

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1902.

Number 200.

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 thieves fall out, honest men get their dues"—sometimes. Let us hope that this old saw may prove true in the case of the legislative war now waging between the cane sugar cabal and the beet sugar combine.

In alluding to these belligerent conspirators as thieves we do not mean, of course, that they are thieves in the indictable sense. Before the law, they are all honest men; or, if not quite so, they haven't yet been found out. But stealing does not consist merely in violating larceny laws. Though there were no larceny laws in the statute books of any state, stealing would be none the less a moral crime, and those who stole would be none the less thieves. The eighth commandment would be in force nevertheless; and the immutable moral law, of which that commandment is the traditional expression, would still prevail.

To steal, is to take the just property of another against his will; and, in the eye of the moral law, the manner in which this is accomplished makes no difference. Some men do it by stealth. When detected, these are consigned to the penitentiary. Some do it by violence, using club or pistol or sandbag to enforce their nefarious demands. These, too, are imprisoned when caught. Others do it by procuring the enactment by legislative bodies of statutes authorizing the deprecation. When successful, these are awarded high places in society and figure among our best citizens. But there is no room for moral distinction. It is all stealing. The victims of the stealth or the violence or the

predaceous law are divested of their property against their will and without equivalent; and the beneficiaries are to that extent enriched at the expense of the victims.

In the category of predaceous laws is the protective tariff on sugar, its object and effect being to compel American consumers of sugar to pay more to American sugar producers for the sugar they buy than they would otherwise have to pay. The sugar rings are thereby enabled to plunder sugar consumers. They do this with greater profit, it is true, than they could get by the conventional modes of stealing, and with absolute immunity from criminal prosecution. But the moral culpability is not less. We are quite within the reasonable proprieties, therefore, when these rings or combinations or cabals get to fighting among themselves, in extracting hopeful expectations from the apothegm that honest men get their dues when thieves fall out.

The quarrel between the cane sugar combination and the beet sugar aggregation—to make what would seem to be a significant distinction—is over the question of reducing the tariff on raw sugar imported from Cuba. Under the tariff law now in force in the United States raw sugar imported from foreign countries is taxed at the rate of nearly one cent a pound, and refined sugar at the rate of nearly two cents. The tariff on raw sugar is intended to enable the American producers of sugar cane and sugar beets to get higher prices for their products than they could get in a free market. The further tariff on refined sugar is intended to enable sugar refiners to get higher prices for refining than a free market would yield them. It is only the tariff upon

raw sugar, not the greater one upon the refined article, that it is proposed to abolish or reduce. The cane sugar refining interests are understood to favor the change, while the cane growers and the beet sugar interests oppose it; and a battle royal between these financial janizaries is now waging at Washington and through the press.

Into the front of this battle the cane sugar refiners have pushed the poor Cuban. The United States is responsible for the prosperity of Cuba, they tell us, and Cuban prosperity depends upon the ability of Cuban sugar raisers to send their raw sugar into the American market. Such an argument from such a source is suspicious. It appeals to sentiment, and the sugar trust is usually too practical to regard sentiment as a valid factor in business problems. Is it not in process of exclusion even from political problems? It is much more probable that there are strong financial reasons for this sudden sentimental interest in the Cubans. One such reason has been suggested. It is said that the sugar trust has bought options on the Cuban sugar crop, and that the product is now held in Cuban warehouses awaiting the maturity of the options, which have several months yet to run, the intention of those holding the options being to complete the purchase if the tariff on Cuban sugar is reduced, and if it is not then to charge off to profit and loss the small payments originally made to secure the options. Meanwhile, the Cuban planters, with their crops locked up with options so that they can neither sell them nor borrow upon them, are upon the verge of despair and of course are using all the influence they can command to induce congress to lower the duty on raw sugar from Cuba. This explana-

tion may not be true. We cannot vouch for it. We tell it, however, as we have heard it directly from Cuba. And it has all the advantage of probability. The prospect of making an enormous profit upon the Cuban sugar crop now in warehouses, simply through a reduction in the tariff, would account much more plausibly for the expensive activity of the sugar trust in behalf of such reduction, than do its lavish expressions of sentimental interest in the welfare of the Cuban people.

Another of the urgent pleas which the sugar trust advances is also too sentimental, considering the intensely practical philosophy which usually governs the gentlemen who put it forth, to be regarded as altogether sincere. It has the weakness, besides, of going too far for its purpose. This is the lugubrious appeal for the breakfast table of the poor American workingman. A specimen may be quoted from the American Grocer of December 18, which, in urging the repeal of the raw sugar tariff, said:

It is a direct tax on the workingman's wages. It is an iniquitous tax if not needed for revenue, and because that which it seeks to protect needs no protection other than that essential to counteract the bounty-fed sugar of Europe.

There is richness indeed! For the sake of the workingman's wages let us repeal the tariff on raw sugar, but maintain a tariff on refined sugar. Let the sugar trust buy its raw material in a free market, so that the American workingman's wages can no longer be taxed for raw sugar, but continue to empower it to tax the workingman's wages so as to get more from him for doing his refining than a free market would pay. Whether the American Grocer so intends or not, the sugar trust itself speaks when this distinction between the tariff on raw sugar and the tariff on refined sugar is made.

It is not to enrich the trust, however, that the sugar-consuming workingman must have his wages taxed through the sacred tariff on refined

sugar. Not at all. The object is only to give to the trust protection against "the bounty-fed sugar of Europe." That is to say, being interpreted out of sugartrustese into English, that inasmuch as some European governments are good enough to pay bounties to their sugar refiners upon their sugars which the American workingman consumes, and inasmuch as in due course of trade the American workingman would get the benefit of these foreign bounties in cheaper prices of refined sugar, therefore, the American workingman ought to be taxed enough by the American sugar trust to prevent his getting that benefit. It might spoil him, and incidentally hurt the trust, to make his breakfast table too free. And that is one of the reasons why, though the tariff on raw sugar should be repealed, the tariff on refined sugar should be retained.

But the beet sugar crowd and the American cane growers exhibit no sentiment. Prosperity for Cuba does not appeal to them. Neither does the American workingman's breakfast table. They are out for the "swag" and don't care who knows it. Yet there are signs that out of the conflict of interests between them and the sugar trust a complication may result from which the people will get free sugar. Some of the beet sugar people threaten to make reprisals upon the other crowd if the tariff on raw sugar is repealed. They threaten to tie up the movement for the repeal of the tariff on raw sugar with a proposition to repeal the whole sugar tariff. They would not expect, of course, to have this comprehensive proposition adopted by congress, their purpose being only to head off all legislation. But they might build better than they intend. Their proposition might carry. This is almost too good to hope for. Clashes between financial interests seldom go so far. But it is the only honest disposition of the whole matter.

The sugar tariff is not needed for revenue. Both raw and refined sugar

could be put upon the free list without the slightest risk of a treasury deficit. The tariff on refined sugar, therefore, like that on the raw, is without the slightest legitimate fiscal reason for continuance. The only reason for retaining the former is to take from American consumers of sugar, earnings which belong to them and give them to the sugar trust to which they do not belong. The argument about the "bounty-fed" sugar of Europe is transparently silly. If the people of Europe wish to subsidize American sugar consumers, what of it? What right has congress to interfere, and why should any American, except the American sugar interest, want it to interfere? Suppose Europe should send us everything we need for nothing, would that justify congress in putting countervailing tariffs upon imports so as to compel us to reject the foreign gifts and to buy of our own trusts? To state the matter in the extreme form is to expose the absurdity of all countervailing tariffs. For there is no difference in principle between a countervailing tariff to prevent foreigners from giving us goods outright, and one preventing them from giving us goods at "bounty-fed" prices. The proper solution of the Cuban sugar question is not to reduce the tariff on Cuban sugar. It is not to repeal the tariff on Cuban sugar. It is not to make a "reciprocity" agreement of any kind. The true course, both in good morals and good sense, is to repeal the American tariff on all raw sugar and on all refined sugar. That would not please the beet sugar interests; but legislation which does please any special interest is apt to be bad. It would go too far to please the cane-sugar refiners; but even a sugar trust ought not to expect to have everything exactly as it wants it. On the other hand, however, it would put an end to one kind of tariff robbery, would kill off one kind of law-corrupting combine, would turn one kind of industry away from the public crib to make its own living in an honest way, would protect American workingmen from one species of legalized plunder,

and would afford to Cuba all the commercial benefits which are being now so vociferously demanded for that infant republic. "Abolish the whole sugar tariff!" should be the platform of every newspaper that is not subsidized by the protected sugar interests, and of every congressman who honestly aims to represent all the people in their common interests, and not the special interests of a favored few.

An acrimonious discussion took place in the Senate on the 26th, over a reported interview of Gen. Wheaton's, sent to the American press in a dispatch from Manila. It was a comment by Gen. Wheaton upon the recent anti-imperial speech made in Boston by Mr. Schurman. This speech was especially significant because Mr. Schurman, who is president of Cornell university, was at the head of the first American commission to the Philippines. He had been understood to be opposed to imperialistic expansion, but upon his return was quoted as a convert to the McKinley policy. In his Boston speech referred to above, delivered before the Boston Reform club on the 20th, he was reported as saying that inasmuch as—

both Americans and Filipinos desire the political enfranchisement of the Filipinos, there can be no issue between them except in regard to the time when an independent and sovereign Philippine republic should be established.

In the course of his speech he made this comment upon the American administration in the Philippines:

Those Americans, patriotic but unversed in history, who desire to recreate the Filipinos in their own similitude, will always be able to demonstrate that Oriental clay is still without shape and seemliness in the American potter's hand, and that, for a perfect product, a vessel of honor and glory, the American wheel must be kept going for years, or perhaps for generations, or possibly even for centuries. Heaven save the Filipinos from such an impertinent and meddling earthly creator! The Filipinos are to develop along their own racial lines, not along ours, and it is colossal conceit and impudence to disparage them because they are different from ourselves. Any decent kind of government of the Filipinos, by the Filipinos,

is better than the best possible government of Filipinos by Americans.

He insisted accordingly that—

if the Filipinos are to learn to govern themselves, in the manner of the really free nations, the sooner they get at it the better.

Gen. Wheaton, as reported by Manila dispatches, severely criticized this speech, including the anti-imperialist senators in his strictures, and it was for that criticism, Gen. Wheaton now being on military duty in the Philippines, that some senators urged that he be reprimanded, while others, without approving such criticism by military officers, questioned the authenticity of the alleged interview.

