

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1902.

Number 216.

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.

Those of us who are for peace and for the things that make for peace—the vivifying peace of fraternity and not the deadly peace of moonlit battle fields—might prefer to symbolize the friendly relations of our country with France otherwise than by erecting a soldier's statue. We can nevertheless applaud the erection of the statue of Rochambeau as a testimonial of international good will. For Rochambeau's name appears in the history of our country as a deliverer and not as a mere military hero. The erection to his memory of a statue by Congress is significant, therefore, of what is more vital to us than respect for military renown. Rochambeau commanded the French forces which Louis XVI. had sent to the aid of the struggling colonies. By making the victory at Yorktown possible, he assured the triumph of the American cause and helped lay the foundations of American republicanism. The continental congress of our fathers loaded him with honors while he remained in this country, and it is a gracious act for us to attest our gratitude and fraternal good will to France by perpetuating his memory in a bronze statue at the capital of our republic.

But suppose that instead of our erecting this statue to Rochambeau, it were proposed to erect one to his royal master, the unfortunate Louis XVI., king of France. What would the American people be apt to say to that? How would they feel? Can there be any doubt that the thing would be almost universally repulsive? Would Congress dare make such an innovation? Would it dare erect to the honored memory of this king

of France a statue within the precincts of our national capital? Would it dare do this, even though Louis XVI. was in fact one of the most amiable of men? even though he was one of the best intentioned of monarchs? even though he was the only royal friend in a practical way that this country had in its revolutionary struggle? even though it was to his power, dictated by his good will, that our forefathers were indebted for Rochambeau himself and the troops he commanded? Or suppose that France were now a monarchy, governed by a king claiming descent from Louis XVI., and that this king offered to symbolize the traditional good feeling between the two countries by presenting to us a statue, not of Rochambeau who fought with Washington for our independence, but of the present king's amiable and royal ancestor, one of the European monarchs of the time when we rejected monarchy and set up a republic—a statue of Louis XVI. of France. Would the American people feel honored by such a demonstration of royal affection? The questions answer themselves. A statue of Louis XVI. in the public grounds of the capital would be intensely repugnant to American sentiment. But why should we object to a statue of Louis XVI. if we welcome one of Rochambeau? Why should we shrink from erecting a monument to the king if we applaud the erection of one to his servant? Upon what theory do we honor the French general who fought for us with Washington if we would refuse a similar honor to his royal master who sent him?

The simple answer is, because the royal master who sent him was a royal master. A monument to Louis XVI. would be a monument to a king. No matter what else it represented, the idea of kingship would be upper-

most. Of course this distinction goes only to the question of titular forms. But there are times and circumstances when forms are vitally important. Marriage ceremonies are only forms; but they certify a relationship the sanctity of which might easily be impaired in practice by neglecting the form. Coronations are only forms, but they symbolize kingly power by divine right. Titles of nobility are only forms, yet the framers of our constitution rightfully regarded them as of sufficient importance to be forbidden. For similar reasons the American people of today who would foster republican institutions would shrink from setting up in the American capital the statue of a European king. Only those decadent Americans who really have no faith in republican institutions and would restore monarchical government here, and those who are indifferent so long as their own larder is full, are disposed to tolerate any flirting with monarchical forms or ceremonies or examples. Americans who are loyal to republican principles want neither the substance nor the forms of monarchy. Conscious of the dangers that lurk in reactionary forms, they are impatient of conferring republican honors upon kings.

But if these are the sentiments of American republicans, what is the rest of the world to infer from the extraordinary offer of the Emperor of Germany to set up a statue of Frederick the Great at Washington? If it be true that a present from France of a statue of Louis XVI., the amiable king who was our one royal friend, would not be welcome because it would seem to symbolize a retrogression of republican sentiment in this country, why does the German emperor offer us a statue of a king who was not amiable, was not in any marked way our friend, and

was hostile to republican ideals not only in the mere fact of his kingship but in his record as well? It is true that friendly relations have long existed between the people of the United States and the people of Germany. It is to be earnestly hoped that they will continue unbroken and undisturbed while time lasts. It is to be hoped moreover that they will knit closer as time goes by. Of the propriety of fitly symbolizing this friendship there should be no question. But have the Germans nothing more fit to offer us than a statue of Frederick the Great? Were there no German members of the world's republic of literature to choose from? Were there no German leaders in science who have helped reveal the democracies of nature? Was there no German statesman whose statue in one of our public places would not hourly challenge our republican ideals and seem to signalize their decay? If there were none such, and this gift was designed as a genuine expression of the esteem of one people for another, then why was Baron Steuben overlooked?—Baron Steuben, the military pupil of Frederick the Great, who came over to our struggling colonies, though not at the command of his royal master but of his own will, and gave his military aid to Washington and his fortune to our hungry and ragged troops? The German people do not lack illustrious countrymen whose statues as a present to us would symbolize our mutual friendship without seeming to rebuke our principles of government? Why then does their emperor offer us a statue which symbolizes kingship in a form most repugnant to republican ideals? It is not to be inferred that he intended offense. He is self-centered and impulsive, to be sure, but his familiarity with affairs of state would have restrained him from offering a present of that character to a friendly nation without first ascertaining its acceptability. The offer must have been the result of a diplomatic understanding between Berlin and Wash-

ington. But this inference would only enlarge the scope of the question. It would not answer it. If it be true that American sentiment recoils from the forms of monarchy, this larger question arises, why has the government at Berlin offered and the government at Washington encouraged and accepted this gift?

There is but one reasonable answer. It must be because the gift is peculiarly symbolic of our recent tendencies toward imperialism. As no gift could be more incongruous with our republican ideals than a statue of Frederick the Great, so none could be quite so appropriate to our recent imperial policies. It must have seemed, both to the German emperor and the American president, to symbolize with perfection the new departure of the American republic. For Frederick the Great was notable as an exponent of the very kind of imperialism to which the party in power in our republic has committed us. Though it has been said in his behalf that he granted extraordinary liberties of speech to the Prussian people over whom he reigned, the true character of those liberties may be best understood by his own commentary when he said: "My people and I have come to an agreement; they are to say what they please, and I am to do what I please." This principle of government has been in vogue at the White House for four years. Senator Hanna invented it in its application to the United States, President McKinley dutifully adopted it, and President Roosevelt has inherited it. He applies it even to the question of accepting the statue. Though he cabled William that he would refer the matter to Congress, he has since decided that this is not necessary. Congress and the people may say what they please, but he will do what he pleases. The symbolism of the royal Frederick's statue at the American capital would be still more striking in another respect. Frederick's conquest of Silesia and his participation in the annihilation of Poland and

the parcelling out of her territory are by no means unlike the American assault upon the Filipino republic and her bloody conquest of the Philippine islands. Even in the detail of treachery to an ally, the comparison holds good; for of Frederick's conquest of Silesia it is said, we quote from Ma-caulay, that "without pretext, without a provocation, in defiance of the most sacred engagements, he had attacked the helpless ally whom he was bound to defend." Nothing but a change of names is necessary to make this quotation fit as closely to the imperialism to which President Roosevelt is committed as that which the great Frederick practiced. In this view of the matter we are obliged to acknowledge the entire appropriateness of the German emperor's gift and the consistency of the President's hasty and unauthorized acceptance. In any other view, we should hardly expect that the statue would be allowed to stand on public ground at the American capital longer than might be necessary for the American people to realize its significance as a royal symbol.

What a comic commentary on the theory of monarchical government, which finds so many advocates among persons who distrust popular government, is the coronation of the king of Spain. Here is a mere lad who talks about "my" people, who is assured of the good wishes even of republics for "his" people, and whose personal insignificance is enveloped in imposing robes and a glittering crown. He would not be trusted to teach a district school in Illinois, yet full-bearded men make themselves believe that he governs them and that if they were not so governed anarchy would reign. Of course he does not govern. He is a fiction. His royal crown and robes do all the governing that is attributed to him. They would do it as well if he stuffed them with straw and went to a bull fight.

The hopelessness of the anthracite coal strike is unintentionally foreshadowed by the final report of the industrial commission in its sum-

mary and digest of the evidence it has collected. This discloses clearly the fact that the monopoly of the anthracite coal lands and of railroad rights of way and terminals is so far shielded from competition that no combination of laborers, subject to the competition of other laborers, can reasonably expect to cope with it by means of a strike. On this point the commission declares:—

Effective control by unity of stock ownership is given to a large proportion of the entire output of the field. It appears that the trend toward consolidation by actual purchase, not only of one railroad by another, but of independent coal holdings by the railroads, together with the extension of the community of ownership idea, is unmistakable. It cannot be long before the anthracite coal business of the United States in all its enormous extent and commercial value will be entirely monopolized by a few powerful financial interests. The only safeguard for the public against exorbitant prices must be found either in the competition of other fuels, in enlightened self-interest on the part of the railroads, or the immediate application of governmental regulation. Competition between either the producers of anthracite coal or the railroads which transport their product can no longer be regarded as of the slightest effect. Competition cannot be perpetuated. It has disappeared apparently once and for all.

To ordinary observers all that has long been evident. The curious thing about it is that so many observers, as well as this commission, do not distinguish the key to the monopoly. They see it and describe it, but they confuse it so hopelessly with non-essentials that they fail to recognize it as the key. What really makes it possible to monopolize the anthracite coal business is not any consolidation of the business of digging coal or of carrying coal. It is not the consolidation of ownership of mining machinery, for that can be reproduced at will; nor is it the consolidations of ownership of railway rolling stock, for that also can be reproduced at will. It is in part the consolidation of the ownership of the anthracite beds; these cannot be reproduced. It is in other part the consolidation of terminal sites of railroads, where coal is shipped and where it is delivered; neither can

these be reproduced. They are all in the category of land, while the rolling stock and mining machinery are in the category of reproducible capital. Why be so shortsighted, then, as to suppose that this monopoly can be destroyed only by government regulation or ownership of the coal business? All that is necessary is to terminate private control of coal land and railroad land. Competition in producing and transporting coal would then set in more briskly than ever. If all the reproducible capital in the world were consolidated in a trust, competition would soon break up that trust; but if all the land in the world were so consolidated there would be no competition except the competition of landless men for a chance to work.

