The Public

Third Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1900. Number 114.

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.

Shall we infer from the Cuban postal fraud exposures that in his repeated promises of stable government for Cuba Mr. McKinley has meant Augean stable government?

The investigation into the New York ice trust, which promises to uncover a scandal rivaling that of the Tweed regime, is especially valuable for its pronounced revelation of the real source of trust powers. Not from organization did this power come in the case of the ice trust, but from a monopoly of the docks. Had the docks been free to all shippers and deliverers of ice, the trust would have been beaten out by competition. But by controlling these docks it controlled the trade. So it is with all the trusts. If the laws that foster monopoly of trade, transportation and land were abolished, no trust could flourish. Any business organization then that was not generally beneficial would collapse. Of course all these monopoly-fostering laws cannot be abolished at once. But the tariff laws that promote trade monopolies could be repealed at the very next session of congress if the people demanded it; and that alone would undermine some of the worst trusts.

The story attributed to Senator Carter, of Montana, who was overheard telling it to a friend on a Washington sleeping car, that Mr. Hanna's "piece de resistance" for the presidential campaign is to be the purchase or bribery of every democratic and doubtful republican paper in the country districts where the vote is close, possesses several elements of probability. Not the least among these is the fact that the plutocratic ring of which Mr. Hanna is political master of ceremonies has for some time been trying to secure control of the principal metropolitan papers, with so much success that Harper's Weekly, the New York Times and the New York Sun, are already well known to be included in Pierpont Morgan's schedule of assets. There are signs, besides, that if that schedule were open for inspection the name of many another pretentious "journal of civilization" would be discovered there. It is a shrewd scheme, this of gaining control of the press and directing its power to the upbuilding and perpetuation of plutocracy; and Mr. Hanna, by planning to include the country papers in the scheme, shows that he has lost none of his cunning.

"There is nothing to fear," says the complacent Robert Collyer, "from the multimillionaire." The reason for Mr. Collyer's confidence is his assumption that "few fortunes survive three generations." This assumption is a pleasant tradition, formerly phrased as "three generations from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves;" but it has long since ceased to express a fact, Since John Jacob Astor showed Americans how to establish fortunes they have become as stable in America as in England. But even if the tradition were as true to-day as it was in the earlier periods of the settlement of this new country, what satisfaction could a thoughtful man draw from it? The social evil is not great fortunes. It is great poverty among those who earn so much wealth that they do not get. To them it can make no difference whether fortunes are stable or not. The great, obtrusive, undeniable and invariable fact is that no matter who may be rich nor how long his fortune may remain intact, the mass of those who do the work of the world, and without whose work there would be fortunes for nobody, are permanently poor and dependent. To borrow a suggestive illustration from the gambling table, what matters it to the many who never win if the few who do soon lose their winnings again?

In his speech of welcome to the Boer envoys at the Chicago Auditorium on the 5th, Mr. Altgeld asked the audience to remember that there are two Englands—an England to be proud of for its devotion to liberty, and an England to despise for its greed of empire and gold. Mr. Fischer, one of the envoys, made the same distinction. It is a distinction that should never be overlooked. The England of a Chamberlain is something very different from the England of a Morley. And when we condemn this Chamberlain England for its villainous assault upon the independence of the South African republics, let us not forget the truly noble England of the Morleys which beholds the outrage with righteous indignation and patriotic shame. Never has the difference between these two Englands been more clearly displayed than in this war for the subjugation of the Boers. The England that Morley represents has been self-possessed and dignified, urging the nation to be calm and just, to avoid conquest and to seek honorable peace. But the England that Chamberlain represents has from the first been hot for war regardless of right, and crazy over inglorious victories. This is the England that has gone wild to imbecility and drunk to ruffianism, because an invading army of 300,000 British has apparently defeated and

driven from their homes a defending army of 35,000 Boers.

It is not so certain, however, that the little army of Boers has been defeated. To capture a people's capital may be very far from subduing the people. The Boers surrendered Johannesburg without a fight, after getting their guns and munitions and supplies safely away. They surrendered Pretoria after withdrawing as safely from that city their equipment, their army and their government, and not improbably their large "catch" of British prisoners as well. These places could not be defended against Lord Roberts's "enveloping" army; the Boer force was too small. But it could and did elude him, and now he must "trek" on to another Boer stronghold, lengthening and attenuating his line and exposing his isolated detachments to raids like those which resulted this week in the capture of a whole British regiment in the "pacified" Orange Free State.

The Boers say the war is not over and that the British troops have not yet encountered their worst experiences in South Africa. There is reason to believe that they are making no empty boast. The military situation is unchanged except that Lydenburg takes the place of Pretoria as the republican capital. Lord Roberts's objective stretches aggravatingly out ahead of him. Even if Lydenburg were taken that would not necessarily end the war. Independence would not yet be reduced to an impossible dream. The Boers justly point to Washington's apparently hopeless condition before the French intervened, to the utter subjugation of Mexico by the French in the sixties, and to their own Netherlands under the Spanish, as instances warranting their confidence that even though they be scattered into small bands by the overwhelming might of the invader they will be able nevertheless to wear the invader out and achieve anew for their country a place in the sisterhood of independent nations.

That was a very transparent political trick which the republicans played in congress with their trust amendment to the constitution. Their purpose was to put the democrats in the position of appearing to vote against trusts, when in fact they were voting against a proposition to give to congress general jurisdiction over business partnerships and corporations. It was precisely the amendment which the trust magnates have been clamoring for. So far from checking trusts, it would have served the purposes of trusts. It was really not a trust amendment, but an imperial amendment, under which the central government would have been strengthened and local government weakened. The most appropriate title for that amendment would have been "an amendment to confirm the jurisdiction of trust magnates over the federal government." If the republicans were sincere about suppressing trusts they could prove their sincerity much more easily and conclusively than by amending the constitution. All they need do is to repeal the tariff they themselves have imposed upon trustified goods. But that they have refused to do; and they will continue to refuse, for the very simple reason that it would disturb the trust schemes of their most prolific campaign contributors.

The only thing that gives any force whatever to the republican campaign trick described above is the fact that Mr. Bryan himself is demanding federal regulation of trusts. In an otherwise able and sound democratic article in the North American Review for June he deliberately repeats his proposition for an act of congress "making it necessary for a corporation organized in any state to take out a license from the federal government before doing business outside of that state," a plan which would no more check the development of evil trusts than a sparrow could check the progress of a locomotive. It is a mere makeshift, which is undemocratic in political principle, unsound in economics, of disputed constitutionality, and unwise in practical politics, and which can serve only to divert attention from the conditions that alone make trusts possible.

But Mr. Bryan, notwithstanding his weakness on the trust question, defines with absolute precision the essential issue of the approaching campaign. He says it is "between plutocracy and democracy," adding in explanation what is clearly true, that "all the questions under discussion will, in their last analysis, disclose the conflict between the dollar and the man." That is indeed the issue that underlies everything else. It is the real issue that divides the two great parties. No sincere and intelligent democrat seeks a political home any longer in the republican party; nor does any intelligent plutocrat, unless he intends to be treacherous, ally himself with the democratic party. And in these circumstances it would be impossible, all things considered, to choose better leaders than those who are acknowledged to be the leaders of either side—Hanna of the republicans and Bryan of the democrats.

In the contest now in progress in North Carolina between the populists and the republicans on one side and a party labeling itself "democratic" on the other, the sympathy of all true democrats of whatever party must be with the populists and republicans. The so-called democrats of North Carolina are only a survival of the slave-holding oligarchy of the era before the civil war. That is the real explanation of the effort they are now making to evade the fifteenth amendment and disfranchise negro voters. Their plan is to amend the state constitution so as to make education the nominal but race the real test of voting rights.

An astounding defense of this North Carolina plan for evading the fifteenth amendment and trampling upon democratic principles is made by the "democratic" candidate for governor. He says that the proposed

amendment of the state constitution—

> adopts the suggestion of Senator Cullom, and demands the existence of sufficient intelligence, "either by inheritance or education," as a necessary qualification for voting. It requires of the negro the qualification by education because he has it not by inheritance, and demands only of the white man that he possess it by inheritance.

Heredity with reference to mental and moral qualities is a fad that has been pretty badly overworked, but this spurious democrat of North Carolina has worked it to death. And in the end, if we mistake not, it will appear that he has at the same time also worked the state amendment to death. For if a state law which requires of negroes, as a condition of voting, that they shall derive their intelligence from education, while assuming that the white man acquires his from inheritance, does not conflict with the fifteenth amendment that amendment must be utterly without force. Think of it! The fifteenth amendment prohibits any denial of the voting right on account of race or color. This does not prevent a denial on educational grounds; but if a law denying the right to uneducated negroes, while granting it to uneducated whites, upon the theory that whites inherit voting intelligence while negroes do not, is not a denial on account of race or color, what would be?

In a recent decision the supreme court of Kansas nullifies an act of the legislature as obnoxious to the fourteenth amendment to the federal constitution. The objectionable act was intended to protect workingmen from the extortions of the truck store system by nullifying labor contracts not payable in money.. "It has been sought by some judges," reads the opinion in the case (state versus Haun) "to justify legislation of this kind upon the theory that, in the exercise of police power, a limitation necessary for the protection of one class of persons against the persecution of another class may be placed upon freedom of contract." To this proposition the Kansas court does not assent. "As between persons sui juris," it asks, "what right has the legislature to assume that one class has the need of protection against another?" Of the soundness of the conclusion indicated by this question there ought to be no doubt. The court was right in holding that paternal legislation in favor of wage workers is intolerable. But if that be true, what becomes of all the usury laws that grace the statute books of the several states. If a legislature cannot interfere with freedom of labor contracts in behalf of the laborer without running foul of the fourteenth amendment, by what right does it interfere with borrowing contracts in behalf of the borrower? There may be a distinguishable difference in legal principle, but if there is it must be an exceedingly nice one.