Much more important than Gen. Wheaton's military offense, if he committed one, is the condition in the Philippines which one of his reported remarks disclosed. He was quoted by the dispatch as saying that men are now in prison in the Philippines for remarks such as those of Mr. Schurman. Whether Gen. Wheaton actually said this or not is a minor consideration. The vital question is whether the thing itself is true. Are men in prison in the Philippines, by American authority, for advocating Philippine independence as Mr. Schurman did? The probability is that Gen. Wheaton did say this; and, whether he did or not, the probability is that it is true. For the American commission in the Philippines has provided for just such cases. It has promulgated what it calls "an act defining the crimes of treason, insurrection, sedition, conspiracies to commit such crimes, seditious utterances whether written or spoken," etc., which has the force of law in the Philippines wherever the American military arm reaches, whether it has the sanction of any legitimate law-making power or not. This "act" of the American commission provides, among other things—we quote section 10—that—

Until it has been officially proclaimed that a state of war or insurrection against the authority or sovereignty of the United States no longer exists in the Philippine islands, it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate,

orally or by writing or printing or like methods, the independence of the Philippine islands, or their separation from the United States whether by peaceable or forcible means, or to print, publish or circulate any handbill, newspaper, or other publication advocating such independence or separation. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$2,000 and imprisonment not exceeding one year.

With that provision in force in the Philippines, what value is there to the reports we get at intervals to the effect that the islands are "pacified," or soon will be, and that their people are delighted with American sovereignty? Who in any country would not appear to be delighted with foreign subjugation if he could not express, either orally or in writing, a desire for separation from the invading power, even by peaceable means, without incurring a fine of \$2,000 and imprisonment for a year. In a country where such a decree has the force of law, no expressions of dissatisfaction, however intense the longing for independence might be, could come from anyone but insurgents in the field. And no matter from whom they came, the correspondent at Manila, official or private, who should advise the American people of them, would have to be a hero, for even to publish anything advocating separation from the United States, though only to inform the American people, would be a crime under this imperialistic decree. To those innocent-minded persons who suppose that this country is engaged in conferring the boon of American liberty upon the Filipinos, or that our invasion of those islands is welcomed by all but a few "ladrones," or that the complacent dispatches from Manila on that subject are trustworthy, we commend the thoughtful reading of the gag law which Mr. Taft's commission has imposed upon our Filipino subjects, and which is quoted verbatim above. The Wheaton interview, whether authentic or not, has served a good purpose in calling attention in America to the suppression of free speaking and honest reporting at Manila; and we respect-

fully suggest that this, and not the military propriety of Gen. Wheaton's interview, is the really important subject for congressional investigation which the Schurman-Wheaton episode demands.

Gov. Taft's denial of the adoption of Weylerian concentration methods by the Americans in the Philippines, is a striking instance of changing a name without altering the thing. He says that there are no "concentration" camps in the ordinary meaning of the term. Quite the contrary. Nothing has been done but to establish "a dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exists"! Could verbal gymnastics possibly be more gymnastical? Gov. Taft describes precisely what Weyler called "concentration." If that word had been as odorous in Weyler's day in Cuba as it is now, doubtless he himself would have been perfectly willing to adopt instead Gov. Taft's "dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exist." Had he shrunk from doing so it would have been because the description is too faithful to the repugnant facts.

Although the Hoar resolution for a special committee to inquire into the situation in the Philippines, something like the committee on the conduct of the war during our civil strife, has been buried in the pigeon holes of the Senate committee on the Philippines, that standing committee has undertaken the investigation itself. A committee so constituted can hardly be expected to make a thorough investigation. Its chairman is a hide-bound partisan who is thoroughly committed to the imperial programme; and of its 13 members all are Republicans but four — Culbertson, Patterson, Carmack and Rawlins. Four members of the committee opposed the Bacon resolution in 1899 — the resolution which disclaimed any intention to exercise permanent sovereignty over the Philippines. These are Lodge, Allison, Proctor and Burrows. One of the Republic-

an members, Hale, and one Democrat, Rawlins, favored the resolution. The other members were not senators at that time. The investigation should have been submitted to a committee selected with more particular reference to the cross-examining and information-gathering reputations of its members, especially those of the minority. Nevertheless, such qualities may be represented among the minority in the standing committee. With a Republican like Hale, and Democrats like Carmack and Rawlins, to probe the imperialist witnesses and bring forward others, the whole scandalous adventure may yet be properly exposed. If Carmack has the disposition and abilities with which he is credited this is his opportunity.

And now comes Senator Spooner with a broad hint that it is the settled policy of the present administration to buy the lands held by religious orders in the Philippines and sell them at cost to actual settlers. What this implies may be learned by anyone who will read up the history of landgrabbing in the United States by "actual settlers." As a rule, the "actual settler" does the grabbing, and land monopolists on a large scale get the land. Sometimes the monopolists hire the "actual settler" to "settle," and sometimes they let him do his own settling, and then freeze him out. "Freeze-out" is not an apt word for what the American monopolists will do to the "actual settler" in the Philippines, under the administration's Philippine land policy, but the process will not differ much and the result will be the same. It is not a matter of tempera- ture; it is a matter of "push," "pull," "boost," "get there," and "grab."

One of the representatives in congress from California might be called a "representative extraordinary." His name is Kahn—Julius Kahn. He is an immigrant, having been born in Germany; which is good enough reason for his activity in trying to exclude immigration from another country, China; though his principal reason, no doubt, is a demagogic impulse

to make local capital in politics. It is none of this, however, that makes Mr. Kahn so very extraordinary. The remarkable thing about him is his proficiency in "statistics as she is taught." Mr. Kahn is quoted by the Chicago Chronicle of the 21st as saying, in effect, with reference to the Chinese question, that not only all the Chinamen in San Francisco, but more than all, are criminals. He finds that there are usually 25,000 Chinamen in that city, and that within the past 25 years 31,000 have been arraigned in the police courts for minor offenses, from which he draws this remarkably intelligent inference:

These astounding figures show that more than 100 per cent. of the Chinese in San Francisco have been arrested for violation of the law in 20 years. It is difficult to believe that such is the case, but the figures are absolutely accurate. They have been compiled with the greatest care.

Should Mr. Kahn remain in public life, Mr. Carroll D. Wright had better have a care for his statistical laurels.

Our reply (p. 644) to the San Francisco Star relative to Chinese exclusion elicits a somewhat remarkable rejoinder. Referring to our figure of speech in which we likened the claim of our Pacific Coast friends to be allowed to decide the matter for the rest of the nation, because they know the facts, to a plaintiff claiming the right to render a verdict in his own case, it accepts the figure and offers the Pacific Coast objectors as witnesses to the facts, saying: "Only those who know something about the facts can testify." Truly, those who know the facts are proper witnesses, but they are not the only witnesses unless they alone know all the facts; and under all circumstances their testimony is to be taken with caution if they are interested parties, and quite rejected if on cross-examination they break down. Moreover, it is a very long time since witnesses were allowed to decide cases. They may testify but not decide. Our contemporary's next point—it's charge that we resorted to epithets by calling the

Pacific Coast "hysterical"—is fully met by the article to which the charge applies. We did not call the Coast hysterical in this matter; we called it an "interested locality," and that is what it certainly is. But the most remarkable part of this remarkable rejoinder of our valued contemporary is its indictment of Chinese immigrants for not assimilating and passing "into the body of our national life." Inasmuch as by our own laws the Chinese are denied all the rights of American citizenship, it hardly lies in our mouth to complain of them for not passing "into the body of our national life." This would be much like the complaints of the Egyptian taskmasters who expected the Jews to make bricks without straw. The Star only confirms our previous impressions that some of the best arguments against Chinese exclusion are made by the "witnesses on the spot," who testify in its favor. Nevertheless we like the San Francisco Star. We like it because it is a courageous Democrat of the democratic variety, even if slightly limited in that respect. We like it, among other things, for the same reason that we like Senator Tillman, of South Carolina. A better democratic-Democrat than Senator Tillman one could hardly wish to meet, until he runs up against the "nigger question." So with the Star. A better democratic paper would be hard to find until it runs up against the Chinese question. These "local questions," as a distinguished and extinguished Democratic candidate for the presidency once described another question of the same general character, are great disturbers of democratic principle.

The advance sheets of the fifteenth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission make interesting reading. One important fact appears quite clearly. It is that the existence of certain kinds of trusts not generally supposed to have any legislative monopoly, is traced to secret contracts with railroads, which do have legislative monopolies. We quote:

The recent investigation of packing-house products showed that rates below published tariff charges had been applied both east and west of Chicago. . . . While the general public probably receives some profit from these lower rates, in the main these sums swell the profits of the packers. These great concerns number only about five or six, and little distinction in the rates appears to have been made between them. The effect is to give them an enormous advantage over smaller competitors located at other points. Already these competitors have mostly ceased to exist. These disclosures afford a pregnant illustration of the manner in which secret rate concessions are tending to build up great trusts and monopolies at the expense of the small independent operator.

This is another illustration of the demonstrable truth that trusts are neither possible under nor an evolution from free competition; but that they depend for existence upon some private monopoly. In this instance the supporting monopoly is private ownership of a public highway.

Daniel D. Healy, warden of the Cook county (Ill.) hospital, deserves special commendation for a thankless interference with medical students in behalf of the impoverished patients at this public hospital. Students had offered indignities to women patients at clinics, and upon learning the fact the warden forbade public surgical operations in cases requiring exposure. He properly declared that the hospital is for the patients, not for the students. A moment's reflection will justify Warden Healy's act. Granted that it is for the general good to have medical students present at surgical operations. What then? Shall county hospital patients be forced to submit to operations in public? Why such patients only? Why not require all persons, of whatever degree of wealth or social standing, who must be operated upon, to submit to the ordeal before medical students? From even the thought of such a law one recoils instinctively. Then why make a law of that kind for patients in the county hospital? Because they are poor.

There is no other answer. It all comes down to this in the end—that the poor who require surgical treatment must submit to an exposure which well-to-do patients escape. This very distinction tends to diminish to medical students the opportunities which of course they ought to have. When public operations are regarded as not only disagreeable in themselves, but also as one of the degrading badges of poverty, no one is disposed to volunteer for the benefit of surgical science. But if they were altogether voluntary, a general disposition, arising from a sense of duty, something in the nature of public spirit, would furnish all the opportunities to students that could be desired. Voluntarily, for the good of their kind, real or supposed, both men and women will submit to much which they seek to evade when it is compulsory. If all clinics were of this voluntary character, students would indulge in no indignities, for they would be invited guests on their good behavior; and poverty would be relieved of at least one of its degrading incidents. Warden Healy has taken a step which will, it is to be hoped, be persisted in by him and followed by his successors and others in like authority.

