

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1901.

Number 171.

**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.

When a man calls himself conservative, he should explain what manner of things he wishes to conserve. If the good that has come down to us from the past, he may be a useful citizen; but if the evil also, then he is a bad citizen.

Much ado has been made by some of the patriotic newspapers over the discovery that several typical American children who were celebrating the Fourth of July in New York with fireworks were unable to tell why the day is celebrated. But the children are wise. Why should American children bother about the original reasons for celebrating the Fourth of July, when a majority of American voters have decided that those reasons are obsolete?

An ex-army officer, a graduate of West Point, who had pleaded guilty to a crime before Recorder Goff, of New York, sued for mercy on the ground that he had acquired the morphine habit, which so affected his brain at times as to make him unable to distinguish right from wrong. Recorder Goff scouted the excuse. But that only shows how unfamiliar—or, maybe, unsympathetic—the recorder is with modern philosophy. Almost any atheistic college professor could inform him that there is no such thing as right and wrong to be distinguished—that ethical questions are questions not of right or wrong, but of better or worse. Perhaps the army officer made a mistake in attributing his obliquity to the morphine habit. He might with greater

effect have referred it to his college education.

If the Massachusetts prosecutors of the Irish World are not supported by law, they must be a set of fools; if they are supported by law, then they are fools none the less, and the law, in the language of Dickens's beadle, "is an ass." Of the propriety of prohibiting desecrating uses of the American flag there should be no question. As the symbol of American ideals it demands this protection. Would that it were possible to protect it from the desecrating usage to which it is subjected in the Philippines as a symbol of foreign conquest and destruction to little republics. But there is no misuse of the flag in printing in a newspaper the cartoon for which the Irish World has been suppressed. That cartoon represented the flag as bearing this inscription: "This flag for liberty, equality, independence, justice and fraternity, if congress or the president so will." To paint that inscription, or, indeed, any other criticism, upon the flag itself, and unfurl it, might warrant a prosecution for desecration; but it is a different matter to make such a newspaper cartoon the excuse for suppressing the newspaper publishing it. Evidently, this action against the Irish World is prompted much less by respect for the flag than by hostility to free newspaper criticism of the imperial policy.

If the action of the Colorado State Medical association in advising the judicial murder of imbecile infants, fairly indicates the degree of sacredness in which Colorado physicians hold human life, it would be only prudent for Colorado invalids to manage in some way to keep out of the doctors' hands. No reason can be given for putting imbecile infants out of the way that would not apply in

principle to imbecile adults, to the hopelessly insane, and to old people in dotage. Having gone that far, the next step would be easy. Dependent incurables of all kinds could then be added to the schedules of persons to be killed for the social good. And as this "scientific" process of elimination went on improving, the Colorado Medical association might reasonably hope to celebrate the day when any man who could not produce a physician's certificate of sound mind and body would be liable to the death penalty. It would then be time for "scientific" clegymen to come forward with a proposition to add to the schedules all who could not produce certificates of church membership. Thus might mankind be redeemed from sickness and sin. With the physically weak and the morally lax eliminated, heredity would be free to build up a race of gigantic saints!

The second step in Mayor Johnson's tax agitation in Ohio has been successfully taken. Every point he had chosen as available for the initial tax fight in the state was accepted by the democratic convention at Columbus on the 10th and inserted in the platform. This triumph, and under the circumstances it was a triumph of no ordinary magnitude, was not achieved easily. The convention was under the domination of McLean, assisted by reactionary leaders who bolted the national ticket in 1896 and are now bent on so reorganizing the democratic party as to make it again an efficient ally of the republicans. McLean's interest in politics is frankly for himself, and his personal supporters opposed the Johnson tax reform with all their might. Kilbourne, the gubernational nominee, was chiefly concerned in reducing friction so as to strengthen himself in the campaign, and he and his support-

ers were hostile in spirit and tactfully indifferent in action, damning the Johnson movement with such faint encouragement as he thought necessary to keep the Johnson men out of bad humor toward himself. Then the gold fanatics, those McKinley democrats like Harmon, a railroad attorney, and Ingalls, a railroad president, were in the convention, by grace of McLean's faction, representing hostility not only to Bryan, but also to the equitable taxation of railroads in Ohio. These elements were thought to be so powerful that the republican press, and that part of the "democratic" press which is owned by republicans, were full of assurances up almost to the assembling of the convention, that Johnson and his tax reforms would be unceremoniously suppressed. But they were mistaken. Shrewd management on the part of Johnson's supporters—he himself being kept away by the recent death of his brother and his own illness—secured the insertion in the platform of a specific demand for the four principal reforms of the Cuyahoga county platform (see pp 137-38), namely: No municipal franchises without a referendum; free passes from railroads to public officers adequate ground for vacating the office; official visitation of public service corporations for the purpose of making public the true value of their franchises; railroads and other corporations possessing public franchises to be assessed for taxation in the same proportion as farms and other real estate. By this success Johnson and his friends scored a complete victory over the reactionaries upon the only points in which he had prepared for any part in this year's campaign in Ohio. His friends had renounced every purpose of seeking nominations for their section or of influencing the convention in any way except upon the subject of state taxation as a sequel to the tax agitation in Cleveland. McLean's faction offered them places on the ticket by way of compromise, but all such offers they refused. They had but one object in view. That was

to secure a thorough agitation of the tax question throughout the state. They held steadily to that purpose, and in spite of the fact that this was a McLean convention, in spite of the reactionaries who sought to conserve railroad interests, in spite of the not unnatural lukewarmness of the gubernational candidate himself, they won their point.

But McLean and his reactionaries scored a success in every other important respect. It is true that Charles P. Salen, who is Johnson's director of public works and his leading political lieutenant, was temporary chairman; but that had been arranged long before as a sort of salve, which the state committee gave to the Johnson people for refusing to hold the convention in Cleveland. It is also true that Salen was made permanent chairman; but that came about through the superior alertness of the Cuyahoga county delegation. It secured action by the committee of permanent organization when only 13 out of the 21 members were present; and the McLean faction dared not invite friction by reversing this action in the committee or overriding the report in the convention. All the important points, we repeat, except the Johnson tax agitation plan, were won by McLean and his associated reactionaries.

They kept out of the platform all mention of the national platform of the party, and they caused the convention to commit the unpardonable rudeness and inconceivable folly of ignoring the national candidate of the party, who, in two campaigns, and in spite of the secret treachery or open opposition of themselves and such as they, proved his popularity beyond reasonable cavil. At the election in 1896, when these reorganizers "bolted," Mr. Bryan polled a larger proportion of the popular vote than President Cleveland had polled when elected four years before, and within a shade of as large a proportion of the Ohio vote. Yet this McLean convention of Ohio ignores him and both the

Chicago and the Kansas City platforms upon which he ran, and the reactionaries boast of it. They thus superciliously challenge every Ohio democrat, who respects Mr. Bryan or sympathizes with his views, to stay away from the polls next fall.

If this unutterable folly, on the part of the anti-Bryan and pro-corporation magnates of the McLean convention, does not defeat Mr. Kilbourne, we miss our guess. In the nature of things human, it must be a heavy handicap. The republican papers see that, and are prompt in their congratulations. They heartily commend the convention for its wisdom in throwing over Bryan and Bryanism. Why? What other reason could there be than that this makes the situation more promising and comfortable for the republican party and its candidates? And they are probably right. In the face of that contemptuous treatment of the national platform and the national candidate, only one or both of two influences can save Mr. Kilbourne from disastrous defeat. Should the McKinley democrats bring to him as much support as their fatuity (which is a milder word than treachery) drives away, then he may win. But no such contingency is probable. Or, he may win if Johnson's support and the popularity of Johnson's tax agitation prove sufficient to hold in line the Bryan men whom McLean's convention has insultingly dismissed. The latter appears now to be the only hope for Kilbourne.

The evident failure of the Detroit social and political conference is not fairly attributable to faulty management. It is due to the faulty nature of the thing itself. When this conference met for the first time, two years ago, it gave some promise of some success. But no success was really in it. The failure of the second meeting, that of this summer, merely signaled the failure, long ago assured, of the whole movement. It be-

gan in a mistake—the mistake of supposing that reforms are to be accomplished by a union of reformers of all shades and colors. Such unions, like the colored figures in a kaleidoscope, though picturesque, are frail. They are not true unions, but only aggregations. Some one said of the Detroit conference that there were 200 delegates there with 400 imperative reforms. That was an exaggeration. But it was only an exaggeration, as the resolutions finally adopted show. These resolutions seem to be an omnium gatherum into which all the reforms represented at the conference were chucked indiscriminately, upon the assumption that each delegate whose particular reform got this honorable mention would stay with the movement. Nothing justifies that assumption but the probability that each may recommend the movement as showing a tendency to go his way. But that does not really justify the assumption. It only indicates that the movement will be pulled and hauled in as many directions as it represents causes, until it loses all cohesiveness and disintegrates. Even if all reformers could unite organically they could not thereby carry through their reforms. For at no time are reformers more than a small fraction of the masses. Public opinion must be influenced in favor of a reform, to make it win; and public opinion cannot be influenced permanently in favor of a mere mess of reform pottage. In such a conglomeration good flavors are neutralized by bad, and the public rejects the whole dish.

If any man believes that he knows a way of improving social conditions, let him hesitate about uniting with other men who know other ways. In other words, let a reformer of one kind hesitate about making organic unions with those who differ radically. He will find it as impossible to convert them as they will to convert him. Even if he does convert them he will have made no great gain; for they, like himself, are apt to be men apart

from the common thought and common impulse. But let him go direct to the masses of people. If his reform is vitalized by the truth, it will make its own way, slowly, perhaps, but surely, in public opinion. The reform that wins must be capable of converting the masses, rather than adaptable to a unification of reformers. This does not mean that the reformer with a true reform must isolate himself and his cause. Quite the contrary. There is no greater certainty of isolation than in a mosaic union of variegated reformers. It means that he must make himself a fellow among his fellow citizens, and his cause one of the vital subjects of common thought.

