

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1899.

Number 44.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Having acquired a species of self-governing rights in their municipalities, the Irish are now reviving the land question. But this time they strike deeper than in Land League days. Then they demanded the land of Ireland for Irish tenants; now they are demanding it for the Irish people.

The postmaster of Chicago has decided to abandon his attempt to put postal clerks in livery. There was a suddenness in his change of mind which he does not explain, but which an editorial in the Chicago Chronicle does. The writer of this editorial had dug up a provision of the United States statutes—chapter 180 of the laws of 1879—which distinctly declares that “postal clerks, route agents, and mail route messengers, shall not be required to wear uniforms, other than a cap or badge.” The real feeling of the Chicago postal clerks, on the subject, may be inferred from the fact that at the annual election in their association on the 1st, 730 voted against uniforms and only 55 for them.

It is an indignation-arousing story, that which comes from Vienna, about the scientific experiments performed by doctors upon charity patients. Charges are publicly made and virtually confessed, that germs of infectious diseases have been injected into these patients to enable the doctors to study the progress of the disease, and that dangerous surgical operations—many of them ending fatally and others maiming the victims for life—were performed simply to give surgeons experience. One

instance is proved in which a doctor took bacilli from a decomposing corpse and injected them into 35 women and three newly born babies. The result is not disclosed. Patients on their death beds were tortured by painful experiments, either upon false pretenses or while lying helpless at the doctors' mercy. Not only is there no denial of these charges, but the doctors defend them, arguing that the same practice prevails in the charity hospitals of Berlin, Paris and London. One distinguished surgeon is reported as saying: “Tests must be made on somebody. Charity-hospital patients generally are available subjects.” Time was when the dead bodies of criminals were turned over to doctors for experiment, and that was regarded as barbarous. But here we have instances of the use for that purpose of the living bodies, not of condemned criminals, but of the innocent and unfortunate poor.

The most completely bottled-up city in the United States to-day, with reference to its newspapers, is Chicago. Every one of these papers belongs now to a newspaper trust; and the trust is subject to the will of three or four capitalists whose general business interests are so interlaced that whatever affects one affects all. The editors have no more influence than reporters and compositors in determining the policies of their papers. Independent journalism in Chicago is extinct.

This is the situation which Altgeld confronts in making his mayoralty campaign against the street car ring and the democratic reactionaries. At the beginning of his campaign there was one daily paper which exposed the rings and supported him, but the newspaper trust speedily got control of that, and silenced its editors along with the other editors.

One of the trust papers bewails the fact that Altgeld has injected into the municipal campaign a question of national partisan politics. “The contest ought,” it says, “to turn on local issues alone.” But the proprietor of that paper knows perfectly well that the contest cannot turn on local issues. He knows that Harrison's reelection would enable Harrison to control one-third of the democratic state convention in 1900; that the state convention would control the Illinois delegates to the national convention; and that if Illinois held the balance of power in the national convention, those delegates would dictate the democratic platform and candidates in 1900. This is one of the chief reasons of the ring for defeating Altgeld if possible. Harrison is acting in collusion with the Chicago newspaper trust and the bolters of the '96 platform. Incidentally, he is acting in collusion with the street car ring to put obstacles in the way of municipal ownership of the street car system. Altgeld is fighting him at both points. It is not Altgeld who has injected national politics into the municipal campaign; national politics were already in it.

At last the lower house of congress has been induced to authorize a large standing army. The probability is that the senate will give its sanction to the measure, and the president's approval is a foregone conclusion.

For a long time the supporters of militarism in this country had been trying to enlarge the regular army. But the people were shy. Fear of the dangers of standing armies was in the American blood. The war, however, gave the militarists their opportunity. They then found it easy to increase the army from what it had been since 1875, 25,000, to 61,000. But they

were compelled to agree, and to put it into the law, that at the end of the war the old limit of 25,000 should be resumed. The war is now practically ended, and, according to the terms of the law upon which the army was increased to 61,000, the war department ought to be arranging to reduce it again to 25,000. But just at this moment a new law is pushed through, a law which makes our peace army not less in number than 50,000, and empowers the president to raise it to 100,000 if he wishes to. He is reported by administration papers as expressing a desire for the full 100,000 army limit. An American standing army of 100,000 men is, therefore, now in sight.

Why this increase? We are no longer at war. Porto Rico makes no demand upon us for a greater military equipment. Cuba can be set up in business as an independent nation without it. For what purpose, then, is the army to be increased to four times its recent peace footing? The ready answer may be found, in part, in the dispatch of troops to the Philippines. What for? To preserve the peace there? No. The Philippine republic is preserving the Philippine peace everywhere except at Manila. There is no disturbance in the archipelago except what we are making. Why, then, do we send troops, more troops, and yet again more troops to the Philippines? There is but one explanation. It is not to preserve the Philippine peace, not to fight the Spanish war or any phase of it, but to enable the president to make a new war, an unauthorized war, a war of conquest against the Filipinos.

But that is only part of the answer to the question. The other part may be found in the rejection of Representative Cummings's proposed amendment to the army reorganization bill. He proposed that the president should not be permitted to send troops into a state to preserve the local peace, without a written request from the appropriate governor. His amendment was defeated. There was

no alternative. To have admitted such an amendment would have nullified a prime purpose of the measure. For one thing, a large standing army is needed by the plutocratic elements of the country, as a police force. State lines are to be obliterated, local government is to be ignored, the president with a great army behind him, subject to his arbitrary will as commander in chief, is to be raised to a position of irresponsible power. As President McKinley now assumes to govern Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines arbitrarily, by the force of a mere military machine, so, in the evolution of which the army reorganization bill is one of the processes, he or his successor will yet assume arbitrarily to rule our own states, even in such purely local matters as the suppression of domestic violence and the administration of domestic law. Already his friends call it "treason" to oppose his will as to the conquest of the Philippines; how long before he, with this vast military machine behind him, will arbitrarily punish all opposition to his will as treason?

We speak of the armaments of Europe as if they were burdensome; but if this army reorganization bill should become law, and the army be increased to the maximum of 100,000 men, no European state would be under a heavier military burden in time of peace than the United States of America. The secretary of the treasury estimates that \$144,000,000 will be needed for the army alone for the fiscal year beginning next July, and that \$47,000,000 will be needed for the navy—a total, without counting pensions, of \$191,000,000 a year in time of peace. Compare that with Russia's war budget in 1898, of \$148,640,191; with Germany's in the same year, of \$141,175,350; with France's in the same year, of \$123,517,681; with England's in 1897, of \$88,152,750; and with Austria's in 1897, of \$86,083,024. We are to lead them all. Which nations will hereafter be the typical victims of militarism, the nations of Europe or the United States?

It is true that the army appropriation asked for by the military committee of the house is only \$90,000,000—\$54,000,000 less than the estimate of the secretary. This reduction is accounted for by the explanation that the secretary estimated upon an army of 150,000 men, instead of 100,000. But does anyone suppose that the comparatively modest sum of \$90,000,000 will cover the expense? Is there any doubt that a large deficiency appropriation will be asked from the next congress? And even if that be not done, \$90,000,000 for the army and \$47,000,000 for the navy make \$137,000,000, which is not very much less than the war budgets of Russia and Germany, and considerably more than those of France, England and Austria. Besides, there are huge river and harbor appropriations to be charged to our military budget, as well as the pay of retired officers and nearly \$150,000,000 in pensions. Altogether, American military expenses in time of peace, are to make those of the warlike powers of Europe seem Lilliputian by comparison.

Once, upon the floor of the house of representatives, John Randolph of Roanoke rebuked a particularly atrocious sentiment, by exclaiming: "I envy the man who can entertain that sentiment neither his head nor his heart." A similar retort might be made to the newspapers, professors and preachers who are now urging the United States to seize the Philippine islands and govern the inhabitants arbitrarily, in the face of our national principle that governments derive their just power only from the consent of the governed. These worthies ignore the moral argument, and urge this national stultification upon the ground that we have more than once been guilty of the same stultification heretofore in our history. Theirs is an argument on a par with what a man might make who, being tempted to steal, should shove the eighth commandment aside upon the plea that his father, his grandfather,

and even his great-grandfather who had made an engrossed copy of all the commandments, violated it on occasion. The question for the American conscience is not whether our nation has in its history always been true to the principle of self-government, but whether the principle itself is right.

At the 250th anniversary of the execution of King Charles I., celebrated on the 30th by divine right leagues in England, a floral shield from Americans was conspicuous among the tributes. This American tribute to royalty bore the following peculiarly American legend: "America Remembers Her Martyred King." It is not long since such a performance would have been shocking to American sentiment; but our "rulers" have so far receded from our political ideals within the past nine months that it would not be unreasonable to suspect that this tribute emanated from the precincts of the white house itself.

The editor of *Cubano Libre* may be "incapable of self-government," but he has a knowledge of industrial conditions in this country that the average American voter does not possess. "We do not want anyone to invest capital in Cuba except the natives," says this Cuban savage. "America is proof of what monopolists can do in ruining a country." When the American workman learns enough to echo the words of this Cuban journalist we shall see the passing of the "trust."

In criticizing the work of Mrs. Eddy, the founder of the Christian Science philosophy, a St. Louis professor—Prof. J. M. Dixon, of Washington University—whose article appeared in a recent number of *The Independent*, says of her:

The writer has evidently never passed through the education—so thoroughly wholesome, so vitally requisite, and yet, to sentimental minds, so hard and unpleasant—which makes an author examine, criticize, and define his terms before using them.

It is fortunate for the university professors of "economics," that they are

not expected to pass through this "thoroughly wholesome" and "vitally requisite" education. Yet it would do them good.

