

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1902.

Number 198.

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.

According to the New York Nation, "advocates of the extension of the referendum will find little encouragement in an analysis of the official election returns from the four states in which constitutional amendments were submitted in November." The reason given for this inference is that only a small vote was cast upon the amendments, owing to "the ignorance or indifference of a large majority of the voters." But does not the Nation favor a limitation of suffrage to the intelligent and public spirited? Why, then, is not the referendum a good thing, even from its own points of view? If the referendum operates automatically to disfranchise the ignorant and indifferent, what more could the Nation ask?

It is with conflicting emotions that we read in the Albany Law Journal of a recent decision of a federal court, reported at page 145 of the Federal Reporter, vol. ix. For an act not committed in its presence, a Kentucky court had summarily convicted a lawyer of contempt and imposed a fine upon him, ordering his imprisonment until payment. The lawyer petitioned in the federal court for a writ of habeas corpus, and that court released him upon the ground, as stated by the Albany Law Journal, that—

a person who is summarily adjudged guilty of contempt without a hearing for an act not committed in the presence of the court, and who, in consequence thereof, is imprisoned for non-payment of the fine imposed, is deprived of his liberty without due process of law, in violation of the fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States.

Our conflicting emotions with refer-

ence to this case may be easily explained. On the one hand every new interference with local courts by federal courts respecting matters of local concern impresses us as a dangerous innovation. On the other hand, summary convictions for constructive contempt certainly are without due process of law, and it is gratifying to have them judicially so decided to be—even by a federal court as against a state court.

Representative F. J. Kern, of Illinois, has been made the butt of a little good-natured ridicule by the press, because he declares that he will not vote to appropriate a cent for the expenses of the American envoys to the coronation of King Edward. But while his objections may at first seem trifling, because they relate to a mere ceremonial, they deserve more than a passing thought or a flippant remark. For one thing, they are made in good faith, which in itself demands for the objecting congressman a respectful hearing. Good faith is not so common in congress that it may wisely be scorned when it comes to the surface. And beyond the matter of Congressman Kern's good faith are the merits of the question itself. Why should this republic send special envoys to participate in a medieval ceremonial—"the survival of feudal funkism and childish love of show," as the Philadelphia North American truly describes it—on the occasion of the crowning of a monarch? It is true that the king of England does not reign by divine right. His throne rests upon the express consent of the English people. But, like his nephew of Germany, he has a notion, only half concealed, that this expression of popular consent was only a restoration of the divine authority which blasphemous rebels had presumed to assail. That apart, however, the cere-

monial itself symbolizes divine right. Why, then, should this republic be especially and ostentatiously represented? American respect for the British people could be sufficiently shown by the unostentatious attendance at the ceremony of our regular representative. There is no reason for any peculiar representation except the itching this republic has recently experienced for the pomp and circumstance of glorious empire.

Inasmuch, however, as the president does send special envoys to the coronation, one from the army, one from the navy and one from private life, he might have done better in making at least two of his selections—better in the official sense, of course, for there is no criticism of the individuals. When the navy is to be represented abroad upon a state occasion, its highest officer, next to the president, is obviously the appropriate representative. The same is true of the army. But, upon the authority of the distinguished correspondent, Walter Wellman, it appears that the president has passed over Admiral Dewey, of the navy, because Dewey filed a dissenting opinion in the Schley case; and over Gen. Miles, of the army, because Miles incurred his displeasure in connection with the same controversy. Mr. Roosevelt seems to be having his own way as president; and a very small way it is, whether regarded from the point of view of a president or of a presidential candidate.

The discourteous refusal of a Bourbon Democratic committee to welcome Mr. Bryan on the occasion of his recent visit to Massachusetts, has been rebuked in a gratifying manner by the people of that state. Citizens of both parties have most cordially received him, applauding his speeches with the enthusiasm which

their sentiments and eloquence deserve. Short-sighted beyond measure is the politician who imagines that Mr. Bryan is without honor in his own country. Defeated though he has been in two historic presidential campaigns, he is, nevertheless, without exception, the most popular man, simply as a man, in the United States to-day. No glamour of success envelops his personality, and he has no official power with which to command the admiration and gratitude that consist in a lively sense of favors to come. He is a simple citizen. Yet in the great heart of the American people—the common people of the East as well as those of the West, including many of both sections who for one superficial reason or another voted against him—there is a feeling that this man has represented them. His eloquence is of a kind that touches a popular chord which the mere politician is too apt to ignore and the money-changers cannot understand. Mr. Bryan's public life has not ended. It has only fairly begun.

In this connection, a word about Bryan's Commoner will not be out of place, though an exception to a general rule to which we are disposed most strictly to adhere. That publication is now entering upon its second year. Fresh from the presidential campaign of 1900, Mr. Bryan started the Commoner to keep alive in the public mind the declarations of the Kansas City platform which so many Democratic papers of the nominal sort were eager to consign to political oblivion. The Commoner has been made to serve that use with ability and fidelity; and it will be well for American democracy if it is liberally supported in the same service in the future. Though some of us may not be in full agreement with the Kansas City platform, and for this reason may be disposed to criticise the policy of the Commoner in some particulars, that platform represents on the whole the best democracy that the Democratic party has put forth since it fell under the domination of the slave

power, and the Commoner is its able exponent and loyal defender. Such a paper is needed at this critical period, and in conducting it Mr. Bryan is doing a work for good government which is not even second to that which for five years he has been doing on the platform. It is to be hoped that in its second year the Commoner may at least double the circulation of its first.

Besides being really an excellent news collector and news purveyor, the Chicago Tribune is notable for its editorial candor. When it has a bad cause to defend, it conceals nothing. It boldly defends the cause, not deceptively for what it isn't but frankly for what it is. An example is its plea in the issue of the 13th for the "real estate" owners of Chicago as against the demands of the public for lower street car fares. George C. Sikes, the secretary of the Chicago council committee on local transportation, has advocated low fares without compensation to the city, for Chicago, as Mayor Johnson is doing for Cleveland; and the Tribune appeals in all seriousness, to them both, to desist for the sake of real estate interests. "The people of Chicago," it urges, "have not complained of 5-cent fares; they have not appealed to the legislature for relief, as the owners of real estate have." Therefore don't tax the real estate owners who do complain, but tax the patient public which doesn't. That is the gist of the Tribune's argument.

Correctly enough, the Tribune traces the responsibility for low fare agitation to the single taxers. They, it says—

are its most earnest advocates. It is in their clubs that it is chiefly preached. The most conspicuous three-cent fare man in this country is Tom Johnson, of Cleveland, who is a notorious single-taxer. The Chicago single-taxers know perfectly well that real estate is already ferociously taxed here. They would like to see other sources of municipal revenue cut off so that even higher taxation of real estate may become necessary. They wish to have more taxes piled on this kind of property until all of what they call the

"unearned increment" shall be wiped out, and all motives for owning or building on real estate destroyed.

This is so correct a diagnosis, in a general way, that it ought to be more accurately stated in particulars, and that we shall attempt briefly to do.

At the outset it should be understood that what the single taxers want is not heavier taxation of real estate, which includes improvements as well as land, but of land itself. So far from wishing an increase of taxes on the part of real estate which consists of buildings and other improvements, they want to exempt that kind of property altogether. It is the land, the site for improvements, the building lot, which they wish to see heavily taxed; and they want this kind of property, this part of real estate, taxed so heavily that no one can afford to monopolize it without improving it. In order to bring about that result, they would like, as the Tribune says, to see other sources of municipal revenue cut off. This is not their only reason for advocating three cent fares. They advocate three cent fares in preference to higher fares with a tax on them to be paid by the companies, for several reasons. The taxation of fares, if honestly enforced, would amount to a tax on the use of street cars, falling with equal weight upon all. The mechanic, the clerk, the washerwoman, the errand boy—all would pay taxes to the city for riding in street cars, over and above the value of the rides, though the only benefit they would get would be the value of the rides. Yet landowners would pay no more, though they would get the same benefit as to riding, plus the benefit of lower taxes on their valuable building sites—sites to which they have no better claim in justice than the others. Another objection to taxing receipts is that this arrangement would furnish an incentive to street car managers to "cook" their books, so as to collect the tax without turning all of it over to the city. Another is that the users of street cars would be compelled to pay five cents for a ride worth only three

cents, in order that the landowners and the street car companies might divide the other two cents between them—the latter as an excessive charge for service and the former in reduced taxation on their valuable building lots. There are still other reasons of this general character; but the greatest reason of all with single taxers, doubtless is, as the Tribune insists, that the rejection of this source of municipal revenue would tend to increase taxes on building lots, and so lead on to the single tax goal, which is the abolition of all taxes except on the value of that part of real estate which furnishes the site, or opportunity, for improvement.

Now this goal involves two points: its justice and its civic wisdom. If it is not just, it is, of course, to be condemned. Single taxers will agree to that. But who can with a straight face argue that the ad valorem taxation of a kind of property which no one produces—the site of a city,—and the value of which is due to no one's individual labor but solely to the growth of the city, would be unjust? Surely not those who argue for the taxation of street car riders. Not being unjust, then, the propriety of such a tax depends upon its advisability as a matter of civic wisdom. On this point the Tribune's objection is that it would destroy "all motives for owning or building on real estate." What crass nonsense! Consider it. Such a tax would reduce the selling price of building lots without diminishing their desirability. How could that destroy the motives for owning them? It would, indeed, destroy the motive for owning them for the purpose of keeping them vacant; but so far from destroying the motive for owning them for the purpose of building on them, it would make that motive more general, more intense, and more effective. This is not a bare assertion; it is the statement of an obvious fact. Then, as to the destruction of all motives for building, is it not quite clear that the exemption of buildings from taxation would en-

courage building? Yet here is one of the leading papers of the West which so far sacrifices its reputation for intelligence to the exigencies of a bad cause, as to assert that the exemption of buildings from taxation (which would favor the production of that kind of real estate), and the taxation of lots so as to reduce their selling price (which would make it easier for intending builders to buy them), would obstruct the acquisition and improvement of real estate. Go to!