So conservative a man as Walter S. Logan, prominent at the New York city bar and but recently president of the New York State Bar association, is preaching a gospel of wealth limitation. He would start with a maximum of $10,000,000 and hold the possessions of individuals down to that amount by means of graduated income taxes and restrictions upon inheritances. The large public revenues resulting he would expend in the acquisition by the state of those franchises which, as he describes them, "have done so much to enrich its citizens at its expense." He suggests, for example, that New York state might buy and operate the New York Central railroad, while New York city might establish public ice plants and furnish ice to the people at nominal prices.

It is encouraging to find a man of Mr. Logan's professional, business and social environment exhibiting contempt for wealth accumulation and accumulators. But it is not so encouraging to find him so indifferent to the elementary principles of wealth distribution. If Mr. Logan were cross-examined upon his reasons for proposing the confiscation of fortunes in excess of $10,000,000, he would probably justify himself morally by insisting that no one can earn so much. Any other moral justification would be impossible. For if any man should earn more than $10,000,000 the state would have no more moral right to confiscate the excess than the whole. Earnings either are sacred to the last penny, or they are not sacred at all. The instant, therefore, that you empower the state to confiscate any excess of private earnings, that very instant you justify the state in making a total confiscation.

Yet Mr. Logan is right in supposing that no man earns $10,000,000. He would be right if he put it at $1,000,000. For it would take a five-dollar-a-day man some 650 years, without allowing him anything for expenses, to earn and save $1,000,000; and it is beyond the range of probability that any man, however gigantic his productive power, can productively earn and fairly save in a lifetime as much as a five-dollar-a-day man could earn in 650 years. But we are confronted with the fact that there are millionaires. It must be, then, that they get enormously more than they earn. How do they get it? If they do not earn it, but are honest, they must get it by means of legal privileges of some kind. The obvious method, then, for limiting unearned fortunes is to abolish legal privileges. It is the natural and just way, too. If that were done, fortunes would be limited as nature limits them—by the earnings of their owners.

The interestingly garrulous and often instructive "Spectator" who contributes to the Outlook, had some very sensible observations in that periodical of May 19, upon the provincial character of the New York press. He rather inclined to the view that New York papers are provincial. We are sure that he would be confirmed in this view by any newspaper reading New Yorker who has ever gone through the back door of the metrop-

olis and made his way to the other coast. As soon as the cockney of Printing House square gets beyond the atmosphere of New York he begins to realize from the papers he reads that things are going on all over the world. Before that he had not known from his newspaper reading that there was any world off Manhattan island, except for vacation purposes. This observation is no Chicago provincialism, nor even a comparison of New York papers with Chicago papers. It is a comparison of New York papers with the whole interior press—Cincinnati excepted, for the Cincinnati papers publish more news that isn't worth knowing and less that is than the papers of any other large city on the continent. Of course, all papers are local; but those of New York are preeminently so. They are wearisomely local to readers unacquainted with the purely local affairs of New York. Not only do they devote themselves to local concerns, but they magnify local news to such a degree that of two men of equal education and the same order of intelligence, one of whom had kept "abreast of the times" by reading New York papers and the other by reading the papers of any other city from the Appalachian chain to the Pacific coast (Cincinnati excepted as before), the latter would have his mind in much closer touch with world affairs. To New Yorkers sojourning elsewhere the New York press is especially interesting for only one purpose—to enable them to keep up with home news. The Sycosset Casket serves the same use to former residents of Sycosset.

In a recent sermon in Chicago a Congregational minister, Rev. F. A. Noble, took an unusual view of the Sabbath commandment—

Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work, etc.

This commandment is usually treated from the pulpit as one of Sabbath rest; but Mr. Noble, rightly as it seems to us, treated it as one of weekly work. Instead of placing emphasis upon the command to rest on the seventh day, he placed it upon the command to labor six days. His subject was the walking delegate, whom he contrasted with God; God says to man: "Thou shalt labor;" the walking delegate says: "Thou shalt not labor." But Mr. Noble discreetly refrained from applying his just interpretation of the text to a social evil that is not only vastly greater than the walking delegate evil, but is accountable for it. For every one man whom the walking delegate forbids to labor, land monopoly forbids thousands. When God commanded man to labor, he furnished him the natural opportunities; but human laws have so monopolized these opportunities that even this great country of ours, capable of supplying working opportunities to hundreds of millions, is already "crowded," and men must beg for a chance to work. Out of this condition comes the walking delegate, who orders men not to work so that enough work may be left to go around. In these circumstances, isn't it a little bit like baby play to fire the labor commandment at walking delegates? They are doubtless a safe pulpit mark, because they have few friends in the church as that institution is now organized. But it takes no more courage to fire at a mark from a pulpit than in a shooting gallery. One's courage is tested by his firing at what can fire back. We should be glad to hear Mr. Noble expound his view of the labor commandment with reference to the legalized monopolization of natural laboring opportunities.

It is refreshing to discover in the editorial columns of so important a daily paper as the New York Herald a distinct recognition of the truth about the favorable balance of trade fallacy. This editorial, which appeared in the Herald of May 16, after mentioning the fact that the "excess of exports over imports is smaller than it was a twelvemonth ago," adds:

But the theory once entertained that national prosperity consists in selling much and buying little has long since been exploded.

When this idea, now so steadily advancing, once takes possession of the public mind, the protection fetish will be unceremoniously knocked off its pedestal.

Even the Journal of Commerce now throws in a qualifying phrase when it points with pride to our excess of exports. In its issue of May 9, in the course of an extended statistical analysis of imports and exports, in which it showed that during the past 30 years "we have exported in merchandise or specie about $131,500,000 a year more than we have imported, so far as the customhouse figures enable us to trace the course of trade," it explained:

Freights on imports, money spent abroad by travelers, profits and dividends and the movement of securities back and forth, and the large sum of money to our credit in Europe now, for lately we have certainly been sending abroad more than enough to settle all occult as well as all obvious accounts, must be invoked to make the accounts balance. No one supposes that this trade has been done at a loss; no American has sent merchandise or specie abroad without getting its equivalent.

Is it so? Has no American sent merchandise or specie abroad without getting its equivalent? What becomes, then, of the favorable balance of trade theory? An exchange of equivalents, if coincident, can leave no balance either way; if not coincident, the excessive export balance of one time must be offset by an excessive import balance at another. Consequently an exchange of equivalents is inconsistent with a continuous excess of exports, and if excessive exporting be continuous the trade cannot be one of equivalents. It is necessarily a trade in which outgo exceeds income. Yet it is a continuous excess of exports that the protectionists assure us is profitable.

The Yale Law Journal for May contains a scholarly and convincing legal argument on the Puerto Rico

tariff question by Edward B. Whitney, who was one of the assistant attorney generals during Cleveland's last administration. Mr. Whitney very thoroughly disposes of a great deal of the imperialistic nonsense that has lately been solemnly masquerading in the magazines and newspapers as constitutional law and precedent. So far as past precedents go, he shows, after a full and discriminating examination, that their weight is against the imperialistic position and in favor of the doctrine that Puerto Rico became part of the United States, at least to the extent of acquiring the benefit of the constitutional clause regarding uniformity of taxation, as soon as the Spanish treaty was ratified. He establishes the same conclusion upon an equally profound examination into the subject as an original question. In this examination Mr. Whitney demonstrates that the constitution must extend to Puerto Rico in order to empower the American officials to act there at all, since they have no power to act anywhere except by authority of the American people as expressed in the constitution.

In concluding his paper Mr. Whitney deals with the "implied sovereignty" notion of the imperialists in a manner so comprehensive yet concise that we quote him literally. On this point he says:

> **There is one gross fallacy which should be noticed in closing this discussion, a fallacy which seems undisputed, and which is applied to Puerto Rico and Oceania alike. I refer to the supposition that congress and the executive can turn our republic into an imperial "world power" at their discretion because to conquer or buy the earth and rule it in subjection is an attribute of sovereignty, and because we have no smaller degree of sovereignty than the greatest of European colonizing nations. It is very true that we have every power of sovereignty in the highest degree—that we have power to establish for ourselves the colonial system of Rome or England, the domestic institutions of Spain or Russia, the religion of Thibet or Sulu. But we have not necessarily delegated those powers to our present rulers. And whatever powers we have not delegated to them, or to the state governments, we have reserved for ourselves.**

All that should be obvious enough. It is only an amplification of the well understood theory of our state and national governments that they are governments by the people. But this Jeffersonian and Lincolnian doctrine has suffered some hard knocks at the hands of the present federal administration.

DEMOCRACY.

The essence of democracy is self-respect. In exact proportion with the approach to universality of this sentiment in any country will be its approach to the ideals of democracy. Political self-respect inheres in the possession of a vote equal in weight to the vote of any other and in eligibility to every office in the nation from the highest down. In a democracy the suffrage is a right and not a privilege. Politically, therefore, the United States, barring its sex discriminations, is a democracy. No American can lose his political self-respect save by his voluntary act. When he sells his vote, or permits another to dictate how it shall be cast, or when he buys another's vote or seeks by intimidation to influence it or advocates depriving any class of citizens of their right to vote, he ceases to be a democrat and becomes politically a serf or a tyrant.

It is often said that Great Britain to-day is a more democratic country than the United States. Those who make this assertion mean that the government of Great Britain, free from the restraints of a written constitution, responds more quickly and surely to the changing currents of popular opinion than does that of America. This is a great advantage, but it does not in itself constitute democracy. Our restrictions are of our own making and can be thrown off by us whenever we get sufficiently in earnest to do so. In England the suffrage is still regarded as a privilege, and there are large classes of people on whom it has not been bestowed, while members of the other classes possess two, three and sometimes a dozen votes each. In Great Britain, too, a hereditary and absolutely irresponsible chamber can defeat the will of the people's representatives and a hereditary monarch must be supported and deferred to. Politically the United States is a more democratic country than it is possible for Great Britain or any monarchy to be.