In the Australian Commonwealth the political situation is beginning to clear. Trustworthy correspondents assure us that the protection ministry has been forced to throw protection overboard. If they had not done so they could not have remained three months longer in power. The worst law they can possibly secure now is one with extensive tariffs along revenue lines and only a few protective features. It is doubtful whether even so much protection as that will be left to the commercial exclusionists. Though such a bill can be carried through the lower house, which came in with a protection majority, the free trade majority in the senate may not sanction it. Protection as a system is, in the language of our correspondent, "as dead as a door nail in Australia."

But that is only a beginning. The glamour that surrounded the Barton ministry is rapidly disappearing. Mr. Reid, the free trade leader in New South Wales, where he was premier and upon whose policy he has deeply impressed his personality, has jumped into the same commanding position in the parliament of the commonwealth that he occupied in the parliament of his state—a position of influence far and away above that of every one else. That was settled by

his first speech in the federal parliament. When compared with the reply of Barton, the premier, no room was left to question Reid's superior powers of statesmanship. And now that he is a national instead of a local character, the protection newspapers outside his own state are no longer able to misrepresent him as successfully as before. He has consequently made tremendous advances in Victoria. Even the protectionist workmen of that state are falling under his sway. So obvious is all this, that the protectionists are already saying that the next election will make Reid "dictator." Meanwhile it has become fairly certain that only a part of the revenues needed by the Commonwealth (possibly \$40,000,000) can be raised by customs and excise, and that the states will have to raise a large amount by land value taxation.

A federal judge in Ohio, of the name of Wing, has outflown all competitors in the judicial race for government by injunction. When issuing a sweeping injunction against "picketing" by striking molders in Cleveland, Judge Wing made this bold reply to the objection that the "picketing" consisted only in arguing with non-strikers with a view to peaceably persuading them not to work: "Persuasion of itself, long continued, may become a nuisance and unlawful." He therefore issued an injunction broad enough to include peaceable persuasion in furtherance of the strike.

With reference to this class of injunctions, persons who are neither sympathetic with nor tolerant of strikes, jump hastily to the conclusion that the injunctions tend to preserve order and peace, and are therefore quite desirable. It is a dangerously thoughtless way of looking at the matter. Something more far-reaching and important is involved than the judicial regulation of strikes. Think of it a moment. When state

courts issue injunctions forbidding "picketing," "persuasion," or other action by working men in furtherance of strikes, they assail our system of government in one or both of two ways. They either enjoin what is already forbidden by criminal law—as riotous or other disorderly conduct; or they forbid what is not forbidden by the criminal law—as long continued persuasion of non-strikers to join strikers. If they enjoin what is already forbidden by criminal law, they deprive persons charged with the crime of their constitutional rights, including the right to trial by jury. By enjoining a crime, the court that does it may try upon affidavits, convict in its own discretion, and imprison at will, any person charged by way of contempt of the injunction with the crime enjoined. Grand juries, indictments, petit juries, confrontation of witnesses, limitation of penalties, all presumptions of innocence, and every other safeguard of personal liberty and precaution against tyranny, are brushed aside when injunctions issue in restraint of crime. It is not merely that this mode of restraining crime is something of which criminals may complain, but that it breaks down all the safeguards that long experience has proved necessary for the protection of the innocent when falsely accused. When injunctions make new offenses—when, for instance, as in the molders' case in Cleveland, they forbid "persuasion of itself, long continued,"—then all these objections apply as before, with another added. In such cases, not only do the courts usurp the functions of grand jury and petit jury, not only do they deprive the accused of the right to be confronted by and to cross-examine his accusers, not only do they throw down these and other constitutional safeguards established for the protection of the innocent when charged with crime, but they also usurp the functions of the legislature, and treat as a crime, punishable with arbitrary imprisonment, that which is not a crime by law. Such, in brief, is government by

injunction when this innovation is adopted by the state courts.

When the federal courts set up government by injunction, they become guilty of still further usurpation. By this means, the federal courts and all their officers, the president as commander in chief and the regular army he commands, together with all the other powers that center at Washington, are brought into play for the regulation of the local peace. State lines are broken down, and the police power of states and municipalities is lodged with the commander in chief of the American armies. "Persuasion," for instance, such as the term "picketing" in labor strikes includes, if by long continuance or for any other reason it becomes an offense, is most clearly an offense not against the federal power, but against the local peace. The same thing is true of every possible act of strikers, however criminal. These crimes are breaches of the local peace. If the municipal authorities cannot restrain them, they may apply to the state authorities for aid, and the state authorities may in turn invoke the aid of the federal authorities. In that way the federal army might legitimately be called upon to preserve the local peace. Let it be observed, however, that the call for such interference then goes up from the locality. There is no usurpation, no invasion. But if a federal court enjoins these breaches of the local peace, and then, upon pretense of violations of the injunction, punishes for contempt, it may call in federal marshals and federal troops over the heads and it may be against the protests of local authorities. Thus it does away with local grand juries, local petit juries, local officers of all kinds. It turns the local peace of every community over to the regulation of judges appointed by the president, whose interests and ambitions tend to alienate them from local interests and sympathies. Back of them are as many deputy marshals as they wish, also alienated from local sympathies, and a federal army of hirelings

if they need it. In a word, federal injunctions for the preservation of the local peace, lay firm foundations for an autocracy as irresponsible as any that ever cursed Europe.

Persons who believe in a strong central government, reaching out with obsequious deputy marshals and disciplined soldiers as its unquestioning instruments, into every nook and corner of the land, for the regulation not only of national affairs, but also of affairs strictly local, will not be concerned about the usurpation of federal judges in labor cases. These judicial innovations lead on to what they want—namely, to the relegation of the states to a place analogous with reference to the nation to the place of counties with reference to the states. Its end will be subordination of the states as sovereignties and the transformation of the federal Union not merely into a nation with a big N, but into an empire with a big E,—an empire with all power concentrated at Washington, and local self-government only an historical remnant as it is in Russia. Such imperialists cannot be argued with. They are only to be reckoned with. But persons who do not look with complacency upon this imperial outcome, will do well to suppress their hostility to labor organizations long enough to stamp out this federal usurpation in its small beginnings. The regulation of local labor disturbances by federal injunctions is becoming a settled policy of the federal courts. Once established it will not stop with the regulation of labor disturbances. This policy is loaded with imperial dynamite.

How much more truly American in spirit than many of the utterances of American statesmen in the imperialistic times upon which we have fallen are these sentiments of Wu Tingfang, the Chinese minister to the United States, put forth by him in a Fourth of July oration this year at Philadelphia:

This nation, it seems to me, has not sprung into existence without a man-

ifest destiny. There must be some noble ends for which the independence of the United States was established. It was to demonstrate to the world what great good to mankind a free and independent people can do; to establish "a government of the people, by the people and for the people;" to preserve law and order; to treat all people alike with fairness and justness; to do away with selfish and clannish feeling; to make American patriotism synonymous with fair play, with the love of mankind, with freedom and liberty in accordance with law and justice. By pursuing these ends this republic will become the greatest power upon the earth and you citizens of this great country will be more than ever respected and loved by all.

That is the kind of "manifest destiny" of which a democracy might proudly boast. But there is all the difference of heaven from hell, between thus making this country the world's exemplar of liberty, which is Mr. Wu's ideal as it was Jefferson's, and shooting liberty into inferior peoples, which is the Chamberlain-McKinley ideal.

When "law and order" papers of the plutocratic type, those for instance like the highly respectable New York Times, inveigh against mob violence, they must not be taken too literally. What they really object to is not mob violence. It is only the kind of mob violence that hurts them and theirs. Such mob violence as interferes with the rights of persons to whom they have antipathy is, in their estimation, if not justifiable, at any rate excusable. In saying this we speak by the book. For here is an editorial published in the New York Times itself, on the 8th of July, with reference to the infamously lawless attack of a swell mob in Evanston upon a party of perfectly well behaved men and women, missionaries of the Dowieite persuasion, who were exercising their lawful right of free speech. Listen to the Times:

Mob violence is never commendable, except, of course, when it rises to the dignity of a justifiable revolution, but one cannot help feeling that the people of Evanston had several fairly good excuses for using means more vigorous and summary than the law provides in driving out of

that highly respectable suburb of Chicago the gang of Dowieite emissaries that had invaded it. Of all the exploiters of ignorant credulity by whom the country is troubled and endangered just now, the man Dowie is probably the most obnoxious. When addressing his dupes, of whom he has thousands in Chicago and not a few elsewhere, he talks like a raving maniac, but the sincerity of his grotesque claims to being a reincarnated prophet with supernatural powers and a large share of divine authority is more than questionable, since his apparent insanity has not prevented him from conducting large business enterprises with much and very practical shrewdness, and he has been even more successful than his feminine rival in the east in transferring to his own pockets the cash of his followers. They joyfully provide the capital for his banks and mills, and they support his pretensions, no matter how preposterous, with an enthusiasm and unanimity which Mrs. Eddy no doubt envies. Evanston, being something of a center of education and intelligence, naturally dislikes Dowie and all his works, and it has several times gone to the length of expressing its disapproval by showering Dowie's representatives with assorted missiles, and hustling them out of town in a rapid and tumultuous way. These are not the best of methods for answering and confuting false doctrine, and the Evanstoners presumably are more than a little ashamed of them, but—well, the Dowieite missionaries haven't been seriously injured, and a veneration of the contents of ancient eggs becomes them marvelously well. The eggs and the cult harmonize beautifully as to odors and otherwise, and harmony is always desirable.

