterly abolish sleep, because sleep does seriously interfere with trade and, in most lines, not simply disturbs but, for eight hours out of every 24, actually puts a stop to business. It is much worse, even, than a presidential campaign, from a purely business standing point.

To all, however, to whom such "strenuous" reasoning does not appeal, and who are still so old-fashioned as to believe that life is more important than business and more valuable than trade, it must be evident that our national campaigns are a great educational agency. They arouse thought, they impart instruction, they develop intellectual activity in relation to national affairs. It is not true in regard to the late campaign that "all was lost save honor." Its educational value was immense. Seed was sown which will never die. Other years, and perhaps other hands than ours, will reap the good harvest; but this is the way with all reform movements. They are not sudden conversions, nor speedy grafts, but slow growths.

It is true that the democracy did not succeed in educating up to the right point, during the campaign just closed, a majority of the voters. One great reason for this, of course, was lack of resources; still another was lack of time. Our national campaigns, instead of being shorter, should be longer. They should be conducted with more deliberation, through a longer period of time, and consequently with more educational power.

Yet it is true, of course, that there is always some discount upon the educational value of work done in a political campaign. Let speakers speak and writers write as fairly, as earnestly and as conscientiously as they possibly can, hearers will hear and readers will read with a certain or uncertain amount of partisan bias specially difficult to overcome. The best educational work is probably done, therefore, through non-partisan channels and outside of specific political campaigns.

Of these non-partisan channels the new democracy (which is the old Lincoln republicanism and the older Jeffersonian democracy) should learn to make more use. Independent organizations, journals, platforms and pulpits should be utilized to the full.

Using the word campaign to connote this greater movement to educate the people up to a full comprehension of their rights and duties as citizens, up to a full understanding of what true democracy is and necessitates, when should the next campaign begin?

At once.

Now is not the time for inaction, much less is it the time for discouragement or despair.

True, educational processes, strictly speaking, cannot reach all minds.

Said one citizen to another the day after election: "Now I will put my money back into the bank."

"Did you take it out?"

"Yes," and with that he pulled from his pocket a great roll of bills.

"What did you do that for?"

"Well, I was afraid Bryan would be elected, and then I could not get my money!"

What can you do to educate such a mind? Nothing. The only kind of education that man could appreciate would be a squeezing between the upper millstone of monopoly and the nether millstone of destitution, and he will probably get it in due time.

However, such a person is not a fair specimen of the average American citizen. The average American is capable of being educated through information and appeals to reason. That is a gloomy pessimism which regards education as incapable of reaching the common people and of no use. Education is of use. The common people can be educated. What they chiefly need is what the dying Goethe prayed for, what we all, living or dying, need—"more light."

Despite the result of the recent election, the intentions and motives of the American people are worthy of all confidence. The great heart of America beats true.

It is said that the heart muscle, which so uninterruptedly throbs in the human breast, if its force were directed against a granite pillar the size of the human body, would, in the course of an ordinary lifetime, wear that granite pillar to dust. The simile holds good. Whatever granite pillars of imperialism, despotism or base appeal are erected in the pathway of the American people, the great, throbbing heart of America will in time wear them away.

It is sadly true, however, that at the present time a majority of the people do not understand. They neither know what are the rights of others nor how to maintain their own. They need education. And the next campaign of education cannot begin too soon nor continue too steadily.

If the leaders of democracy are wise, they will begin educational work for 1904 right away. It can be carried on through anti-imperialist leagues, anti-trust organizations, and many other independent and non-partisan channels, as well as through the regular machinery of party action.

"We must educate. We must educate, or we must perish by our own ambition." Never was this more true than to-day; nowhere was it ever more true than in America.

The worst foe to human knowledge, human progress, human rights, in America is not, as some think, the priesthood. It is not, as others think, the saloon. It is the daily press. There are, of course, noble and notable exceptions; but the daily press, as a rule, is owned, body and soul, by Mammon, and by its suppressed, its colored, its distorted news it hoodwinks and deceives the people and imprisons them in what Socrates rightly regarded as the worst possible ignorance—"the seeming and conceit of knowledge without the reality."

There are not a few weekly journals, however, which are truly independent, and the reading of which during the year amounts to a liberal education. These should be wisely distributed and strongly supported. This will act, in large measure, as the needed corrective for the misinformation of the daily press.

The lecture platform should be revived, rescued from the uses of mere amusement, and restored to the pristine vigor and worth which it possessed, as the people's university, in the days of Phillips, Parker and Beecher. This can be done. It is indeed true, as the Rev. Dr. George H. Peeke has said, that "the lectures which please most" are, for the most part, "full of wind and rose leaves," but it is also true that if those who believe in and desire social and political reform will send out, to give free lectures, men and women of power whose chief ambition is not to win applause nor to amass a fortune, but to instruct the teachable and inspire the patriotic, a large hearing can be obtained and a vast amount of educational work be done among the common people.

In these and other open ways, the next campaign should be begun at once. Four years is none too long in which to educate the people how to see, to think, to vote.

S. W. SAMPLE.

Minneapolis, Minn.

NEWS

The most important event of the week, to Americans at least, is the opening, on the 3d, of the last session of the Fifty-sixth congress. And of that event the most important feature was the reading of President McKinley's message. It is a very long document and deals with a great variety of subjects, chief among them being the situation in the Philippines and the Chinese problem.

Beginning with congratulations upon our "individual and national prosperity," and assurances that "American liberty is more firmly established than ever before" while "love for it and the determination to preserve it are more universal than at any former period of our history," Mr. McKinley dwells for a moment in his message upon the larger statistics of our national growth, and then plunges into the Chinese question. His account of the evolution of this question is a model of clear statement, leading up to a presentation of the American policy on the subject. This policy, which he says has been adhered to consistently, he describes as having consisted first in rescuing the imperiled American legation at Peking; second, in obtaining redress for wrongs already suffered; and, third, in securing all possible safety for American life and property in China and preventing a spread or recurrence of disorders. Involved in this policy is the idea of "permanent safety and peace to China" along with preservation of her "territorial and administrative entity," protection of "all rights guaranteed to friendly powers," and maintenance of the "principle of equal and impartial trade" with all parts of the empire. These views coincide with "the views and purposes of the other cooperating governments," and negotiations for settlement accordingly are in progress. "The Russian proposition looking to the restoration of the imperial power in Peking has been accepted" by us; but "we forego no jot of our undoubted right to exact exemplary and deterrent punishment of the responsible authors and abettors" of the anti-foreign outrages. For them, "full expiation becomes imperative, within the rational limits of retributive justice." This is "the initial condition" of settlement. An essential factor of durable settlement is a guarantee by China of freedom of worship, and a question of grave concern is the matter of indemnity. China may not be able to pay an adequate money indemnity, yet all the powers disclaim any purpose of dismembering the empire by demanding land grants. In this dilemma President McKinley is "disposed to think that due compensation may be made in part by increased guarantees of security for foreign rights and immunities, and most important of all by the opening of China to the equal commerce of the world." But he inclines favorably, in the event of disagreement among the co-

operating powers, to the suggestion of Russia, that "the matter be relegated to the court of arbitration at The Hague."

