

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1902.

Number 215.

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 page.

Attention is called by that excellent representative of democratic principles and ideals, the Springfield Republican, to a recent remark upon the question of imperialism as a political issue, reported to have been made by Tom L. Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland.

Describing Mayor Johnson as a Democratic presidential possibility, the Republican observes that he "has been opposed to the Republican imperialist policy and again announces his opposition;" but it criticizes him because "he is not favorable to any plan to direct the attention of citizens to outside issues when the real issues are to be found right here at home."

In the language of this criticism of the Republican upon Mayor Johnson—

His idea seems to be that syndicate privilege is primarily responsible for the imperialistic plunge of the nation, and that the way to strike at imperialism is to strike at monopoly. This may be true, but the view that the Philippines outrage is not to be considered immediately and apart from its possible ultimate origin, will not find much favor among voters opposed to the course of the Washington administration. A man who regards the Philippine business as an "outside issue" is decidedly too queer in his mental processes to make much headway toward the Democratic presidential nomination two years from now.

It would be a sufficient reply to the Springfield Republican that Mayor Johnson has given no indication of trying to make "headway toward the Democratic presidential nomination." He is mayor of Cleveland; and, so far as we have been able to learn, he has

devoted himself to the intelligent and faithful administration of that office, utterly regardless of the effects upon his personal fortunes, his partisan affiliations, or his possible ambitions. If in this local public service he has developed into a national character toward whom men of all parties look as to a presidential possibility, it is not because he has used the office to "pull wires," to "lay pipe," or to construct "combines," nor because he has cultivated "hothouse issues," "advanced his claims," or otherwise sought the presidential nomination. There is no indication of his having done anything of the kind. It is because his management of the affairs of his city, at a time when municipal administration has become a subject of national concern, has manifestly been guided by principles of broad statesmanship, by disinterested fidelity to his trust, and by a refreshing spirit of elemental democracy.

What Mayor Johnson has accomplished in the first year of his term is worth a brief review. The groundwork for a complete reassessment of all the real estate in the city of Cleveland has been made, which will show the property that is overvalued for taxation as well as the property that is undervalued, and just how much in each case. Among other things it exposes the fact, doubtless true in principle of all other cities, that small properties which are assessed at over 60 per cent. must be reduced by, from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 to bring them to a 60 per cent. basis; while from \$70,000,000 to \$80,000,000 must be added to under-assessed real estate to bring it up to that basis. To this valuable work the Republican legislature has interposed obstacles in the way of "ripper" legislation. As to the property of public-service corporations in Cleveland, appraisements for taxation have been in-

creased \$20,000,000; not arbitrarily, but in compliance with sound fiscal principles. But Republican revenue officials and a railroad court have interposed for the protection of these long privileged tax dodgers. An ordinance for a three-cent fare street railroad system, with the privilege reserved to the city of taking it over as a municipal concern whenever the legislature assents, has been secured; capitalists to build and operate the road have been found; consents of property-owners have been obtained; the work of construction has begun; and nothing but an injunction procured in the interest of the present 5-cent monopoly system, which Senator Hanna controls, stands in the way of the prompt completion of this low fare road. The parks of the city have been made resorts for the common people instead of mere driveways and gardens for the wealthy; but this reform has been attacked by the legislature through another "ripper" act, which may or may not stand the test of an appeal to the courts. Lastly, the water department has been taken wholly out of partisan politics by Mayor Johnson, who has made merit instead of party service the standard of employment; and the experiment has already resulted in such improvement of the service as to furnish an indication of the benefits to be expected, under good administration, from the further assumption by cities of the monopolies that use city streets.

With such a democratic record to his credit, and it is only a suggestion of all that has been accomplished of similar radical tendency, it is little wonder that Mayor Johnson has turned a Republican stronghold into a Democratic city, that he has turned over the county from Republican to Democratic, and that he is expected

even by leading Republicans of Ohio to place the state in the Democratic column. But none of that has been the end he has had in view. Even though he has spent several days in each week all through the past winter at the state capital endeavoring to promote equitable taxation laws and to defeat monopoly tax measures, he has done so as mayor of Cleveland, in the interest of Cleveland, and only because taxation in Cleveland is inextricably tangled up with the tax laws of the state. And what he has done and tried to do proceeds from an acute perception and firm grasp of the natural economic and moral laws with reference to principles of government that apply with equal force to one municipality as well as another, to one state as well as another, and to the nation itself as well as to its larger and smaller political divisions.

As to the Springfield Republican's contention that Mayor Johnson does not lay emphasis enough upon imperialism as an isolated issue, the Johnstown Democrat, also an able and tireless adversary of the infamous Philippine policy, offers a complete reply when it says:

His critics need not waste time in worrying over Tom Johnson's queer mental processes. Mr. Johnson's queer mental processes have generally brought him to the sanest possible conclusions; and we suspect they seem queer only to those who are not accustomed to logic that doesn't limp and to reason that doesn't fall into fits of the blind staggers. Mr. Johnson knows whereof he is speaking. He understands, as every single taxpayer understands, that imperialism has but one spur—and that is greed. Imperialism has gone over seas on a piratical war, not for benevolent assimilation, and not even for glory. It has gone for loot. It has gone to grab franchises, to gobble up land, to appropriate valuable natural opportunities, to grasp new privileges and through these to exploit labor. But what would happen to adventurers if here at home a rear fire should be poured in upon the whole fabric of privilege—upon franchises, upon protective tariffs, upon government by injunction, upon the hundred and one devices of greed for robbing labor and limiting its opportunities? Would they waste their time in the Philippines if here at home their base

of supplies were threatened? Would they feel safe in centering their energies on a foreign conquest when the enemy was in their rear cutting them off from their communications and destroying the very citadel of their power? Johnson is right. A war on the imperialists here at home would be the quickest possible means of stopping the infamous attack on liberty in the Philippines.

It must be remembered that when men like Tom L. Johnson refer to economic issues at home as too important to be lost sight of in a conflict over foreign policies, he is not to be put in the same category with men like Senator Gorman, who would make the beef trust a paramount issue. With Gorman any popular issue is a "good enough Morgan until after election;" with Johnson issues are not made to carry elections, but elections are held to settle issues. Gorman is playing politics; Johnson is not. Gorman wants to be president; Johnson wants to be right. When Gorman proposes a policy it is to flatter voters and win offices; when Johnson proposes one it is to promote a principle and win a cause. The man who would make the beef trust the subject of a political issue before election for the sake of partisan success, is so narrow in his statesmanship that he could become an imperialist after election as easily as he could take the oath of office. But a man with the principles, the political acuteness, the democratic sensitiveness, and the public record of Tom L. Johnson, though he declares for the priority of questions of home policy over those of foreign policy, could under no circumstances give countenance to a foreign policy of imperialism. To him democracy is a universal principle, which must indeed be rooted in our domestic policy, but which must also control our foreign policy. The advocate of home rule for Ohio cities, upon grounds of principle, as Mayor Johnson is, could not and would not countenance a colonial system and imperial rule.

Some New York clergymen have broken the conspiracy of silence among "the cloth," regarding the

recent disclosures of American atrocities in the Philippines, and have signed an appeal to their brethren in all denominations throughout the United States to protest against the conditions which these disclosures reveal. Among the clergymen who sign this appeal are C. H. Parkhurst and John C. Bliss, Presbyterian; Robert Collyer, Unitarian; D. W. Couch, Methodist; Eugene G. Fuessle, Evangelical Reform; Conrad E. Hermsstaedt, Moravian; P. F. McSweeney, Roman Catholic; H. Pereira Mendes, orthodox Jewish; John McQuirk, Protestant Episcopal; J. B. Remensnyder, Lutheran, and Henry A. Stimson, Congregational. Joseph R. Duryea declines to sign; but in doing so he explains that his objection is to making "the army bear the blame of an immoral policy of subjugation begun four years ago." We are not altogether out of sympathy with that objection. The American policy of subjugation in the Philippines does demand brutality in the execution, if it is to be executed. If we want the policy we must tolerate the brutality. Subjugation involves all sorts of horrible possibilities. It is no Sunday-school affair. And what can be said for those ministers, of whom there are so many, who not only tolerate the brutality but defend the policy of which it is a natural fruitage? If partisanship in politics and a habit of deference to plutocrats in church pews have left any spark of Christian religion in their souls, how can they read the text of this ministerial appeal from New York without crying out against the whole Philippine iniquity?

The appeal referred to contains numerous extracts from the report of the proceedings of the Senate committee of which Mr. Lodge is chairman. Some of these have been published, but not all of them. Here, for instance, is a description of the water torture, which the imperialist papers characterize as gently as if it were a mild form of infant school hazing:

The Witness—I witnessed quite a number of cases, because I was act-

ing as a sort of an aid to the officer in command of our two companies, Maj. Geary. . . . A man is thrown down on his back and three or four men sit or stand on his arms and legs and hold him down, and either a gun barrel or a rifle barrel or a carbine barrel or a stick as big as a belaying pin is simply thrust into his jaws and his jaws are thrust back, and, if possible, a wooden log or stone is put under his head—under his neck, so he can be held firmly. . . . He is simply held down, and then water is poured onto his face, down his throat and nose from a jar, and that is kept up until the man gives some sign of giving in or becomes unconscious, and when he becomes unconscious he is simply rolled aside and he is allowed to come to. That is as near a description as I think I can give. All the cases were alike I saw on that occasion. . . . A man suffers tremendously; there is no doubt about it. His suffering must be that of a man who is drowning, but who cannot drown. . . . Some men would yield almost instantly, and would not be put through as brutal methods as I have described, while other men would have more courage or, perhaps, would be more ignorant, and they would be put through the stage where they were unconscious or almost drowned. . . . I think the men who were more courageous or perhaps did not have any guns suffered the most. By ignorant I mean that they did not really know anything to tell us.

This torture appears to have been practiced by the Americans or under their authority pretty generally throughout the islands. If it had been in Armenia by the unspeakable Turk, our churches would be thundering their demands for war to make the Turks stop. It remains to be seen whether enough ministers will follow the lead of their courageous but not very numerous New York brethren, who are appealing for their signatures, to make an influential showing in number and professional standing sufficient to oblige the Americans to stop.