When the legislature of Ohio adjourned last week it had passed but two of the "ripper" bills with which the Republican majority threatened Cleveland. Both were designed to cripple Mayor Johnson in his work of giving to Cleveland a good non-partisan, but fundamentally democratic government. One was brazenly in the interest of the local monopolies, and each was cynically defiant of local public sentiment.

The park board "ripper" takes the management of the city parks out of the control of the city authorities and turns them over to a county board to be appointed by a Republican official, whom the law designates by the title of his office but whom it might with equal propriety and no greater impudence have designated by name. This "ripping" was done on the theory, distinctly announced by a Republican leader in the legislature, that the Cleveland parks ought to be managed by the rich and not by the public at large. A proposition to submit the measure to a vote of the people of Cleveland was therefore voted down by the Republican majority in the legislature.

The other "ripper" relates to taxation. Mayor Johnson's administra-

tion having sought to tax the local franchises on the basis of 60 per cent. of their value, the same as other property (vol. iv, p. 741), those interests combined and under the dictation of Senator Hanna secured from the Republican majority in the legislature a measure empowering the county auditor of any county to apply in his discretion to the state officials—dominated by railroad interests—for the appointment by them of a local board in which all power over taxation shall be vested. The significance of this measure will be understood when it is explained that the county auditor of the Cleveland county, Craig, is a friend of the corporations, one of the beneficiaries of railroad pass privileges (vol. iv, p. 115), who became so brazen in serving them that at last fall's election he was defeated for re-election in his strong Republican county. But his term of office does not expire until next fall. Consequently this Hanna law enables him to perpetuate the power of serving local monopolies, which the voters took away from him, by authorizing him to secure the appointment of a tax board to his own liking. He has applied for the appointment of such a board, and Mayor Johnson declares his intention of resisting the Hanna law under which the application is made as unconstitutional.

Among the other acts of the Ohio legislature just adjourned were tax measures calculated to protect railroad companies from equal taxation while heavily taxing competitive business corporations. The earnest efforts of Mayor Johnson and his friends to secure laws making taxation equitable, and putting a stop to the tax dodging of railroad, street car and other monopoly corporations were frustrated by the Republican majority.

But two or three hopeful measures did slip through this boss-led and monopoly-ridden Ohio legislature. One was a bill establishing a uniform system of accounting in the public offices throughout the state. Even this bill,

however, was not made applicable to public service corporations. So, while it will have a tendency to check official corruption, it will not disclose the secret bookkeeping of monopolies which water their stock in order to create an appearance of small pro rata earnings. Another of the hopeful measures is a resolution amending the Ohio constitution, which is to be voted upon at the coming election. It would abolish that snare and delusion, the "uniform rule" of taxation, under which all property in Ohio is now required to be taxed equally but never is. It would also authorize classifications of taxable objects, so that the legislature might impose varying rates as between different classes, though required to treat all the objects of the same class alike. For instance, if building lots were put in one class and buildings in another, all building lots would have to be taxed at the same rate *ad valorem*; but buildings, though they also would have to be taxed at the same rate as compared with one another, might be taxed at a very different rate from the lots. Again: the franchises of railroads might be put in one class and taxed at one rate, while the rolling stock was put in another class and taxed at a different rate. Only a few objects could be wholly exempted from taxation, they being the same as are now exempt.

As we surmised last week, President Roosevelt has decided that it is not a breach of neutrality for Great Britain to buy munitions of war and load British war vessels with them for transportation directly by those war vessels to the seat of war in South Africa. It was not probable that an officer of the state department would publish his opinion to that effect in a magazine unless the decision had already been reached even if not announced. And the President skips the same hard place, in reaching his decision, that the state department expert did. He holds, and correctly, that our people have the right to sell munitions of war to either belligerent in regular course of commerce.

But he does not explain why he considers it regular course of commerce to establish on our soil a British army depot, in charge of British army officers, for storing munitions of war, and to ship them, not upon commercial vessels, but upon British war vessels which lie for days in our ports loading with these munitions, and which carry them directly to the seat of war. That seems much less like commercial enterprise than like military operations.

Great Britain so regarded similar transactions during our war with Spain. On the 3d of April, 1898, the governor general of Newfoundland promulgated a British proclamation (see *The Public*, Vol. i., No. 5, p. 10) forbidding the delivery of coal to any belligerent ship except for the express purpose of enabling them to proceed directly to their own country, or to some specified neutral destination, and advising against supplying coal to belligerents for any purpose if there were reasonable grounds for suspecting bad faith. Now there is no doubt that the people of Newfoundland had at that time a right to sell coal to the American government, or to the Spanish government, or both, in the ordinary course of commerce; but Great Britain decided that its delivery to American or Spanish war vessels for war purposes would not be in regular course of commerce and therefore would be in violation of neutrality. If there is any difference between the delivery of British coal in British ports to American war vessels for American war purposes, and the delivery of American coals in American ports to British war vessels for British war purposes, it would be interesting to see the difference defined. Mr. Roosevelt's decision implies that there is a difference.

In his speech on the 20th before the Presbyterian General Assembly at New York, President Roosevelt did a little patriotic boasting which will not bear very close examination. Re-

ferring to the recognition of Cuba, he said:

We have the right to feel proud that we have kept every pledge to the letter and established a new national precedent. I don't remember another such case—and I have looked for one with care—a case where, as the result of such a war, the victorious nation has contented itself by starting a new nation, free on the difficult path of self-government.

Is national fidelity to national pledges so rare a thing that the head of a great nation may boast of being true? Even if we had kept our pledge with Cuba to the letter, boasting of so obvious a duty would be in poor taste. But when in fact we have halted, and hesitated, and in the end assumed to reserve to ourselves a power at variance with the pledge, such boasting violates other standards besides those of taste. And is it true that there is no other case "where, as the result of such a war, the victorious nation has contented itself" with—what? With doing that for which it made the war. Did we not go to war with Spain for the purpose of liberating Cuba and making her an independent republic? Was not that the only purpose of the war? Certainly it was the only professed purpose. How then can we boast of our virtue in liberating Cuba and making her an independent republic? Does our wretched Philippine policy, which stultifies our national ideals and contravenes the spirit of our war pledge, weigh so heavily upon Mr. Roosevelt's conscience that he finds relief in pointing, though mistakenly, to the fulfillment of the letter of that pledge? When we boast of keeping the letter of the pledge in dealing with Cuba, do we not disclose a consciousness of having violated its spirit in dealing with the Philippines? Remorse sometimes seeks shelter in brag. Is this such a case?

Why didn't the flag "stay put" in Cuba? If it came down because in good faith and good morals it ought to have come down, then why should it "stay put" in any other place when in good faith and good morals it ought to come down? To be perfect-

ly candid, isn't there something demagogic in all the talk about making the flag "stay put?"

President Roosevelt writes to the Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts an open letter regarding the Philippine atrocities in which he says—

I hope it is unnecessary to say that no one in the country can be more anxious than I am—save perhaps Secretary Root—to discover and punish every instance of barbarity by our troops in the Philippines. . . . Long before any statements had been made public, and before any action had been taken by Congress, the war department had ordered a rigid investigation of certain of the charges, including the charges of Maj. Gardner, the orders of investigation as regards these particular charges having gone out over three months ago.

Mr. Roosevelt's memory does not cherish his consistency. If he and Mr. Root were as anxious to discover and punish instances of barbarity before the exposure through Congress had made them active, it is rather remarkable that he and Root should have joined in the Miles correspondence. In their celebrated rebuke to Gen. Miles for alluding to these barbarities, they denied his statement that the war had been prosecuted with severity, and asserted that it had been prosecuted with marked humanity; and they gave a color to the whole correspondence well calculated to create a public impression that there had been no barbarities. How does that accord with Mr. Roosevelt's present assurances that he and Root were already on the trail of the perpetrators?

If it is an honorable policy to withdraw from Cuba and leave the island to the government of its own people, why would it be a "scuttle" policy to withdraw from the Philippines archipelago and leave those islands to the government of their own people?

Last week Lewis J. Toombs, convicted recently of a brutal murder, was sentenced by one of the Chicago judges to be hanged on the 13th of June. In passing sentence the judge said that the prisoner had been fairly

and lawfully tried. Judges always say something like that. Presumably they believe it; otherwise they could not in conscience impose the sentence that only a fair and lawful trial justifies. Nevertheless, men whose convictions are so approved are often granted new trials by higher courts because they have not been fairly and lawfully tried. And if ever there was a case in which a convict did not have a fair trial, the case of this man Toombs is one. Of his guilt we know nothing. But that is beside the question. The question is one of safe government. Innocent men may be hanged through miscarriages of justice. It is unfortunate, but if the trial has been as fair as good faith and good sense can make it, only the immediate victims of the error suffer. It is something to be grievously deplored, but it does not strike the administration of justice at the roots. It does not imperil social order. Very different is it when convictions, even of guilty men, are secured by official fraud, coercion or intimidation. So far as society is concerned, it is better that an innocent man be convicted and punished through an unavoidable miscarriage of justice, than that a guilty one be convicted and punished by a perversion of the machinery of justice. For this reason, whether Toombs be guilty or not, a greater crime against society than the one charged to him, atrocious as that was, will be perpetrated if he is hanged. For he did not have a fair trial. Two juries sat in his case. The first one disagreed. Two members whom no one accuses of bad faith refused to convict. They did not believe the evidence against him. The prosecuting official thereupon denounced them publicly as unfit jurors, for no other reason than that they had done their duty as jurors by forming and standing by their own conclusions. And by bringing the case immediately to trial again he thereby in effect warned the next jury that if any of their number should refuse to convict they might expect to be similarly denounced. Under those circumstances, any

juror at the second trial who had been disposed to acquit must have been a moral hero to stand out for acquittal. A jury so menaced could not give the friendless prisoner a fair trial. Yet upon their verdict he is to be hanged. Is there no longer any professional spirit at the bar, that lawyers remain silent under such circumstances? Have judges lost their regard for the due administration of justice, that they tolerate such an instance of unfairness in a capital case without a protest? The time was in this country when bench and bar would with one voice have demanded that even the most friendless prisoner, though he were in fact the vilest criminal, should not suffer the penalty for his crime without a fair trial before an impartial and unintimidated jury. Has all sense of professional and judicial responsibility to the community been displaced by the struggle for money and the itch for success?