The disciples of Henry George in Boston have adopted a unique method of propagating the doctrines of their apostle. They proceed upon the theory that the most efficient work can be accomplished by converting leaders of opinion, leaving to them the task of converting their followers. Pursuant to this theory, the Massachusetts Single Tax League, the president of which is William Lloyd Garrison, a son of the old abolitionist, gives three or four banquets in the course of each year, to which representative men in special fields of thought and work are invited. The latest of these banquets took place on the 17th of last month, when some 200 people attended. The guests were representatives of the various charitable and philanthropic organizations of the state. Father Huntington, the Episcopal priest and a son of the distinguished Bishop Huntington, of Central New York, delivered the address. At the conclusion of the address, short speeches on both sides of the subject were made, and questions asked and answered. Father Huntington's leading point was that the single tax contemplates the adjustment of social conditions to divine law. Among the men who have expounded George's doctrines for the Massachusetts Single Tax league on these occasions, besides Father Huntington, are ex-Congressman Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, Thomas G. Shearman, of New York, the Rev. S. S. Craig, of Toronto, and the Rev. Charles D. Williams, dean of Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland.

A recent sale of real estate in Boston calls attention to the remarkable fact that the annual rental of the building and its total tax valuation are almost identical in amount. The building is assessed at \$30,000; its annual rental is \$29,000. What kind of building can it be that rents for as much per year as it is worth alto-

gether? This riddle is solved when we learn that the comparatively valueless building in question rests upon a site worth about \$430,000—the price at which the property, inclusive of the building, has just been sold being \$452,000. The property is known as 443 Washington street. Its area, 1,955 square feet, could be multiplied by 20 without equalling an acre of farming land. This land, therefore, not counting its improvements, sells for about \$11,000,000 an acre—the value of over 5,000 improved average Illinois farms.

Unless Gov. Roosevelt interferes, a woman will soon be legally killed by electricity in New York. It is doubtful if he will interfere; it is certain that he ought not to. If the death penalty is a proper one, there should be no distinction of sex. If not a proper one, its infliction upon a woman may awaken a dormant public sentiment against it. At any rate it is not one of the functions of an executive to determine whether a penalty is proper or not. It is his function to execute the law as he finds it.

Delegates from farmers' organizations in Illinois are arranging to organize a farmers' party. A declaration of principles has been adopted which explains the motives and purposes of the new party. After declaring that all men are created equal, and asserting that "the rule of minority classes is contrary to the spirit of our institutions and destructive to our rights," this declaration announces that the only free and just government "is that in which the law making bodies are composed of direct representatives from such industries or occupations as have a majority of the votes in the congressional and legislative districts." Inasmuch, therefore, as agriculture is the chief industry of the United States, the new party proposes to unite the farmers of the country for the purpose of sending representatives of their industrial class to congress and the legislatures. The obvious objection to such a party is that it proposes to thrust one class out

of power by putting another class in. The rights of the people as a whole would be no better conserved by the farmer class than by the manufacturing class, the merchant class, the "labor" class, the lawyer class, the middle class, the plutocratic class, the "lower" class, or any other class. What is needed in American politics is not another class organization for class purposes; but an organization which shall faithfully stand for equal rights for all men, regardless of their class.

A writer in *The Sunny South*, published at Atlanta, claims Uncle Tom's Cabin as in reality, though without its author's intention, a defense of slavery. This claim is made because the book "portrayed a relation between the employers and employed which begot more confidence and mutual good will than has ever existed between these classes elsewhere." In the view of Uncle Tom's Cabin which this writer presents we are not deeply interested, either for it or against it; but we are interested in the clear vision he has of the essential character of the labor question, and his extraordinary candor. Among other things of like tenor with the words quoted above, he says of African slavery as it existed at the south that it "was the most satisfactory adjustment of the opposing claims of capital and labor that ever has been known!" It is a sad thought, but true, that the present condition of multitudes of workingmen is so hard that chattel slavery might be an amelioration, if not a "satisfactory adjustment." Yet there is something morally stunning about the suggestion of chattel slavery as an ideal solution of the labor problem.

The *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* takes *The Public* to task for urging reduction of fares on street cars instead of advocating taxes on gross receipts. How competent the P.-I. is to discuss any question of taxation may be inferred from its contention that an increase of direct taxes on lot owners would increase rents, and so

force tenants to bear the additional tax burden. It should read and digest John Stuart Mill's chapters on taxation before setting up as a fiscal schoolmaster. No wonder it imagines, after that display of fiscal ignorance, that a tax on the gross receipts of street car companies would be borne by the corporations. But consider. If street car companies could not afford to do business for less than 5 cent fares, then it is true that a tax on gross receipts, with fares limited to 5 cents, would be borne by the companies. Inasmuch, however, as that would reduce their receipts below the profit mark, they would have to quit business. Such a tax, therefore, is out of the question. But suppose the companies could do a profitable business at 4 cents fare, as they certainly could; then a tax of 20 per cent. on gross receipts, with fares left at 5 cents, would be paid not by the companies, but by the passengers, at the rate of one cent a ride. The companies would then be called the tax payers, and the passengers would be referred to—is it not so with indirect tax payers now?—as persons who pay no taxes. Yet the real tax payers would be the passengers; the companies would be nothing but collectors.

Commenting upon the criticisms that are made of stock watering, J. Sterling Morton's *Conservative* has a very sensible thing to say. It calls attention to the fact that corporation stock is not the only kind of property that is "watered." It has witnessed, it says, in Nebraska, "the rise of raw prairie land from one dollar and twenty-five cents to twenty-five and fifty dollars an acre." And this enhancement, it adds, has come—

not because of any effort or expenditure upon or about these lands on the part of their owners. "In fact," it proceeds, "The *Conservative* has observed lands mortgaged to secure cash loans for sums aggregating ten and twelve times more than their owners paid for those lands." And then it shrewdly asks:

Have land owners then differed very much from the owners of railroads in raising their values for the purpose of

borrowing money? Have they or have they not been watering their stock?

Of course land owners have been "watering" their stock. The increased land value being due to no work or expenditure of their own, it is to them pure "water." And the reason they can appropriate this "water" is precisely the same as that which enables railroad companies to appropriate the "water" of their watered stock. Neither could appropriate that increment—truly an "unearned increment,"—but for a monopoly privilege. The railroads do it by means of their monopoly of right of way; the landowners do it by means of their monopoly of location. In each case the pecuniary measure of communal growth attaches to the earth-chance, by means of which alone the value can be appropriated; and the owner of that earth-chance—be it right of way, farm, mine or city lot—diverts the earnings of the community as a whole, in contradistinction to his earnings as an individual, away from the community's pocket into his own. In the one case the sums thus diverted are called "land values;" in the other, stock "water." The *Conservative* is right. Landowners who get enhanced prices for their land are virtually "watering" their stock.

There is this difference, however, between the profits of the land owner and that of the stock waterer, a difference which The *Conservative* overlooks. The law has not attempted to limit the profits of landowners; it has attempted to limit the profits of railroads. It fixes maximum dividends on railroad stock. And stock watering is resorted to by railroads for the purpose of enabling them to pay dividends which nominally are within the legal limit, but actually are far in excess. Therefore, while increased land values and watered stock are the same economically, legally the former are innocent while the latter is larceny by trick and device.

Socialism receives a new definition at the hands of one of its devotees, J.

Pickering Putnam, architect. In his interesting brochure on "The Outlook for the Artisan and His Art," just published by Charles H. Kerr and Company, of Chicago, Mr. Putnam defines socialism as "the substitution of constructive for destructive competition." The difference between the two he succinctly describes. "Destructive" competition is "objective, a seeking to obtain for oneself some object desired equally by others, but without adding to the world's wealth;" whereas "constructive" competition is "subjective, aiming at the development and happiness of the individual without injury to others, through the creation of something useful." We doubt if socialists generally will accept Mr. Putnam's definition. They may well object to it, for it would sweep away their philosophy, which rests upon the idea of abolishing economic competition. What he calls "destructive competition" is nothing but monopoly; and what he calls "constructive competition" is nothing but true economic competition. Mr. Putnam vaguely recognizes this when he says that "the most prominent and dangerous characteristic of the present industrial scramble is not the fostering of a healthful competition, but rather its very destruction by monopoly and special privilege." To foster healthful competition, what is really needed, is very far from being the program of change in industrial details which Mr. Putnam prescribes. All that is needed is the abolition of monopoly and special privilege, which he truly indicates as the antitheses of healthful competition. With freedom and equal opportunity secured to all, men would decide for themselves, through the action and reaction of healthful competition, better than they could through any law making machinery, whether such changes as Mr. Putnam proposes are desirable. Desire would then regulate production. That is what it should do. That is what all classes of economic reformers wish it to do. That is what it naturally would do. Yet that is

what it never can do except through the force of economic competition, of free competition, or, as Mr. Putnam calls it, of "constructive" competition.

It is unfortunate that the old-time American debating society has never developed into something like the parliamentary debating clubs which are found in England and some of her colonies. The old American debating societies were never very useful. Seldom did they discuss questions of more vital interest than "Resolved, That country life is preferable to city life." Vital questions were as a rule taboo. Those of a religious character opened the door to heterodoxy, and those of a political character to partisan rows. Both were, therefore, dangerous. Modern American debating societies, however, do handle questions that have life in them, but usually in academic form, and as a rule men are assigned to debate the question, on this side or the other, with an utter disregard of the debaters' convictions. Debates of that kind can have but little influence either in making debaters or influencing public opinion. Yet debating societies could be so organized as to make them the moulder and mouthpiece of public opinion wherever they exist.