As an illustration in a small way of the single tax idea in practical operation, some single taxers point to the little village of Fairhope, on Mobile bay. It is the only "fad" colony that has grown and strengthened. It owns the values of its own site and with this fund pays the state and county taxes of its inhabitants. It also owns its own public improvements. Commenting upon the financial condition of the village down to the close of last year the Fairhope Courier says, in its issue of January 1:

The rent list for this year on the basis of present holdings will bring the association nearly \$800, of which considerably over \$500 will be available for local expenditure, in addition to the net revenues from the wharf, which are increasing rapidly. If any are disposed to think the rentals too high, let them imagine an individual holding the 1,200 acres of land upon which this colony is located, including this thriving village of nearly 250 people, growing in population and business at the rate of about 40 per cent. a year, and ask himself if this individual would not expect to be able to exact more than \$500 a year for all the opportunities afforded on these sites. It seems hard for people to understand that the association is exactly like other landlords in wanting to get the full value of its lands. Everywhere where there is growth and progress land increases in value. Where growth is greatest there values rise most rapidly. This is as true under single tax as under the generally prevailing system. The purpose of the single tax is to see that these increasing values go to those properly entitled to them. Where they attach to lands unimproved or to improved land in excess of the value of the improvements they manifestly do not belong to him who happens to hold the title, but jointly to the people whose common

demand and improvements have caused them to appear. If the association does not take for the common benefit the values thus created they will be taken by individuals who are not entitled to them, and a long train of evils will follow.

The British board of agriculture is reported to be so thoroughly aroused on the subject of rural depopulation that it is about to ask appropriations for the purpose of offering prizes for plowing, ditching, hedging, straw-binding, stacking and thatching. It also proposes interesting schemes for adding interest and variety to country life. Excellent proposals. One drawback, however, should be guarded against. If the appropriations are made from general revenues, the ultimate effect of thus exciting the energies and improving the life of farm-laborers will only be to raise the standard of efficiency without raising wages and to increase the value of agricultural holdings. This was demonstrated in principle when parliament sought recently to relieve tenants from oppressive rents by exempting landlords from taxation. The landlords gratefully accepted the exemption. But they did not lower rents, to the surprise, curiously enough, of confiding tenants and benevolent members of parliament. Yet it is easy to avoid such an undesirable result. Let the board of agriculture get its revenues for prizes, etc., from an ad valorem tax upon farm holdings, exempting improvements, and it will be gratified with the success of the undertaking. The same result might be accomplished without offering prizes, but merely by so burdening land monopoly with taxation while exempting improvements and other productions, that the prizes of work would go naturally not to landlords but to workers. Farm workers would then make their own prizes in their own way without the intervention of a paternal board of agriculture.

Apropos of the controversy over second-class mail matter we might observe that the third assistant post-

master general appears to have placed himself in a position which calls for some explanation. We allude to his denial of the validity of what, at page 609, two weeks ago, we described as and then supposed to be a construction by the Publishers' association of a post office ruling. The Publishers' association had announced that—

the post office officials at Washington, D. C., have just ruled that a subscription to any publication entered as second-class matter must be discontinued when the time for which it is paid in advance has expired.

In consequence of that announcement, the third assistant postmaster general, on December 30, instructed postmasters to notify all publishers in their respective cities that there had been no such change in the rules or practice with regard to subscriptions to legitimate second-class publications, adding:

The report grows out of a ruling in an individual case of a New York publication which was carrying an enormous list of expired subscriptions which were largely first induced by premiums and where due notice had been given to the subscriber, who had failed to renew or to order continuance with a promise to pay, expressed or implied. When general rulings are made they are published in this Bulletin for the information of the public and all postmasters.

This explanation is now badly discredited by the Publishers' association, which, in defense of its own good faith, gives out the following official letter, dated December 17, from the third assistant postmaster general:

In reply to your letter of the 14th inst., you are informed that the department holds it to be not within a publisher's privilege to mail at the pound rate of postage, as to subscribers, copies of his publication to persons whose subscriptions have expired; and the inclusion within the number presented for mailing as to legitimate subscribers of copies addressed to persons who are not legitimate subscribers, will deprive the publisher of his pound rate upon the whole, unless the illegitimate portion be separated therefrom.

It would appear, therefore, that the third assistant postmaster general has got himself into a tangle which in some of its aspects is significant of too much indifference to at least one of

the ten commandments. What did he mean when on the 30th of December he gave out a public notice to the effect that the department had not made the ruling described by the Publishers' association, if it was true, as he had written officially on the 17th of December, that the department had made precisely that ruling?

Mayor Johnson's efforts to redeem his promise to give to Cleveland a three-cent rate of street car fare (p. 612) is now far on its way toward redemption. After much difficulty he has secured from the city council an ordinance authorizing bids for street car service upon the basis of a straight three-cent fare, with no tax on receipts, and the rest is only a matter of business—open and legitimate business, not lobby "business."

Meanwhile the Cleveland mayor, whose "equitable taxation" clothes the republican governor has put on and found too large for a comfortable fit, is working with the Democratic delegation to the legislature from the Republican county of Cuyahoga upon plans for proposed legislation. This legislation ranges, to say nothing of tax bills, from a two-cent-a-mile fare on steam railroads to municipal ownership of municipal monopolies. The first bill on the latter subject is thus described by the mayor:

This bill concerns the question of street railroads alone. It is to give the city power to acquire, construct and operate street railroads. It provides that the city may issue bonds for this purpose, limitations being placed on these issues, of course. The city council shall first, by ordinance, outline the plan to be followed and the routes to be operated. After that is done and when everything is in readiness for the measure the question shall be submitted to the vote of the people.

Asked if this measure could be enacted in time to apply to the new street railway system provided for by the recent ordinance, the mayor said:

I am no prophet. I wish that might be the case. Of course I would prefer municipal to the private ownership of that road, but I would rath-

er have a three-cent fare now than to have to wait a long time for the other plan.

Pursuant to his expressed preference for municipal ownership of municipal monopolies, Mayor Johnson has induced the city council of Cleveland to petition the legislature for power to adopt such a system. The resolution came before the council at its regular meeting on the 13th. It called for the merit plan of employment as part of the system. Mayor Johnson, who has the right, ex-officio, of debate upon the floor of the council, made a strong argument for the resolution, in the course of which he laid stress upon the importance of the merit clause. Notwithstanding that the council has a Republican majority and that the president of the council and one other Republican member bitterly opposed it as part of a scheme to give the Johnson administration more political power, the resolution was adopted by the extremely significant vote of 18 to 4.

In a well-tempered article, an editorial contributor to that excellent democratic weekly of the Pacific coast, the San Francisco Star, criticises our position (p. 563) on the question of Chinese exclusion. Not only is this criticism well tempered, but, what is quite unusual in newspaper controversy, it fairly and intelligently meets the essential issue as we raise it. We had admitted the right in principle of a people to resist hostile invasions, whether invasions with arms or in peaceable form; insisting, however, that the defensive necessity must be apparent in order to justify defensive action. Accepting this principle, the Star urges that nothing remains but a question of fact, namely, whether Chinese immigration, if not restricted, would really be equivalent to a hostile invasion. But on this issue it demands the right of decision for the people of the Coast. There is no avoidance, however, of our contention that such questions should not be left to the decision of interested and probably prejudiced localities. The Star's

critical article admits this contention in so far as it relates to the principles involved, but denies it as to questions of fact. It claims, accordingly, that the question of whether Chinese immigration would amount to a hostile invasion should be left to the determination of the Coast, as the locality familiar with the facts. That claim cannot possibly be allowed. It is like claiming for the plaintiff in a lawsuit, that while the interpretation of the law in the case should be left to a disinterested judge, the verdict should be left to the plaintiff himself, he being so well informed about the facts. What the Star contends for would never be conceded with reference to an armed invasion. The country would not and ought not to go to war with China because the people of the Coast demanded it on the ground that they knew that a Chinese army was being fitted out for purposes of invasion and that their location and interests made them peculiarly familiar with the facts. Before a nation can justly enter upon defensive war, the nation itself and not merely a hysterical locality must be convinced of the defensive necessity. Equally so, the nation must be convinced, not merely informed by an interested locality, that a current of foreign immigration is a menace to natural rights or national institutions before it is justified in closing its ports under the principle which we have laid down and the Star adopts. This nation is not so convinced with reference to the Chinese and no evidence has yet been presented which justifies such a conviction. So far, with all respect for the sincerity of opponents of Chinese immigration, we fail to find evidence in the case they present of anything but an unwarranted and unworthy race intolerance.

It has been noticed that in popular speech the name of this nation is used in the singular instead of the plural, as formerly; and the congressional committee on revision of the federal statutes has departed from

authoritative precedent by adopting the newer form. A recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune, in calling attention to the change, observes:

The plural form, which was universal once, has given place to the singular form, and grammatical revolutions no more go backward than do other revolutions.

But this revolution is not grammatical alone. Essentially it is not grammatical at all. The revolution in grammatical form is strictly in obedience to a revolution in political sentiment. It marks a reversal of the old idea that this nation is one of strictly limited powers, being only a federation of sovereign states which have invested it with authority to act for them in certain specified particulars. When that idea obtained, grammatical usage conformed to the political principle. We said of the United States that "they are a nation." But now, with the advance of world-power imperial aspirations, that idea is passing into oblivion, and grammatical usage takes cognizance of the fact. We no longer say of the United States that "they are a nation," but that "it is a nation."

It is interesting in this connection to recall a political prophecy made in 1893 by the great publicist, David Dudley Field. His prophecy is rapidly approaching fulfillment. It was made to Prof. Adam S. Hill, of Harvard college, in a letter in which Field discussed the use of the word "is" instead of "are," as applied to the United States. To Field "the United States is," was not only ungrammatical but dangerous to democracy. In his letter occurs the pregnant passage:

In our own history we see unmistakable proofs of a strong flood tide setting in towards federal authority. To go no further than the Chinese deportation act of the last session, enacted and upheld upon the plea of federal sovereignty, it needs no prophet to foretell that, if the foundation of that enactment be not dashed in pieces, the incoming century will see this nation either broken into fragments or converted into a consolidated republic—another name for despotism, which would be

but a prelude to anarchy, and that but another name for an emperor and military dominion.

