

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1902.

Number 217.

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.

Because William J. Bryan and Tom L. Johnson met at Chicago for a brief interview this week the newspapers rush to the conclusion that they were arranging for the Democratic nomination for president. In some instances it is even stated, though with the admission that the subject of the interview has not been disclosed, that Mr. Bryan pledged his support to Mr. Johnson.

Both gentlemen might be credited with much more common sense without doing either any injustice. It is not remarkable that they should arrange to meet each other, for they are personal friends. Neither is it remarkable that, having met, they should talk about politics; for they belong to the same political party and while differing in some respects are influenced by the same general ideals. But it would be remarkable if they had arranged a conference, two years in advance of the election, for the purpose of entering into pledges regarding the presidential nomination. Not only would it be remarkable, but it is no betrayal of confidence, even if there were any confidence for betrayal, to say that they made no such extraordinary arrangement. Mr. Bryan is not the man to give personal pledges in politics for personal reasons, and Mr. Johnson is not the man to solicit them. Were it otherwise, neither is so impoverished as to resources that he would plan a hurried meeting, a sort of catch-as-catch-can affair, as the occasion for entering into an alliance.

One of the false assumptions about Bryan is that he is a peanut politi-

cian, seeking whom he can put into office when he cannot put himself there. In truth, probably no public man thinks less than he about public office for its own sake. He has never thrust himself forward as a candidate, both of his nominations having come to him literally unsolicited; and if, in 1904, things remain as they are he will not be a candidate then. Only in the event of a recurrence of "hard times," attributed by the public to financial conditions, would he be the standard bearer of the Democracy in 1904. Even in that event his inevitable candidacy would not be of his own seeking. He would be the candidate then because those members of the Democratic party who furnish its votes, as distinguished from those who now and then furnish it with campaign funds, would not tolerate any other nomination. If this contingency does not arise, some other nomination will doubtless be made, but Mr. Bryan would not assume to dictate it. It is grossly unfair to him to suspect that he would, for he has done nothing to justify such a suspicion. That he would oppose nominations hostile to the essential principles of democracy, in which he believes, is doubtless true. He is already doing that. He certainly could not stand silently by while plutocrats disguised as Democrats were foisted into positions of supreme leadership in the party. But just as certainly he would not become a partisan of any person against others whom he regarded as also genuine Democrats. It would not be good policy to do so, for one thing; and, for another, it would not be in keeping with his real ambitions in politics, which are not personal success but democratic progress.

And even if Bryan were a different

kind of man it would be a false assumption to suppose that Tom L. Johnson would solicit him to do so impolitic and vain a thing. The presidential office is such a distinguished honor that it is difficult to realize that any public man can regard it as a secondary consideration in his career, and it must be confessed that few men do. Yet Mr. Johnson, as well as Mr. Bryan, would be better understood by the newspapers, and the significance of their movements and what they say could be more correctly interpreted, if the fact were accepted, as fact it is, that neither is playing for the presidency either for himself or for some personal favorite. Mr. Bryan is editing a paper which is devoted to democratic doctrine, as he conceives it, and not to office seeking; while Mr. Johnson is shaping the affairs of the city of which he is mayor, and influencing the affairs of the state whose laws control it, with reference to democratic principles as they appeal to him. Each is exemplifying his democracy within the sphere of his own present public duties, without reference to the effect upon his own personal or political fortunes. These facts are well known, and the sincerity of the men is not doubted except by persons who have become tainted with the prevailing notion, so commonly exemplified in practice, that public office is a public reward to be sought for instead of a call to service, and who judge the motives of others by their own low standards. It should be easy to infer, then, that many political subjects of national scope and national interest might prompt a hurried conference, such as that which took place this week between the editor of the Commoner and the mayor of Cleveland, without the slightest regard for the possibilities or personal preferences of either with reference to the next presidency.

The attitude of the Republican press towards the Democratic party is well worthy of note, it is so eminently friendly to Democratic leaders whose fidelity is under suspicion. Mr. Lamont, for instance, is regarded by the Republican press as one of the men whose nomination by the Democrats would save that party from political ruin. Why Republicans should want the Democratic party to escape political ruin is not quite clear, yet they are really extremely solicitous. Mr. Cleveland would be acceptable to them for this purpose, but as he is not regarded as available they fall back upon Mr. Lamont, the creature of Whitney whom Mr. Cleveland took into the cabinet and launched upon the ways to a speedy fortune of millionaire dimensions. Along with Mr. Lamont as the Republican choice for the Democratic nomination, comes Mr. Olney, another product of Cleveland's notoriously disastrous administration. And then there are Gorman and Hill. Any of these gentlemen would be highly acceptable to the Republicans as the Democratic candidate for the presidency. Let him who doubts it read the Republican papers. But why do Republicans turn to them and beg the Democrats to nominate one of them? Is it because their pecuniary interests, their social connections, and their general environment make them as good plutocrats as the Republicans could find in their own party? Or is it because they would be easy to beat at the election?

Walter Wellman, the Republican correspondent whose letters have many ear-marks of White House inspiration, writes with entertaining candor of the Republican campaign-fund problem. In his Washington letter of the 26th, published in the Chicago Record-Herald of the next day, he says:

So great is the anxiety of the Republican managers about the coming elections for members of Congress that they are endeavoring to induce the President to lend them a helping hand. What they are most anxious the President should do is to aid them in raising money for their cam-

aign expenses. To-day Chairman Babcock of the congressional committee visited the White House and had a long talk with the President over the coming battle. . . . Mr. Babcock's idea of running a congressional campaign is to get together a lot of money to be used in the close districts. He has in the past shown himself somewhat of an expert in the expenditure of money, but not so clever in getting hold of the money to spend. He has always been compelled to fall back upon Mr. Hanna. After Mr. Babcock had failed to "raise the wind" he thrice appealed to the chairman of the national Republican committee, and each time Mr. Hanna helped him out. But when he was begged a few weeks ago to pass the hat once more Mr. Hanna replied:

"Why should I? The one measure which has carried my name and which I have been anxious to pass through Congress (meaning the subsidy bill) you people of the House have held up. If you want the hat passed you had better pass it yourself."

Despite all appeals, Mr. Hanna has stood his ground. Now the President is asked to bring influence to bear upon the national chairman, and it is probable the President will do what he can. Mr. Babcock doesn't know where he is to get the \$300,000 or \$400,000 which he thinks he needs to save the next House from becoming Democratic.

After that exposure of political family secrets, the futility of the Chicago American's efforts to start President Roosevelt upon a crusade against the coal trust is evident. It is one thing to pursue the beef trust with brass bands, but a different thing to pursue the coal trust as the American advises. The beef trust could get in under the shelter of New Jersey incorporation statutes along with the steel trust, if worse came to worst; and the real strength of trusts would not be exposed meanwhile. But vigorous proceedings against the coal trust might bring into plain view the secret of the whole trust system. And that is not what Mr. Roosevelt is after, as Mr. Wellman's letter shows. What Mr. Roosevelt wants, more than he wants to suppress trusts, is trust contributions to the Republican campaign fund. To get these he must go to Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Hanna can't get them unless he

can guarantee protection. Under the McKinley regime he was able to do this. That he did promise it to the Pennsylvania railroad, and that McKinley enabled him to make his promise good, was distinctly charged by the Chicago Tribune, a Republican paper, in its issue of May 13, 1902. It said:

We distinctly charge that after the election of 1896 Mr. Samuel Shallenberger was appointed second assistant postmaster general, in whose office all matters relating to the railway mail service are attended to, in pursuance of a bargain or understanding with the Pennsylvania railroad. Mr. Shallenberger at that time was an attorney for the Pennsylvania railroad. The company had made a subscription—possibly the largest in the United States—to the campaign fund. What could be more natural than that the attorney of the railroad should be appointed to superintend the railway mail service immediately after the election. Still, it was a second-class bargain, and in any other country would have disgraced everybody connected with it. Shallenberger is still in office. This was in 1896. In 1900 there was another bargain with the Pennsylvania railroad. Again it made the largest subscription and again it received the largest promises. In 1896 it grabbed control of the railway mail service. In 1900 nothing less would satisfy it than the control of the Atlantic ocean. Clement Griscom modestly asked for the ocean as a playground—a "small park," to be dedicated to him and his associates and maintained at the expense of the government of the United States. Clement Griscom is a director and member of the executive committee of the Pennsylvania railroad. He is also the president of the International Steamship Navigation company, which is as surely a part of the Pennsylvania company as is the annex from Jersey City to Brooklyn or the Twenty-third street ferry. Griscom did not ask much or hard. He did not need to. After the election all that he wanted was handed to him in good measure, pressed down, full, and running over. The subsidy bill is framed in the interest of his company, and his deep and profound and abiding affection for it is not disguised. It gives subsidies to ships just as fast as his ship—and no faster—no slower. It subsidizes swift passenger ships—not too swift—mainly used for pleasure travel by well-to-do people, but carrying little or no freight. The subsidy bill is conceived in sin and born in iniquity. It is payment for a big

campaign debt that never should have been contracted.

It remains to be seen whether or not Mr. Roosevelt will follow his predecessor's lead in making Mr. Hanna's campaign-fund bargains good.

There is nothing strange about Mr. Hanna's objection to raising further campaign funds from trust sources, without official assurances enabling him to make good the equivalent he bargains to give. The question is whether Mr. Roosevelt will so equip him. Shall it be, hereafter as heretofore, campaign funds in return for official services to the contributing trusts? or prosecution of the trusts and no campaign funds? Big corporations and trusts do not contribute to campaign funds for exercise. Their contributions are purchase money, and they expect the goods they buy.

Senator Spooner made an admission in the Senate on the 19th, which, considering his high professional reputation and his position of leadership among the imperialists of the Republican party in the Senate, is virtually decisive of the legal question regarding the occupation of the Philippines by the American army at the beginning of the actual fighting there—February 4, 1899. The admission came out in the following colloquy with Senator McLaurin, of Mississippi (p. 6,001 of the Congressional Record of May 19, 1902):

Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi—Now let me ask the Senator a question. Did we, on the 14th of February, 1899, have a perfect title to the Philippine islands?

Mr. Spooner—We had a perfect title to whip any body of troops that attacked our men anywhere under God's Heaven. That is all I care to say about that.

Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi—The Senator can, of course, answer or not. I cannot force the Senator to answer; but I should like to have a direct answer, as I am willing to answer any question that any senator may propound to me. I have asked the Senator a question, if we had any title of any kind to the Philippine islands on the 4th of February, 1899, and if so what was that title?

Mr. Spooner—We had a perfect

right to occupy the suburbs of Manila under the protocol. I have never claimed that we acquired a legal title to the Philippine archipelago except by the treaty.

Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi—Then the Senator does not claim that we had any title to the archipelago on the 4th of February, 1899?

Mr. Spooner—I do not.

If we had no title to the archipelago on the 4th of February, 1899, we certainly had none on the 21st of December, 1898. Yet that was the time when President McKinley proclaimed American sovereignty, asserting our title, and thereby made war upon the Filipino Republic, which had for months been peacefully governing all the country outside of Manila.

Gen. Chaffee has made a bad matter worse by his action in reviewing the findings of the Waller and Day court-martials (pp. 9, 19, 24, 39). One of these court-martials had acquitted Maj. Waller, charged with ordering the execution of natives of Samar without a trial, on the ground that he had acted "in accordance with the rules of war, the orders of his superior, and the military necessities of the situation." The other had acquitted Lieut. Day, who carried out Waller's orders. The "orders of the superior," mentioned in the Waller verdict, refer to the now notorious instructions of Gen. Smith to kill all natives over ten years of age and to make Samar a howling wilderness. These verdicts, being reviewed by Gen. Chaffee, are reversed. But Gen. Chaffee's reported reasons for reversal present the case in a more shocking aspect than before.

Although Maj. Waller and his counsel had maintained that Waller was in the full possession of his faculties when he ordered the shooting of the native prisoners, Gen. Chaffee decides that he was at that time mentally irresponsible. For this reason, Gen. Chaffee sustains the finding of not guilty. But he reverses the finding in other respects, holding that while the laws of war justify summary executions in certain cases, there were no such cases in this Samar cam-

paign, and that Waller's acts were more like unlawful retaliation than justifiable warfare. Maj. Waller's acts are therefore declared to constitute a crime falling short of murder only because Waller was temporarily insane. But Lieut. Day, who executed Waller's death sentences, was not insane. Moreover, he knew that Waller was incompetent. So, at least, does Gen. Chaffee find. Gen. Chaffee also finds that Day, knowing Waller's condition, should have disobeyed his murderous orders. But as Day promptly executed the orders, Gen. Chaffee finds him guilty of not having prevented "one of the most regrettable incidents," etc., etc., and—solemnly censures him!

So Gen. Chaffee puts the matter in this light: First, Maj. Waller committed murder by ordering the summary execution of several natives whose country he was invading; but as he was mentally irresponsible he is acquitted. Second, Lieut. Day aided and abetted Waller in committing the murder, but as Day was a subordinate owing obedience to Waller, which it was his duty under the circumstances not to yield but which he did yield, he is guilty of something or other deserving censure. All of which goes to show that the "honor of the army" can be conserved by condemning its "regrettable" crimes and acquitting their irresponsible perpetrators. No harm done except to the murdered Filipinos, and they don't complain. Next!

The National Reciprocity league, a nonpartisan body recently organized, declares that "in order to give continuous and remunerative employment to our labor and capital we must secure markets for our increasing surplus products among the 1,500,000,000 of people who constitute the population of the world." Is there not some danger in this movement? If our "surplus" goes into foreign markets, it must be paid for either with money or goods or not be paid for at all. If the latter, we could

dispose of the "surplus" more easily and quite as profitably by throwing it into the sea. That it will not be paid for with money is evident, for but little money is ever imported. Considering silver and gold together, we export much more than we import. If paid for, then, our exported "surplus" must be paid for chiefly if not altogether with "pauper goods." But in that case what becomes of our workingmen? Will not this influx of "pauper goods" take the bread out of their mouths, so to speak? Or were the Republicans mistaken when they taught us to believe that importations of goods are only a little less injurious to American labor than importations of cholera?

In a book called "English as She is Taught," a story may be found which contains a subtle lesson on "trade-balances." A pupil being asked to define the meaning of the words "imports" and "exports," wrote this answer:

The imports of a country are the things that are paid for; the exports are the things that are not.

That boy's idea of exports was evidently derived from the American statistics of foreign trade, which show such enormous "favorable" balances that are not paid for.

"Confidence begets confidence," says a Chicago paper in discussing the possibility of an end to the present era of prosperity. Its essential idea is that prosperity will last while confidence lasts. That is true of a confidence game. So long as the victim is confiding, the buncoer flourishes; and to the extent that the prevailing prosperity is confidence-prosperity, it will doubtless continue as long as confidence does. But people don't eat confidence, nor wear confidence, nor live in confidence houses. The things they need are substantial things produced by human labor; and unless they get these things—not merely see others have them in abundance but get their share themselves—no amount of confidence, however begotten, will be an acceptable sub-

stitute. The basis of genuine prosperity is not confidence, but comfort.

That there is less comfort than confidence in the prosperity which now prevails is evident from the signs. Colored census figures may indicate a flourishing condition for workingmen, but obtrusive facts grimly refute these rose-colored statistics. One instance is typical. The Johnstown Democrat, which advertised recently in a trade paper for a printer, ordered the advertisement out, saying—

Overwhelmed with replies. Your medium is too good. We're out about \$2.00 in stamps notifying applicants that the place is filled.

If multiplying experiences of this kind were not enough to convince reasonable persons, the cry that some labor organizations are making about the "dead line" which large employers have established—refusing to hire men who are over 45 years of age—should do it. In one Chicago labor union the bafflement over this found expression in a bitterly satirical proposal to shoot every man of that age who is dependent upon his labor for a living. No such "dead line" could be maintained if opportunities for employment were really abundant; none would have been set up if the employers did not find workers in excess of demand. This makes prosperity, of course, for some persons. No one doubts the prosperity of the trusts. These exploiters say they are prosperous, and all the indications confirm them. But what is prosperity food to the trusts may be adversity poison to everybody else.

It is not an easy fight that the home rulers of Colorado have entered upon in their movement to secure constitutional authority to each county to raise its own revenues by taxing land speculators, if the inhabitants of the county so decide by popular vote. Of course the land speculating fraternity are resisting with all their might. Of course the land-grant railroads are joining in. Of course the Republican papers are behind them all. And of course an attempt will be

made to commit the Republican party at its state convention against the movement. But the supporters of the movement are working, too. Handicapped as they are for want of funds, they have, nevertheless, placed 100,000 copies of the Bucklin report in the hands of as many Colorado voters. Although much of the work necessary to this accomplishment has been contributed without pay, the funds for printing and incidental expenses are exhausted, with 118,000 voters not yet reached. But hope rises high that so important and promising a movement will not be allowed to languish.

An example of the kind of opposition this Colorado home rule movement arouses is furnished editorially by the Denver Republican, which describes the Bucklin amendment as "a menace to all real estate investments in any part of Colorado," and urges that—

it should be defeated by so overwhelming a majority that no such crazy proposition would ever again present itself for the consideration of the people of this state. There is no element of good in it, and the fact that we had a legislature foolish enough to submit it to the voters has brought all Colorado into disrepute among intelligent people of other parts of the union. . . . When they go to the polls next fall the people should reject each and every one of these amendments. They should not risk making a mistake by trying to vote for some and against others. All should be condemned. They are all the spawn of a legislature made up of cranks and irresponsibles of every species and degree. No one had a right to look for any good from that conglomeration, and no good has come from it. The answer of the people should be a condemnation of all that was done. There should be no hint or suggestion of approval in any degree whatsoever; and especially should anything like approval be withheld from the proposed constitutional amendments. Each and every one of them should be voted down.

A pointed reply to that startled exclamation of Colorado plutocracy is made by the Monte Vista (Col.) Journal, when it says:

The Republican undoubtedly voices the sentiment of its party, and yet that party will hardly dare to express its position at the next state conven-

tion. What is the object of the Bucklin amendment which menaces the welfare of Colorado? It simply provides that any county in the state may be permitted to raise its revenues as a majority of the voters may determine. It means majority rule in local affairs. This the Republican fears and takes the position that majorities are not competent to manage local affairs.

But even if under home rule in taxation, which the Bucklin amendment would allow, the people of any or all the counties of Colorado should adopt the Australasian tax in place of the present property tax, how would all real estate investments be injured? As taxes on improvements would be abolished, investments in real estate improvements certainly would not suffer. On the contrary, such investments would be benefited. The only kind of real estate investments to be injured would be investments in vacant land for the purpose of monopolizing it. But that would not be prejudicial to the true interests of Colorado. It is not investments in land, which is already there, that Colorado needs; but investments in improvements, which would utilize the land and are not already there. The latter kind of investments would be encouraged by the Bucklin amendment; for whenever its permission was availed of by the people, improvements would be exempt from all local taxation.

An agitation appears to be in progress among orthodox Jews, who observe Saturday as Sabbath, to secure the legal right to pursue their regular vocations on Sundays. Regarding this right, Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists are in the same category as the Jews. The restrictive legislation upon these religious sects has been sustained by the courts by the most absurd reasoning imaginable. Conceding that the legislatures cannot make laws in the interest of any religious worship whatever, and therefore cannot legalize any sect's holy day for religious reasons, they have decided that laws forbidding labor on Sundays are police regulations for the preservation of

the public health, and not religious enactments. It would be as reasonable to enforce generally by law the Dunkard rite of feet washing as a police regulation in the interest of the public health. These Sunday laws clearly violate the rights of religious worshippers whose holy day is not Sunday. Bound by their own religious convictions to abstain from labor on one day in the week, and by other people's religious convictions to abstain on another, they are put at a peculiar disadvantage by unwarranted legislation. It may be said that the Sunday laws violate the rights also of persons who recognize no holy day; and that, too, is true. While a regular weekly rest day is doubtless a valuable social inheritance, and everyone who desires should be protected in its enjoyment, it is a very different matter to enforce by law its observance upon those who object, no matter whether they observe another rest day or not.

When Senator Beveridge, of imperialistic ambition and fame, spoke before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in session last week in New York, he gave voice to the following extraordinary composite of pagan piety and pinchbeck patriotism:

The flag and the cross are alike in one respect. They never retreat. You may temporarily close a church here and a flag may be withdrawn there, but only in order to advance more permanently their interest. They have one common purpose—the cross to advance Christianity, the flag to make this Christian country the greatest power on earth.