Even in so large and cosmopolitan a city as London the parliamentary debating clubs are real institutions, and in provincial places they exert a marked influence upon public affairs. They are mimic parliaments, where actual measures are as seriously discussed as in the law making body itself. To illustrate the earnestness and public spirit which characterize these clubs, we quote from the leading paper of Durban, Natal, South Africa, the following report:

The concluding meeting of the fifth session of the Durban Parliamentary Debating society was held in the council chamber, town hall, on Tuesday evening last, and proved to be one of the most interesting meetings of the session, the business being the election of leader for the ensuing session. Messrs. McLarty, Tassie and Dunlop were nominated for the post, and the

two first-named were chosen to submit programmes they would be prepared to debate should they be elected. Mr. Tassie's programme was as follows: (a) Imposition of income tax in order to relieve existing duties and abolish the stamp duties; (b) compulsory vaccination of the white population with calf lymph; (c) the introduction of the decimal system of weights and measures; (d) amendment of the customs union tariff as regards the tax on meat; (e) introduction of the postal order system on the same lines as existing in England; (f) proposed issue of loans for railway extensions, acceleration of traffic and the duplicating of the main trunk line; (g) taxation of land values. Mr. McLarty's programme embraced the following: (a) Abolition of taxes on food; (b) imposition of the single tax; (c) entire stoppage of Indian immigration; (d) railway reform and facilities as regards the export of coal; (e) safeguarding of drifts and rivers; (f) provision of open spaces as "lungs" for the populace of towns; (g) vaccination of the white population. Questions were asked the two candidates on their respective programmes, and upon a ballot being taken, Mr. McLarty was declared elected as premier, and Mr. Tassie as leader of the opposition.

No one could participate in debates of that kind without gaining strength as a practical debater, nor could any community maintain such a society without benefit to its political and moral sense. If the entrance into American public life were through similar debating societies, we should soon have a higher grade of politics and a better order of politicians than we are at present familiar with.

LAND TENURE AND TAXATION.

Though the imperialistic craze has thrown English politics into confusion as regards foreign policies, pretty much as it has disturbed the currents of politics in the United States, the political tendencies in England were never so satisfactory as now, so far as they concern home government.

Sound principles of taxation are making a distinct impression there upon public sentiment. Split into two great factions as is the liberal party—which corresponds to our democratic party—by the tory principle of imperial expansion, it is nevertheless virtually a unit for the democratic principle of taxing ground values. Upon whatever else that party

may in the early future agree or disagree, it is almost certain to come together upon the issue of making landlords support the government out of the values which government gives to their land.

Chief among the liberal leaders of the imperialistic faction are Lord Rosebery and H. H. Asquith, both of whom were members of Mr. Gladstone's last ministry. Lord Rosebery was himself prime minister in 1894. And both these men are advocates of ground value taxation.

Lord Rosebery speaks of ground values as a "gold mine" given to landlords; and the *Ayrshire Post*, of October 29, 1898, alluding to this, comments as follows upon a striking illustration which it gives of the present system:

Things work out after this fashion at present. A man has a hundred acres of arable land in the outskirts of Ayr. He lets it for agricultural or for grazing purposes at £3 per acre. At 30 years' purchase the value of his hundred acres, agriculturally considered, is £9,000. He does nothing to improve it. That is not his business; all he has to do is to sit still and wait, for he knows that the town is growing and thriving and that by and by it must come to him in its need and feu his land at the figure he puts on it. In due time he has his reward. The town creeps out and out till it reaches his hundred acres, and by a few years, or perhaps less, the fields disappear, roads are formed, terraces and villas are built, the corporation supply drainage, light and water, the police perambulate; and the land that was worth £3 an acre per annum, and that was worth £9,000, agricultural value at 30 years' purchase, returns to the ground landlord £20 an acre, or £2,000 a year, and, valued at 30 years' purchase, is worth in the market £60,000. To the community that gave it its enhanced value it returns nothing in the shape of rates. The men who build the houses on it are taxed. The men who live in them are taxed. But the man who alone did nothing, and who yet "scoops in the pile," escapes. That is the anomaly sought immediately to be redressed. If the ground landlord in such a case as that specified were rated as he should be, it needs no demonstration to show that the general taxation of the town would be reduced. Things are at present upside down. Industry is paying right into the pocket of the man who plays the waiting game. . . . Of course this is only one phase of the question, but it touches the crux of it, and affords an interesting and a striking example of the anomalies that be-

set a system that has succeeded in throwing itself clear of its own lawful burdens, and that has settled itself a dead-weight upon the growth of communities.

Only a few days before, at East Fife on the 14th of October, Mr. Asquith, the other liberal leader we have mentioned, spoke in the same strain upon the same subject. He said:

How are all these great improvements in our social and municipal life which we have witnessed during the past generation, how and at whose instance have they been effected? They have been effected by the representatives of the rate-payers, and they have been carried out at the cost of the occupiers of houses and land. But, gentlemen, who in the long run have benefited, and will continue to benefit by them? Those who have contributed little or nothing to the cost—the owners of the ground. I am convinced that the next great step in the direction of a larger and better municipal life will be in the opening up, as justice and reason require, for the benefit of the community, of the hitherto untried source of taxation—a form of taxation which no one can assert to be inequitable, because it simply imposes the burden upon those with whom the benefit will ultimately rest. I trust, therefore, that in the years that are before us we of the liberal party will, with increased vigilance, ventilate this great question; accumulate, as we can, by inquiry and by personal experience, the facts which bear on, and which form the foundation of the demand, so that when we are again intrusted with the control of legislation, and with the management of the affairs of the country we may be able to submit to parliament a well-considered scheme which will free our municipalities from the trammels under which they at present act, and which will open an avenue to a new source of social and industrial development.

Commenting upon this speech, the *North British Daily Mail* said that—

all the great improvements in our social and municipal life have been effected at the cost of the occupiers of houses and land. The owners of land get the benefit, yet they have contributed little or nothing; therefore the just taxation of land values must be the next step in the direction of larger and better municipal life.

This position on the land question, taken by liberals who are also imperialists, is taken, too, by Sir William Vernon Harcourt and John Morley, liberal leaders who were liberal members of the last Gladstone min-

istry, and are not imperialists. And the speech of the liberal-imperialist Asquith, quoted above, was vigorously applauded by the *Manchester Guardian*, the leading anti-imperialist paper of England, and one of the few really great newspapers of the world, in an article quoted by us early in the winter, which we here reproduce:

The taxation of ground values offers many difficulties of detail; but, from Mill onwards, economists have recognized the injustice and impolicy of allowing so large a measure of the wealth created by municipal energy and the industry of the community to pass in the form of enhanced ground rents into the hands of land owners without calling upon this class for any proportionate return. The system is unjust because it throws upon the occupiers, those who live and work in a town, the whole cost of the improvements through which it grows and thrives, while the result of this thriving and growth is that in a few years the occupier has to pay so much more for the privilege of living in the place. Thus the occupier pays twice over, while the ground landlord makes no return for the increased value of his land. This is the injustice of the system. Its impolicy is that by imposing too heavy a burden on the rate payers it cripples municipal administration and deprives a progressively minded community of the sinews of war. We are glad to find Mr. Asquith following Lord Ripon in urging this matter upon the attention of the liberals.

The subject has been brought to the attention of the people of Glasgow, Scotland, in a pressing manner and they have taken emphatic action. Glasgow is the city which has made such a noteworthy success of municipal ownership of the street car system. But the people there have been forced to observe that the pecuniary benefits of this extraordinarily successful experiment have gone not to the people at large but to the land-owners. Higher ground values, as a result of excellent street car service, have enabled the ground-owners to collect, and compelled tenants to pay them, in the form of higher rents, for the pecuniary benefits of the improvement. Urgent demands, therefore, have been twice made upon parliament by the Glasgow council for permission to tax land values in lieu of other property, and at two elections these demands have been approved by popular vote.

Similar evidence to that we have quoted might be cited in abundance, all going to show that the English are awakening to the fact that land-owners alone are enriched by public improvements and good government; and that they are bent upon adopting the fiscal reform which in this country is colloquially known as "Henry George's single tax."

This reform must not be confounded with land nationalization, which also finds extensive support in England, and of which Alfred Russell Wallace, the great naturalist, is the leading exponent.

The theory of land nationalization contemplates the acquisition of land by the government as public property, and its rental for short terms to tenants. The single tax, on the other hand, would leave land titles as they are, but take ground rents for public use, by means of a tax on land in proportion to its value, as a substitute for all other taxes.

To appreciate the significance of the English land tax movement, as well as to understand the distinctive character of the single tax agitation which had its origin in the publication in 1879 of George's "Progress and Poverty," and of which the English land tax movement is a phase, it is important clearly to recognize the difference between the single tax and land nationalization.

In one respect, the single tax and land nationalization are alike. Each theory recognizes at bottom the principle that all men are equally entitled to the land, and therefore to the rent which land—the soil as distinguished from the improvements—commands. Thus, both theories deny the justice of private ownership of land; and both propose its abolition. But there the identity ceases. Beyond that, there is hardly so much as a similarity.

The difference may be indicated in a word, if we describe land nationalization as socialistic and the single tax as individualistic. The former would transfer land ownership from individuals to the state, turning the state into a universal landlord; the latter would leave existing ownerships nominally undisturbed,

merely requiring the owners to compensate the state annually for the value which it annually gives to their land.

It is not difficult to see that the single tax would accomplish all the beneficial objects of land nationalization. By taking the rent of land for public purposes, it would remove every incentive to appropriate land except to use it. Consequently the appropriation of land to hold it for a rise in land values, now so common, would cease. Only used land would be withdrawn for private occupation. All other land would be common. And this not because the law so ordered, but because mere ownership of land would no longer pay. Everyone wanting land would be free, therefore, to help himself from the common. He would not have to ask permission even of the state. Nor would he be obliged to pay either rent or tax for any of this land which no one else needed. No land would be taxed until land of the same desirability had become so scarce as to command rent.

But as to land in use, a tax would be exacted in proportion to the rent it could command. Such land as was highly desirable, and therefore very scarce, could command a high rent and would pay a high tax. Such as was not especially desirable, and therefore not very scarce, could command little or no rent, and would pay little or no tax.

In this manner, valuable land would be required to contribute its value to the support of the state, while non-valuable land—no longer capable of exciting the cupidity of speculators—would be common and free. Everybody who wished could work or live upon the latter without paying anything, not even a tax, for the right; and everybody who wished could work or live upon the former, by paying in lieu of all other taxes a tax equal to the annual value of the difference in desirability between the common land and the valuable land he chose.

With such a system in full operation, equal rights to the use of the earth would be as fully established as they could be under the highest possible ideal of land nationalization.

But the single tax principle would inevitably accomplish something besides, which land nationalization, while it might or might not accomplish it, does not comprehend at all in its philosophy.