We are not always in accord with the Chicago Chronicle on questions of democracy. But one of its recent pronouncements we most heartily indorse. It rebukes the Democratic leaders in congress for trying to make reciprocity a Democratic issue. What the Chronicle says on this question is so timely, so true, and so compact in statement that we quote it. Defining reciprocity, it says:

In the first place, it is an attempt in violation of the constitution to take the power of originating revenue bills from the house of representatives, and to place it in the hands of the president and the senate, the treaty-making power. In the second place, it is a scheme of the big protectees to remove their selfish interests from the omnibus tariff bills of the future and to intrench themselves in such a way in treaties negotiated by a few men who can be trusted to look after their welfare that the amount and the character of protection which they are to enjoy hereafter will depend more upon their own ideas and bargainings and less upon the uncertainties of action by the representatives of the people. In the third place, it is indubitable evidence that the whole rotten tariff system is breaking down of its own weight of lies and corruption. Democrats as such have no more reason to interest themselves in these measures than missionaries of the cross have to espouse the cause of a Chinese joss as against the claims of Buddha.

There is a whole battery of democratic principle and argument in that brief quotation. The Democrat in the lower house, if any such there be, who has within him the ability of a statesman and the spirit of true leadership, could make it the text for an epoch-making speech and the dynamic of a great public career. Reciprocity is indeed only the rotten fortification to which special privilege is retreating before the silent but resistless advances of free trade.

Says one of the publications of Dun's commercial agency,—

Prices are now at the highest point in many years, and, in fact, surpass

all records since the present improved methods of manufacture and distribution have been in use and agricultural operations were first begun on the present extensive scale with labor-saving machinery.

That has a prosperous sound. But as wages generally have not increased, it cannot indicate prosperity for the mass of wage workers; and as general opportunities for work are not plentiful, it indicates rather that the "prosperity" cry is all cry and no fodder. Are we mistaken in saying that opportunities for employment are not plentiful? Read this unconscious answer from the Buffalo Times of December 1:

The superintendent of the delivery department of the Western Union was seen by a reporter for the Times yesterday. "Yes, we are getting more men and fewer boys for our service," he said. "There are a great many men out of work at the present time, and as an energetic boy can earn about \$1.50 a day with us, which is more than some men earn, we saw no reason why we should not let the men have the chance. They are more reliable.

When work is so scarce that reliable men can be got to do boys' work at boys' wages, it is in order to ask embarrassing questions about that "prosperity which everybody shares."

PARALLELISM IN PARTY POLITICS.

There is always a certain amount of fascination in measuring our own progress by that of others, whether in political growth or any other; and the element of provincialism which as a people we have never outgrown in America leads us, perhaps, to be more prone than other nations to such comparisons. Of late years there has been a strong tendency among students of political life to determine just where we do stand, by an examination of the landmarks set in other climes and often under such totally varying conditions that the resemblance can at best be said to be fanciful. Most natural of all is the attempt to find common springs of action among that closely allied branch of the so-called Anglo-Saxon race which composes the government of Great Britain, an attempt for which more excuse than usual exists in the partly accidental coincidence of fundamental causes

to which British and American politics have been subject during the generation that is now on the scene of action in both countries.

Under the influence of these causes, the conclusion is often jumped at just now that the British Liberals have always been substantially identical with American Democrats, and governed by the same general impulses and tending in the same direction, which the conservative school of thought confidently predicts is now in the line of a rapid extinction of Liberalism, the broad principle taken as embodied by the respective parties in the two nations. A conspicuous instance of this reasoning appeared in a recent clever article in the Atlantic, which argued that Liberalism has passed through the cycle of natural law from beginning to decay, and is now doomed to disappear and be succeeded by a strenuous triumph of the imperialism of the day; which by a queer inversion of ideas and in defiance of all the patent facts of its genesis and nature is expected to bring about an equality of conditions on the denial of which it is essentially based; the secret to this contradictory conclusion lying in the half-concealed socialistic convictions of the author, which lead him to look for material gain to individuals only through their subjection to some powerful organization that can work out for them benefits which they are unable otherwise to obtain.

If indeed it is true that the work of Liberalism is over, it is a sad thing for civilization; for it is liberalism in one form or another which has been the motive force of all civilization, and progress without liberalism would be a contradiction of terms. That, so far as the forms of government are concerned, no great further advance is to be looked for is perhaps true; yet it is a law of nature that nothing can stand still, and that if we do not move forward we must more or less gradually fall back. The progress of the future must doubtless be more on economic than on purely political lines; and it is on such lines that British Liberalism has slowly evolved from the whiggism of Palmerston which was concerned chiefly with completing the work of securing political liberty

that had begun with the overthrow of the Stuarts, to the radicalism of Morley which is groping out toward the establishment of economic equality. For what we know as imperialism is at bottom an effort to intensify the inequality which already exists, by extending the power of the wealthy minority to whom the fruits of imperialism invariably accrue. As we glance back over British history of the past century, we can see how steadily the current of liberalism has set toward improving the condition of the masses of men, first as to political and then as to economic essentials. Steadily, in spite of its setbacks, and in the face of these, it is not hard to dream of the spirit of Gladstone, which in its experience has overlapped part of both the earlier and the later period, refreshing itself with the exhortation sung by our own poet:

Let us then be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate,
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait.

With us the change from political to economic issues really began when the marvelous development took place of our natural resources that occurred in the late sixties. The opening up then of our coal and oil fields and forests, of gold and silver and iron and copper mines, first gave to some men a power of commanding the labor of others which has gone on since with ever cumulating force, until now as a nation we are enormously richer, while as individuals the vast majority of us are really poorer. Not that there has been any great increase of "saved capital," as is so often gratuitously assumed. To quote once more from Longfellow:

Nothing that is can pause or stay,

What now is bud must soon be leaf,
What now is leaf will soon decay.

For Nature's law prescribes that all things are constantly going through a process of transmutation; and our most permanent works begin to pass away as soon as created, while the great mass of our products have a life that is scarcely more than ephemeral. It is an old truism that mankind lives from hand to mouth, and if all men were suddenly to cease working, it would be startling to see how quickly they would starve. We do not store or

save capital, but we do store knowledge, and most effectively of all the knowledge of how to make other men work for our benefit; and when a few men, comparatively, laid hold of and opened up the sources from which new comforts and luxuries could be derived by human labor, new problems sprang into existence as to how these were to be distributed, or, rather, whether that power of the community which we style government was to be exercised in the direction of protecting the few in the chief usufruct of the sources of wealth or of making it easier for the many to gain access to them, on which to exert their labor for their own benefit. What with us has been of sudden growth, has been with our British cousins a long existing condition, this control of the sources of wealth by the few at the expense of the many; so long existing, in fact, that its beginning might be said to be prehistoric. Yet so much more palpable to the average mind is political oppression, that it was not until Englishmen attained in a substantial degree their political freedom, after centuries of painful effort, that they have seemed to think of bending their energies toward securing a greater measure of economic freedom. Or rather, perhaps, it was the end most easily accomplished which was first secured and it was in that fight that the weapons had to be won to wage the other. But, whatever the cause of sequence, certain it is that since parliamentary government was finally won, the nature of the contest between liberalism and entrenched privilege in Great Britain has changed to a striving for increased commercial and industrial liberty, in which material advances have been made, and to which purely political reforms have been for the most part incidental.

When we turn from a study of British Liberalism to a glance at the progress of the same spirit in this country, it is a far less consistent development that we discern, up to the immediate present at all events. The history of our organic politics thus far is a kaleidoscopic one, in which certain parties have risen and disappeared in the execution of specific tasks, while op-

posed to them has remained one persistent conservative force, rallied under the title of Democracy. It is partly the incident of nomenclature that has resulted in this condition, partly the accident of political as distinct from economic conditions, which have led our domestic evolution into channels where the flood tides of liberalism and the ebb tides of reaction were not really felt. It is by no means always, indeed, that it is the mass of people, the "demos," which is truly liberal, especially in the cruder stages of society. When these prevail and the myriad shades of middle classes are lacking, it is oftener that the richest and the poorest stand together to resist progress; and so it was for the most part in the earlier chapters of our political history. Except for the spirit of Jefferson's influence, most of what was vivifying in American political life came from the party for the time being against which the Democratic party stood aligned; and great as Jefferson was, the impression that he made in his own generation was but a transitory one, destined to pass on and bear its true fruit long after he was dead. He spoke great truths, of permanent significance; but men only half absorbed them, and except so far as they followed his personal leadership were not governed by them; for in his day, our politics were in a formative condition, dealing only with temporary emergencies and issues that had to be disposed of before permanent tendencies could be established. Thus arose the Federal and Whig and Republican parties, each to perform a specific work in turn, with the Democratic masses in steady opposition to the work of each, and to die in turn while the Democratic opposition lived on; for the Republican party of Lincoln is as dead to-day as the other organizations of progress which preceded it.

To-day the conditions are changed, and, with the differentiation of classes similar to that of other and older nations, that has grown up with us as the nation also grew older, seems to have come a more crystallized alignment of parties, based on liberalism as against conservative paternalism. State socialism and paternalism are only different names for the same thing, the rule of the few who are stronger over

the many who are individually weaker; and whether their strength is first derived through force of arms, as in the medieval period, through the power of wealth as in our commercial times, or through the ability to control political organization as in the hope of Marx and Gronland, the effect is the same. Because the later socialism aims also at equality, it is a common mistake to compare democracy with socialism; but in reality with us, thus far at least, it is the forces that have worked against democracy which have been socialistic.

The Republican party has always been socialistic in its tendency, except so far as the great work of abolishing slavery was concerned; and some of the motive impulse to that work even was socialistic in its origin, being born of the desire on the part of a conscience of a higher grade to regulate other men actuated by a lower grade of conscience. The tariff legislation which has been the chief purpose of Republican party energy for a generation past has had the state socialism spirit pure and simple; and even the distinction which is sometimes drawn between this and socialism, that one is in the interest of a favored class and the other for the mutual benefit of the entire community, cannot be taken as a real one, in considering the principles involved; since protectionism has always been advocated on the ostensible ground—and in great part honestly, however mistakenly—that it was for the benefit of the whole people and not a few only, that government was led to step in with artificial restrictions upon industry. As to the imperialism which has now become a prime article in the creed of the Republican party, its origin from and relation to the paternal government which is the very essence of state socialism, would seem to be hardly disputable.