In the issue of the Chicago Chronicle of March 23 last, that journalistic representative of bourbon Democracy clearly described the test of party regularity, applying it to Mr. Bryan. It said, having reference to the Democratic party:

The thing for the party to do is to have a definite, affirmative policy and stand out for it boldly. If Mr. Bryan supports the policy it constitutes him a Democrat. Not otherwise.

Now, for nearly six years the Democratic party has had a definite affirmative policy. It has stood out for it boldly. The policy is as yet unrepealed by any authoritative act of the party, but is its policy still. Mr. Bryan has all along supported and does yet support that policy. Therefore, according to the Chronicle's test, he is a Democrat. His fidelity to the party policy constitutes him one. But the so-called Democrats whom the Chronicle represents have not supported that policy. They are, therefore, according to its own test, not Democrats, but "otherwise." And as Grover Cleveland is conspicuous among the men who have not and do

not support the party policy, he is, by the same test, conspicuously not a Democrat.

It is not for the Chronicle, then, to criticize Bryan for proving that Cleveland does not come up to its own standard for a Democrat. It is rather for it, and for that matter for all other Cleveland papers, to stop making faces at Bryan and calling him names, long enough to explain away the following indictment which Bryan made against Cleveland as a Democrat, in one of the March issues of the Commoner, and to which there has been as yet no answer.

For four years he stood between the people and reform; for four years he made the White House the rendezvous of cunning and crafty representatives of predatory wealth; for four years the corporations and syndicates controlled his administration and forced him to veto Democratic measures and sign Republican measures. He refused to give sanction to the most important measure supported by the Democrats and bent all his energies toward securing legislation desired by the Republicans, even when he knew that he would divide his party by doing so.

He loaded tariff reform down with the blame that should have been borne by the gold standard, and not only did nothing for the country himself, but left a record that has hung like a millstone about the neck of the party ever since.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN.

The rejoicings over the recognition at last of the Republic of Cuba are not altogether unmixed with regret.

On the part of a certain class, whose reactionary purposes have ingloriously dominated American policies for the past four years, it is regretted that Cuba has not been made a colonial dependency of the United States.

Some of these acknowledge that this could not have been done with any semblance or even a pretense of honor, in the face of the altruistic resolutions with which Congress declared the intentions of the American people in making war upon Spain, resolutions which they now choose to denounce as sentimental folly. Others, better equipped with the courage of their satanic convictions, would have had the American government throw

honor to the winds by ignoring those resolutions altogether. In imitation of the imperialist policy of Great Britain, they would have had us make of Cuba what the British call a "crown colony," as we have done with Porto Rico, and as, with cruelty so revolting that it shocks the humane sensibilities of mankind, we are trying to do with the Philippine islands.

The regrets of another class spring out of a different spirit.

They regret that our public servants have not been sufficiently sensitive to national honor, saying nothing of the simplest principles of morality, to execute the mandate of those congressional resolutions without modification, crooked interpretation or other manner of evasion.

The resolutions having declared that the people of Cuba then were and of right ought to be "free and independent;" that the United States, in expelling Spain from the island of Cuba, had no "disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof;" and that it was the determination of the United States, when pacification should be accomplished, "to leave the government and control of the island to its people"—such having been the guarantees of good faith and the altruistic aims which this government pledged in making war upon Spain, this class of persons would have had those guarantees observed with all honorable fidelity.

The island having been pacified they would have had the independence of Cuba recognized by their own country as fully as that of their own country is recognized by the rest of the world. Pacification in Cuba having been accomplished, as it long since has been, they would have had the United States make good its pledge "to leave the government and control of the island to its people," by wholly relinquishing, in form and in fact, all "sovereignty, jurisdiction and control" over it. They would not have imposed as conditions precedent to doing what they were already pledged to do, such limitations upon Cuban independence as Congress did impose a year ago.

But regrets of either kind no long-

er avail; and those of the better kind are likely to prove practically unimportant, so far as Cuba is concerned.

In the hearts of Americans who love their country, who cherish its honor, and who are devoted to its great ideals, there must always be a rankle of regret and a tingle of shame when they reflect upon this perfidious episode in its history. They must be conscious, also, of a resulting weakness of the nation in dealing with moral problems in the future. For they cannot but feel that whenever it may again assume to lead in a righteous cause, however sincerely, it must incur not only unfounded suspicions, but also sneering and deserved allusions to its "disinterested" intervention in behalf of Cuba. Notwithstanding this perfidy, however, Cuba's independence is virtually assured.

Though the conditions wrongly imposed by duress upon her constitutional convention remain of record, the circumstances now attending her recognition as a republic are of such a character that those conditions, insofar as they degrade her sovereignty, must gradually fall into innocuous desuetude. Whether President Roosevelt has deliberately designed the release of Cuba from the suzerainty in which the McKinley policy and the resolutions of a year ago placed her, as is to be earnestly hoped, or has blundered, as some of his party organs say, makes no difference to the result. By causing an American minister to be sent to Cuba, and arranging to recognize a Cuban minister at Washington, he has placed this country in the position of acknowledging the essential sovereignty of that republic. A suzerain nation does not station ministers at the capital of its dependencies, nor receive ministers from them. By her example, therefore, the United States does acknowledge the complete independence and sovereignty of Cuba. This example, whether a blunder or by design, will of course be followed by other nations. Great Britain has already acted. She was even represented by a minister at the inauguration of the Republic, while we had no diplomatic representation there at all. President Roosevelt had appointed a minister, but he was not yet confirmed. In time, all the nations will be

represented diplomatically at Havana, and Cuba will be represented diplomatically at all the capitals of the world. Having by example invited the establishment of these diplomatic relationships, it will no longer be diplomatically possible for us to insist upon suzerain claims in Cuba. The issue of right would be against us, and the issue of might would not then be all our way.

We might hold Cuba bound by treaty obligations, but we could not safely construe those obligations into pledges of fealty; and insofar as the obligations themselves are partial to American pretensions, they will grow weaker and weaker as Cuba's diplomatic relationships extend and her international interests ramify, until they finally disappear.

A new sovereign nation has therefore really come into existence; one which is not only distinct upon the maps and sovereign in outward form, but which despite all formal reservations, is also sovereign in fact.

It may be that Cuba will hereafter become part of American soil. It may be that she will raise aloft the flag of our Union, which, perverted and polluted though at times it has been, is for all that the truest symbol among the flags of nations of individual liberty and national independence. But if Cuba should do this, her act would be voluntary and her status that of a sovereign state in the American federation. She would be no victim of "criminal aggression," no mangled beneficiary of "benevolent assimilation," no mere creature of Destiny, no "crown colony," no dependency, no alien member of the American family attached to the house but not of the household. She would be a state like any of the other states.

And until she does come into our Union by her own voluntary act, in obedience to the free will of her people and ours, or similarly associate herself with some other American republic, whose people may be by race and language better adapted for fraternal as distinguished from benevolent assimilation—until she does in that way voluntarily yield some of her sovereignty in exchange for a larger national association, she will

remain, in spite of all the sordid intrigue which has darkened what might otherwise have been our glorious record in connection with her history, an independent republic. What Texas was she will continue to be, a sovereign nation, until she herself elects to become what Texas is, an equal member of a larger nation.

Surely this gives good cause for rejoicing. Even if our national record is besmirched we can rise above all vain regrets for that, to the high hope that yet in the progress of our national life we may atone for it and outlive it.

The one fact, however, that cannot be ignored, yet which brings discord into the song of rejoicing over Cuban independence, is the sad condition of the people of the Philippines. Our treatment of those people, whose claims upon our generosity, if, indeed that may not have ceased to be one of our national traits, have for four years been equal to the claims of the Cubans, is no closed record which can only be regretted vainly. It is a record still in the making. We cannot restore the thousands of innocent lives we have sacrificed. We cannot undo the slaughter, devastation and cruelty for the sake of conquest, which have turned the affection for us of a whole people into undying hatred, and provoked cynical mirth in every autocratic court of Europe. Thus far this record is closed and can only be a subject of vain regret. But we can reverse our policy. We can do for the Philippine islands even at this late hour what has been done for Cuba. We can revive the Filipino republic even as we have revived the Cuban republic. And as with Cuba this is our pledged duty.

When our nation declared that it had no intention of profiting in Cuba by making war upon Spain, the letter of the declaration did apply to Cuba alone. But no one then expected that the destiny of the Philippines would be involved in the war. If such an expectation had arisen, can it be for a moment supposed that our declaration of disinterestedness would have proposed annexing the Philippines? Does anyone imagine that we would have said it was our inten-

tion to remain in Cuba only to pacify it and this being done to get out, but that as to the Philippines we intended to "expand" by adding them to our dominions? What a laugh that would have evoked to grate upon our national nerves. We should have said nothing of the kind. Neither should we have been silent. Had we foreseen the expulsion of Spain from the Philippines, we should have made the same declaration regarding those islands that we did regarding Cuba. This would have been necessary not only to save our face in Europe; it would have been necessary also to preserve our self-respect and honor, for at that time the American people, hot though they may have been for war, chivalrous or vindictive, had no stomach for conquest. The pledge regarding Cuba applied, then, though not in letter yet incontestably in spirit, to the Philippines as well as to Cuba. And that pledge we have violated and are continuing to violate.

We found a revolution in progress against Spain in the Philippines as in Cuba.