Looking exclusively to the socialistic side of the social problem, land nationalizers forget that there is an individual side also. Under their system, individual rights of property are ignored.

While land nationalization, if realized in perfection, might operate to secure individual rights of property incidentally, there is nothing in the theory to antagonize an invasion by the state of those rights. For example, taxation of private property, of labor products, is not inconsistent with land nationalization principles, and personal property and improvements might be taxed though land were nationalized. But all such taxation is inconsistent with the principles of the single tax. According to the single tax philosophy, a man's earnings are his own; and no one, not even the state, has a just right, by taxation or otherwise, to deprive him of them. Thus, the single tax recognizes on one hand the equal rights of all to the use of land and to the enjoyment of its rent; and on the other the right of each to the full wages of his own work.

Moreover, for securing equal rights to the land, the single tax is superior in every way to land nationalization, as a method.

The latter would be revolutionary. It would run counter to prejudices which will never bend and can only be broken. Many generations have passed since civilized peoples were accustomed to tenures corresponding in form to land nationalization. And those were the feudal tenures, regarding which our traditions bring down to us no pleasant reports. Feudalism is in the common mind a synonym for tyranny. The difficulties, then, in the way of effecting a revolution which would appear to be a return to feudalism may be surmised.

But we of this generation are familiar with taxation. We are familiar with it not only for the purpose of raising revenues, but also for the purpose of effecting ulterior purposes

—such as taxes on dogs to lessen the number, taxes on saloons in the interest of temperance, taxes on foreign goods for the promotion of prosperity at home, and so on. A tax upon land values, therefore, for the purpose at once of raising revenues and destroying land monopoly, would run counter to no prejudices. It would be fought, of course, fought bitterly; but the opposition would derive no support from long established prejudice.

The single tax has the advantage, also, of being susceptible of adoption gradually. Every tax abolished, except land value taxes, is a step in the single tax direction. It is one more labor tax removed, the loss of which from the treasury necessitates a higher tax upon land values.

For the single tax is everywhere in operation to some degree even now. That part of real estate taxation that rests upon the value of the site as distinguished from the value of the improvements, is the single tax. To increase it, therefore, is to increase the single tax; and every abolition of other taxes necessarily tends to increase that one. The single tax is to be established, then, by simply abolishing other taxes. Abolish personal property taxation, and follow that with the abolition of taxes on landed improvements, and you have the single tax in undisturbed operation. Then increase the tax so as to make it equal the ground rent of the land upon which it is levied, and you have the single tax in ideal perfection.

All this could be fully accomplished by normal progressive steps, before the people could be brought even to consider the propriety of substituting national for private ownership of land.

That Henry George was not unaware of the superiority of the single tax for accomplishing what land nationalizers seek, he shows in the second chapter of book eight, in "Progress and Poverty," where he says:

We should satisfy the law of justice, we should meet all economic requirements, by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such

conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements. . . . But such a plan, though perfectly feasible, does not seem to me the best. Or rather, I propose to accomplish the same thing in a simpler, easier and quieter way than that of formally confiscating all the land and of formally letting it out to the highest bidders.

To do that would involve a needless shock to present customs and habits of thought—which is to be avoided.

To do that would involve a needless extension of governmental machinery—which is to be avoided.

It is an axiom of statesmanship, which the successful founders of tyranny have ever understood and acted upon—that great changes can best be brought about under old forms. We, who would free men, should heed the same truth. It is the natural method. When nature would make a higher type she takes a lower one and develops it. This, also, is the law of social growth. Let us work by it. With the current we may glide fast and far. Against it it is hard pulling and slow progress. . . . Nor to take rent for public uses is it necessary that the state should bother with the letting of lands, and assume the chances of favoritism, collusion and corruption that might involve. It is not necessary that any new machinery should be created. The machinery already exists. Instead of extending it, all we have to do is to simplify and reduce it. By leaving to land owners a percentage of rent, which would probably be much less than the cost and loss involved in attempting to rent lands through state agency, and by making use of this existing machinery, we may, without jar or shock, assert the common right to land by taking rent for public uses.

We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes in our modes of taxation to take it all. . . .

In this way the state may become the universal landlord without calling herself so, and without assuming a single new function. In form, the ownership of land would remain just as now. No owner of land need be dispossessed, and no restriction need be placed upon the amount of land any one could hold. For, rent being taken by the state in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood, or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property, and every member of the community would participate in the advantages of its ownership.

Now inasmuch as the taxation of rent, or land values, must necessarily be increased just as we abolish other taxes, we may put the proposition into practical form by proposing—

To abolish all taxation save that upon land values.

One very important objection to land nationalization which the sin-

gle tax method would practically avoid, is what is known as "compensation."

When it is proposed to transfer the ownership of land from private individuals to the state, the idea at once arises in the minds of just men, that the expropriated owners should be compensated for their loss. The idea is misleading, and from really just and intelligent minds it can be removed; but it is an idea which this method of accomplishing the land reform vitalizes.

The reasoning in favor of compensation will run somewhat in this fashion: The state has furnished the land to its owners; it now proposes to transfer this ownership to itself; should it do so, it ought in justice to compensate them for their loss. And when you show, as well you can, that compensation would only be another mode of continuing the unjust privilege you wish to abolish, nevertheless the idea of ownership obtrudes, so as to make the nationalization plan seem to be confiscation. It is not the strength of the argument for compensation that gives it vitality. The argument is void of strength. It is the weakness in form of the proposition that confronts it—that of transferring ownership from the individual to the state. This proposition comes in conflict with the prejudice produced by that long cherished custom of allowing the state to take nothing from individuals without paying them for it.

So plausible, superficially, is the plea for compensation as a condition of land nationalization, that most land nationalizers favor compensation. And land nationalizers who upon doing this realize the truth that compensation would nullify the reform, abandon their ideal altogether, as insusceptible of even approximate realization. They assert that private ownership of land is wrong; but conceding that nationalization of land without compensation would be another wrong, and conscious of the futility of nationalizing and compensating too, they sigh a hopeless sigh and conclude that the whole thing is too much of a muddle for them.

There is no such embarrassment in connection with the single tax theory.

Though the single tax would ultimately put an end to the evils of private ownership of land as completely as land nationalization could, and though the question of compensation is therefore involved in the one proposition as well as in the other, it is not involved in the single tax proposition in the same way in which it is involved in land nationalization. In connection with the land nationalization scheme, compensation is a practical question. The state cannot transfer land ownership from individuals to itself without directly deciding whether to compensate or not. But in connection with the single tax proposition, compensation is only an academic question. Nothing could be more absurd than seriously to propose to compensate men for paying their taxes. That would instantly be seen to be a proposition to return his taxes to every taxpayer. The single tax, therefore, does not and cannot raise the question of compensation, as a practical issue. The only question it raises is whether public expenses ought to be met by taxes upon property which public improvements and government do not increase in value, as at present, or upon property which public improvements and government do increase in value.

That question has been raised in England, as the quotations at the head of this article pretty conclusively show. And though the movement there may at the beginning aim to do no more than bring land values into the category of taxable property, the principle from which it evidently derives its impulse, that of taxing men in proportion to the pecuniary benefits which the public confers upon them will not allow it to stop with that beginning.

After the English people see that the pecuniary benefits of government are absorbed in ground rents by land-owners, and so made to doubly burden tenants—once in taxes to maintain the government, and again in higher rents for the privilege of living under the government they maintain—the English movement for the taxation of ground values will not lose its momentum until all ground values are swept by taxation into the public exchequer and all other taxes are abolished.

NEWS

The first step in the process of establishing a large standing army for the United States was accomplished on the 31st, by the passage in the house of representatives of the bill for army reorganization. This bill makes many alterations in detail, but its leading and most important feature is its provision for increasing the size of the regular army.

Since 1875, and up to the war with Spain, the army was strictly limited to 25,000 enlisted men and 2,116 officers, exclusive of the hospital corps. Its actual strength fell slightly short of this maximum. Attempts were frequently made in congress to raise the maximum, but always without success. The traditional dangers and expense of standing armies still strongly influenced public opinion. This influence was felt also when the army was put upon a war footing last spring. As the bill for that purpose was first reported by the military committee of the house, it authorized an increase to 61,000, without providing for a reduction to the old maximum at the end of the war; but by amendment, the bill when finally passed required that at the end of the war the army should be reduced to the peace basis of 25,000 enlisted men. But at the present session of congress, when the war was virtually at an end and the army had been recruited up to the new maximum, its reduction to the old maximum of 25,000 was sought to be forestalled by the introduction of a bill raising the maximum to 100,000 men. By amendment this maximum was coupled with a minimum of 50,000, leaving the size of the army, between those extremes, to the discretion of the president; and in that shape the bill passed the house on the 31st, as stated in the preceding paragraph. The vote for the bill as thus amended was 168. There were 125 votes in opposition. Six republicans voted against the bill; 4 democrats and 1 populist voted for it.

Representative Amos Cummings, of New York, proposed an amendment to the army reorganization bill, prohibiting the use of United States troops to suppress riots and maintain the local peace, except upon the application in writing of the governor of the state in which such domestic disturbances might occur; but his amendment was defeated.

Orders have been issued by the war department to expedite the movement of reinforcements to the Philippines, and all the week troops have been in motion in that direction. The 4th regiment of infantry is on its way on board the transport Grant, which sailed from New York, and is probably not far now from the Suez canal. The 22d infantry sailed from San Francisco on the 1st; and the 3d infantry, with several companies of the 17th, are on their way to New York to go to the Philippines through the Suez canal. The 12th infantry is under orders to sail from New York on the 9th.

This hustling of reinforcements to the Orient is supposed to indicate that a conflict with the Filipinos is expected. But hardly any information is given out at Washington, and news from Manila is censored by the American authorities there. It appears, however, that Gen. Otis has recalled the 51st Iowa volunteers from near Iloilo, leaving the 18th regular infantry and the 6th artillery behind. There is also news to the effect that the Filipino congress at Malolos has adopted the republican constitution, passed a vote of confidence in Aguinaldo, and empowered him to declare war on the Americans whenever he deems it advisable.