When we turn from political to social democracy, the advantage on our side is still more apparent. In Europe the vices of subserviency on the one side and snobbery on the other have their roots away back in feudal times, and their gradual decay is the slow growth of centuries. In America, except for the curse of negro slavery, we had the inestimable advantage of starting fair. Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues laid broad and deep a foundation of equality on which the American people have since stood. Hence, ours is still to Europe's downtrodden millions the land of the free. We hold in repugnance the stratification of classes into upper, middle and lower. We smile contemptuously at the antics of royalty. We make presidents of rail splitters and canal boys. If our millionaires try to emulate the haughty pretensions of Europe's aristocracy they are jeered at for their pains. No man orders himself lowly and obediently before his betters. He who greets another obsequiously or begs a gratuity or dons a livery may possibly have been born under the American flag, but in the act he repudiates his democratic heritage and ceases to be an American.

This is democracy. This is the spirit of our fathers. It has in the past been shared by native and foreign-born alike. It still endures, and so long as it endures, though the fabric of our political liberty may crumble, there will remain unshaken the foundation on which to rebuild.

For the preservation of this spirit, then, every believer in the republic should strive. To deny the grave danger that threatens it is idle. With the growth of wealth and monopoly an opposite spirit—the spirit of toryism—has gained ground. This is the spirit that denies the equal and natural rights of men, that believes in the rule of the few, that would impose educational restrictions on the suffrage, that would prevent popular agitation by the arm of force. It is the spirit which in England cherishes aristocratic privileges, maintains a state church, denies freedom to Ire-

land and seeks to crush the Boers. In America our "colonies" and our war of conquest in the east are its first ripened fruit. Militarism, press censorship, interference with free speech, class legislation threaten to follow.

This spirit of toryism takes two forms. There is the callous, sordid, brutal toryism of Morgan and Merriam, Hanna and Denby, with its contempt for human life, its frank avowal that might makes right, its unsqueamish desire to trample on the weak. There is the far more dangerour toryism of benevolence, fathered by the pulpit and indorsed by the influential and the conventionally religious in all parts of the land. This is the toryism that wishes to control for the good of the controlled. Conscious of their God-given superiority, its apostles would fain force their fellows to do as they in their omniscience should direct. Justice seems to play small part in this philosophy. It is founded on a perverted and very human wisdom, which an analysis resolves into that colossal error and hoary wickedness of doing evil that good may come.

It is this spirit that makes light of the slaughter of 20,000 Filipinos so that it clear the way for western enterprise and pharisaic evangelism. It is this spirit that lauds the Carnegies and Rockefellers for their donations as if in the eternal economy of the heavens it were the way in which money is expended and not the way in which it is acquired that matters. Its Lord and Lady Bountifuls at home, its bishops and college professors abroad, play directly into the hands of the land grabbers, the blood shedders and all the exponents of the other, the frank and brutal toryism.

Happily the ideas of our American tories have not yet met with acceptance from any large number of their less prosperous countrymen. Once let these ideas prevail, once let them be accepted meekly by the masses of the people, and democracy as a national possession will become a thing of the past. The forms of republicanism may survive, but they will be empty and meaningless. The people will cease to govern and will submit to be governed. The dreams of benevolent despotism—that contradictory and imposisble conception—will give place to the realities of rule by a greedy and conscienceless plutocracy, and freedom will be lost.

This has in the past been the fate of republics where great estates at home and unjust wars abroad sapped the strength and destroyed the moral fiber of the people. Before it overwhelms the United States may an awakened electorate uproot the monopolistic privileges whose growth alone it is that makes assaults on democracy possible and tory theories dangerous.

FRANK C. WELLS.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

NEWS

An unauthentic report of the surrender of both Johannesburg and Pretoria was the final item last week in our narrative of the progress of the British war in South Africa. Although the daily papers were full of this report at the time of our going to press, all of them regarding it as marking the end of the war, the report soon proved to be not only unauthentic but false. Neither Johannesburg nor Pretoria had at that time (May 31) been surrendered. But both have been surrendered since.

Lord Roberts had on the 29th, as authoritatively stated in these columns last week, crossed the Vaal and, moving upon Johannesburg without either encountering much resistance or succeeding in his plans of surrounding the enemy, had occupied a suburb of that town. He intended to enter Johannesburg on the 30th, but delayed doing so at the request of the Boer commandant, in order to enable all the Boer troops to withdraw and thereby to avoid the necessity of street fighting. His entry was not made until June 1, when it was accomplished peaceably. Only three Boer guns were found in the fort. The others had been removed. From Johannesburg Lord Roberts advanced to Pretoria. No news was received from him for four days, when on the 5th he announced his occupation of that city. His dispatches indicate that severe fighting preceded the surrender, but of its extent and casualties no news has yet been received. It would appear to have been a rear guard fight. The Boers got away with everything of value to them, apparently even with the British prisoners who have been confined there.

Pretoria was surrendered on the 5th, but prior to the surrender the Boer forces had withdrawn and the Transvaal government was removed to Lydenburg, about 150 miles east of Pretoria, and somewhat north of the Pretoria and Delagoa Bay railway line. As it is now learned that the Boers have never had in the field more than 35,000 troops, it is probable that they surrendered Pretoria so much more easily than they were expected to, because they could not spare enough men from other points to defend the city, which appears to be so located as to be difficult of defense without a large force; and the indications are that notwithstanding the loss of their capital, the Boers will prolong the war interminably by guerrilla tactics.

To some extent they are already doing this with success. During the current week they have been fighting Roberts's right wing, under Gen. Rundle, as far south as Senekal, which lies well to the southeast of Kroonstad, in the Orange Free State. Rundle was reported to have won a fight there on the 28th, but he suffered a loss of 45 men killed and many wounded. In the same region on the following day the Boers captured two British patrols numbering some 40 men, and on the 31st, between Kroonstad and Lindley, Col. Spragge's British regiment of Irish yeomanry was compelled to surrender to a force of Boers described by Lord Roberts to number from 2,000 to 3,000 men. Gen. Methuen had been sent to the relief of Spragge but was too late, though he drove the Boers away with their prisoners after a five-hours' running fight.

The last official list of British casualties cabled to this country brings the total losses of the war down to May 19. It is as follows:

Killed in action	2,355
Wounded in action	10,794
Missing and prisoners	4,555
Died of wounds	575
Accidental deaths	54
Died of disease	2,803
Sent home as invalids	10,418
Total to May 19	31,554

On the 5th the Boer envoys, whose arrival in the United States was noted last week, came to Chicago, where they were welcomed by an overflowing mass meeting to which an admission fee of 25 cents had been charged, the proceeds over expenses to be devoted to the relief of the Boer wound-

ed. Judge Dunne presided, and ex-Gov. Altgeld, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and ex-Judge Moran joined him in delivering addresses of welcome and sympathy. On behalf of the two South African republics speeches in English were made by two of the envoys—Fischer and Wessels. The resolutions adopted by the meeting expressed the conviction that "the sympathy of 90 per cent. of the people of the United States, without reference to political affiliations, is with the burghers of the two republics in South Africa in their heroic efforts to maintain and preserve their sacred rights of liberty and self-government," and they deplored the fact that—

the official voice of the United States has remained silent, contrary to tradition and precedent as expressed from the earliest time to the present in the cases of France, Greece, Armenia and Cuba, although no more holy and righteous cause than that of the Boers has been known since our country was rescued from British oppression.

The resolutions closed with a pledge to the Boers of "moral and material assistance until their right to be a free and independent people is again fully vindicated." A like meeting of sympathy had greeted these envoys at New York, Washington, Boston and Cleveland.

The guerrilla warfare in the Transvaal which Great Britain is beginning to experience has grown to be an old story with the United States in the Philippines, but this Philippine conflict is still kept up. If there is any change it is in the direction of greater severity. There are frequent engagements, but only some of them are reported specifically. Of one in which one American and eight Filipinos were killed reports were given out at Manila on the 1st. On the 4th there was a report of another, in which Gen. Funston lost one captain and one private, both of whom were killed. These engagements, and one in the province of Bulacan, were in Luzon. One was reported on the 5th as having occurred on the island of Tablos, but without loss; and it was reported on the 3d that a detachment of the Thirty-third regiment had killed Aguinaldo about 100 miles northeast of Vigan, in Luzon. There is no better basis for this story, however, than that the apparent leader of a Filipino band of 100 had been shot at long range. Whether he was killed or only wounded and whether he was Aguinaldo or some one else are not known.

President McKinley's new Philippine commission, with Judge Taft at its head, arrived at Manila on the 3d, after a voyage of 47 days.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to May 30, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900, (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported since May 16, 1900,	2
Deaths from wounds, disease and accidents reported since May 16, 1900,	47
Total deaths since July 1, 1898,	1,896
Wounded	2,129
Total casualties since July, 1898,	4,025
Total casualties reported last week	4,001
Total deaths reported last week	1,872

Over in China, next door to the Philippines, the international complications regarding the "Boxer" conspiracy against missionaries and other foreigners, of which we told the beginnings in last week's paper, are becoming more alarming. Our report last week (page 122), closed with a statement that upon the landing on the 29th of marines from all foreign ships at Taku, with the intention of marching to Pekin, the Chinese government refused them permission to pass the Taku forts. This opposition appears to have been withdrawn on the 31st by the Chinese foreign office, in obedience to an ultimatum from the foreign powers; and at noon on that day 360 British, Italian, Russian, French, American and Japanese troops started for Pekin, carrying with them machine guns ready for immediate use. A Chinese imperial edict was issued on the same day ordering the crushing of the "Boxer" conspiracy. The foreign troops arrived at Pekin on the 1st, and the American minister then reported an immediate improvement in the situation there, upon the basis of which Secretary Hay expressed his conviction that the danger was over. But British advices quickly followed to the effect that the condition of affairs was likely to become more serious, a view which was confirmed on the 4th by this dispatch from the American minister:

Outside of Pekin the murders and persecutions by the Boxers seem to be on the increase. The Paoting-Fu railway is temporarily abandoned. Work on the Pekin and Hangkow line is stopped. All foreigners have fled. The Chinese government seems either unwilling or unable to suppress the trouble. The troops show no energy in attacking the Boxers.