In this connection it should be remarked that another ingenious method of torture in vogue in the Philippines for purposes of "pacification" and "benevolent assimilation" was reported in the Washington correspondence of the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican paper, on the

10th. It is known as the "rope cure;" and, in the complacent language of the Washington correspondent, "for simplicity it is unrivaled." Here is the description, quoted from John Loughran, who had seen it "administered to natives in the islands during the first year of American supremacy" (which was certainly before the natives had been discovered to be a cruel set of people):

A light but strong rope is passed across the throat of the man to be examined. It is crossed behind his back and carried under the armpits, the ends are again brought around the neck and over to the back, turned under the armpits and shoulders, and then the free ends are carried as a girdle around the waist just at the end of the ribs and tied fast and securely. A stick is put through the ropes where they cross between the shoulders and then turned to suit. "Will it make a man talk?" Mr. Loughran was asked. "A wooden Indian would make a speech if you gave him the rope cure," he replied. Mr. Loughran says that this was far more effective than the water cure, which is slow. The rope cure often persuaded a native to reveal the hiding place of his gun, and it did it quickly, because he knew that as soon as he consented to talk the stick would be loosened and would fly back, relieving the agony instantaneously. Of course, if the victim should have a weak heart he might die of shock, but the native Filipino does not seem to be troubled with the malady.

The American pacification of the Philippines is a promising candidate for the place in history of twin horror with the Spanish inquisition.

Another hue and cry over Senator Tillman was raised in the press a few days ago. He had again broken loose on the Negro question. But a comparison of his speech as reported in the Congressional Record, with the daily press reports, affords an excellent example of the unbalanced methods of reporting public matters now in vogue. In what Tillman said there was enough, though barely enough, to justify the sensational reports that went over the wires. On the whole, his speech was able, judicious and well tempered. But Senator McComas had dug up the "bloody shirt" and waved it in Tillman's face, ac-

companied with taunts about the maltreatment of the Negro in the south. It was in answer to this that Tillman furnished his adversaries with further material for campaign documents to be used among Negro voters and hesitating Republicans at the North.

We have had occasion before to criticize Senator Tillman's bitterness of mind toward the American Negro, and those criticisms still stand. But in fact he is no more bitter in that respect than the majority of the people he represents; and they are no more bitter than Northerners who go South to live. Southerners often say that the Northern man who settles there comes to have the same repugnance to the Negro race that they have, and this is true. In both cases the repugnance is due to a feeling, active in the South and latent in the North, that white men are superior beings whom black men were born to serve—precisely the same feeling that white rich men in the North have for all poor men, that the Hohenzollerns of Germany have for the common man of every shade. Tillman's distinction is that he is perfectly candid in dealing with the question. He makes no pretense. Thoroughly democratic until he touches the Negro question, he bluntly renounces his democracy when he does touch it.

But suppose that Tillman's attitude toward the Negro is as bad or worse than that of Lodge and Roosevelt and Root and the rest toward the Filipinos. What of it, so far as the Philippine question is concerned? That question rests upon its own facts and not upon Tillman's ideas of white domination in the South. No matter how reprehensibly wrong Tillman may be on the Negro question, that cannot make the administration policy right on the Philippine question. "You're another" may be good invective, but it is bad argument. Tillman himself made this clear enough in his speech in question. For partisan purposes Republican senators had goaded him

into making a characteristic excursion into the Negro question; but he came back quickly to the real issue, and in words which sounded the keynote of his whole speech, all but the discord which has been so magnified by the press, he begged the imperialists to put the "bloody shirt" back again into its grave. Said he:

But do not let us discuss these questions. We want you to vindicate before the people your policy toward the Philippines, to exonerate the American army from the stigma now resting upon it, and we propose to hold you to the issue. We will discuss the South; we will discuss the Negro; we will discuss carpet-bag government; we will discuss anything you want if you will bring in a bill affecting those questions, but we are not going to run off after foxes just now. We are after this Filipino coon, and we want his hide. . . . I think that if Congress had the authority, sustained by the Supreme Court, to pass an act forbidding any member of either body ever injecting into debate any discussion of the civil war or the revival of any of those bitter feelings of the past, it would be a blessing to our country.

No decision has yet been made by the President on the question of the American breach of neutrality at New Orleans, nor has any authentic report of the investigation appeared. But the general nature of the decision, should the matter ever come out of the pigeon hole in which it seems at present to be resting, may be surmised from an article in the *North American Review* for May, from the pen of an official of the state department. It is hardly probable that an officer so closely related officially to the question under advisement (or at rest) would have been allowed to publish an argument upon it in a popular magazine unless his argument were in harmony with the views of the head of his department and the probable decision of the President. It is interesting, therefore, to learn that this official concludes that the British mule and horse station at New Orleans, and the operations in connection with it, do not amount to a breach of American neutrality. It is also in-

teresting to observe that he evades the vital point at issue. This point is not whether American citizens may sell munitions of war to a belligerent, "in the ordinary course of commerce," which is the point upon which the state department official places his emphasis. No one disputes their right to do that. Nor does anyone dispute the right of the British to buy munitions of war in this country, "in the ordinary course of commerce." The question is whether they may establish on American soil an army supply station for the reception and shipment of munitions of war, not "in the ordinary course of commerce;" and whether they may enter an American port with naval transports and anchor there while they load those war vessels with munitions of war, "not in the ordinary course of commerce." On that question the state department official is silent. Will the state department, the law department, and the President also be silent on that point? At any rate, the legislature of Louisiana is not. A concurrent resolution passed both houses on the 13th, fully sustaining Gov. Heard in his protest to the President, and urging him "to take any such further steps, conformable to law, as in his judgment may be necessary to establish and maintain in this state obedience to the law of nations and respect for the treaties of the United States." Here is an earnest that, in at least one state of this Union, the merry dollar is not the advance agent of that "Destiny which determines Duty."

The supreme court of the District of Columbia, through Judge Bradley, has made a group of gratifying decisions on the subject of second-class postal matter, a subject to which we have heretofore had occasion to refer at length in terms of criticism (vol. iv., pp. 596, 628, 643) of the postal law, the postal regulations and the post office department. The court has by these decisions restored to second-class privileges some of the publications which the department had excluded, and has issued injunctions

restraining the exclusion of others which the department had threatened. Judge Bradley bases the decisions upon the ground that the post office department cannot legislate under the guise of making rules and regulations. It cannot exclude publications by a ruling, which Congress does not exclude by law. This principle is so simple, so sound and so obvious, if government by law and not by bureau is to prevail, that it is inconceivable that a public officer should ever have questioned it. Yet it was questioned, or else deliberately defied, by the postmaster general when he made rulings—now reversed by the supreme court of the District—for which his department had vainly sought the sanction of Congress. Congress having refused to amend the law as he desired, he proceeded to amend it himself. This has now been stopped by the interpretation of the courts of the District.

The Postal Progress league, of which James L. Cowles, of Farmington, Conn., is secretary, proposes to settle all questions regarding second-class mail matter in the only fair way. This league suggests two classes, and only two classes of matter—letters and parcels—to be carried on the basis of cost. The second, or parcel class, would include periodicals; and as the charge would be based upon cost of service, the only just arrangement, there could be no discrimination such as now prevails, nor any danger of the censorship of new or small papers which is now threatened. From the biggest daily to the smallest weekly, every publication would be equal before the postal law. If the established rates would not pay, the necessary increase would be assessed pro rata, as it should be. Deficits would not then be reduced by excluding from equal mailing rights papers that were distasteful to the administration.

Whenever the post office department has given reasons for its crusade against unwelcome publications, it has

fallen back upon the postal deficit, attributing that to the enormous second-class mail. But it is in fact more than probable that the second-class mail, directly and indirectly, pays for itself. What really causes the deficit is the extravagant payments that are made by the department to railroads for mail transportation. This leakage has been exposed again and again, and now it is accounted for. The Chicago Tribune explains how the railroads are protected. They supplied campaign funds galore to Mr. Hanna, and at Mr. Hanna's dictation the late sacrosanct administration did the rest. Note the startling testimony of the Tribune, turned "state's evidence," in an editorial published in its issue of the 13th:

We distinctly charge that after the election of 1896 Mr. Samuel Shallenberger was appointed second assistant postmaster general, in whose office all matters relating to the railway mail service are attended to, in pursuance of a bargain or understanding with the Pennsylvania railroad. Mr. Shallenberger at that time was an attorney for the Pennsylvania railroad. The company had made a subscription—possibly the largest in the United States—to the campaign fund. What could be more natural than that the attorney of the railroad should be appointed to superintend the railway mail service immediately after the election. Still, it was a second-class bargain, and in any other country would have disgraced everybody connected with it. Shallenberger is still in office.

No further explanation of the "economical" crusade against second-class mail matter as a cover for extravagant payments to railroads is necessary. The Chicago Tribune has let the cat out of the bag.

The Bucklin or Australasian tax amendment to the Colorado constitution (p. 11, and vol. iv., p. 810), which has already had many vicissitudes, is now subjected to another attack designed to prevent a formal expression of the popular will in its favor. As our readers know, this amendment, adopted by the legislature over a year ago, and to be voted upon by the people of Colorado next November, would allow any county in which a majority of the voters so decide, to draw its local revenues whol-

ly from land value taxation. It would not put this system of taxation in force; it would merely allow the people of the respective counties to put it in force or not as they choose. It is, therefore, simply a home rule amendment, a county referendum on taxation. But there are diligent efforts on the part of the land grant railroads and the other speculative interests of the state to prevent the submission of the amendment to the people. The latest form these efforts have taken is an application to the supreme court of the state for a writ restraining the secretary of state from printing any constitutional amendments upon the ballots. The contention is that constitutional amendments proposed by the legislature for submission to the people must be in harmony with the rest of the constitution; and that if a proposed amendment would alter the constitution fundamentally, as it is claimed the Bucklin amendment would, it can be made only by a constitutional convention.

Desperate efforts are being made by the Republican machine of Illinois to create an appearance of harmony where there is no harmony. Nor can there be harmony there in view of the boss-ridden character of the Republican state convention. Its nomination of Albert J. Hopkins for United States senator was in no sense a party nomination. As Hopkins and Lorimer had packed the convention, he was nominated by himself and Lorimer. In these circumstances there is an excellent opportunity for the Democrats to name Senator Mason's successor. If it were positively known that a democratic-Democrat like Alschuler, whose popularity throughout the state was demonstrated when he ran for governor two years ago, would be sent to the Senate if the legislature were Democratic, while Hopkins would be sent if it were Republican, there is every reason to believe that the Hopkins machine, which captured the Republican state convention by "boodle" and ballot-

box stuffing, would be demolished at the polls.