Advance sheets of consular reports on taxation in New South Wales and New Zealand have been issued by the state department. The most notable feature of the report from New South Wales is a ridiculous argument by the consul, intended to show that the land value tax in vogue there is an indirect tax on improvements, because "in taxing the increased value of the land, the improvements producing the increment are taxed indirectly." As any cross-roads politician could make that absurd argument without prompting, and any intelligent boy could refute it, it was hardly necessary to devote to it the "general observations" of a consular report. The astute consul who is primarily responsible for this report is Orlando H. Baker. He is well supported by Consul

Frank Dillingham, who, in reporting upon taxation in New Zealand, omits all reference to the experiment of local option in local taxation, which has been in operation there for several years, and under the authority of which some 60 municipalities have resorted to the novelty of a single tax on land values for local revenues. Consular reports which don't report are doubtless better than those which report falsely; but when a matter so novel and important is overlooked in such a report, one may be excused for doubting the information which the report seems to supply.

Pursuant to the governor's call (p. 659), the legislature of Colorado met in special session on the 27th. All but one of the objects of the session are only of local and ephemeral interest, and that exception is not specifically distinguished in the call. We refer to the efforts of the speculative real estate interests to cause the repeal of the Bucklin constitutional amendment before the people get a chance to vote upon it. This amendment, if adopted by the people, would empower the voters of any county to stimulate business there, by exempting from taxation for local purposes all investments in productive enterprises and getting local revenues from land value taxes alone. The possibility of an attempt at the special session to gag the popular voice by repealing this measure before the popular vote, set for next fall, has aroused a discussion all over the state which would hardly have arisen had the real estate speculators pursued their original policy of silence; and the probabilities now are not only that the legislature will not vote to repeal the measure, but that it will take no action upon it at all. Still, the repealers are backed by the Denver Real Estate Exchange and some of the strongest financial forces of the state, and no stone will be left unturned—nor bank account either—that may be supposed to have influence with the members of the legislature. A popular vote is to be prevented if possible.

PHASES OF THE IMPERIALISTIC ARGUMENT.

We have invented new doctrines to justify the policy of spoliation. A new and wonderful theory of obligations has suddenly been thrust upon us. It is the man in the street whom this theory is intended to influence. We smashed the fleet of Imperial Spain in the Harbor of Manila, and we became at once endowed—so we are informed—with certain responsibilities to the people of the Philippine Islands. The theory is analogous to this: A child deprived of its natural protector becomes the ward of the state, to whom certain duties and responsibilities are at once owing. Spain was the "natural protector" of the Filipinos; we must protect them in the absence of their cruel step-mother. This we will do if in the meantime we do not exterminate them. But these obligations are all armed with mausers and maxim guns; and they are really ingenious inventions after all. But even under this milder theory of obligations what becomes of the old American faith in the right of peoples to govern themselves; that faith has no place for wardships.

How did the smashing of the Spanish fleet alter our foreign obligations? What do we owe to the Filipinos that we do not owe to the Armenians, for example? The latter, of course, already have a protector, and Turkey is discharging her obligations in a way that is regarded as highly creditable—in those remoter regions where Belzebub records the acts of his earthly agents. But as for our moral obligations, they are the same in Armenia as in the Philippines. The first, however, involves some risk and may therefore be dismissed. But our obligations to the people of the Philippines could have been closed by serving a writ of ejectment on Spain—without the hilariously comical payment of \$20,000,000.

The obligations that we are now assuming are those which some other power must have previously laid down. That power is Spain. To this conclusion we are brought by the acceptance of this theory of obligations. How do you like it? Not that we are not good imitators. Our taxes on the long suffering Filipinos are higher

than Spain's, and we are twice as successful in ridding the islands of their inhabitants; give us time, too, and the "Anglo-Saxon" will demonstrate his superiority as a public plunderer; we have had some experience in the "carpet bag" era of reconstruction. He does nothing on a small scale, this "Anglo-Saxon," and his thefts will be proportionate to his opportunities and his world-girdling arms. When he is through with the Filipinos they will think kindly of Spain.

Organized Protestantism has altered its ethics to suit the changing conditions of time and place. Much of the piety in these days is as brutal and bloodthirsty as Pagan ruffianism. Nothing can exceed the war spirit of many of the clergy—surely not that of the army, which is far less in love with carnage, and infinitely less sordid. Of course there is a prejudice against the introduction of politics in the pulpit, and when murder is suddenly elevated to the dignity of a political principle, the fifth commandment is abrogated by almost unanimous clerical consent. That all questions are at bottom moral questions a few broad minded clerics will admit, but most of them agree that there is no morality save the immorality that is fashionable. If the early Christians had been of this sort, Christ would never have perished on the cross, Paul would never have been summoned before Agrippa, and Peter would have denied his Master to the end. The Christianity of Mars Hill would have seemed as innocuous to the Greeks and Romans of that day as it is to the Romans of this, and it would have occasioned the same boisterous laughter along the docks and quays of Rome, where it first found its lodgment, as most clerical utterances do among the longshoremen of today. It would have been referred to, not as "a dangerous doctrine,"—as Pliny termed it,—but as one very useful to the Roman Senate in its decay; useful to the oppressors of labor, and to the ambitious designs of Tiberius Caesar; and finally Christ and Paul and Peter would have been sent as commissioners into Gaul to advise the foolish barbarians to consent to the benevolent purposes of Roman Assimilation.

The highest aim of the truly "strenuous" nations is to evangelize the people who are unfit for self government, and who at the same time have anything that is worth stealing. If their lands are rich and their harbors inviting, it is only necessary under the plea of "coaling stations" to establish a base for carrying on the policy of spoliation.

Useful as a cloak for such designs is what is called "suzerainty." Nobody, according to a prominent British official, knows precisely what it is; but it is useful. The claim of suzerainty is always put forward where valuable mines or rich territory are in question. It is far better than any philosophy—Darwin's, Nietzsche's or anybody else's—for the purpose of coming into other people's own, for such philosophy is for the sanctum, and is chiefly entertaining as a speculative philosophy which, after all, can interest and influence only a few. Britain's claims to suzerainty over the Transvaal, which had practically expired by "statute of limitation," increased in positiveness and intensity as the resources of the Johannesburg mines became better known. This is the secret of our benevolent interest in Cuba and the Philippines; every member of the Philippine Land and Lumber Company is a fiery patriot, to whom any proposition to haul down the flag is rank treason. Our desire to help these people is in direct ratio to our inclination to help ourselves to something they have and we want. If they do not "administer their estate" in a way that seems best to us, we will administer it for them; if they object—

By Jingo, if they do,
We have the men, we have the guns
We have the money, too.

And if we can provoke them into firing on our "brave boys"—(we always say "our own brave boys" with a snivel for the public ear and a wink for the private eye)—whom we engage for \$16.50 per month to fight our battles for us (us meaning the Philippine Land and Lumber Company and all similar companies hereafter to be formed), we will arouse the nation to the patriotic pitch of wiping out the "rebels;" we will always be careful to call them rebels, because what are dictionaries for, if not for exact defi-

nition? To rebel is to be a rebel. And for the philosophically inclined we will urge the necessity of the "survival of the fittest," which every house-breaker with a club and a dark lantern will be glad to quote against us when we interrupt his incursions in search of the family plate.

But why should the highest missionary endeavors be inconsistent with the policy of national and other aggrandizement? We can Christianize and subjugate at the same time, and land grants and franchises combine very nicely with the establishment of Sunday schools for inferior peoples. But we ought not to forget the demands of Christianity, the duty of properly evangelizing our weaker brethren. For adequate popular support of the new policy, to which manifest destiny is so plainly urging us, we must not fail, however, to make our appeal to glory and the flag, for like Charity the flag covers and successfully conceals a multitude of sins.

There is no smoother path to commercial exploitation than the appeal to the imaginations of men. It is for this reason that phrases designed to dazzle and capture the fancy go to form so large a part of the audible philosophy of conquest. Of course it is a more or less open secret that imperial expansion offers inviting opportunities to capitalists for investment, but this is not the side that constitutes the strength with the common people. The appeals made behind closed doors, to railroad magnates, to great financial operators and others, when transferred to the broader fields where the support of the great army that uphold by its votes the policy and prestige of the marauders must be enlisted, changes its battle cry to conceal its purpose. It would be folly to appeal to the voters to uphold a railroad franchise or land grant, for these are not the symbols of emotion or sentiment; there is no power in them to make the blood flow quicker, and to render the imagination dizzy. But the flag—the flag's the thing! We are assured that it is infamous to haul it down where once it has been raised, though it should have been planted by the greatest of undelegated scoun-

drels. We are asked to stand by the country, to support the government, though the government be in the hands of rascals who deserve hanging. Every crime is possible and its perpetration may be entered upon without compunction, if under all circumstances and everywhere, we are to stand by the government. "Our country right or wrong" sums up this spurious philosophy—but as nearly all countries have usually been wrong—which every man of any nationality will cheerfully admit to be true of all the others—we are thus asked to choose as a settled policy for each individual an almost unailing course of moral turpitude.

Among the phrases that help to dazzle and capture the fancy is that "we are now a world power." It has been our boast hitherto that we had no "entangling alliances." Now in strange and unfamiliar phrase 'we are boasting that we have them. We have indeed entered strange and untried paths. We have come to the parting of the ways; we have actually taken the first steps in the new paths of another destiny, and we must now retrace them, or continue on until our whole national policy is changed, and we have become, in effect, a different people.

We are to be no longer a "hermit nation," forsooth! Is there not a concealed humor of a fine quality in a people secreting themselves from human observation by spreading over an entire hemisphere! a policy of isolation that takes as its habitat half the rolling globe! To alter those lines of Addison's Cato:

A pent up Utica contracts our powers,
For only one whole continent is ours.

Is not the pretense of territorial expansion, appealing to national vain-glory, merely a cloak for ambitious designs entirely unconnected with the thought of national greatness even in the sense of national bigness? If we could go behind the scenes where the national sentiment is manufactured, we could perhaps see the ingredients that compose the brew, and it would be a very witch's cauldron indeed!

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

If possible let no wealth be got through oppression; but if it must be got through oppression, by all means let it be got by consecrated men.—Life.

NEWS

The British war in South Africa has assumed a new phase. Negotiations by the government of Holland with the British government have been set on foot with a view to making peace. The first known fact in this turn of affairs is a flying visit which it is now learned was made to London by Dr. von Kuyper, the prime minister of Holland, shortly before the opening of parliament on the 16th. His presence was not discovered at the time, but it now transpires that he spent most of the time with Mr. Chamberlain's secretary, and it is suspected that he had a conference with Mr. Chamberlain himself. The object of his visit was doubtless known to Lord Rosebery, who, on the opening day of parliament, formally asked Lord Salisbury, the British prime minister, if the Dutch prime minister had not been in London on an errand of peace. Lord Salisbury's reply was: "Not so far as I know." Eight days later, on the 24th, Mr. Labouchere brought the subject to the attention of the Commons by an interpellation of the ministry in that house. His question was answered by A. J. Balfour, the ministerial leader in the House, who denied that any peace overtures had been received, either directly or indirectly, from anyone having the authority of the Boer leaders to make them. Mr. Balfour's reply, as well as Lord Salisbury's, was generally regarded as an evasion, and so it now seems to have been. For on the 28th, in response to further questioning by Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Balfour said:

No overtures for peace have been received from anyone authorized to speak in behalf of the Boers. A communication was, however, received late Saturday last from the Dutch government, and it is now under consideration. I propose to lay on the table as soon as I can do so a copy of that communication and of our reply to it.