We relied upon the revolutionists to drive the Spaniards on the islands into Manila and bottle them up there from the land side, while our fleet held them in check from the bay.

We saw them organize a republic and knew, as our public records prove, that they aspired to independence.

Our own naval commander certified that these people were as capable of self-government as the Cubans.

Our own naval officers of lower grade, sent into the interior on tours of investigation, reported that the authority of the new republic was recognized by the inhabitants and that it was maintaining order and peace—that it alone stood between order and anarchy, preserving the former and preventing the latter.

Against this republic we wantonly declared war. Six weeks before the actual outbreak at Manila, our President, without authority from Congress, but simply in his military capacity as commander in chief of the army and navy, proclaimed American sovereignty over all the territory which the Filipino republic had for six months effectively and peacefully governed. It was a notification to that government to dissolve. It was

a warning to its citizens that if they did not yield to the United States in preference to their own self-established government—the first republic of Asia—they would be violently dealt with by American troops and American warships. This was the first declaration, the first announcement, the official beginning of the American war of conquest in the Philippines. And under that proclamation we have crushed a republic modeled upon our own. We have made charred ruins of civilized cities and villages and laid the country waste; we have slaughtered the inhabitants by scores of thousands and have savagely broken the peace and disturbed the good order that our own officers reported as prevailing under the republic; and we now spread over the islands a pall of death and call it "pacification."

How different all this might have been. Had we as a nation remained true to the letter and spirit of our pledge regarding Cuba, a pledge which was but a concrete expression of the foundation principles of American democracy and applied no more to Cuba than to the Philippines, we might now rejoice over the advent, under our good offices, not alone of one republic in the West Indies, but of one there and of a greater one in the far Pacific. Had we done that, we might rejoice over the spread of republican ideals. Had we done that, we might rejoice over our exalted position as a world power ruling by the force, not of mere armaments, but of ideas, ideals and moral example.

It is true that in this case internal dissensions in the republics we fostered might at times make us grieve and possibly despair. They might be subject to the disorders of South America, of Haiti and of San Domingo, which are so often cited as instances of the failure of popular government among "inferior" peoples.

But sneers like these could be answered with a little intelligent reflection. Pray are the "superior" people of autocratic Russia free from internal commotions. Does England govern Ireland without a jar. Was Spain a model of harmony while her seceded colonies, turned republics, were in the throes of revolution? Was not our own

civil war sanguinary enough to offset several generations of civil war in Haiti or San Domingo or the republics of South America? Or, to come to the immediate point, what can the scoffer at republics of "inferior" peoples say for our administration in the Philippines? Is that "pacification" which we in our might have spread over those islands preferable to the peace and order our officers reported from the interior of Luzon under the Filipino republic? Is it preferable even to the commotions in Haiti?

And what if we are told that peace and order would prevail if the people there did not resist our benevolent designs? Why, that is the way the oligarchy of Russia explains disorder under the benevolent regime of the czar. It is the way tyrants always explain disorder under their rule. Disorder in republics may be an objection to the republican mode of government; but if it is, it is not an objection which can be urged either as an excuse or a justification for autocratic modes, whether benevolent or malevolent. No mode of government can preserve peace and order among a dissatisfied people.

But this point is quite incidental in connection with the Philippine question, for we have the evidence of a three-years' war, attested by the reports of our generals that the Filipino people are not contented with American rule; and we have the further evidence of our own officials that they were contented with the rule of their republic. So far, then, as the actual facts aid us, we are justified in the inference that if our government had fostered the Filipino republic, as the spirit of its Cuban pledge required, instead of proclaiming its suppression, as President McKinley did on the 21st of December, 1898, we might now be celebrating two of the greatest achievements of our history next to the establishment of our own independence and the emancipation of our slaves.

That is what might have been. And in this case as truly, but with importance infinitely greater than in that of Whittier's judge and his hayfield maid, those are the saddest of all sad words. No sadder are in-

scribed in the history of our nation, and they can never be wholly effaced.

But the rising hope is that our people, under the inspiration of an awakened public conscience and revived patriotism, will yet write beneath that doleful lament, and write in blazing letters which our public servants cannot fail to see, these words of atonement: "That which might have been shall be!"

NEWS

Cuban independence (p. 88) was formally established on the 20th.

Five days earlier, on the 15th, the Cuban senate and house of representatives met in joint session at Havana, and after examining the credentials of the presidential and senatorial electoral colleges, declared them correct and proclaimed Tomas Estrada Palma as president and Luiz Estevez as vice president. Gov. Gen. Wood was at once formally notified of this action, and on the next day President Palma appointed the following cabinet:

Secretary of government—Diego Tamayo (nationalist), formerly secretary of state under Gov. Gen. Wood; secretary of finance—Garcia Montes (republican); secretary of state and justice—Carlos Zaldo (republican-autonomist); secretary of public instruction—Eduardo Yero (nationalist); secretary of public works—Manuel Diaz (nationalist), and secretary of agriculture—Emilio Terry (independent).

Public festivities in celebration of the establishment of the new republic began on the 16th with a banquet in honor of Gov. Gen. Wood and the other American officers about to depart from Cuba. It was given by the veterans of the wars for Cuban independence, and Gen. Maximo Gomez, formerly commander-in-chief of the Cuban army, presided. At his right sat the principal guest, Gov. Gen. Wood, and at his left President Palma. William J. Bryan sat next to the President and spoke to the sentiment, "Patriotism." In closing he said he would rather see the stars and stripes live in the hearts of the Cuban people than float over the island. During Gov. Gen. Wood's speech, in which he congratulated the Cubans upon their triumph, thanked them for their cooperation, and in the name of the United States

government and the American people wished them success, the assemblage remained standing. The reply to Gov. Gen. Wood was made by Gen. Gomez.

By the 18th the festivities had become general all over the island, and upon the eve of the great occasion Havana was crowded with visitors and splendidly decorated.

The official ceremony of transfer on the 20th was very brief. It took place in the same room of the palace in which Spain had relinquished control over the island to the United States. At noon, when the signal guns from the forts announced the end of foreign dominion, Gov. Gen. Wood began the ceremony by reading a letter from the President of the United States, and the proclamations of transfer prepared by the American war department and signed by himself as military governor.

There were three proclamations. One recited the establishment of the Cuban republic with a constitution to go into effect May 20 at noon, and proclaimed that—

at that time, the occupation of Cuba by the United States and the military government of the island will cease and determine, and the government and control of the island will be transferred to the president and congress so elected, to be held and exercised by them under the constitution so promulgated. Such transfer will be upon the understanding and condition that the new government does thereby and by acceptance thereof, pursuant to the provisions of the said appendix to the constitution, assume and undertake all and several the obligations assumed by the United States with respect to Cuba by the treaty between the United States of America and her majesty the Queen Regent of Spain, signed at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

The second proclamation simply declared the constitution to be in full force from and after the 20th and recited its provisions. The third was as follows:

To the President and Congress of the Republic of Cuba—Sirs: Under the direction of the President of the United States I now transfer to you as the duly elected representatives of the people of Cuba the government and control of the island; to be held and exercised by you, under the provisions of the constitution of the Republic of Cuba, heretofore adopted by the constitu-

tional convention and this day promulgated; and thereby declare the occupation of Cuba by the United States and the military government of the island to be ended. This transfer of government and control is upon the express condition, and the government of the United States will understand, that by the acceptance thereof you do now, pursuant to the provisions of the said constitution, assume and undertake, all and several, the obligations assumed by the United States with respect to Cuba, by the treaty between the United States of America and her Majesty, the Queen Regent of Spain, signed at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898. All money obligations of the military government down to this date have been paid as far as practicable. The public civil funds derived from the revenues of Cuba, transferred to you this day, amounting to \$689,191.02, are transferred subject to such claims and obligations properly payable out of the revenues of the island as may remain. The sum of \$100,000 has been reserved from the transfer of funds to defray anticipated expenses of accounting, reporting, and winding up the affairs of the military government, after which any unexpended balance of said sum will be paid into the treasury of the island.

The plans already devised for the sanitation of the cities of the island and to prevent a recurrence, of epidemic and infectious disease, to which the government of the United States understands that the provision of the constitution contained in the fifth article of the appendix applies, are as follows:

1. A plan for the paving and sewerage of the City of Havana, for which a contract has been awarded by the municipality of that city to McGivney, Rokeby & Co.
2. A plan for waterworks to supply the City of Santiago de Cuba, prepared by Capt. S. E. Reckenbach, in charge of the district of Santiago and approved by the Military Governor, providing for taking water from the wells of San Juan Canyon, and pumping the same to reservoirs located on the heights to the east of the city.
3. A plan for the sewerage of the city of Santiago de Cuba, a contract for which was awarded to Michael J. Dady & Co. by the Military Governor of Cuba, now under construction.
4. The rules and regulations established by the President of the United States on the 17th of January, 1899, for the maintenance of quarantine against epidemic diseases at the ports of Havana, Matanzas, Cienfuegos and Santiago de Cuba, and thereafter at the other ports of the island, as extended and amended and made applicable to future conditions, by the order of the Military Governor, dated — day of April, 1902.
5. The sanitary rules and regula-

tions in force in the City of Havana and in any other city having official rules.

It is understood by the United States that the present government of the Isle of Pines will continue as a de facto government pending the settlement of the title to said island by treaty pursuant to the Cuban constitution and the act of Congress of the United States approved March 2, 1901.

I am further charged by the President of the United States to deliver to you the letter, which I now hand you.

The letter referred to, signed by Mr. Roosevelt himself, as President of the United States, was in these terms:

“White House, Washington, D. C., May 10, 1902.—To the President and Congress of the Republic of Cuba—Sirs: On the 20th of this month the military governor of Cuba will, by my direction, transfer to you the control and government of the island of Cuba, to be thenceforth exercised under the provisions of the constitution adopted by your constitutional convention as on that day promulgated, and he will thereupon declare the occupation of Cuba by the United States to be at an end. At the same time I desire to express to you the sincere friendship and good wishes of the United States, and our earnest hopes for the stability and success of your government, for the blessings of peace, justice, prosperity and ordered freedom among your people, and for enduring friendship between the republic of the United States and the Republic of Cuba.