A wonderful meeting was held at All Souls' church, New York, early in April. Thomas L. James presided, and Walter S. Logan, Recorder Goff, and that redoubtable spiritual knight of the unspiritual sword, the Rev. Dr. MacArthur, all spoke. They discussed a great theme—"the thought of the past, the thought of the present, the thought of the future, with reference to man's relation to his fellow man." Then, inflated with the idea of brotherhood, this meeting solemnly resolved in testimony thereof to erect "a monument to Philanthropy"! After that the meeting adjourned. The inscription on its proposed monument is to be a sentence about brotherhood, from the strenuous Mr. Roosevelt, who believes in making all men brothers even if he has to kill them to do it. A more appropriate inscription would be this: "A mountain labored and brought forth a mouse."

We regret that a misunderstanding of the circumstances led us into the error of saying last week (p. 67) that a constitutional initiative is to be voted on in Rhode Island at the next general election. Such an amendment was before the general assembly of the state, but the Republican members made opposition to it a party measure and defeated its passage in both houses. The question of submitting such an amendment, and not its adoption, is therefore likely to be the leading issue before the people at the November election.

PUT YOURSELF IN HIS PLACE.

To be self-centered is the original condition of mankind. The infant knows of nothing and cares for nothing but self. And this original condition is never wholly eradicated even from the most altruistic characters. Each of us is to his own imagination always the central sun around which everything else revolves.

So essential to our sanity is this in-born habit of looking out from our-

selves upon the surrounding universe, that he who should succeed in habitually looking in upon himself from the world without would risk totally losing his mental balance. Yet it is only by occasionally withdrawing ourselves from ourselves, and getting our moral bearings by taking a survey from the standpoint of our brethren, that we become civilized. It is only in this way that we can apply that touchstone of righteousness in human relations, that infallible test of civilization—the golden rule of the Nazarene.

By putting ourselves imaginatively in the place of another, under any given circumstance, we are able to realize what it is that we would men should in similar circumstances do to us. So advised, we are prepared, if we are civilized and not savage, to do even so to them. And whether we are civilized or not, we are able to understand why others do what we condemn, and are prompted to suspect that possibly we might in their place have done even the same as they. No moral exercise is more urgently needed than this by the American people at the present time.

Some of their trusted leaders, who lately assured them that "marked humanity" has governed the conduct of their soldiers in the Philippine islands, but are now obliged to confess that this conduct has been characterized by "marked severity," explain that the severity, though savage to a degree, is excused if not justified by the barbarities of the savage foe we have to meet in that far away tropical archipelago. Let us make the test, then, of putting ourselves in the place of the Filipinos. Let us try to realize what we might have done had we been they and our country instead of theirs the scene of a devastating policy of assimilative benevolence.

What if some alien race—the Chinese, for instance, or the Japanese, or a wholly strange race of giants from Mars—had secured a landing upon the California coast, and taken possession of San Francisco?

What if they had then issued, about Christmas time, 1898, an edict from their potentate, asserting that he had purchased this country and its peo-

ple of Messrs. Rockefeller, Hanna, Morgan, & Co., and proclaiming his sovereignty, while assuring us that he was inspired only by the most benevolent intentions?

What if his military representatives had preceded this by sending a floating war engine of unprecedented killing capacity to New Orleans or New York and anchoring it menacingly in the harbor?

What if the Americans had felt helpless in the presence of a foe so destructively armed with novel war machinery and so anxious for a bloody fight?

Suppose the Americans had nevertheless held their ground, only yielding now to their invaders' threats a few yards and then to their blandishments a few more, until they had received reinforcements and arrayed a formidable army against us, crowding us back farther and farther and lining up to our lines, with no neutral ground between.

Suppose that then one of their sentries had fired upon an American who did not understand the gibberish in which he was challenged and so failed to obey the foreign sentry's demand.

And suppose that now, a deadly shot having been fired by one of the invaders six weeks after they had declared war upon the United States by proclaiming sovereignty over it, some of the men on our line had returned the fire, whereupon the invaders had trained their great war machines upon us, and swept Alameda and Oakland and all the neighboring towns off the face of the earth, filling trenches to the brim with the torn and ghastly bodies of our compatriots, the slaughtered inhabitants.

Suppose that after that this race of benevolent invaders had pursued the dwindling American armies over the mountains, across the deserts, down to St. Louis, up to Chicago, over the Alleghenies to the Atlantic slope, and with their irresistible slaughter-machines had bombarded our coast from Canada to the Gulf and mown down our people and burned down their homes the whole country over.

Suppose they had called us by opprobrious names, as offensive to us as "nigger" is to men of darker hue.

Suppose they had gone to the In-

dian reservations and turning our traditional savage enemy upon us, given him a chance to "get even."

Suppose these savages had scalped the American dead, and had tortured the living who refused to yield to the advancing conqueror.

Suppose the invaders themselves had learned the arts of savage torture from their savage allies and had resorted to them in cold blood to extort from stubborn American patriots information about the movements of their compatriots and the hiding places of defensive arms.

Suppose that one of their trusted officers had forged a letter purporting to come from an American general to President Roosevelt in his hiding place in the Adirondacks; had utilized this forgery to get access to the President; had pretended to be a prisoner in the custody of American patriots who were in reality Tories under his command; had been hospitably relieved with food by the President while on his way and almost dying of starvation; had come to Mr. Roosevelt's house with his pretended captors, who at a signal from him had shot down the hospitable and confiding President's few attendants and kidnaped the President himself; and had for this exploit been rewarded with high promotion by the potentate at his home in Asia or in Mars.

Suppose the invaders had ordered Americans into reconcentrado camps, and to enforce obedience had cut off all possibility of food supplies outside and laid waste the surrounding country.

Suppose they had retaliated for desperate assaults not in accordance with their ideas of civilized warfare, made by some unpacified Americans, by selecting by lot American prisoners, total strangers to the offense, for execution.

Suppose they had forced some Americans to guide them to the hiding places of others, and had punished alleged delinquents in connection with that repugnant task with summary death.

Suppose their commander in Illinois had issued orders directing that every American in that state over ten years of age and capable of bearing arms should be ruthlessly killed.

Suppose, in a word, that this alien

race, with its gigantic implements of destruction and slaughter, had invaded our country as we have invaded the country of the Filipinos, and that we had suffered at its hands what the Filipinos have suffered at ours, how much better would we have treated our invader than the Filipino has treated us?

Should we not have been as savage as he is accused of being? Should we not have furnished the distant potentate, who was trying to assimilate us benevolently, with ample material for justifying savage means of enforcing his benevolence on the ground that he had a savage foe to assimilate? Let each of us probe his own conscience with that question before venturing to condemn our "little brown" brother in the Orient.

For ourselves, we sadly fear that if Americans were in the place of the Filipinos, even the moderate limitations upon savage warfare of "General Order No. 100" would be insufficient to restrain acts of resentment that might be called treacherous and cruel. There are strenuous Americans who, under such provocation, would invent water torture variations and sweat box devices that would make a Sioux warrior fairly ache with jealousy.

It is much easier for a powerful invading army to observe the humane rules of the inhuman game of war, than it is for a weak people whose country is invaded. Yet in this respect we have totally failed, disgracefully failed, even in the role of powerful invader. What license might we not have run into had the situation been reversed and we been the victims of invasion instead of the criminal aggressors. Let us be cautious about concluding that we are civilized and the Filipinos savage, even if it turns out that the Filipinos were first to resort to treachery and cruelty. They have not been "patriotically" fighting for the possession of other people's homes, as we have. They have been desperately and despairingly fighting for their own. And it does make a difference. He who defends his country against foreign invasion may be excused many things which no possible provocation can excuse in an invader.

NEWS

Universal horror was excited by news on the 9th that the city of St. Pierre, on the island of Martinique, had been totally destroyed and its inhabitants killed, by an eruption of the neighboring volcano of Mont Pelee.

Martinique is one of the West Indies in the Lesser Antilles chain. Its capital city is Fort-de-France, and it is held as a dependency by the French, who began to colonize it in 1635. The colony is under a French governor and an elective general council, besides municipal councils for the 32 communes into which it is politically divided. It is represented in the French legislature by one senator and two deputies. The area of the island is 380 square miles. It is 40 miles long by 12 wide, and its population in 1895 was 187,692 (90,373 males and 97,319 females). Only 1,307 were born in France. Its principal agricultural products are sugar cane, coffee, cocoa, tobacco and cotton, and its chief manufactures sugar and rum. The island has historical interest as the birthplace of the Empress Josephine. There is a cluster of volcanic mountains in the south and another in the north. A line of lower heights connecting the two forms the backbone of the island and culminates in the northeast in Mont Pelee, a volcanic peak, 5,000 feet high, which overlooks the city of St. Pierre.

The first news of the disaster came from St. Lucia, the next island to the south of Martinique. A British steamer, the "Roddam," had returned to St. Lucia from Martinique on the 8th, almost a wreck, with 17 of her crew dead and the captain seriously burned. She had narrowly escaped being annihilated by a storm of red-hot ashes which had destroyed all the other shipping in the harbor of St. Pierre, including the Quebec Steamship company's steamer "Roraima." The "Roddam" escaped only by cutting her cables and steaming out of the harbor at full speed. This report was confirmed on the 10th by a dispatch from the commander of a French cruiser who had cabled to his government in Paris at night on the 8th, stating that St. Pierre had been completely destroyed by an immense mass of fire which had fallen on the city at about eight o'clock that morning, and that the entire population (25,792 at the latest census)

was supposed to have perished. He too reported that all the shipping in the harbor had been wrecked. The eight survivors of the destroyed "Roraima" were rescued by him. They said that between seven and eight o'clock on the morning of the 8th Mont Pelee seemed to explode. The land appeared to be convulsed, and the waters of the harbor to pick up the steamer and throw it at the sky and then to let it drop into a seething caldron, where it was wrenched to pieces. It was not until the 11th that a landing at St. Pierre could be made and the true condition of the city ascertained; and on that day the American consul at Guadeloupe, who had been ordered to investigate, reported the disaster at St. Pierre as complete. The city had been literally wiped out, and the American consul there and his family were among the dead. It now appears that the destruction was caused by what one of the dispatches describes as "one all-consuming blast of suffocating, poisonous, burning gases." No person inside the limits of the city seems to have escaped, and it is believed that in all cases death was instantaneous when the first whiff of the poisonous fumes entered the lungs. Bodies were burned and charred, but this is supposed to have occurred after death. A mountain resort, Morne Rouge, nearer to the volcano than St. Pierre, and where some 600 people were staying, was unharmed.