Mr. Labouchere being insistent upon knowing whether proposals or suggestions had been submitted prior to last Saturday, Mr. Balfour added:

If the communications did not come authorized by the Boers they are no proper subject of question and answer across the floor of the House. If they were merely part of private correspondence they consist of that with which all the ministers are more or less flooded.

The nature of the correspondence which Mr. Balfour promised to di-

vulge as soon as possible is not yet known.

Reports from the field of the war indicate the continued determination of the Boers to resist British conquest. The London Daily News publishes uncensored dispatches to the effect that their power in Cape Colony is increasing daily, the executions of Lotter and Scheepers having converted even loyalists and caused them to join the Boer forces. The dispatches tell also of 12 defeats suffered by the British, from September to November, of which no mention has been made in the official or the censored dispatches. On the 27th Lord Kitchener reported the capture of Gen. B. Viljoen; but it soon leaked out that Gen. Viljoen had been killed, not captured. The capture of a Boer camp near Vryburg is reported by Gen. Methuen, 25 prisoners having been taken, together with a large herd of cattle. Captures near Rustenburg were also reported. But near Frankfort, in the Orange Free State, after capturing 20 Boers, Col. Wilson was attacked by another force, and during a hot fight all but three of his prisoners escaped.

The effort of the British ministry to influence American sentiment regarding the Boer war by disclosing evidence of peculiar friendliness to the United States on the part of Great Britain at the time of the Spanish-American war, the details of which were reported last week, has drawn out the following official explanation, dated the 22d, from the Russian foreign office:

Russia has always been and now is extremely desirous of maintaining amicable relations with the United States. Russia never had any intention of participating in any collective step in the Spanish-American dispute, which did not directly concern her, nor did Russia receive any proposition having such action in view. Indeed, we received no information regarding Austria's alleged initiative or about an attempt on the part of any of the powers to interfere in the interest of Spain.

A suggestion of the London Times, apparently inspired by the British ministry, to the effect that Great Britain would welcome the publication of the papers relating to the negotiations of the European powers on this subject, caused the Associated Press to solicit responses from the foreign offices of the respective governments con-

cerned. The following replies were received:

France—"No suggestion has been received here from the British government to publish the Hispano-American papers, and none is expected. No importance is attached to the Times' statement, as England is aware that the several governments would not agree to their publication."

Austria—"The British government has made no inquiry. Should such an inquiry be made Austria's answer would probably be according to the answers of the other powers."

Germany—"We have nothing to add to what was said to you on Tuesday."

Russia—"Should a request for publication be made by Great Britain, Russia will willingly consider the matter. No such request has yet been received."

From the Philippines, where, as one of the results of the Spanish-American war, the American government is playing the part of the British in South Africa, there is no military news except reports of two or three small captures, vague indications of unsatisfactory developments in the island of Negros, and a suggestion of the terrible experiences of a party of American marines which attempted to penetrate the island of Samar, under Capt. David B. Porter. They had been given up as dead, but on the 28th they returned to camp delirious from privation. For several days the party was without food, and neither the captain nor any of his men is yet in condition to relate their experiences in detail.

A full investigation of the Philippine situation has been decided upon by the Senate committee on the Philippines; and it is understood that Gov. Taft, who has just returned from his gubernatorial post at Manila, on leave of absence, is to be the first witness. In newspaper interviews on his way to Washington, Gov. Taft is reported as saying, that—

Civil government in the islands is a distinct success. It has been firmly established in nearly 40 provinces. . . . Opposition to our rule exists in practically only three provinces, and that will soon be stamped out. At the end of this year I hope to see the military forces reduced to 15,000 men in the islands. That number of troops, together with the native constabulary, will be ample force with which to maintain order and peace. Just as soon as we can persuade all the natives that the war is over our task will be made easier.

On the subject of "reconcentration" he is reported as follows:

Although I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the full military plans to speak with absolute authority, I can say that the whole subject is much misunderstood by our people. As a matter of fact there has never been any thought of establishing "concentration camps" in the ordinary acceptation of the term. All that has been proposed is an insurgent cordon, the establishment of a dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exist.

What appears to be another colonial venture on the part of the United States is the signing of a treaty between the Danish minister at Washington, Christian Brun, and Secretary of State Hay, for the sale by Denmark to the United States of the Danish West India islands—St. Thomas, St. John and St. Croix—lying to the east of Porto Rico. In 1865 a treaty for the purchase of these islands was made by Secretary Seward, but the Senate refused to ratify. Negotiations were renewed by the United States in 1892, and again shortly before the Spanish-American war, but without result, Denmark refusing to entertain them. In 1899, however, it was reported that an informal offer had been made by Denmark to sell for \$3,000,000. At the same time it was said that Germany was in negotiation with Denmark for their purchase; but this was immediately contradicted, it being announced that Germany would do nothing that might be regarded as an infringement of the Monroe doctrine. Rumors of the contemplated purchase by the United States were rife in 1900 and 1901, and on the 2d of December of the latter year it was reported from Copenhagen that the terms of an agreement had been actually reached. But a hitch occurred. These islands are largely inhabited by Negroes, who enjoy, under the Danish regime, all the rights of citizenship that are possessed by the whites. They have an unrestricted voting franchise and full representation in the colonial council. Being an intelligent people, they understand that the tendency of American politics does not promise conditions so favorable to their race, and they object to the sale. Petitions against the sale without a vote of the inhabitants, signed by 34,000 names, were consequently laid before the King of Denmark on the 13th of January, and the American government was sounded by Denmark as to its

willingness to consent to a vote by the inhabitants of the islands. Secretary Hay was reported on the 23d as declining to agree to such a procedure. As reported, he said that "this government desired to acquire the islands and was prepared to make liberal terms, but it could only negotiate with the Danish government and not with its subjects." He is also reported to have been asked to agree to a provision in the treaty for the full American citizenship of the inhabitants and to have refused that concession also. Finally, on the 23d, Denmark communicated its willingness to accept the terms offered by the United States, and on the 24th the treaty was signed at Washington by Mr. Brun for Denmark and Mr. Hay for the United States. The terms of the treaty are as yet not divulged.

In preparation for the colonial system now so significant a feature of the American policy, and also for other commercial reasons, the first step in the organization of a new executive department has been taken. It consists in the passage on the 28th, by the Senate, of a bill for the establishment of a department of commerce and labor, the head of which is to be a member of the cabinet. As originally drawn the bill provided that the department be called "Department of Commerce," but the Senate added the words "and Labor" to the name.

NEWS NOTES.

—Santos-Dumont successfully guided his airship around the harbor of Monte Carlo on the 28th.

—The birthday of the late President McKinley was generally but informally observed on the 29th.

—Members of the American Secular Union organized the National Liberty party at Cincinnati on the 26th.

—The National Traders' association, in annual session at Milwaukee on the 29th, refused to pass a resolution asking congress to retain the sugar duty.

—A consolidation of all the principal glucose factories of the country was reported on the 28th to have been closed at New York, with a capitalization of \$80,000,000.

—James J. Hill, Darius Miller, Edward H. Harriman, George B. Harris and C. S. Mellen, railroad magnates, were examined by the interstate commerce commission at Chicago on the 25th and 26th.

—In the French Chamber of Deputies on the 29th the socialist bill limiting working time in the mines to eight hours a day was adopted in

principle, and the details are now under discussion.

—The supreme court of Ohio rendered a decision on the 24th in favor of the "Nickel Plate" railroad in a suit brought against it by Frank Shaffer, discharged and kept out of railroad employment for joining a strike, who had sued for damages for blacklisting.

—Dr. Felix Adler, of New York, will give a series of public lectures under the auspices of the Chicago Ethical society, in Steinway hall, on the 9th, 12th and 16th of February. His subject is "Outlines of Twentieth Century Morality." The three lectures deal respectively with the new attitude toward others, toward marriage, and toward wealth.

—On the 27th Attorney General Douglas, of Minnesota, argued before the supreme court of the United States the application of the state of Minnesota (see p. 634) for leave to begin original suit in that court to prevent the merger of the Northwestern railroad systems into the Northern Securities company of New Jersey. He was assisted by M. D. Munn, of Minnesota, and opposed by W. D. Guthrie, of New York, on behalf of the railway companies, and by former United States Attorney General John W. Griggs, in behalf of the Northern Securities Co. Decision was reserved.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE SUGAR TARIFF.

Salt Lake Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 24.—We have done a great deal for Cuba, at costly sacrifices in blood and coin. There is no reason why we should continue our losses to her gain.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Jan. 25.—It is hoped that the majority in congress, for the sake of Cuba and the honor of the American people, to say nothing of its own escape from stultification, will pay no heed to the wiles of the beet sugar people.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 27.—Reduce the duties. We have incurred obligations in Cuba. We must discharge those obligations or stand convicted of something so much like oppression that the most ingenious casuist would be puzzled to find the difference.

Indianapolis Journal (Rep.), Jan. 28.—It would be interesting to have a statement from the beet sugar manufacturers showing wherein their own claim is so essentially just and so conspicuously different from begging. If Cuba is asking for charity what are they doing?

Philadelphia Press (Rep.), Jan. 28.—All called to act on this question must put aside all but the broad principle, policy and practice which swayed the nation during the Spanish war, and must continue to direct it as Cuban independence is crowned with Cuban prosperity by reducing the duty on Cuban sugar.

Kansas City Star (Ind.), Jan. 28.—As the United States is the natural market for the island, most of the business would come to this country. A liberal reciprocity policy would build up this enormous trade for the United States. To continue to close American ports to Cuba would strangle this commerce in its infancy.

New York Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 27.—The sugar interests of Louisiana follow the lead of the beet sugar manufacturers in

opposing a reduction of the duty on Cuban sugar. . . . If our Louisiana friends will consider this question from all points of view, we believe that they will see that a just measure of reciprocity with Cuba will not injure them, but will greatly benefit them and will protect them from far greater evils than any which their imagination has created.