The day following that dispatch, the Russian minister at Pekin offered the Chinese foreign office the assistance of Russian troops to suppress the "Boxers." His offer was politely taken into consideration and nothing has been heard of it since. On the 5th reports were received at Pekin that a battle was in progress with the "Boxers," and that more troops from the foreign ships at Taku had been forwarded. American missionaries, confined at Paoling-Fu, had telegraphed the American minister at midnight of the 4th-5th that they were being attacked by "Boxers" and were in need of immediate help. The battle reported on the 5th appears to have been close to Pekin and between the Boxers and Chinese troops. Many were killed on both sides. There are as yet no details.

At conferences at Washington on the 31st between Secretary Hay and the diplomatic representatives respectively of Great Britain, Russia, Germany, France, Japan and China, Mr. Hay explained to his callers that the landing of marines in China by this government was for the purpose not of taking joint action, but, in pursuance of the historic policy of the United States, of "acting concurrently." The Chinese minister admonished Mr. Hay that the Chinese government is opposed to the landing of foreign troops upon Chinese soil.

Interest in American presidential politics revives with the returns from the election in Oregon. It took place on the 3d. A justice of the supreme court and a dairy and food commissioner were the state officers to be chosen, while two congressmen were to be elected. There were three tickets in the field—republican, prohibition and democratic-populist fusion. The registration was unexpectedly large, being nearly 20 per cent. greater than the vote of two years ago, and about equal to the vote for president in 1896. At the close of the campaign the republicans claimed the election by the largest plurality ever given. They have carried it, but at this writing the returns are not all in and the exact result cannot be stated. It is estimated by the republicans, however, that the candidate for supreme court justice is elected by 10,000 plu-

rality, while their candidates for congress will have a plurality in the first district of 2,000 and in the second of 7,000. Two years ago the republican candidate for governor was elected by a plurality of 10,551, and that year the republican candidates for congress had in the first district a plurality of 2,037 and in the second 6,657. McKinley's plurality for president in 1896 was 2,117.

A woman's suffrage amendment to the state constitution was voted upon at this election in Oregon. So far as can now be judged it has been overwhelmingly defeated.

Owing to the peculiar condition of the democratic party in New York with reference to national politics, the democratic convention of that state has been looked forward to with especial interest. It met on the 5th at New York city, and ex-Gov. Hill came forward again as leader. His name goes at the head of the delegation to the national convention, with Richard Croker second. But to secure his position as leader once more, Gov. Hill was obliged to consent to accept instructions from the convention requiring delegates to the national convention to vote as a unit for William J. Bryan. Hill is credited with having dictated the platform, which makes trusts and imperialism the leading issues. It opposes war taxes in time of peace, favors a tariff for revenue only, favors bimetallism without specifying a ratio, and denounces—

that foreign policy of the present administration commonly known as "imperialism," which contemplates schemes of conquest and the establishment of colonial governments in accordance with British theories and practices, demands large standing armies for purposes of subjugation, impoverishes the people with vast public expenditures, creates hordes of officials to rule over people who should be permitted to rule themselves, disregards the principles of the declaration of independence, and materially changes the nature of our republican form of government.

On the subject of trusts the platform describes them as the "direct outgrowth of the policy of the republican party, which has created, fostered and protected them," and "receives their support and solicits and accepts their prodigal contributions to aid its retention in power;" for which reason that party is denounced as "incapacitated and unwilling to abolish and destroy them or even to properly regulate and restrict them." But no policy regarding the trusts is proposed by the platform except that—

the necessary relief by legislation or otherwise for the correction of these evils can only be received from the opponents of these trusts, and not from their tools, associates and apologists.

The platform closes with a pledge of "the unfailing support of the democracy of New York to the platform" to be adopted by the national convention.

The democratic state convention of Mississippi, meeting on the 5th, indorsed Bryan and the Chicago platform. So did the Alaska territorial convention, which met on the same day, and the Indiana, Missouri, South Dakota, West Virginia and Idaho state conventions which met on the 6th. The Maryland convention, meeting on the 5th, was dominated by ex-Senator Gorman; and the only concession it made to the supporters of Bryan was to put one of their number at the head of the national delegation. A resolution instructing the delegation for Bryan and the Chicago platform was defeated by a vote of 85½ to 27½.

Passing from American to English politics there is nothing to record except in Italy. Italian parliamentary troubles, which were described on page 92 as having culminated in the dissolution of parliament on the 16th by King Humbert, are not likely to be diminished by the results of the succeeding parliamentary elections. These elections, held on the 3d, yield increased gains to the socialist and other advanced parties who were the obstructionists of the last parliament. It is now believed that the Pelloux ministry, with a greatly decreased majority, will be forced to resign upon the opening of the new parliament.

In labor difficulties, the St. Louis street car strike is still the most important affair. Though now in its fifth week, it shows no signs of abatement. On the contrary rioting has somewhat increased. On the 1st the sheriff began swearing in a posse comitatus to keep the peace. He drafted prominent citizens, and after many attempted evasions succeeded in organizing a posse of 600 men, which has since been increased to 1,200. Armed with shotguns the posse was placed on duty at the various car barns and power houses to guard the few cars the traction company attempted to run. Several collisions between the posse and the strikers have occurred, but none have resulted seriously. Practically no car service exists and there seems to be no immediate prospect of a settlement of the strike.

NEWS NOTES.

—Rev. Dr. Richard S. Storrs, the famous Congregational preacher, died in Brooklyn on the 5th, aged 79 years.

—A movement is announced from prominent negro circles which has for its object the organization of a negro political party.

—The fifth biennial convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs opened its sessions in Milwaukee on the 4th.

—Stephen Crane, the well-known American war correspondent and author of the "Red Badge of Courage," died in Baden, Germany, on the 5th. He was 30 years old.

—An offshoot of the socialist labor party which refuses to fuse with the social democracy, met in convention at New York on the 6th and nominated Joseph F. Maloney, of Massachusetts, for president of the United States.

—A warrant for the arrest of W. S. Taylor, late governor of Kentucky, charged with complicity in the Goebel murder, was issued in Frankfort on the 31st. Efforts will be made to arrest Mr. Taylor in Indiana and have him extradited.

—The famous "Freedman injunction," which enjoined the striking New York cigarmakers from "picketing" and their union from rendering financial assistance to the strikers, was dissolved on the 5th by Judge Fitzgerald, of the supreme court.

—The American district messenger boy, James Smith, who was charged with delivering the message of sympathy of 25,000 school children to President Kruger, arrived in Pretoria on the 29th, where he delivered his message to President Kruger in person.

—A national civic federation has been organized under the auspices of the Chicago civic federation, with Franklin H. Head, of that city, as chairman of the advisory council. Its object is to promote the discussion of public questions by means similar to those of the trusts conference held in Chicago last fall.

—Two large industrial plants have

closed down during the past week. The American Steel and Wire company on the 1st closed three of their principal mills in Cleveland, throwing 1,000 men out of employment. This was followed on the 2d by the Federal Steel Co.'s closing down of their South Chicago plants, known as the Illinois Steel Co., which has thrown out 3,000 men.

—At Chicago on the 3d Mrs. A. P. Stevens died at Hull House, where funeral ceremonies were conducted on the 5th by Mr. Salter of the Chicago Ethical society, and Mr. Taylor, of Chicago Commons. Mrs. Stevens was the originator of the Illinois juvenile court law, and during Gov. Altgeld's administration was an Illinois factory inspector. She had a national reputation in labor organization circles.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

May 28—June 2, 1900.

Senate.

On the 28th the conference report on the naval appropriation bill was agreed to, after which Wellington spoke in favor of Teller's resolution of sympathy with the Boer republics which is printed at page 5375. The consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill was then resumed. Bacon spoke in favor of Teller's resolution of sympathy on the 29th, which, after a long debate, was referred to the committee on foreign relations. Consideration of the sundry civil bill was then resumed and an amendment appropriating $5,000,000 for the benefit of the Louisiana Purchase exposition to be held at St. Louis in 1903 was adopted. The senate was not in session on the 30th. On the 31st the sundry civil bill and on the 1st the military academy bill were passed and the consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill was begun and resumed on the 2d, when it also was passed. On this day a bill to provide for Cuban extradition was passed by a vote of 46 to 10. It is printed at page 6691. After this Stewart spoke in opposition to the Philippine war and government bill.

House.

The Alaska civil code bill was passed on the 28th; and on the 29th, the senate and house, having disagreed on the naval appropriation bill, conferees were appointed. The conference report on the postal appropriation bill was agreed to. On Decoration day, the 30th, pension bills were passed. The joint resolution to amend the constitution so as to enable congress to suppress trusts was under consideration on the 31st. The consideration of this resolution, which is printed on page 6830, occupied all this day and was resumed on the 1st, when it was defeated by a vote of 132 to 154, having failed of a two-thirds vote. Conferees were appointed on the sundry civil appropriation bill on the 2d, and on this day Ray, of New York, introduced a bill to amend the Sherman anti-trust act of 1900, which is printed on page 6982.