The religion which breathes through that sentiment is akin to the piety of the profane Rhode Island colonel in the civil war, of whom it was told in Harper's Magazine that upon being informed by his adjutant that the chaplain of a neighboring Massachusetts regiment had baptized 25 converts the previous Sunday, exclaimed: "Order out a detail of 50 men for baptism next Sunday. No blankety-blank Massachusetts regiment shall get ahead of ours, even in religion!"

EDWIN L. GODKIN.

No one who believes in maintaining moral standards in public life could wish to have the death of Edwin L. Godkin pass unnoticed. For Mr. Godkin was one of the few champions of civic righteousness who have become distinguished in this generation of materialistic utilitarianism.

In many respects we disagreed with him. In some respects the disagreements were fundamental and irreconcilable. His perceptions of moral principle often differed from ours. But that he had moral perceptions, discerned with intelligence and adopted with sincerity, by which he was guided and for which he fought, was evident to all who read his trenchant reviews of current events. For this we should honor his memory though we had differed from him at every point.

Mr. Godkin had the courage and the vigor of his convictions. He has left behind him no evidence of any disposition to minimize anything in which he believed, from fear of consequences either personal or logical; and he was capable of indulging that righteous wrath at essential wrong and deliberate wrongdoers which is as necessary to a sound character as the spirit of toleration toward accidental wrong and unwitting offenders. Good people forget too easily that the considerate: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!" was no more characteristic of the life of the Galilean than the wrathful flagellation in the temple.

Nordid Mr. Godkin flabbily reserve his wrath for the sin and let the sinner escape. He realized that evil is done by individuals, and that if you would bring it to the bar of human justice you must bring it there in the person of an individual. It is as necessary to make criminals unpopular as it is to make crime abhorrent. And this is as true of crime against public rights as it is of crime against private rights. Accordingly he was always ready with his potent and dreaded, "Thou art the man!" He did not content himself with denouncing public theft; he also denounced public thieves. He was not satisfied to denounce vicious public policies; he denounced just

as relentlessly faithless public servants who, with malice aforethought, promoted those policies.

It was in these respects that Mr. Godkin rendered his best service. At a time when respectable rascals were outraging the truest ideals of public life, when hypocrites in high places were giving an air of piety to public crime, when teachers were inculcating the morally destructive doctrine that righteousness is a plaything of time, place and circumstances, Mr. Godkin held aloft what he believed to be the standard of immutable moral principle.

What if he may have been now and then mistaken? What if he seemed to be intolerant? His mistakes were those of the wolfhound thrown off the scent; his intolerance was that of the upright judge dealing with high-handed crime. With all their mistakes and all their intolerance, the New York Evening Post and the New York Nation, which Godkin edited so long, have been among the most efficient agencies for civic righteousness in this country.

"THE HONOR OF THE ARMY."

We hear much just now about "the honor of the army." So did France when the Dreyfus episode was on.

Imperialistic tendencies always parade in military fashion. When Rome was passing from republic to empire, the legions demanded patriotic worship. When Bonaparte was rushing France backward into absolutism, the "grand army" was his shibboleth. To William of Germany the army is the most sacred thing in the realm next to himself. And now that our own country has plunged into imperialism, denunciations of criminal acts committed by army officers upon inhabitants of the distant country they have been sent out to conquer and subdue, are smothered by demands that we respect "the honor of the army." We, too, are thus invited to set up a military fetish for permanent adoption.

Before we joined the procession of world power imperialism, an appeal

to refrain from criticising public policies or military cruelties, out of respect for "the honor of the army," would have produced a popular anticlimax. Regular armies were hated for their historic associations as the tools of despotic power. Our people have always detested them.

It is true that volunteer armies, raised for particular emergencies and to be disbanded when the emergency was over, have commanded and deserved popular respect. As applied to volunteers for a defensive war the "honor of the army" is a phrase full of patriotic meaning. And defensive wars are the only kind we ever waged, with one infamous exception, until President McKinley discovered that conquest is our destiny and learned from the old slaveholding oligarchy that our destiny determines our duty. But "the honor of the army," as applied to regular troops, means in any country what it means in all countries. It means in the United States what it means in France, in Germany, in England, in Russia, or wherever else a regular military force is disciplined into that unquestioning obedience which makes it a fit implement for "the man on horseback."

In France "the honor of the army" is the catch-phrase of Chauvinism, and a verbal capsule for such iniquities as those of the Dreyfus persecution. In England "the honor of the army" is the catch-phrase of jingoism; it palliates the devastating reign of the British conqueror in South Africa. In Germany "the honor of the army" is the modern catch-phrase of the almost obsolete doctrine of divine right. In Russia "the honor of the army" is the catch-phrase of absolutism. In the United States this same phrase now rolls smoothly off the tongues of imperialists as justification or excuse for barbarities that are shocking to the unmilitary mind. Johnson's definition of "patriotism" as the last refuge of a scoundrel, might be fairly paraphrased in a definition of "the honor of the army" as the ready refuge of a Christian savage.

Honor is not the peculiar attribute of armies. Honor is as honor does. We don't speak of the honor of the fire department. Yet fire departments are at least as useful as standing armies and the service as dan-

gerous. We don't speak of the honor of the police force. Yet a police force is at least as necessary as a standing army and its honor as important. Then why should we speak of the honor of the army? Why should we defend it against charges of crime by parrot talk about its honor? Isn't all this solicitude about the "honor of the army" borrowed from the manners of those well dressed scoundrels of the eighteenth century who could stick a man as a butcher sticks a pig and cared nothing for their debts unless they were gambling debts, but who were forever prating about their "honor"? The honor of the army is not assailed by charges of crime. It can be assailed only by its own dishonorable acts. The question must always be, not whether the charges are shocking, but whether they are true. Whenever accusations of such dishonorable acts are answered with confessions, accompanied with denunciations of the accuser as an assailant of "the honor of the army," there is danger ahead.

History teaches that nothing is more dangerous to the liberties of a people than popular reverence for "the honor" of a standing army. That is one of the essential poisons of militarism. "It is needless to say," writes Goldwin Smith, in his recent admirable essay on "Commonwealth or Empire," "what is the relation of militarism to political liberty. It has been the same ever since the military power enslaved Rome." And the advance of militarism among us may be marked by observing the attitude of our people toward our regular army.

If they regard "the honor of the army" as something which cannot be questioned they are far gone in militarism. If politicians make a fetish of "the honor of the army," these politicians think the people are far gone in militarism, for politicians keep their ears to the ground. But if the people hold our army to the same accountability that they would hold our fire departments, our police forces, our legislators, or any other public servants, and do so with such emphasis that the politicians can make no mistake, then they are still safe

from militarism. Let us pray to be delivered from the tyranny of a phrase which, by raising the standing army above reproach or criticism, would make it a fit implement for the needs of some ambitious and despotic commander-in-chief.

NEWS

The coal strike looms up as the most important event of the week. At the time of last week's report (p. 106) four out of the necessary five districts of the United Mine Workers of America had joined in a call for a national convention with a view to extending the strike so as to include not only the anthracite region, where it is now in progress, but also all the coal mines of the country. Three of these districts were those into which the anthracite region is divided, and the fourth was the Michigan district. The necessary fifth has since joined in the call. It is the West Virginia district, No. 17. This district was reported on the 26th by the secretary-treasurer of the national organization as having taken that action at a conference of district organizers and officers held at Fairmount, W. Va., and President Mitchell has since admitted the fact. The calling of a national convention is, therefore, now imperative; and as the five districts which have joined in the call will be entitled to a majority of the delegates, it is believed that a general strike will be ordered.

A strike throughout the West Virginia district had already been ordered at a convention held at Huntington, W. Va., on the 24th. It is ordered to begin June 7 and to continue until the demands for an increase of wages by from 10 to 22 per cent. shall have been granted. The number of miners involved is estimated at from 30,000 to 40,000. This strike, like the anthracite strike, was declared after all efforts on the part of the workmen to secure a joint conference of workmen and employers had failed.

A teamsters' strike against the meat trust packing houses at Chicago was declared by the Packing House Teamsters' Local Union on the 25th to enforce its demand for an increase of wages. The strike went into operation at once, and on the 27th every packing house in the stock yards was tied up, their teamsters having in a

body refused to haul for them. They negotiated with the big express companies for substitutes, but the express drivers refused to take the strikers' places. Then they applied to the railroad companies to switch their cars to points where the wagons of retail butchers could get at them, but the railroad freight handlers declined to do any work in furtherance of the meat trade. At this writing it is expected not only that there will be a general strike throughout the stockyards, but also that the retail butchers will close their shops out of sympathy with the strikers, and that there will be an absolute suspension of trade in meat in Chicago. The smaller dealers are willing to adopt the teamsters' scale of wages, and some have formally done so, but the large packers refuse all concessions.

Another Chicago strike is imminent, one in connection with the operation of the street cars. Should it occur it will be due to low wages and to efforts on the part of one of the street car combinations to break up a recently formed union of street car employees.

Some six weeks ago several employes were dropped from one of the lines for having joined the union, and a feeling of resentment became general at once among the men. Until then the meetings of the union had been in secret, but on the 2d of May five open meetings were held at which 1,665 employes joined the organization. At that time there was no design to strike. On the contrary, all strike talk was discouraged. Since then large numbers of men have been discharged for alleged incompetency who are all members of the union, which intensifies the general feeling of resentment. Attempts to confer with the employers have been frustrated. They refuse to confer with a committee of the Federation of Labor, and also with one composed of their discharged employes. They do offer to confer with committees of their own men, but it is feared by the latter that this is intended as a trap to catch the union leaders among their employes for the purpose of making examples of them. To offset the labor organization, a benevolent association of trusted employes of the traction company has been formed by or with the approval of the company.