New York Evening Post (Ind.), Jan. 17.—The cause of protection must be in its last ditch if it is to stand like a brute force athwart the path of reason, international trade, our own highest self-interest, and humanity itself. . . . But in this very effrontery of tariff beneficiaries, in the very steps they are taking to make protection absurd and hateful, we see the promise of a speedy reaction, which will compel the monopolists to loosen their grasp, lead to the relief for which Cuba is crying aloud, and inflict one more deadly wound upon a fiscal system which is embodied selfishness, the height of unreason, and never more clearly than now a national folly.

THE DANISH WEST INDIES.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), Jan. 28.—The purchase of these islands is but one of the results of our expansion and opens the fields for other purchases and establishes dangerous precedents.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Jan. 25.—We only buy the islands, not their inhabitants. They may, if they choose, remain subjects of King Christian, or they may declare their allegiance to the United States.

Chicago Chronicle (Dem.), Jan. 26.—If we buy the Danish West Indies without the consent of the natives we sin wantonly against the light. The natives do not wish to be sold. It is against our fundamental law, it is against universal humanity that they should be bought.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Jan. 25.—Recent events have emphasized the importance of acquiring these islands, not only because of their strategic value as naval bases, but because their possession will avert the possible necessity for our warning other powers to keep hands off.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 26.—The proposed purchase of the Danish West Indian Islands does not excite the people as it would have done five years ago. The United States has acquired sovereignty over so many large and populous islands that these islets, with their limited area and small population, which Denmark offers to dispose of, cannot be expected to attract popular attention.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Jan. 23.—Strangely enough, while the United States is willing to buy without the consent of the people, Denmark is unwilling to sell without it. The Danish government, before alienating them, will let them decide for themselves whether they wish to be alienated. In this particular the monarchy shows more respect for republican principles than the republic.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Jan. 25.—What rights and privileges will be accorded the people of the islands, whether they are to be treated as subjects or received as citizens, remains to be made known. . . . A plebiscite was requested, but is reported as having been discouraged by this government. The United States buys the islands, and their people have no voice in the transaction, which is of the approved imperial pattern.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 26.—The United States refuses to bind itself in the treaty to any grant of political and commercial rights to the people of the Danish Islands, but it is certain that they will not fare worse than the Porto Ricans in those particulars. The special reason for buying these islands is their strategic importance, which is great, and the obvious good policy of removing the possible

bone of contention that islands for sale in the West Indies are sure to offer.

SCHURMAN ON PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Jan. 29.—The officer [Gen. Wheaton] is obliged to suppress sedition by the very terms of his service, and is it surprising under the circumstances that he should resent speeches that promote sedition?

Washington Post (Ind.), Jan. 27.—It is evident that Prof. Schurman no longer believes in the Filipino paradise he once preached—in and out of season, as the true evangel should—and now that he announces his enlightened views, what more natural than that the salary list at Manila should tremble and scream aloud?

Albany Argus (Dem.), Jan. 28.—In justice to President Schurman it should be borne in mind at all times that he declares that these have always been his views—that his attitude—which, he says, was also President McKinley's attitude—has undergone no change. But it is also fair to say that he was generally regarded as an advanced imperialist.

Atlanta Constitution (Dem.), Jan. 27.—It may be true, as Gen. Wheaton says, that "men have been sent to prison" in the islands for just such remarks as have been made by President Schurman and by the minority of the Senate committee; but that does not do much credit to our Philippine administrators nor make their policy any more palatable to freedom loving Americans.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Jan. 30.—In the worst period of the insurrection there was no justification for such a censorship as existed, since it was absolutely unnecessary to safeguard military operations. Its chief effect was to keep the news from the American people, who were entitled to it then as they are now, and whatever the situation may be to-day the people need not assume from Mr. Beveridge's declamation that the garbling of news has been a myth. It has been very real, and some light might be let in on this subject at the committee's investigation.

"RECONCENTRATION" IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), Jan. 24.—There are millions of men and women in the United States who repudiate and abhor Weyerism in the Philippines as they repudiated and abhorred it in Cuba, and the time will come when their protests will be heard. Imperialism is now in the saddle, but its end cannot be far away.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Jan. 24.—It has been known in Washington for several weeks that Gen. Chaffee was establishing reconcentration camps in the province of Luzon, some of them not far from the city of Manila. Gen. Chaffee, however, did not issue an order so sweeping as that of Gen. Bell. He has contrived in a measure to veil his methods.

Columbus Evening Press (Dem.), Jan. 27.—Indignation throughout the country has been aroused by Gen. J. Franklin Bell's reconcentration methods in the Philippines. It is justly felt that our honor will be clouded with shame if we allow our colonial armies to be officered by a man who adopts Butcher Weyler's barbarous policy of reconcentration.

SUBJUGATION OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Jan. 26.—The American conscience may be dulled, but it is not dead to the injustice of a war for the subjugation of aliens who are strangers to our ways and desire to govern themselves.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Jan. 26.—Hereafter no representative or senator opposed to the war because he regards it as anti-American and unholy should vote a cent to the support of the soldiers

engaged in its prosecution. It is moral cowardice for those who hold it to be wicked to give it encouragement.

THE "COLLECTIVE NOTE."

Chicago Chronicle (Dem.), Jan. 24.—Lord Cranborne has made an unfortunate fiasco which must be cause for broad smiling in international diplomatic circles.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Jan. 24.—Nothing is clearer than that the British cabinet strove to excite ill-feeling in this country against the continental powers.

Chicago Daily News (Neut.), Jan. 24.—The fact of immediate interest is the obvious desire of all the powers named to show their friendliness toward the United States.

Louisville Courier-Journal (Dem.), Jan. 28.—The outcome of the whole matter is that it appears that there was no danger of intervention, and so nobody could have headed off what did not exist.

Cleveland Leader (Rep.), Jan. 28.—The powers undoubtedly would have been gratified if England had complied with the request of Austria concerning the sending of a collective note to Washington.

Los Angeles Daily Times (Rep.), Jan. 25.—All this, as we have said, is very funny—a sort of international comic opera. Columbia can well afford to indulge in a quiet smile at the amorous antics of the jealous European suitors.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), Jan. 23.—The purpose of the statement is plain. It was made to impress on the United States that at an important moment Great Britain proved itself a valuable friend, and that Germany did not. "Codlin's your friend, not Short."

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Jan. 27.—Selfish interest has more to do than sentiment with all those hurried pronouncements of friendship which might have been left unspoken. Miss Columbia takes them for what they are worth, and she does not "cotton to Codlin."

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Jan. 24.—The European protestations and disclosures have not failed of effect. There is considerable truth in them, and England had no monopoly of friendship for the United States. At the same time it is fair to demand the production of the official correspondence.

New York Nation (Ind.), Jan. 23.—No documents were laid on the table by Lord Cranborne, but none were needed. Time enough to produce them when some foreign chancellor denies their existence. It is safe to say that none will, irritating as it must be to some of them to see England make herself known as the power which prevented a European coalition against the United States.

AUSTRALASIAN TAXATION IN COLORADO.

Colorado Representative, Boulder (Peo.), Jan. 23.—It is a question if the governor did not lend too much heed to the real estate scalpers of Denver who have the vacant lots cornered, by including in his call a possible reconsideration of the various amendments to be voted upon at the fall election. The one thing that they were after was the Australasian amendment for the reason that that amendment is after the idler in the interest of the active man who is using his substance in enterprise. The amendment is after the lot boomer in the interest of the farmer and the home owner.

Colorado Springs Gazette (Rep.), Jan. 25.—Under the circumstances there is not even a reasonable possibility that the legislators will put themselves in the attitude of refusing to let the people vote upon the subject, thus seeming to show their lack of confidence in the people. . . . It may therefore be taken for granted that the Bucklin amendment to the constitution will be presented to the people, and those who are opposed to the bill, as well

as those in favor of it, should direct their attention to getting the people informed as to the effect of the proposed amendment, as well as to the arguments which may be brought for or against it. The proposed amendment to the constitution does not change the law. It simply permits the law to be changed in a way that is not possible at the present time on account of constitutional provisions. . . . If the Bucklin bill is unwise and impracticable, we may trust to the people to find it out and act accordingly. If it is wise and practicable, and for the best interests of the people of the state as a whole, then certainly we all should be in favor of it. Between now and the time that the measure will come up for voting, there is plenty of time to discuss the matter thoroughly and to get at the real truth of it.

Denver Daily News (Ind.), Jan. 26.—The Bucklin amendment, therefore, in its last analysis is a measure to exempt from local taxation capital employed in active productive industry. Mr. Bucklin's theory is that such exemption will bring a flood of capital to Colorado, that the flood of capital will stimulate productive industry, and that the stimulation of productive industry will provide employment for labor, immensely increase population and wealth, and thus actually increase the value of the land itself. It is well that those who are discussing the amendment should understand this point, which is the real meat of the matter. The question to be decided is whether or not the people of the various counties shall have the power to exempt from local taxation all capital except such as is invested in land or in rights of way and franchises in public ways.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Baltimore American (Dem.), Jan. 28.—There is no prejudice of any note against the Chinese save in one or two localities, but there is a universal feeling that if the gates are thrown open the United States will be filled with Chinese.

Pennsylvania Methodist (Pro.), Jan. 23.—It is neither fair, honorable, honest nor Christian for us to seek an entrance to that empire in the hope of benefiting our trade and commerce, and then prevent its citizens from immigrating to and becoming citizens of the United States, if they so choose.

Coast Seamen's Journal, San Francisco (Lab.), Jan. 22.—It is known positively, and it might readily be inferred, if it wasn't known, that the great steamship concerns, the great employers of unskilled labor, and, indeed, the great foes of the industrial masses, in general, have for a long time been preparing to reap the harvest of cheap and servile labor that will ensue immediately upon the letting down of the bars to Chinese exclusion.

PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES.

Baltimore American (Rep.), Jan. 16.—Since the Democrats controlled the situation, and since their choice had to be a Democrat, we know of no man whose selection could presage as much material benefit to the state as does that of Mr. Gorman.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), Jan. 14.—While the story which tells of the candidacy of David B. Hill for president in 1904 is as yet only a rumor, it is the outgrowth of a sentiment favorable to such an event that has been growing steadily since the last Democratic national convention. . . . With Carter Harrison, of Chicago, as a running mate, Mr. Hill would unite the Democratic party from coast to coast.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 17.—The serious objection to Senator Gorman. . . . is that in his election methods he has been one of the most unscrupulous men ever known in public life. He has done more to debauch and corrupt the suffrage in his own state and by example in other states than any other living Amer-

ican. This ought to outweigh in the mind of every Marylander who believes in honest elections the fact that Senator Gorman has been a liberal purveyor of pork for his state.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Jan. 27.—Is Mr. Gorman the leader for whom the Democrats of the senate are looking? The answer depends upon one's point of view. That he is a tactician, a clear-headed, astute politician, is certain, and that he is able to restore harmony in the ranks is probable. On the other hand, the distinguished Marylander's record is hardly in keeping with the beliefs of the great body of Democrats to-day. He has had a strong tendency towards the protectionist ideas of the Republicans, and there is reason to believe that on matters of currency and finance he holds ground very close to that of the party in power.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 33 of that publication.