Another volcanic eruption in the Lesser Antilles occurred at about the same time with that at Martinique, though reported later. This was on the island of St. Vincent, about as far south of St. Lucia as Martinique is to the north of it. St. Vincent, like St. Lucia, is a possession of Great Britain, under a British administrator and a colonial secretary. It has an area of 13 square miles and its population in 1891 was 41,054, of which only 2,445 were whites. The capital is Kingstown, with a population of 4,547. Fears for St. Vincent arose immediately upon receipt of the terrifying news from Martinique; for it was known that a volcano in St. Vincent, which nearly destroyed the island in 1812, had been active for several days, and on the 8th the St. Vincent cable had suddenly ceased working. On the 10th the governor of the Windward islands, to which group St. Vincent belongs, left St. Lucia for St. Vincent to investigate, and three days later he

reported officially that "the country on the east coast, between Rolmrock and Georgetown, was apparently struck and devastated in a similar manner to St. Pierre," all living things within that radius having probably been destroyed. Dead to the number of 1,000 had been found and buried, and probably 1,600 persons all told had been killed, including "the managers and owners of estates with their families and several of the better class of people." There were 160 persons in the Georgetown hospital, of whom 6 might recover. The governor found the details of the catastrophe "too harrowing to describe." From other dispatches it appears that a heavy explosion occurred at the volcano Soufriere on the 5th, and that on the 8th two craters belched forth smoke and stones and poured down the sides of the mountain six streams of molten lava. The entire northern end of the island is described as cut off from the southern end by an enormous lava river.

Farther northward in this chain of islands which separates the Atlantic ocean from the Caribbean sea, a deadly eruption of political instead of physical origin is in progress. This outbreak is in the Negro republic of Haiti, the western neighbor of San Domingo, where a revolution was last week reported (p. 72) to have overturned the government. By the constitution of Haiti, the executive authority of the republic is vested in a president elected for seven years. Since 1896 the president has been Gen. Tiresias Simon Sam, a Negro of full blood, nearly 70 years of age, whose family history blends prominently with the history of the republic. Early in March the development of a revolutionary conspiracy was reported, but no indication of its cause appears except in so far as it may have been against President Sam personally. To counteract the revolutionary movement several persons charged with conspiracy were imprisoned on the 19th of March, among them being two of the most prominent men in the republic, Supreme Court Justice Bourjolly and Gen. Destouche. To escape these wholesale arrests large numbers of Haytiens sought refuge in Jamaica. Early in April, nevertheless, the revolutionary movement had advanced to the stage of civil war on the south coast, where a body of revolutionists under Gen. Baptiste attacked and captured Jacmel on the 5th and released the state prisoners incarcerated there.

Gen. Baptiste retired the next day to the mountains, taking with him all the arms and ammunition he could obtain; but he was pursued by government troops, his force was overcome in battle at Fonds Melon, near Jacmel, and being himself captured he was immediately shot. At this point there was a lull in Haytien news. But on the 8th of Maya dispatch from Port-au-Prince, the capital of the republic, announced the resignation of President Sam, but gave no reason for it. Congress met on the 12th to fill the presidential vacancy. The legislative chambers were packed with troops which the government refused to remove, explaining that they were necessary for the protection of the congress in its deliberations. The cry of "revolution" and "to arms" was then raised from the floor and the body dissolved in confusion, street fighting following immediately. Several factions were trying to get into power, and ex-President Boisrond Canal succeeded in getting possession of the arsenal and control of the troops and within 24 hours had set up a provisional government; but he has not yet got what the dispatches call "control of the situation." On the 13th the dispatches ignored his government and reported that Gen. Firman, formerly Haytien minister to France, was marching on Port-au-Prince, having been put forward as president by the north and northwest; while on the 14th they stated that the admiral of the Haytien fleet had declared for Gen. Firman and was about to put the fleet at his disposal. A battle was at this time imminent. Ex-President Sam has embarked for France, and all his political prisoners have been released and his exiles are returning.

Cuba, the larger western neighbor of Haiti, is in readiness for the limited independence to be conferred upon her (p. 72). The president-elect, Gen. Palma, terminated a tour of the island on the 11th at Havana. Upon his arrival the Cuban flag was raised over Moro Castle by Gen. Wood. The house of representatives has agreed upon its credentials and is prepared for business when the United States shall have given the signal on the 20th. It is reported from Washington that the state department has decided that the government will not announce the birth of the Cuban republic by proclamation, but will send identical notices to all United States ambassadors and ministers abroad

that "the military occupation by the United States of the island has ceased and that Gen. Palma has been duly installed at the head of a new government of the island of Cuba." According to the same reports, there will be no invitation on the part of the United States to the nations to recognize the new republic, but it is expected that they will take notice themselves of the fact that the United States has recognized it by sending to the island a minister resident and staff of legation and consuls, and it is not doubted that this example will be followed.

In the United States itself, the most important news of the week is the beginning of another great anthracite coal miners' strike (see vol. iii., p. 472)—involving in round numbers 150,000 miners. These miners were represented in a convention at Shamokin, Pa., on the 18th of March last by 600 delegates from districts 1, 7 and 9 of the United Mine Workers of America. President John Mitchell, of the general organization, presided. The convention had been called to deliberate upon the refusal of the anthracite coal operators to confer with the officers of the union on subjects relating to the interests of the workmen. It adopted resolutions on the 20th demanding an eight-hour day and the recognition of miners' committees; and on the 24th it declared for a strike to take effect on a day to be fixed by the district executive boards, provided a final effort at arbitration with the operators through the reconciliation committee of the industrial department of the National Civic Federation, of which Senator Hanna is chairman, proved unavailing.

Messages were accordingly sent to Senator Hanna, and he called a meeting for the 26th. After hearing the miners on that day, the committee appointed a subcommittee of three, with Mr. Hanna as chairman, to get into communication with the operators. Presidents of four of the coal-carrying roads consequently met with the principal committee and the miners' representatives the following day, when it was agreed that no strike should be declared for 30 days. Negotiations proceeded slowly, but on the 3d of May Mr. Mitchell published a statement declaring that—the members of our executive committee and the Civic Federation have done their utmost to bring about a settlement with the operators. It has been found utterly useless. The railway presidents have rejected every re-

quest we have submitted. They have peremptorily refused to make any concessions whatever as to the scale adopted by the Shamokin convention or to make any change whatever in the hours of labor.

One more effort for arbitration was made by the miners. At the decisive meeting at Scranton of the executive boards of the anthracite districts, in whom the power to call a strike had been vested by the convention in March, a proposition was made on the 8th of May, and that day wired to the operators, that all questions at issue between the anthracite miners and the anthracite operators—

be submitted to an impartial board of arbitration, such board to be selected by the industrial branch of the National Civic Federation.

This proposition was declined by President Baer, of the Philadelphia & Reading company; Chairman Thomas, of the Erie company; President Truesdale, of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, and President Olyphant, of the Delaware & Hudson. Other operators made no response.

On the 9th of May, therefore, President Mitchell issued a temporary strike order, at the same time reconvening another delegate convention of the anthracite districts, to meet at Hazleton, Pa., on the 14th, for the purpose of determining upon the advisability of making this temporary order permanent. The order opens with a report of the exhaustion of all conciliatory means at the command of the union officers and the failure to obtain any tangible concessions from the operators; and, after reciting the authority conferred by the Shamokin convention, it states that nevertheless the committees feel that the local unions should express themselves in delegate convention directly upon the question before a decisive general strike is ordered. The order then proceeds:

In the meantime all persons employed in or around the collieries, stripings, washeries and breakers are instructed to abstain temporarily from working, beginning with Monday, May 12, and continuing thereafter until a final decision is reached by a delegate convention, which will meet on Wednesday morning, May 14, at Hazleton, Pa. The basis of representation in this convention shall be one vote for each 100 members and one vote for each additional 100 members or majority fraction thereof. The executive committees recommend that special meetings

of all local unions be held on Monday afternoon, May 12, for the purpose of selecting delegates and considering the question involved, and it is especially recommended that specific instructions be given to delegates as to how they shall vote on the proposition to inaugurate a strike or continue work under present conditions. The instruction for all men to suspend work on Monday does not include firemen, engineers, pumpmen and other labor necessary to preserve the properties of the operators.

In obedience to this order approximately 140,000 men and boys quit work in the anthracite region on the 12th, and the delegate convention assembled at Hazleton on the 14th.

Before the strike order went into effect, but after it was issued, two lockouts were ordered by operators. One was ordered on the 11th by Coxe Bros. & Co., of the Beaver Meadow colliery, and the other on the same day by Calvin Pardee, Sons & Co., of the Latimer mines, both in the Hazleton region. But an unnamed official of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western railroad, gave out on the 12th a statement in which he declared that his road would not declare a lockout. He said:

We do not intend to irritate the men, and the other companies are of the same mind. Nothing will be done before Wednesday. The situation is in the hands of the miners. After Wednesday it will be in our hands. We appreciate the fact that John Mitchell does not want a strike. Neither do the companies, despite what has been said to the contrary. While we do not want a fight, we will give the men all the fight they desire if they decide that there is to be one.

Next in interest, if not in importance, to the anthracite coal strike, is the prosecution of the Chicago meat packers by the Federal government, for violation of the Sherman anti-trust law. Owing to the high prices of meats there has been an outcry especially against the packers' combination, and for several weeks the attorney general has been reported as making preparations for legal proceedings. He caused such proceedings to be formally begun at Chicago, in the circuit court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois on the 10th. A bill was then filed by the United States attorney for an injunction. The bill charges that the packers are engaged in interstate and foreign commerce; that they represent 60 per cent. of the fresh meat trade; that in order

to restrain competition among themselves as to the purchase of live stock they have formed a combination to refrain from bidding against each other in good faith, and also to manipulate prices by making them high so as to induce large shipments and then low so as to obtain these shipments at unfair prices; that in order to restrain competition among themselves as to their products they have combined to raise and lower prices arbitrarily; and that for like purposes they have combined to make secret agreements with railroad companies for reduced rates of transportation not allowed to others. Notice of a motion for a preliminary injunction has been given by the United States, in which the hearing is set for the 20th.