The Chicago Federation of Labor took decisive action on the 11th with

reference to a possible strike by adopting resolutions declaring that—as the tactics of the Union Traction company are plainly intended to precipitate a strike, it is the sense of this Federation that all our efforts should be concentrated on the promotion of organization until such time as the membership thereof shall be justified in presenting their reasonable demands to the company and thus protect the public from inconvenience; and be it resolved, further, as an earnest of this pledge, that we request all affiliated unions to contribute a sum equivalent to 1 cent per capita per week on their membership until it shall become necessary to increase the contribution; and be it further resolved, that each delegate here present pledge himself to bring his local union into the closest harmony with the foregoing resolution, with a view to hastening the contribution, so that no victimized men may suffer and thus be discouraged from showing their activity; and resolved, that the Chicago Federation of Labor, wishing to demonstrate its fairness to the public, will again send a committee to request the company to refrain from further discrimination against its employes on account of exercising the constitutional rights as American citizens to organize, and in the event of a refusal to meet us in a spirit of fairness, the executive board be authorized to take such action as may be necessary in the premises.

Pursuant to the last of these resolutions a committee of the Federation has been in conference with Franklin McVeagh, the local member, along with James H. Eckels (who is also a director and officer of the traction company), of the committee of the National Civic Federation on arbitration, of which Senator Hanna is chairman. As we write (May 29) it is rumored that this conference has proved successful and that the strike will be averted. The demands of the street car employes are in substance that all employes discharged for becoming members of the union, now numbering about 150, shall be reinstated; that the union shall be recognized by the company; and that the scale of wages be raised to 25 cents an hour.

Still another important strike has been in progress for several weeks past. It is that of the licensed tugmen's union of the great lakes. This strike, which originated at Duluth, has affected the whole shipping interest of the lakes from Duluth to Buffalo. The Duluth firemen and line-men, who had received \$60 a month last season, struck against accepting

\$52.50, the amount offered this season by the Great Lakes Towing company. They were supported in their strike by the grand grievance committee of the Tug Firemen's and Linesmen's Protective association, in session at Cleveland on the 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th of April; and on the 7th of May a general strike was ordered to take place on the 8th if the Great Lakes Towing Company did not on that day grant the demands of the strikers. The general strike went into effect accordingly, the tugmen tying up their boats, and the strike is still on throughout the entire territory of the great lakes. After trying in vain to break the strike by employing non-union men and disrupting the tugmen's organization, the towing company took steps to secure a revocation of the United States licenses of the tugmen. Complaints for this purpose were laid before the United States steamboat inspectors at Cleveland and Buffalo on the 24th, charging the tugmen with conspiring to hinder lake commerce. No decision upon these complaints has yet been made.

In American politics the chief event of the week is the session of the Republican convention of Ohio, which met at Cleveland on the 27th. Gov. Nash was elected temporary chairman, and Congressman Grosvenor permanent chairman. The convention adjourned on the 28th after adopting a long platform and nominating Lewis C. Laylin for secretary of state.

The highest officer to be elected in Ohio this year is secretary of state; but the convention was a notable event because it so distinctly recognized Senator Hanna as the Republican leader. According to the Associated Press report of the 27th—the feature of the Republican state convention here to-day was the unanimity of sentiment in favor of Senator Hanna. He has been the center of interest since his arrival here from Washington last Sunday. In the meeting of the delegates by congressional districts the feeling for him was demonstrated in an unprecedented degree. His friends had claimed eighteen out of the twenty-one districts, and more than realized their expectations. Interest centered in the selection of state committeemen, as the new state central committee selected to-day will have control next year when members of the legislature are elected who will choose the successor to Mr. Hanna in the Senate. It is claimed to-night that

there is only one anti-Hanna man elected on the new state committee, and that he "has been reconciled." The drift of sentiment in all the preliminary meetings was most enthusiastic for the senator, and in the convention the delegates would not rest till he got up and showed himself, although he insisted that he would not discuss the issues in advance of the speech of Gen. Grosvenor, who is to be the permanent presiding officer. . . . While the interests of Senator Hanna were paramount in the selection of all the committees, others were recognized in the selection of the committee on resolutions.

Kansas is another state in which nominations for the fall elections have been made. The Democratic convention met at Wichita on the 22d, and on the 23d it nominated a partial ticket, with W. H. Craddock as the candidate for governor, and adjourned to meet at Topeka on the 24th of June, with a view to adjusting a common ticket with the People's party which is to assemble there at that time. The action of the People's party with reference to a fusion campaign in Kansas was foreshadowed by an advisory convention held this Spring, the result of which is reported in volume iv. at page 761. The platform is a progressive one, declaring, says the Kansas City World, "first and last, that the equal rights of the entire people shall be uppermost." The principal plank on local questions demands home rule in taxation for the counties and cities of Kansas. The initiative and referendum also are demanded.

The Republican convention of Kansas met on the 27th, also at Wichita, and on the 28th nominated W. J. Bailey for governor. This was a triumph for the Roosevelt wing of the convention, the anti-Roosevelt element having opposed Bailey vigorously. The convention went further in the same direction by nominating Mr. Roosevelt, in a long and eulogistic plank of the platform, for the presidency in 1904.

Although the Pennsylvania conventions have not yet been held, there are indications of a radical tendency in the Democratic party of that state with reference to the advancing question of taxation. A tax reform conference, composed of delegates from the counties of Allegheny, Beaver, Blair, Cambria, Somerset, Mercer, Juniata, Berks, Philadelphia,

Butler and Bedford, met at Pittsburgh on the 23d and adopted the following significant resolution:

Believing that more equitable laws on taxation are of paramount importance, and that a man of character and education, in favor of home rule in taxation, and of securing to communities the full value of franchises granted, should be the next governor of the state of Pennsylvania, we suggest the name of Mr. Warren Worth Bailey, of Cambria county, to the favorable consideration of the Democracy, and urge upon the delegates to the state convention a fair and full canvass of his availability.

The conference which adopted the foregoing resolution made arrangements to take an advisory referendum in Pennsylvania upon the question of home rule in taxation, pursuant to which circulars are now being distributed over the state asking the recipients to mark upon accompanying postal cards (to be mailed by them) a cross indicating whether they are for or against the tax reform proposed. The referendum circular is of interest wherever questions of taxation are discussed, and we reproduce it:

Pittsburgh, Pa., May 23, 1902.

We herewith mail you a copy of the report of the revenue commission of Colorado, and respectfully request that you read same and give it your careful consideration. The people of Colorado will vote on the amendment to their constitution therein contained, giving them "home rule" in taxation, on the 4th day of next November. This amendment has the approval and support of all the labor organizations of Colorado, and all papers actuated by high ideals of popular government, among which is Mr. Bryan's Commoner, also that sterling democrat, Hon. Tom L. Johnson. The auditor general's report of the state of Pennsylvania shows that the farmers and home owners pay \$16.50 in taxes for each \$1,000 in value, while the steam railroads pay but \$2.75; the street railroads but \$4.75; the telegraph and telephone companies but \$3.20. This has been set forth in an able article by our state chairman, Hon. William T. Creasy. We assert that the people who are so inequitably taxed are entitled to such representation as will enable them to apply just and equitable remedies looking to the abolition of the wrongs arising from a system of taxation the one aim of which is to secure revenue irrespective of equity or justice. The fact we wish to ascertain, in order that we may carry on an intelligent propaganda, is, Do you approve of, wish to further consider or to oppose the proposition to amend

our state constitution along the lines of the Colorado constitutional amendment? Will you kindly mark the word on the enclosed postal indicating your position on this question, thus X, and mail same, with any remarks you care to make? We would be pleased to receive the names of those whom you would like to have read this report, or requisition us for any number you may require for distribution. Yours sincerely,

The Tax Reform League of Pa.

From political action and creeds to religious, and we find the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, which met at New York last week (p. 107), adopting the explanation of the Confession of Faith then recommended by the revision committee. The motion to adopt was made on the 16th, when the committee reported it, but the vote was not taken until the 22d. Only two voters were adverse. The explanation now goes to the various presbyteries, or local governing bodies of the church, for ratification. Before final adjournment the General Assembly listened to a speech by the Rev. J. M. Buckley, of the Methodist Episcopal church, in which he said:

Protestantism cannot be maintained in our age except through great organizations, but I say to you that the Presbyterian church and the Methodist Episcopal church in the United States hold within them great potentiality for the extension of the doctrines of evangelical Christianity. Let us stand as neighboring rocks against the growing evil of agnosticism that is brought to us under modern names and under new guises, and against the doctrines disseminated by the followers of the old man in Rome, and not least against the corrosive fluid, the materialistic spirit of the age.

The body adjourned on the 26th, having first selected Los Angeles for next year's meeting.

Gen. Wood, who left Cuba immediately after the inauguration of the republic (p. 104), arrived in the United States on the 26th; and on the same day H. C. Squiers, the first American minister to Cuba, arrived at Havana and was formally received on the 27th by the president. On the 28th President Palma delivered his inaugural message to the Cuban Congress. Thus far the republic has been officially recognized by Great Britain, France, Mexico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, San Domingo, Ecuador and Paraguay, as well as the United States.

General acquiescence in the provisional government of Hayti under Boisrond Canal as provisional president (p. 107) is now reported from Port au Prince. Gen. Firmin halted his army at Arohaie, two days' march from the capital, and after formally declaring that he did not intend to enter the city at the head of his army, came there in person on the 23d on board a Haytian man of war. The

next news was to the effect that on the 26th the following provisional government was peaceably established:

President, Boisrond Canal; Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Jeremie; Minister of the Interior, M. Colin; Minister of Justice, M. Lalane; Minister of War, Gen. Nord; Minister of Public Works, M. Cesarion; Minister of Finance, M. Dennery.

This provisional government has arranged for a registration of voters, to be completed in 30 days, for the election of deputies to choose a constitutional president.

NEWS NOTES.

—President Loubet, of France, returned to Paris from St. Petersburg (p. 107) on the 28th.

—Lord Pauncefoot, the British ambassador to the United States, died at Washington on the 24th.

—The sixth annual conference of the Ohio Single Tax League is to meet at the Great Southern Hotel, Columbus, on the 8th.

—The state board of health of Kentucky has ordered a smallpox quarantine against Indiana, to become effective on the 1st, under which no person will be allowed to cross the line into Kentucky unless he has a certificate of having been successfully vaccinated within five years.

—The Swedenborgian convention which met at Philadelphia this week has chosen Chicago for next year's convention. One of the most important decisions was to transfer the church paper, the New Church Messenger, to the West, under the editorship of the Rev. S. C. Eby.