If any "fairly good excuses" for the Evanston lawlessness are specified in that article, we should like to have them pointed out. For ourselves, we fail to find any at all, unless the Times considers that "a center of education and intelligence" is excusable for mobbing peaceable persons who utter sentiments which it "naturally dislikes." It is interesting to know, incidentally, that when a well behaved and reputable woman, whose only offense is that she preaches false doctrines, is hit in the eye with a rotten egg by a mob of "education and intelligence," as in the Evanston case, the New York Times does not regard her as having "been seriously injured," but on the con-

trary thinks that "a veneration of the contents of ancient eggs becomes" her "marvelously well." Most admirably does the Times represent the spirit of brummagem law and order that prevails with the upper class mob to which it caters. But is the Evanston mob any less ashamed of its New York defender than its defender thinks it probably is of its own "excusable" criminality? Probably not. That it is not ashamed of its own lawless acts is evident from its subsequent repetition of them with increased violence. Why, then, should it be ashamed of its lawless defender? May not this progress in lawlessness be due to the encouragement of hypocritical "law and order" papers like the Times?

The example of Colorado with reference to the Australasian system of taxation, has been imitated by Hawaii to the extent of the initial steps. At the legislative session this year, a joint committee of the Hawaiian legislature was selected, of which the Hon. John Emmeluth, of the house of representatives, is chairman, to ascertain the nature and effect of the system as exhibited in Australasia. Mr. Emmeluth will probably make the same tour of investigation for Hawaii that Senator Bucklin made for Colorado.

#### JOHN FISKE.

Justice to the memory of John Fiske would not be done, if his death were made the occasion only of recalling his greatness as a philosopher, historian and teacher. Great teacher though he was, both in philosophy and history, and also in the blending of the two so that each served the other, his larger greatness lay in his cultivation of those qualities of mind and heart which distinguish his philosophical and historical work and made its superiority possible. He was an intelligent theist and a profound democrat.

Whether we think of theism, the principle of the fatherhood of God, as involving democracy, the principle of the brotherhood of man, or of democracy as implying theism—that is, whether belief in a beneficent God generates belief in equality of human

rights, or belief in equality of human rights leads up to belief in a beneficent God—John Fiske's mind had traversed the path that connects them. Some of his writings are direct expositions of theism and all are vital with the spirit of democracy.

These are the qualities that will immortalize his influence if not his fame. Other writers may teach history as brilliantly; other thinkers may expound philosophy as clearly. So far, then, as concerns the outer shell of his life work, Fiske's fame may be dimmed or even totally obscured, and his influence be wholly superseded, by theirs. But that which constitutes the soul of his work, while it tends to preserve the one, will perpetuate the other.

Eminent as a teacher of philosophy at a time when philosophy was Godless, Fiske nevertheless found God even in the scientific know-nothingism of Spencerian evolution. Eminent as a teacher of political history at a time when plutocracy dominated schools and press, yet he bowed at the altar of democracy. As the principle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—the principle of the two great commandments, love of God with all one's heart and of the neighbor as one's self—grows to be more real and definite in human thought and action, the fame of such a teacher must grow with it, even though these teachings of his appear now to have been only incidental allusions instead of the primary impulses they were. At any rate, whatever may become of his personality the effect of teaching so inspired can never come to an end. Theistic democracy lays a wreath upon the bier of John Fiske.

#### THE CASE OF ST. CLAIR COUNTY

St. Clair county, Mo., is again furnishing food for the eastern press. Many are the times, for a generation, that it has done service in pointing a moral and adorning a tale of western lawlessness. One might judge from reading the New York Evening Post and eastern commercial journals that the people of St. Clair county are nothing more nor less than banded outlaws, ornamented with Winchester and bound together with blood-freezing, hell-born oaths, and that no

stranger with money on his person can safely set foot inside its borders without an attendant company of militia.

Yet when one goes to St. Clair county, one finds the people not at all different from people elsewhere. They do not carry arms nor gather at midnight. They attend church on Sunday and send their children to school. They pursue their peaceful vocations as quietly and industriously as people do in the best ordered communities. Crime is as infrequent there, and all the amenities of civilized life are just as observable there, as in other rural districts of the United States.

The immediate occasion of the present editorial eruption is the imprisonment of the county judges of that county, by order of the federal court, of which they are held to be in contempt.

True it is, that St. Clair county is, and for 30 years has been, in a sense in open rebellion against the government of the United States. The judges of the county court, which has charge of the administrative affairs of the county, have persistently refused to levy a tax wherewith to pay the county's bonded debt. When recently ordered to do so by the federal court, in which judgment had been rendered against the county, they steadily refused, and were promptly committed to jail for contempt, there to abide while their term of office lasts. There they will abide rather than yield to the order, for the same thing has happened to their predecessors in office for a generation. This gives rise to the cry of "repudiation," "anarchy," "brigandage," and other complimentary terms which have been so often applied to the case.

If, as a matter of fact, St. Clair county has repudiated a just debt, and has refused to levy a tax to pay it, even after it is reduced to judgment, then morally, as well as legally, such punishment and such epithets are well deserved. But is it so?

In the early seventies, while the constitution and the laws of Missouri authorized any county of the state to subscribe for stock in any railroad company organized under the law of the state, many of the counties voted

large subscriptions to such enterprises. The county courts of the several counties were authorized, in discharge of their ministerial functions, to provide the necessary funds (issue bonds) to pay such subscriptions. St. Clair county, like the rest, voted a subsidy in the form of a stock subscription to some mythical (as it turned out) railroad, and the county court at that time issued the necessary bonds.

Thus far the progress of the matter was clear and easily understood, but from that on the whole thing became involved in a fog so dense that no one has ever been able to penetrate it. By some means, those bonds got into circulation, without a mile of railroad, or any form of quid pro quo to the county, to show for it. Valuable negotiable commodities like county bonds don't lie around loose without attracting attention. They cannot safely be suffered to run at large even in a thinly populated region like St. Clair county, and the bonds in question got away, "without a bell on," as a Missourian would put it. Whether it was by some deal between a corrupt county court and bond sharks, or by the stupid yielding of the county court to some seductive flim-flam, nobody now seems to know. They were next brought to notice by a scire facias, in the hands of a United States marshal, issued from the federal court, where "innocent purchasers" were seeking to recover judgment on them. St. Clair county was not alone, for some 26 other counties in southern Missouri were in the same fix. There seemed to be an epidemic of corrupt bond deals. There was a general stampede of bonds from their corrals over the whole district, and the fugitives were "gathered in" somewhere east.

The people suddenly realized that their liberality and enterprise were to be repaid by persecution. Instead of the railroads for which they had so confidently voted, they were saddled with hopeless debts. Yet, some people affect to wonder at the hostility to bonds and bondholders which remains with them to this day, and that a Missourian has "to be shown" when a bond proposition comes up.

Counsel was employed, and the

cases were fought through all the courts until the court of last resort determined the issue against the counties. But the bondholders were generous, as they could well afford to be, and some of the counties compromised, refunding their bonds at a liberal discount. Others refused to compromise on any terms, and among them was St. Clair county. The judgments rendered against that county were so large that at this time they amount, with accrued interest, to as much as the assessed valuation of all the property in the county—\$1,500,000. It is as impossible to pay the judgments, or a considerable portion of them, as it is for St. Clair county to pick itself up and take position in some other state. Had the railroads been built as expected, the county would have had exact value for its indebtedness. It would have had an equivalent in railroad stock to show for every dollar of debt, and the one could have been made to pay the other.

When judgment was rendered, the county court in charge at that time refused to levy a tax whereby to pay it. A writ of mandamus was issued from the court which had rendered the judgments to compel such levy. The three members of the county court promptly declined to obey the writ and were as promptly committed to jail for contempt. They served their term of office, two years, in jail. The next county court was tried with the same medicine, and likewise failed to yield to the treatment. The judgments were renewed from time to time, and it became understood that a candidate for election to the county court was a candidate for imprisonment, and contests for the office were not spirited. It is strictly a case where the office seeks the man. For many years the citizens have selected their victims, those who had the time, the patriotic fortitude and the constitution to endure two years of incarceration. Sometimes they have escaped the United States marshal by hiding in the hills and meeting to transact county business at some secret place by night; some terms have passed without a mandamus, but never have three members been selected who would obey the order to levy a tax.

The recent case shows no abatement of the resolution to hold out.

If one takes pains to understand the people of St. Clair county, one sees a plausible explanation of their conduct without referring it to lawlessness. They voted the subscription in honest expectation of a railroad whose value to the county would have been beyond calculation, besides the equivalent of the debt in railroad stock, and got nothing for their pains except a debt which they can never pay. The outrage is more than they will submit to, and they say they will resist as long as the county contains within its borders three men who can endure two years in jail.

It is no use to point out to them that they are beating innocent parties—widows and orphans it may be who have inherited those bonds. Their ready response is, that there could be no innocent purchasers of those bonds.

And that is certainly true.

While the holders of those bonds when suit was instituted were held to be innocent purchasers in a technical sense (the supreme court of Missouri held the bonds invalid and it was the federal supreme court which determined it), they could not have been innocent in any real sense. Investors do not buy bonds without some inquiry about how, by whom, and for what purpose they are authorized. The slightest inquiry would have shown the fraudulent manner in which those bonds were put in circulation, would have shown that they were not exchanged for railroad stocks as was intended, nor for anything of value to the county.

So, while the people of St. Clair county may possibly be charged with bad judgment in dealing with the matter, it cannot be said that they are dishonest. The term "repudiation" does not apply to the case.

JOHN TURNER WHITE.

Springfield, Mo.