MISCELLANY

THE GREAT REPUBLIC.

For The Public.

The Great Republic! This is she,
"The eldest-born of Liberty,"
With shackled limbs and drooping face,
Led up and down the market place,
Her children toiling at her side;
Oh, Liberty, our ancient pride
Is strangled in the clinking chains;
Would that our fathers' blood might leap
From ocean grave and churchyard sleep,
From battlefield and mountain hold,
To flash again the truths grown old—
That men are equal in their birth,
And equal in their right in earth—
From altar rail and household fire
To schoolroom desk and town hall spire!

Oh, Liberty! Where bidest thou?
The Great Republic's children bow
To tyrants fattened on their blood;
And toiling through the griming mud,
Are burden-bearers lashed and spurred,
Bitted and bridled with a word—
The word that was the power of kings;
The word from which all slavery springs;
The black word "Privilege!" It has been
The fountain-head of civic sin;
Injustice's daughter, born of Greed,
A race of human ghouls to breed.

Oh, Liberty, thy lances speed!
The Great Republic in her need
Must summon from thy battle-might
The strength to guard men's sacred right.
Break thou the golden fetters through,
Forged by the planet-owning few.
The Great Republic is thine own,
In deadly danger dearer grown.
Be with her, and she yet shall stand
Unfettered, on unfettered land;
Her children nourished at her breast,
With God's own peace and plenty blest;
While new-born nations at her feet
Learn Nature's lesson, true and sweet.

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

THE MAN OF COMMON SENSE.

"Twice five are ten," said I to the Kaffir.

The Kaffir looked at his fingers. "Yes," said he, after a pause.

"And two tens are twenty," I said.

The Kaffir hesitated.

"Count it on your fingers and toes."

"Yes," said he, doubtfully.

"Then," I continued, "five tens are fifty."

"Oh, no," said the Kaffir, "that's sheer mysticism; no one has so many fingers and toes as that."

He was a Kaffir.—Bolton Hall, in the Ideal Review.

THE SERVANT QUESTION.

To my mind failure to solve this problem proceeds primarily from failure to recognize the scope and character of the matter we assume to settle. It is not a little personal row among women, chiefly of importance to ladies' clubs and comic papers. It is an integral part of the great labor question, and it is an American question. We have first of all to recite the declaration of independence in our kitchens—to establish household labor on the clear understanding that this work is performed in our country, not by servants, but by our peers.

To so much as name a servant question in a democracy, is to define an anomaly potent with all sorts of disorders, and dealing with domestic labor under this head tends inevitably to nothing but confusion. The end sought in a servant is—servility.

This is the inseparable condition of all the activities we engage in a servant. To impose servility on an American is degradation of character intolerable to a democratic spirit. His want and my money may effect a combination making this abuse possible, but a sense of the wrong perpetrated, more or less dumb and brutish according to the intelligence involved, operates constantly to cripple the laborer's usefulness and limit the power of production of the wealth which employs him. No profitable relation between mistress and maid is possible until popular conception of household labor reclaims it from the order of servitude and regards it in its true industrial character. Considering the Americanism of the servant question, it seems to me we must necessarily, for the sake of intelligent action, admit something further on the score of national characteristics. We must admit the commercial spirit of our people, and accept the fact that the relation between mistress and maid is before anything else a money relation, and that not poetic sentiment, not Christian charity, but straight business principles, are to govern. Love of independence and love of gain—the American soul's part in the twentieth century civilization—is the animating spirit of all our conflicts with our kitchens, and but to admit in our own minds that it is lawful and proper—constitutional in the individual and in our form of social existence—that our "hired girl" should demand both independence and the most money they can extract from us, is to bring the servant question out of the dark into the light where we can at least see the thing that is troubling us. — Flora McDonald Thompson, in The Cosmopolitan for March.

THE SUN'S ECLIPSE.

For The Public.

A glorious morning, indeed; the few clouds visible well out of harm's way, and old Sol shining his merriest. A day of days to get nearest nature, and everyone seemed to feel this.

Plum Branch is merely a "clachan,"

as the Scotch term is for the thing smaller than a village or hamlet—just half a dozen scattered houses and an old wooden church. The country people were standing at their doors, and for once the "man with the hoe" lifted his head to apprehend something of the nature mystery about him. An old woman with a hard face seemed transfigured as she stood gazing upward at the sun—reclaiming her birthright.

To the unskilled observer, peering through smoked glass, the first sign of the unusual phenomenon appeared in the sun's upper right-hand corner, if the term is allowable in reference to a circle. Here the perfect circle of the sun's disc seemed to have been eaten into as if by some celestial caterpillar. After this process had gone on for some 40 minutes there was an appreciable change in the daylight. There was a softness, and even now a certain strangeness in the quality of it—presage of the weird darkness to follow.

Now the sun appears like a crescent, with horns sharp and clear. Presently, as the eclipse proceeds, the horns are blunted. Finally they disappear till only an exclamation mark of light is left.

Now the birds seek the trees with apprehensive twitterings, shadows fail and the morning night is upon us—a Goetterdaemmerung, a twilight of the gods indeed. Suddenly by some majestic legerdemain the sun is the sun no longer — blotted out! But to the north and south of the inky disc feathery streamers of light, most beautiful to behold.

Not far from the sun shone one bright star, and in other parts of the firmament others came out, glinting red and blue and gold. Away on the northern horizon gleams of yellow light like early dawn. Over all a mysterious stillness and a chill as of night air.

Once more, suddenly and far too soon, the sunbeams danced over the green grass and through the leaves; not indeed making the customary "little suns," but dearest "little crescents." One smiled as he saw them. They were the humorous fanciful side of the affair—God's playthings!

And humanity, what happened to it? All were touched, and for brief seconds men and women were themselves, while the children gave up to joy quite naturally as they always do when they are pleased. Of the "grown-ups" some were merry and some were grave; but that the marvelous beauty of the spectacle had opened eyes that see not there could be no question.

And now it is day once more. Earth "has resumed her reign." But the memory of the event will be deeply graven on many souls.

W. L. TORRANCE.

Plum Branch, S. C.

THE FARCE OF DEMOCRACY.

For The Public.

Fletcher, of Saltoun, a celebrated Scotchman, once said that if he only had the ballads of a nation, he did not care who made the laws. For ballads in those days led to insurrections, and insurrections overcame laws, so that whoever could command the political spell that stirred the national feeling, held the key of the situation. We, however, live in duller times. Either we are not to be moved by ballads, or there are no ballads to move us with. Stand, therefore, the laws where they did. But it will be found that almost all insurrections and wars, when stripped of the heroic glamour with which enthusiastic partisanship has invested them, had, for object and result, the transfer of real estate from one set of hands to another. That was the material fact that underlay the clash of opposing sentiments. The field belonged to those who won it, and the cessation of warfare left their descendants in undisputed possession. The modern version of old Fletcher's saying should, therefore, read: "Give us the land, and let who will make the laws."

Property implies exclusion, except as regards the individual who owns it. The idea of property shuts out the law itself. The more things are private property, the more contracted is the sphere of the law. To say, therefore, that in a particular country the people make the laws is not to give any definite idea of the real power of the people, unless we know how much of all that goes to make up rational comfort and happiness is excluded from the operation of these laws. Now if we apply this test to the case of the United States we shall find that private ownership covers not only the land of the country, but nearly all the industries which minister to human convenience and comfort, that, in fact, as regards the supply of nearly all the necessaries of life, it is not law or public opinion that rules, but the humors and caprices of a small number of individual men. It is for such men as J. W. Gates and Andrew Carnegie to say in what quantities, at what times, and at what prices the American people shall have the necessities of life, for can they not do what they like with their own? If this be so—if so much of American life be reserved for the sway of capitalist despotism, how much of it remains over for democracy to control? And when the answer to that question has been obtained, we must still make a large allowance for the extent to which the votes of senators and instruments of government are, equally with land, coal and petroleum, the property of organized capitalists.

If we look all those facts squarely in the face, is it not time to ask to what end should the people of the United States go periodically through the ordeal of electing men to send to Washington? The real owners of the United States have already determined, according to their commercial code, in what degree of comfort the people shall live, and how much they shall pay, and the only questions left over for congress to adjust are in what kind of currency the tribute shall be paid, what shall be the design and color of its instruments, and matters of like importance. Is it worth while that the nation should every few years work itself into a fit of fury to determine what particular individuals shall be sent to perform these minor offices and formal acts of government—to pick up ,so to speak, the few crumbs of legislation which remain after capitalism has dined? It is no doubt pleasant and self-satisfying to think that we are legislating, when we are being legislated for, just as it is pleasant to feel that we are swimming, when we are only drifting, and that we are leading the horse, when we are only dragging the halter. It is pleasant to see a president act as a conjurer, pouring out of the same bottle wine for the Americans, water for the Porto Ricans and vinegar for the Filipinos. All this is very interesting, no doubt. But it is not government by the people, for the people. It is plutocracy, thinly disguised with democratic varnish.

T. SCANLON.

Liverpool, Eng.

HOW FIGURES LIE.

"I do not believe in theories; I believe in facts and figures," says the practical man. Here is an individual who can be made to believe anything. Suppose he should say: "I do not believe in logical processes that lead to conclusions, but I do believe in facts that may be misrepresented and figures that can be juggled," you would say: "The man is a fool." And he is.

Let this individual open part three of the census of 1890. He will find that there are 79,032 more married males in the United States than married females! As the widowed are separately

tabulated and as the women of Utah would incline the balance the other way, the numbers, making deductions for Utah, should exactly correspond.