—A bronze statue of Rochambeau, the French general who commanded the French troops at Yorktown when Lord Cornwallis surrendered to Washington, which had been presented by the French government to the United States, was unveiled at Washington on the 24th by the Countess de Rochambeau. President Roosevelt delivered an address.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), May 24.—It is sad that the eloquence, zeal and ability of Senator Hoar should be exerted on the

wrong side of a great public question. Fortunately no harm will result from this. The American people cannot be swerved from the course they have laid out for themselves concerning the Philippines.

Chicago Chronicle (con. Dem.), May 24.—We need for the good of the people of the Philippines, and even more for the good of the people of the United States, a Congress which will declare plainly and unequivocally that we intend American liberty, American free government, under the guaranty of our common constitution.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), May 23.—Senator Hoar swept away the sophistry and hypocrisy which have bolstered the pretense that the subjugation of the Philippines was conducted for the uplifting of their people, showing that what we have sought there is sovereignty, "the principle of eternal dominion over that people."

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), May 24.—These problems are presented to the American people in the first instance rather as national problems than as party problems. They should study them with an open mind free from party bias, and then decide whether they will force their sovereignty onto an unwilling people of another hemisphere. . . .

Columbus (O.) Press, May 22.—Mr. Hoar's speech in the Senate Thursday cannot be discredited with cheap ridicule or bitter billingsgate, nor will the lofty rhetoric of the administration spokesman, Senator Lodge, stem the tide of indignation which moves Senator Hoar to speak for that element of the Republican party which is not in sympathy with the imperialistic policy of the national administration.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), May 24.—Senator Hoar rose majestically to the occasion, as he has risen before in this bloody Philippine business, and contributed to its discussion a masterpiece of reason and eloquence and passionate protest. His speech on the pending Philippine civil government bill in the Senate is one of the most powerful of his philippic against American criminal aggression in the Orient, and it will rank with the noblest efforts yet made by patriotism in defense of the national honor and of the national ideals.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), May 24.—It is the duty of every intelligent American citizen to "clear his mind of cant" and restudy the essence of the Philippine question. Let him begin by reading Senator Hoar's dignified, statesmanlike, effective and impressive speech. . . . The great beauty of such a speech as his is that it silences the sophist, ranter and demagogue. It challenges earnest and honest consideration. It compels sober and statesmanlike statement of the problem. How can Senator Hoar be answered; how is his argument to be met? Why are we not doing in the Philippines what we are so proud of having done in Cuba?

COAL STRIKE.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), May 26.—The coal miners are already suffering from lack of fuel and are too poor to buy even waste from the mines. In the midst of nature's abundance, this fact points to a problem which should challenge the best thought of the age for its solution.

Farmers' Voice and National Rural (agr'l), May 24.—That Senator Hanna's arbitration plan has proved a failure at the first serious attempt to employ its good offices is exactly what this journal at the time it was created said would be the case. Men whose business is based on special privilege "don't have to" submit to arbitration; . . . So long as spe-

cial privilege exists none need expect to see arbitration thrive, at least through the encouragement of the privileged.

PRESIDENTIAL PROBABILITIES.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), May 27.—A wave of indignation will sweep the country now because Mayor Johnson and Mr. Bryan took a pilgrimage together. These "dangerous agitators" are always doing something to annoy the Republican patriots.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), May 23.—Tom Johnson is right. The surest way to stop injustice abroad is to first stop it at home. The men who are now throttling American industry by every species of monopoly that can be devised by the wit of man, are the real men behind the guns in the Philippines, and they are the men who hope to profit by grabbing the franchises and exploiting the labor of defenseless and distant islands. Tom L. Johnson never begins at the wrong end. He isn't trying to lead the mule by the tail. He would strike directly at the enemy's capital, and strike hard.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), May 27.—If Mr. Bryan has selected Tom L. Johnson as his presidential candidate, he has fulfilled his mission of destruction to the Democratic party. The work of disorganization, begun in 1896, needs only the nomination of this exalted apostle of liberty, as depicted by the orator of the Platte, to be complete. The Democratic leaders, in search of an issue on which to go before the country, need look no further. They can find it in Mr. Johnson himself. He can expound the doctrines of Jefferson, as interpreted by Mr. Bryan and indorsed by himself, and preach the politics of Andrew Jackson in the light of the same "higher criticism." The two statesmen are one on the great questions on which Mr. Bryan believes the safety of the republic hangs. They agree that "militarism" and "imperialism" ought to be made issues and the army abused; that the courts should temper justice with bids for popular favor; that injunctions are all iniquitous; and that the United States must get out of the Philippines. With Tom Johnson in the Presidential chair and William Jennings Bryan as his chief adviser, one might look for blessings of the same sort that were declined with thanks by the voters of the country in 1896 and 1900. But they will decline the blessings whenever offered.

THE IMPERIAL STATUE.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), May 26.—The German emperor should withdraw his offer to present a statue of Frederick the Great to the American people and to have it put in Washington. There is no propriety in having any representative of foreign monarchy honored by a statue in our nation's capital.

SHIP SUBSIDY.

Outlook (rel.), Mar. 29.—A proposition to transfer millions of dollars a year for a score of years to a few favored firms in order to interrupt mutually profitable international transactions.

Albany Argus (Dem.), Mar. 26.—Some of the Republican congressmen are wondering just what Senator Allison meant when, holding aloft the ship subsidy bill in presence of his colleagues, he said: "Senators, this bill that I hold in my hand will be in the canvass this fall."

Commoner (Dem.), Mar. 28.—The ship subsidy is not intended for the farmer, laborer or merchant, neither is it intended for the ship builder. It is intended for a few wealthy ship owners who have influence enough to secure enormous contributions from the public treasury and they will be expected as a return to contribute to the republican campaign fund.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Mar. 28.—The programme of some Republican House members to postpone action on the ship subsidy bill is not wise. . . . If this ship subsidy bill is permitted to slumber in the House it will become one of the lively issues of the campaign. Speakers on every stump will be asked to discuss it. The Republicans will be expected to defend it or convict their own party of that kind of a blunder which is nearly akin to a crime. . . . There should be no cowardice, no evasion, no paltering with the issue. Let us see courage in the House, preferably the courage of honesty, but if that be lacking, then the courage of dishonesty.

OREGON POLITICS.

Red Wing (Minn.) Argus (Dem.), May 24.—To the politicians a stumbling block and to the bourbon foolishness 'is the amazingly frank letter of acceptance given by C. E. S. Wood, of Portland, to the Oregon Democrats who have nominated him for the United States Senate. He doesn't expect to be elected, and frankly says so. He would rather be defeated fighting for principle than elected without. He would oppose the special privileges of Oregon as firmly as those of Pennsylvania. . . . Mr. Wood's letter is not politics. But it's great. We need more men like him to stand firmly for what they conceive to be right, to speak clearly what they see to be true, absolutely blind to the consequences.

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 19-23, 1902.

Senate.
Mr. Dooliver continued the debate (p. 6045) on the Philippine question on the 19th, and on the 20th the speakers were Mr. Bacon (p. 6065) and Mr. Foraker (p. 6063). Mr. Bacon finished his speech on the 21st (p. 6124), on which day Mr. Wellington also spoke on this subject, while all the time allotted to it on the 22d was occupied by Mr. Hoar (p. 6177) and Mr. Teller (p. 6189), the latter presenting a documentary history of the relations of the United States to the Cuban republic. In this connection Senator Beveridge's North American Review article was made part of the record. The Philippine question being still under consideration on the 23d, Mr. Dubois (p. 6270) and Mr. Beveridge (p. 6282) were the speakers. When they had finished the Senate adjourned to the 26th.

House.

Consideration of the naval appropriation bill being resumed on the 19th (p. 6012), the bill was passed (p. 6033); after which, under suspension of the rules (p. 6033), the eight-hour bill on public work, the text of which is given on the same page, was also passed. The conference report on the omnibus claims bill was adopted on the 20th (p. 6077), and the urgent deficiency bill was passed (p. 6077). In connection with the disagreement between the two houses on the army appropriation bill (p. 6077), a controversy arose involving the prerogatives of the chairman of the committee on military affairs and the power of the speaker (pp. 6078-6085), and the contention of the chairman and the speaker was voted down. An amendment to the passport law, intended to allow passports to persons owing allegiance, though not citizens (p. 6086), was then discussed and passed, after which the day was devoted to private bills. Having disposed on the 21st of miscellaneous business, including the report of the committee on elections against John E. Fowler (p. 6123), John J. Lentz (p. 6139) and James J. Walker, contestants for seats, the House entered upon the consideration in committee of the whole (p. 6141) of House bill No. 12199, for the regulation of immigration of aliens into the United States. The same subject was continued on the 22d, but the session on the 23d was devoted to private bills, and adjournment was then taken to the 26th.

Record Notes.—Speeches of Senators McLaurin, of Mississippi, (p. 5986), Welling-

ton (p. 6161), and Bacon (p. 6230), and Representative Vandiver (p. 6111), on the Philippine question. Speeches of Representatives Smith (p. 6081) and Flynn (p. 6107) on statehood. Speeches of Representative Underwood (p. 6253) and Perkins (p. 6259), on immigration.

Resolution of welcome to Cuban Republic (p. 6086) and text of Associated Press report on inauguration of Cuban Republic (p. 6121).

MISCELLANY

THE CONDEMNED.

For The Public.

Hopeless and doomed, he paces back and forth
While warders watch him through the grated bars;
His little shifty eyes look out askance,
Furtive and cunning, tiger-like and wild;
Like some fience beast held captive in a cage,
With shambling gait he wanders round his cell;
A grim embodiment of foulest crime;
A brute in human form fierce and untamed;
A man to manhood lost—degenerate.
A few more hours; the gallows and the grave
Will claim this product of our 'lightened age;
A human wolf whose fangs are dripping blood.
Observe him then, and note his brutal jaw;
His forehead like an ape's, receding, low;
His shuffling feet, and hang-dog sullen look;
His head too small by far for his huge frame.
Look at him well, and ask, what made him so?

What depths of squalor and iniquity,
Begot by Selfishness and Unjust Laws,
Engulfed him while an infant at the breast—
Made him a Brute who should have been a Man?
Look on this form, and looking be appalled,
For there is menace in this wretched shape;
A frightful menace to Society!
I read in him and in his kind a threat
Of vengeance for the wrongs that marred his birth;
That damned him in his wretched mother's arms—
Made him an outcast and a loathsome thing.
What life is safe when such hell-spawn as this
Is bred and fostered in our cities' slums—
Brought forth in filth and reared in misery?