Following its discussion of the Chinese problem, Mr. McKinley's message presents many other subjects before dealing with the Philippine situation. First among these are our relations with the Argentine republic, Austria-Hungary, Belgium and the nations of South America. Then comes a description of the Paris exposition, with an account of the satisfactory part taken in it by the United States. After our relations with Germany have been reviewed, there follows a recital of certain vexatious questions arising out of the seizure by Great Britain of American shipments to Portuguese South Africa of food destined for the Transvaal. Other relations with Great Britain have to do with Canadian questions. Then come references to minor matters concerning Guatemala, Hayti, Honduras and Italy. The Italian difficulty, which grows out of the lynching of five Italians at Tallulah, La., serves the president as a text for decrying lynching, which he does in very general terms and without in any wise connecting his general observations with the lynching of American negroes. Japan is the next subject of consideration, and, following that, is a series of notes and observations regarding the court of international arbitration, the Mosquito revolution in Nicaragua, conflicts in South America, the matter of an isthmian canal, the Delagoa bay arbitration, a treaty with Peru, a seal fishery arbitration with Russia and the courtesy of Russia to American missionaries in Siberia, our new relations with Spain, and the arbitration of losses in the Samoan islands. Another miscellaneous collection of notes and observations begins with assurances of an early settlement with the sultan of Turkey, touches then upon reciprocity treaties, mentions next the forthcoming pan-American exposition at Buffalo and pan-American congress at the City of Mexico, and concludes with a tribute to the American consular service. The statistics of treasury receipts and expenditures next claim attention, and in this connection the president recommends the continuance of the "parity under all conditions between our two forms of metallic money, silver and gold," and explains the refunding of the debt under the act of March 14, 1900, and the growth of the national banking system. Space is then given to the increase of the excess of exports, the growth of manufacturing, and the extension of agriculture, after which a reduction of internal revenue taxes is advised, and the passage of the ship subsidy bill is urged, while a colorless reference to trusts closes the list of miscellaneous subjects which precedes the discussion of the Philippine question.

With reference to the Philippines, Mr. McKinley recalls the statement in a previous message of his purpose, "until the congress shall have made known the formal expression of its will," to maintain American sovereignty in the archipelago by means of the military power, and reports that as no contrary expression of the will of congress has been made, he has "steadfastly pursued the purpose so declared," employing also the civil arm. Here he quotes at great length from his message of a year ago to show what action had then been taken and what instructions given, following the quotation with a statement of progress since and a recommendation to congress. He would impress upon congress that any legislation regarding the Philippines should be along the "generous lines" of "insuring the benefits of liberty and good government to the Filipinos, in the interest of humanity and with the aim of building up an enduring, self-supporting and self-administering community." Calling the Filipinos "the wards of the nation," he declares it to be our duty as their guardian "so to treat them that our flag may be no less beloved in the mountains of Luzon and Negros than it is at home, that there as here it shall be the revered symbol of liberty, enlightenment and progress in every avenue of development." Though he prophecies great culture and advancement for the Filipinos "if our duty toward them be faithfully performed," he studiously refrains from indicating that they should ever be invested with either independence or statehood or otherwise be allowed to rise above the level of an American colony.

Of Porto Rico, the next subject of the message, but little is said, and nothing whatever to indicate a policy under which the island shall cease to be a colony. The president promises to transmit the Cuban constitution, as soon as framed, to congress for its consideration and action. These subjects are followed by recommendations for the laying of a chain of electric cable by way of Hawaii to Manila. They give way in turn to a discussion of army reorganization, wherein Mr. McKinley proposes a standing army of from 60,000 to 100,000 men, in the discretion of the president, inclusive of 15,000 native troops in the Philippines. A few minor military recommendations are succeeded by a discussion of the state of the postal service, of the needs of the navy, of the progress of American government in Hawaii, of the work of the census bureau, and of the agricultural department. There are then recommendations regarding the alien contract labor law and the eight-hour law, and explanations with reference to the civil service commission in its functions both at home and in the Philippines. The erection of a hall of public records is next advised. Reference follows to the proposed celebration of John Marshall day, and to the centennary of the removal of the seat of government to Washington, after which the message closes with an admonition lest business prosperity generate extravagance and growing national power invite conflict and aggression. "Let us keep always in mind that the foundation of our government is liberty, its superstructure peace," are the final words.

On the day following the reading of the president's message, the senate gave precedence, by a vote of 38 to 20, to the ship subsidy bill, and Senator Frye opened the discussion with an elaborate speech in its favor. The lower house on the same day received from the committee on military affairs its report recommending a bill for the enlargement and reorganization of the standing army, and on the 5th began the consideration of the bill in committee of the whole. Mr. McCall, republican representative from Massachusetts, obtaining an hour's time from the democratic managers, enlivened the debate with a keen but dignified criticism of the military and colonial policy of the administration. The ways and means committee reported on the 5th a bill reducing the war taxes by $40,000,000. The largest reduction it proposes is on beer. It would also do away with stamp duties. Two Boer

resolutions were offered in the house, one on the 3d, by Fitzgerald, of Massachusetts, and the other on the 4th, by Sulzer, of New York. The former expresses the sympathy of the American people with President Kruger in his effort "to obtain the assistance of the civilized nations of the world in securing peace and proper terms of settlement;" the latter urges upon the British government the adoption of the principle of arbitration.

President Kruger's enthusiastic reception in France, described in these columns last week, was brought to an end on the 1st by his departure for Germany. Before leaving, he was advised by Delcasse, the French foreign minister, that France would decline taking the initiative in proposing intervention in South Africa, but would not discourage intervention by any other country. The chamber of deputies, by unanimous vote—600 members being present—adopted a resolution on the 29th addressing him as "President Kruger of the Transvaal," and conveying to him "a sincere expression of respectful sympathy." Upon arriving at Cologne, on his way to Berlin, Kruger was met by a representative of the emperor, who, in answer to a message of "respectful devotion and cordial sympathy" he had sent to the emperor, conveyed to him the emperor's regret that it would be impossible to receive him at Berlin at present. In consequence of this intimation, Kruger altered his plans, going directly from Cologne, where his popular reception had been most gratifying, to The Hague, where he arrived on the 5th.