President Palma replied to Gov. Gen. Wood, saying:

I receive in this act the government of the island of Cuba which you transfer to me in compliance with the orders communicated to you by the President of the United States, and I recognize that in this act the military occupation of the island ceases. In accepting this transfer I declare that the government of the Republic of Cuba assumes, in conformity with what is determined in the constitution, each and all of the obligations that the government of the United States took upon itself in regard to Cuba by virtue of the treaty signed on the tenth day of December, 1898, between the United States and her majesty, the queen regent of Spain. I note that all financial responsibilities contracted by the military government up to this date have been paid, that \$100,000 has been set aside to attend, insofar as it is necessary, to the liquidation and settlement of the obligations contracted by said government, and that there has been transferred to the government of the republic \$689,191.02, which constituted the balance in cash to the credit of the

nation. In all that article V of the constitutional appendix may be applicable, the government will take care to facilitate the execution of the work of sanitation planned by the military government. The Cuban government will also endeavor, as far as possible, and as far as depends on it, to comply with the necessity of sanitation and the observance of the system established by the military government of Cuba. It is understood that the Isle of Pines continues de facto under the jurisdiction of the government of the Republic, pending what will be agreed upon between the United States and Cuba, and in conformity with what is ordered in the Cuban constitution and by the law voted by the Congress of the United States, passed on March 2, 1901. I receive with great satisfaction the letter which President Roosevelt has addressed to the congress of the Republic and to me, on account of the sentiments of friendship therein expressed for the people of Cuba. I take advantage of this solemn occasion, when there is fulfilled the honest promise of the government and of the people of the United States in regard to the island of Cuba, and when the personality of our country is established as a sovereign nation, to express to you as a worthy representative of that great nation the immense gratitude that the people of Cuba feel to the American nation, to its illustrious president, Theodore Roosevelt, and to you personally, for the efforts which you have made for the attainment of that cherished ideal.

An interchange of courteous expressions having then been made between the outgoing military governor and the incoming president, the latter took the oath of office.

All the foreign representatives thereupon expressed in turn their good wishes to Gen. Wood and President Palma, being led by the new British minister to the Republic of Cuba, L. E. G. Carden, formerly British consul general at Havana, the only foreign minister in attendance. He appeared in the uniform and character of his new office.

Now came the spectacular ceremonial. Thousands of Cubans had assembled before the palace to see the American flag come down and the Cuban flag go up in its place; and as soon as President Palma had indorsed Gov. Gen. Wood's proclamations of transfer they were gratified. Gen. Wood and Gen. Gomez ascended to the roof of the palace. Their appearance was welcomed with great shout-

ing from the street. Gen. Wood personally lowered the American flag from the staff. As it fluttered down it was saluted by a detachment of American cavalry and the echoes of guns from the forts, which were almost drowned in the cheers of the people as Gen. Wood, assisted by Gen. Gomez, raised in its place the Cuban flag. Having performed this final act of transfer, Gen. Wood said his farewells, and, accompanied by the American troops, embarked for the United States.

So ends a sad episode in history, the general outline of which, filled in with the more important details, may be traced in these columns, beginning at page 8 of No. 1.

For the information of foreign powers Secretary Hay sent a note of instructions on the 20th to all American ambassadors and ministers informing them that the military occupation of Cuba by the United States had that day ceased, and that an independent government, republican in form, had been inaugurated there under the presidency of Tomas Estrada Palma. The ambassadors and ministers were instructed to convey this information to the governments to which respectively they are accredited. On the same day, at the suggestion of Representative Sulzer, Representative Hitt offered in the lower house of Congress a resolution expressing its satisfaction "at the appearance this day of the Cuban Republic among the nations of the world." The resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted.

Legal proceedings against the meat trust by the United States government, under the Sherman anti-trust law (p. 89), have reached the stage of a temporary injunction. It was granted at Chicago on the 20th, by Peter S. Grosscup, as judge of the circuit court of the United States for the 7th circuit. There was no opposition, but the injunction is subject to a motion to be made at any time to dissolve it. The injunction restrains the several meat packing houses, together with their respective agents and all other persons acting or assuming to act by their authority—

from entering into, taking part in, or performing any contract, combination, or conspiracy, the purpose or effect of which will be, as to trade and commerce in fresh meats, a restraint of trade or commerce among the several

states, territories, and the District of Columbia, either by directing or requiring their respective agents from refraining to bid against each other in the purchase of live stock; or collusively, and by agreement, refraining from bidding against each other at such sales; or by arbitrarily raising or lowering prices, or fixing uniform prices at which said meats will be sold, either directly or through their respective agents; or by curtailing the quantity of such meats shipped to such markets and agents; or by imposing penalties for deviations from prices, or establishing and maintaining uniform rules for the giving of credit to dealers in such matters; or by imposing uniform charges for cartage and delivery of such meats to dealers and consumers; or by any other method or device, the purpose and effect of which is to restrain trade and commerce, as aforesaid.

The injunction also restrains these persons, in terms, from violating the provisions of the Sherman anti-trust law by—

combining or conspiring together, or with each other and others, to monopolize, or attempting to monopolize any part of the trade and commerce in fresh meats among the several states and territories and the District of Columbia, by demanding, obtaining, or, with or without the connivance of the officers or agents thereof, or of any of them, receiving from the railroad companies or other common carriers transporting such fresh meats in such trade and commerce, either directly or by means of rebates, or by any other device, transportation of or for such fresh meats, from the points of the preparation and production of the same from live stock or elsewhere, to the markets for the sale of the same to dealers and consumers in other states and territories than those wherein the same are so prepared, or the District of Columbia, at less than the regular rates which may be established or in force, on their several lines of transportation under the provisions in that behalf of the laws of the United States for the regulation of commerce.

The coal miners' convention, which assembled at Hazleton, Pa., on the 14th (p. 89), to consider the advisability of continuing the temporary strike order issued on the 9th, and which went into effect on the 12th, has decided that question in the affirmative. The question came to a vote in secret session on the 15th. The total vote cast was 811, of which, as reported by the press, 346½ votes were against, and 461½ in favor of continuing the strike. But the result as officially announced to the public

was unanimous for continuance of the strike. Steps are now being taken to make the strike national by bringing into it all the coal miners of the country. To that end the three anthracite districts now on strike have joined in a call for a national convention of the United Mine Workers of America. Five districts are necessary to make the call effective. One more has joined in it—the Michigan district,—and if another joins the call will be issued.

Plans for resisting the strike were considered at a secret meeting of the presidents of the coal-carrying roads involved, which was held at New York on the 20th.

As the time when Congress is expected to adjourn draws near, interest grows in the arrangements that both the principal political parties are making for the congressional elections next fall. In connection with the Republican side of the contest there is nothing unusual to report; but Democratic leaders are at work drawing together different elements of the party in the expectation of securing a majority of the lower house in the next Congress. Several weeks ago, John M. Griggs, a congressman from Georgia, was unanimously elected chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee by the Democratic members and senators. It was then suggested that the active work of the committee be done by an executive committee, with ex-Congressman Ben T. Cable, of Illinois, at its head, and this idea has since been put into practical shape. At a meeting of the whole committee, held at Washington last week, it was decided to increase the executive committee from 11 to 14. It was understood that 8 of these should be senators and representatives, that 1 of them should be Mr. Cable, and that the remaining 5 should be well-known Democrats selected by Mr. Cable. The committee decided also to establish headquarters at Chicago. The members of the executive committee as since constituted are as follows:

Ben T. Cable, of Illinois; Senator Cockrell, of Missouri; Representatives Richardson of Tennessee, Newlands of Nevada, Robinson of Nebraska, Randall of Texas, Gooch of Kentucky, Ruppert of New York, and Griggs of Georgia; Edward M. Shepard, of New York; Judson L. Harmon, of Ohio; David T. Overmeyer, of Kansas; Jo-

siah Quincy, of Massachusetts, and E. C. Wall, of Wisconsin.

Mr. Cable has not yet been made chairman. It is reported that his appointment now depends upon whether the general committee or the executive shall make the appointment. If the latter, it is believed that he will be appointed, but if the former that he will not.

An obstruction, temporary probably, has been encountered in the proceedings by the United States to acquire the Danish West India islands from Denmark. According to the last report upon that matter in these columns (vol. iv, p. 777) the folkething, which is the lower house in the Danish rigsdag, or parliament, had voted on the 11th of March to ratify the treaty of cession, the text of which appears in volume iv, at page 711, and which had already been ratified by the United States senate (vol. iv, p. 730); but on the 7th of April the landsting, or upper house, was barely saved from rejecting it by a vote of 35 to 28, and on the 23d of that month voted to ratify, with a proviso for a referendum vote in the islands. The referendum required was based by the landsting on a property qualification of 2,000 kroner, or about \$500. The government party, which advocates ratification without any referendum, numbered 22 in the landsting, while an independent group which favors a popular referendum numbered 8; but the party that advocated a property qualification referendum succeeded in securing against this aggregate of 30 a vote of 34. The question of ratification was consequently again submitted to the folkething, where the property qualification referendumists are in a hopeless minority; and on the 16th of May, by a vote of 98 to 2, this branch of the rigsdag decided to ratify with a proviso for a referendum vote of all the inhabitants of the islands. It was supposed that the upper house would yield, but it did not. On the same day it voted 33 to 30 to reaffirm its demand for a property qualification referendum. The houses being therefore at a deadlock, the time for ratification, June 24, must be extended if the United States is to acquire the islands. Elections for a new rigsdag are to be held in September, when the government hopes to secure a majority that will ratify unconditionally.