Agoncillo, the Filipino envoy to the United States, has submitted a voluminous memorial to the state department at Washington. He protests that legislation not authorized by the people of the Philippine islands can have no binding force; that upon American testimony the Philippine revolt against Spain was fully alive before the American war; that its purpose was independence; that the Philippine republic was entitled to recognition by the United States before the protocol with Spain; that Spain has no substantial possession in the Philippines to deliver to the United States; and that the American purchase of public buildings in the Philippines is ineffective, as the Philippine republic had already acquired them by conquest. Agoncillo asks that this memorial be forwarded by the president to the senate. On the 31st, the day after the submission of the memorial, the secretary of state reported its receipt to the cabinet, which decided that it should be ignored.

Commissary General Eagan, who became subject to court martial two

weeks ago, as reported in these columns at the time, was convicted on the 27th of both charges specified in the report of his case last week—conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, and conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline. The sentence recommended was dismissal from the service. No inquiry was made by the court into the truth of Gen. Eagan's words, for uttering which he was upon trial. The case turned wholly upon their objectionable character.

The senatorial deadlocks are diminishing in number. On the 30th the deadlock in Wisconsin was broken. The republicans in caucus on that day agreed upon Joseph V. Quarles as their candidate, and on the 31st Mr. Quarles was formally elected by the legislature in joint session. He had been the leading candidate from the beginning. In Montana the deadlock gave way on the 28th, when Wm. A. Clark was elected. He received 40 democratic, 11 republican and 3 silver-republican votes. In the progress of the struggle Clark was charged with bribery, but a grand jury summoned for the purpose of hearing the charge reported that it had discovered no evidence which could convict on a trial. The third deadlock to be broken was in Washington. This occurred on the 31st, when enough republicans to elect met in caucus and agreed to support A. G. Foster.

Deadlocks continue in the legislatures of Delaware, Nebraska, Utah, California and Pennsylvania. In Pennsylvania, Senator Quay is still in the lead. In California, where Ulysses S. Grant, Jr., is still ahead, charges of corruption have been made. They were referred to a legislative committee which reported on the 27th that Howard E. Wright, speaker of the assembly, had received from U. S. Grant, Jr., through his political manager, Milton J. Green, \$900 as a gift and \$750 as a loan; that Wright, prior to his election, deceived John D. Spreckles and W. S. Leake to secure their support for the speakership, stating that he was unpledged to any senatorial candidate; that by promising to vote for Robert N. Bulla for United States senator he secured Bulla's support for the speakership; and that by the acceptance of Grant's money and by the solicitation of Daniel M. Burns's influence to secure his election as speaker Wright led each of those candidates for United States

senator to expect his vote. The report further states that Milton J. Green, the duly appointed and accredited agent of U. S. Grant, Jr., expended large sums of money, exceeding in the aggregate \$20,000, but the exact amount of which is to the committee unknown, to secure the election of a republican legislature. On the 30th Speaker Wright resigned the speakership.

The Cuban question turns now to the matter of compensating the Cuban soldiers for their service in the insurgent army, so as to enable them to settle down to industrial pursuits. The Cubans solicit this compensation from the United States as an advance, or loan, with Cuban customs receipts for security. They argue that by taking possession of the Cuban custom houses, the United States has deprived the people of Cuba of an income which they would devote primarily to the compensation of their soldiers; and that in these circumstances it is but fair that the United States should provide out of that income, or advance upon its source as security, the wages which the Cuban soldiers have so hardily earned.

Another objectionable Cuban order of the war department has been revoked. It is the order reported in these columns two weeks ago, by which the Bank of Spain in Cuba was vested with temporary authority to collect the general property tax in Cuba for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, upon a commission of 5 per cent. The order was revoked on the 27th by Secretary Alger, and the bond of \$1,000,000 given by the bank was returned to the surety. At the same time Gen. Brooke was ordered by the department to establish such tax collecting system in the island as he might judge expedient.

A large and threatening labor strike is in progress at Colon, United States of Colombia. The dock laborers and railroad employes are striking for pay in gold. Public sympathy is generally with them. Some disturbances having occurred in connection with the attempt of the employers to import laborers, the military was called out on the 29th, and a proclamation was issued by the authorities, which forbade the assembly in public places of more than three persons, under pain of imprisonment.

In Bulgaria on the 28th the cabinet resigned. What brought about

this resignation is not definitely reported; but it is supposed to have relation to an agitation of Bulgaria in Macedonia looking to the acquisition of that country from Turkey, a subject which is giving Europe no little concern lest a local outbreak at that point might precipitate a general European war. This cabinet was organized September 7, 1897, with Dr. C. Stoiloff as premier. Prince Ferdinand, upon receiving the resignation, authorized Dr. Grekoff to organize a new cabinet, which he did on the 31st. It is described in the dispatches as an anti-Russian cabinet.

NEWS NOTES.

- Sardou is writing a play on "Robespierre," for Henry Irving.
- The National Live Stock convention met last week at Denver.
- The Rev. Myron W. Reed, of Denver, died on the 30th in that city.
- The National Creamery and Buttermakers' association met last week at Sioux Falls, S. D.
- It is now conceded by the legal adviser of Keely's widow, that the Keely motor was a fraudulent device.
- Having been authorized by the Spanish council of ministers to fix a date for the convening of the cortes, Premier Sagasta has named February 20.
- Simon Pokagon, the Indian chief, one of the signers of the treaty which surrendered the site of Chicago to the whites, died on the 27th at Benton Harbor, Mich.
- Ex-Attorney General A. H. Garland, of President Cleveland's cabinet, dropped dead on the 26th, while arguing a case before the supreme court at Washington.
- The Chicago Chronicle reports a farewell dinner given at New York by single taxers to Edward McHugh, organizer of the dock laborers' union, upon the occasion of his departure for his home in England, at which ex-Congressman Tom L. Johnson, the millionaire monopolist and single tax advocate, said in his speech:
I have withdrawn from all my business enterprises. I have disposed of every conflicting interest and of every duty that would interfere with the devotion of my time, my entire energies, my fortune—in fact, my life—to this movement.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

Week ending January 28, 1899.

Senate.

On Tuesday, the 24th, Senators Lodge and Clayspoke in opposition to the Vest resolution. Routine business on the

25th was followed by executive session during which it was formally agreed "to vote on the treaty with Spain and all amendments, on Monday February 6, at 3 o'clock p. m. Senator Mallory spoke on the 26th in favor of the Vest resolution, after which the pension appropriation bill was considered. On the 27th Senator Mason asked unanimous consent for a vote on the 3d upon his resolution against attempting to govern the people of another country without their consent, but Senator Carter objected. Senator Hoar made the same request as to his resolution declaring that the people of the Philippine islands are and of right ought to be free and independent; but to that also Senator Carter objected. Senator Sullivan offered a resolution declaring that—

the ratification of the pending treaty of peace with Spain shall in no wise determine the policy to be pursued by the United States in regard to the Philippines, nor shall it commit this government to a colonial policy; nor is it intended to embarrass the establishment of a stable, independent government by the people of those islands when conditions make such a proceeding hopeful of successful and desirable results. After desultory discussion of the Vest resolution, consideration of the pension appropriation bill was resumed, and the bill was passed. On the 28th the consular appropriation bill was considered and passed.

House.

On Tuesday, the 24th, the army reorganization bill was debated. The debate continued on the 25th, 26th and 27th without result. This bill furnished an opportunity, largely availed of, for discussion of the question of self-government in the Philippines and the maintenance of a large standing army.

MISCELLANY

OUR FATHER'S CLOSET.

For The Public.

"Give us this day our daily bread."
Beside the tiny trundle bed,
The baby knelt and prayed;
Then: "Mother, if 'tis our daily bread,
Some of it must be mine," she said;
'It must be lost, I'm 'fraid.

"'Cause I'm so hungry nearly every day.
Has God bread for us, somewhere, put
away?

Mother, when you have bread
You put it in the closet for us all.
Where is God's closet? Why don't some
one call,
Right loud, and ask Him where He put the
bread?

'He must have put it somewhere, mother
dear;
He surely must have put it somewhere
near.
Mother, out on the lovely farm
Where the kind lady sent me when I was
so sick,

And where the world is made of ground
instead of brick,
And you can play and play and do no
harm—

"I saw the flowers growing in the ground,
And all the green grass springing up
around,
And, oh, such shady trees!
With nests and little birdies everywhere:
And butterflies went sailing thro' the air,
And lots and lots of humming birds and
bees!
Mother, did God put their bread, do you
know,
In the green country where they live and
grow?

"Those are the things that God made, so
you said;
Don't you guess that's where He'd have
put the bread?
Down in the ground, you know?
It couldn't have been forgotten or mis-
laid—
He wouldn't have put it in the things men
made,
He must have put it in the ground to grow.

"And I shall keep on asking 'till I'm dead
'Can't I go to the closet and get my bread?'
It is His closet, for it is His ground!
Won't it be glorious when we hear Him call:
'Open the closet wide, there's bread for all!'
And all the bread we haven't had is found.'"
VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

RUMORS OF TOLSTOI'S EXILE.

A writer in Free Russia calls attention to the current rumors that Tolstoi, now 80 years of age, is about to be exiled from his fatherland. Those who know the temper of the Russian official mind must have felt some surprise at the immunity so far accorded to him. The presence of a prophet who is also a man of genius and can command the attention of the entire civilized world must be an endless bitterness to M. Pobyedonostsev and the bigots of whom he is the directing spirit. To these representatives of official religion Tolstoi is hateful as a heretic and as a defender of heretics. To the civil power he is equally an object of fear and dislike for his courageous exposure of maladministration. Thus a semiofficial Moscow paper styles him the "archfiend," and declares that he and all his followers "must be destroyed." Russia has had men of genius before Tolstoi—and some of them have died in exile—but she has never yet had one who so completely made himself the voice of conscience for the nation. He warns against all violence, but passive resistance is a powerful weapon in the hands of a determined race, and the Russian people have in them qualities that may make such a policy more paralyzing to those who claim the right divine to govern wrong than either isolated outrage or overt rebellion. Few things are so remarkable in the history of our time as the manner in which Tolstoi has deliberately defied the Russian govern-

ment, and at least once—in the matter of making public the truth about the Famine—inflicted upon it signal defeat.—Manchester (Eng.) Guardian.