On the other hand, all genuine movement on the part of the newer Democracy has been in the direction of effort for greater freedom of the individual from "needless fetters imposed by the state," which Mr. Cozzani in the Atlantic article mentioned above implies might be one of the fruits of state socialism, although such fetters are in reality one of the primary conditions of socialism and

justified even by avowed socialists only by the claim that they would bring compensation in other ways; together with effort for the greater equality of opportunity which undoubtedly is desirable. True it is that the financial programme on which the Democracy has been so disastrously defeated in the two latest presidential elections, was itself socialistic in its essence, because it aimed to create a system of currency with an arbitrary basis of value. But there is every reason to believe that most of the ardent silver men failed to see the question from this standpoint, and thought rather that they were trying to restore an equilibrium that had been disturbed by what they considered as paternal legislation in behalf of the gold standard; and it is certain that Democratic leaders like Tom L. Johnson are anti-socialistic from every point of view, their advocacy of government ownership being limited absolutely to kinds of industry that are monopolistic by nature, and the only choice as to which therefore must be as between a public and a private monopoly.

Working along these lines, the Republican party has assumed a really closer parallelism to the historic Tory party of Great Britain than has ever been shown by any of our political organizations previously; evidenced, too, by the sympathy which it now openly avows for the toryism for which Chamberlain most conspicuously stands to-day. While the Democratic party, really changing front and at the same time to a considerable extent changing its personnel, has assumed much the same attitude as that held by the British Liberals toward such questions as have begun to present a more or less identical international significance. The truth would seem to be that our political and social evolution having been more rapid than that of our kin across the sea, we have yet just reached the status which has existed with them for some time back. For a century past, indeed, it has been social and economic questions, rather than purely political ones, which have occupied their attention, while with us the reverse has been the case up to the present generation. It is for this reason,

doubtless, that while their parties have been gradually modified and remolded so that their character has been utterly changed and yet their organic continuity maintained, new parties with us have risen and died and been recreated to embody the new issues as they arose; whereas now that we have a condition beginning to exist here that has long been seen abroad, we find in the Democratic ranks the same class of minds and to some extent the same individuals who founded the Republican party 45 years ago, the change having come about almost imperceptibly and without disturbing the organic continuity of the party, although its doctrine and its personnel have both been so thoroughly modified—just as the British Liberals have been evolved from a chrysalis of a hundred years ago that would be considered somewhat retrograde by the British Conservative of to-day. Until the past decade or two, it was always the Democratic party which stood for the conservation of existing institutions, and held itself in solid array against the new propositions brought forward by the Federalists, the Whigs and the Republicans; but now the positions are reversed and it is from the Democratic side that the fresh impulses are coming, with the not unnatural concomitant that until these have gained sufficient force, its ranks are disorganized and weakened, while the new aligning goes on. In this position they have just placed themselves on the same side of such questions as are international in their relations with the British Liberals; but up to the time that this transforming came about, it would be a great mistake to consider the two organizations as in any sense parallel.

Judging from the past, it is not unnatural that the prediction should be frequently made that our political organizations are on the eve of fresh dissolutions and reformations; but now that we have reached a parallelism with British parties which did not before exist, it is really their experience to which we should look for the basis of prediction. That experience would seem to point to a maintained continuity of organization that by no means implies a persistence of issues

or even of the same class of issues; nor yet a true continuity of personnel—the absorption by the liberal side of new thought and the minds in which new thought is awakened taking the place of the creation of new party organizations. The history of our own politics for the past generation and particularly of the Democratic party, would seem to indicate that we have reached this stage and that the lines of our political progress for the future must be entirely different from those of the more distant past; and that American like British liberalism will fit itself to take up the tasks which it must meet, by gradual modification through infusion of new blood expressing itself in new creeds. What those tasks will be is already beginning to be unfolded, and it is only one of the phases of the pending struggle that we must face the question whether the strong arm of government is to be invoked for the purpose of aiding the few to extend abroad in colonies their power to command the labor of others, or whether we are to confine our communal forces to the simple duty of protecting each citizen from the aggressions of either his fellow citizens or of foreigners, and leave all a free field and no favors. * * *

NEWS

Definite public action was taken in the United States this week to secure the neutrality of this nation, now being violated, with reference to the war in South Africa. The movement was set on foot on the 12th at a business meeting of the Chicago Branch of the American Transvaal league, held at Masonic Temple, Chicago. From the evidence presented at that meeting it appears that agents of the British army, stationed at New Orleans, have for a long time been buying mules and horses at that port for belligerent uses in South Africa; that they have shipped these animals upon British transports at the port of New Orleans to other agents of the British army, in South Africa; and that upon the arrival of the animals at South African ports they have been sent directly to the seat of war. This, it was argued at the meeting, is not commercial trading, but is a use by the British of American ports and waters for the renewal and augmentation of military

supplies, which, under the treaty of Washington of 1871, constitutes a breach of neutrality calling for preventive action by the American government. In support of that contention a brief, approved by prominent Chicago lawyers, was made the basis of a petition to President Roosevelt, which is now being circulated throughout the country for signatures. The petition urges the president—

to at once insist upon a strict enforcement of Article vi of the treaty of May 8, 1871, between the United States and Great Britain, and prohibit the further exportation of horses and mules from the harbors of the United States for use against the Boers of South Africa.

The brief which accompanies the foregoing petition quotes from the treaty of Washington the following clauses:

A neutral government is bound . . . Secondly, not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms, or the recruitment of men. Thirdly, to exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters, and as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties.

An explanation, also, is made in the brief, of a legal decision in a federal court which refused last Spring to issue an injunction, at the suit of private parties, against the action of the belligerent British army agents at New Orleans. The decision in that case held nothing further than that the enforcement of the neutrality defined by the treaty of Washington is not a judicial function but is the function of the executive department of the government—in other words, of the president. It is quite in accordance with this decision, therefore, that the petition described above has been prepared and is to be presented to Mr. Roosevelt.

From the seat of the war there is no news of interest or importance except a report of the 13th from Lord Kitchener that Gen. Bruce-Hamilton had almost captured Gen. Botha. Gen. Hamilton heard of a concentration of Boers at Knapdar, but when he arrived at the spot they were already three miles away. He chased them until his horses gave out, capturing 32 and some ammunition; but Gen.

Botha, who led the retreating column, was not among the prisoners. An official report of less moment tells of the surprise of a Boer camp and the capture of 42 prisoners, including Maj. Wolmarans.

British politics, now at an exciting point owing to the reassembling of parliament on the 16th, oscillates about the Boer war issue. The British people supposed the war to have been victoriously ended fifteen months ago, and the awakening has been rude, the more especially as slow enlistments are prophetic of conscription and heavy expenses demand drastic taxation. The Liberal party, therefore, is much more vigorous than at any time since the war began. As noted in these columns at the time (p. 584), Lord Rosebery returned to politics with a speech at Chesterfield on the 16th of December, in which, while advocating the prosecution of the war, he urged recognition of Kruger and consideration of proposals for peace if offered by the Boers. The speech created a widespread impression that Lord Rosebery's policy was self-contradictory and designed to give shape to a new party; and when the London Liberal association met on the 13th of the present month, a letter from Lord Rosebery, regretting his inability to attend but expressing the hope that the meeting would second his own efforts to secure a common sense Liberal policy, was hooted and hissed. But it was also cheered, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal leader, explained that he regarded the points of difference between himself and Lord Rosebery as immaterial and welcomed Rosebery's cooperation. To the same effect was a speech by James Bryce at Aberdeen on the 9th. There seems, therefore, to be a strong probability of a union of the Liberal factions in parliament upon a demand that proposals of peace from the Boers be considered. As the ministry has refused to consider anything but unconditional surrender, and as there is evidently an increasing opposition among the British people to waging such a war as this, a union of the Liberals upon that one point will not unlikely put the ministry in an embarrassing situation. It may possibly result in an honorable peace.

In American politics the event which has excited most interest, though of little importance in itself, is the withdrawal of Richard Croker

from the leadership of Tammany Hall, the regular Democratic organization of New York city. The place of leadership in that organization is the chairmanship of the finance committee. This place has been held for several years by Mr. Croker, but on the 11th, the chairman of the general committee, ex-Judge George M. Van Hoesen, announced, in making up the different subsidiary committees, that Mr. Croker had declined to serve further as chairman of the finance committee, and that upon Mr. Croker's suggestion he had appointed to that place Mr. Lewis Nixon. Mr. Nixon is an honor graduate of the naval academy, who came into general notice as the designer of the battleships Oregon, Indiana and Massachusetts. He was born in Maryland about 40 years ago and has lived in New York seven years.

Three states have elected United States senators. For Maryland, Arthur Pue Gorman, Democrat, was elected on the 15th in joint session of the legislature by the vote of 68 to 52 for William H. Jackson, Republican. Senator Gorman's nomination had been made (p. 634) in the Democratic caucus of the legislature on the 8th. Also on the 15th James B. McCreary, Democrat, was elected for Kentucky by the vote, in joint session, of 97 to 35 for Senator De Boe, Republican. On the same day the legislature of Ohio, in joint session, elected Joseph B. Foraker, Republican, by 87 to 53 for Charles W. Baker, Democrat. Republican nominations for the long and the short term senatorships for Iowa, equivalent to election, were made in caucus on the 14th, William B. Allison being nominated for the long term and Jonathan P. Dolliver for the short one.

The debate over the Isthmian canal bill. Nicaraguan route, in progress in the lower house of congress as our last week's issue went to press, was concluded on the 9th, when the bill was passed by the vote of 309 to 2. On a test vote upon an amendment it appeared that the Panama route had large support, and the overwhelming vote noted above was secured with the understanding that if the Senate decides in favor of Panama the Nicaraguan majority in the House will acquiesce. As it passed the House, this bill authorizes the president to secure from the states of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, in behalf of the United States, control of such portion of the territory of those states as may be

necessary for the construction of a canal suitable to the wants of modern navigation and commerce, and appropriates such sums as may be necessary to secure the control of the territory. It further authorizes the president, after securing control of the needed territory, to direct the secretary of war to construct the canal from the Caribbean sea, at a point near Greytown, in Nicaragua, by way of Lake Nicaragua, to a point on the Pacific ocean near Brito, and also to construct proper harbors at the termini of the canal, and to make necessary provisions for the defense of the canal and harbors. Authority is also given the president to make such surveys as may be necessary and to employ such persons in constructing the canal as may seem wise to him, and directs that in the construction of the canal the river San Juan and lake Nicaragua shall be used as far as they are available. The president is to guarantee to the states of Costa Rica and Nicaragua the use of the canal and harbors, upon terms to be agreed upon, for all vessels owned by those states or their citizens. Finally, an immediate appropriation of \$10,000,000 is made to carry on the work, and the secretary of war is authorized to enter into contracts for material and work, such work and material to be paid for as appropriations may be made from time to time, the aggregate cost being fixed at \$180,000,000. The bill went up to the Senate on the 13th, and was immediately referred to the Senate committee on interoceanic canals.