From that other island of the West Indies, Haiti, where a revolution be-

gan last week (p. 88), nothing decisive is yet reported, but news of the situation is not so vague. The provisional government set up by ex-President Canal, which seemed for a day to have lost control, is now reported as in possession of the capital; and Gen. Firmin, who was then hourly expected with an army from the north, is still camped at Cape Haytien, where he has been joined by Admiral Killick, with one of the two vessels of the Haitian navy. Gen. Firmin is tied up for lack of funds.

The question of revising the Presbyterian creed (vol. iv, p. 713) is now before the supreme body of the Presbyterian church—the General Assembly—which met at the Fifth Avenue church, New York city, on the 15th. It elected as moderator, the presiding officer, the Rev. Dr. Henry Van Dyke, of Princeton University, who represents the liberalizing tendency, by a vote of 298 to 276. There were six candidates, and on the first ballot, although Dr. Van Dyke was in the lead with 217 votes, he did not receive a majority and a second ballot was necessary. On this ballot there were only three contestants, and of the minority votes 227 were cast for the Rev. Dr. James D. Moffat, president of Washington and Jefferson College, and 49 for the Rev. Richard S. Holmes, of Pittsburg. During the morning session of the 16th, among the reports of special committees submitted was that of the special committee on the confession of faith. Final action has not yet been taken upon the report, which is too lengthy to be here produced in full and too comprehensive to admit of brief condensation. It purports to be not a substitute for the old confession but an explanation of it.

NEWS NOTES.

—A hurricane which swept southern and western Texas on the 18th destroyed from 100 to 200 lives.

—President Loubet, of France, arrived at St. Petersburg as the guest of the czar (p. 90) on the 20th.

—In a coal mine explosion at Coal Creek, Tenn., on the 19th, between 175 and 225 miners were entombed.

—The seventy-second General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian church in the United States met at Springfield, Mo., on the 15th, with the largest roll call in its history.

—Prof. Willis L. Moore, of the weather bureau, has applied for a patent on an apparatus which at small

expense will automatically keep living rooms cool in warm weather.

—Edwin L. Godkin, died at Brixham, South Devonshire, England, on the 20th, at the age of 71. Mr. Godkin was the founder of the New York Nation, and for many years the editor of that publication, and also of the New York Evening Post.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the ten months ending April 30, 1902, as given by the April treasury sheet, are as follows (M. standing for merchandise, G. for gold and S. for silver):

M	\$1,190,168,674	\$754,517,725	\$435,640,949	exp
G	46,200,018	46,437,744	228,726	imp
S	42,696,842	24,462,590	18,213,252	exp
	\$1,279,065,534	\$825,438,069	\$453,625,476	exp

—The governor general of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Earl of Hopetoun, who was sworn in January 1, 1901, as the first governor general of the federation (vol. iii, p. 616) has resigned because the federal parliament refused to increase his annual allowance from \$50,000 to \$90,000. He found the salary insufficient to maintain the dignity of the office and the difference too heavy a drain upon his private resources.

—The queen regent of Spain resigned on the 12th, and on the 17th her son Alfonso XIII, 16 years of age, who had been proclaimed king at his birth, took the oath of office. The king of England was specially represented by the Duke of Connaught, and President Roosevelt by J. L. M. Curry. While on his way to take the oath, the king was attacked by a lunatic who demanded the hand of the king's sister in marriage.

—Judge Kohlsaot, of the United States district court for the northern district of Illinois, sitting in the United States circuit court at Chicago, has granted a perpetual injunction against Richard Mansfield and A. M. Palmer, restraining them from producing Edmond Rostand's play, "Cyrano de Bergerac." The court decided that this play is a plagiarism in some of its ideas and part of its plot and scenes from "The Merchant Prince of Cornville," of which Samuel E. Gross, a Chicago real estate dealer and the plaintiff in the suit, is the author. An accounting for past profits is allowed, but Mr. Gross has accepted \$1 in full liquidation, asserting that his only purpose in bringing the suit was to vindicate his claims as author.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE COAL STRIKE.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), May 16.—Several days ago the coal strike was discussed by President Roosevelt and his Cabinet. Great ado will be made over the possible trouble that may come from the strike, the blame being entirely laid at the door of the miners' union, but nothing will be done to abolish the coal trust, which has continued to exist in spite of the so-called anti-trust

law, and is the real cause of the present unfortunate conflict.

Denver Post (neut.), May 17.—In addition to the feeling engendered by the refusal of the mine operators to submit to arbitration, the public has not forgotten the promise made a year ago, at the time the anthracite coal trust was organized. The plea then was that the purpose of the trust organization was to promote economies in operation to the end that cheaper coal might be furnished the consumer and higher wages paid the miner. Neither pledge has been kept. On the contrary, the trust's coal products are higher than they were a year ago, and now when the men ask for a trifling advance in wages they are coolly informed that if they are not satisfied with their present wages they may quit.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), May 18.—The petitions of 145,000 workmen for redress of grievances deserved to be treated with greater consideration than was extended by the coal trust, which rejected all propositions for compromise and arbitration in the most peremptory and galling way. . . . This coal trust should receive the attention of the prosecuting officers of the government the same as the beef trust, now on the legal rack at Chicago. The entire anthracite coal production is in the hands of three or four transportation companies. Six companies control 92 per cent. of the output. They regulate the supply, the price of mining and transportation, and the wages of the 145,000 men. Last year when the wages of the men were advanced 10 cents a ton, the trust advanced the price of coal 50 cents, although prices at the time were about a dollar a ton in excess of what they were four or five years previously.

THE TRUSTS.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), May 16.—If Mr. Roosevelt is sincere in his prosecution of the beef trust, why does he not also institute proceedings against the other trusts that are plundering the people, crushing the small dealer and monopolizing business?

Buffalo Inquirer (Ind.), May 14.—The anthracite trust, buttressed by the railway monopoly, is one of the most powerful combinations in the country. Its employees form but a fraction of the people who suffer from its exactions, for every consumer of coal is laid under tribute to the monopoly and should sympathize with the miners in their appeal for a shorter workday and higher wages.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), May 16 (weekly ed.).—The United States government is now prosecuting an alleged combination of meat packers. Doubt exists whether such a combination can be proved. But no doubt can be entertained of the existence of a hard coal monopoly, and if an unincorporated meat combination is contrary to law this coal combination, which is a certainty, must also be contrary to law.

Bryan's Commoner (Dem.), May 16.—Mr. Roosevelt says the trusts must work under the law. This is calculated to make the trusts patch up and strengthen the protective tariff law, under which they not only live, but under which they were born, nurtured and strengthened. . . . After all, isn't it rather humorous for the Republican administration to talk about prosecuting those who form combinations in restraint of trade when the cardinal principle of Republicanism is the protective tariff, which is intended to restrain trade?

PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), May 13.—Chicago Democrats have invited Tom L. Johnson and David B. Hill to speak at their picnic this summer. That is a better plan than the New York idea of "harmony," where David B. is made to stand for all sections of the party whereas he represents a diminishing minority. The Democracy of Tom L. Johnson is the kind to tie to in these stormy times.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), May 16.—If we are to make a square stand-up fight against monopoly in 1904 we must have a square stand-up fighter who knows monopoly when he sees it and is not afraid to give it challenge in whatever guise it may appear. Tom L. Johnson is that sort of man. He is not afraid of his horses. He knows the very foundation of monopoly and he would not hesitate a second in destroying it. With Mr. Bryan out of the field, there is no other Democrat who measures up to the requirements. Mr. Johnson does measure up. He is a democratic Democrat.

East Oregonian (Dem.), May 14.—There is only one man who has the capacity to be captain of the Democratic ship in her present condition. That man lives in Ohio. He knows Hanna and his methods; he knows the Republican party and its machine-like workings, better than Hanna does himself. He is the man for the helmsman! With Tom Johnson at the helm of the Democratic party it would become a real party of the people, a clean implement with which the voice of the people would be law in every nook and corner of the land! Others would make the Democratic party as much like the Republican party as one blackeye pea is like another. But Tom Johnson would make it different, so much so, that what a human eye is to a burnt hole in a blanket the Democracy under Tom Johnson would be to the Republican party!

PHILIPPINE ATROCITIES.

Albany Argus (Dem.), May 13.—The horror aroused by such disclosures is not a criticism of the army; it is an expression of the popular dismay that the American army should be used to do such work. . . . There has been criticism of the cruelty of a few individual officers and men, but in the main the criticism has been directed against the policy which officers and men are being used to enforce. That policy is despotic; and despotism inevitably breeds cruelty.

Bryan's Commoner (Dem.), May 16.—The imperialists are on the defensive. They are now trying to prove that the Filipinos are as cruel as we are, and it is hoped that they will not be driven to any lower position. . . . Administration organs are defending cruelty in the Philippines on the ground that the Filipinos practice cruelty also. This is entirely in harmony with imperialistic logic. Instead of lifting warfare to an American level we are to descend to the Filipino level and thus convince them that our civilization is no better than theirs.

BRITISH POLITICS.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), May 16.—The one parliamentary election in England since the ministry declared its "bread tax" to raise money for the Boer war had a very significant result. . . . At the election in the Bury division, for a vacancy in the house of Commons, the "bread tax" made necessary by the Boer war figured prominently, and the overturn in the constituency from a Unionist plurality of 849 at the last preceding election to a Liberal one of 414 may at least be accepted as meaning that the masses of the British people, who live in towns and cities, are not going to abandon free trade in foodstuffs without a struggle.

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 12-17, 1902.

Senate.

Mr. Foraker continued the debate on the Philippine bill on the 12th (p. 5654), introducing in the course of his speech the text of the protocol of peace and also of the treaty of peace with Spain (p. 5698), together with the President's proclamation

of sovereignty over the Philippines issued December 21, 1898 (p. 5699) and that of the Philippine commission of April 4, 1899 (p. 5700). He was followed by Mr. Stewart (p. 5730) on the 13th, after whose speech there was a brief informal discussion of those items of the bill which relate to land holding and coinage. On the 14th the Philippine bill was informally laid aside while the omnibus claims bill (p. 5781), the fortifications appropriation bill (p. 5784) and a District of Columbia bill (p. 5802) were considered. These measures having been disposed of on the 15th, consideration of the Philippine bill was resumed, Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi (p. 5832), making the only extended speech. After he had concluded on the 16th (p. 5906), Mr. Deboe (p. 5906) took up the debate, quoting in full in the course of his speech the instructions of President McKinley to the Taft commission (p. 5907). The only other business of the day, besides private and routine legislation, was the passage of a bill to restrain false markings of food products (p. 6236-7), and adjournment was taken to the 19th.