NEWS

Notwithstanding the confident predictions to the contrary, Tom L. Johnson carried all his points at the Ohio democratic convention. He was himself unable to attend, being detained in New York, partly on ac-

count of the recent death of his brother, but also because his own illness made attendance impossible—as he telephoned his associates on the Cuyahoga delegation, of which he was chairman—even if the adoption of his tax proposals depended upon his personal presence. The convention met at Columbus on the 10th. Charles P. Salen was both temporary and permanent chairman. The platform, adopted on the 10th, opens with a declaration for "equality of taxation and other public burdens," and for "the equal rights of all the people and special privileges to none." The "monopolization of industry, with its tendency on the one hand to crush out individual enterprise and on the other to promote a socialistic spirit among the people as the only refuge from oppression," is denounced. Charging the republican party with the corruption of municipalities, the platform then "calls upon the people to unite with it in placing the conduct of municipal affairs upon a business basis, that they may be administered by the people in the interest of all the people on the principle of home rule." That is a paraphrase of the demand of the Cuyahoga delegation for a plank favoring home rule in taxation, which was rejected because the committee on resolutions thought it a single tax plank. It is followed by the other Johnson demands as follows:

No franchise, extension or renewal thereof ever to be granted by any city or village without first submitting the same to a vote of the people.

The acceptance of free passes or other favors from railroads by public officers or employes shall be made adequate ground for vacating the offices held by them.

All public service corporations shall be required by law to make sworn public reports, and the power and duty of visitation and public report shall be conferred upon the proper state and local auditing officers to the end that the true value of the privileges held by these corporations shall be made plain to the people.

Steam and electric railroads and other corporations possessing public franchises shall be assessed in the same proportion to their salable value as are farms and city real estate.

On the tariff question the platform reads:

Tariff reform, never more urgently demanded than now, when the production of the country so far ex-

ceeds its power of consumption, that foreign markets are a prime condition of its continued prosperity and when the existence and abuses of trusts have been brought about by the policy of protection of favored industries. The abolition of the so-called protective system and the substitution in its place of the traditional democratic policy of a tariff for revenue so levied as not to burden one industry for the benefit of another.

In this connection trusts and subsidies are made subjects of condemnation:

The enactment and rigorous enforcement of measures which shall prevent all monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade and commerce—the matter of first importance being to prevent the use of the government as an instrumentality for the creation and increase of the wealth of the few while preserving intact the right of private property and the fullest measure of individual liberty of contract and assuring to every man the just reward of superior industry and skill. We demand the suppression of all trusts and a return to industrial freedom. As a means to that end all trust products should be placed on the free list and the government should exercise a more rigid supervision of transportation lines and abolish, in fact, all discrimination in rates.

Our merchant marine to be restored to its former greatness and made the ally of the people against monopoly by the repeal of antiquated and restricted navigation laws. But no subsidies for favored shipowners.

On imperialism the convention declares that—

The powers granted the federal government were not meant to be used to conquer or hold in subjection the people of other countries. Their use for such purposes not only belies our declaration of the rights of men, but also unbalances our system by increasing the centralization of power at Washington to the ultimate overthrow of home rule. The democratic party has never favored and now opposes any extension of the national boundaries not meant to carry speedily to all inhabitants full equal rights with ourselves. If these are unfitted by location, race or character to be formed into self-governing territories and then incorporated into the union of states in accordance with the historic policy of the republic they should be permitted to work out their own destiny. Only territorial expansion demanded by the national welfare and the national safety to be at any time favored—the objection which should have prevented certain of our recent acces-

sions being that they imperil the national safety without promoting the national welfare; that they devolve upon us enormous responsibilities we have no call to assume; that they are certain to be unremunerative drain upon our resources; that they tend to embroil us with European powers; that they weaken our claim to supremacy on the American continent, at the same time that they lessen our ability to make the claim good; and that they furnish a dangerous opportunity and temptation for the disregard of "the self-evident truth of universal application that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The remainder of the platform consists of condemnations of the republican party for aiding and sympathizing with the British against the Boers and for class legislation and public corruption; of promises to improve conditions; of a reaffirmation of the Monroe doctrine, and a demand for a sufficient navy; of pledges of devotion to civil service reform; of a plank on the labor question; and of the following clause with reference to the election of United States senators, taken from the Cuyahoga county or Johnson platform (p. 137-38), and only slightly changed in verbiage:

A constitutional amendment requiring the election of United States senators by the direct vote of the people. Hereafter, until this is passed, whenever a senator is to be elected it shall be the duty of the state committee to give notice in its call that the nomination of a senator will be made at the state convention.

The platform carefully excludes all reference to the Chicago and the Kansas City national platforms and also to Mr. Bryan.

Upon the adoption of the foregoing platform, the convention made the following nominations:

Governor, James Kilbourne; lieutenant governor, Anthony Howells; judge of supreme court, Joseph Hidy; clerk of supreme court, Harry R. Young; attorney general, M. B. McCarthy; treasurer of state, R. P. Alshire; member of board of public works, James B. Holman.

The second National Social and Political conference, in session at Detroit, as reported last week, closed its deliberations on the 3d with the adoption of an address and a brief platform, none of the delegates or those they may represent being bound thereby except as they themselves

may elect to be. The platform is as follows:

We declare for direct legislation and proportional representation, direct nomination of candidates for offices, equal suffrage for all, regardless of sex or color; honest elections, free from all partisan manipulation or control; direct taxation through progressive land values, inheritance and income taxes; public ownership of public utilities, an eight-hour day, sole control of the medium of exchange by the government, home rule, postal savings banks, state insurance and workmen's compensation for industrial injuries, opposition to militarism and conquest and advocacy of peaceful arbitration; demand the same rights and liberties for others as for ourselves.

A series of socialist resolutions, though adopted one by one, was laid upon the table as a whole.

British politics referred to last week on page 182, is marked by a further step in connection with the imperialist defection in the liberal party. A meeting of liberal members of parliament was held at the Reform club, in London, on the 9th, which had been officially summoned by Herbert Gladstone, the chief liberal "whip." It was a large gathering, 159 liberal members of parliament being present. The object of the meeting was to ascertain whether the Asquith "imperial liberal" speech (p. 182-83) had seriously affected party cohesion. Mr. Asquith was present and spoke, as did other "imperialist liberals;" but the "imperialist liberal" movement was not strong enough to raise an issue. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the liberal leader, took prompt advantage of its weakness. He boldly tendered the party the alternative of accepting his resignation as leader or giving him a vote of confidence. This put the "imperialist liberals" in a dilemma. Not being prepared to name a leader in Bannerman's place, they were forced to support the vote of confidence. While doing this, however, they declared their opposition to him on the South African question. The vote of confidence in Bannerman was accordingly adopted unanimously.

The South African war, which has caused this uneasiness in the British liberal party, is more deeply hidden in mystery as to its progress than ever. The British reports are censored, though to what extent can only be inferred. The Boers are evidently active, and the British are evidently

baffled; but of the facts the public is kept in ignorance. The only important exception comes out through parliament. On the 5th, the secretary for war, Mr. Broderick, announced on the floor of parliament that Gen. Kitchener had a few days previously granted permission to Gen. Botha to send a cipher message to Mr. Kruger and to receive a reply in cipher. Through this concession the Boer commandant in the field was able to communicate confidentially with the Transvaal president in Europe. The result was disclosed at a meeting of De Wet, Botha and other Boer leaders, who, after consultation, issued a proclamation to the burghers declaring that Mr. Kruger is still loyal to Boer independence, and that armed resistance to the British invasion will continue. This episode implies that the British have been trying to negotiate peace without independence, and have failed.

Independence day was celebrated in the Philippines by the formal inauguration of American civil government there. Commissioner William H. Taft, appointed civil governor by Mr. McKinley, pursuant to the Philippine amendment to the army appropriation bill of last February (vol. iii, p. 762) was escorted by Gen. MacArthur and Gen. Chaffee to the Plaza Palicio, Manila, where he took the oath of office as first civil governor.

In his inaugural address, Gov. Taft said:

This ceremony marks a new step toward civil government, the ultimate step of which will be taken by congress. Of 27 provinces that have been organized five are still in a state of armed insurrection and hence will remain under the control of the military governor. There are 16 provinces entirely free from insurrection which the commission lacked time to organize. The conditions under which the municipal governments will have their first test are trying. Four years of war and the ravage of cattle and locust pests have pauperized the country and crippled agriculture. With to-day's change to civil government you must stand alone, not depending on the army to police the provinces. Congress has delayed to pass provisions for the sale of public lands and the mining franchises—all that is necessary to give the country the benefit of American and foreign enterprise. Our most satisfactory ground for expecting the success of this experiment is the universal desire for education. Without

assuming to express an opinion on the Puerto Rico cases I venture to state that the supreme court decision will be of benefit to the Philippines, as the application of a high protective tariff in connection with trade and manufacturing conditions in the United States would be a hardship. The conduct of the civil and military branches of the military government under independent heads is a delicate matter, depending on the fullest cooperation of the military and civil arms. I believe that there will be the same cooperation in the future as in the past. While profoundly grateful it is with no exultant spirit, if with confidence, that I begin my new duties. I rely upon the cooperation and energy and ability of those sharing my responsibility.

A feature of this address was an announcement by Gov. Taft that on the first of September the Philippine commission would be increased by the appointment of three native ministers—Dr. Wardo Detavera, Denit Legarda and Jose Luzuriaga. It was also stated that before that date executive or cabinet departments would be established as follows: Interior, Commissioner Worcester; commerce and police, Commissioner Wright; justice and finance, Commissioner Ide, and public instructor, Commissioner Moses.

As part of the inaugural ceremonies at Manila, the following dispatch from Mr. McKinley to Gov. Taft was publicly read:

Upon the assumption of your new duties as civil governor of the Philippine islands, I have great pleasure in sending congratulations to you and your associate commissioners and my thanks for the good work already accomplished. I extend to you my full confidence and best wishes for still greater success in the larger responsibilities now devolved upon you, and the assurance not only for myself but for my countrymen of good will for the people of the islands, and the hope that their participation in the government which it is our purpose to develop among them may lead to their highest advancement, happiness and prosperity.