In American politics the only event of the week of possible interest is the meeting of the Republican state convention of Illinois. After a complex and bitter fight at the delegate primaries the convention met at Springfield on the 8th. It fell completely and undisguisedly under the dictation of the faction organized by William Lorimer, the Republican "boss" of Chicago, whose prominent object was to nominate Congressman A. J. Hopkins for U. S. Senator to succeed Wm. E. Mason. The test vote, brought out by a parliamentary question, was 937½ to 561½. It was around the issue of the senatorship that the faction fight had raged; and, so far as a party convention can decide such a question, it was decided in favor of Mr. Hopkins, who was named by the convention as the party's choice for that office by a vote of 1,015½ to 492½. But Senator Mason publicly declares that Mr. Hopkins must fight for the seat to the end. Referring to Gov. Yates, who has cooperated with Lorimer, Mr. Mason said, as reported in the Chicago Tribune of the 10th:

Yates and his henchmen descended even to the corrupt tactics of South Carolina politics to secure representation at the so-called Republican state convention. I will prove this, too, and then let citizens of Illinois decide whether they will countenance the methods of this crowd of political highwaymen. That the convention was not a representative Republican convention I propose to show by giving in detail the counties that were controlled by the ballot box stuffing, and to show, also, the counties where boodle was used to secure the procuring of instructions.

Political excitement in France subsided with the second balloting for deputies (p. 72), which took place not on the 12th, as heretofore reported, but on the 11th. Out of 174 seats (not 170 as previously reported) to be filled at the second balloting, returns have been reported in this country with reference to 168. The ministerialists' candidates are elected in 128 of these, thus assuring the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry a large majority in the next chamber of deputies.

NEWS NOTES.

—The oleomargarine bill (p. 56) was signed by President Roosevelt on the 9th.

—President Loubet, of France, left Paris on the 13th to visit the czar of Russia.

—The airship of the Brazilian inventor, Augusto Severo, exploded on the 11th while he was making an ascension in it at Paris with an assistant. Both were killed.

—The lower house of congress voted on the 9th to admit Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma into the Union as states.

—The Federation of Women's Clubs, in session at Los Angeles on the 8th, elected as president of the Federation Mrs. Dimies T. S. Denison, of New York.

—Lewis Nixon, the temporary leader of Tammany hall, New York, in the absence of Mr. Croker, has resigned. He objected to the conditions which made his leadership hardly more than nominal.

—Miss Florence A. Fensham, of Constantinople, Turkey, has been given the degree of bachelor of divinity by the Chicago Theological Seminary. She has been a student at Cornell, Harvard and Oxford, and occupies the chair of biblical literature and comparative religion in the American college for girls at Constantinople. Miss Fensham is the first woman to receive this degree in the Congressional denomination.

—As a result of a series of naphtha explosions on the 12th in the yards of the Panhandle railway at Sheridan, about four miles from Pittsburg, 25 persons were killed and from 200 to 300 badly injured. A collision of two tank cars caused the first explosion. The second occurred half an hour later, showering with burning oil a crowd that had been drawn together by the first report. Three-quarters of an hour after that the fire had communicated with a large naphtha tank having a gas dome, and this exploded with still more disastrous results.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE COAL STRIKE.

Denver Post (neut.), May 10.—There is every reason for believing that the coal mine operators of the Pennsylvania anthracite districts have not acted either with moderation or wisdom in rejecting the proposal of the Mine Workers' union to submit the differences between them to the recently organized Civic Federation, or any other competent and disinterested body, for arbitration. Certainly the decision is an unfortunate one for all public interests concerned, and if a strike shall result, as now appears probable, the mine operators will have placed themselves in a position to shoulder all the responsibility.

Kansas City World (Ind.), May 12.—What strikes one as being a little singular is the utter and complete failure of the board of conciliation in the premises. In the fall of 1900 Mr. Hanna, unaided by an influential board of conciliation, had not the slightest trouble in effecting an agreement between the miners and operators. Now he can do nothing. . . . This much-lauded board of conciliation seems to have for its basic idea the notion that the strife between labor and capital is due to temperamental causes in men and that the nearest way to prevent strife is by means of such agencies as will assuage passion, check the spirit of greed and promote trustfulness between employer and employed. . . . But the theory is not true. The cause of the trouble is economic, not psychological; is institutional, not temperamental. The remedy must be institutional to accomplish any lasting results. It must recognize and deal with economic conditions and not merely busy itself with schemes of persuasion addressed to the spirit of greed. The economic situation in the coal region is that of a powerful monopoly pitted against the workingman. Why should it make terms or arbitrate points of difference with the latter? It is absolute master of the situation—that is, until a national election, that threatens the privileges on which it is based, approaches. In such a case, as in 1900, it usually finds something to arbitrate.

ILLINOIS POLITICS.

Chicago Daily News (neut.) May 9.—Unless some trace of independent spirit leads to a revolt at the eleventh hour the next United States senator from Illinois is quite likely to be a product not of the people of the state, nor of a party, nor even of a party legislative caucus, but of Lorimer.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.) May 10.—We regret that the candidacy of Mr. Hopkins was blended with the issue of "boss rule" in such a manner that the Tribune could not support it from the beginning, but as the bosses have decreed that so fit a man shall be chosen to the United States Senate, it would be kicking against singular good fortune to object to his nomination and election.

THE PHILIPPINE ATROCITIES.

Bryan's Commoner (Dem.).—Would it be possible to commit an act so atrocious that the administration organs would refuse to indorse it, providing it was done under sanction of the administration?

Columbus Press (Dem.), May 5.—If a few more court-martials are ordered for the Philippines our standing army over there will be almost entirely occupied sitting in judgment when not "killing everything over 10."

Red Wing (Minn.) Argus (Dem.), May 8.—If this administration had been in power when Decatur made his little excursion to the Mediterranean, this government would still be busy pacifying the Barbary pirates. We did it and got out, and the flag was not hurt.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.) May 7.—The imperialist press has now abandoned argument. When cornered they simply cry, "Don't haul down the flag!" and claim that the people are not patriotic because

they do not defend the barbarous acts of some American soldiers. The fruits of imperialism are now in full view of the people. The policy of "benevolent assimilation" has changed to a policy of "criminal aggression." Expansion has grown into a despotic colonialism.

Bryan's Commoner (Dem.).—After declaring that the Filipinos are "treacherous," "full of deceit," "not to be trusted" and "incapable of friendship," the administration organs seek to excuse the brutality of Gen. Smith's order by saying that supposedly friendly natives attacked soldiers who were surprised and unprepared for fight. What about the officers who were unprepared for a fight in the midst of such a people? The logic of the administration organs always shows up with enough kinks in it to make it look like a worm fence.

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, May 5-10, 1902.

Senate.

After passing, on the 5th, the bill (Senate bill No. 2,992) ratifying an agreement with the Sioux Indians of the Rosebud reservation (pp. 5371-76), and considering during the remainder of the morning hour the sundry civil appropriation bill (p. 5375), the Senate resumed consideration of the Philippine civil government bill, speeches being made by Senators Lodge and Rawlins. This business was suspended before adjournment, and the sundry civil appropriation bill taken up again (p. 5383) and passed (p. 5385). Consideration of the Philippine bill being resumed on the 6th, Mr. Beveridge (p. 5427), and Mr. Turner (p. 5434) occupied the day. The principal speakers on this subject on the 7th were Mr. McComas (p. 5449), Mr. Tillman (p. 5454) and Mr. Burton (p. 5458); the latter continuing his speech on the 8th (p. 5512), when he was followed by Mr. Carmack (p. 5513), Mr. Dooliver (p. 5519), Mr. Money (p. 5524) and Mr. McComas (p. 5527). During the morning hour on the 9th an extended discussion (p. 5573-5579) grew out of a motion to discharge the committee on privileges and elections from further consideration of the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment for the election of senators by popular vote and to place the resolution upon the calendar. In regular order discussion of the Philippine question was then resumed (p. 5579); and in this connection Mr. Lodge asked unanimous consent that the bill come to a vote on the 21st. Mr. Dubois objecting, there was some discussion regarding the limitation of debate, after which Mr. Teller (p. 5581) spoke on the merits of the bill. The subject was informally laid aside on the 10th (p. 5513) and private legislation disposed of. But prior to that action, the army appropriation bill being under consideration (p. 5504), Mr. Bailey moved as an amendment (p. 5506) that no money appropriated thereby should be expended in defraying the expenses of any representative at the coronation of any hereditary king, prince or potentate." He afterwards withdrew the amendment (p. 5511) and moved instead an independent resolution (p. 5511) declaring that—

It is contrary to the policy of the United States to accredit to any foreign government any ambassador, minister, or other diplomatic officer or agent to especially represent the United States at the coronation of any hereditary prince or potentate.

That no power exists in the president of the United States to appoint any ambassador, minister, or other diplomatic officer or agent and accredit him as the representative of the United States to any foreign government except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as prescribed in section 2, article II, of the constitution of the United States.

The army appropriation bill was then passed.

House.

No business of general interest was transacted on the 5th, adjournment being

taken as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Otey (p. 5387); and on the 6th the House adjourned out of respect to the memory of the late Representative Salmon (p. 5435). After the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill had been agreed to (pp. 5468-5475), on the 19th, the bill (H. bill No. 12543), for the admission into the Union as States of Oklahoma, Arizona and New Mexico was taken up in committee of the whole (p. 5481) and debated through the remainder of the day's session. This debate continued on the 8th, when an amendment authorizing Congress to attach the Indian Territory or any part thereof at any time to the State of Oklahoma (p. 5533) was lost—67 to 103 (p. 5541). The same bill being under consideration on the 9th (p. 5547), was amended and passed (p. 5553). No further business of general interest was done during the week.

Record Notes.—Senator Lodge's speech on the Philippine question, p. 5389; Senator Turner's on the same question, p. 5492; Representative Robertson's on Cuban reciprocity, p. 5439, and Representative Grosvenor's on oleomargarine, p. 5603.

Senator Vest's account of the civil war conference at Hampton Roads between President Lincoln and the Confederate commissioners, p. 5612.