Take one last look e'er yet they lead him forth,
The proper fruitage for the gallow's-tree;
The ripened harvest of Oppression's seed;
The unresisting slave of dark environment.
Ponder this in thy soul: Had Fate but made
The slightest slip, thou also might'st have been
Like to the horrid thing thou seest here.

ROBERT T. WHITELAW.

TO-DAY'S LESSON.

A certain Man with his servants
went down from Imperusalem to
Fredomco, and fell among thistles
and briars and was lost in the wilder-

ness. Now a Samar-itan hearing of the unhappy condition of the Man and his attendants, sent oil and wine and food to him, even enough for him and for all his servants.

It came to pass on the morrow that the Man and his company were refreshed and strengthened by the contributions from the Samar-itan, and they resumed their journey. And when they had arrived near to the dwelling place of the Samar-itan, they approached humbly, as befitted men who had received succor. But suddenly they fell upon the servants of the Samar-itan and smote not a few of them. And when they had done this they put forth their hands and took the Samar-itan, and made him captive.

Then the Man cried with a strenuous voice and he said: "O, Samar-itan, when we were hungry you gave us food, and when we thirsted you gave us wine to drink. Great, therefore, will be your reward, and you will be repaid a hundred thousand fold. For the rest of your days you will live in peace, and all that you will desire to eat and drink will be furnished without cost."

Now which of these two men was neighbor to the other?

G. T. E.

THE FAT OX AND THE LUSTY YOUNG ASS.

"I say you!" bawled a fat Ox to a lusty young Ass, who was braying outside, "the like of that is not in good taste!"

"In whose good taste, my adipose censor?" inquired the Ass, not too respectfully.

"Why—h'm—ah, I mean it does not suit me. You ought to bellow."

"May I inquire how it happens to be any of your business whether I bellow or bray, or do both—or do neither?"

"I cannot tell you," answered the critic, shaking his head despondingly, "I do not at all understand it. I can only say that I have been accustomed to censure all discourse that differs from my own."

"Exactly," said the Ass, "you have sought to make an art of impertinence by mistaking prejudices for principles. In 'taste' you have invented a word incapable of definition, to denote an idea impossible of expression; and by employing in connection therewith the words 'good' and 'bad' you indicate a merely subjective process in terms of an objective quality. Such presumption

transcends the limit of the merely impudent, and passes into the boundless empyrean of pure cheek."

At the close of this remarkable harangue, the bovine critic was at a loss for language to express his disapproval. So he said the speech was in bad taste.—The Goose Quill.

THE TRUE DEMOCRATIC POLICY.

The contest is one between the many who desire justice and are interested only in good government, and the few who are entrenched behind special privileges and enjoy government favoritism. Some who were firm in 1896 have been won over and their places must be taken by stronger and more courageous men. Such an opportunity as is now presented for service to the party may not soon return. One honest, fearless Democrat in a precinct can defeat the reorganizers; two in a county can put the corporation element to rout; and half a dozen in a state convention can save the party from humiliating surrender.

The test can be made upon a resolution indorsing the Kansas City platform. Such a resolution ought to be introduced at every primary, for here is where the rank and file of the party speak and where the real opinion of the people must be ascertained. Such a resolution ought to be introduced into every county convention, and into every state convention.

The friends of the Kansas City platform must not be deceived by the pretended anxiety for harmony now manifested by the gold element. They did not want harmony when President Cleveland made up his cabinet from the minority of the Democratic party and ostracized every Democrat who would not surrender at the dictation of the financiers; they did not want harmony when they carried on their Palmer and Buckner campaign of fraud and deception in the interest of the Republican ticket; they did not want harmony when they went out in the fall of 1897 with the belief that they could substitute the Gold Democrat organization for the regular organization. They prate about harmony now that they are in a minority; they plead for recognition; but they are planning to fill every committee position with a reorganizer, and every office with a man who has been tried in the balance and been found wanting. When they had control of the national committee they drew the line against every Democrat who believed in bi-metallism, and they will do so again if they are intrusted with power.

There has been no change in those who were leaders of the administration force of 1896. Their sympathies are not with the people and they have been counted upon to oppose every necessary reform. The party under their leadership would not be a Democratic party, for it would compromise with the Republicans on every vital question. The pressing need at this time is for men who will fight on the people's side and who prefer defeat to disgrace.

The contest may be a long one, but the time will come when Republican policies will be repudiated and when Democratic principles will be vindicated. All that is required is that the party shall be honest and courageous. In times of adversity it can establish a character that will commend it to the people and its victory will be permanent. Those who are willing to suffer defeat with right principles will be called upon to administer the government and apply Democratic principles when Republican experiments fail, as fail they will.

Wanted—Men—honest men, industrious men and courageous men, patient men; democratic men!

Some of the greatest successes in life are deemed failures by the world at large.—Bryan's Commoner.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTER TO JOHN BULL.

HE LOOKS A GIFT HORSE IN THE MOUTH AND TALKS OF TRUSTS.

Dear John: Been thinkin' it over; and I don't believe I'll set up any brass kings or emperors in America yet awhile. If Billy of Germany would send us another statue of Liberty Enlightening the World, like the French sent, I'd hesitate a little, as it's a close scratch to get fire enough to keep the light a burnin' in the one I've got, under Theodore's administration. I might set up the statue of Frederic under the light of the Goddess on Bedloe Island, so he'd get the benefit; or I can let Theodore set him up in the Philippines. He was a pretty hard old hickory nut, but it wouldn't be a goin' back on anything we've done in the Philippines to erect old Fred there right in sight of Taft's front door.

Say! I've got my missionary back; but this is the last! I'm done paying ransoms for stolen missionaries. If anybody needs missionaries bad enough to steal 'em, they ought to have 'em, and they get mine from now on. What's a missionary for, anyway? If they are missionaries only to the select circles they'd bet-

ter resign and preach to the trusts.

What are we goin' to do with these trusts, John, anyway? I'm a suin' mine; but Theodore has it in hand and I guess he won't hurt 'em—makes too much noise to catch any fish, Theodore does. Had the lawyer's beat a tom-tom from Washington to Chicago and from Chicago to Washington and then back again—greatest racket you ever heard—like the Chinese make war. It makes me grin. Got a hundred thousand dollars' worth of free advertisin' out of it, Theodore did. Then the trusts cum into court very demure and winkin' one eye and say they are willin' to be enjoined if it'll help the administration any, seeing that it won't affect the price of beef, which is rising, and the grand jury has gone home. When the price of beef gets up about high enough they will have the injunction made perpetual and keep it there.

Well, it's the same old world, John, it was in Taffy's time, Taffy the Welshman. He was in the meat business, too, you remember; but the ways were different then. Taffy was the first beef trust. He held up the meat; now, they hold up the people. I celebrated him the other day in an ode:

To Taffy.

"Taffy was a Welshman,
Taffy was a thief!"

O, thou! who erstwhile was a Welshman bold,
And culled from stores replete the marrow bone;
Who carried off the beef, and to thy hold
Mushrooms, perhaps—for sure by bread alone
No man can live,—tell me if on thy way
Adown the glens, beneath thy leathern zone
Thy heart-beats pattered light and sweetly gay
As if a railroad thou hadst overthrown,
And hadst it in thy pocket. Prithce tell
If honey sweet of stolen meat hath taste
Like stolen office; if to deftly sell
One's country for an ermined robe of ease,
Can have the zest of beef purloined in haste
And yanked, long-legged, down the craggy dell?

UNCLE SAM.

A ROYAL REPUBLICAN BANQUET.

For The Public.

To the Editor: My great and good friend, Whitelaw Reid, said some things the other day at a Union League dinner about the coronation of KING EDWARD VII. (Please print these words in capitals.)

The paper says that that "those present included men prominent in all walks of life. There were no representatives of the Hod Carriers' or the Horseshoers' union at the dinner,

probably because these people were not considered to be in any of the "walks of life," and therefore, not capable of enjoying that kind of a dinner.

The health of KING EDWARD (please use capitals again) was drunk standing, with applause, which was a graceful act, and will give the king a clear idea of how much we love him, and our republican institutions.

Among the things that the great and good Whitelaw said were some words that carry the impression that the special embassy to the coronation is a matter of mere diplomacy. I am sorry he said this, because the king may take it that we are not sincere in this tribute we are going to pay to monarchical institutions and ancient customs, and if there is anything in the world that we are anxious about, it is to have it understood that we love the pomp and ceremonies, and the glittering tinsel that accompanies the coronation of a king, and we are almost sorry that we cannot have some of it over here.

My great and good friend went deeply into the question of clothes, and dived into the musty records of the past to find out that James Buchanan wore a sword at the British court, in deference to the queen, which pleased our people so that they elected him president. This is extremely well put, but it ignores the well-known devotion of James Buchanan to the anti-slavery cause, which certainly ought to be considered in this connection.

But the things which were not said on this occasion, probably on account of the limited time, will give our good King Edward a better idea of the esteem in which he and his institutions and prerogatives are held by the "men prominent in all walks of life," who congregate at banquets. Nobody said:

"We sympathize with you, O king! at the difficult task you have in carrying liberty and civilization to the Boers in South Africa, for we have with us the sad case of the ungrateful Filipinos." We have here the protective tariff and the trusts, which you have not, but your footsteps are turned in the right direction, and you will soon get them.

"We have here, O! king, the same institutions that make such a solid foundation for your throne, and but for a needless prejudice among our people, we might have the throne and the coronation also. We have the paupers and the millionaires, the poor-houses and the palaces, the masses and the classes, and we do not know how to get rid of them, any more than

you do. Indeed, we rather like these kind of things, for it gives us a chance to boast of our charities, and to point out to the beggar and the tramp what a magnificent place there is at the top, if they can only get there.

"We have, O! king, the same thirst for dominion that has carried the British empire around the world, and made the British name so loved by alien nations.

"We have the same identical idea of bayonet-guarded liberty, and battalion-buttrressed trade that made you so powerful, and, although we lag behind a little, a few more strenuous administrations will bring us neck to neck with you, and entitle us to the kingdom and the crown."

These were some of the omitted things, which were barred from the banquet speech by the rules of diplomacy. It is hoped they may reach the king through some other channel. Yours truly,

JACKSON BIGGLES.

Chicago, Ill., May 16, 1902.