MR. DOOLEY ON OUR RELATIONS WITH THE FILIPINOS.

"We say to thim: . . . 'Now, ye mis'rable, childish-minded apes, we propose f'r to larn ye th' uses iv liberty. In ivry city in this unfair land we will erect schoolhouses an' packin' houses an' houses iv correction, an' we'll larn ye our language, because 'tis aisier to larn ye ours than to larn oursilves yours, an' we'll give ye clothes if ye pay f'r thim, an' if ye don't ye can go with-out, an' whin ye'er hungry ye can go to th' morgue—we mane th' resth'rant—an' ate a good square meal iv ar'rmy beef. An' we'll sind th' gr-reat Gin'ral Eagan over f'r to larn ye etiket an' Andrew Carnegie to larn ye pathreetism with blow-holes into it, an' Gin'ral Alger to larn ye to hould onto a job, an' whin ye've become edycated an' have all th' blessins iv civilization that we don't want, that'll count ye wan. We can't give ye anny votes because we haven't more thin enough to go round now, but we'll threat ye th' way a father shud threat his childer if we have to break ivry bone in ye'er bodies. So come to our ar-rms,' says we.

"But, glory be, 'tis more like a rasslin' match than a father's embrace. Up gets this little monkey iv an Aguenal-doo an' says he: 'Not for us,' he says. 'We thank ye kindly, but we believe,' he says, 'in pathronizin' home indus-thries,' he says, 'an', he says, 'I have on hand,' he says, 'an' f'r sale,' he says, 'a very superyor brand iv homemade lib-erty like ye'er mother used to make,' he says. 'Tis a long way fr'm ye'er plant to here,' he says, 'an' be th' time a cargo iv liberty,' he says, 'got out here an' was handled be th' middlemen,' he says, 'it might spoil,' he says. 'We don't want anny col' storage or embalmed liberty,' he says. 'What we want an' what th' ol' reliable house iv Aguenalduo,' he says, 'supplies to th' thrade,' he says, 'is fr-fresh liberty, r-right off th' far-rm,' he says."—Chicago Journal of Jan. 28.

THE DIFFICULTIES BEFORE THE ENGLISH IN AFRICA.

There are one or two fallacies which those who talk confidently of holding down the African peoples with a few white officers are constantly falling into. It is forgotten that European nations are trying an experiment in Africa the like of which has never been tried before. The Roman Empire, wide as it was, never embraced peoples so funda-

mentally distinct as the European and the African. Syrians garrisoned the Great Wall in Britain for the Roman Empire; but there was less difference between the Syrian and the Ancient Briton than between the white officer and a Waganda or a Yoruba. The Briton and the Syrian were both citizens of the Roman Empire in a sense in which no African can be a citizen of the British Empire for many years to come. There was no color line, differences of civilization were less marked, and there was far greater possibility of personal sympathy between governor and governed. It is assumed, too, that what was done in Canada, Australia and other colonies in the strict sense of the term can be done in Africa. The two cases have nothing in common. The Red Indian and the Australian aborigines have become practically extinct; the African will never die out. He will always remain in an overwhelming numerical superiority to the white man, and over the greater part of Africa that superiority will increase every year. Up to now the African nationality has never come into sharp conflict with European, for the reason that the African as yet has hardly attained to national as distinct from a local and tribal patriotism. Yet imagine the crusade of black man against the white preached in Africa by some black Napoleon—by a Toussaint l'Ouverture, for instance,—as its converse is occasionally preached elsewhere, and the whole fabric of European civilization in Africa would fall like a house of cards. The military training we have given would be turned against us as it was in the Soudanese mutiny in Uganda, and Africa would be lost to Europe, probably beyond recovery. We hope for better things than this. Yet it is as well that we should see the other side of all the glib talk of civilizing Africa. If we begin by recognizing the fact that Europe has before it in Africa a far different task from any yet attempted in past history, we shall have taken the first step towards averting any such danger as we have indicated.—Manchester (Eng.) Guardian.

THE BALANCE OF TRADE THEORY IN THE LAST CENTURY.

An extract from a pamphlet entitled "The Decline and Fall of the English System of Finance," by Thomas Paine, published in 1796. This extract appears in the pamphlet in the form of a footnote on page 12.

Among the delusions that have been imposed upon the nation by ministers, to give a false coloring to its affairs, and by none more than by Mr. Pitt, is a motley, amphibious characterd thing

called the balance of trade. This balance of trade, as it is called, is taken from the custom house books, in which entries are made of all cargoes exported and also of all cargoes imported, in each year; and when the value of the exports, according to the price set upon them by the importer, or by the custom house, is greater than the value of the imports, estimated in the same manner, they say the balance of trade is so much in their favor.

The custom house books prove regularly enough that so many cargoes have been exported and so many imported; but this is all that they prove, or were intended to prove. They have nothing to do with the balance of profit or loss; and it is ignorance to appeal to them upon that account; for the case is, the greater the loss is in any one year, the higher will this thing, called the balance of trade, appear to be according to the customhouse books. For example, nearly the whole of the Mediterranean convoy has been taken by the French this year; consequently those cargoes will not appear as imports on the customhouse books, and therefore the balance of trade, by which they mean the profits of it, will appear to be so much the greater as the loss amounts to; and, on the other hand, had the loss not happened, the profits would have appeared to have been so much the less. All the losses happening at sea to returning cargoes, by accidents, by the elements, or by capture, make the balance appear the higher on the side of the exports; and were they all lost at sea, it would appear to be all profit on the customhouse books. Also every cargo of exports that is lost that occasions another to be sent, adds in like manner to the side of the exports, and appears as profit. This year (1796—Editor) the balance of trade will appear high, because the losses have been great by capture and by storms. The ignorance of the British parliament in listening to this hackneyed imposition about the balance of trade, is astonishing. It shows how little they know of national affairs; and Mr. Grey may as well talk Greek to them, as make motions about the state of the nation. They understand fox hunting and the game laws.

LET THEM CHOOSE THEIR OWN SYSTEM.

Extracts from the speech of the Hon. Henry U. Johnson, of Indiana, in the house of representatives, Wednesday, January 25, on "The Crime Against the Philippines, and the Evils of Territorial Expansion."

We are told that the Filipinos are

utterly incapable of self-government, and that therefore we should take them under our protection. Sir, are we to travel around among the various islands of the earth to apply our exacting standard of self-government and citizenship to them, and, if they fall short of our inexorable and exalted criterion, impose upon them, against their wishes, our peculiar system? If we do, in the name of God let us select for our victim some nation powerful enough to resist, to the intent that while the world is bound to say that we are aggressors, it cannot truthfully say that we are cowards. Ah, yes, the excuse is that these people are incapable of self-government. . . . When the governments of South America threw off the yoke of Spain, while many of us greeted them with cordiality, there were many pessimists—here and elsewhere who declared that they were utterly incapable of self-government. And yet, through stages of harsh experiment and much travail and difficulty, they have at last succeeded in establishing governments not only satisfactory to themselves, but which have answered reasonably well the requirements of the civilized world.

Sir, it is not true that the Philippine people are incapable of self-government. I grant you that they are alien in race, in language, in habits of thought to ourselves; that they are an inferior civilization, and have not the capacity for such a representative government as ours. . . . But with all this they are capable of constructing in their own way, if left free to do so, a government which will answer all of their legitimate needs and purposes.

That their government may be crude at the start I do not doubt. All government is progressive. Ours has been so. The science of government has to be learned by sore experience. The lot of the Filipinos will be the lot of every other people on earth that have ever undertaken to solve the problem of governing themselves. But I have no doubt that in the course of time they will be able to attain it. They at least have the right to try the experiment if they desire to do so. It is possible that they may have taken on some unfortunate characteristics and committed some wrongs under the system of tyranny and oppression to which they have heretofore been subjected; but if so, I confidently hope and believe that, under the inspiration of the spirit of liberty which now possesses them wholly, they will in due course of time be amply able to "rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things."

The Public

A GOOD DEAL LIKE MOST STATISTICS.

"Nothing like fake statistics for giving a fellow a reputation for scholarship dirt cheap," chuckled an astute citizen. Statistics are the most impressive things in the world, and the beauty about 'em is that nobody dares to contradict you. I've been working the scheme for several months, and my stock has advanced about 1,000 points a day. How do I do it? Well, to illustrate the thing, I was standing in a crowd on Canal street yesterday watching the big pile driver hammering down the walls for the drainage canal.

"Lot of power there," remarked a gentleman at my elbow as the weight came down, biff!

"Immense," I replied, 'and, by the way, I was just making an interesting calculation in regard to it. Do you know, sir, that blow is exactly equal to 9,562 carpenters driving tenpenny nails into two-inch oak planks with four-pound steel hammers? The man looked startled. 'You don't say so, professor?' he replied, respectfully, and presently I saw him whispering to the others, who sized me up with awe. The other day when it was raining I joined a group under an awning. 'Bad day,' said somebody. 'Yes,' I returned. 'I was amusing myself a few minutes ago in figuring up the quantity of water that has fallen in the city limits between six a. m. and noon.'

"At that the other fellows got interested. 'How much was it, doctor?' asked one of 'em. 'Poured into a row of ordinary half-pint tumblers,' I said, impressively, 'it would make a line once and two-fifths around the globe; it would fill a 13-inch gun barrel reaching from here to a point about nine miles east of Copenhagen; it would quench the matutinal thirst of 9,468,941 Kentucky colonels the day after Christmas; it would barely go into a tank 4,562 kilometers long and 2,411 millimeters wide.' By Jove! You ought to have seen those fellows' eyes stick out.