Representative Cooper's bill for permanent civil government in the Philippines (p. 632) came before the House committee on insular affairs on the 9th, and was referred by that committee to a sub-committee composed of Representatives Cooper, Moody, Crumpacker and Hamilton (Republicans), and Jones and Henry (Democrats).

From the Philippine islands it is reported that two of Gen. Malvar's principal supporters in Batangas province, Luzon, have surrendered to Gen. Bell, of the American army, and that they have been granted an armistice of five days for the purpose of enabling them to concentrate and surrender 160 Filipino troops with their arms. American successes of another kind are reported from the same province, Cols. Wint and Wells having "destroyed a large number of

barracks and hamlets and enough rations to keep 20,000 Filipinos for six months," without a single American casualty during the entire expedition. The Filipinos are described as fleeing before the Americans, while "many of them were killed and several surrendered."

A petition regarding Filipino leaders has been forwarded from Boston to congress, by the Anti-Imperialist league. It asks that a hearing be given by that body to Mabini and Aguinaldo. In the same general spirit Senator Hoar introduced a resolution in the Senate on the 13th, providing for the appointment of a committee of seven senators to examine into the conduct of the war in the Philippines, the administration of the government there and the condition and character of the inhabitants of the archipelago, the committee to have power to send for papers and persons, to administer oaths and to sit during the sessions of the senate. On the 14th Mr. Hoar spoke at length upon his resolution. Senator Lodge opposed it, urging that the matter be referred to the Philippines committee. No disposition of the resolution has yet been made.

A new phase of the memorable legal fight (p. 533) of the Chicago school teachers to compel the traction companies of this city to pay their taxes, has developed. The Federation of Teachers, under the leadership of Catharine Goggin and Margaret A. Haley, began this litigation because the deficiency in public revenues was a constant menace to the public schools. In investigating the reason for the annual complaints of shortness of funds, the teachers discovered that the traction companies were evading taxation on enormous franchise values, and after a litigation covering two years they won their case before the supreme court of the state, and the board of equalization accordingly assessed the Chicago traction companies at an amount (p. 534) that would yield an increase in taxes from them for 1900 of over \$2,000,000. But the companies still hold the taxing authorities at arm's length, and the school authorities announce the probable necessity of either cutting down teachers' salaries or closing the schools. In consequence of that announcement, the Teachers' Federation held a meeting at Masonic Temple on the 11th, which, after listening to Miss Haley, adopted an ad-

dress to "the parents, taxpayers and citizens of Chicago," saying:

The schools of Chicago are to be closed—the children are to be turned into the streets. Do you know why? Because the street railway and other companies refuse to pay this city the taxes that they owe on their franchises. The supreme court of Illinois says they owe these taxes. The state board of equalization, acting under the order of the supreme court, made the assessment on these franchises for one of the omitted years—1900. The corporations have applied to the federal courts to stop the collection of this tax, amounting to over \$2,000,000. These street railway companies, at the same time, are asking for renewal of these immensely valuable franchises from the city council. There is every indication that they will succeed in getting them. Do you not think these railway companies ought to pay what they owe before the city of Chicago considers the matter of granting them leases?

Accompanying this address the teachers are sending out for signatures a petition addressed to the city council. After a recital of the facts, it is as follows:

The undersigned protest against the renewal of any franchises to any of the present street railway companies, and petition that the city of Chicago do not treat with the said corporations until they have paid the taxes for which they are in arrears to the city.

At the same meeting the teachers adopted resolutions reciting the shortness of school funds, tracing the difficulty to apathy on the part of the public regarding the evasion of taxes, explaining their own work and its success in the courts, and resolving—

First, that the inconvenience of insufficient revenue should not be borne chiefly by us, who have done all that has been done to avert the situation that now exists; second, that in the alternative of closing the schools or cutting the teachers' salaries the schools should be closed, as that is obviously the only way in which the public can be brought to a proper sense of the alarming condition that now exists; third, that a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the city council and the board of education.

NEWS NOTES.

—Gov. Nash, of Ohio, was formally inaugurated for the second time as governor of Ohio on the 13th.

—The Chicago Inter Ocean, formerly controlled by Charles T. Yerkes,

has been bought by George W. Hinman, its editor.

—The international league of Press clubs, in session at Charleston, S. C., on the 11th selected Boston for the next annual meeting.

—The Chinese emperor has issued an edict ordering the members of the Han-Lin Academy to study ancient and modern political science and the western arts.

—Gov. Van Sant has convened the Minnesota legislature in special session, to meet February 4, for the purpose of considering the tax bill framed by the state tax commission.

—Leslie M. Shaw and Henry C. Payne, appointed as secretary of the treasury and postmaster general, respectively (p. 634), by President Roosevelt on the 8th, were confirmed by the Senate on the 9th.

—President Roosevelt has appointed Gen. James H. Wilson, Capt. Charles E. Clark and Whitelaw Reid to represent the United States at the coronation of the king in London next June.

—The students of Albion college, Mich., in the department of economics, are undertaking a scientific investigation, having for its purpose the feasibility of the single tax theory, as presented by the late Henry George.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE ISTHMIAN CANAL.

Memphis Commercial Appeal (Dem.), Jan. 11.—We may look upon the Nicaragua canal as a certainty of the near future.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 16.—Senator Morgan is quite justified in saying that the promoters who are besieging congress now have the Panama canal on the bargain counter.

Northwestern Christian Advocate (Meth.), Jan. 16.—The interests involved are so great that congress can well afford to take a few months for further investigation before deciding which route to adopt.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Jan. 18.—"The estimated annual cost of maintaining and operating the Nicaragua canal is \$1,300,000 greater than the corresponding charges for the Panama canal." These are the very words of the Walker commission.

Chicago Journal (Rep.), Jan. 10.—The Hepburn bill has been jammed through the house and now goes to the senate where it will probably be treated with the contempt it deserves. At all events when it emerges from that body its own parent will not know it.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Jan. 10.—Although the action of the House was without partisanship, and supposedly reflected public sentiment, its propriety may fairly be questioned if it is true that the Panama route is the better and would be the cheaper.

East Oregonian (Dem.), Jan. 10.—It is quite well established that the Nicaraguan route is the better, better than the Panama. The transcontinental railroads are hostile to any canal legislation. They have been the means of former defeats. They are still hostile.

San Francisco Chronicle (Ind.), Jan. 11.—The bill goes to the Senate in good shape. . . . The Panama diversion is of recent

date and is the result of the efforts of the Panama people to sell their works, re-enforced by the interests which hope to defeat or postpone the building of any canal.

Southern Mercury, Dallas, Tex. (Ind.), Jan. 9.—The bill is in the interest of all the people. But opposed to it are the transcontinental railroads and their connections, with other lines, and also their Atlantic and Pacific transportation trust. Never before was such a powerful lobby organized against any one bill.

Seattle Post-Intelligencer (Rep.), Jan. 11.—The Walker commission. . . . favored the Nicaragua route solely because they considered the amount of \$109,000,000 to be paid for the Panama concession entirely too large; an argument which has disappeared with a reduction of the price to \$40,000,000.

Buffalo Commercial (Rep.), Jan. 10.—During the brief and perfunctory debate on a measure that may cost the United States hundreds of millions of dollars many speakers criticized various objectionable features in the bill, but justified acquiescence on the ground that the Senate would correct these defects.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Jan. 14.—Panama is impossible from every viewpoint of trade interest, statesmanship, and decency, and the people know it. They also are beginning to understand that those who persist in advocating Panama are either utterly ignorant, more or less venal, or else opposed to any canal because it will act as a regulator of railway rates.

Los Angeles Times (Rep.), Jan. 11.—In taking this action the House of Representatives has reflected the wishes and the will of a vast majority of the American people and has performed a manifest duty. . . . The Senate could not do better, nor perform a more popular act, than to pass the Hepburn bill, entire and without amendment, as it reaches that body from the House.

New York Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 13.—Among the considerations which should influence the choice between the Panama and Nicaragua canal routes their relative healthfulness certainly deserves a place. . . . Both General Abbott [in "The Engineering Magazine"], and Dr. George A. Soper [in "the Medical News"], are satisfied that the situation at Panama is superior.

New Orleans Picayune (Dem.), Jan. 10.—It is impossible to see how, in the face of so strong a display of the popular wish, the Senate can hold out against the measure when it comes before it. . . . Everybody clearly understands that the Panama scheme has been put forward merely to gain time, and, if possible, defeat all canal legislation in the interests of the transcontinental railroads.

Baltimore American (Rep.), Jan. 14.—The absurdity of the attempt of the Nicaragua Canal company's agents in congress to make a bogey out of the concessions at Panama, is shown by the fact that that company has no concessions itself, and has not had for several years. In reality it has nothing—no route, no tools, no surveys—that would be of the slightest use to the government. Yet in Senator Morgan's bill provision is made to reimburse it at an extraordinary rate. This is the milk in the cocoanut.

Kansas City (Mo.) Star (Ind.), Jan. 10.—The debate was brief and disappointing. It furnished the country with no adequate reason for the choice made. The nation does not care which route is adopted so long as it is, all things considered, the more feasible of the two. But it is entitled to know the grounds for the selection. . . . The bill has now gone to the Senate. It would be quite proper for that body to incorporate the amendment leaving the choice of route to the president, under the advice of the Isthmian commission.

Pittsburgh Post (Dem.), Jan. 12.—Irrespective of the battle over routes there is no need of rushing the canal enterprise without the most thorough and complete information in the hands of the deciding authority; no matter whether the decision is to come from the president and the commission or be determined by a vote in congress. The country wants the canal, but wants it by the best and cheapest route. The weight of authority is that the Panama line now meets these conditions. Further investigation may favor the Nicaragua.