Other colonial celebrations of American independence day took place in Guam, Tutuila, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The Puerto Rican celebration included the passage by the colonial legislature and the signing by the colonial governor of a resolution looking to the immediate establishment of

free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States. This action has reference and is pursuant to the act of congress of April, 1900, for the government of Puerto Rico. The act provides (No. 105 of The Public, p. 5) for a tariff on commerce between Puerto Rico and the United States, of 15 per cent. of the Dingley act rates, until March, 1902, unless Puerto Rico shall sooner establish her own system of taxation. The Puerto Rican resolution mentioned above recites this limitation, and then proceeds:

The Puerto Rican assembly, in extra session, and acting pursuant to the instructions of congress, does hereby notify the president of the United States that by virtue of the Hollander act and other acts, it has enacted and put into operation a system of local taxation to meet the necessities of insular government, and it hereby directs that a copy of this joint resolution be presented to the president of the United States, and it requests that Gov. Allen deliver the resolution to President McKinley to the end that proclamation may be made by him, and if it shall seem wise and proper to the president of the United States, the assembly requests that his proclamation be issued July 25, as that day is being established a legal Puerto Rican holiday to commemorate the anniversary of the flying of the American flag. Gov. Allen purposes bringing this resolution to Washington and presenting it to the president in person.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—A bank failure at Odessa has caused a financial panic in South Russia.

—The fortieth annual convention of the National Educational association met at Detroit on the 9th.

—Turkey has paid to the United States the amount of the indemnity claim of the latter against her, \$95,000.

—The American Library association has been in convention during the current week at Waukesha, Wis.

—Prince von Hohenlohe, formerly chancellor of the German empire, died in Switzerland on the 5th of old age. His age was 82.

—Pierre Lorillard, head of the great tobacco establishment founded by his father, Peter Lorillard, died at New York on the 7th, aged 69 years and worth \$25,000,000.

—Gen. Gomez, of Cuba, was entertained at dinner at the white house by President McKinley on the 3d, and by W. E. D. Stokes at the Union League club, New York, on the 6th. He returned to Cuba on the 10th.

—Charles E. Dawes resigned on the 3d as comptroller of the currency, the resignation to take effect October 1. His announced reason is his intention of becoming a candidate for the United States senatorship from Illinois.

—The twentieth international convention of the Christian Endeavor societies assembled at Cincinnati on the 6th. Almost every country is represented by delegates, and the attendance mounts up into the thousands.

—The funeral of ex-Gov. Hazen S. Pingree was held at Detroit on the 6th. The burial was made according to the service of the Scottish Rite masons and with military honors. Over 5,000 men escorted the body to the cemetery.

—A mob of 3,000 at Evanston, Ill., assaulted a party of Dowie missionaries who were preaching in the streets on the 10th. The mob threw rotten eggs and other missiles, and seriously injured several of the missionaries, including women.

—Martial law for six months has been proclaimed in Buenos Ayres, and all messages are censored. The declaration was made in consequence of riots caused by a ministerial bill in congress providing for refunding the public debt of the Argentine republic.

—John Fiske, the eminent historian, died at East Gloucester, Mass., on the 4th, from the effects of the excessive heat. He was 59 years old. His full name was John Fiske Green, but upon the second marriage of his widowed mother, born Fiske, he dropped his paternal name.

—Secretary Chamberlain announced to parliament on the 4th the intention of the ministry to introduce a bill altering the title of King Edward. He did not indicate what title will be proposed, except by saying that it will more clearly recognize the king's "sovereignty over the entire British empire."

—Lieut. James Weir Graydon, formerly of the American navy, is exhibiting in London a compound steam turbine, by means of which he believes that steamships can make the trans-Atlantic trip in three days. Andrew Carnegie is reported to be organizing a company to apply this new motor to steamships.

—Jacob S. Rogers, the millionaire locomotive builder of Paterson, N. J., who recently died, left the bulk of his estate by will to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. A nephew, to whom he gave "seventy-five thousand thousand dollars," in a codicil, claims the whole estate, on the ground that the double use of the word "thousand" is not a verbal rep-

etition due to clerical error, but makes the bequest \$75,000,000, which is 60-odd million more than Mr. Rogers possessed.

—The burial of Albert L. Johnson, brother of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, whose death we reported and commented upon last week, took place on the 5th. It was largely attended by former employes. The body was buried at Greenwood. A large memorial meeting was held at Cleveland on the 7th, at which Henry J. Davies presided and ex-Judge Blandin, Henry Eubanks, L. A. Russell, Charles P. Salen, Horace Andrews and the Rev. Harris R. Cooley spoke. On the 8th the Cleveland city council adjourned out of respect to his memory.

—Frederick N. Judson, chairman of the tax conference held at Buffalo in May, under the auspices of the National Civic Federation (pp. 123, 136), has named the Committee of Fifteen authorized by the conference to promote interstate comity in taxation and tax reform. It is as follows:

Edwin R. A. Sellman, John A. McCall, Charles S. Fairchild and Lawson Purdy, New York; Arthur T. Hadley, Yale university; Charles S. Hamlin, Boston; F. W. Taussig, Harvard university; M. E. Ingalls, Cincinnati; James R. Garfield, Cleveland; Frederick U. Upham, Chicago; T. E. Howard, South Bend, Ind.; N. P. Gilson, Madison, Wis.; William Wirt Howe, New Orleans; John Francis, Colony, Kan., and J. W. Bucklin, Grand Junction, Col.

Besides the 15 named, Frederick N. Judson, of St. Louis, and Ralph M. Easley, of Chicago, are ex-officio members. The committee will have headquarters in the New York office of the Civic Federation and will begin active work in September.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for June shows on hand June 30:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	176,833,124 92
Total.....	\$326,833,124 92
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1900.....	305,705,654 78
Increase for the fiscal year July 1, 1900, to June 30, 1901.....	\$21,127,470 14

—The treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the federal government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff.....	\$268,786,740 89
Internal Revenue..	305,514,410 95
Miscellaneous.....	41,547,157 16
	\$585,848,309 00
Expense:	
Civil and Misc.....	\$122,310,434 65
War.....	144,620,590 59
Navy.....	60,515,357 12
Indians.....	10,696,006 67
Pensions.....	139,323,489 24
Interest.....	32,317,402 12
	\$509,983,310 39

Surplus for the fiscal year July 1, 1900, to June 30, 1901.....	\$75,664,998 61
Surplus for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900 (Vol. III., p. 218).....	80,676,600 23
Accumulated surplus July 1, 1899, to June 30, 1901.....	\$156,341,608 84

MISCELLANY

WHEN FOOLS RUSH IN.

For The Public.  
 Truth crushed to earth would rise again  
 Unharm'd, if all the blows  
 By which she falls were dealt by men  
 Whom she could call her foes.  
 Most snares that in her path abound,  
 Most dangers that she dreads,  
 Are due to disproportions found  
 'Twixt mortal hearts and heads.  
 And this has been her sorry plight  
 Since progress was begun;  
 The zeal with which her lovers fight  
 Discretion has outrun.  
 "O, that the wise were always good!"  
 Oft the reformer cries;  
 But Truth may rather sigh: "O, would  
 The good were always wise!"  
 From enemies she scorns to flee,  
 Their power she can defy;  
 But, "From my friends deliver me!"  
 May aptly be her cry.  
 That heads are worse than hearts we see;  
 The consequence is, then,  
 That hearts than heads can better be,  
 And hope abide with men.  
 And so, though blunders to repair  
 May task us day and night,  
 We bid defiance to despair,  
 Since hearts are ever right.

JAY HAWKINS.

IT DIDN'T HELP HIM.

"Yes," he said, "I've quit, and I want to say that I think these stories of the way men get ahead in the world are all fairy tales. I've tried the methods and know. Only a few days ago I read about Tom L. Johnson making his first big hit with the manager of a street railroad by picking up the scrap iron he found lying around. 'You're the kind of a careful man I want,' said the manager, and he promoted him right away. That was enough for me, so I began picking up things whenever the boss was near.  
 "What are you doing?" he demanded yesterday.  
 "There's no use letting these things go to waste, sir," I answered, for that's what Tom Johnson said.  
 "Of course not," he said, "and we hire men for a dollar a day to do just that class of work. But we can't afford to have clerks wasting their time over it. Hump yourself back into the office now or I'll have you on the pay roll as a day laborer."  
 "So I quit. Somehow things don't seem to happen in real life the way they do in print."—Chicago Evening Post.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

Mayor Johnson signalized his coming into control of the park system of Cleveland by emphatically declar-

ing that "the parks are for the people," and the whole people are entitled to the full enjoyment of their advantages. His first order regarding them was to remove all the "Keep Off the Grass" signs, and this was followed by a notification to the park caretakers that the people have a right to walk on the grass, sign or no sign. It is there for the comfort of feet elsewhere confined to hard and hot pavements. The experience of other cities where like freedom is enjoyed shows that the grass is not injured by the roving of people across it "dispersedly" instead of in beaten lines.—Editorial in *Cleveland Plaindealer* of July 4.

"Mayor Johnson's orders that there shall be no shooting of firearms on Fourth of July will be strictly enforced," said Chief Corner Wednesday. "All persons violating this rule will be arrested. Persons shooting firecrackers off any place but in the street and those who put torpedoes on street car tracks, will also be arrested."—*Plaindealer* of July 4.

The white wings system of street cleaning was handsomely illustrated Friday. All the wild litter of the Fourth had completely disappeared before nine o'clock in the morning. When the old system was in vogue the rubbish would have blown about for days before being carted away.—Editorial note in *Plaindealer* of July 6.

#### FROM A SOLDIER IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Extracts from a letter written by an enlisted man in the Philippine islands, under date of May 18, 1901, to his cousin.

Firstly, as the ministers say: Take a fool's advice and stay away from the Philippines, and above all, Manila. From about the first of December till the middle of April the climate is all that could be desired,—balmy days and cool nights; but from then till about the first of July it is so hot as to be almost unbearable. Then comes the rainy season, which lasts till about the middle of November.