Text of secretary of war's report on objectionable military orders in the Philippines, p. 5459.

MISCELLANY

THE SLAVE OF IGNORANCE.

For The Public.

Once, as in dreamy mood I strayed
Along a splendid hall of art,
I saw one picture on the wall
That burned its import on my heart;
That fixed its meaning in my soul,
And stamped its impress on my mind;
For in that picture I beheld
The tolling millions bound and blind.

The canvas held the burly form
Of Hebrew Samson at the mill,
Docile and ox-like, trudging round
Obedient to a master's will.
His captors mock him at his toil,
And jeer his eyeballs dulled and seared:
Oh, where has fled the dauntless pride—
The god-like strength that made him
feared?

Oh Samson! thou art but a type
Of Labor, through the weary years
Treading the ceaseless round of toll,
In want and unavailing tears;
Thy masters mock thee, and despise
The patient strength on which they feed,
Thy feeble protests they ignore
In haughty overmastering greed.

Slave of the mills of Privilege,
Scoured on by Poverty and Dread,
The selfishness of ages weights
The crown of thorns upon thy head,
The greed of all the years has bound
The fear of want about thy brow;
A serf thou wert in ages past,
Wealth owned thee then—*It owns thee
now!*

Oh slave, by Ignorance enthralled,
Uplift thy visage to the light!
The sun of Reason shines for all,
Look up—its beams will give thee sight!
Thou hast the power to shape the world,
To make it what thou'dst have it be,
There is no need of other power
Than thine own Will to make thee free.
ROBERT T. WHITELAW.

THE SACREDNESS OF PROPERTY.

We contend for the sacredness of property and property rights. Property is, and should be held, sacred. Property rights are inherent. But we must recognize the fact that the claim of sacredness becomes a pernicious absurdity unless we restrict

our claims to actual property, id. est., real, produced wealth, and unless we have come into possession of it by natural and just methods that deny to no other man his just and sacred claim to the property which he has produced. Mere legality does not always establish the moral right, and only the moral right is sacred.—St. Louis Finance.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

HIS MOTIVE IN MONEY-MAKING.

Some years ago, when Tom Johnson's soul was first fired by the Henry George philosophy, he was for leaving his business life and entering the lists for the new crusade. It was Henry George, to whom Mr. Johnson expressed his desire, who said:

"Don't do it, Tom. Some day the cause will need you more than now, and then you will know the necessity of having means to carry on the fight. Stay in business. Make all the money you can, even if you do not believe in the methods of getting riches; for in your case these same riches taken from the people by laws giving special privileges will be used for the common good, in overthrowing those same laws."—Wilmington (Del.) Justice.

HIS RULE ABOUT DONATIONS.

Not long ago a minister, who asked for a donation to help build a church, received from Mr. Johnson a letter to this effect:

"You will have to excuse me from donating to this worthy cause for which you appeal. I, too, am in a fight for truth and justice, which seems to me as great, if not greater, than the cause you represent. In my fight, I stand almost alone among men of means willing to give their money to help bring about just social conditions. Many wealthy men will gladly help with your work, who cannot, or will not, see the needs of the cause for which I am giving my time and means. I feel the necessity of husbanding my resources to carry on the battle for economic freedom and justice."—Wilmington Justice.

AN INSTANCE OF "UNEARNED INCREMENT."

Russell Sage owns the house in which he lives, at 506 Fifth avenue, New York, and Elbridge T. Gerry owns the ground upon which it stands. Mr. Sage began to pay ground rent to Mr. Gerry some 44 years ago, taking at first a 22 years'

lease at \$700 a year. At the end of that period the lease was renewed for an equal term at \$3,300 a year. Now another renewal has been made at a rental of \$12,500 a year, which Mr. Sage says is outrageous, but as he and his wife cannot bear the thought of moving from their old home, they conclude to submit. Mr. Sage's house has been steadily deteriorating in value all this time, while Mr. Gerry's land has been appreciating to a remarkable degree. The value of Mr. Sage's house came out of his own pocket, but the present value of Mr. Gerry's land is due, not to himself or his work, but to the growth and efforts of the community as a whole. Cases like this, which are so common in England, are uncommon in the United States, where the ownership of improved realty in individual hands usually embraces land, as well as buildings and improvements. If separate ownership were common to the country, the ideas of the late Henry George would gain much more rapid headway than they do.—Springfield Republican (Weekly), May 2.

FUNSTON, CONSIDERED AS A FILIPINO PATRIOT.

I read in the Associated Press dispatches that Senator Burton, of Kansas, "defended Gen. Funston and praised his record," and that Senator McComas, of Maryland, "made a warm defense of Gen. Funston" and "paid high tribute to his courage and patriotism." I am very curious to see what was actually said by these gentlemen, for I am entirely unable to imagine any defense for Funston except that advanced by Mark Twain in the North American Review for May, namely: that Funston was born that kind of a man, liking cruelty and other moral slag, and therefore cannot help practicing them.

But let that pass. I desire in all earnestness and sincerity to appeal to the daily readers of the Chicago Evening Post, whom I believe to be the cream of the citizens of Chicago, to put this question to themselves and answer it truthfully.

If Aguinaldo had bribed a deserter from the United States army to give him some letters of an inferior American officer; had then forged that officer's signature, and by means of it had opened communication with Funston and found his whereabouts; had then, with other deserters from the United States army and soldiers of his own outnumbering altogether Funston's

body guard two to one, reached a place some miles from Funston's headquarters, where the latter was alone with that bodyguard; had there, with all his men, become too weak from lack of food to move, and in the presence of imminent death from starvation had sent to Funston to beg for food to save his own and his followers' lives; had received it, and with it, guides; had been ushered into Funston's presence with his men disguised as American soldiers and himself as a prisoner; had then, while shaking hands with Funston, signaled his men to shoot down Funston's bodyguard and make Funston a captive and carry him away; had succeeded in his undertaking and returned to his army and his kindred and received their unlimited praise and plaudits—what would they (the readers of the Evening Post) have said of the Malay character and of Aguinaldo individually?

Let each reader of the Evening Post, taking counsel of his conscience, not of United States senators nor of newspapers, answer this to himself, and then tell his boys whether he would like to have them emulate the exploit.—Edward Osgood Brown, in Chicago Evening Post of May 9, 1902.

THE MESSENGERS.

For The Public.
Dramatis Personæ:

President Roosevelt.
Mr. Wolmarans, Boer representative.
Mr. Wessels, Boer representative.
Dr. Mueller, Orange Free State representative.
Lord Pauncefoot, British Ambassador.
Scene, Library in White House.

Enter Roosevelt:

Oh, what a come-down; not a week ago Henry, the brother of dear Germany, Even within these humble walls did come,

And here, of my poor hospitality, Without a sign of spurning, did accept. But now a note from Hay advises me Three men from Africa who represent The poor foolhardy wretches who aspire

To conquer England's vast imperial strength, Do wait on me.

(*Enter Wolmarans, Wessels and Mueller*)
I welcome you, my friends.

Wessels—Much does your excellency favor us.

Wolmarans—You help us with your hospitality.

Mueller—We thank you greatly.

Roos.— Pray, be seated now. You, Dr. Mueller, take this rocking chair;

This sofa rest on, Mr. Wolmarans; And Mr. Wessels, in the roomy depths Of what we call a "Dewey," sink—No, no,

Not that! (*aside*—he was about to occupy The chair the prince so lately rested in!)

Now, to your business, gentlemen, my time

Is closely pressed with matters that concern

The glorious Power of which I am the head;

And any subject that is not germane I must dismiss with promptness, though it seem

My haste does savor of discourtesy.

Wessels—Your excellency, for this audience

You have our gratitude, and we shall speed

Our errand with all proper diligence.

We have not come to tell a craven's tale,

We do not you entreat to intervene

In the great bloody conflict, where our foe

Is ten times more in numbers than are we.

We come to plead that you will only give

Your kindly and most powerful offices To us so that we may compel a strict

And fair compliance by our enemy

With those humane requirements of the laws

Enacted by all nations Christianized, Covering the matter of conducting war.

Roos.—What, tell me, has dear England ever done

To make her snowy reputation black?

I should as soon believe to unfair deeds Had stooped Columbia. Most surely you

Are mastered by a morbid fantasy!

Wessels—I would, your excellency, that I were,

And that I had not just complaint to make.

And passing thankful would I be if men

Would prove beyond dispute I am a liar When I relate in tear-begetting words, The story of brave Scheeper's murderous death.

And if there is a place for me in Heaven, I would with gladness trade it for the proof

That I have no foundation for a case Against the British for unworthy deeds,

When I recount the horrors of the camps,

Those earthly Hades, where for not a sin,

Are fevered, starving, non-combatants mewed,

Whose sufferings are the sufferings of the damned

Save that they lack the factor of remorse,

Where hydra-handed Herod rules so well

That Rachels, moving anywhere about, Lift high their feet, so not to tread upon

The omnipresent, little sandy mounds.

Roos.—Enough, enough; you voice your tale in vain.

I may do nothing, for Neutrality Does raise her hand, forbidding any act.

But if the Boers were men of Cuba's isle,

And were the English cruel Spanish Dons,

Then would I mount my steed, and at the head

Of Botha, and Delarey, and DeWet, Cry, "Forward, my brave comrades!" and would charge

Triumphantly, as I charged at San Juan

Where no Neutrality benumbed my blood.

Mueller—Your excellency, pardon us, but we

Had serious but hesitating thought To broach the subject of Neutrality;

And now that you have mentioned it we pray

To quote from this agreement that was made

Between the British and your countrymen.

(*Reads from the Treaty of Washington*): A Neutral Government is bound—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 renewal or augmentation of military supplies, or arms, or the enlistment of men.

Now in the face of this it does appear That cargoes destined for South Africa,

Cargoes of mules with many muleteers, Are loaded at New Orleans, and thence, With all impunity are shipped.

Roos.— You speak Of commerce that is most legitimate, As evidenced by many legal minds; But if that commerce should not lawful be

I could not logically interfere, For interfering would be giving aid To one of the belligerents, which act Would be Neutrality's antithesis.

Wolmarans—Our minds move dully, Mr President.

They cannot grasp your deep philosophy;

But we shall vex you with our complaints no more,

Yet hoping still, we bid you now farewell.

Roos.—My friends, farewell. (*Exit the Envoys.*) (*Enter Pauncefote.*)

Oh, honored am I now!
How glad I am to see you here, my lord.