Washington, Jan. 20-24, 1902.

Senate.

Mr. Lodge, of the committee on the Philippines, reported back, on the 20th, with sundry amendments, House bill No. 5533, to provide temporarily for revenues for the Philippine Islands, and gave notice of a motion to take it up for consideration tomorrow. In behalf of the minority of the committee, Mr. Rawlins offered a substitute. The text of the bill as amended by the committee, together with the text of the minority substitute, appears at page 745. A majority and minority report on the shipping subsidy measure, Senate bill No. 1348, were also made (pp. 745, 747), and a message from the president transmitting a supplementary report of the Isthmian canal commission (p. 749), recommending the Panama route, was received, the text of the report being printed at page 750. Consideration of the department of commerce bill, Senate bill No. 569, was (p. 752) thereupon resumed. The bills of general interest which were introduced were as follows: Nos. 2887 and 3015, both relative to pure food (p. 746).

Pursuant to his notice of the day before, Mr. Lodge moved on the 21st (p. 826) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the temporary tariff for the Philippines (House bill No. 5533), and the motion being agreed to the remainder of the day was devoted to that subject.

On the 22d Mr. Teller introduced a resolution relative to the death sentence upon Commander Scheepers in South Africa, which went over the day under the rule (p. 865); and the Senate resumed consideration (p. 865) of the department of commerce bill.

The first business of public interest on the 23d was the passage of a bill (Senate bill 2063) granting a pension of \$5,000 to the widow of the late President McKinley (p. 964); after which consideration of the department of commerce bill was resumed (p. 906), being interrupted at the close of the day by adjournment to the 27th.

House.

On the 20th the House went into committee of the whole (p. 772) for consideration of the urgent deficiency bill—House bill No. 9315—but came to no resolution (p. 788). The only bill introduced on a subject of general interest was: No. 9512, for repeal of the bankruptcy law (p. 790). In this day's issue of the Record appear speeches by Representative Hepburn, of Iowa (p. 726), and Representative Mann, of Illinois (p. 734), on the Isthmian canal.

Consideration of the urgency deficiency bill was resumed on the 21st (p. 839), but still without resolution, and no other business of public interest was done. Speeches by Representative Grosvenor, of Ohio, on the ship subsidy (p. 799), and Representative Champ Clark of Missouri, on the urgency deficiency bill (p. 806), appear in the Record of this date.

The 22d was devoted to consideration of the urgency deficiency bill (p. 877), but still without resolution. The bills of public interest introduced were No. 9865, dele-

gate from Alaska (p. 896); 9958, convict labor (p. 894); j. r. 134, constitutional amendment on trusts; j. r. 135, amendment to constitution on marriage and divorce (p. 890). A further speech on the Isthmian canal by Representative Hepburn, of Iowa, appears in this day's issue of the Record at page 859.

Consideration of the urgent deficiency bill was continued on the 23d, when the bill, with committee amendments, was reported back to the House (p. 944), with a favorable recommendation. The bills and resolutions of general interest introduced were No. 10058, banking currency; 10060, oleomargarine; 10062, to prevent leprosy; 10063, protection of the president; j. r. 137, sympathy for the South African republics (p. 945).

The urgent deficiency bill was put on its passage on the 24th. A motion by Representative Richardson to recommend the bill with instructions that the president be required to submit to congress a detailed report showing how an appropriation of \$500,000, the expenditure of which by him in his discretion for the shelter and protection of troops in the Philippines was authorized in the bill, failed of adoption—125 to 159 (p. 971), and the bill was passed. The House then adjourned to the 27th.

MISCELLANY

LOUDER THAN WORDS.

Dear little thin hands, famine-wasted fingers,

Holding on to dreary life that struggles to be free;

Hands where not a tender curve of baby roundness lingers,

Lift yourselves, that all the world the wan reproach may see.

That all the world's gay, thoughtless heart may break such sight to see.

Dear little pale lips, where no mother's kisses

Leave the print of mother-love to sink into the heart,

Lips that could not tell me aught of childhood's tiny blisses,

Cry aloud your loneliness that all the world may start,

That all the world of pleasant ease at grief like yours may start.

Dear little tiny eyes, weighed down with weeping,

Opening every day to ills that harder grow to bear,

Eyes where gladness never shines in waking or in sleeping,

Look reproach that all the world may come to know and care,

That all the world of listless souls may understand and care.

Dear little bent forms, in your narrow alleys

Hidden from the searching sun that longs to make you well,

Forms that never run and leap in grassy groves and valleys,

Stand before a startled world that knows not where you dwell,

That all the world may shudder at the places where you dwell.

MARY W. PLUMMER.

OUR MOUTHS SEALED WITH BLOOD.

Why has America sat dumb while England murders prisoners in South Africa, and, as if to add infamy to infamy, compels the friends and kinsmen of their victims to witness their executions?

Because our mouths are choked with Filipinos' blood!

When Greece fought for liberty from the Barbaric Turks, President Monroe voiced American feelings by officially extending the friendship and sympathy of this country to the Greeks.

When Hungary warred for freedom from the Austrian monarch, President Tyler gave this nation's sympathy and greetings to the Hungarian patriots and received Kosciusko with open arms.

But when the huge British empire masses troops from the ends of the earth to conquer two tiny republics, when the soldiers of this empire burn and destroy and desolate, starve women and children and hang patriot prisoners, what says President Roosevelt?

Not one solitary word! Does the spirit of freedom no longer arouse a thrill in American breasts? Yes, but not in the breasts of American officials, because our officials are themselves engaged in subjugating a people whose only crime is a love of independence—Public Ownership Leader, of St. Louis.

ORGANIZED LABOR MUST CHAMPION ALL LABOR.

Extracts from a speech made by Robert Baker at a dinner given in Brooklyn, December 10, to M. J. Flaherty, by the Central Labor Union.

Organized labor must broaden out and come to see that the interests of the masses of the people are their interests.

Theirs must be the fight for freedom and not for restriction. To the extent that they throw any influence for restrictive measures, to that extent they are playing the game of their enemies, the monopolists; they are strengthening and supporting monopoly; they are making it easier for the Morgans, the Carnegies, the Rockefellers, the Vanderbilts, the Astors, et al., to rivet their grip on the people, in exploiting whom they are exploiting organized labor.

Through cunning, trickery and corruption the people have been robbed of their birthright. These strong, powerful, wealthy and unscrupulous forces have gotten possession of their immense wealth through the backstairs of legislative halls, but organized labor cannot, if it would, compete in that game. It has no immense corruption fund to grease the legislative machinery. Their cause to command success must be shown to be a popular

demand, the cause of the common people. That cause is always the cause of freedom, of equality, of justice, which can only be secured when we have succeeded in abolishing special privilege in every form.

In the nation, in the state, in the city; wherever monopoly has secured possession of a special privilege, there must organized labor make its fight. Make it openly, bravely, boldly. No matter how formidable its possessors may appear, no matter how influential in either or both parties its chief beneficiaries may be, wherever this hydra-headed monster of special privilege shows itself, there will the ablest and bravest of labor's champions find their fight, and there will they achieve their greatest triumphs.

The more organized labor champions the cause of all labor, unorganized as well as organized, the greater will be its victories; the more lasting, the more permanent, the more beneficial and the more far-reaching will be its successes. If it would extend and broaden its influences—aye, if it would accomplish most for itself—it must persistently and vigorously attack special privilege in every form; it must make the cause of humanity its cause.

HOW TO GET RICH, AND HAVE FUN DOING IT.

For The Public.

The following incident will show how easy it is to make money. It is really easier than falling off the proverbial log, for there's never any fun faking off a log, and there may be making money.

My young hopeful, aged nine, had his ambition to make money fired last summer by seeing other boys selling lemonade—a very common thing in the city of Providence—so he asked his mother could he do likewise, and her consent being given, here is what he did:

It was a lonesome job alone, so he induced his little chum—a boy of his own age—to go partners. They set up a stand outside my boy's, or his father's house (I'm not sure which), and sold lemonade, two and three cents per glass. The weather being hot, business was good; I should say very good, for in two days they had cleared three dollars each. Had they continued both might have had a nice little bank account, but they didn't. At the end of the second day they had a row. The partner made a big kick. Here's the kick:

Partner—I don't think this is a square deal.

My Boy—Why? (Indignant as a young hornet).

Partner—Why? Why? (His voice becoming staccato) I'm doing everything! I'm the whole bunch! And you're doing nothing! No, not one little bit! But you get half the money, all the same! I've supplied the stand; I've supplied the crock to hold the lemonade; I've supplied the lemons, the sugar and the glasses. Furthermore, I've sold every glass there was sold. I haven't left the counter for a minute; and you, what have you done? Nothing! Only went to the circus one day, to a ball game the other; and when you might have relieved me, you wouldn't do it, but went playing with the boys instead. That ain't a square deal! I ain't agoing to stand for it! Me do all the work, supply everything, and you get as much as I do! Not on your tintype!

My Boy—Ain't it my dad's sidewalk?

Partner—Yes.

My Boy—Well, if you don't like it, you just take your stand, and your crock, and your lemons, and—and yourself, too, and get out, and don't talk to me again, and I'll get Willie Jones to go into partnership with me.

When the young partner went home his mother spanked him, and his father said he did not know enough to go in when it rained.

Moral.—If you want to make money in the lemonade business, be sure your father owns the "sidewalk;" that's where the fun comes in.

"Now, do you see the cat?"

JOHN A. M'LAUGHLIN,
56 Benefit St., Providence, R. I.

PROF. SELIGMAN AND CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS ON THE SINGLE TAX.

Portions of a news report published in the Boston Evening Transcript of Jan. 11.

Seldom have the members of the Massachusetts Single Tax league had such an outcoming of listeners to their after-dinner addresses as they had at the Hotel Brunswick last night. Prof. Seligman, who was to have been the chief speaker, was unexpectedly detained in New York by illness, but he sent his address in abstract by special messenger, and it was read by Prof. Charles J. Bullock, of Williams college, and there was an extended discussion. . . .

Prof. Seligman made these points: "The tax on personal property at the present time is a snare and a delusion. As it is administered in the United States it is a tax not upon property, but upon honesty.

"Any attempt in the direction of freeing the individual as an individual

from the burden of taxation, and of levying the taxes on the sources of the income rather than on the income or the property itself, is an attempt in the right direction.