A DEMOCRATIC TENDENCY IN CHICAGO.

Extract from the opening speech of George A. Schilling, at a meeting of democratic Democrats held in Chicago, May 20, 1902, to organize a movement to recover municipal government and state legislation from the control of the predatory classes.

There is in the city of Chicago a number of public utility corporations whose stocks and bonds exceed the cost of duplication from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000. That is to say, these corporations are drawing dividends and interest upon this amount because of the good will of our community in permitting them to use our streets for business purposes. The profits accruing to these corporations from mere franchise values alone, amount in the aggregate to from \$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000 annually, which substantially represents a mortgage upon every wealth producer of this city of about \$500.

This movement is inaugurated for the purpose of ending, as soon as possible, that system of public plunder. Its projectors are democratic Democrats. We purpose to make a demand on our party, and to ask that it nominate citizens, including members of labor organizations, whose election would be a guarantee that the public interests will be fully conserved. Should the Democratic party be so undemocratic as to deny this, if by its forthcoming action it demonstrates that, like the Republican party, its leaders and machinery are controlled by predatory

wealth, then the tocsin must be sounded, and our citizens rallied under the leadership of men whose interest in the welfare of their city is paramount to mere party fealty when such parties are controlled and used for purely mercenary purposes.

It is contended by anarchistic writers that government, the state, the political element of society, is purely predatory and parasitic. If this contention is to be disproved, our citizens must elect a more conscientious and intelligent body of public servants than those who comprise our official class to-day. What are the facts? Your constables and petty judges plunder the poorest people of our city every day in the name of law. Their conduct often results in the destruction of homes and the scattering of families. Your city government levies special assessments far in excess of cost, and then lets the citizen whistle for the rebate. The treasurers of our cities, counties, and the state, constantly withhold the payment of bills due, so that they may draw enormous interest on the deposits of public funds. Your legislative, executive and judicial officials, with but few exceptions, are the mere lackeys of corporate wealth. Within the shadow of the city hall of every city in this country thrive the political microbes, contractors and officials, who through criminal methods are exploiting entire communities. Our courts of justice are invaded and their findings perverted by the bribe giver, representing the interests of the public service corporations. Whatever we do, wherever we turn, in our dealings with our political machinery, corruption and venality stalk abroad; not in shame, but holding up their heads proudly and arrogantly.

If this condition is not overdrawn, and I contend it is not, then what are we to do about it? In spite of all the discouragements that meet the reformer, there are many hopeful signs. Look at the emphatic expression of the people at the spring election in favor of the initiative and referendum and municipal ownership. Look at the work performed by Catherine Goggin and Margaret Haley, representing the School Teachers' Federation of Chicago. Two years ago these women were unknown outside of their immediate circle of friends. To-day they stand before the community and the country as victors, crowned with a glory that

should bring the blush of shame to us men who have followed a do-nothing policy. Surely if these school teachers, without a vote, can "round up" the corporations as they have done, and are still doing, what may we men not accomplish, if we but do our duty to our city and state?

But let us be wise in our methods of procedure and just toward the Democratic party. Let us ask that the spirit of Bryan and Altgeld be embodied in its platform, and that it nominate men, for all legislative positions at least, who will not be driven like a herd of cattle in the interest of corporate wealth. All the signs of the times point to Democratic victory this fall, if those who control the party's destiny but act wisely and justly toward the public. Let no one at this time urge independent political action. But should the Democratic party be false to Democratic principles, we will then appeal to the independent citizenship of Chicago, and do all in our power to arouse this community against the predatory elements that control both Democratic and Republican machines. Meanwhile, let us organize, and remember that the god of battles is ultimately with the persistent and aggressive forces of the world.

SPLENDID BARBARITY.

In the face of the official Philippine horrors that are being discussed, horrors which have been perpetrated with the knowledge and by the command of the military authorities in the islands, the American people will read with dismay that at the recent banquet of the Sons of the American Revolution the President of the United States, the commander-in-chief of the army and navy, "drank to the health of the soldiers and sailors of the present day, who, during the last three years, have done such splendid work in the inconceivably dangerous and harassing warfare of the eastern tropics."

Without an uncivilized mode of warfare during the last three years, the "splendid work" could never have been accomplished. The struggle for liberty would still be going on in Samar had not "the soldiers of the present day" done that "splendid work" of creating a "howling wilderness." Are we to interpret the expression of the President as approval of the official barbarities committed in the Philippines the past three years? There is abundant proof that the barbarities began with the war, only increasing in degree,

growing "stiffer and stiffer," until, as Gen Hughes testified, the "splendid" work is nearing completion.

If the work done was "splendid," the workers may not be classed as "wrongdoers," subject to punishment. But should such become a political necessity, a Chaffee-Smith-Bell-Hughes-Waller-Funston scapegoat will not appease the sense of justice of the American people. They will demand the political lives of those in authority who place a seal of approval upon the diabolical work these human bloodhounds have accomplished.

What is this "splendid work" that has been done in the tropics? The glory, if glory it be, died with the booming of Dewey's cannon. Our army officers surrendered all claim to honor by carrying on a policy of deception and trickery, which began as soon as the army disembarked upon Philippine soil. Failing by such means, they have operated under double-distilled Spanish methods until the United States counts more victims in three years than Spain dispatched in three centuries.

Is it a "splendid work" to hold up a people and rob them of country and nationality at the point of the bayonet? Is it a "splendid work" to turn the cannon upon allies because they decline to yield their inalienable rights? Is it a "splendid work" to sweep thousands from the earth because they take up arms in defense of home and liberty? Is it a "splendid work" to apply the torch to the homes of earth, while helpless women and babes and tottering age flee before the flames that blot out those hallowed spots? Is it a "splendid work" to make God's fair isles a "howling wilderness"? Is it a "splendid work" to slay the wounded on the battlefield, to spare no prisoners of war, but to make them the target of a three days' shooting match? Is it a "splendid work" to choose by lot an innocent person—a prisoner of war—and execute him for the crime of another? Is it a "splendid work" to torture human beings until, racked with pain, writhing in agony, frenzied with anguish, the will power shattered, they admit anything charged, however false, to gain a moment's respite? Is it a "splendid work" to exterminate a people by murdering non-combatants, all over ten years of age, leaving the remnant to the horrors of starvation? All these facts are in evidence. They have been admitted by the official perpetrators. Is this the way "strong men, not weaklings," prove their strength. This is the

strength, not of men, but of demons.

Oh, what "splendid work," what valor, what heroism, what magnificent courage "the gallant Americans, wearing the uniform of the American republic," displayed. How "gloriously have they upheld the most glorious traditions of the past," as, protected by a moving breastwork of enforced Filipino citizens, they swept forward, armed to the teeth, to valiantly battle against those fierce Malay warriors, Filipino boys of eight and ten years, come out to defend the honor of their mothers, if perchance they escape the brutal massacre—come forth to avenge the slaughter of their sires and the murder of their brothers, whose life-blood drenched the soil of their native land. What "inconceivably dangerous and harassing warfare of the eastern tropics" was this for "the soldier of the present day."

How flattered must be the survivors of the Grand Army of the Republic, how exalted the military giants "wearing the blue and the gray," how elated the Sons of the American Revolution, whose ancestors fell at Lexington and fought at Bunker Hill, and left the prints of their bleeding feet upon the snows of Valley Forge—what worldwide fame to have their names coupled with "those gallant Americans," disgracing "the uniform of the American republic" in the Philippines.

Long will Theodore Roosevelt drink to the health of those who wrought the "splendid work" of death ere the spirit of liberty shall be crushed from the souls of the infant heroes of the Philippines; but not till the land is left desolate, not while humanity lives in the American heart, not till the doctrine of the brotherhood of man dies in Christendom, not until God forgets His brown children will the flag "stay put" on the bloodsoaked soil of the Philippines. Eternal shame on such ignoble warfare.—Rebecca J. Taylor, in Washington (D. C.) Post.

SENATOR HOAR'S LATEST LIBERTY SPEECH.

Extract from the speech of this venerable Republican, senior senator from Massachusetts, delivered in the United States Senate, May 22, 1902, as reported in the Congressional Record, pp. 6176-86.

... We said in the case of Cuba that she had a right to be free and independent. We affirmed in the Teller resolution, I think without a negative voice, that we would not invade that right and would not meddle with her territory or anything that belonged to her. That declaration was a declaration of peace as well as of righteous-

ness, and we made the treaty, so far as concerned Cuba, and conducted the war and have conducted ourselves ever since on that theory—that we had no right to interfere with her independence; that we had no right to her territory or to anything that was Cuba's. So we only demanded in the treaty that Spain should hereafter let her alone.

If you had done to Cuba as you have done to the Philippine islands, who had exactly the same right, you would be at this moment, in Cuba, just where Spain was when she excited the indignation of the civilized world and we compelled her to let go. And if you had done to the Philippines as you did to Cuba, you would be to-day or would soon be in those islands as you are in Cuba.

But you made a totally different declaration about the Philippine islands. You undertook in the treaty to acquire sovereignty over her for yourself, which that people denied. You declared not only in the treaty, but in many public utterances in this chamber and elsewhere, that you had a right to buy sovereignty with money, or to treat it as the spoils of war or the booty of battle. The moment you made that declaration the Filipino people gave you notice that they treated it as a declaration of war. . . . So you deliberately made up the issue for a fight for dominion on one side and a fight for liberty on the other. Then when you had ratified the treaty you voted down the resolution in the Senate, known as the Bacon resolution, declaring the right of that people to independence, and you passed the McEnery resolution, which declared that you meant to dispose of those islands as should be for the interest of the United States. That was the origin of the war.

My desire to-day is simply to call attention to the practical working of the two doctrines—the doctrine of buying sovereignty or conquering it in battle, and the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. For the last three years you have put one of them in force in Cuba and the other in the Philippine Islands. I ask you to think soberly which method, on the whole, you like better. I ask you to compare the cost of war with the cost of peace, of justice with that of injustice, the cost of empire with the cost of republican liberty, the cost of the way of America and the way of Europe, of the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence with the doctrine of the Holy Alliance. . . .

In Cuba, of right, just government, according to you, must rest on the consent of the governed. Her people are to "institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

In the Philippine Islands a government is to be instituted by a power 10,000 miles away, to be in the beginning a despotism, established by military power. A despotism where there is treason without an overt act, and elections, if they have them, without political debate, and schools where they cannot teach liberty. It is to be established by military power, and to be such, to use the language of the McEnery resolution, such as shall seem "for the interest of the United States."