In President Kruger's absence from South Africa upon his European mission, the little army he left behind has given new life to the war. There was some indication of this in last week's report, but further facts make it evident that Great Britain has far from completed her conquest. Dewetsdorp, which lies to the southeast of Bloemfontein, in the Orange Free State, was on the 23d seized by Gen. De Wet and President Steyn. The British garrison of 400 surrendered, after a battle in which they lost in killed 15 and wounded 42. But the Boers immediately withdrew with their prisoners and the British reoccupied the place on the 26th. All through the country, south of Ladybrand, Thabanchu and Bloemfontein and between the railroad and Basutoland, the Boers are most active; and, according to the London Mail, "the British seem everywhere upon the resentative of the emperor, who, in defensive." Kitchener reports some British successes, but they consist only in resisting Boer attacks.

Partly from irritation at the military situation in South Africa and partly from indignation at the uncivilized methods employed by the British army officers, who are ruthlessly destroying property, laying the country waste and warring upon women and children, a revulsion of public feeling in England appears to have set in. One of the more distinct indications of this is an editorial published on the 1st in The Statist, the leading financial journal of London, which says:

> We are losing in every way, losing in prestige and losing in life. We are seeing our South African possessions plunged into greater distress and the opinion is gaining ground abroad that we are incapable of bringing the struggle to a satisfactory termination.

The same influences have extended and intensified the anti-British feeling in Cape Colony, until the situation there is regarded, in the language of the London Mail's correspondent, as "graver than at any previous period during the war." But the British government shows no disposition to modify its drastic policy. Lord Kitchener, who has the reputation of being a British Weyler, has been made commander in chief in place of Lord Roberts. There are rumors, however, that Cecil Rhodes has undertaken to formulate a scheme of conciliation, the central idea of which is a confederation of South African states under the British flag, and that some members of the cabinet are encouraging him, feeling that the only hope of the ministry is to offer such terms to the Boers as, without humbling the government, will enable it to withdraw the British troops from South Africa.

If these rumors are justified, developments in harmony with them may be expected soon in the British parliament, which assembled on the 3d. It is the first session of the new parliament—the fifteenth of Victoria's reign—which was chosen at the elections in October. No business was done besides the selection of a speaker, and for that office William Court Gully was elected for the third time.

From the Philippines there is no news worth noting, besides the casualty report, except a report that 2,100 combatants have voluntarily surrendered and taken the oath of allegiance to the United States. The oath was administered with impressive religious ceremonies in a church at Santa Maria, near Vigan, under the direction of Gen. Young. Gen. MacArthur, in his official report, attributes the submission of these Filipinos to "the president's reelection and vigorous prosecution of the war." No rifles were surrendered.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington to December 5, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	468
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Kiled reported since presidential election	17
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	76
Total deaths	2.508
Wounded since July 1, 1898	2,373
Total casualties since July 1, '98	4,881
Total casualties to last week	4.866
Total deaths to last week	2,504

The Chinese complications appear to be reaching a solution more favorable to China, the allied powers having now come to an agreement that it is injudicious to insist upon demands which China would be compelled to reject and which would therefore necessitate a renewal of military operations. This news was given out on the 5th by the state department at Washington, which claims credit for having brought about the result. Germany and England are said to have stood out for large indemnities and the execution of the anti-foreign leaders; but as Russia, France and Japan were disposed to be conciliatory, the United States, influenced by the Chinese minister at Washington, joined them in efforts to procure a withdrawal of the more drastic demands. The ef-

fort was successful. All the powers have now modified the demands which we summarized last week at page 538. Instead of the first demand, that for execution of 11 designated princes, China is to be required only to inflict as severe punishment as it can. Instead of the second demand, that for indemnity, China is only to recognize that indemnity is due. Instead of requiring the destruction of all the forts on the coast of China the demand in that respect relates only to those on the gulf of Pechili. Otherwise the demands are substantially unaltered. Upon this basis, then, negotiations between the foreign ministers and the Chinese peace commissioners are to proceed.

NEWS NOTES.

—The cabinet of Chili has resigned.

—The Puerto Rican house of delegates held its first sessions on the 4th.

Gen. Fitzhugn Lee took command of the department of the Missouri, with headquarters at Omaha, on the 4th.

—President Diaz, of Mexico, was inaugurated president for the sixth successive time on the 1st, with imposing ceremonies.

—The American Federation of Labor opened the sessions of its annual convention in the Music hall at Louisville on the 6th.

—A bill prohibiting child labor in mills in Georgia was overwhelmingly defeated in the legislature of that state on the 27th.

—Mrs. Abby Sage Richardson, the well-known dramatist, poet and literary critic, died in Rome on the 5th. She was 63 years old.

—The Ohio Single Tax league has elected William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, president, and S. Danziger, of Cincinnati, secretary.

—The Chicago Federation of Labor issued on the 23d an invitation and appeal to negro workmen to enlist in the trades union movement.

Oscar Wilde, the well-known English playwright and "apostle of estheticism," died on the 30th at a hotel in the Latin quarter of Paris.

—The American Transvaal league of Chicago is procuring signatures to a message to President Kruger inviting him to visit the United States.

—Rear Admiral McNair, of the United States navy, died on the 28th at his home in Washington from a stroke of apoplexy. He was 61 years old.

—William M. Salter will make "Fair Taxation and the Teachers' Grievance" the subject of his Sunday morning discourse before the Chicago Ethical society, at Steinway hall, on the 9th.

—England is greatly stirred by a recent beer poisoning epidemic at Manchester, caused by arsenic in the glucose and sulphuric acid which were used by the local brewers as cheap substitutes for malt and hops.

—The social democratic party has issued a call for a national convention to be held in Chicago January 15, to make changes in the laws of the organization and to prepare for vigorous campaigning.

—Prof. George D. Herron will deliver a series of Sunday afternoon lectures at Central Music hall, Chicago, on the "Economics of the Kingdom of Heaven," beginning with Sunday, January 6 at 3:30, and continuing until March 24.

—The Women's Christian Temperance union opened the sessions of their twenty-seventh annual convention at Washington on the 3d, with 1,000 delegates present. A petition was adopted urging congress to enact a new army canteen law.