The first year over here is not so bad on one's health, but after that the blood begins to thin and the system gets run down more or less, and disease has an excellent chance to get hold. If typhoid does not strike you, you are sure of malaria fever or some stomach trouble. I may be speaking plainly, but I want you to see this thing as I do, and as I have

found it by conversation with those who have lived here some years.

Regarding consumption, I will simply give you an instance which came under my own observation. We are allowed to enlist natives in our regimental bands, and ten native musicians applied for enlistment in our band. Out of the ten examined six were in the incipient stages of consumption, and I have noticed that a large proportion of the natives have that cough which so readily stamps one as a victim of the dread disease.

So I say, for your health's sake, stay away. Of course, way up in the mountains in the interior, the conditions are different; but it will be many years before American women are allowed up that way.

Manila is not a cheap city by any means. Board such as you would desire is high. You would have to pay \$50, gold, a month, and then pay extra for your laundry work. Of course I don't know what teachers receive in Minnesota, but \$40 in the states is better than \$75 here. Some things are cheaper than in the states, but others are correspondingly high. You can save more money where you are.

Reviewing the whole ground, I say stay where you are.

I have not received my commission yet. I took my examination in March, and passed with a general average of 85 per cent. But there are so many applicants who have political influence that I am afraid I'm doomed to be "left." I haven't "pull" enough to get on the city sewer gang. If I don't get the shoulder straps I shall serve out my enlistment and then return to the states. My present enlistment expires on January 26, and as soon as I can get a transport I'm off for 'Frisco.

We are having our share of work over here trying to impress on the minds of these natives the fact that Uncle Sam wants them to be "nice."

I had just come in from a four-days' trip yesterday. Had charge of 20 men escorting a wagon team loaded with provisions up in the mountains about 50 miles. And it is no pleasure when you don't know what moment you are going to get a volley poured into your party from a clump of bamboo. So far as I can see, these colonies of ours are far from being pacified. So long as we retain them, just so long will the government troops be needed to suppress the numerous bands of ladrones.

We expect to start out on an expedition next week against a band of insurrectors who are raising a little

disturbance about 75 miles from here. From all accounts we will be about 40 days.

#### THE LATE ALBERT L. JOHNSON.

Editorial in *Cleveland Plaindealer* of July 4.

The news of the unexpected death of Albert L. Johnson was not only a grievous shock to his many friends in this and other localities but it was painful news, as well, for the community at large that has taken a lively interest in the projects of this vigorous young promoter and investor, and has learned to look upon him as one who meant well for his fellow-men.

If Albert Johnson had lived in the days of chivalry he would have led on field and in foray. He was fearless and aggressive with a touch of the romantic in his make-up that prompted him at times to display the variety of his unusual gifts. Yet this driver of a 12-horse snow plow, this reinsman of a spirited four-in-hand, was cool, long-headed, quick to see a business advantage, and ready for any commercial venture, no matter how great its magnitude.

Active, virile, with a big man's contempt for all that is petty and mean, Albert Johnson placed his mark high up on the gauge of human endeavor, and died, his work but half done, his mind filled with great projects that others must carry to the conclusions that he so eagerly anticipated.

News article in *Cleveland Plaindealer* of July 4.

Expressions of sincere sympathy were heard on all sides yesterday when the news of the death of Albert Johnson became generally known. From the official walks of life, from the bench, from the social world and from the realms of labor came tributes to the generous hearted nature, the simple character and the almost phenomenal powers of mind and body which made him preeminently a leader of men.

At the city hall there was a shade of gloom about the offices, not only for the loss of the man whom all admired, but out of sympathy for the mayor, his brother. As a mark of respect to his memory and his official connection with the city government as a member of the board of aldermen when that form of city government was tried, the flag at the Public square floated at half-staff. The city officials sent a joint floral tribute of sorrow in the form of a broken shaft.

Among the judges of the local court there was a similar vent to expressions of sorrow at the untimely end of the dead man. Judge Phillips voiced the sentiment of his colleagues when he said "That he was able to amass so many millions and still retain his hold upon the hearts of the great masses of people among whom he lived is, in my opinion, the sincerest proof of innate greatness."

One of the noticeable things in connection with the sorrow expressed is that it does not come from a single class or walk of life. Rich and poor alike see in his death the loss of a personal friend. The street car employees who remember the times when he worked with them and was one of them joined with the representatives of gigantic capital in giving voice to their estimate of the man, and they agree.

One point of common regret is that he was not allowed to complete the projects which he had planned. Common opinion gives him a unique place in the world of progress and all looked upon him as the explication of reforms in the world of traffic and transportation. A leader in certain lines of activity and of reductions of charges, he commanded the attention of all interested in street car traffic. No one seems to be able to fill the place made vacant.

#### SHALL WE ALL WORK HARDER?

A letter published in the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune of June 13, from Daniel Klefer.

Rev. Charles F. Goss, in his "Snap Shots at Daily Life," tells your readers Monday morning, in substance, that if they will all be industrious and virtuous they will all succeed in life. Like Sir Joseph Porter, in "Pinafore," he tells them the story of somebody's success, and winds up with practically the same advice: "Just stick to your desks, and never go to sea, and you all may be rulers of the queen's navy." Such talk is well enough in a comic opera, where it is only intended to furnish amusement, but, when it is delivered in all seriousness, it is anything but complimentary to the intelligence of the person to whom it is addressed.

In last Monday's issue he tells the story of an errand boy, who, by taking, or pretending to take, a great interest in his employer's success received an increase in salary at once, and, it is to be presumed, finally got to own the business. The moral he points out is that, if all errand boys and all others who occupy subordi-

nate positions will attend to their employer's business, and not their own, then every mother's son of them will get to be a boss, and no one need be an underling.

"This is not the doctrine you will hear on the street corners," he says. "It is not the philosophy of the agitator." Let us hope it is not. There ought to be some people somewhere who do not dish out such nonsensical stuff to their listeners, and if such people cannot be found in the pulpits of our fashionable churches, let us be thankful that at least the agitators on the street corners have sufficient respect for the intelligence of the multitude to spare them that infliction.

Let us imagine such a thing as that every man in somebody's employ should actually take Rev. Mr. Goss seriously and follow his advice. What would be the result? As all would be working equally well in the interest of their employers and entirely disregarding their own, then no reason would exist, due to the efforts of any one of these employes, for advancing any one of the number above the rest. The only effect would be to raise the standard of efficiency; to make everyone work harder, without in any way bettering their future prospects thereby.

It is only because the great mass of employes are sufficiently human to prefer their own interests to that of their employers, and sufficiently honest not to try to conceal that fact, that it is possible for an occasional one—who may give his employer's interests the preference, or, what is more probable, may successfully pretend to do so—to raise himself above the multitude. If all would do as he has done no one would secure any advantage and no one would be any better off.

If one employe in an establishment should voluntarily put in an extra hour every day without extra pay, he might thereby secure his employer's favor and succeed in raising himself above his fellows, but if all the employes did this, then none of them would have any claim to preference, and all they would succeed in doing would be to increase their hours of labor, without increasing their reward. So far from bettering themselves, they would only hurt themselves by such a course.

It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Goss to question the justice or wisdom of a social system wherein, in order that men may obtain something more than the bare necessities

of life, or even to get the chance to earn that, it is necessary for them to secure the favor of other men. Yet, ministers of the Gospel ought to be the first ones to recognize this very fact. They ought to see that the existence of such a system cannot possibly be in accordance with the will of a just and wise God; that, consequently, it must exist contrary to his will, and that all who profess to worship him must be recreant to their duty if they neglect to do what is in their power to change the system. In spite of all this, the ministers who fearlessly do their duty in pointing out these facts are exceedingly rare. It is doubtful if there are more than three of them in this city. The rest are well described by Mr. Goss himself in the individual who has the church or does not help it "just in proportion as it is profitable to himself." It is not very profitable to the man in the pulpit just now to tell the facts about existing social conditions. It is more profitable to lay the blame for existing evils on individuals than it is on the system which compels most men to do wrong. Some beneficiaries of legalized robbery may cease donating to the church if the truth be told regarding the source of their income, consequently the pulpit generally keeps silent on this matter. "No wonder," to quote Rev. Mr. Goss once more, "the church has lost so much of its power."

#### "IDEALS IN POLITICS."

Extracts from the oration of Hon. Wayne MacVeagh before the Phi Beta Kappa society at Harvard university, June 27, as reported in City and State, of Philadelphia, for July 4.

My purpose is to point out, without the slightest bitterness, to the members of the contented class, the commercial value of ethical ideas as the safest source of the political aspirations of the majority of our people, and the most conservative influence in our national life, and also to point out to them the grave dangers from a business standpoint, in these days of possible conflict between capital and labor, of continuing to substitute money for morals as the permanent and controlling force in American politics.

The first ethical idea which it seems to me it would be wise for us, even from the point of view of the stock exchange, to guard most zealously just now is the ideal condition of society with which President McKinley closed his congratulations upon the opening of the exposition at Buffalo

—that of peace on earth and good will to men. I observe with especial sorrow that many Protestant clergymen mistakenly suppose that they can safely substitute at this day and in our country the teaching of Mohammed for the teaching of Christ. We all know the temptations to which such clergymen are exposed. It is so much more comfortable to "swim with the tide," and it is so much more certain that the incomes on which themselves and their families are dependent for the comforts and luxuries of life will share in the commercial prosperity of the country, if the doctrines preached by them and advocated in their religious journals recognize that the making of money is the first duty of man in the new century, and that keeping one's self unspotted from the world, so far from being, as was formerly supposed, true religion and undefiled, is a foolish and sentimental expression, incapable of application in the rough world in which we live, where each man's duty is to take care of himself. But, after making all allowance the most abundant charity can suggest, it will still remain a grave and menacing peril to American respect for the moral law if clergymen are permitted without rebuke to preach the righteousness of unnecessary or aggressive warfare, the killing of weaker peoples in order to reduce them to subjection, and the robbing them of their possessions.