But tell me why your brow so deep is lined,
Has Worry with her keen engraving tool
Been working there?

Pauncefote—Your excellency, no.
But as I crossed your threshold I did meet
Three men of peasant mien who spoke a tongue
That touched my trusting spirit with distrust.

Roos.—My lord, your intuition played you false;
So let your trust reign undisturbed again.
The men you met were envoys of the Boers
Whom I had greeted unofficially.
I listened with politeness to their words,
But that was all.

Pauncefote—Oh, greatly I rejoice
That you are ever loyal to my cause.
Your faithfulness Great Britain does repay
For her maternal service in your war
With the Iberians—when her hand forced back
The eager German, French, Norwegian, Pole,
The Turk, the Russian, and the Japanese,
The Chinaman—aye, all the nations that
Were thirsting for your Country's blood and death.
I thank you, Mr. President, and now
That I am so relieved I shall depart
With gratitude.

Roos.—But wait to hear, my lord,
The joke that humorous Choate sent to Hay,
About the Coronation. In the folds
Of documents pertaining to the state,
Our great ambassador did put a sheet,
On which he had inscribed, he would be forced
To meet the Coronation's strict edict
To put on trousers ending at the knees,
And, "Hay," he wrote, "I shall be gratified
If you will lend me for that regal time,
Your 'little breeches.'"

Pauncefote—I see not the joke;
Will you explain it, Mr. President?

Roos.—With pleasure great, my lord,
but pardon me
If I appoint some early future time.
For, now, before me stretches but an hour

In which I shall be free to trace for you
The intricacies that do make the jest.

Pauncefote—I shall with joy look forward to that time.
Good day.

Roos.—My lord, the best of days to you.
(*Exit Pauncefote.*)
(*Exit Roosevelt.*)
G. T. E.

A DEMOCRATIC-DEMOCRAT FOR SENATOR FROM OREGON.

The Democratic convention of Oregon having nominated for United States senator, C. E. S. Wood, of Portland, a leader at the Oregon bar, Mr. Wood wrote the subjoined letter of acceptance. The state election will take place June 3, 1902.

Samuel White, Esq., Chairman, and Richard W. Montague, Esq., Secretary, Democratic State Central Committee, of Oregon: I have just received your notification that I have been nominated by the state convention to the candidacy for United States senator. The nomination to any position of trust, which comes to a man unsought, is an honor, and I feel grateful to my Democratic fellow-citizens for this expression of confidence in me.

The chances of success seem to me of very secondary importance compared to the fight to be made and the principles to be discussed. I know there is a feeling among political experts that defeat ought never to be admitted beforehand, because certain votes follow the winning side and are captured by the enthusiasm of success; but for such votes I do not care and I think it never truly hurts any cause to admit the truth. Let me frankly confess here and now that to me there seems not the ghost of a chance of my ever reaching the United States Senate from Oregon. But it is better to be right on the page of history than victorious to-day. The party or the man who makes mere success the prime object will dodge and quibble, blow hot and cold; abandon the eternal truths for the expediency of the moment. I hope and believe that Democrats everywhere will prove their willingness to adopt a great fundamental principle and patiently go down with it to defeat a thousand times—to die with it, if need be, confident that some day it will rise triumphant, though the voices of its first advocates are hushed forever. Lincoln's party did not begin by winning,

nor did it change to suit the temper of the times. Has any man who sought to move the world upward a little begun with victory?

It seems to me, therefore, that whether I can succeed or not is of very little consequence. What is of consequence is to preach with might and main what we conceive to be the truth, so that hereafter the people will vote more upon understanding and beliefs and less upon the mere accident of a temporarily full dinner pail. My first inclination was to decline this responsibility. I have been absent from home and office since last November, and many personal and family reasons urged that I decline; but on reflection it seemed to me again, as it has in the past, that a man does his truest duty towards his family who, in his own day and generation, shirks no fight or burden, but sacrifices himself for unborn generations, as others in times past have sacrificed themselves for the liberty and progress we now enjoy. I feel also there is much due to the wishes of a party, and that I can speak more freely the full party doctrine, as I conceive it to be, if I am myself a candidate. Therefore, I accept this nomination and shall do what I can. But, as I have said publicly many times, I have no political aspirations for myself; there is no office whatever which I desire.

Before closing this letter, perhaps I ought to state, after the fashion of candidates, briefly my conception of the political situation to-day. (I have not seen the platform adopted.)

One of the historical axioms is that power (political and military) lodges where property does. The great holders of property are the holders of great power. The wealthy class of Rome held the power of Rome; the feudal lords of the middle ages held the power of the middle ages. At the time of the Revolution, this country lay vast and virgin. There was comparatively little difference among the people. Untold millions of wealth have been developed out of this great domain, but the wealth has steadily concentrated in the hands of the few. This is not to be considered a cause of envy or hatred of the rich, for differences will always exist; but the differences here are so great as to indicate a wrong economic base. Certainly no one will contend that our wealthiest men are exclusively our smartest men; or their brains are as much greater as their wealth is greater. The Republican party, by a sort of evolution, has become the guardian (or the instrument, if you please) of this con-

centrated wealth and power and of this false economic basis. A permanent change can only come by evolution or revolution. Revolution will mean the sudden and more or less blind uprising of envy and suffering; evolution means the gradual education of the people. I take it to be the mission of the party opposed to the Republican party to earnestly and persistently enforce this education without passion and low appeals until the reforms are brought about, and the world moves. Change of some sort there will be, whether we like it or not. Certainly no one expects us to remain precisely as we are to-day, and the question now is shall there be more concentration of wealth and power or less, more government or less.

I believe in more freedom and less government, and plant myself on Thomas Jefferson's enunciation of the whole truth: "That government is best which governs least. Equal opportunity to all; special privilege to none." It seems to me this nation has been growing almost wholly along Hamiltonian lines: special privilege, a fostering governmental care of private interests, and distrust of the mass of the people. And it seems to me the condition we are in is due to robbery of the people by laws passed in the interest of a special and privileged few, and not permitting the people a sufficiently direct voice in their own government. The Jeffersonian idea of government is an organization to keep peace and order. The more government is forced back into that position, the more prosperous will the mass of the people be in my opinion; for, certainly, the more you cut the claws of government, the less it can scratch the people while purring to them. I do not know a law which has invaded the domain of free individual effort which has not resulted in some jobbery and robbery. Let us resolve all questions to-day by an honest application of these maxims—"Freedom" and "Special privileges to none."

I have always denied that this is truly a government by the people, for the people. For example, it is conceded that the people, east and west, north and south, want to elect their own senators by popular vote. An amendment to the United States constitution, after years of battling, is brought to the Senate. Senator Depew introduces an amendment to the resolution which passes with only one dissenting Republican vote. The Depew amendment is intended to kill the constitutional amendment desired by the peo-

ple. In my opinion, the people would be fools to accept such a dangerous innovation in the constitution. Senator Depew's amendment provides that whenever an election of any member of either House is being held, Congress shall prescribe the regulations, and Federal authority shall oversee, conduct and control it. In short, it Mexicanizes this Republic. Federal troops would police the polls and Federal courts pass on all judicial questions arising. It also requires that the qualifications of such electors be uniform throughout the states. Do you think Senator Depew and his Republican friends here represented the people, or did they represent the strong centralized wealth which put them where they are; often by corrupt purchase of their seats, always by packing the legislature beforehand? What real interest do you think the people of Oregon had for four long years, whether Senator Mitchell or Senator Corbett was returned to the Senate? Was there not one other Republican in Oregon fit for the place?

Apply our test of freedom to this question, and we answer it: Let the political power get back to the mass of the people where it belongs. So, too, with the initiative and referendum. Hamilton in his day said the people were not to be trusted. That idea clings to the Republican party to-day—either in the way Hamilton meant it, that the people were not capable; or in another sense, that the people would strike at the privileges the few are fattening on and which they have grown to believe themselves entitled to. My belief is if this Republic cannot live as the government of the people by the people themselves, let it die. Certainly, as we look back upon the long record of land grants, subsidies, protective tariffs, franchises and private grafts, we can be sure the people cannot do worse for themselves than their representatives, national, state and municipal have done for them. But the recent election in Chicago shows that the people, when given a voice in their own affairs, are glad to use it and use it intelligently—far more intelligently than any council had ever done for them. There is an instinct which teaches even a squirrel to protect its nest and winter hoard. Cannot man be as wise? Hamilton said, in effect: "Out of the people's pockets let us foster our infant industries." Jefferson said it is a vicious principle—government should not meddle with industries. Which was right? A century has passed; we have grown to greatness; the toilers

still sweat to produce wealth from the soil; the infant industries are giant trusts—and is there one which has ever let go the teat? Or is willing now to let it go? Not one. They sit in the seats of Congress and laugh at the people. Even the Republican President when he pleads for our promise to Cuba is laughed in the face and told it might as well be understood first as last that there will be no change in the tariff. Mr. Schwab, president of the steel trust, told Mr. Lawrence, member of the English House of Commons, that the trust could deliver steel billets in England at \$16.50 per ton. He asked his American Customers \$26.00 a ton. Guess the profit! American copper was bought in England last year and reconveyed to this country at a profit over the home price. In Mexico, South America, Russia, China, everywhere but among ourselves, American made reapers, tools, rails, nails, cotton-goods and coffins, everything used, from the cradle to the grave, can be bought cheaper by foreigners than by the citizens of this country which makes them. The artificial price forced on us by the tariff wall is unnatural, exorbitant, and fears no competition. And yet I remember Mr. Tongue in the last campaign was cheered to the echo by young men of Oregon when he said the tariff was only making foreigners pay our taxes. If so, why not let them pay all our taxes? But alas! the buyer has always paid the cost of an article, and the customs duty on such articles as may be imported is part of the cost. It is the policy of the large profitters by protection to let as many as possible suck at the sugar, and the sucker is pleased with the sweetness and becomes a partisan for protection, forgetting he is paying his little profit many times over on such things.

I think the people of Oregon would be well pleased if I were in the Senate to have me do what I could to break down this tariff robbery on the things they buy; but I think many would object to wool and sugar going on the free list. And yet, if I were senator, I would most certainly advocate no protection of any kind to anything. If protection is wrong, it is all wrong. I believe if one man is entitled to buy his machinery free of subsidies, another is entitled to buy his clothes and sugar free of subsidies. I believe the good of one is best found in the good of all, and that a principle is true for all or not true at all. I am for free trade; by that I mean just what the words mean—trade set free. I believe in free speech; free press; free work; free

play, and free trade. I believe in freedom.