A few months ago the Rochester Herald took the annual report of the New York state board of charities, where it is stated that the inmates and other beneficiaries of state institutions number more than 2,500,000, and said that "two and a half million people in a population of 7,000,000 receiving charity may well create a surprise in the foremost state in the union." Indeed it may, but it is not nearly so surprising as the Rochester Herald's failure to see how such figures are obtained. Obviously there are a number of individuals who figure more than once.

That very curious conclusions can be made to follow from statistics may be illustrated in those which deal with pauperism. England has the greatest number of paupers in the world (28 in each 1,000), and Italy very nearly the lowest (ten in each 1,000). This ought to prove to your devotee at the feet of the statistical Buddha that Italy is more prosperous than England! All it does prove is that organized poor relief in England is more systematic and thorough. In the United States paupers will not number more than two or three in each thousand, but this would not be a measure of our prosperity over England, for we certainly are not four times as prosperous as England. Sig. Lombroso not long ago stated that "wealth leads to crime," and this is the way he proved it: Rhode Island, the richest state in the union (with an estimated wealth of $200 to each inhabitant), shows a high percentage of crime, while Dakota and Alabama (the first having $30, the second $20 to each inhabitant), show the very lowest percentage of criminality!

Another wonderful fact which the statistician has discovered is that so few great men have great sons, and this, in common understanding at least, has been established as one of the laws of heredity. But look at it. If great men had great sons there would soon be an overplus of great men, or, to have great men at all, the level of greatness would have to be raised much higher. If a large proportion of the sons of great men were idiots, that would be an important fact, but as most of them are, like most of the rest of us, men neither greatly above the average in ability, nor greatly below it, the equilibrium which nature strives to preserve is not seriously imperiled. If we consider the proportion of great men to the rest of us, the number of those who have had offspring greatly endowed is not small.

It used to be thought that the sons of clergymen were apt to be worthless "ne'er-do-weels," and there were statistics for that. But De Candale, the distinguished French savant, says that the sons of ministers have contributed to science more eminent men than has any other class. He might have added, too, that they have also swelled the ranks of the poets, theologians, and not a few of the military heroes of the past.

On statistical absurdities such as these great reputations are built. Belief in them is a world-wide superstition; Germany is probably most profoundly deluded by them, but England and America are not far behind. I do not say that statistics have not their use; the contention I advance is that everywhere they are made to supply the place of pure reasoning, and that to multitudes of minds they stand for conclusions almost always irrational, and not infrequently immoral.—Joseph Dana Miller, in Philadelphia Saturday Evening Post.

RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Extract from a leaflet with the above title, by F. C. Selous, the South African explorer; issued as No. 17 of the publications of the South Africa conciliation committee, Talbot house, Arundel street, Strand, London.

The whole of the Dutch population of South Africa looks upon the war now being waged in that country as the result of an unjust and iniquitous conspiracy to subvert the independence of the Transvaal, and should it be carried on until the vast resources of the British empire have worn down the resistance of the Boers, and the two republics lie at England's mercy, there will, in my opinion, be no permanent peace in South Africa, should their independence be taken away from them; for there will still be 400,000 Dutch Africanders in South Africa—the majority of the total white population of the country—who will have lost all faith in the justice of England and England's rulers. This disaffected population, dour and stubborn as the lowland Scotch, rooted to the land, ever increasing in numbers, and constantly brooding in their lonely farmsteads over what they consider injustice and bitter wrong, will have to be kept in subjection by an enormous army of occupation, which will be a considerable drain on the resources of this country. On the other hand, if, when the Boers have been driven back into their own territories—a point in the campaign which will not be reached until further terrible bloodshed has taken place, but which, having been reached, would make it plain that Great Britain was capable of wearing down any further opposition that might be offered—I believe that it would be not only just but politic to give the republics the chance of making peace on terms which would allow them to retain their independence and their flags in return for the granting of reforms which would secure good government and fair treatment for all foreigners within their borders. . . .

Should it, however, be determined to erase the Boer republics from the map of Africa, and to carry on the war to the point of practically exterminating the able-bodied male population of these two sparsely-peopled states, let it not be thought that the surviving women will bring up their children to become loyal British subjects. Let Englishmen remember that the men who prophesied that within a short time after the war was over the Boers would become reconciled to the British, whom they would then have learnt to respect, are the same people who also told us that the war would be a very short and simple campaign, as the Boers were a degenerate, cowardly race, who could no longer shoot at all well, and who would be sure to disperse to their homes after the first, battle, if only a hundred of them were killed. These were the sort of predictions which were very commonly heard in this country a few months ago before the war commenced, and they were the utterances of men wholly ignorant of the Boer character. . . .

In 1848 Sir Harry Smith defeated at the battle of Boomplaats the full strength of the emigrant Boers who left the Cape Colony in 1836, with a force of 800 British soldiers and a regiment of Hottentots. Only 52 years have gone by since then, but to-day we find the descendants of these same emigrant Boers forming the main strength of an army which is holding at bay over 100,000 British troops. In view of this most significant piece of history, and the fact that the majority of her majesty's subjects in the Cape Colony are not British, but people of the same hardy and prolific race as the Boers of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, I cannot but believe that if in the settlement of South African affairs at the conclusion of the present unhappy war a policy should be pursued which, whilst despising Dutch Africander sentiment, hopes to retain British paramountcy forever in South

Africa by the aid of British troops, such a policy must necessarily be predestined to failure.

A HINDU ON THE ENGLISH ADMINISTRATION OF THE REVENUES OF INDIA.

A letter written to the Manchester Guardian by Romish Dutt, dated at London, April 21.

India has waited for the report of the royal commission on Indian expenditure for five years, and the people of India, who have enough trouble and misery of their own, expect that in the matter of foreign wars and foreign complications England will at last deal justly and even generously by the people of India. Judging from the substance of the report which has already appeared in print, the recommendations made by the majority of the commissioners are full of the worst forebodings for India. Permit me to refer only to one or two heads. Under the head of "Apportionment of Charges" it is recommended that India should contribute one-half of the military charges of Aden, one-half of the cost of the Persian mission, £12,500 for the China establishment, £10,000 for the Zanzibar and Mauritius telegraph subsidy, and also the present Euphrates-Tigris subsidy. The amount under each of these heads is comparatively small; but is it just on principle to saddle India with any portion of the cost of maintaining British power and influence in different parts of Asia and Africa? Does England saddle Cape Colony or Natal with the cost of Ashanti or of any of the British establishments in West Africa?

Under the head of "Indian Troops Out of India" we are told that a part of the cost of employing Indian troops out of India should be borne by India if she has a distinct and special interest at stake. And then we are told that India has a "direct and substantial interest" in keeping open the Suez canal and in the maintenance of order in Egypt; a "modified interest" in Zanzibar and the African islands in the Indian ocean; a "direct and substantial interest" in Persia, the Persian gulf and the coast and islands of Arabia; a "direct and substantial interest" in Afghanistan and parts of Central Asia; a "direct and substantial interest" in Siam, and a "modified interest" in China and the Malay peninsula. Does this mean that the resources of India, which are scarcely enough for her civil and military administration, will continue to be drawn upon by England in her various complications in different parts of Asia and Africa? Does this mean that the richest country in the world will continue to tax the poorest and most miserable peasantry on earth, not only for their own welfare, but also for the maintenance of England's influence and empire in portions of two continents? The principle that India is responsible for keeping the path from England to India clear is a principle which would be considered outrageous if it was applied to any of the colonies. The Australian colonies are as much interested in the Suez canal, the Arabian and Persian coasts, and in the Malay peninsula as India; has any royal commision or colonial secretary suggested that the Australian colonies should be saddled with the cost of maintaining British influence in these places? Sir Henry Fowler said at Wolverhampton: "Why am I standing here to defend the [Transvaal] war? Because it is a war not for the obtaining of the franchise, not for the rights, sound and strong as they were, of the outlanders, but because it is a war for nothing less than British supremacy in South Africa. That supremacy means our Indian empire." If the recommendations of the majority of the royal commission were accepted and followed out to their logical conclusion, would not the Indian empire be charged for this South African war, which is necessary, according to Sir Henry Fowler, for maintaining the Indian empire? Would not the Indian empire be charged for the maintenance of the British army and the British fleet and of the British power generally, because they are all necessary for maintaining the Indian empire? Where will you draw the line when you once depart from the old and equitable and sound maxim that India shall pay for troops maintained for her protection in India—not for troops and establishments and wars outside India? The army now maintained in India is not for her protection only, but for England's Asiatic and African possessions. Considering the large portion of the Indian army now employed in South Africa, the question was raised, not long ago, by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman whether the whole of the army now stationed in India should be paid for from the Indian revenues. I do not find that this question has been dealt with in the report of the majority of the royal commission. While the majority of the commissioners are anxious to define India's interests on the Nile and the Tigris, in Mozambique and the Malay peninsula, I do not find that they are anxious to define England's imperial interest in the army now stationed in India. I write this in regret and in sorrow—a sorrow which will be universally felt by my countrymen when they read the substance of the report which has been published.

"God help the people of India!" said Mr. Donald Smeaton, a member of Lord Curzon's council, to Reuter's agent at Bombay the other day; "Great Britain and Ireland owe a debt to the Indian peasant, a debt of millions upon millions." We know that India annually remits to England a sum estimated between £20,000 and £30,000 for home charges, pensions, interest, and the like. We know that the people of India are virtually debarred from the higher posts in India, except a very small percentage, and that £15,000,000 are annually paid to European officials employed in India and sending all their savings to Europe. We know that our ancient industries like weaving and spinning and dyeing have been killed by European competition, and that the land is so heavily taxed in many provinces that the peasant cannot save in good years for years of bad harvest. We know that an army is kept in India, and paid for by India, sufficient for England's imperial requirements over the best part of Asia and Africa. We know that our finances are adjusted by executive councils in India and in England in which the people of India have no seat, and that in the taxation of India we have no voice. These are some of the burdens we bear in India, and these are some of the causes of the famines from which we periodically suffer. Will Englishmen add to them the burden of paying for British forts and armies, British establishments and wars in various parts of Africa and Asia—from the Suez canal to Mozambique, from the Tigris to the Malay peninsula? Will the English conscience reconcile itself to thus proceeding in a year when 90,000,000 of people are affected by the worst famine that India has ever known and 5,000,000 are actually attending relief centers? After the famine of 1770 and the desolating wars of Warren Hastings, the great Minister Pitt brought in his Indian bill in 1784 to give us a better government. Is there no statesman in England at the present day who will give us a new India bill, moderating land tax, reducing expenditure, opening up the higher services to the people of India, and giving them some control over their finances? Is there no Englishman of this generation who will stand up for justice to India?

The expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production.—Marx.

THE GIANT INDIANS OF TIERRA DEL FUEGO.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by Dr. Frederick A. Cook, of the Belgian Antarctic expedition, published in the March Century.

In the western Chilian channels, living in beech-bark canoes and in dugouts, using mussels, snails, crabs and fish in general as food, are the short, imperfectly developed Aliculufs. These are met by many vessels navigating the Strait of Magellan, and most of our reports of Fuegians are limited to hasty glimpses of these people; but they are now nearly extinct, and they always were the lowest and the most abject of the Fuegians.

Closely allied in habits to the Aliculufs are the Indians inhabiting the islands about Cape Horn and northward to Beagle channel. These are called Yahgans. They have been the most numerous and the most powerful of the Fuegian people, but to-day they too are nearly extinct. They are dwarfed in stature, dwarfed in mental development, and, like the Aliculufs, live in canoes, and feed upon the products of the sea.

The third tribe is the race of giants. They are called Onas by their neighbors, the Yahgans. The Onas have thus far evaded all efforts at civilization, have refused missionaries and have, to the present time, with good reason, mistrusted white men. They have, in consequence, remained absolutely unknown.

The homes of the Onas are on the main island of Tierra del Fuego. For centuries they have fought to keep this as their preserve; but the Yahgans have been allowed to pitch their homes on the southern coastal fringe along Beagle channel. In a like manner the Aliculufs have been permitted to use the shore-line of the west. Neither the Yahgans nor the Aliculufs, however, nor white men, until very recently, have dared to venture into the interior. The great prairies of the north and the mountain forests of the middle of the island, with its still unknown lakes, have been guarded as hunting ground exclusively for the Onas. The island is nearly as large as the state of New York. The boundary line of Chili and Argentina, running from north to south through the middle of the island, gives each republic a nearly equal share of the country. Gold has been found in the sands along the beach of various parts of the land. This is being mined with considerable success. The pampas of the north and a part of the southern ground have proved to be some of the best sheep-farming country of the world. The gold diggers and the sheep farmers have thus rediscovered Tierra del Fuego. The mining camps and the wire fences are crowding the once ruling race of Onas into the useless forest-covered lowlands and the ice-covered highlands of the interior, where they must either starve or freeze or perish at the hands of Caucasian invaders. The old happy hunting ground of the Ona has gone the way of all other Indian homes; but he has fought bravely for it, and he will continue to do so until the last skeleton is left to bleach on the wind-swept pampa.

The Onas, as a tribe, have never been united in a common interest, nor have they ever been led by any one great chief. They have always been divided into small clans under a leader with limited powers, and these chiefs have waged constant warfare among themselves. To the present they have had their worst enemies among their own people, but now that sheep farming and gold diggers want their country, they are uniting to fight their common enemy.

The Ona population at present is about 1,600, divided into 16 tribes of about 100 each. From this number there is a constant diminution. Many of the children have been taken from their wild homes bordering on the sheep farms and placed in European families about Punta Arenas. These children thrive well at first, and are capable of considerable education, but few reach adult age. The mnor children's diseases, such as measles and whooping cough, are extremely fatal to them, and those who escape other diseases are almost certain to succumb to tuberculosis.

Physically the Onas are giants. They are not, however, seven or eight feet in height, as the early explorers reported their neighbors and nearest relatives, the Patagonians, to be. Their average height is close to six feet, a few attain six feet and six inches, and a few are under six feet. The women are not so tall, but they are more corpulent. There is perhaps no race in the world with a more perfect physical development than the Ona men. This unique development is partly due to the topography of their country and to the distribution of game, which makes long marches constantly necessary. The Ona men are certainly the greatest cross-country runners on the American continent.

The mental equipment of the Ona is by no means equal to his splendid physical development. He understands very well the few arts of the chase which he finds necessary to maintain a food supply. His game in the past has been easily gotten; his needs have been few, which fact accounts for the lack of inventive skill portrayed in the instruments of the chase. The home life, the house, the clothing—everything portrays this lack of progressive skill. Instead of the children being well dressed and well cared for, as is the rule among savage races, they are mostly naked, poorly fed, badly trained and altogether neglected, not because of a lack of paternal love, but because of the mental lethargy of the people. It is the same as to shelter and garments. They have abundant material to make good tents and warm, storm-proof houses; but they simply bunch up a few branches, and throw to the windward a few skins, and then shiver, complaining of their miserable existence.

The Onas have been masters of Tierra del Fuego, not because of the perfection of their implements of war, but because of their splendid physical force. The only destructive weapon which they have brought to effective use is the bow and arrow. The bow used by them is made of the wood of the Antarctic beech, which is scraped and worked into the desired shape by the sharp edge of one of the numerous shells which everywhere are found on the beach. The string is made of the sinews of the guanaco, neatly braided. The arrow-shaft is a reed-like branch of a tree called the winter's bark; it is winged with feathers of native birds, and is tipped with a unique glass point.

With the bow and arrow as their sole implement of chase, the Onas roam about always in the footprints of the guanaco from the barren interior mountains to the forest-covered lowlands, and during the winter from the forests over the pampas to the seashore. If they fail in securing their favored game, the guanaco, they capture a kind of ground rat, or gather the snails and mussels of the beach; but the one grand aim of life is to hunt the guanaco.

The matter of clothing, with the Onas, is a very simple affair. Although the climate of their region is cold, stormy, and even humid, they are very imperfectly dressed. The children run about in the snow either naked or nearly so. The men have a large mantle made of several guanaco-skins sewed

together. This reaches from the shoulders to the feet, but it is not attached by either buttons or strings; it is simply held about the shoulders by the hands. On the chase the mantle is allowed to drop, while the hunter rushes on, naked, to capture his game. The women, when well dressed, wear a piece of fur about the waist, and another loosely thrown about the shoulders; but they are not often well dressed, and must generally be contented with a kind of mantle carelessly suspended from the shoulders, which is allowed to fall upon the slightest exertion.

Nothing could be more homeless than an Ona house. It is proof to none of the discomforts of the Fuegian climate. Rain, snow and wind enter it freely. The house is a simple accumulation of tree branches thrown together in the easiest possible manner. Sometimes it has a conical shape, but more often it is only a crescent or breastwork, behind which the entire family sit or sleep. To the windward are thrown a number of skins to keep out the wind, but from overhead the cold rains drizzle over poorly clad bodies. In the center of this circle of shivering humanity, or just outside of it, is a camp-fire, which, however, serves better for cooking purposes than for heating.

The arrangement of the house is such that the heat all escapes. At night the fires are allowed to go out, and the adults, lying in a circle, place the children in the center, with blankets of guanaco skins placed over all. To keep the blankets from being blown off, and to add additional warmth, they next call their dogs to take their positions on the top of the entire mass of Indians. In former years it was a poverty-stricken family that did not have enough dogs to cover it out of sight; but the shepherds have now killed the dogs, and the Indians must rest cold and comfortless without their canine bedfellows.

The unwritten laws which govern the actions of the tribe as a whole are very vaguely understood. There never has been any great need for the Onas to assemble and unite against an enemy. Any one of the numerous clans under one chief has been more than equal to overcome the feeble onslaughts of other Indians and white men. Hence the lack of tribal organization. In the family, however, the organization is firmly fixed by habits which never change. The loose arrangement of marriage and divorce does not seem to disturb seriously the equilibrium of the home circle. The camp is pitched from day to day at spots convenient for the chase. This makes elaborate houses or complex fixtures impossible. It never requires more than half an hour to build an Ona house.

The work of the man is strictly limited to the chase. He carries his bow and quiver of arrows, and his eye is ever on the horizon for game; but he seldom stoops to anything like manual labor that is not connected with the actual necessities of the chase. He kills the game, but the wife must carry it into camp. In moving, the women take up all of their earthly possessions, pack them into a huge roll, and with this firmly strapped across their backs they follow the unencumbered lead of their brave but ungallant husbands. Thus the women carry, day after day, not only all the household furniture, but the children and the portable portions of the house. The women certainly have all the uninteresting detail and the drudgery of life heaped upon them, but they seem to enjoy it. In defense of the men it should be said that they are worthy husbands. They will fight fiercely to protect their homes, and they will guard the honor of their women with their own blood. It is a crying sin of the advance of Christian civilization that this red man of the far south should be compelled to lay down his life at the feet of the heartless pale-faced invaders to shield the honor of his home.

I doubt if missionary efforts will improve the hard lot of this noble band of human strugglers. The efforts thus far made have certainly had the contrary effect, and altogether they do not need a new system of morals as badly as we do ourselves. I do not mean to infer that missionary work, in general, is hurtful to aborigines. There is a legitimate field for such efforts, but it is not among Onas, unless the work is conducted in a new manner by a thoroughly practical man. They need to be placed in a position where they may follow their wild habits without the infectious degeneration of higher life. Individually and collectively they have fewer sins than New Yorkers. It is true that there are among them no faultless characters, but there are also no great criminals. There are some good and some bad, but the worst and the best are found side by side.