Gentlemen talk about sentimentalities, about idealism. They like practical statesmanship better. But, Mr. President, this whole debate for the last four years has been a debate between two kinds of sentimentality. There has been practical statesmanship in plenty on both sides. Your side have carried their sentimentalities and ideals out in your practical statesmanship. The other side have tried and begged to be allowed to carry theirs out in practical statesmanship also.

On one side have been these sentimentalities. They were the ideals of the fathers of the revolutionary time, and from their day down till the day of Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner was over. The sentimentalities were that all men in political right were created equal; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are instituted to secure that equality; that every people—not every scattering neighborhood or settlement without organic life, not every portion of a people who may be temporarily discontented, but the political being that we call a people—has the right to institute a government for itself and to lay its foundation on such principles and organize its powers in such form as to it and not to any other people shall seem most likely to effect its safety and happiness. Now a good deal of practical statesmanship has followed from those ideals and sentimentalities. They have builded 45 states on firm foundations. They have covered South America with republics. They have kept despotism out of the western hemisphere. They have made the United States the

freest, strongest, richest of the nations of the world. . . .

You also, my imperialistic friends, have had your ideals and your sentimentalities. One is that the flag shall never be hauled down where it has once floated. Another is that you will not talk or reason with a people with arms in their hands. Another is that sovereignty over an unwilling people may be bought with gold. And another is that sovereignty may be got by force of arms, as the booty of battle or the spoils of victory. . . . What have your ideals cost you, and what have they bought for you?

1. For the Philippine islands you have had to repeal the Declaration of Independence. For Cuba you have had to reaffirm it and give it new luster.

2. For the Philippine islands you have had to convert the Monroe doctrine into a doctrine of mere selfishness. For Cuba you have acted on it and vindicated it.

3. In Cuba you have got the eternal gratitude of a free people. In the Philippine islands you have got the hatred and sullen submission of a subjugated people.

4. From Cuba you have brought home nothing but glory. From the Philippines you have brought home nothing of glory.

5. In Cuba no man thinks of counting the cost. The few soldiers who came home from Cuba wounded or sick carry about their wounds and their pale faces as if they were medals of honor. What soldier glories in a wound or an empty sleeve which he got in the Philippines?

6. The conflict in the Philippines has cost you \$600,000,000, thousands of American soldiers—the flower of your youth—the health and sanity of thousands more, and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos slain.

Another price we have paid as the result of your practical statesmanship. We have sold out the right, the old American right, to speak out the sympathy which is in our hearts for people who are desolate and oppressed everywhere on the face of the earth. Has there ever been a contest between power and the spirit of liberty, before that now going on in South Africa, when American senators held their peace because they thought they were under obligation to the nation in the wrong for not interfering with us?

. . . . This war, if you call it war, has gone on for three years. It will go on in some form for 300 years, unless this policy be abandoned. You

will undoubtedly have times of peace and quiet, or pretended submission. You will buy men with titles, or office, or salaries. You will intimidate cowards. You will get pretended and fawning submission. The land will smile and smile and seem at peace. But the volcano will be there. The lava will break out again. You can never settle this thing until you settle it right.

UNCLE SAM'S SOLO IN THE CONCERT OF POWERS.

For The Public.
Tune: Kill everyone over ten years of age, and leave the provinces a howling wilderness.

Come, let us sing and laugh—
Enjoy the wine we quaff;
'Tis children's blood,
A warm, red flood,
And is not bad by half.

Chorus:
We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

They're young and brown and slim—
So tender—like of limb;
The children lie
Beneath the sky,
Shot down in name of Him!

Chorus:
We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

And spreads a Herod fear
Whenever we come near;
And mothers moan,
For, like our own,
Their babes to them are dear.

Chorus:
We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

It is our pious Job,
Though many millions sob,
To teach the youth
The precious truth—
Of Destiny by God.

Chorus:
We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

Now all you pulpiteers,
Go tell to Christian ears
That war is good—
Christ's precious blood.
Is glad of mother's tears.

Chorus:
We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.

We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!
C. E. S. WOOD.

Bull—The Boers are not so invincible as they are said to be.

Ball—Why don't you think they are?

Bull—Why? Didn't Kruger's grandson surrender just because he had lost an arm and leg?

In spite of Gen. Smith's censurable acts he should receive credit for not placing the age of execution at less than ten.

We could not help but observe that our heathen allies were mystified when we fell on our knees and prayed for victory in the conflict which was plainly at hand.

"To the God of Battles," we courteously explained.

"But the God who said: 'Thou shalt not kill!' will not He be offended?" urged they, anxiously.

We did not laugh at them; it was a solemn occasion; and, besides, it was too much to expect of these simple people that they rise at once to a just conception of the essential unity of the Christian deity.—Puck.

"What is a captain of industry?" asked the boy who is going to be very wise some day.

"It is a term that is applied to the head of a great monopoly when he is at a banquet."

"And what is a robber baron?"

"It's the same man when he is in politics."—Washington Star.

"Captain," remarked the nuisance on shipboard who always asks foolish questions, "what is the object in throwing the anchor overboard?"

"Young man," replied the old salt, "do you understand the theory of seismic disturbances? Well, we throw the anchor overboard to keep the ocean from slipping away in the fog. See?"—Baltimore News.

"What is your policy?" inquired the inquisitive individual of a great railroad lawyer.

"Our policy," replied the railroad lawyer, "is millions for defense, but not a cent for damages."—Columbus (O.) State Journal.

BOOK NOTICES.

A handsomely printed edition of Clarence S. Darrow's "A Persian Pearl,"

with other essays by Mr. Darrow, has been issued by C. L. Ricketts, of Chicago. The volume is one which should appeal both as to matter and typographical beauty to lovers of the "Rubaiyat," which is the Persian pearl, and to admirers of Walt Whitman, who is the subject of one of the supplementary essays. In "The Persian Pearl" Mr. Darrow discloses religious impulses which have been diverted by hatred of pietism toward a pessimistic fatalism. If the essay were an argument, its ragged edges might be pointed out; but poetry does not admit of controversy, and this is poetic, though in the form of prose. It is worth remarking, however, that the conception of the "Rubaiyat" that there is no place for heaven or hell in space, but "I myself am heaven and hell" — of which Mr. Darrow makes much—was not an original discovery of the sensual Persian poet, but was declared at least a thousand years earlier in the words of the Nazarene when he said: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! for behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." But in what age this truth was discovered is of little moment, the first consideration being that it is a truth. It furnishes a key, moreover, to what might otherwise be a puzzling mystery in Mr. Darrow's pleasing essays. For through the clouds of fatalism that darken them all there come frequent flashes of spiritual light, of which the fatalist and the materialist and the pessimist and the self-centered utilitarian could have no realization. Democracy abhors fatalism; unselfish love of the race has no standing in the utilitarian courts of the materialist. But both sentiments deeply color Mr. Darrow's essays.

PERIODICALS.

In the Westminster Review (London, Paris and New York) for May, Francis Grierson plausibly foretells "The Doom of American Democracy," and Henry George, Jr., vividly and truly describes the conditions leading up to "The Next Depression in America."

—Louis Wallis contributes to the May number of the American Journal of Sociology (Chicago), in "Capitalization of Social Development," a new materialistic theory of sociology, whereby he arrives inductively at the same practical conclusion

Women's National Single Tax Conference.

(Change of Date.)

For the convenience of delegates expressing a desire to attend, the Executive Committee of the Women's National Single Tax League have deemed it advisable to change the time of holding the Annual Conference from the 12th, 13th and 14th, dates heretofore announced, to the 26th, 27th and 28th, of June, 1902. The Conference will be held at The Tuxedo, corner of 59th Street and Madison Avenue, New York City, beginning at 10:30 o'clock, Thursday morning, June 26th.

It is hoped that every state and territory will be represented by one or more delegates. The annual fee for club membership in the League is one dollar for every five members of the club. Individuals may also become members of the League upon payment of an annual fee of one dollar. Women desiring to attend the Conference, or wishing to be represented by proxy, can obtain desired information by addressing Mrs. John S. Crosby, President W. N. S. T. L., No. 7 West 106th Street, New York, N. Y. Friendly papers please copy.

that Henry George reaches deductively. Mr. Wallis's idea is that in the evolution of society, slavery and land monopoly were inevitable stages, the necessity for which has now passed; and that the so-called "unearned increment," heretofore properly enough appropriated to private use, could best be applied to public use. The article is one which the "scientific" cult of economists, who have evaded George's conclusions by denying moral principle as "unscientific," will need to turn their attention to.

The Colorado Campaign for Home Rule in Taxation.

A great opportunity is presented for advancing the cause of true tax reform in Colorado. Senator Bucklin has secured the passage of a bill to amend the constitution of Colorado by granting to each county of the state the power to exempt from taxation any property other than land values and franchises in public ways. The people are to vote on this amendment at the next election in November, and if approved by the people it becomes a part of the constitution of the state.

If this great reform is effected in Colorado its influence will be felt throughout the United States. The prospect of a favorable vote is excellent, as the amendment must receive only a majority of the votes cast for or against it and not, as in some states, a majority of all the votes polled at the election. The bill passed the Senate and Assembly with very little opposition, and Senators Teller and Patterson have both declared themselves in favor of the amendment. Senator Patterson is the owner of the "Rocky Mountain News," the most important paper in Colorado, and the support of this paper can be relied upon. The State Federation of Labor has endorsed the amendment, and many local Unions have pledged themselves to vote for it.

Some opposition has already developed, but the chief danger is that the amendment will not be sufficiently well understood to avert the danger of misrepresentation toward the end of the campaign.

It is the duty of everyone who understands the great social and economic change that can be brought about through scientific taxation to help to the full extent of his power. A national committee has been formed and makes an appeal for contributions. Money is needed for the spreading of literature on the subject and for the expenses of speakers. Let us give what we can, and promptly.

Contributions from any of the southern states may be sent to Dr. R. H. Cage, P. O. Box 1305, New Orleans, La.

J. H. DILLARD.

National Committeeman for Louisiana.

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 for sample copy to 123 E. 26th 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. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS.

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

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

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1255 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.

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