House.

Business on the 12th was confined to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia, and on the 13th to the omnibus claims bill and naval appropriations. The latter bill was further considered on the 14th, when, also, the conference report on diplomatic and consular service in the Republic of Cuba was agreed to; and on the 15th and 16th consideration of the naval appropriation bill was continued. Prior to taking up this bill on the latter day, however, the House passed a bill relating to the disposition of public lands in Porto Rico (p. 5927). The 17th was devoted to the naval appropriation bill.

Record Notes.—Speech of Senator Burton on the Philippine bill (p. 5631), including full text of Gen. Funston's speech (p. 5648) before the Lotus club, New York. Speeches of Senator Stewart (p. 5961) and Representative Cooper on same subject (p. 5936).

Text of President McKinley's instructions to the Taft commission (p. 5907), and of Gen. Bell's "pacification" orders (p. 5916), and the report of J. H. Grant as provincial governor of Leyte.

MISCELLANY

THE AMERICAN.

For The Public.

Are you an American? Not if your mind
Would deny or begrudge equal rights to
mankind!

For though born in our Land if, forgetting
her story,

You lord it o'er others, you're only a tory—
Though hailing "Old Glory" you're merely
a tory.

For Freedom's proud title what price have
you paid?

Has your spirit confronted the Hessians of
trade

Or their white savage allies for rapine em-
powered?

Who dares not attack them is only a cow-
ard.

With freedom though dowered he is still
but a coward.

Have word, spinners woven a web that en-
snares,

And ties you up snug as a part of their
wares

To be bartered for privilege, places or plun-
der?

If so, you're no freeman—you're simply a
blunder.

For aught you may thunder—your being is
a blunder.

When public weal calls for your effort or
vote

Are there personal ends you must stop to
promote?

Though you howl at corruption a little
while later

'Tis due to your kidney, you smooth selfish
traitor.

Snug, cynical prater, your true name is—
traitor.

M. D.

BETWEEN THE LINES.

For The Public.

May 6.—Situation to-day in every way satisfactory. No hostile shot has been fired since escape of prisoners from the guard. (There is every indication of very rich deposits of mineral.) Would be exceedingly easy for Moros to climb bluff and cut our telegraph traversing shore of lake four or five miles—not molested. (Great opportunities for telegraph and railroad exploitation when the country is "Americanized." Big money for rich Americans.) Sultan Genassi says Datto Pagoag was killed at Bayan fort and his people dead or dispersed. Will investigate. (Great outlet for products American steel trust when Americans occupy.) Number of prisoners escaped, probably not exceeding 25. Ten have been recaptured. For miles about the country is much the same in its natural aspect as Camp Meade, Pa. Enormous agricultural facilities. All wounded doing well. (Possibilities of great wealth for American timber land monopolists when country is conquered.) Lieutenant seriously hurt. (American pork and packing house products should find good market when natives civilized.)

May 7.—No change in situation. (Possibilities for American exploitation immense.) Wounded doing well. (No place for poor workingman except for soldiers to use in civilizing natives.) Datto from lower Bayan says his people want peace. (Paradise for American monopolists.) Natives must be made to respect authority of United States.

Chaffer.

A. J. GRAY.

St. Paul, Minn.

THE "RIPPER" LEGISLATION FOR CLEVELAND.

With a majority hostile to the party in control in Cleveland and also hostile to advanced steps in the monopoly problem, the efforts of the solid delegation from Cuyahoga county, backed up by the almost unanimous vote of the Cleveland city council to secure the right of popular decision with regard to franchise questions, met with crushing defeat in the legislature this spring. The final blow was delivered in defeating a proposed amendment to a bill which was passed taking away the control

of Cleveland parks from the administration, and conferring the control upon a park board, appointed by a county judge, of Republican politics. The amendment in question would have left to the voters of the city of Cleveland the final decision as to whether they preferred the new or the former method of park control. Just before this amendment, so apparently in accord with American traditions, was voted down by a strict party vote, a leader of the senate had the assurance to make the following remarkable statement:

"I should hesitate to permit the people to vote on matters pertaining to the parks. The parks are a contribution from the rich to the poor. A contribution from the more intelligent to the less intelligent. They should not be controlled by those who have the political or business interests of the city on their hands. The parks should be controlled by the class which donated them."

Last week the legislature followed up the attack upon the referendum and all home rule by lodging the local assessment of all property for taxation in the hands of a state board in any county where such action might be requested by the county auditor. It is well understood that this is to enable the defeated county auditor of Cuyahoga county, before he goes out of office, to throw all local assessments into the hands of this undemocratic body, to be appointed by the governor, attorney general and state auditor. But a reaction against this extreme legislation is sure to follow, and in fact there is evidence already at hand that the principle of the referendum and home rule has received fresh impetus from these very attacks.—From a paper read May 8, 1902, before the National Municipal league, by Prof. Edward W. Bemis, of Cleveland.

BATTLE OF MEN AGAINST A MONSTER.

Editorial in the Chicago Daily News of May 19, 1902.

When the railways that run through the anthracite coal districts of Pennsylvania decided to own the mines from which they hauled the coal to market they put up the freight charges to a prohibitive price. It was a policy of confiscation and was successful. Mines and coal lands were sold by their owners to the railways. The sales were forced sales.

There are more mines than are

needed to supply the coal that is required by consumers at the high prices charged for it. The result is that the output of the various mines is limited according to an agreement among the mine-operating companies. Mines are shut down part of the year. That throws the miners out of work. By the encouragement of foreign immigration into the mining districts the coal companies supplied themselves with more labor than they need. They made labor cheap. They have paid low wages and have made many charges against the men, such as those for rent, powder for blasting (a shameful overcharge), doctors' services (whether required or not), oil for lamps and provisions from company stores. In 1900 the United Mine Workers of America organized the anthracite coal miners and brought on a great strike, lasting 42 days and resulting in a substantial victory for the men. Some of the old bitter wrongs were righted.

Other wrongs remain. Wages are fearfully low. Work is precarious. The miner can barely live on what he is permitted to earn. Meanwhile the price of anthracite coal to the consumer has risen enormously. The coal monopoly, working under an ironclad agreement, absorbs the great profits and hides them away under tricky bookkeeping by which 40 per cent. or more of the selling price of coal disappears as freight charges—paid by the monopoly to itself. These charges are wildly unreasonable. Meanwhile the miner is permitted to dig when the mine is not shut down by agreement, making a bare living. He costs so little that the coal monopoly does not have to improve its methods. It can continue to use obsolete machinery and do its work in a wasteful manner because men are so cheap.

The coal trust pays its men on an average \$1.28 a day. As the miners are employed only a part of the time, the figures do not fairly represent what their wages is in proportion to their living expenses. Last year, which is said to have been a good year for the miners, they were employed only 194 days, which means that their actual yearly earnings calculated by the day amounted to less than 80 cents. In 1899 the average number of working days was 180. A recent estimate places the average earning capacity of a miner for a year at \$248. Out of this sum he must pay the coal trust for house rent from \$36 to \$72 a year, must supply his own powder at \$14 a year and his own oil at \$5 a year, to say nothing of the fee to the coal companies' physicians, which is \$6 a year whether the

physician is needed or not. With what the miner has left he must clothe and feed himself and his family, and this at a time when the necessaries of life are unusually high.

Recently the miners, through their union, asked 20 per cent. increase in wages. It was denied them. They are said to have offered to compromise on a five per cent. advance, but the trust declined to treat with them. Now the miners have struck. The coal monopoly is going to do its best to defeat the miners and destroy their union. It wishes to thrust back into their former condition of serfdom the men who ask a living rate of payment for their hard and perilous toil. It is a battle of men against a monster—a sight to bring tears of compassion to the eyes of anyone who considers all the circumstances attending it. These 140,000 workers ask merely a just wage, so that they may make life a little less hard for themselves and those whom they love. Yet they are to be crushed for daring to dispute with this lawless trust, which insists on "running its own business."

The coal monopoly makes one serious mistake. The business which it conducts in violation of God's laws and man's laws becomes the public's business because of its evil nature. It is the duty of the United States Department of Justice to destroy this wicked trust.

EFFECTS OF THE COLONY SYSTEM.

Extracts from an article entitled "The Broken Necklace: A lesson in the Government of Distant Colonies," by Robert T. Hill; published in *The Century Magazine* for May, 1901. "The broken necklace" is Mr. Hill's picturesque term for the Lesser Antilles of the West Indies. We have selected from the article scattered paragraphs which refer to the piteous poverty of the wretched inhabitants of these islands, despite the tropical prodigality of nature, and suggest various causes for it.

Notwithstanding the beauties of nature, the richness of soil, the accessibility to markets, the remarkable historical association, the pleasant impressions of these islands diminish when the traveler steps ashore and comes in contact with the social and economic conditions. . . . The laboring people, who outnumber the proprietor class a thousand to one, at first interest one with their peculiar habits and oddities of dress, but a look into their lives excites sorrow and pity. Wages are abnormally low, work is scarce, and vice, notwithstanding the many churches and schools, peeps out at every corner. Paupers

greet one at every step, and beggary is practiced by all.

At St. Thomas the traveler going southward through the Caribbee islands first sees those ever-present signs of natural decay, the abandoned sugar houses and mills, though nature conceals the old cane fields by rapidly spreading over them a mantle of tropical vegetation. This sight is repeated in every island. . . .