"To the extent that the single taxers are showing the iniquity of the personal property tax and the essential injustice of our present methods, there is a substantial agreement between them and the economists.

"But, whereas, the single taxers desire to have all taxes on the land, the ordinary economist will supplement this land tax by a tax on inheritance in the hope of reaching in that way some of the forms of privilege.

"So far, however, as the next step in tax reform is concerned, the reduction and the final abolition of the individual tax on personal property, there is a substantial agreement between the economist and the single taxer.

"Let us not look too closely into the fundamental theories of private property. Let us be willing to unite on a practical scheme of tax reform."

Among the letters was that of Hon. Charles Francis Adams, who wrote in part:

"I am, after long and deliberate consideration, a thorough believer in what is known as the 'single tax;' that is, in the system of raising all the revenue required for the economical administration of public affairs from ground rent. In this connection, however, there is one point I wish, now and always, to emphasize. While the principle at the basis of public revenue from ground rent is correct, it must in my judgment be very carefully connected in the legislative mind with the two following principles: First, the exclusiveness of that tax; second, that the amount to be raised shall be only what is required for meeting public expenses necessarily incurred under an economical administration of affairs."

NO COLOR LINE IN HAWAII.

The Literary Digest of December 14 says that "According to the Honolulu correspondent of the Boston Transcript, the color line is something that in Hawaii is absolutely unknown. 'Black and white and yellow and brown,' he says, 'are on a social equality.' The news of the Booker T. Washington dinner incident caused no stir there, where 'American, Hawaiian and negro sit down at the same table with Japanese and Chinese, and with never a thought of the proprieties.' The social conditions, continues the correspondent, 'are probably the most peculiar of anywhere in the United States.'" The Literary Digest then quotes the following from the Transcript correspondent:

The Hawaiian has, it is true, a skin of somber hue, but the darker the

color the prouder he is of his social status. There are innumerable wealthy natives here who move in the best society circles, and the issuance of the "Blue Book," for the first time, a few days ago disclosed that the "Four Hundred" of the city was made up of both black and white and yellow and brown.

The most prominent attorney and the best speaker in the islands is a negro, and he is much in demand upon every public occasion. This is T. McCants Stewart, who is also prominent in the high councils of the republican party, which is due not only to his own undoubted ability, but also because of his color, which gives him a powerful influence over the natives. There are four score at least of Chinese citizens, and the like, who move in the best society, and who are rated at anywhere from \$10,000 to \$3,000,000 when wealth is taken as a factor. The hospitality of the famous Ah Fong family is well known, particularly among army and navy officers, who have often been their guests.

The Japanese are also no small factor in the prosperity of the islands, and there are many with large accumulations of wealth. There is not the slightest social distinction made upon their own account, though they very rarely entertain. Among the Hawaiians, however, there is the greatest rivalry for social distinction. Princess Theresa, who is the wife of Delegate to Congress Wilcox, by her official position, claims the honors. Ex-Queen Liliuokalani is still the recognized leader among her own people, and Mrs. Wilcox's claims are disputed by several other ladies. Princess Theresa is the real leader of the home rule party, which is dominant in local politics, and is said to far exceed her husband, the delegate to congress, in her ability to control the party.

There are in all hardly more than 10,000 whites in the city of Honolulu, and a good part of that number is made up of transients, who cannot be called citizens. The prominent society people are among the descendants of the old missionaries, and they mingle freely with the other nationalities in a social way. The social peculiarities of the place are further augmented by the unlimited number of queer marriage mixtures. A man's color here is no index to his nationality. Hawaiian, Chinese, American, French, Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish and African blood are so intermingled that an attempt to accurately distinguish one from the other would be absolutely impossible.

IT'S UNWORTHY OF US.

The message of President Roosevelt was accepted as an able one, coming from a president in the midst of situations brought about by others than himself. In his remarks under the caption: "The Monroe Doctrine," he quotes from President Monroe in these words: "The American continents are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power." Mr. Roosevelt follows this up by saying: "In other words, the Monroe doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil."

Now, if the career of Great Britain as a colonial nation has been beneficial as a whole wherever she has exercised such policies (and in certain instances, at certain periods she has not been the very worst), what objection did President Monroe have, and what has President Roosevelt now, to England, for instance, exercising colonial rule over some of the turbulent South American countries, such as Venezuela and Colombia? Is not the answer clear, that both these presidents believed that: These South American countries can work out their own governmental problems better than "foreigners can for them, who are not in touch with their wants or surroundings? Yet, it will not be doubted but what more "stable" governments would be the rule were certain "European powers" to be in control at such times as "anarchy" and revolution take place in some of the countries mentioned to our south.

These people, and every people, are entitled and capable of self-government to the extent of their needs. Their requirements are not of the same standard as are ours; and are never likely to be. If, therefore, as President Roosevelt says in his message, "the peoples of the Americas can prosper best if left to work out their own salvation in their own way," why cannot that same broad, fair minded and true statesmanship extend to the Philippines?

How does it happen that the Asiatic legacy of Spanish rule and civilization is inferior and less capable of "working out their own salvation in their own way" than the legacy of Spanish rule in South America?

To maintain and defend the American proposition—the Monroe doctrine—as applying to the South American countries, we are practically at no cost at all; to maintain and force

the European proposition in the Philippines, we are spending millions upon millions of dollars; and sacrificing the lives of American soldiers in numbers that should stagger us for the "benefits" we receive. These lives are forfeited, these millions of money are being squandered in the Philippines against the Rooseveltian policy in South America, "to work out their own salvation in their own way." In other words, the president stands for independent self-government in South America, but "colonial" government in the Philippines.

This war can never be compensated in the lives and treasure that have been forfeited in carrying it on, as was the civil war. That war had for its end and aim, "one united country." The continuance of the Philippine war means that at least one-half of the countrymen here are opposed to it. While the Filipinos will continue to fight their "banditti" warfare indefinitely. It will instill an inborn distrust and hatred for Americans. What a prospect from a financial standpoint! As to the deaths of American soldiers, in which cause are they falling—like the revolutionary soldier fighting the principle of "taxation without representation," and "tariffs levied on necessities," or, like the Briton in South Africa, for "territorial aggrandizement and power?"

England to-day has a more defensible cause in fighting the Boers than we have in fighting the Filipino! For England had certain suzerain authority over the Transvaal according to treaty. But we never for one moment had any rights over the Filipinos; not one, except those established at the end of a cannon's mouth; and have since those "rights" were created done all we could to deny them the privilege of "working out their own salvation in their own way."

LEE H. GOULD.

251 The Arcade, Cleveland, O.

WAS EMERSON AN ANARCHIST? For The Public.

While we are discussing the wisdom of passing laws against those who preach a higher conception of human society than that based upon government sustained by the bayonet, let us take a look at that brightest of America's literary stars—that smile of the nineteenth century—Ralph Waldo Emerson. Indeed, for giving expression to the following thoughts, Emerson would be brought under the ban of all the bills now proposed in congress.

How will the following suit those who believe in the divine right of governments to rule?

In dealing with the state, we ought to remember that its institutions are not aboriginal, though they existed before we were born; that they are not superior to the citizen; that every one of them was once the act of a single man; every law and usage was a man's expedient to meet a particular case; that they are all imitable, all alterable; we may make as good; we may make better.

The state must follow, and not lead the character and progress of the citizen.

Nature is not democratic, nor limited-monarchical, but despotic, and will not be fooled or abated of any jot of her authority by the pertest of her sons; and as fast as the public mind is opened to more intelligence, the code is seen to be brute and stammering.

The old, who have seen through the hypocrisy of courts and statesmen, die and leave no wisdom to their sons.

Every actual state is corrupt. Good men must not obey the laws too well. What satire on government can equal the severity of censure conveyed in the word politic, which now for ages has signified cunning, intimating that the state is a trick?

Love and nature cannot maintain the assumption; it must be executed by a practical lie, namely, by force.

The growth of everything in nature—man as well as plant—is made possible and facilitated by individual effort alone. One cannot confer mental or physical power upon another. Such can only be attained by self-effort—self-exercise. The only virtue that government ever expressed was in removing the bonds that prevented the free exercise of liberty in the individual citizen. "Want of liberty, by strengthening law and decorum, stupefies conscience." The individual liberty of a people can as well be destroyed by the economic conditions of society, as by decrees promulgated by despots with that object boldly expressed. This has in a great measure been accomplished in America, and it has dulled the American conscience so that it fails to comprehend the enormity of its crime in the orient—a crime which, if attempted even 25 years ago, would have resulted in the annihilation of the party attempting it.

Laws, if of any value at all, must express the general average sentiment of those living under them. And the question must necessarily follow that if the law does express such sentiment, would that sentiment express itself in the actions of the people without the law? "Could not a nation of friends devise better ways?" says Emerson, and continues:

On the other hand, let not the most conservative and timid fear anything from a premature surrender of the bayonet and the system of force. For according to the order of nature, which is quite superior to our will, it stands thus: There will always be a government of force where men are selfish; and when they are pure enough to

abjure the code of force, they will be wise enough to see how these public ends of the post office, of the highway of commerce, and the exchange of property, of museums and libraries, of institutions of art and science, can be answered.

Whether laws and governments are cognizant of the fact or not, the individuality of the citizen will express itself in proportion to the power and genius of that citizen. If the citizen be of mean quality, then he covertly acts and expresses his desires. He does under cover what he fears to do in the open. If his wisdom and courage are in keeping with his desire, then we have a Cromwell, a Henry or a Washington. Hence we see (again quoting Emerson) that "all laws, but those which men make for themselves, are laughable." And again:

Hence, the less government we have, the better—the fewer laws, and the less confided power.

Now the lower degree of "less" is least; the lower degree of "least" is nothing, and government disappears. So with "fewer laws and the less confided power." The logical conclusion from such premises must be the absence of law and the disappearance of power.

We live in a very low state of the world, and pay unwilling tribute to governments founded on force.

Observe this estimate of those who long to rule:

Senators and presidents have climbed so high with pain enough, not because they think the place specially agreeable, but as an apology for real worth, and to vindicate their manhood in our eyes. This conspicuous chair is their compensation to themselves for being a poor, cold, hard nature. They must do what they can.

To educate the wise man the state exists; and with the appearance of the wise man, the state expires.

Fear, Craft and Avarice
Cannot rear a state.

The power of love, as the basis of the state, has never been tried.

It is to be questioned whether those who prate so much upon the divinity of government and the respect due to those in authority, could ever form so lofty an ideal as a state based upon the "power of love." Yet true civilization shall not arrive; true liberty will not abide; true progress shall not be; true manhood and divine womanhood shall be unknown, and the greatest happiness and joy unrealized until the "power of love" shall be the foundation of human institutions.