Atlanta Constitution (Dem.), Jan. 8.—The transcontinental railroads have a selfish interest in dividing the supporters of canal construction into contending camps of partisans for the Nicaragua route upon the one part and the Panama route upon the other. . . . It would be better, in our view, for congress to wash its hands of the route question altogether. Rather than delay definite action of some kind, devolve the duty of considering, comparing and choosing the route upon a commission, of which the president might properly be head, or, in any event, the deciding factor.

Detroit Free Press (Ind.), Jan. 11.—The . . . offer made by the Panama company . . . was listened to by few and heeded by a minority that counted but 2 in a total of 312 votes. No sensible man believes for a moment that these comparative figures represent the actual sentiment of the House towards the question at issue. It is only another of those abnegations of duty that is bringing the popular branch into discredit. "Let the senate do the deliberating," has become its motto. . . . The superior claims of the Panama route, if an unclouded title can be had, are almost universally conceded. Shorter, better, cheaper, healthier and two years less work to be done—this does not cover all its superior claims. . . . Ordinary business foresight would at least have vested a discretionary power in the president.

BRITISH POLITICS.

The Speaker (Lib.), Jan. 4.—Can it be true that Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey mean to break away from the leader of the Opposition? That is the real question behind all the controversies and speculations which are in the air about the Liberal party. . . . Although Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, and Sir Henry Fowler not only refused to associate themselves with his protest, but took sides openly with the Government, the Liberal leader was able to compel the Government to reform the camps, and a strong, alert opposition had grown up in the country. . . . This was how matters stood when Lord Rosebery went to Chesterfield and made a speech in which everyone found something to welcome and everyone found something to condemn. It was not, as we remarked at the time, a Liberal speech, but an assortment of miscellaneous views. . . . But there was this important fact about the speech. Lord Rosebery, . . . suggested a "passive policy of peace," and Liberals who disagreed with Lord Rosebery about the origin of the war accepted with alacrity his reinforcement of their argument that the war must be ended by a treaty. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, it is understood, welcomed Lord Rosebery's cooperation, and all that was helpful to peace in the Chesterfield speech was generously acknowledged by men who had ceased to cherish any faith in the speaker's Liberalism. But Lord Rosebery has replied to all this that he cannot cooperate with the Liberal party. He will criticize the Government, but not from the ranks of the party he has left. He will set himself to create a new party, which is to supersede the Liberal party, with a programme of its own. . . . We do not blame or praise Lord Rosebery for refusing to work with the Liberal party. . . . He has throughout associated himself with the war policy; he was the first

to appeal to the sentiment of national revenge by his allusion to Majuba; he looks at the empire in a spirit which is a continual menace to peace, and he is not opposed to conscription. No one knows but himself what are his precise views on domestic questions. He is in favor of housing reform, but he never says a word about the rating of land. His opinions on Ireland have changed, not because the local government act has altered the groundwork of action, but because Irish members have said offensive things about the war. Knowing his own views, he decides that they make it impossible for him to work with the Liberal party. . . . If Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey respond to Lord Rosebery's appeal for "spade-work," they are definitely leaving the Liberal trenches to throw up trenches for a new party. It is a grave situation.

WM. J. BRYAN.

Boston Post (Dem.), Jan. 11.—A most pleasing impression is created by the visit of the Hon. William J. Bryan to New England. . . . The public, which has known him heretofore as a fiery party orator, blazing like a meteor through a hot campaign, now makes the acquaintance of an amiable philosopher and high-thinking citizen of the republic who teaches the civic virtues in fascinating discourse. . . . Mr. Bryan is making a good many new friends hereabouts, who don't care a fig for his politics.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 30.—One of the best authorities on taxation in the city—an assessor who has made a close investigation of the facts—is responsible for the statement that the homes of the people are assessed on the average at 66 2-3 per cent. of their value while the vacant lots on the average are assessed at only 16½ of their value. It is thus that the honest assessor contributes to the house famine which has so long prevailed in this city.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.), Jan. 11.—Mr. Bryan was in splendid form at Holyoke last evening, holding with ease the close attention of a large audience for two solid hours. The address contained much wholesome doctrine. . . . When in normal state, Mr. Bryan's vocal organ is a superb instrument of speech, and the orator is rarely gifted by nature who combines voice and physical presence as he does. . . . Those who heard him last evening could scarcely avoid the feeling that Mr. Bryan is likely to remain in some form a considerable force among that portion of the American people who have adhered to the Democratic party. One feature of the address was the reference to Mayor Tom Johnson, of Cleveland, O. The audience at once applauded the name and Mr. Bryan was quick to show his pleasure at the incident, adding, too, that people are likely to hear more of Mr. Johnson in the future.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Jan. 10.—There is just enough of an appearance of design in the department's ruling to arouse deep feeling and resentment in radical circles. The socialist papers are naturally making the most of what they declare to be a government persecution.

San Francisco Star (Dem.), Jan. 11.—This latest statement of the third assistant postmaster general can mean nothing less than the assumption of a right to deal with publishers individually, without reference to general rulings and without the creation of precedents for future cases. That is not government according to law, but according to the caprice of Mr. Madden.

Cleveland Citizen (Sec.), Jan. 11.—Side by side in a daily paper we find two suggestive announcements. The first is to the effect that President Roosevelt indorses Madden's policy of suppressing radical newspapers. The second is a cable from Helsingfors, Finland, stating that by order of the czar three papers have been suppressed

and seven temporarily suspended for hinting at freedom from Russian oppression.

Free Society (An.), Jan. 12.—Mr. Madden, who, to some extent, is running our socialistic postal system, announces that he has not excluded from the mails any publication on account of its politics, or the ideas advocated by it, and points out the fact that he recently admitted Free Society to the second-class rate, by reason of its showing a paid-in-advance subscription list. Mr. Madden appears to be a real nice man, and Free Society is deeply pained at the rumpus those naughty socialist disturbers are making over his rulings.

THE MONEY QUESTION.

Windle's Gatling Gun (Dem.), Jan.—The silver issue may be shelved for the present, but the demand for a central bank, that will place the government and the business of the country at the mercy of a few Wall street sharks, shows that the money question is still very much alive.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Jan. 10.—The money and currency questions cannot be considered as settled when there is a strong interest headed by the secretary of the treasury advocating a great change in the national banking system, and urging something like a return to the old United States banking system, as well as a change in the security basis of the national banks from government bonds to one of bank assets.

The Commoner (Dem.), Jan. 4.—For the benefit of those who have talked so much about the money question being dead, The Commoner calls attention to the fact that in accordance with the plans of the bankers, bills have already been introduced into congress providing for the gold redemption of silver dollars and for an asset currency. The object of the former is to start a new endless chain which will give the financiers an excuse for demanding the retirement of the legal tender silver dollars. The asset currency measure provides for the issue of guaranteed bank notes by national banks. . . . It ought not to be necessary to point out that this new currency not only gives great advantage to the banks, but also impairs the security of depositors.

OHIO POLITICS.

Dubuue Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Jan. 10.—Gov. Nash's message to the Ohio legislature is a confession that Tom Johnson's tax reform theories are rapidly increasing in popularity, and an admission of fear that unless they do something to distribute the burdens of taxation more equitably the Republicans will lose the state. . . . As a tax reformer Johnson is rendering a greater service to his state and the country than any other man of his time.

Columbus Press (Dem.), Jan. 7.—He [Gov. Nash] has a dimly defined notion that, by adopting home rule in taxation for the counties and shifting burdens to state corporations in general, the tax levy can be entirely abolished. But he leaves the "how" of all this great problem to the legislature, making no recommendation whatever that can furnish a clew to its just and equitable solution. He points mutely to a bill which has been drafted on this topic, forgetting to add that this bill is as artful a dodger of the real issues involved as his message. He ignores all distinction between private and public service corporations—the whole meat of the tax controversy—and his silence. . . . admits the strength of Johnsonism and Democracy in the stand taken against corporations that are enriched by the public-service benefits they reap.

THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

Chicago Chronicle (Dem.), Jan. 16.—The war department is just now straining every nerve to persuade a subservient congress to throw down the bars in the Philippines to the corporator boomers and franchise hucksters on the pretense that the country cannot be developed except as monopoly rights and privileges are conferred upon

men of enterprise. The men of enterprise, of course, are favorites of the department.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Jan. 16.—It is unquestionably true that some investigation should be made into the charges that the government is suppressing the news and that the condition in the islands is much worse than the official reports would lead one to think. These charges cease to be mere idle gossip when they are taken up and seriously considered by such a man as Senator Hoar.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Jan. 15.—Some of the things he [Senator Hoar] would inquire into have ceased to interest the people, and can have no bearing on the proposed legislation. . . . But we all want to know the full and whole truth regarding the existing situation in the islands. The commission and General Chaffee have not agreed in their respective reports, and the contradictory news has been bewildering as well as disquieting. The Senate is entitled to get at the facts.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

New Age, London (Rad.), Dec. 26.—"The moment an offensive war was waged, from that moment America was lost beyond hope." So spoke Burke. In almost the same words have spoken and written the men who know best South Africa and the temper of the Boers.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), Jan. 7.—A suggestion of mediation in the South African difficulty by President Roosevelt might be met by a tender on the part of King Edward of the good offices of Great Britain to "bring about a speedy termination of the disastrous and unequal conflict" in the Philippines.

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. 35 of that publication.

Washington, Jan. 7-10, 1902.

Senate.

No business of general interest was done on the 7th, beyond the adoption of a resolution (p. 455) empowering the committee on interoceanic canals to inquire and report with reference to an agreement between railroads and steamships for the control of transportation and rates across the Isthmus of Panama. An agreement of this character was read by Senator Morgan and is printed at page 453 in full. The bills of general interest introduced were as follows: No. 2210, Hawaiian silver money (p. 448); 2256, Philippines (p. 449).

Only routine business was done on the 8th; and the only measure of general interest introduced was s. r. 33 (p. 473), regarding election of senators by the people.

No business of public interest was done on the 9th, and the senate adjourned to the 13th.

House.

On the 7th the House began the consideration, in committee of the whole, of house bill No. 3110, providing for the construction of a Nicaragua canal from Greytown, on the Caribbean sea, by way of Lake Nicaragua, to Brito, on the Pacific. The bill is presented in full at page 456. No further general business was done. The bills of general interest introduced were: No. 7325, civil government in the Philippines; 7326, bankruptcy; 7360, to incorporate clearing houses and regulate clearing house currency; 7364, leasing arid lands (p. 460); 8131, contempt of court; j. r., 105, thanks to Schley (p. 461).