"When they see me now they all touch their hats. I squelched a smart Alec at our boarding house by informing him at the table that the pies consumed annually in New Orleans would form a column, piled one above the other, precisely 12,622 miles high. 'Oh, I admit it leaves about 16 pies over,' I said, when he ventured a question, 'but that's only 3½ dekometers and too small to compute.' That settled him. Now I'm the accepted authority of the establishment on everything from hash to hydraulics.

"I've found it a good idea, by the way,

to use the decimal system whenever possible. It mixes 'em up when you begin to talk about millimeters and hectometers and gives a finer flavor of learning to your remarks. I never ran across a fellow yet who dared to question a statement in decimals. If I keep up this statistician racket until summer I wouldn't be surprised if they offered me a chair in one of the colleges."—New Orleans Times-Democrat.

"BLESS THOSE WHO ARE OUT OF WORK."

For The Public.

At a church service recently when one of the most learned and eloquent ministers on the Pacific coast, Rev. Bert Estes Howard, officiated, and delivered an excellent sermon, he first prayed, as usual, for all classes and conditions of men. In asking God's blessing upon them he said: "Bless those who are out of work."

The thought at once occurred to me that he could find no better text for his discourse than that brief but significant sentence. I could but hope that he would devote at least a small portion of his remarks to a discussion of the unemployed problem, but he never again mentioned the matter, either in his prayers or his 40 minutes of such fine oratory as is seldom equaled in the modern pulpit. However, it was something for him to even publicly recognize the fact that there are people out of work, and that they are worth praying for. Especially as only a few months have elapsed since the president of the United States announced that the country was so completely submerged in prosperity that "jobs were hunting men instead of men hunting jobs."

The good minister did not inform his vast audience why men are out of work. Perhaps he did not know why. Perhaps he did not care to spend his valuable time in trying to find out. And then perhaps, like thousands of others, he believes that involuntary idleness and also poverty are among the foreordained conditions of society, and therefore society itself is not responsible for them. However that may be, the popular preacher struck a key note with which he could, if he only would, unlock the apparent mystery of increasing poverty with the march of progress and abject want in the midst of abundant wealth.

"Bless those who are out of work!" It is easy for anyone to invoke the blessing of Heaven upon the unfortunate who are seeking employment and are unable to find it. But such petitions to a throne of grace will not feed

the hungry, clothe the naked, nor repeal the infamously unjust laws that shut off would-be workers from natural opportunities. My clerical friend with the ready wit, eloquent tongue and admiring congregations, must know that there is a cause behind every effect and a remedy for every institutional wrong that exists. He must know that in this great country the natural resources are sufficient to afford a comfortable living for all; that there is enough on and beneath the earth's surface to employ all the hands and brains of all the people in California and many millions more; that no one who wants work in California need be without it for one day if nature's workshop were accessible to all. Nobody wants to work merely for the sake of working—for the sole purpose of getting tired and being called industrious. But it is ordained that man shall earn his bread by the sweat of his face, and in order to do that he must have something on which to sweat. That something is the earth. No man can work, or live, without using land, in one way or another. But by our wretched laws and customs, land the passive and labor the active factor in wealth production, are kept apart in countless instances, and men, women and children who desire to honestly earn a living are debarred from doing so. Monopoly of these natural resources intended for the free use of all mankind comes in between land and labor, so that the earth-lord practically owns the toiler, and as the labor market is always glutted the so-called owners of the earth are enabled to reap where they do not sow, while labor begs in vain for a chance to apply itself to the bountiful resources provided by our impartial and all-wise Father.

I will take the liberty of suggesting to my kind-hearted and eloquent clerical friend that in future prayers he should invoke the Almighty to open the eyes and stiffen the backbone of the average fool voter, so that he will put forth his best efforts to overthrow landlordism by legal methods. As long as the masses are forbidden to exercise their god-given right to earn a living it sounds very like hollow mockery to pray otherwise for them. The unemployed are out of work simply because our social system is out of harmony with natural laws and the demands of justice.

RALPH HOYT.

Los Angeles, Cal., Jan. 23.

When we speak of liberty we think of ourselves as exemplifying it, and a nation like Russia as expressing the opposite of it. But Russia has liberty, if it is liberty for a few men at the central

government to decide what they want and then do it. A large part of liberty consists in the right of decision as to whether we shall do a thing or let it alone.—Prof. W. G. Sumner, of Yale.

ROBERT EMMET, LEADER OF A FORLORN HOPE.

A lecture by Rev. H. S. Bigelow, of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, O., delivered January 15, 1899, being the third of a series of five lectures on the subject: "Leaders of Forlorn Hopes." From the author's MS.

Macaulay, in language wonderfully suited to a modern application, has said: "Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition, that no people ought to be free until they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story who resolved not to go near the water until he had learnt to swim. If men are to wait for liberty until they become wise and good in slavery they may indeed wait forever."

A traveler of the sixteenth century, in commenting on the provinces of Lower Austria, said: "In them there are five sorts of persons, clergy, barons, nobles, burghers and peasants. Of these last," the writer significantly adds, "no account is made because they have no voice in the diet." This is the universal testimony of history. No people have ever yet had their rights respected who have not first established their right of self-government. The experiment has always failed. Those circumstances never yet arose when it was safe for one people to intrust their liberties to the guardianship of another. That nation never lived, no matter how advanced or enlightened, that could safely be intrusted with the liberties of any other people, no matter how weak or benighted. When a man arrives at years of discretion it is conceded that it is best for him to exercise his own judgment and be left free to determine his own conduct. A man may sin, he may prostitute his God-given powers, he may throw his life away, yet even God himself has not seen fit to lay the least straw in the way of such a man, or to curtail in the slightest degree his right to think his own thoughts and live his own life. To do so would be to destroy his manhood. To do so would be to deprive him of his only hope of becoming a man.

Nations are collections of individuals. It is just as disastrous to a nation to deprive it of the right of self-government as it would be to the individual to take from him the right of free choice in matters pertaining to his private

conduct. No matter how good government may be, if it is not self-government, it fails in its chief end; for the end of government is the development of the character of a nation; but without freedom character is impossible. This observation has much to do with present day politics, but what has it to do with the life of Robert Emmet?

My words will be idle indeed if I do not make it clear that Robert Emmet died for this principle, and only for this principle, that all just government must be derived from the consent of the governed, and that all government not so derived is tyranny, resistance to which is obedience to God. If I were to dip my pen in the blood of Irish patriots and write across the sky the meaning of Irish history I would have to write those words of Thomas Jefferson: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" I would wish to write them there as a warning to those so-called statesmen whose fashion it is to sneer at that principle; and I would hope that those words might flame across the sea, a beacon light to those who are fighting to be free. Every page of Irish history is bespattered with the blood of her martyrs, and in that dismal record may be read the history of England's colossal failure. One does not know which is the more wonderful in that story, the heroism with which that unhappy island has fought for her freedom, or, the infatuation with which England has persisted in the exercise of a dominion that is a failure in the eyes of the civilized world, and as unprofitable to herself as it is hateful to Ireland. I do not see how any man can turn from that history without offering up the prayer that his country might be saved from a similar infatuation, and that every island of the sea might learn from Ireland's sad experience the folly of surrendering their liberties for an hour.

What were Ireland's grievances? In the first place, she had a religious grievance. The vast majority of the Irish people were Catholics, yet as Catholics they were denied any voice in the government. They were not permitted to enter any of the professions. They had no vote and could hold no office. They had not even the right of educating their own children. They could be banished for life for refusing to attend Protestant churches. How did it come that a people that made up the vast majority of the population should have been thus proscribed by the laws of their land? Because Ireland was ruled not by the people of Ireland, but by a bigoted old king and by a bigoted Prot-

estant parliament which sat in London and had nothing in common with their subjects across the Irish sea.

But Ireland had another grievance. She suffered from English landlords, in whose interests laws were enacted as prejudicial to the welfare of the people as the laws which proscribed the faith that was dear to the people's hearts. Well might Dean Swift suggest that Irish babies should be fattened for the tables of the landlords who devoured as their right the substance of the people. Every improvement which the tenant put upon his farm, thus increasing the value of the land, was made the occasion for a rise in the rent. If he refused to pay he was promptly evicted. The law allowed him no compensation for the labors, perhaps, of a life time. "Summer or winter, day or night, fair or foul weather, the tenants were ejected. Sick or well, bed-ridden or dying, the tenants—men, women or children—were turned out. They might go to America if they could, or they might die on the roadside if it so pleased them. They were put out of the hut and the hut was unroofed that they might not seek its shelter again, and that was all the landlord cared about. The expiring tenant might, said Mitchell, "raise his dying eyes to heaven and bless his God that he perished under the finest constitution in the world." The Irish patriot cried out: "We wish to let the world know that we are slaves, but not contented slaves. We protest against this intolerable tyranny and denounce to the world the hypocrisy of England in pretending to be the friend of freedom and of oppressed nationalities."

It is estimated that between the years 1847 and 1857 nearly a million people left the country. Evictions occurred by the thousands yearly. In 1880 it was found that 2,110 families had been evicted. In 1881 and 1882 over 3,000 were evicted. The population of Ireland in 1845 was 3,000,000; in 1880 it had been reduced to 5,000,000. Was not John Bright right when he declared that the Irish people were dispossessed of their soil? In 1880 Gen. Gordon, of Chinese fame, traveled through Ireland. When he returned he declared that the condition of the Irish people was worse than that of any people in the world, let alone Europe. "I believe," said he, "that these people are made as we are, that they are patient beyond belief, loyal, but at the same time, broken spirited and desperate, lying on the verge of starvation in places where we would not keep our cattle." Furthermore, Justin McCarthy tells us that the Irish peasant is convinced in his

heart that the land is his; that the landlord to whom he pays his rent and the agent to whom he touches his hat are alike, whatever their nationality, the representatives of a hostile rule; of a coercion which is no conquest.