When the church is social worth,
When the state-house is the hearth,
Then the perfect state is come,
The republican at home.

L. J. QUINBY.

Omaha, Neb.

If all else fails, the railroad managers might quietly abolish the state of Minnesota.—Buffalo Express.

SEED OF A NATION.

Pharaoh speaks:

'So your name is Aaron,
and you should be Moses,
my grand aunt's Jew protege,
I remember.

"It is monstrous,
preposterous, out of the question.
I wonder at my own forbearance
that calmly gives hearing
to your crazy appeal for your people.

"Why, sirrahs,
I should do them poor kindness
to set them adrift at this juncture,
untrained and dependent,
not fit for self-government,
prey for the first sturdy tribesmen
they met on the way to your Canaan,
your far-away, dim land of promise—
a priest and a shepard to guide them.
Madness!

"No, no. I have care for my task folk.
I have marked out a policy for them,
and in course of, say, three generations,
—they can't even make decent brick now—
trained in habits of industry
and taught to be capable workmen,
I can't say of course what might happen.

"But now they are idle, rebellious,
I hardly can handle them.
And what would you do with such people
without the restraints I have need of?

"See that Numidian,
Sleek and contented?
Oh, I have good care for my people
and I know a good servant
and how to reward him.
He's a eunuch, in charge of my household.
Go preach content to your people
and give them good counsel
if you really would do them a service.

"I have spoken.
I might not again be so patient."

Well, the Hebrews set out for their Canaan
and Pharaoh proved not a bad prophet
altogether.

They murmured,
they provoked God to anger,
they vexed the meekness of Moses,
they rebelled every step of the way,
they sighed for the flesh pots of Egypt.

Not one of those pilgrims
who set out from Egypt—
Moses included—
ever reached Canaan.

Wandering, wandering,
toiling and fighting,
winning a battle
but gaining no foothold,
tediously marching
but getting no nearer,
adrift in the desert—
it was full forty years
of travels and quarrels
before the advance guard crossed Jordan.

And then,
were they fit for self-government?
Hardly.

Dissension,
backsliding, captivity,
—because of their sin and idolatry—
slow, painful progress
that seemed to go backward—
it was not forty years but a thousand
they puddled around in the morass
of worse than Egyptian bondage.

And finally came to this climax—
that they slew the Holy One
who should have redeemed Israel.

Fit for self-government?
Evidently not.

But Pharaoh
—who perished at Red Sea crossing—
saw not his world's fulfillment.
And I mind me,

The Book
hasn't a word
of approval for Pharaoh.
—John Stone Pardee, in the Argus, of Red
Wing, Minn., for Jan. 19.

Altogether the most significant fact
in the art world of Boston is the strag-
gling procession of poor Italians who
trudge from the north end of Copley
square every Sunday afternoon to de-
light themselves in the lovely galleries
and corridors of the museum of fine
arts. The significance of that proces-
sion is its rebuke to us Yankees. In
Europe there obtains a sort of fine
democracy in art; in America things
artistic belong to a class. Those ear-
ringed, kerchiefed aliens point out a
serious American defect when they
show to how lowly a level the taste
for the beautiful may find its way,
and when they show by contrast our
very feeble achievement in the demo-
cratization of art.—Boston Tran-
script.

Once upon a time there lived a very
patriotic People, who put in most of
their time worrying about their Coun-
try.

"Is our navy commensurate with our
territorial importance?" they asked
themselves, and, the doubt being con-
firmed, built many ships.

But one day they made a very dis-
agreeable discovery.

"Our territorial expansion is not
commensurate with our navy," they ex-
claimed, and, facing the situation can-
didly, grabbed more land.

This shows that up-to-date Patriot-
ism is, even in its subjective aspect, no
Pudding.—Life.

Experience has effected a great
change in Senator Platt. When he is
thrown down by a president he calmly
brushes the dust off his clothes and
claims he slipped.—Detroit Free Press.

Briggs—It won't be long now before
the United States will have to act as
peacemaker for those South American
republics.

Griggs—Well, we shall never own
them unless we make a beginning
some time.—Life.

"What we want," said the First Pa-
triot, "is honest elections."

"I should say so," agreed the Second
Patriot. "Why, Heeler promised me
\$50 for my influence in my ward, and

now he says he never agreed to give me
more than \$10."—Baltimore Sun.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Marrow of Tradition," though a
title that gives no clew in advance, is the
deeply significant name of a book by
Charles W. Chesnutt (Boston and New
York; Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) which for
more than one reason deserves and is like-
ly to win a permanent place in American
literature. One of the distinguishing
things about it is the fact that its author
is a Negro, a member of the Ohio bar, prac-
ticing in Cleveland. But more than that,
it is a Negro's story of the new South,
absorbingly interesting as to characters
and plot, for which the relations of the
Negro race to the hostile white race fur-
nish the motive, and the Negro outlook
the point of view. Through the author of
this book the Negro race becomes articu-
late in literature. We have had speeches
by Negroes and for Negroes, but it is the
orator and not his race that has spoken.
We have had poetry by Negroes and of
Negroes, but for white men, in which only
the superficial peculiarities of the Negro,
mirthful and sad, have found expression.
Mr. Chesnutt has the distinction of first
enabling his race to disclose itself. In
this story of contemporaneous life at the
South, the Negro does not say what he is,
or thinks, or hopes for, but shows it all
by his conduct in the unfolding of the
narrative. And he turns out to be just
a man, as all races do when they deliver
their message. Of the literary qualities
of the book let the professional critics
speak. For the ordinary reader it is
enough to know that it not only does not
offend against ordinary standards of lit-
erary taste, but upon the whole is of su-
perior quality, and that as a narrative it com-
mands attention in the first chapter and
retains it to the sensational climax at the
end. The characters are alive, the whites
as well as the blacks; the environment is
true in outline and color; the principal in-
cidents are as a rule historical, while the
minor and fictitious ones are in no re-
spect distorted; and throughout the story
the reader finds himself unconsciously
looking out upon the world through the
eye of the Negro race. Yet the white race
is treated with entire fairness. This is
one of the most remarkable features of the
book. Not only are the weaknesses and
wickednesses of the Negro freely dis-
played, but the lovable side of even intense
Negro haters is placed in the best light.
No reader will lay down the story with any
feeling of resentment toward the dominant
race at the South. On the contrary, he
will carry away truer and more agreeable
impressions of the Southern gentleman
than most Northern men possess and quite
as much consideration for the white ruf-
fians of the South as they deserve. No
white writer has ever been so judicially
fair to the Negro as this Negro writer is
to the white man. But he must have a

CHINESE
EXCLUSION

The editorial article of THE PUBLIC
entitled,

"The Chinese Exclusion Act,"

has been put in pamphlet form. For
price, etc., see list of PUBLIC LEAF-
LETS on next page.

narrow mind and strong prejudices whom Mr. Chesnutt's book does not stir with a sense of righteous wrath at race hatred and injustice of all kinds.

PERIODICALS.

—"Sound Currency," the quarterly finance publication of the New York Reform club, contains in the issue for December an historical resume, by L. Carroll Root, of the commercial asset banking of New England for the two decades preceding the civil war, together with the paper of George R. De Saussure, on branch banking, which won the third prize in the Reform Club's competitive essays on financial questions.

HIRAM B. LOOMIS
WILL LECTURE ON
"Reciprocity—A Form of Imperialism."
Sunday, February 2, at 3 p. m.,
17th Floor of the Masonic Temple,
Under the Auspices of the
HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

LAUGHLIN
FOUNTAIN PEN
Sent on Approval to
Reponsible People

We offer your choice of these popular styles, superior to the \$3.00 grades of many makes for only

\$1.00

Try this Pen a week, if you like it remit, if not, return it.

Finest quality hard Para rubber reservoir holder, highest grade, 14 K. gold pen, any desired flexibility, in fine medium or stub. Perfect ink feed. Sent postpaid on receipt of order (by registered mail 8 cents extra). **Safety Pocket Pen Holder Free** with each Pen.

Do not miss this special opportunity to secure a strictly high-grade guaranteed Fountain Pen at a price that is only a fraction of its real value.

Ladies, to a young man or an old man, to a married man or a single man, there is nothing in the world more appropriate, more welcome, or useful, either as a birthday gift, philopena souvenir, card prize, or keepsake, than a **Laughlin Fountain Pen**, which is ever ready, ever handy, and ever suggestive of the fact that the pen is mightier than the sword.

Remember, there is no "just as good" as the **LAUGHLIN.**

State whether ladies' or gentlemen's style is desired. Illustration on left is full size of ladies' style; on right, gentlemen's style. (Either style, richly trimmed with heavy solid gold mountings for \$1.00 additional). Agents wanted. Write for Catalogue. Address

LAUGHLIN MFG. CO.,
288 Griswold Street,
Detroit, Mich.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

WALTER A. LANTZ. T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2364.

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.
Cleveland.

SAMUEL DOERFLER,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR,
501 American Trust Bldg. Cleveland, O.

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
30 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1263 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1014.
NEW YORK.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE TRUSTS

Moody's Manual of Corporation Securities, 1901 Edition.

gives more practical information regarding corporate industry in this country than all the essays, treatises, reports of investigating committees, hearings of industrial commissions, gropings of college professors, journalistic misstatements of facts, or any other literature of the "trust problem" which has appeared in a decade. The book is an encyclopaedia of American industrial progress. . . .

Price, bound in cloth, \$7.50 per copy

In flexible leather \$10.00 per copy

For sale by leading booksellers, or will be sent prepaid by the publishers

JOHN MOODY & CO.
35 Nassau Street, New York City

The Public
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.

CIGAR SMOKERS ATTENTION!

Send me \$2.50 and I will send you 50 of the best 10c straight Clear Havana Cigars that money can buy. Express prepaid. J. POPPERS, Manufacturer, 1556 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

THE GREAT STEEL STRIKE WAS LOST.
But you can gain something by reading
"BY BREAD ALONE."

A story of the steel workers—a study of the psychology of the strike.

BY L. K. FRIEDMAN. **POSTPAID, \$1.50.**
H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Connecticut, O.

The Public Leaflets.

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

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

The following pamphlets have been issued:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898.) Out of print.
3. **Nero-Ten**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. **The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust**, by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. **Monopoly and Competition** (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. **Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case** (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900). Out of print.
8. **Assassination and Anarchism** (from THE PUBLIC of September 14, 1901).
9. **Australian Taxation in Colorado** (from THE PUBLIC of August 31, 1901).
10. **Landmarks of Liberty** (from THE PUBLIC of September 28, 1901).
11. **The Chinese Exclusion Act** (from THE PUBLIC of December 14, 1901).