Resuming on the 8th the consideration of the Nicaragua canal bill in committee of the whole, the House came to no conclusion, but fixed to-morrow at two o'clock to close the general debate. Mr. Parker, of New Jersey, proposed a substitute bill (printed in full at p. 488) allowing the president full discretion to obtain territory for the canal from any foreign state and to build the canal by any route from the Caribbean to the Pacific. Mr. Morrill, of Pennsylvania, proposed a similar substitute (printed in full at page 490), but which limited the

president's discretion to the Nicaragua or the Panama route.

On the 9th the House went at once into committee of the whole for the further consideration of the Nicaraguan canal bill. Mr. Shackelford, of Missouri, offered an amendment (printed at page 521) which is substantially the same as those offered yesterday by Parker and Morrell, and was by their consent offered as a substitute. It was rejected (p. 527) by 170 to 102; and, with an unimportant amendment in detail, the bill as originally proposed (p. 456) was agreed to and reported back to the House with the recommendation that it pass. A motion was thereupon made in the House to recommit the bill with instructions (p. 531) to report a substitute enabling the president to choose between the Nicaragua and the Panama route. A call for the yeas and nays on this motion was voted down viva voce by 206 to 40. The bill was then passed (p. 531)—309 to 2, with 44 not voting.

The census bill (House bill No. 196), making the present temporary census organization permanent, was taken up in committee of the whole on the 10th, and after consideration was reported back to the House (p. 563) with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the select committee on the census, with instructions to prepare and submit a substitute providing for a detailed organization of a permanent census bureau with a provision placing the employes within the classified service. The House adopted the recommendation. After enacting a bill (p. 563) giving to the widow of the late President McKinley the privilege of sending mail matter free of postage, it adjourned to the 13th.

MISCELLANY

STRIKE AT THE WRONG!

For The Public.

Ye who would lead your fellow men
To tread a newer, better road;
Who strive by deed, and tongue, and pen,
To lighten Labor's galling load;
Have courage! Scorn the idle jeers,
Nor deem your slightest effort vain;
The world shall in the after years
Pay tribute to each restless brain.

Mankind shall claim the truths ye teach,
And follow where your dreams have led.
The feet of Progress soon shall reach
The paths ye solitary tread.
Enlightenment shall sweep away
The Ignorance that cries you down;
Ye bring the world a brighter day,
And place new gems in Freedom's crown.

The world has suffered, patient, long,
Beneath the grinding soulless sway
Of unjust laws and social wrong;
These ills your light shall sweep away.
Your words of reason, flashing bright,
Shall set the tolling millions free;
Swing hard the ax of Truth and Right—
Strike at the wrong, where'er it be!

ROBERT T. WHITELAW.

PRO-BOER ECHOES FROM CLEVELAND.

A Pro-Boer mass meeting was held Sunday afternoon, Jan. 5, in the Grays' armory, Cleveland, under the auspices of the German Central Bund. The Hon. John J. Lentz, of Columbus, was the principal speaker of the occasion, and the Hon. William J. Bryan, and the Hon. Tom L. Johnson, who were present, were also called upon. The following extracts are taken from the report in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Jan. 6.

The war now being carried on should not be dignified with the name. It is murder and assassina-

tion. England knows it, the Boer feels it. For from centuries of ages past has come the note of warning that in Teuton blood the love of liberty can never be extinguished. Germans may die and do fighting in the cause, but with the steadfastness of purpose and the zeal of gods, they still retain that spark of liberty which has ever characterized them. Only when the last Boer lies a corpse upon the brown veldts of the republic will Britain have won.—Hon. J. J. Lentz.

A republic cannot perish anywhere in the world without injuring all republics. The cause of liberty is not limited by boundary lines, and a blow to it at one point is felt in all.

Sad will be that day, fallen will be the star of our destiny, if the time ever comes when struggling freemen feel that they cannot look upon the people of these states for sympathy.

I am glad that it has taken over 200,000 Englishmen to fight less than 25,000 Boers; glad that even yet they have been unable to conquer. It will furnish in times to come an incentive to other oppressed peoples, and stands as a proof that men still live who will fight for liberty.—Hon. W. J. Bryan.

My sympathies are always with the oppressed, and while I am in full sympathy with this meeting, I believe that such meetings should sympathize with the oppressed of every sort. For myself, I feel for the struggling classes of England who must bear the expense of this costly war. It is from their labor and their tears that the bills which the policy of extermination of the Boer must be paid.—Hon. T. L. Johnson.

"A CENTURY WITHOUT STRIKES."

An extract from a discourse delivered in the Vine street Congregational church, Cincinnati, January 5, by the pastor, Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow.

We are told that in the last 20 years strikes have cost labor and capital nearly \$400,000,000. This expenditure ought to be eliminated, since the nation gets no return for it but social animosities.

In the hope of bringing to an end this industrial strife 36 gentlemen of prominence have resolved themselves into a board of arbitration, which Senator Hanna, their chosen president, says is the greatest step ever taken in the direction of industrial peace.

Are the lion of monopoly and the lamb of labor actually going to lie

down together, or is there some treachery in the proposition of the lion to the lamb that they should get closer?

Capital has nothing to hope from this organization, and labor has nothing to fear. The only damage will be that done to the reputation of these gentlemen who have allowed their names to be identified with such a farcical and flippant treatment of the labor problem; and the only good that can come of it will be the certain demonstration of its futility.

Think of the sober brows getting together to devise ways and means of establishing industrial peace, while barring from their deliberations any consideration of "abstract labor questions," that is, of the economic causes of industrial war!

Who would listen to the advice of physicians who, having been invited in for consultation over a sick patient, should bind themselves to consider only the questions of remedy, and refrain from any abstract question as to the cause of the malady?

It is like the national conference of charity and corrections assembling professional philanthropists year after year to consider ways and means of dispensing charity, but tabooing any discussion as to the real causes of poverty.

The present century will be a century without strikes, but it will not be due to the efforts of the peacemakers. Arbitration boards are no novelty, yet strikes have proceeded in spite of them, and will do so as long as there is hope of accomplishing anything in that way. But as a weapon in the hand of labor the strike is doomed. Such defeats as that recently administered to the steel workers are showing workmen that the ballot is their only hope. The strike will be abandoned. But that will not mean an industrial truce. It will mean that by bitter experience labor has been forced to adopt more effective means of warfare.

Any law which will increase opportunities for the legitimate employment of capital must of necessity increase the opportunities and the rewards of labor.

When a federation of labor unions in Chicago recently determined to devote a regular meeting to the discussion of political measures looking toward the improvement of industrial conditions, they took a more radical step in the direction of industrial peace, and showed more insight into the nature of the problem, than did the wise men in New

THE PROPOSED PHILIPPINE TARIFF LAW.

The bill provides that the tariff law enacted by the United States Philippine commission on September 1, 1901, shall be and remain in full force and effect; that there shall be levied, collected and paid upon all articles imported into the United States from the Philippine archipelago the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries; that the duties and taxes collected in the Philippine archipelago in pursuance of this act, less the cost of collecting the same and the gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles imported from the Philippine archipelago and upon vessels coming therefrom, shall not be covered into the general fund of the treasury of the United States, but shall be held as a separate fund and paid into the treasury of the Philippine islands to be used and expended for the government and benefit of said islands.

Let every man who reads this bill sit down and think it out for himself. Think for himself and he will see how much profound wisdom it takes to be a congressman; he will see how much it will cost, when we try to subvert natural law. For man is a trading animal, and the Philippines may have a surplus of some things that our citizens may want to exchange for our surplus of other forms of wealth. Now the natural law would let both parties make the exchange without any fines or restrictions whatever.

But see what this "whim" of congress proposes to do. If it was not for the principle of the thing it would make us laugh it off as a joke. Yet it is a serious joke, and will force the citizens of the United States—proper—to pay a tariff tax on all goods they may buy of our Filipino subjects. Now the extra price we must pay on account of the tariff on goods imported from the Philippines does not go into the treasury of the United States at all but is sent over to the Philippines to be used in making good roads, building school houses, erecting bridges, paying high salaries and making other internal improvements. Just as if we had all the good roads, school houses, bridges and internal improvements we needed ourselves.

What would the people of Kansas say if a democratic legislature had the power and would pass a law forcing the citizens of Kansas to pay a 50 per cent. tariff tax on all goods imported into the state, and, instead of putting the money thus obtained from tariff taxes into the state treasury, send it back to the different states from which the goods came

on which the obnoxious tariff tax had been paid. Of course such a foolish act would be a pretty good thing for some of the people of other states, but would it not be a little rough on the citizens of Kansas?

The Philippine tariff bill about to pass congress is of this kind; it will be a pretty good thing for some of the people in the Philippines, and a little hard on us fellows living on this side who must work a little harder to get Philippine tariff-taxed goods. And who will it benefit in the Philippines? The man who has only his labor to sell? Will it enable such as he to get a living any easier? Not at all. If it did we might feel that the extra price we were forced to pay did some good, by making it easier for the "poor" Filipino to get a living. But such will not be the case by any means.

All the money, let it be much or little, paid by citizens of the United States on goods imported from the Philippines, the amount being sent to those islands to be expended on internal improvements, the benefit, all the benefit, will accrue to the friars and other land monopolist owners of franchises to be granted and other special privileged classes. That is the natural law. True everywhere. The more money we are forced to send to the islands the more valuable will be the Philippine monopolies and other special privileges that under a just government should bear the burdens of state. It will be robbing the many in the United States—proper—for the benefit of a few men in the Philippines.—R T. Snediker, in Kansas City World.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

AT A SESSION OF THE BOARD OF PARDONS.

Quite a few of the applicants sought to gain favor by announcing to the mayor that they had voted for him. Mr. Johnson was manifestly displeased at this, and showed an inclination to return the men to prison at once.

One of the first applications to be considered was that of Eli Dennis, better known as "Frenchy," the little old man who was the proprietor of the numerous Canal street hovels which have recently been torn down by the building inspector. He was arrested on Thanksgiving day for having purchased ten cents' worth of stolen coal, and received a sentence of \$25, costs, and 30 days. "Frenchy" was very nervous, and his utterance was extremely shaky. After asking him sev-

eral questions Mayor Johnson was about to grant the application, when "Frenchy" volunteered the information:

"I voted for you last spring, mayor," as if he thought that would surely decide matters in his favor.