—The Russian census, calculated by the minister of finance, gives the population of the empire as 136,000,000. This includes 86,000,000 Russians, 9,000,000 Poles, 6,000,000 Finns, 5,600,000 Lithuanians, 11,000,000 persons of semi-Turkish extraction, 4,000,000 Hebrews and 1,000,000 people of German descent.

Yosemite, an auxiliary cruiser of the United States navy, was wrecked and sunk in a terrible typhoon which swept the Island of Guam on November 13. Four sailors were drowned and 163 natives were killed and the crops of the island completely destroyed. Provisions and aid have been sent from Manila.

—Newport has ceased to be the capital of Rhode Island, which honor it has shared with Providence since early in the eighteenth century. By the direct vote of the people of Rhode Island at the recent election Providence was made the sole capital, and will soon dedicate the new state capitol erected there at a cost of more than $5,000,000.

—With only one dissenting justice —Harlan—the supreme court of the United States has just decided that railway companies may segregate negro passengers. This decision gives federal sanction to the "Jim Crow" car. A negro who buys a ticket through different states must change to the "Jim Crow car" when he crosses a state where that is allowed.

—Wernher, Beit & Co., the Mineral Assets Co., H. J. Robinson and other large English mining magnates are seeking, through agents, to acquire control of the large Colorado and California gold mines, options on many of which have already been obtained. It is on the strength of these proposed investments that the formation of a world's gold trust is rumored, with a backing of $975,000,000.

MISCELLANY

LABOR.

For The Public.

A giant's strength, a giant's power
Chained serflike to the soil;
The burden of unnumbered years
Of hopeless, thankless toil,
Has bowed the sinewed shoulders down,
And deep in sweat and grime,
Has written on the furrowed brow
The misery of time.
Its countless years, a monument
Built up of Moloch greed,
That ever cries for more and more,
Denying him his meed;
That holds him as a soulless brute,
An earthly human clod,
Content to do a master's will,
And cringe beneath the rod.

Awake thy soul, shake off the chains,
Learn now thy strength and might;
Gird up thy loins, and heed the call
To battle for the right.
Unworthy he who, midst the fray,
Knowing his cause is just,
Subservient waits another's time,
Another's arm to trust.
Free thine own self, lift up thy head,
Too long bowed to the earth,
And in the knowledge of thy strength,
Appreciate thy worth;
And in thy manhood's divine light
No more to serfdom cling,
Thrall to no man, proclaim thyself
Lord of thyself, and King.

King of thyself, beneath the sky
To God alone bend knee,
And in the fullness of thy power,
Make no man slave to thee;
Forget not, in that coming day
Thine hour of deepest gloom;
Remember, who forsakes the path
Sounds his own knell of doom.
For He who planted in the soul
The germ of conscious right,
Will in His day, and in His hour,
The stewardship requite.
And woe to him who in that day,
The talent that he gave,
Debased it in unholy power
To make his brother slave.

AMY DUDLEY.

WHAT "S. T." MEANS.

For The Public.

I was asked by a Newark bank official: "How is it most of you Single Tax men are poor, unprosperous men?"

I told him this fable:

THE FABLE OF THE STARVED AND THIN.

A Father left a large and valuable estate to His children. The stronger and subtiler soon ACQUIRED all the best parts for themselves. At last poverty, even to the point of starvation, drove the weaker members,

CHILDREN equally with the richer members of the family, to SUE in the COURT for an accounting.

"Do you notice how all the SUITORS are poor and discontented?" said one fat and prosperous one, with a WINK at another fat and prosperous one.

"Yes," was the answer; "Starved and Thin—that is the meaning of 'S. T.'"

THOS. H. POTTER, S. T.
Belleville, N. J.

THE SHAME OF A UNIVERSITY.

Lines by a student of Stanford university, written upon the dismissal of Prof. Ross from that institution, and published in the San Francisco Star of November 17.

Is it a lie? Is it all a lie?
The great ideal and the purpose high?
Where is the promise of yesterday
That freedom and light should hold full sway,
Unfettered of thought and free of speech,
The right to learn and the right to teach?
What if the part held another view?
Is the right less right or the truth less true?
Shall the hand of death reach, out of the past,
To throttle science and learning at last?
Are the truths of science bought and sold?
Must learning bow to the weight of gold?
Not towering buildings nor massive arch
May turn the truth in its onward march.
Gone is our glory and pride of name,
For the selfish gift is the giver's shame.

THE BROOKLYN SINGLE TAX CLUB TO MR. BRYAN.

The following letter has been sent by the Brooklyn Single Tax Bryan and Stevenson club to W. J. Bryan:

Hon. William J. Bryan,

Dear Sir: This club, which was organized to promote your candidacy, desires at the close of the campaign to express its confidence in you, and the profound conviction of its members that the cause of equal rights for all and special privileges for none, for which you have so ably stood for four years, has been greatly advanced as the result of your two magnificent campaigns. Believing this, we cannot look upon the struggle which has just closed as having been a fruitless one.

Although not successful in securing the indorsement of the people at the polls, you have done that which is probably much more important to posterity — you have directed the minds of thoughtful men, not only of this country, but of the whole world, toward the finding of a remedy which will avert the danger to society which lurks within legislation favoring monopoly and special privilege. To the minds of the believers in the doctrine taught by Henry George there can be no sure foundation for the permanent existence of a true republic without equality of opportunity that would result from the public appropriation of land values known as the single tax. We believe that in no other way can justice be established on earth. While we have seen no expression of your opinion coinciding with this belief, we have supported you in both campaigns because we have recognized by the position which you have taken on all public questions that the keynote of your action was justice. We are confident that the work which you have done in directing thought to the attainment of such an ideal condition will ultimately triumph in the battle that is ever being waged between right and wrong, between democracy and plutocracy.

It is our earnest belief that you will continue your admirable and effective efforts in behalf of the rights of the masses of men against the oppression of unjust legislation.

With our most earnest wishes for your welfare and for the coming of that true democracy which we all desire, we remain, faithfully and sincerely yours,

Brooklyn Single Tax Bryan and Stevenson Campaign Club,
D. B. VAN VLECK, President.
H. G. SEAVER, Secretary.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF OUR RECENT ELECTION.