In Montserrat most Negro peasants possess land, and the universal poverty and distress are slightly less. The British in the West Indies claim that Montserrat has survived the sugar desolation and has branched out into new lines of agriculture, particularly the cultivation of limes. But I saw no sign of what Americans call prosperity. The conditions suggest only the "abandoned farms" of New England. The revenue is constantly falling off; public works are advanced and new roads are built, but these only add to the taxation and distress of the people. . . .

Beautiful St. Christopher, once the metropolis of the Leeward islands! Mount Misery is as fair as ever, but monkeys crawl over the battlements of the noble fortifications at its foot, and the jungle is creeping down its summit year by year, slowly reclaiming the fair fields that once waved with cane. Sugar is virtually the only export, and the industry is almost dead. Reduction of labor and want of employment caused great distress among the blacks who were unable to obtain holdings of their own, and in 1896 there were serious riots. More miserable than the monkeys of Mount Misery are these poor jabbering black people, who have to be literally knocked from the steamer's gangway with clubs, so ravenous are they for alms or work from the passing traveler. You step ashore and are waylaid by hundreds of these British subjects of dusky hue, who beg from you outright because you are an American. "Oh, Mr. Buckra, the American is so rich and the Kitefonian is so poor!" There is not one day's labor per week for the willing hands, and travelers need not wonder at the scramble of the black men for cargo or the piteous beggary ashore. These black Kitefonians are making more rapid strides backward than even the other islanders. Already they have an unpleasant notoriety for crime, and yet there are churches,

schools, government and taxes galore. The writer never saw one who could not read or write; but the untilled lands are not theirs. "Our system," complacently remarked our British fellow-traveler, "is for the proprietor, official and professional classes." . . .

In all there are eight distinct European colonial governments over the small group of Lesser Antilles, each of which, with the average area of an American county, means an administrative establishment as large as that of an American state, and in which each official draws a salary from two to five times that paid the average American public servant.

The population and wealth of all the islands are not sufficient to support more than one small and efficient administrative force. The expenses and revenues of Jamaica are exactly the same as those of the state of Texas, which has 70 times the area and five times the population. The salaries of the governors of the four British colonies in the Lesser Antilles, which have an aggregate population about equal to that of Alabama, amount to \$65,000, or as much as that paid to the governors of 17 American states. The present movement for confederation among these colonies confirms the proposition that there are at least three times too many British governors in the Lesser Antilles. . . .

A sad feature of small colonial government is the absolute inability of the colonials to help themselves. "I have no more power to act than you in the control of these islands," said an affable British governor. "My every deed and policy is dictated to me by a clerk in the colonial office in London. Yet the people think, or rather we make them think, they have local self-government. They have legislatures, which pass laws, which I, the representative of a clerk in London, am instructed to veto. It gives the people pleasure to think they are free, and the world gives us the credit of giving them freedom." . . .

Another curse of these colonies is absentee ownership of land. One reason which mother-countries advance for colonial ownership is that colonies offer fields for landed investment of capital. Large areas are thus acquired to be tilled for the profit of a distant owner, leaving only a small acreage available for the numerically larger native population. A plantation which fails to

yield its interest for a series of years goes back to the jungle for want of care.

It has been fully demonstrated that the provisions produced by a few acres in the tropics will support a peasant family, and yet the vast black population of nearly all the islands is forced to lie idle in towns because most of the land, often uncultivated and neglected, is tied up in the estates of foreign holders. The rich lands of one of the largest of the islands are mostly in the hands of three proprietors. The 800 inhabitants of Barbuda are crowded in a village an acre in extent; law prohibits their gathering a piece of wreckage on the shore or catching a fish in the adjacent waters, while the remaining broad acres, owned by a citizen of Edinburgh, lie idle and untilled. Yet this island has been on the market for years, and under any other form of government would have been purchased and distributed for a minimum among the people who would develop it.

Still sadder is the effect of colonial government upon the colonial citizens: they lean unduly upon the government treasury, thereby destroying their initiative and self-reliance. Public works are constructed, not because they are needed, but to distribute money among the idle population. The island revenues are made to yield to the individual at every opportunity. "Here is the greatest curse of this government," remarked a Canadian fellow-traveler as he pointed to an official bulletin-board in the principal club of Port of Spain, on which were posted announcements of pensions granted to various persons for trivial and sundry services.

The native of a colony is also politically the inferior of the citizen of the mother-country, and his opportunities in life are handicapped by this fact. Liberty and self-government, with the right to grow, prosper and derive from the soil its fullest yield, belong to some men; but the colonial people grope in despair, palsied by foreign governmental control, which gathers all they garner. Opportunity is the one grand heritage of republics. The superior caste of foreign official classes in the colonies is an ever-present reminder to the natives of a station to which they cannot attain. . . .

To produce revenue for alien planters the world is scoured for cheaper

labor than that already procurable upon the islands, thereby reducing the standard of living, keeping wages down to the merest pittance, and forcing thousands to idleness. At Trinidad I saw landing a motley crowd of Hindu immigrants, whose sole possessions were the filthy pugress and loin-cloths which they wore. They had been imported under the same contract-labor system as that which in our colonial days brought the low whites to Virginia. I asked a high official of Trinidad why a humane government permitted further addition to the 70,000 Hindus already oversupplying the labor market of the island. He replied that from his residence he could see 500 huts inhabited by idle people who would gladly work for a shilling a day, but for whom there was not an average of one day's work in five. . . . Trinidad has thousands of acres of virgin soil, but held at such price per acre that these people could not acquire it with years of steady labor. . . .

It is the favoritism and power of wealth and title at European courts that permit absentee landlords to hold the titles of idle soil which thousands of willing natives are anxious to cultivate. It is the avariciousness of European monarchies in their warfare for more territory which makes them forget and neglect that which they have. . . .

Since our national government has seen fit to establish for Porto Rico a colonial administration closely resembling that of the adjacent crown colonies, it will find in the history of the latter many valuable lessons which may prevent the repetition of injustice and economic strangulation.

GOD WILL SEND THE BILL TO YOU.

"Ez fer war, I call it murder,
There you have it plain and flat;
I don't want to go no furdur
Than my Testymnt fer that.
God has said so plump and fairly—
It's ez long es it is broad—
An' you've got to git up airly
Ef you want to take in God.

"Tain't your eppylets an' feathers
Make the thing a bit more right;
'Tain't a-follerin' your bell-wethers
Will excuse ye in His sight.
Ef you take a sword an' draw it,
An' go st'ck a feller thru,
Gov'mnt ain't to answer fur it—
God'll send the bill to you."

James Russell Lowell.

Mrs. Odd—Mary, where is the whisk broom?

Mary—Why, mem, we were all out

o' breakfast food, and I had to chop it up for Mr. Odd's breakfast.—Chicago Daily News.

"Is everything true that has been said about the water cure?" questioned the pastor.

"Certainly not," replied the Funstonite; "why, the actual number of fatal cures is less than seventy-five per cent. of the number reported."

G. T. E.

When at last a physician came and settled among them, the people wondered.

"Nobody is ever sick here," they said. "Of course not, with no medical assistance at hand," said the doctor, smiling at their simplicity in spite of his determination to be courteous.—Life.

Cahill—Religion is a great thing, Dennis—a foine thing!

Casey—To be sure ut is;—Oi get into more foights about religion than anything ilse!—Puck.

"Did you hear the wild rumor from Washington?"

"No, what is it?"

"The Congressional Record is to have a colored supplement."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

BOOK NOTICES.

It would make a marked difference in the unfortunate trend of political thought in this country—or, more accurately, lack of thought—if all Americans could read Goodwin Smith's interesting monograph on "Commonwealth and Empire," recently published by the Macmillans. Whatever we at home may try to make ourselves believe about the matter, Prof. Smith is right in saying that in the estimation of the world at large the paramount issue confronting us "is that between Commonwealth and Empire;" and, as he truly adds, "never has a nation's choice been more important to mankind." On the sinister side of that issue this distinguished thinker observes, what all who reflect may see, that three distinct but converging forces are of worth—plutocracy, militarism and imperialism. Plutocracy is the new force which revives and utilizes the other two. Already it may be said to have begun the process of practically possessing itself of supreme favor, without any formal change of the American constitution. Such subtle changes are not unknown to history. There is at least one historic example of the furtive extinction of popular government without change of constitutional forms by the action of wealth, and Prof. Smith cites it. He refers to Florence, which "was converted from a republic into a principality under the absolute government of the Medici." Of imperialism, into which plutocracy has plunged us, Prof. Smith gives the warning that it has always had but one ending and that is disaster. Spain was a vast empire when the reign of Philip II. began, and the empire drained away her life blood as a nation. This is the experience of all empires. "One after another they pass in long procession over the scene of history to their inevitable grave. The same

end awaited the empires of the Assyrian, the Babylonian, the Mede, the Persian, the Macedonian, the Roman, the Frank, the Saracen, the Spaniard, the Bourbon, that of Napoleon. All were artificial, and, whatever transient purposes they might serve, had in them from the beginning the seeds of decay and death." To thoughtful Americans these examples are prophetic. But Prof. Smith is confident that with the wreckage of American Imperialism American nationality will revive. For nature seems to have set no bound to the life of a nation. "It may languish, but it does not expire, and one day its vigor returns." Though the American Commonwealth is now under a cloud, "the sun of humanity is behind the cloud. The cloud will pass away and the sun will shine forth again. The aged will not live to see it, but younger men will."

In "Blood and Gold in South Africa" (London: International Arbitration Association, 40 Outer Temple, W. E. Price, 6 cents), by G. H. Ferris, a precise and extended answer is made to Conan Doyle's pamphlet on the Boer war. Persons who are sufficiently interested in that war to read Doyle's pamphlet ought to follow it by reading Ferris's reply.

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.

THE MULTITUDE MAGAZINE.

The exponent of Imperial Socialism. The domination of the world by the white race united and perfected by socialism. Walter Vrooman, editor. 50c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 128 E. 23th St., New York City.

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. Familiarly with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filling.

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 Roanoke 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, 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.
NEW YORK.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

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