"I am sorry you told me that," said Mayor Johnson, dropping the pen with which he was about to affix his signature to the pardon paper. "We never pardon men who voted for me.

At this point "Frenchy" became almost tearful in his supplication.

"If we let you out will you promise not to vote for me again?"

"Yes, your honor, indeed I'll promise that," stammered "Frenchy," amidst roars of laughter from the spectators.

"Then I guess we'll have to let you out," replied the mayor, signing the pardon.

One of the 374 John Smiths on the police records was an applicant for pardon. He had received a sentence of \$25, costs, and 30 days on a charge of petit larceny, it being charged that he had stolen some carpenter's tools from an unfinished barn.

"What's your real name?" asked the mayor.

"I'm the real John Smith," was the response.

Detective Rowlands here stated that the tool thief was a common variety of criminal, and a very despicable variety, inasmuch as he deprives workmen of the ability to earn their living. Mayor Johnson was inclined to agree with Rowlands. Seeing the tide was evidently turning against him, the real John Smith declared that he was one of the mayor's most enthusiastic supporters last spring.

"That settles it," said Mr. Johnson, "the pardon is not granted," and the real John Smith was led back behind the bars.—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Jan. 10.

SENATOR M'LAURIN'S NEW DOCTRINE.

For The Public.

That eminent Republican, Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, is credited with saying, at the recent annual dinner of the New York city chamber of commerce, that henceforth all political considerations, both at home and abroad, must be subordinated to the demands of trade.

We have so long listened to administration hypocrisy that we thank the senator for so much honesty. But the doctrine he announces is one whose principles, if applied to his private conduct, would be apt to land him in the penitentiary. For even the utilitarian idea that honesty is

the best policy will have to be rejected, as the senator knows that many a private fortune is gained by means that would not endure the test of day, much less of morality. But the senator also knows that transactions do not lose their moral character when we leave the domain of private life and enter that of national politics. He knows that, if there is any difference, the ethical obligation is more binding in public than in private life, on account of the greater numbers and interests involved.

But, if the senator's doctrine be new, its practice had been thoroughly initiated by the United States before he spoke.

The sincere and hearty welcome given by Porto Rico was rewarded by the subordination of the political consideration of "plain duty" to the demand for a tariff on the part of the commercial oligarchy which ran the McKinley administration.

The political consideration of Cuban independence, reaffirmed "to the letter" by the last Republican national convention, was subordinated to the demand of that oligarchy for the control of Cuba's foreign policy, and for interference in her domestic concerns.

The political consideration of our virtual pledge of independence to the Filipinos was subordinated to the demand of that oligarchy that the Philippines be seized under the form of a treaty and that the war be provoked by us for the purpose of subjugation or extermination.

And, if the Danish West Indies are ceded to us, against the well-known wishes of their inhabitants, the senator will doubtless be the first to proclaim that, if they have the impudence to object to being sold to a new master, all political considerations must be subordinated to "benevolent assimilation" at the cannon's mouth.

Of course the mere fact that we have already expended more money on the Philippine war than we are likely to gain in trade profit with the islands, or through them, for 200 years, is too trifling a consideration for a sound business man like Senator McLaurin, or for the present "sound business administration."

The policy advocated by the senator involves, too, a not unlikely abandonment of the Monroe doctrine, for if, in return for our permission of European encroachment in Central and South America, we may obtain any commercial advantage (which is

not at all impossible), it will of course be our duty to throw that doctrine overboard.

The senator distinctly advocates a policy which is utterly at variance with constitutional liberty, and which robs the United States of that peculiar honor which she enjoyed until recently as the bulwark of republicanism. He advocates a policy which measures the national honor by the extent to which we can exploit weaker peoples. He advocates the very policy against which his own forefathers rebelled in 1776—a policy through which Great Britain lost her national honor so long ago that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary,

Soften the senator's doctrine by whatever euphemism he may, it nevertheless remains a fact that his doctrine means nothing more or less than robbery and murder on a national scale.

It is suggested that the United States senate appoint a commission, of which the republican senator from South Carolina shall be chairman, to make a tour of the world and report as to those peoples (weaker than ourselves) with whom our trade may be increased; so that, upon one miserable pretext after another, we may seize their lands and subjugate or exterminate their inhabitants for the enhancement of the balance of trade and to the glory of the "national honor."

JOHN SAMPSON.

Washington, D. C., 2420, 14th St., December 27, 1901.

To the children of the tenement a park means play. They are slow to appreciate the esthetic values of trees, grass or landscape gardening, and make the lives of the policemen who do miserable. I met two little girls one day, each holding a baby in her arms, gazing through the fence around one of the small triangle parks downtown, beautiful examples I thought of what nature studies in the schools can do; but when I asked one of them whether they were ever allowed to go inside, she hitched up the baby and said: "No, it ain't a park, it's grass."—Robert Alston Stevenson, in Scribner's for September.

The story is told of an anonymous correspondent who forwarded £50 in bank notes to a predecessor of Sir M. Hicks-Beach with the note: "Dear Sir—Some time ago I defrauded the revenue of £500; my conscience gnaws

and I send you £50. When it gnaws again I'll send you more."—English Paper.

"Molly," said some one to the little daughter of a clergyman, "does your father preach the same sermon twice?" "I think, perhaps, he does," returned Molly, cautiously, "but I think he talks loud and soft in different places the second time, so it doesn't sound the same at all."—London Tit-Bits.

The remedy for the evils of liberty is more liberty.—Macaulay.

Wantno—Ah! so he saw service in South Africa. Did he take part in many victories?

Showup—He fought on the English side.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Common People," by Frank Oliver Hall (Boston: James H. West company. Price \$1.00) comprises eight sermons. They deal respectively with common people at home, at work, at play, at study, in politics, at church, as neighbors, and climbing. Though sermons in general character, these essays lack both the text and the dullness of your conventional sermon. There is not a dry paragraph in one of them. And altogether they are wholesome as well as interesting. From many of the ideas presented we should dissent, and from some of them strenuously. But any book which strives with intelligence and vigor to awaken young men from a lethargy of satisfaction with their own comfort and enjoyments to their responsibilities, as this book does, may be forgiven many more and much worse things than we find in it to condemn. Its description of patriotism, a typical example of the style, is alone an inspiration: "What is a patriot? A man who lies behind a breastwork and undertakes to shoot some other man to death? A man who charges up a hill and perhaps lies down and dies on a slope? No, that is not patriotism. That may be one of the manifestations of patriotism, or it may be only a manifestation of bull dog ferocity, of brutal and degrading lust for a fight. * * * To love one's country, to be ready in emergency to die for one's country, to be ready above all to live for one's country—that is patriotism."

"Smaller Profits, Reduced Salaries and Lower Wages; the Condition, the Cause, the Cure, by a Business Man," is the

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 LEAFLETS on next page.

lengthy title of a vest pocket exposition (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth. Price five cents) of the prosperity question. Those who share in the prosperity of the time will not be especially interested in this booklet; but if those who do not share in it and would like to know the reason why, were to buy a copy each, the publisher would soon roll in riches. The explanation is a sound one, and it is interestingly made.

PERIODICALS.

—The Open Court (Chicago) for January offers an interesting historical and defensive paper, by Henri de Ladenize, on "The Truth About the Jesuits."

—The second number of The Rubric (Chicago: Studio building), a unique bi-monthly magazine, gives most of its space to an eloquent appreciation of Tolstol, from the pen of Clarence S. Darrow.

—"What a School-Girl Saw of John Brown's Raid," an article by Jennie Chambers, in Harper's Magazine (New York), for January, is well worth reading, as a vivid personal recollection of one of the most important events in American history.

—In "The Modern Workman and Corporate Control," by Samuel McCune Lindsay, of the University of Pennsylvania, the International Journal of Ethics (Philadelphia) for January, furnishes a delicious morsel of superficial reasoning in support of the plutocracy of the time.

—In the International Socialist Review (Chicago) for January, a fanciful little essay on the "Socialization of Art," by Prof. Oscar L. Triggs, is followed by an exceedingly readable and amusing philosophic dialogue by Peter E. Burrowes, together with a variety of matter of special interest to socialists.

—A newcomer among the numerous and various periodicals of socialism is "Social Justice," a bi-monthly edited by Frederick G. Strickland and published under the management of May McDonald Strickland, at Yellow Spring, O. It is witty but good natured, and while not obtrusive is intensely in earnest.

—Bulletin No. 1, January 2, 1902, of "The Economic Year Book," (William English Walling and John R. Commons, Bliss build-

ing, Washington) announces the proposed publication of an industrial annual, which as foreshadowed by the bulletin, gives promise of being a publication of exceptional value in the field of industrial statistics.

—The paper of M. S. R. James, on "Women Librarians and Their Future Prospects," read before the international council of women in London in May, 1899, is printed in Public Libraries (Chicago) for January. This number of the magazine contains also an excellent paper by Jennie Elrod, on critical magazines as an aid in the selection of books for libraries.

—The feature of the fall number of Municipal Affairs (New York), just out, is a symposium on the decoration of cities; but the article of special interest is a retrospect, by John DeWitt Warner, on the recent municipal election. One sentence gives the key to Mr. Warner's exceedingly interesting article: "The cause of reform was constantly imperiled by the necessity of keeping together the conservatives, upon whom it was dependent for journalistic and financial support, and the progressives, without whose votes a reform campaign would be futile."

MARGARET A. HALEY

WILL LECTURE ON

"The Taxation of Franchises,"

Sunday, January 19, at 3 p. m.,

17th Floor of the Masonic Temple,

Under the Auspices of the

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

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

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY.
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

R. ZEPH & CO.,
OPTICIANS,
Room 26, 53 State Street,
Eyes Examined Free. **CHICAGO**

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 one address, postage paid, per 100, . . . 1.25

The following pamphlets have been issued:

1. **A Business Feasibility** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898.) Out of print.
3. **Non-Res.** 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. **Association and Anarchism** (from THE PUBLIC of September 14, 1901).
9. **Australasian 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).

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2264.

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

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

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1283 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.
NEW YORK.