It always savors of impertinence when the citizens of one country show themselves partisans in the domestic affairs of another, but the American people for all their different blood have so much in common with us in their language and their religion, and the principal difficulty before them so closely resembles that with which we are ourselves grappling, that it is impossible for English liberals not to give some expression to their disappointment at Mr. Bryan's defeat. We do not believe this defeat to be wholly due to Mr. Bryan's silver fallacies, still less do we believe it to spring from any passion for expansion. It is not out of any respect for the name of Mr. McKinley or for the character of the strong man, Mr. Roosevelt, or for the cunning of the boss, Mr. Hanna, that an appreciable majority has returned the republicans to power. It is because they have never yet had a national experience to teach them what "imperialism" means, so that they still confuse it with the pride in and love of one's country, and the coupling of this ignorance with the fear of idealism and reform that prosperity always produces in a commercial people. Neither of these causes is worthy of the men who first wrote down in English that political liberty was "inalienable" and "a self-evident truth."

If one descends from the ideals upon which this election turned to the practical results which it may produce, one thing stands out prominent. The return of Mr. McKinley means that the one chance offered by fate to the United States to save their prestige in the far east has been thrown away. The unselfish emancipation of the Philippines under the enthusiasm of a generous impulse, coupled with a declaration of protection, would have left the international power of America and its military name intact. As it is the American people have pledged themselves to one of two inevitable courses. Either they will plunge into that hopeless morass, the continued attempt to conquer under conditions that forbid conquest; or they will consent to admit themselves beaten and will retire by force when they might have retired of their free will. The first misfortune is that which has throughout history been the principal and most obvious cause of national decline. The second is a sharp humiliation which a selfish aristocracy or a wise despot may inflict on a nation, but which a democracy of all forms of government will be most reluctant to adopt; and if it is better than a hopeless and weakening struggle, yet it certainly lessens for a time the strength of any nation compelled to it. That the half-barbarous, tropical Philippines, with millions of inhabitants, can be conquered and administered by the volunteers of an unmilitary democracy, living in a temperate climate on the other side of the world, is a fantastic notion.—The London Speaker of Nov. 10.

THE DEMANDS OF THE PRESENT CRISIS.

For The Public.

To all who observe closely the trend of social forces, it is apparent that the crisis long ago foreseen is now approaching with the cumulative power and swiftness of a terrible storm. For years far-sighted men and women have been faithfully laboring to avert social disaster by teaching great economic truths and by pointing out simple methods of bringing about a better social order. Noble efforts have been made to enlighten the people upon the true fundamental relations of human society. What has been the result? The people have not heard. They have not heard because they have not listened. Plutocracy and monopoly rise supreme from every contest and triumphantly maintain their ascendency. In spite of every demo-

cratic effort on the part of those who believe in the common man, the mass of the people remains unmoved, untouched, ignorant that there is a social problem they themselves can solve; unconscious of their power to change the institutions under which they are victimized; viewing with apathy and indifference the insolent encroachments of plutocracy upon their rights and liberties. Greed, commercialism and the spirit of conquest stalk across our sacred precincts, worshiped by the masses whom they trample upon and destroy.

Could aught more sharply testify to the moral and mental degeneration of the people than the recent presidential election? In this the people have officially repudiated the doctrine of self-government which our fathers died to establish. They have forgotten what liberty is, and principles of justice have lost their inspiring influence. This degeneration has come in the face of the most active, persistent, unselfish reform efforts that the world has ever seen. Why?

It is because the people have lost faith in American ideals. The conscience of the people is asleep; the consciousness of a loving brotherhood is dulled and deadened. So long as their thoughts are only of self and of the shrewdest winning from others in the bitter struggle for existence, the people will remain as putty in the hands of the careful, discerning, plutocratic genius.

Before we can have an economic system, based upon common right to the resources of nature, the people must want such a system, and want it badly enough to take steps to secure it. They are now indifferent; they are undeniably content to play at the present game in the hope that they may achieve some sort of individual salvation. When they shall be brought to conceive the desirability of a better social order, and a faith in justice and human brotherhood shall revive, they will listen to those who are qualified to teach fundamental economic truths; truths which must be recognized to insure the stability of the state they desire.

The imperative thing to do now is to waken the sleeping conscience of the people; to revive in them a devotion to ideals of human liberty. The faith that is dead must live again; the old fires of freedom must be rekindled, and the new made to blaze with the promise of a better industrial day. The hearts of the people must be made to burn with a faith in the possibility of a heavenly order on earth. This once achieved, the beauty and significance of the idea of brotherhood once understood and acknowledged, the selfish barriers to the common ownership of the natural resources God has provided for all men will fall like a house of cards.

The only way to stem the coming disaster, or even to raise a better order from its ruins is to strive now to fill the souls of men with vital religious fire. The supremest output of spiritual strength from every devoted, fervent soul who loves the cause of humanity is, in the face of the gathering social revolution, the least that God may hope for or require.

FRANKLIN H. WENTWORTH.

THE DISFRANCHISEMENT PARTY.

"It is of course absurd to speak of the party which withholds from the negroes privileges extended to the whites as the party of 'equal rights to all, special privileges to none.'" Thus says the Dubuque Times, and we quite agree with it. But the Times is in error in implying that the democratic party does this. The organization does nothing of the kind. Its principles are set forth in its national platforms, and in none of these since the party has come under the control of those who are democratic in fact as well as in name is inequality approved. On the contrary, equality is demanded for all regardless of race, color or creed. It is true that southern states which for a considerable period have cast their electoral votes for democratic candidates for president have disfranchised the blacks by amendments to their state constitutions. But this is not the work of democrats, republicans or populists, but of white men acting as such. In the south the question is not one of partisanship, but of race. The Caucasians refuse to accept negro domination, and to prevent it they have taken from the African the elective franchise. Without stopping to discuss the wrong or the right of this, it may be said that no party can be held responsible for what has been done in and by these states unless it approves it. We challenge anyone to find in the democratic national platform of 1900 or that of 1896 a paragraph or a sentence which the utmost ingenuity can torture into even a semblance of approval. And as the party is not and has not been in power, it has not sanctioned the disfranchisement by its acts. The organization, therefore, must be exonerated.