Well, if the Irish peasant was convinced that the land belonged to him, why did he not change the laws by which he was torn from the one spot on earth he had learned to love and turned loose by the roadside to beg or starve or steal? The simple answer is that the Irish had no voice in making the laws or changing them. England very graciously did that for them, or, rather, for their landlords. What wonder this island was a network of secret societies? What wonder it was like a smoldering bed of fire always breaking out anew, always pouring forth its hot but ineffective indignation against the masters who laid upon them such burdens? What respect could we have for Ireland if her sons had not raised the torch of insurrection and welcomed even the gallows in preference to such servitude? Against that dark background of English hypocrisy, against the century of blood and crime, there is one redeeming feature, one glorious sight; it is the spectacle of the Irish patriot bidding defiance to overpowering armies in the face of certain defeat, stimulated by each new martyr who gave his life to the cause, rising again and yet again to demand that sacred right of self government without which they could hope for no relief from the intolerable burdens which England with protestations of kindness and paternal care had put upon them.

One of the noblest of the men who were put to death for demanding that Ireland should have a voice in her own government was Robert Emmet. Ireland had once a parliament of her own. That parliament was abolished at the close of the last century. At its last meeting it passed what is known to history as the act of union. By this act the Irish parliament was abolished. Henceforth Ireland was to be ruled from London. Why was this done? Says Justin McCarthy: "I say with grief and shame that it is my own conclusion and my own conviction that the main object of the Irish legislative union on the part of those who planned it and brought it about was to depress and weaken, and if possible to extinguish the spirit of Irish nationality." But why did the Irish consent to the abolition of their parliament? They never did consent. But their representatives in parliament were bought up by as shameless a piece of bribery as history knows. We have

not time to dwell on this disgraceful chapter. It is a plain fact, however, that England deliberately conspired against the liberty of the Irish people and accomplished the overthrow of their parliament by the use of enormous bribes. Maybe some Irishmen were foolish enough to think that England would rule them better than they could rule themselves. England made beautiful promises. But the hidden motive was the desire of the English landlords to make Irish land laws to suit themselves, and the desire of the Protestants of England to suppress the Irish Catholics. But from the first this union was odious to every patriotic Irishman, and from the hour in which the act passed the perjured parliament all that was good and true in the nation consecrated itself to the effort to secure the repeal of that infamous bill.

When this parliament met in the year 1800 Emmet, a young man 22 years of age, sat in the galleries. The excitement was intense. An uprising was feared. Nothing, however, occurred except that those who were still true to their country vainly opposed with all the scornful eloquence at their command the passage of the bill. Among these Irish patriots who strove in vain to save the national parliament was the great orator, Grattan, already an old man, who had come back from his retirement to hold up to scorn and contempt this infamous transaction, making an epoch in the history of Irish oratory by the scorching invective with which he impeached the false members of the parliament. How the blood of Emmet must have tingled in his young veins as Grattan declared that "the treason of the ministers against the liberties of the people was infinitely worse than the rebellion of the people against the minister."

... Emmet was a traitor. He had failed. Yet, how great was his success compared with those who had purchased seats of power by selling their country's liberty. How great was his success compared with those who were too prudent to follow his example. . . . We may get a few glimpses of the young patriot as he awaits his trial. One morning as the keeper entered Emmet asked him if he had any news from his mother. He was quietly informed that his mother was dead. Died of a broken heart, now that her last son was to be offered up on the altar of English despotism. Emmet turned his head with a sigh. "It is better so," said he, glad, doubtless, that she had escaped the pain of the experience that awaited him. Again we see the young

man in the gloom of his cell quietly braiding a lock of golden hair. And yet again we see him. An angel form appears before his prison door. It is Sarah Curran. Let us turn from that scene. How those stony walls must have softened at the sight. The last press of the lips. The last silent look of love. And then the doomed man quietly led her, who, next to Ireland, was dearest to his heart, to the door where they parted forever.

Finally the hour of trial came. So hopeless was his case that he did not even try to defend himself. "I am arraigned here," he said, "as being engaged in a conspiracy against the English government in Ireland. I avow it; I am a conspirator. For that I am to undergo the penalty of the law and to answer for my intentions before God. I am ready to do the one and the other."

While asking no mercy, while not deigning to offer a reason why he should not suffer the penalty of the law, he used his opportunity to answer some of the false charges which had been made against him. One of these charges was that he had conspired to deliver Ireland over to the French. France and England, it must be remembered, were at war. Emmet expected promised help from Napoleon. But it was with the understanding that Napoleon was merely to assist in establishing Irish independence. His position was precisely analogous to that of Aguinaldo to-day who has welcomed the aid of Americans to establish independence for the Philippine islands. Emmet had expected France to help Ireland just as she had helped the American colonies to throw off the English dominion. But they charged him at his trial with having conspired to hand Ireland over to France. To this charge he replied in words that are graven on the hearts of every Irishman. We applaud his words to-day. It is always easy to sympathize with the patriot who struggles against despotism when that despotism is not our own government or when that patriot in no way opposes us. But I am not telling the story of Emmet's life for your entertainment. I shall have told it in vain if I do not make you feel that the principle for which he died is just as sacred now as it was then, just as applicable to the Philippines as it ever was to Ireland. It is easy to state principles and to enthuse over them, but it is not so easy to apply them. It is my opinion that these martyrs would not care for the plaudits of men who were unwilling to pay them the tribute of putting their principles into prac-

tice. Lest we deceive ourselves, therefore, and think that we honor Emmet, while in reality we are turning against the very thing for which he gave his life, let us take those immortal words of the Irish patriot and put them in the mouth of Aguinaldo. I will not change the speech of Emmet's in the least. I will only substitute in a single place in the speech the word "Americans" for the word "French." Suppose Aguinaldo were on trial before a Spanish tribunal on the charge of having conspired to turn the sovereignty of the Philippines over to the United States of America.

And suppose that, in denying this charge, he had used these identical words of Emmet. Would we applaud them? That is the test of our loyalty to the pure principle of liberty to-day. Let us hear, then, what this modern Emmet would say. "Were the Americans to come as invaders or enemies, uninvited by the wishes of the people, I should oppose them to the utmost of my strength. Yes, my countrymen, I would advise you to meet them on the beach with a sword in one hand and a torch in the other. I would meet them with all the destructive fury of war. I would animate my countrymen to immolate them in their boats before they had contaminated the soil of my country. If they succeeded in landing, and if forced to retire before superior discipline, I would dispute every inch of ground, burn every blade of grass, and the last entrenchment of liberty should be my grave. What I could not do myself, if I should fall, I would leave as a last charge to my countrymen to accomplish; because I should feel that life more than death is unprofitable when a foreign nation holds my country in subjection."

Let him who cannot cheer that sentiment waste no tears at Emmet's grave. Let him rather take the headsman's ax and strike this fairest of Irish patriots to the earth; for so in spirit every man does who questions for a single moment the right of any people to rule themselves. Only last week Gen. Shafter said to a sort of a Y. M. C. A. club in the city of Washington: "My plan would be to disarm the natives in the Philippine islands, even if we killed half of them in doing so." A member of the senate has expressed the belief that the Filipinos will never consent to become a dependent colony. In this same week a newspaper in our own city threw off the mask of hypocrisy and frankly argued in its editorial columns that the principle that just government could only be derived from the consent

of the governed was an old fogy notion. The ghost of Emmet rises in condemnation of this age. Let us not sully the reputation of these martyrs by our unmeaning praises. Let us take our rightful places by the side of those whose hands are stained with the blood of martyred patriots and frankly remain there until we repent of our apostasy and return to our old love, until we can claim once more the honor of believing in liberty, not for ourselves only, but for all mankind. . . .

THE GRANTING OF FRANCHISES UNDEMOCRATIC.

I feel constrained to announce myself as being unalterably opposed to any grant of municipal franchise for any purpose whatever, and I take this position as a matter of principle.

I maintain that the idea of granting franchises to private individuals or corporations to minister to, a city in social necessities is as wrong in scientific theories as it is mischievous and destructive of what is best in municipal life in practice.

The whole idea of granting special privileges to a few people to make profit of from all the rest of the people is undemocratic, and consequently is opposed to and stands in the way of progress toward the realization of our loftiest and best ideals—the equality of all men before the law. * * *

Private ownership of public franchises is a high crime against democracy. It is contrary to the spirit of republican institutions. It is a city granting a privilege to an individual to enrich himself, usually at the expense of the classes least able to bear it, the poor people.—Mayor S. M. Jones, of Toledo, Ohio, at Cooper Union, New York.

ONE OF FRANKLIN'S STORIES.

A gentleman received a letter, in which were these words: "Not finding Brown at hom, I delivered your meseg to his yf." The gentleman, finding it bad spelling, and therefore not very intelligible, called his lady to help him read it. Between them they picked out the meaning of all but the yf, which they could not understand. The lady proposed calling her chambermaid, "because Betty," says she, "has the best knack at reading bad spelling of anyone I know." Betty came, and was surprised that neither sir nor madam could tell what yf was. "Why," says she, "yf spells wife; what else can it spell?"—From Letter by Benj. Franklin, quoted in *The Century*.

Prof. —, a leading light of Edinburgh university, recently wrote on the blackboard in his laboratory:

"Prof. — informs his students that he has this day been appointed honorary physician to the queen." In the course of the morning he had occasion to leave the room, and on returning found that a student had added to the announcement the words: "God save the Queen!"—Household Words.

"What is a fraction?"

"A part of anything, sorr."

"Give an example."

"The sivinteenth of June."—Harvard Lampoon.

"The millennium will be a hard time for the cynics, if there are any left."

"Oh! I don't know. They can spend their time demonstrating that it can't last."—Puck.

God Winning Us.

BY

REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:

GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US (Incarnation)
 GOD WINNING US (Atonement)
 GOD OPENING OUR EYES (Faith)
 GOD GROWING IN US (Regeneration)
 GOD ACTING THROUGH US (Beligion)
 GOD CARING FOR US (Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
 GERMANTOWN, PA

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

1101 Chamber of Commerce Building . CHICAGO

FRIENDS

of this paper are requested to send us the names and addresses of persons of their acquaintance who would be interested in reading it regularly.

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,
 Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago, Ill.