The bitter and the sweet of human life flow in the same stream. They have the same origin and the same termination. The lesson of ages to untutored man has impressed upon him a prescription of moral direction, which is quite as good as, and far more appropriate for him than, the white man's code of ethics.

A MISGUIDED MONARCH.

Once upon a time there was a king who was marvelously wise and who knew it. Therefore, he communed thus with himself one day, when he felt particularly Solomonic: "It's a shame that all my wisdom should go to waste; besides, my fame as the knowingest thing ever perched on a throne isn't as great as my distinguished deserts merit. I wonder if there isn't some way to make the Sunday newspapers make a scarehead article of me. By crickey, I have it! I'll do the ancient fairy-tale act, and offer my daughter and half my kingdom to anyone asking me three questions I can't answer; unsuccessful applicants to be treated as usual."

Now, the princess was wondrous fair and the kingdom was so preposterously prosperous it hadn't even a national debt; so every prince who read the papers flocked to the contest, and the hotel rates in the king's capital were doubled, to the satisfaction of his subjects. But there was the customary melancholy result; princes' heads got so common they were used for cobblestones, and it was pronounced by experts to be the finest block pavement ever seen.

One day, however, a tall, gaunt, sallow individual presented himself, and signified, with a nasal twang, his intention of forthwith putting his majesty up a tree.

"Where are you from?" asked the king, curiously.

"Connecticut, U. S. A.," replied the man.

"Oh," said the king, beginning to look troubled. "Well, go ahead."

"What makes a novel successful?" demanded the man, briskly.

The king mentally reviewed the successes of the last few years, and sighed deeply. "Er—hum—ah—I guess that's one on me," he conceded, reluctantly.

"Why do we Americans retain confidence in the republican party as it is at present controlled?" demanded the man, chuckling.

The king's lower jaw dropped with a dull thud against his breast. "The Lord only knows!" he groaned, helplessly. "No, no more of your cussed conundrums," he shrieked desperately, as the man was again about to speak. "I give up. But say," he continued, cunningly, "I'll go you doubles or quits. I'll bet you the rest of my family and kingdom against your winnings that you can't answer those questions yourself."

"Do you take me for a gambler?" demanded the man, severely, as he tucked

the princess's hand under his arm and started in the direction of the treasury.—Alex. Ricketts, in Life for May 17.

OCCUPATION AS AFFECTING CHARACTER.

For The Public.

Just to show how a man's occupation affects his character, I want to tell you about two men. One of them we will call McGuff; the other, say, Marvin.

McGuff is a landlord, on a small scale. He owns a front flat and a rear flat, and he makes his living from lodgers, who are mostly students. Perhaps he has a little money besides; no matter. He spends his time puttering around and giving orders to the janitor. Last week he got into a scrap with that worthy, and wore a bandaged eye as a result.

Marvin is a machinist. He has to tide over an idle period during a strike, and starts a boarding house in McGuff's rear flat. Mrs. Marvin is the cook, and the little Marvins become dishwashers and helpers. Marvin is a clean, straightforward man, with not a lazy muscle in his body. He doesn't own any property. His function in life has been to pay bills. Rent and grocer's bills and meat bills and clothing bills. He has paid them up to the mark all his life. His children, too, have not been neglected, for they have grown to be attentive, obedient, helpful little ones, and all do their part in the house.

The McGuffs have one little girl only, and she has a snarl in her voice, in spite of the fine dresses in which she is made to parade.

Marvin made the boarders smile when he used to call down the dumbwaiter: "Mamma, is that order ready?"

But the table was good, too good, perhaps, to last, for Marvin was new at the business and he had a certain pride about him which made him say to himself: "I am unaccustomed to the business, but at any rate the boarders shall have no chance to complain; and if I make enough to keep me from going in debt till I get work again, it's all right." That was his simple way of looking at it.

McGuff and Mrs. McGuff skimped to save a dollar. They raised the rent a dollar a month to the young couple in the fourth rear suite when their baby came. But Marvin wasn't that kind of a man. He will go on paying bills all his life, and working faithfully at his trade. He will have nothing but his little savings and his children to support him and the good wife when he is too old to work.

Who is the most highly developed man of the nineteenth century? Is he a McGuff, or a clean, honest, wage-working proletarian Marvin? And how does Mrs. Marvin compare with the swell dames on the drive, who dress in barbaric splendor, and have the same taste for ornament as the female Zulus and Hottentots? The little Marvins are the best answer that can be given to that question.

THE MAN IN OVERALLS.

For The Public.

I'm just a man in overalls,
But quite as good as you.
I'm sorry for the awful rich
And for the privileged few.

I'm sorry for the howling swells,
They have to dress so much.
I'm sorry for the ministers,
They keep so out of touch.

I'm sorry for society men,
They work so hard for fun,
What things you see when out for a walk!
Oh, Johnnie, get your gun!

It's we, the men in overalls,
It's we who pay the tax,
The rich will get the marble heart,
Till they get off our backs.

W. D. M'CRACKAN.

Jinks—Minks's wife is a mighty clever little woman. If there were more women like her there would be fewer divorces. She knows how to keep the domestic machinery running smoothly. Did you hear what she gave her husband for a Christmas present?

Binks—No; what was it?

Jinks—A big leather-covered box containing 150,000 collar buttons.—N. Y. Weekly.

"I find no allusion to the event," said the book-worm in the Carnegie library, at the close of the twentieth century.

"But, you are looking in the volume of history relating to 1951," explained the librarian, "you will have to look in the following volume for the account of Aguinaldo's capture."

G. T. E.

It was in 1852, according to an authority that "the first successful attempt was made to analyze correctly the stresses in a framed structure, and to proportion the members to resist the given external force." This was one of the longest strides ever taken by man in the conquest of nature. The new system thus introduced has now been carried so far that, whereas the largest single span ever covered before the engineering era was 390 feet, the projected North River bridge, now awaiting for its construction only the demonstration that it will pay, has a clear span of 3,000. — Montgomery Schuyler, in Century Magazine.

Halfer—The Patriothams are so afraid that their infant son has no chance of being the president.

Panshon—No chance? Don't they know that he has just as good a chance as any other boy born in this country?

Halfer—But they are not sure he was born in this country. You see his birth took place when his parents were in Puerto Rico. G. T. E.

Here is the fundamental error, the crude and monstrous assumption, that the land which God has given to our nation is or can be the private property of anyone. It is a usurpation exactly similar to that of slavery.—Lectures on Political Economy (1851), by Prof. F. W. Newman.

"We'll send you these circulars early to-morrow."

"Can't you print them and deliver them to-day?"

"Goodness, yes; we'll send them to you yesterday if you say so."—Chicago Record.

Property in land is always conditional. Land is the source of the life of the state, and the state must exist at any cost.—Address in Favor of the Peasants of the North (1757), by Marmontel.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Psychiasis," or healing the body through the soul, by Charles H. Mann (Boston: Massachusetts New Church Union), is an inquiry into the subject indicated by the title, from the standpoint of the Swedenborgian philosophy. Though all the mind cure schools are considered in this little volume, Christian Science as the most prominent naturally receives most attention. Mr. Mann rejects the philosophy of this school, because it is pantheistic and therefore essentially a negation of all love but self-love, and also because its conception of God is of a vague principle instead of a definite personality. But he does not reject the idea of healing the body through spiritual agencies or influences. On the contrary, tracing bodily ailments to spiritual evils, he teaches that regeneration tends to remove them by removing their spiritual causes. The essential distinction between his view of spiritual healing and that of the Christian Scientists, as he explains it, is that whereas they claim to displace the appearances of body illness by thought life, he would restore order in bodily life by righteous spiritual living. "It should not be called mind cure," he says, "but spiritual character cure." Not that the righteous, even if there were such, would always be well. Environment, heredity and other spiritual disorders in society may interfere. But health must be the tendency, because bodily diseases are ex-

pressions of spiritual evils. But in this doctrine—

the health of the body is not the end sought. It is simply the normal expression of the regenerating man's spiritual state. To seek bodily health for itself, that is, for the mere physical and selfish comfort of it, is like devoting one's self to attaining the external appearances, or insignia of a condition without reference to the thing itself which these signs represent. Man's body is the very outside of his life, and its health is the orderly expression of the health of the inner life, and in the aims and purposes of life we should so esteem it.

So long as those verbal clubs (as Heber Newton has called them), "socialism," "communism" and "anarchy" are wielded indiscriminately by people who ought to know the difference, there will be a want if not a wish for some such book as that of E. V. Zenker on "Anarchism, a Collection and History of the Anarchistic Theory" (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons), which is a sincere historical and critical presentation of the subject. The author is not an anarchist. He is not even sympathetic. But he is true to his promise to tell what anarchism is. Beginning with an account of the early history of anarchistic theories and movements, his volume describes and discusses especially the doctrines of Proudhon and Kropotkin, and after considering the influences of anarchism and distinguishing its various schools in Russia, Germany, England and America, concludes not only that all anarchist theories are harmless at bottom, but that anarchist movements can be conquered not by force and injustice, "but by justice and freedom." However acceptable or objectionable the author's criticisms of anarchistic theories may be, his entirely fair account of the different schools is a welcome contribution to the literature of a subject with which it is not otherwise easy to become acquainted.

"Oom Paul Kruger, the Lion-Hearted Patriot" (New York: Hanover Square library), is the title that Charles F. Wingate, of Twilight club fame, adopts for a ten-cent book in which he tells what he knows about the president of the South African republic and what he thinks of him. Mr. Wingate's unique style, which makes even the advertisements he writes attractive, is a guarantee that this little book offers half an hour's entertaining reading.

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

The Public Leaflets.

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

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

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. **Nero-Thes,** by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. **The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust,** by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. **Monopoly and Competition** (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. **Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case** (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900).