But the republican party cannot be, for while it does not approve the disfranchisement in its platform it intends to do so in fact. It has control of both branches of congress and of the executive department, it is about to make a new apportionment of congressmen based on the recent federal census, and the Fourteenth amendment provides that when citizens of the United States are disfranchised by any state for other cause than conviction of crime the representation of such state shall be reduced correspondingly. The constitutional provision is mandatory, not permissive. It says shall, not may. Is it to be enforced? Is the republican majority to reduce southern representation because of negro disfranchisement? Not at all. Though he is solemnly sworn to respect and uphold the constitution of the United States, President McKinley protests! And why? For sound public reasons? There can be no sound public reason for a violation of the organic law. He objects for partisan reasons. He is satisfied that with the negroes divested of the elective franchise and the whites thus emancipated from the danger of black domination, the southern whites, no longer bound to act together as a unit in the face of a common menace, will divide politically, that in consequence of the division the republican party will experience a rapid growth south of Mason and Dixon's line, and that by reason of its growth the party will carry states which have been democratic since the completion of reconstruction. For reasons so obvious as to make detail needless, congress will do as the president desires. To strengthen the republican party where heretofore it has been weak, no provision will be made in the reapportionment bill for a reduction of southern representation, and the absence of such provision, especially in view of the constitutional mandate, will be an approval by the republican party of the practice of taking from the negro the franchise which the party, in its earlier and better days, conferred upon him for his protection. Now that it has beeome the facile instrument of plutocracy, the party is eager to undo what it did when it was a party of freedom.

The very opposite of what the Times implies is the fact. The democratic party is not in favor of negro disfranchisement. It objects to it first because it is wrong in principle, and next because, from the political standpoint, the party has everything to lose and nothing to gain by it. The republican party favors negro disfran-

chisement because it is the forerunner of the disfranchisement of white wage-earners—because the more the elective franchise is restricted the easier it will be for combined and organized wealth and monopoly to govern; and it also favors it because it promises to give the party control of states in which hitherto it has had a merely nominal existence.—Dubuque (Ia.) Telegraph.

A PLEA FOR PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

For The Public.

The election is well over, and we are gradually settling back to the consideration of matters of still more practical politics. This being the case, I would like to commend with as much force as possible a notion of method to all reformers.

We all know how difficult it is to make even one convert to any advanced economic idea. One reason for this is that people in general do not care to trouble themselves deeply about anything. Especially do they not wish to bother about others' suffering, having enough of their own, or being safely out of its reach, as the case may be. Often, however, we find those who would really be willing to consider new theories, but who say to us that there is no use in doing so. The theories may be good, but they are not practical now. They have not enough adherents to command majorities. In some far future they may be worth while analyzing, but not now. Therefore, why spend thought upon them?

Thus we fail to attract interest which we might have easily, if anything less than majorities were useful in our legislative system.

This condition would not alter to one of much greater propagandic ease were we to have direct legislation by the people, though that would be of benefit. We had really a popular vote upon imperialism lately, though complicated by other issues—mainly bread-and-butter ones. What we need most is not so much that the people may be readily divided en masse to deliver a majority verdict upon some issue they have already made up their minds about. We need far more that all political creeds which any portion of the people believe shall have the means of being held up before the nation as forcefully as the numbers of those believing them warrant. In other words, we need the representation of our ideas in our representative bodies. We do not have it. Majorities only are represented, because majorities only can elect.

Let us take, for example, the state of Missouri. Probably two-fifteenths of the voters in the state are prohibitionists. I am not a prohibitionist, but I think that under those circumstances they should have two of Missouri's 15 representatives in congress. If not, why not? But they have absolutely no representation in congress, because they have no majority in any one district, and consequently vote for persons and policies they do not like, thereby swelling the influence of such policies to their own discomfort. The single tax men in Missouri are one-fifteenth of the voters. But they must vote for something they only partly believe in, and have no representation that is quite fearless and outspoken, because their mouthpieces are more indebted to others for majorities. The republicans of Missouri are a very large proportion, but have usually two representatives out of 15, because the districts are arranged to give a small majority in each against them. Possibly the socialists in the state could cast one-fifteenth of the vote, being numerous in the cities and labor unions. But instead of perhaps two prohibitionists, one single taxer, a socialist, five republicans and six democrats, the congressional delegation of Missouri is more likely to be two republicans and 13 democrats. Does anyone call this representation? It is nearer misrepresentation.

Not only is congress not a miniature of the nation as it actually stands, but this fact reacts upon the nation's units, and they will not take an interest in a new idea because it will not count. What is the consequence? We have two large political bodies, each naturally ultra-conservative because needing a majority. In order to get that majority there must be a highly organized machine, delicately responsive to central management, and therefore peculiarly fitted for oligarchic control, which is susceptible to corrupt influences, and finds it easy to work through them. The people are compelled to choose between these two parties or nothing.

With proportional representation, on the other hand, we should have at once probably half a dozen parties, each of which would have at least a voice in the affairs of the country. Machine politics would immediately become less powerful. There would be no parties so large as now. Probably the tendency would be for parties to multiply and become comparatively smaller. They would combine upon issues strictly of the moment, which would, of course, still be decided by majorities. Upon theoretical questions there would be a willingness to consider, a responsiveness, and therefore a progressiveness not possible while minorities are unrepresented. For any sound reform there would be hope, for it could obtain a hearing, not as now, by stealth and skillful maneuvering, but by its own few adherents, responsible to their electors. Of course what is true of the nation and congress, is also true of states, cities and their representative bodies.

This political reform, like all political reforms, is only a means to social and economic reforms. But without democracies instead of monarchies, or without real representation instead of unreal, social reforms are slow coming. Moreover, we can much more easily bring about a political reform than an economic one—remember the Australian ballot laws. Personally I am very sure I can make 20 converts to proportional representation to one, for instance, to the single tax. These 20 can do likewise. I rarely find a man—not one in 30—who will disagree with the proportional representation idea. More than half will disagree with direct legislation. More than nine-tenths will at least withhold opinion on the single tax. Are not these considerations very strong arguments that all who champion minority ideas should combine upon definite propaganda of proportional representation? It would soon be followed, I think, by opportunity for its gradual introduction.

ETHELBERT W. GRABILL.
University of South Dakota.

AMONG THE DOUKHOBORS IN CANADA.

Probably most have heard more or less of the Doukhobors. This Russian sect of uneducated peasants has been suffering persecution at home for a century and more because of the fact that its members abjured the established church and condemned war and military service. But it was not until about 13 years ago, when universal conscription became the rule, that their troubles became unbearable. These inoffensive people, who have charmed all who have met them by their simple piety and kindliness, were banished from their homes and exposed to all kinds of hardships. At last, some influential Russians stirred themselves on behalf of these oppressed peasants and obtained as a great favor from the czar permission for them to leave the country at their own expense. They had but little of their savings left after these years of sorrow, and it was necessary for the quakers of England and America to

come to their aid, and largely through their assistance some 7,000 of these peaceable people have been transported to northwestern Canada, 600 or 700 miles beyond Winnipeg. Here they were placed in an unsettled country upon the open prairie some two and a half years ago, with the necessity upon them of providing shelter and food for themselves before the long cold winter set in. They set to work with determination, and already they are beginning to feel at home in their new fields and houses.