In 1820 the merchants of London revolted against the protective system and presented their famous petition to "buy where we like, and sell where we like." In this petition they said: "But foreign commerce is conducive to the wealth and prosperity of a country by enabling it to import the commodities for the production of which the soil, climate, capital and industry of other countries are best calculated, and to export in payment those articles for which its own situation is better adapted." "That freedom from restraint is calculated to give the utmost extension to foreign trade, and the best direction to the capital and industry of the country." After these principles were adopted, British trade leaped from a level line to a steadily climbing upward one.

It is said the trusts have an expanding commerce, Why not? They sell abroad at the expense of the buyer at home. But the expansion is not for the merchants and citizens of this country, nor for the trade in general. It is all for the trusts. I am told by experts that the real balance of trade, so far as the people are concerned, is against us.

I am writing too hastily to condense, and this letter is already too long. My views are pretty well known to you and my fellow citizens. When in doubt as to my position, anyone can safely resolve his doubts by considering that I believe the earth was made for the inhabitants thereof. I believe in freedom wherever possible, and in all things. I oppose governmental interference in private enterprise, and I oppose all special privileges. Again let me urge that we take no special thought about the success of to-day, but strike out some deep principles which we believe in as we do in life itself, and hang to them until they win. If they be truth, they will win in time, and if they be not truth they ought not to win.

I would not regard our party's defeat in the next national election as an unmixed sorrow, for we will soon be on the eve of another "hard times" epoch which will surely be laid at the doors of the then existing administration. It will be largely the result of Republican inflations and subsidies, and tariff and speculation, and it would be hard for the Democratic party, now that it is so much needed, to be wiped out by the effects of the very evils it seeks to remedy.

Again thanking, through you, those fellow citizens who have shown their

confidence in me, I am, yours very truly,

C. E. S. WOOD.
New York, Apr. 21, 1902.

IN OUR HUMAN HIVE.

This much at least is certain; our "little black specks" would not reveal the vast moral direction, the wonderful unity that are so apparent in the hive.

"Whither do they tend, and what is it they do?" he would ask, after years and centuries of patient watching. "What is the aim of their life or its pivot? Do they obey some God? I can see nothing that governs their actions. The little things that one day they appear to collect and build up, the next day they destroy and scatter. They come and they go, they meet and disperse, but one knows not what it is that they seek. In numberless cases the spectacle they present is altogether inexplicable.

There are some, for instance, who as it were, seem scarcely to stir from their place. They are to be distinguished by their glossier coat, and often, too, by their more considerable bulk. They occupy buildings ten or twenty times larger than ordinary dwellings, and richer and more ingeniously fashioned. Every day they spend many hours at their meals, which, sometimes, indeed are prolonged far into the night. They appear to be held in extraordinary honor by those who approach them; men come from the neighboring houses, bringing provisions, and even from the depths of the country, laden with presents. One can only assume that these persons must be indispensable to the race, to which they render essential service, although our means of investigation have not yet enabled us to discover what the precise nature of this service may be.

There are others, again, who are incessantly engaged in the most wearisome labor, whether it be in great sheds full of wheels, that forever turn round and round, or close by the shipping, or in obscure hovels, or on small plots of earth that from sunrise to sunset they are constantly delving and digging. We are led to believe that this labor must be an offense, and punishable. For the persons guilty of it are housed in filthy, ruinous and squalid cabins. They are clothed in some colorless hidé. So great does their ardor appear for this noxious, or at any rate useless activity, that they scarcely allow themselves time to eat or to sleep. In numbers they are to the others as a thousand to one. It is remarkable that the species should have been able to survive to this day under

conditions so unfavorable to its development. It should be mentioned, however, that apart from this characteristic devotion to their wearisome toil, they appear inoffensive and docile; and satisfied with the leavings of those who evidently are the guardians, if not the saviors of the race.—From "The Life of the Bee," by Maurice Maeterlinck.

PARODIES YOU OUGHT TO KNOW.

JINGOISM.

With undiminished respect for the memory of Sir Walter Scott.

For The Public.

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said:
"Let's grab some nation's native land!"
Who hath not massacred and burned,
Wasted and ruined, ere he turned
From robbery on some foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well!
He makes no water tortures swell;
High though his talents, wide his fame,
Patriot his soul as wish can claim—
Yea, be he Honor's second self,
His worth and intellect we'll shelf,
And make a hero of some clown,
Who bawls: "Let peacemakers go down
To the vile dust from whence they sprung,
All drawn, all quartered, and all hung!"*

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

* Or words to that effect. He said "hung." I know it ought to be "hanged." I am not responsible.

"I suppose that the Filipinos are very deceitful," remarked the imperialist, as he saluted the flag.

"Oh, they are," exclaimed Lieut. Returne; "they deceive without shame. Why, I have actually seen Filipino mothers swear up and down that their grown up children were not ten years old."

G. T. E.

Ever stop to think that someone has to go around and pick up and straighten out after the easy-going, good-natured people?—Atchison Globe.

It is time for Spain to reciprocate and interfere with our Philippine business "in the interests of humanity."—Helena Independent.

BOOK NOTICES.

WATSON'S NAPOLEON.

Of course everyone who has had the good fortune to read the Story of France will read this third volume. In real understanding of Napoleon—whether as a politician, as a statesman, as a commander, or especially as a man and, in spite of his imperialism, as a humanitarian—this life seems to me to surpass all the histories of Napoleon that have ever been written.

To understand a man as great as Napoleon it takes time and it takes sympathy. The life must be written by one who can enter into the arcanum of his hero's ideals and purposes. Mr. Watson, himself a "lib-

eral" in the best sense, seems to me to have succeeded in doing this.

I used the word humanitarian advisedly; for Napoleon was this, in the sense of wishing well to all men, rather than to a caste or class. He understood and resisted the whole Bourbon brood with its dogmas of divine right and special privilege. No man that ever lived ever did more for democracy than he. The tragedy of his life was that he stopped short, that he did not have enough faith in democracy. The mismanagement of the revolution and the attitude of all the institutional forces, which he had seen in his young days, had impressed him too deeply. In his last desperate days in France the masses would have rallied to him, had he said the word. He stopped short of the sublime height of seeing that the salvation of democracy is more democracy.

Why did his almost superhuman genius fail to see this? The failure lay in the very human weakness of selfishness. The thing that dragged him down was the selfish desire to found a dynasty. The glamour of kingship poisoned his ideals. He longed to perpetuate his line. This is shown in his great desire for a son and in his repeated care for the interest of the son. Each time he abdicated he made an effort to stipulate for the succession of this son. With this purpose always in view he feared to put himself at the head of a real social revolution, and thus to alienate forever the higher powers and institutions at home and abroad.

How the people believed in him, loved him! Had he only trusted them, called upon

Home Rule and Tax Reform in Colorado.

Advocates of home rule in taxation should be interested in and lend their aid to the campaign now in progress in Colorado, for a constitutional amendment allowing counties desiring to do so to adopt land value taxation for local purposes, as is done in New Zealand and elsewhere in Australasia. The resolution submitting this amendment to popular vote passed both houses of the Colorado legislature by a two-thirds majority. An attempt subsequently made in the interest of land grant railroads and other speculative real estate interests to repeal the resolution was defeated by a close vote. The same special interests are now canvassing the state against the measure. They are spending money freely for this purpose, while the friends of the measure have but little to spend. As usual, what it is everybody's business to pay for nobody pays for. That should be remedied. It is to the interest of the whole country that this Colorado amendment be adopted, for its adoption would surely be followed by the adoption of similar measures in other states. We therefore call upon the people of Illinois to help the friends of home rule and just taxation in Colorado. Money is needed to send speakers through the state and to supply the people with explanatory literature. For the purpose of raising such a fund by national subscription a National Australasian Tax Reform association has been organized. Hon. James W. Bucklin, of Grand Junction, Col., is president. Lawson Purdy, of New York, is secretary, and August Lewis, of the same state, is treasurer. An Illinois branch of this association has been formed, which will receive contributions, either in bulk or in monthly installments, and forward them to the national treasurer. The amendment is to be voted upon at the Colorado election in November next, and funds are needed NOW. Send contributions to U. A. H. Greene, secretary, 138 Jackson boulevard, Chicago.

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN,
Chairman Illinois Committee for the Promotion of the Australasian Tax System.
U. A. H. GREENE, Secretary.

them to stand by him in wiping out every vestige of the old regime, perhaps liberalism would not have suffered its great setback.

Mr. Watson's clear and vivid style, shown to perfection in the second volume of the Story of France, is fully maintained in this last volume. With the exception of Froude and Flske, no modern historian possesses to as high a degree the quality of being interesting. This life of Napoleon carries one on like a novel. One ceases to watch the number of the page and is sorry when the last is turned.

On page 667 there is a common lapse from good English; but in such a book as this one feels almost ashamed to notice so trifling a matter. It is like criticising Napoleon on spelling and penmanship.

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

—The International Socialist Review (Chicago) begins in the May number a history of the United States in its economic epochs, from the standpoint of historic materialism.

LOST—One Full Dinner Pall marked "McK-H-Rlt. 00." The finder may keep the Contents for his honesty, and no questions asked; the advertiser wishing only to recover the Pall for a memento of his folly. Address: Workingman "No. 10,171," care of The Gold Brick Manufacturing Co., Washington, New York, Chicago, St. Louis or San Francisco. Labor papers please copy and send bill to the nearest Republican Committee.

Volume IV of The Public

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

BOUND VOLUMES NOW READY.
PRICE, \$2.00.

Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

VOLUMES II AND III.

We have on hand a limited number of volumes II and III, bound in the regular half leather style of **THE PUBLIC** at \$2.00 per volume. Express charges to be paid by consignee.

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which **THE PUBLIC** may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 30 cents, postpaid.

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It reads the daily papers and tells its readers what they say. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, 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.

TERMS.

Annual Subscription	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription	1.00
Quarterly Subscription50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks)10
Single Copies05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of **THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.**

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:
THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

Houston.

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

New York.

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

THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL
for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of four weeks for .
10 CENTS.