

ticipate either in the preparations for that battle or the actual engagement.

The testimony introduced by the judge advocate indicates that there was a deliberate effort to keep Admiral Schley uninformed as to certain important details of the search for the enemy. The much talked-about loop has been shown by the judge advocate's own witnesses to have been essential to the success of the great battle and it is significant that the judge advocate rested his case after Captain Cook, one of his witnesses, had in answer to a question concerning Schley's demeanor said: "I always regarded him as an enthusiastically brave and patriotic officer."

That was the verdict of the newspaper correspondents who witnessed the battle of Santiago Bay. That was the verdict of the American people immediately after the battle, and undoubtedly that is the verdict of the American people today.

Band-wagon Journalism.

The New York World is inclined to criticize Edward M. Shepard, the Democratic nominee for mayor of New York City, because he does not pledge himself to remove certain police officials now in authority in the New York metropolis. The World has nothing but words of praise to say of Mr. Shepard personally and it concedes that his own ideas of local government are above criticism. In one and the same issue the World pays a high tribute to Mr. Shepard and to Mr. Seth Low, the Republican candidate. Mr. Shepard's reply to the demand that he pledge himself to remove certain police officials in New York is that he has so far declined to make pledges to any one. He adds, however, that if he should be chosen as mayor of New York every man placed in authority under him would represent "in season and out of season, in the day time and in the night time, notions of public order and good government entertained, and so often given voice to, by Edward M. Shepard."

The World, however, seems not disposed to accept this as conclusive.

Without any desire to pass upon the propriety of Mr. Shepard's position those who have no immediate interest in the result in the New York City election may be inclined to say that a newspaper that is so insistent that a candidate for office shall be explicit should itself be explicit.

It is an old trick of some newspapers that they print articles first favorable to one side and then favorable to another, all the time insisting that candidates for public office shall be candid, yet all the time failing themselves to be plain with the people.

While it is undoubtedly true that all candidates for office should be frank; that they should tell voters exactly what they intend to do; that they should take the people into their confidence; that they should let the public know where they stand upon every question in which the public is interested; yet this same duty rests no heavier upon the candidates than upon the newspapers. The newspaper that pretends to stand up at all hours for

public interest should never make itself liable to the suspicion that it is "trimming."

Today the New York people are not in a position to tell whether the World is supporting Mr. Low or Mr. Shepard for mayor of New York.

If the press is really the instructor and the leader of the people then the press should instruct and lead the people.

There is no question concerning the personal merits of either Mr. Low or Mr. Shepard. But it is the duty of newspapers as it is the duty of men to take positive position upon every question with which the people are confronted. It would seem therefore that if the New York World expects the people to accept its criticisms in all seriousness it is the duty of the World to say where the World stands.

Is the World waiting for the band wagon to come rumbling down the road?

Is the World waiting for the "cat to jump?"

Does the World hope to postpone its announcement of its position on the mayoralty question until the editor of the World determines whether Seth M. Low or Edward M. Shepard will be successful at the polls?

It is true that the people are interested in explicit statements. They want to know where candidates for public office stand. It is no less true that the newspapers wield considerable influence with the people. It is true that the newspaper which hopes to be a power among the people must not be afraid to stand up, even in the presence of defeat, and declare its purpose and its preference.

Where does the World stand? Is it for Shepard or for Low, or does the World simply seek a place in the band wagon?

Tariff Concessions to Cuba.

There are indications that the sugar trust is determined to make a vigorous fight against the proposition that tariff concessions be made to Cuba. Congressman Hepburn of Iowa says: "I have heard much talk about the tariff concessions that should be made to Cuba. I have but little sympathy with the idea of concessions. The articles that Cuba would desire to have admitted free of duty, or at a less rate than other nations pay, would be sugar and tobacco. We are probably producing in the United States this year 200,000 tons of beet sugar, justifying the expectation that in ten years' time, with the present conditions continued, we will produce all the sugar needed in the United States." We are not producing sufficient sugar to supply the demand in this country. Will public interests suffer by tariff concessions that permit the entrance into this country of Cuban sugar? The Washington Post, commenting upon Congressman Hepburn's statement, presents a few figures of its own. The Post says:

"Suppose we produce 200,000 tons this year, how far will it go toward supplying the demand? That would make a huge pile of sugar, but our total consumption is ten times that quantity, being 2,000,000 tons of 2,240 pounds each. We produce 300,000 tons of cane sugar, to which add the beet product of 200,000, and we are 1,500,000 short. In other words, we must import 75 per cent of our

enormous consumption. Our present importation is about 1,800,000 tons per annum."

With what reason shall we refuse tariff concessions to the Cuban people on the sugar question when the demand in the United States cannot be supplied by the sugar produced in this country? We have assumed considerable authority over Cuba in spite of our pledge to see to it that the Cuban people were free and independent. It seems, therefore, that on our part we should be willing to make some concessions; and those concessions which will contribute at once to the public welfare of Cuba and to the public welfare of the United States would seem to recommend themselves to practical men.

"A World Power."

A subscriber asks what is meant by the phrase "a world-power" when used in connection with the United States? That depends upon the view point from which the subject is considered. When the imperialists talk about this nation being a world power, they mean that we should have a large army and a large navy, and join European nations in parceling out the land of what are called the inferior races. When the anti-imperialists speak of this nation as a world power, they mean that it should, in the future as in the past, influence the world through its ideas and example.

For a century this nation has been the most potent influence in the world, and has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations combined. It has been a world power and its influence has been exerted without any evil effect upon our own institutions.

The esteemed Washington Post, after several years of sharp criticism of President Roosevelt, is now snuggling up to him like a sick kitten to a hot stove lid. As a snuggler the Washington Post has no equal.

Macaulay's "Horatius."

Lord Macaulay in his "Lays of Ancient Rome," draws a contrast between earlier and later Rome. The student of history will be interested in studying the two pictures and in examining into the causes which brought Rome from her high to her low state. It was the Roman heart rather than the Roman head that went astray; it was the elevation of greed and the ignoring of justice. The story of the nation's decline (and it will fit all nations that have gone down to ruin), is told in cantos thirty-two and thirty-three.

32.

"Then none was for a party,
Then all were for the state,
Then the great man helped the poor,
And the poor man loved the great;
Then lands were fairly portioned,
Then spoils were fairly sold:
The Romans were like brothers
In the brave days of old.

33.

"Now Roman is to Roman
More hateful than a foe,
And the Tribunes beard the high
And the Fathers grind the low.
As we wax hot in faction
In battle we wax cold;
Wherefore men fight not as they fought
In the brave days of old."