The few settlers who had occupied these regions before the Doukhobors came did not know what kind of people they were, and thought they might prove to be lawless and dangerous. One ranchman, who was about to make a journey and leave his wife alone in his house, just at the time of their arrival, went to the Doukhobors and by signs with his gun threatened them with death if they came near his ranch. The morning after his departure his wife heard a knock at the door, and went with trepidation to the door, expecting to be assaulted. There she found a Doukhobor woman who smiled at her, for they could not understand each other's language, pushed her way in, took the milk-pail, went to the barn and insisted upon milking the cow for her hostess and doing other house work for her. She had taken this practical method of showing their good-will. This lady and her husband are now among the strongest friends of the Doukhobors. They have no children of their own and would be glad to adopt a Doukhobor child, but these Russians love their children so that, notwithstanding their poverty, not one child in all the settlements can be secured.

These people are anxious to become Canadians and to be able to communicate with the Anglo-Saxon settlers around them. Knowing this, two ladies of Kingston, Ont., Mrs. Varney, a quaker, and her young cousin, Miss Nellie Baker, determined to establish a little summer school at one of the new Doukhobor villages on Good Spirit lake. They arrived at their destination after a long journey, early in July of this year. Mrs. Varney had already passed the summer of 1899 there, conducting a dispensary for the Doukhobors, who have no physicians among them. They pitched their tents near three of the Doukhobor villages, a small tent for their residence, another for the dispensary, which was under Mrs. Varney's charge, and a third, 20 by 20 feet, for the school, over which Miss Baker presided, and for which work her studies at Queen's university had fitted her. Mrs. Varney had won the affections of the villagers last year, and they were not slow to send their children to the new school, some of them arriving before the ladies had unpacked their luggage.

Miss Baker's report of her experiment, which has just been made to the Canadian commissioner of immigration, shows what difficulties she encountered. She found herself confronted by a tentful of boys and girls with none of whom did she have a single known word in common.

"By signs and motions," she says, "I got them seated in rows on the prairie grass of the tent floor, and holding up a pencil, said: 'One.' I could not detect any apparent comprehension. Then taking up another pencil, I said: 'Two,' and added a third, 'Three.' Still no response, and my heart sank somewhat. However, I decided to repeat the method, and as I said 'One,' I noticed a look on a boy's face that told me he knew I was counting, and I saw him turn and speak to the others. Almost instantly they understood, and soon, repeating after me, counted up to ten."

From this beginning the course of teaching proceeded. Some of the pupils walked five miles to school and five miles back every day. Miss Baker carried on this school for 6½ hours a day and for 5½ days a week, and as almost the entire time was occupied with oral teaching, some idea may be formed of the arduous character of her work. She was naturally tired when the hour to close came, but the children were never tired. The favorite method was object teaching. They learned the divisions of time from a watch, to count money from coins, and so on. The children had a natural taste for figures, and at the end of the two months during which the school was open the older children had succeeded in getting through one-half of the multiplication table, and some of the more advanced pupils were in the second reader (Canadian). In writing, she declares that some of them equaled or surpassed the teacher. The children were anxious to have tasks assigned to them to prepare at home, and never were satisfied with the amount of such tasks; they always wanted more. Their clothing was scrupulously clean and picturesque as well. "Of their needlework and embroidery," Miss Baker adds, "I am speaking of that done at their homes by the girls of my school, their handiwork is simply wonderful. For this purpose my handkerchiefs were taken, and soon returned, beautifully worked."

At first the Doukhobors did not know that Miss Baker's work, like Mrs. Varney's, was entirely voluntary and unremunerated. When they found it out they sent a committee to her to offer her some compensation, although they were in need themselves. When she declined it they told her that they thanked her "all the day and all the night."

Some of the older boys, who did not know a word of any language but Russian at the beginning of July, can now, after barely two months' teaching, correspond with Miss Baker in "fairly understandable English."

It is worth while to quote Miss Baker's remarks upon the general character of the Doukhobors. She writes:

"The dignified courtesy and hospitality extended to us in more than a score of their villages, the manly bearing of the men, the delightful sympathy and affection with which they regard everything connected with their homes—an estimation of the home that has little to learn from, and possibly something to teach to, even Anglo-Saxons—their dwellings that already surpass in comfort and cleanliness those of any other class of settlers excepting those from older Canada and Great Britain, all testify to the desirability of the Doukhobors as settlers, who will, I believe, soon make good Canadian citizens. It does not require very keen perception on the part of one having had a welcome into hundreds of their homes to be assured that this is a community living up to high moral standards and holding tenaciously to the simple tenets of Christian faith. Of their daybreak services of a Sunday morning, their impressive intonation of the Scriptures, their beautiful singing and harmonious chanting of hymns one could write chapters. They sing much of evenings in the villages and going to and returning from work afield. A favorite chant, freely translated, runs as follows:

"You tell me, stranger, where you are going.
With the hand safe in my Saviour's,
I will go over the mountainside and valley,
Over fields and prairies I will go, my friends,
To see the heavenly spring wild flowers;
I will go after Jesus
Over the hard sand, and the Lord God be with me.
He leads us on to Heaven
In his paths of righteousness,
Straight, straight to the Kingdom of Heaven."

A little story will add a touch to this picture of a noble people: A lady

living 20 miles from one of the Doukhobor villages wanted a girl for a servant. A young girl went to her on trial for a month, but at the end of the period she promptly returned to her home. Her employer came after her, wishing to keep her, but on no account would the girl go. Urged to give a reason, at first she only replied that she " could not," but finally she said: "I cannot go back; my mistress did not love me." This little story throws a flood of light on the servant-girl problem. It is love that the Doukhobors want in life and which they freely give. It was love that prevented them from learning to kill their fellows in the Russian army, and it was their too great love that made the Russian government force its best subjects to leave their native land. It will be Russia's loss and Canada's gain. If they can only teach us on this continent the folly and sin of war, the joy of loving even one's enemies, and the impossibility of doing it with bomb-shells, their long pilgrimage and their years of hardship will not have been in vain.—Ernest H. Crosby, in The Christian Herald.

THE OLDEST OF LIVING THINGS.