It is quite possible there may also be great commercial value for us at the present time in the ethical ideal that all men are born equal and equally entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I fully recognize the present unpopularity of this ideal. I know that to declare one's belief in it is to expose one's self to the dreadful charge of disloyalty; but as in matters of religion American democracy rested at its birth upon the message of the herald angels, so in politics it rested at its birth upon the doctrine of the equality of men.

Great popularity no doubt just now attaches to money and great unpopularity to morals, on the ground that money is modern and practical, while morals are antiquated and impracticable; and they tell us that the race of to-day is a race for new markets won by war, for the exploiting of weaker peoples, for larger armies, for ever-increasing navies, for expanding trade and for greater wealth. I confess I would have thought the growth of our own be-

loved country in material wealth and prosperity in the last 30 years of unbroken peace and of amity with all mankind had more than satisfied any avarice which could have found a place even in the dreams of civilized men. Those 30 years demonstrated that in order to be a world power we need not be a robber nation.

There is still another ethical ideal which may soon prove to be of very great commercial value in American politics—the ideal of the citizen, whether in or out of office, exhibiting moral courage in dealing with important public questions. The truth is that physical courage has always been the most commonplace of virtues, and could always be bought at a very cheap price, so that it has become an unfailling proof of decadence for any people to become hysterical over exhibitions of animal courage without regard to the moral quality of the service in which it was displayed or of the comparative weakness of the adversary. Just the contrary is true of moral courage. It is among the rarest of virtues, and its services are of far greater value in this democratic age than ever before.

Indeed, the days may not be distant when the existence of law and order in America may depend upon it, for it may be found that it, and it alone, can protect us from the dangers which Mr. Webster believed would follow our present condition, a "rapid accumulation of property in few hands." For that reason the commercial value of such courage in a government by the majority can hardly be overestimated; and surely, if we are to find it a bulwark of defense in our day of need, we ought to be now commending it by our example, showing how really brave men face grave problems of government, and set themselves as brave men should, to finding the best possible solution of them.

There is another very grave problem which we are also refusing to consider, and by which refusal the ethical ideal of law is also being destroyed. It is the problem presented by our negro population, now approaching 10,000,000 souls. We gave them the suffrage and we have allowed some of them to be killed for possessing it. We appointed some of them to office, and have stood meekly by when they were shot for having our commission in their hands. They are being burnt before our eyes without even a pretense of trial. We are allowing state after state, openly, even contemptuously, to nullify a

solemn amendment of the constitution enacted for their protection, to secure which we poured out our treasure without limit and shed the blood of our sons like water. All of us, whether in public office or in private station, now concur in trying to ignore the existence of any such problem at our doors while, laughing like the Roman augurs in each other's faces, we indulge in self-congratulations about the blessings we are carrying to another 10,000,000 of dark-skinned races in far-distant lands.

It certainly would tend to make private property far more secure in America if the less fortunate majority of our population saw us of the more fortunate minority giving courage and time and thought to efforts to solve these problems and others like them, and thereby to lessen some of the evils which in many cases bear so heavily and so unjustly upon the poor. Indeed, the influence of ethical ideals upon American democracy ought to be considered of value if only because the cultivation of such ideals will inevitably tend to make more really patriotic all classes of our countrymen, for such ideals lift us all above the unsatisfied standards of public duty with which we are vainly trying to connect ourselves. They bring us into the air of a higher and purer love of country, and they set us face to face with the early American spirit in its best estate. In such communion a sordid and selfish public opinion, with low methods to mean ends, tends to disappear, and a cowardly and corrupt public life becomes less possible.

#### TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

An address issued by the American Anti-Imperialist leagues on July 4, 1901.

The Anti-Imperialist Leagues of the United States have been silent since the Presidential election, but not because they have less faith in their cause or believe the battle lost. They had hoped that those who voted for Mr. McKinley, while disapproving his policy in the West Indies and the Philippines, would see that their votes were misinterpreted, and would make their disapproval known and felt. They had hoped that congress would claim its place in our government, and would insist that the principles of freedom must be recognized and applied wherever our country holds sway. They had hoped that the supreme court would with no uncertain voice declare that no human be-

ing under our control could be without the rights secured by our constitution, and that neither president nor congress, nor both together, could exercise absolute power over men entitled to the protection of our flag.

These hopes have not been realized. Where Benjamin Harrison nobly led, too few have followed. The war in the Philippines has been prosecuted with unrelenting cruelty until the resistance of the unhappy islanders seems to have been crushed. Many thousands of their bravest men have been killed or have died of disease, during the contest; and to-day the president exercises a power as despotic as the czar's over the whole Filipino nation. Congress has abdicated its function, has given these people into the president's hands, and has adjourned without attempting to deal with the questions presented by the islands. Already it has learned that free government is hard and absolutism easy—a dangerous lesson in a republic. Liberty and absolutism cannot exist together.

Three years ago congress by joint resolution declared "that the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent"—that they were then independent, and were justly entitled to be independent. This country intervened to establish their independence, and by the same resolution promised not to exercise "sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof." To-day the president is the absolute ruler of Cuba. He spends the revenues of the island as he pleases. No constitution, no law, fetters his power. At his instance congress has violated the nation's pledge. The "independent" Cuban people have been told that they will not be allowed to establish any government in their own land, unless they surrender in part the control of their finances and foreign affairs; unless they give to this country the possession of strategic points on their territory; and unless in addition they give to it the right to intervene in their domestic affairs whenever in the judgment of our authorities the occasion shall demand such intervention. They are offered no option to refuse these demands, which are backed by the presence of American troops on their soil. Thus to the whole world our course has become an example of national perfidy. The enforced submission of the Cubans to these unjust requirements has made

the stain on our national record indelible.

The supreme court has spoken, but has left the law in doubt. Some of its members have given their countenance to views urged by the administration, of which their associate, Mr. Justice Harlan, says: "If the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will be the result. We will in that event pass from the era of constitutional liberty, guarded and protected by a written constitution, into an era of legislative absolutism."

Where such a revolution is threatened, and when congress and the supreme court both fail, there is no help save in the people. If they would avert the impending calamity they must help themselves. Let us not be misled by names. Imperialism is not a question of crowns and scepters, of names and titles. It is a system of government. Where a man or body of men, an emperor, a president, a congress, or a nation, claims the absolute right to rule a people, to compel the submission of that people by brute force, to decide what rights they shall have, what taxes they shall pay, what judges shall administer their laws, what men shall govern them—all without responsibility to the people thus governed—this is imperialism, the antithesis of free government. As Mr. Justice Harlan says:

The idea that this country may acquire territories anywhere upon the earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere colonies or provinces, and the people inhabiting them to enjoy only such rights as congress chooses to accord them, is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius as well as with the words of the constitution.

In organized society there is no liberty that is not constitutional liberty. Even in America, where we have only to fear the abuse of power by our own fellow-citizens, we all rely on constitutions, national and state, to protect our rights. We cannot conceive an American community without these safeguards. Do not the inhabitants of Luzon need against us the protection that we need against ourselves? It has ever been the American method to incorporate acquired territory with representation; it is now proposed to revert to the Roman method and hold conquered territory by force without representation. This policy which we oppose gives to the Filipinos and Porto Ricans no constitutional rights, no American citizenship, no hope of statehood, no voice

in the congress which rules them; it leaves them without a country, the subjects of a republic. To believers in free government this policy is monstrous.

"Let it be remembered," said the continental congress, "that it has ever been the pride and boast of America that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature." When this country denies to millions of men the rights which we have ever claimed, not only for ourselves, but for all men, its policy is suicidal. As Lincoln said: "Those who deny liberty to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it." Indifference to liberty anywhere breeds indifference to liberty everywhere. No man can defend despotic methods abroad and long retain his loyalty to democracy at home. The common speech of those who support our new policy gives us daily examples of this truth. We cannot have citizens and subjects under the same flag. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." For  
Laws of changeless justice bind oppressor  
with oppressed,  
And close as sin and suffering joined we  
march to fate abreast.

We insist that constitutional liberty shall be the inalienable right of every man who owes allegiance to our flag; that freedom shall belong to man and not to place; that our constitution shall be no respecter of persons, colors or races; that it shall recognize the equal rights of all. Ours is the policy of liberty. Ours is the cause for which the American revolution was fought and which triumphed again in the civil war. It is the cause of human freedom now threatened in the house of its friends. It makes little difference under what name we rally to its support. As Daniel Webster said:

Arbitrary governments may have territories and distant possessions because arbitrary governments may rule them by different laws and different systems. . . . We can do no such thing. They must be of us, part of us, or else strangers.

With Benjamin Harrison, we are unable to rejoice in the acquisition of lands and mines and forests and commerce, at the cost of the abandonment of the old American idea that a government of absolute powers is an intolerable thing, and, under the constitution of the United States, an impossible thing.

We agree with him that this view will not limit the power of territorial expansion; but it will lead us to limit the use of that power to regions that may safely become part of the United States, and to peoples whose American citizenship may be allowed.

We urge all lovers of freedom to

organize in defense of human rights now threatened by the greatest free government in history. Even if our government may exercise arbitrary power over millions of men in disregard of the constitution—which we deny—it can never be right for it to exercise such power. Right is higher than might. Let every citizen study the facts and make his conclusion known, combining with his neighbor to influence congress to stand true to the principles of the Declaration by which this government was founded and under which it has grown so great. The gravest danger our country has known till now has come from a denial of those principles. The incoming congress is not yet committed to the policy of incorporating the island peoples into our system without rights. Let it resume its place in the government in defense of the inalienable rights of man.

We appeal from those who for the moment exercise the power of the nation to the people who are the nation—that nation which, on July 4, 1776, was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

**AMERICAN ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,**

By George S. Boutwell, President, and W. J. Mize, Sec'y.

**NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,**

By Albert S. Parsons, Chairman Executive Committee, and Erving Winslow, Secretary.

**ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE OF NEW YORK,**

By Ernest H. Crosby, President, and E. W. Ordway, Sec'y.

**AMERICAN LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA,**

By George G. Mercer, President, and Samuel Milliken, Secretary.

**WASHINGTON ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,**

By W. A. Croffut, President.

**CINCINNATI ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,**

By Charles B. Wilby, Chairman Executive Committee.

**MINNEAPOLIS ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,**

By Henry J. Fletcher, President.

We concur in the above address:

- Carl Schurz, New York.
- Charles H. Aldrich, Chicago, Ex-Solicitor General United States.
- Leonard Woolsey Bacon, Connecticut.
- John Beatty, Columbus, O.
- James L. Blair, St. Louis.
- Horace Boies, Iowa.
- Donelson Caffery, Louisiana.
- D. H. Chamberlain, Massachusetts.
- Samuel L. Clemens, New York.
- C. R. Codman, Massachusetts.
- Louis R. Ehrlich, Colorado.
- William H. Fleming, Georgia.
- Frederick W. Gookin, Chicago.
- Arthur C. A. Hall, P. E., Bishop of Vermont.

- Moses Hallett, Denver.
- Edward Holton James, Seattle, Wash.
- William D. Howells, New York.
- Henry U. Johnson, Indiana.
- Henry W. Lamb, Boston.
- Daniel S. Lord, Chicago.
- J. Laurence Laughlin, Chicago.
- Henry B. Metcalf, Rhode Island.
- J. Sterling Morton, Nebraska.
- Charles Elliot Norton, Cambridge, Mass.
- Warren Olney, San Francisco.
- George L. Paddock, Chicago.
- Robert Treat Paine, Jr., Boston.
- Wheeler H. Peckham, New York.
- Henry Wade Rogers, New Haven.
- James Ryan, Bishop of Alton.
- Edwin Burritt Smith, Chicago.
- Rufus B. Smith, Cincinnati.
- Charles B. Spahr, New York.
- J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria.
- Moorfield Storey, Boston.
- Charles M. Sturges, Chicago.
- William G. Sumner, New Haven.
- John J. Valentine, San Francisco.
- Herbert Welsh, Philadelphia.
- Horace White, New York.
- C. E. S. Wood, Portland, Ore.
- Sigmund Zeisler, Chicago.

**THE DREAM OF A DREAMER.**

Last night I dreamed that I  
 Ruled over all the land—  
 Held all 'twixt earth and sky  
 In the hollow of my hand;  
 I dreamed I ruled the beasts,  
 Likewise the birds in air—  
 Ships, mills and mines and men  
 I governed everywhere.

Kings yielded to my sway,  
 And fawning princes came  
 To ask my favor, and  
 The whole world knew my name;  
 My trains rushed o'er the plains,  
 My ships rode on the sea,  
 The tolling millions all  
 Paid tribute unto me.

Yet woe was in my breast,  
 For in my dream, alas!  
 I sat and gazed upon  
 My image in a glass  
 And saw that o'er my face,  
 Once boyish, there had spread  
 The cold and ghastly look  
 Of one whose soul is dead.  
 —Chicago Record-Herald.

**WHAT DOTH IT PROFIT US?**

Figures issued by the treasury department appear to show that business in the Philippines is booming. During the first nine months of 1900 there were imported into those distracted islands goods to the value of \$17,187,872, which was 21 per cent. more than the imports of the previous year. The exports, apparently for the entire year, were \$17,883,200. Those figures sound well and are apparently made public to give the American people some idea of the magnitude of the benevolent work which we are doing. And it is benevolence unadulterated. Out of the entire volume of the purchases of our "subjects" during the first nine months of 1900, only \$1,571,872 were bought of their "imperial" masters. They are very unprofitable servants. During the

period considered we had American soldiers in the archipelago to the number of about 60,000. If we divide the total importations from the United States by this number we shall get for our quotient \$26.19, which we may be sure does not exceed the average purchase for the period of the lusty young Americans whom we sent there to carry on the work of civilization. Before the most of us discovered the Philippines, while we were very good customers for their products, our annual sales to them ranged from \$61,000 to \$162,000 per annum. From the above showing it would appear that if we should call home the army which we hire to stay there and buy things from us we should not be shipping to that wretched country a dollar's worth more than we were selling to them before we ever heard of them. Their trade is with Europe, Asia and Africa—anywhere but with the United States, and we are paying say \$100,000,000 per annum and a great many lives to keep them in order while they trade with other people. It is lucky that we are rich. A poor nation could not afford such nonsense.—Editorial in San Francisco Chronicle of June 8.

Casey—An' phwy shud Oireland be taxed to pay for the Boer war?

Brady—Oh! That's fair enough. 'Tis a shmall price to pay for the injymint she's had out av the distasters!—Puck.

Lord Salisbury, in his last speech on the Boer war, says: "We are defending the king's territory against the invasion by neighbors whose international law had no complaint against us and who were merely actuated by the greed for territory and the desire of enlarging their dominions." So Great Britain went to war against the Boers merely to protect British territory against forcible invasion by the two republics! Our politics has not a little hypocrisy, but nothing in depth and breadth equaling this solemn cant from the British premier.—Des Moines Leader.

Tom L. Johnson is already giving the Ohio politicians more trouble than anything that has come down the pike since the war.—Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat.

Dollard—"Bis dat qui cito dat." That's Eye-talian, I guess. What's it mean? Do you know?

Scollard—Literally, "He gives twice who gives quickly." A freer translation would be: "He who gives quickly gives twice as much as he would

if he stopped to think it over."—Philadelphia Press.

The average Chinaman doesn't feel that he needs Christianity. He has excellent teachings of his own which he doesn't follow.—Puck.

I don't think it makes any difference waa way or th' other how free ye make idjagation. Men that wants it'll have it be hook an' be crook, an' thim that don't ra-aly want it niver will get it. Ye can lade a man up to th' university, but ye can't make him think.—Mr. Dooley (F. P. Dunne), in Chicago American.

Considerations of national honor may usually be relied on, if we rightly read history, to make almost any bad matter worse.—Puck.

When a London lad was asked what the Lord had made, he replied: "The earth, the sea, and all the tindummies." Not until the examiner had exerted his mental faculties until he was almost a wreck did he solve the riddle, "all the tindummies," was shorthand for "all that in them is."—Chicago Chronicle.

Friend—Each side of the question presents difficulties.

Statesman—Exactly! I thin. I'll take a bold stand on both sides of the question.—Puck.

### BOOK NOTICES.

In the much advertised book "Who Lies?" (Chicago: Nancy B. Irving, 70 Dearborn St.), Emil Blum and Sigmund B. Alexander offer the public a superficial specimen of the philosophy of Nordau, in the woodeny literary form adopted by the Rev. Mr. Sheldon. In fact an essay, it is ostensibly a story. No reason for making it a story is evident except the authors' desire to decoy light-story readers into grappling with a heavy thesis; which, according to the moral standards of the book, makes the book itself a lie. Nor is that the only thing that makes it a lie by its own standards. By higher standards the condemnation is stronger. A more wretchedly false picture of life and character, even in their lying aspects, would be hard to find. Its philosophy also is manifestly false. Some of the things its characters are tempted to say would, indeed, be lies. But for the most part the "truths" they are made to tell and suffer for are either brutal or tactless half truths. They are at best only verbal or formal truths, un-vitalized by profound sincerity—gruesome corpses, if the figure is allowable, of assassinated veracity. The standard of truth which the authors set up would require a man to proclaim all his disagreeable thoughts in order to be true, and if he went visiting to go unclothed because clothing does not make the man but conceals him, and is therefore deceptive. The distinction between truth expressed with tactful reference to place and circumstances, and mere brutality, is not recognized.

Brutality is mistaken for veracity. To say that the book is coarse might convey a false impression. There is nothing in it to appeal to morbid readers. But of that coarseness which consists in obtruding delicate subjects with unnecessarily vulgar phrase and ill-concealed bravado, this book comes very near being guilty. It is moreover insufferably dull. Though the story begins in an interesting manner, and gives promise of variety of incident and character, the authors soon strike a monotonous gait which they wearilessly maintain to the wearisome end. Even the characters, though they come upon the stage with some individuality, instantly lose it in the individuality of the authors. After the first few pages they cease to be human characters and become lay figures with phonograph attachments.

"Democracy versus Socialism: A Critical Examination of Socialism as a Remedy for Social Injustice and an Exposition of the Single-Tax Doctrine, by Max Hirsch, Melbourne" (London: Macmillan & Co., Limited. Price, 10s. net), which we have heretofore announced (page 144), has just appeared. It will be reviewed later.

### MAGAZINES.

—Howard's American Magazine for July opens with an illustrated sketch of Miss Howard, the Afro-American sculptor.

—In the June number of "The Land of Sunshine" there appears the first installment of a translation of Castanso's rare manuscript account of the early settlement of what is now California. Mr. Lummis, the editor, contributes a final article to the controversy regarding Prof. Ross and the Stanford university.

—The North American Review for July deals a heavy blow to the "favorable balance of trade" fallacy. This cherished delusion of protectionism, a lingering remnant of the medieval mercantile theory of political economy, has fallen upon rough places in these days of enormously excessive American exports. Such an object lesson in "favorable" balances leads to questions, questions bring explanations, and explanations are shattering the fallacy.

## Volume III of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes Now Ready. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

## The Public

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico,

### ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago.

For any Book on Earth Old or New

Write to H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conneaut, Ohio. CATALOGUES FREE.

## 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,  
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

### ATTORNEYS.

#### Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 420, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Long Distance Telephone, Central 3361.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,  
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT  
Telephone Central 2254.

LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,  
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

#### Houston.

EWING & RING,  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,  
HOUSTON, TEXAS.  
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

#### New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1383 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015  
NEW YORK.

### BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. tf