Clifford Pinchot, the forester of the department of agriculture, has compiled a pamphlet on the big trees of California, which has just been issued from the government printing office. It is handsomely illustrated with a number of fine pictures of the great trees, showing their size as compared with that of other conifers. Mr. Pinchot presents the following salient facts regarding the big trees:

"The dimensions of the big tree are unequaled. Its age makes it the oldest living thing. The majestic beauty of the big tree is unique and world-renowned. Its exists only in ten isolated groves on the west slope of the Sierra Nevada mountains and nowhere else in the world. The Mariposa grove is the only one of consequence which is completely protected. Most of the scattered groves of big trees are privately owned and are, therefore, in danger of destruction. Lumbering is rapidly sweeping them off. Forty mills and logging companies are now at work wholly or in part upon big tree timber. The southern groves show some reproduction, through which there is some hope of perpetuating these groves. In the northern groves the species hardly holds its own. The big tree and the smaller coast redwood represent a surviving prehistoric genus of trees once widely distributed over the globe.

Mr. Pinchot says that before the glacial period the genus of big trees, called sequoia, flourished widely in the temperate zones of three continents, and Europe, Asia and America each had its share. But when the ice fields moved down out of the north the luxuriant vegetation of the age declined, and one after another the different kinds gave way until only the big trees and the redwood survived. These trees have come down to us through the vicissitudes of many centuries, solely because of its superb qualifications. Its bark is often two feet thick and almost noncombustible. The oldest specimens felled are still sound at heart and fungus is an enemy unknown to it. Yet the big trees have not increased their range since the glacial period, and have just managed to hold their own on the little strip of country where the climate is locally favorable.

The finest of all groves, the Calaveras grove, with the biggest and tallest trees, came into the possession of a lumberman on April 1, 1900; in short, the majority of the big trees of California, certainly the best of them, are owned by the people who have every right and, in many cases, every intention of cutting them down for lumber. Many of the notable trees in Calaveras grove are 300 feet in height and 20 to 23 feet in diameter. The Stanislaus, or South Calaveras grove, contains 1,380 big trees. The Mariposa grove has 125 trees over 40 feet in circumference.—Chicago Chronicle.

AN UP-TO-DATE JOKE FROM PUNCH OF OCTOBER 17, 1900.

Hostess—What do you think of our game pie, Mr. Brigson? We rather pride ourselves on it, you know.

Brigson (nervously anxious to please) —Oh, thank you, it's very nice indeed, what there is of it. What I mean to say is, there's plenty of it—such as it is! (Awful pause.)

Mrs. Brown—I always thought the British would win in the long run.

Mrs. Smith—So did I; I said right along that all they needed was tact.—Puck.

"You ought to take down that sign! You sold me some of those 'fresh mixed nuts' the other day," the indignant customer said, "and they are not fresh mixed nuts at all. When I took them home I found they were all old and strong."

"Nevertheless, ma'am," replied the man who kept the establishment, "that sign is a-going to stay right where it is. I mix those nuts fresh every few days, ma'am."—Chicago Tribune.

Visitor—Ah! What a picture of innocence that child is!

Mother—Dear me! I hadn't noticed! Gertrude, what have you been doing?—Puck.

England cannot well complain of French enthusiasm for Kruger. In times past she gave warm welcome to the exiles of Poland, feted Kossuth, glorified Garibaldi after his failure to capture Rome, sheltered and [illegible] ed the exiles from Fran[illegible] coup d'etat of 1851 and gave [illegible] to the men who later attempted the life of Napoleon III. with an infernal machine. England has sympathized, in fact, with all kinds of liberators except those who have tried to liberate their countries from herself.—N. Y. World.

"Oh, pa!"

"What is it, little Fred?"

"Why, pa, jes' now, out on th' avenue, I seen a autermobeel have a fit!" —Puck.

The world tends more and more in these piping times to divide itself between those who own Standard Oil stock and those who don't. It is not an equal division, and it grows less equal every day as more and more of the earth passes under the Standard Oil dominion.—Life.

"Don't tell me that worry doesn't do any good!" exclaimed Mrs. Fret. "I know better. The things I worry about don't happen."—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

A plan for abolishing the use of money is proposed and elaborated in "Business Without Money" (Chicago: The Cooperative Press, 370 Dearborn St.) by William Henry Van Ornum, Ph. D. The plan requires for realization neither political action nor great organization, but can be started upon a small scale. Dealers in

commodities—for example, a department store—are to offer to the manufacturers from whom they buy, not money but a credit at the store, subject to checks payable in goods or services. These credits, it is assumed, will be available to the manufacturers in purchasing materials and paying laborers, because they will reach the hands of persons desirous of buying at the department store, where they are redeemable. With only one business house doing this the friction might, of course, be very great; but with every addition to the number it would diminish and the checks become more and more generally acceptable in facilitating exchanges. To the reader of Dr. Van Ornum's book who happens to be familiar with the impulses that move men in trade, the plan proposed will not appear to be feasible. But as the author has set on foot a practical demonstration, experience may prove in this case, as it has so often done before, that what appears to be visionary in anticipation is in the highest degree useful in realization. If business should come to be generally done in this way, there is really no reason for supposing that the plan would not work more smoothly than existing methods. It involves nothing but an extension of the clearing house principle. But the author's governing idea, that when in operation it would abolish interest, derives its only plausibility from the erroneous assumption of all projectors of similar innovations, that interest is a premium for the use of money. The plan is at best but an improvement in the mechanism of trade, whereby trade operations are made easier. It cannot, therefore, abolish interest, except as interest is attributable to difficulties in trading. Neither can it contribute to the betterment of society except as other labor-saving devices do—by its influence upon production. Looked at in the most favorable light, it would enhance only productive power. It would not tend in the least degree to make distribution more equitable.

"The Philippines" (Chicago: Donohue Bros.) is the authorized translation by David J. Doherty, A. M., M. D., of Chicago, of Blumentritt's account of the ethnographical, historical and political conditions of the Philippines. Blumentritt stands high in Germany as a teacher of ethnology, and he has spent many years among the Filipinos. The translation is intended as a contribution, from a non-partisan source, to the literature of the presidential campaign, but it is of permanent interest and value to students of the Philippine question.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 6,000.

LEGAL NOTICE.

Office of The Public Publishing Co., Chicago, Dec. 6, 1900.

Public notice is hereby given, that a special meeting of the stockholders of the corporation The Public Publishing Co. will be held at Room 1401, No. 109 Randolph St., Chicago, on the 19th day of January, 1901, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of considering the question of increasing the capital stock of said corporation.

THEODORE J. AMBERG,
ALICE THACHER POST,
LOUIS F. POST.
Directors.