# The Public

First Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1899. Number 45.

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.

The president has carried his Spanish treaty through the senate, but by a narrow margin. The change of two votes would have produced a different result. And that change might easily have been made. Not all who are recorded in the affirmative really approved the terms of the treaty. Senator Mason had made a strong speech against its disposition of Philippine sovereignty, but fell into line for party reasons. Senator Perkins also was opposed to that part of the treaty, but voted against his convictions because he regarded a resolution of instructions from the legislature of his state as binding upon his conscience. Besides these two republicans, whose votes alone if cast against the treaty would have prevented its ratification at the present session, 11 democrats and two populists, most of them opposed to imperialism, voted—for one reason or another, but mainly because the ratification of the treaty was necessary to conclude a peace—with the majority. What enabled the president to carry his treaty through, was a feeling among both democratic and republican senators, that it would be impolitic to defeat a treaty of peace.

---

The event has proved that Wm. J. Bryan was right. Recognizing the difficulty of defeating a peace treaty even at the present session, and the certainty that a decision against the treaty now would be reversed by the new senate at a special session in the spring, he proposed to make the decisive battle against imperialism, not upon the ratification of the treaty but upon the question of disposing of the territory which by the treaty Spain would surrender. To those who opposed Bryan's policy on the ground that the ratification of the treaty would be decisive of that question, the ratification now made must seem like the final triumph of imperialism. For if the treaty binds us, as these objectors have maintained, to a future policy at variance with our traditions, at war with our principles of government, and destructive of our national ideals, then the fight against American imperialism is ended. But to those who are in accord with Bryan, that fight has only begun.

---

It has been suggested by friends of the treaty that the battle with the Filipinos at Manila came just in the nick of time to secure its ratification. They certainly made the most of this sad event, to influence votes. But it is inconceivable that any senator would have changed his vote upon a question involving the fundamental principles of his government, merely because the newspapers were publishing alarming dispatches received through channels under the control of a censor. These dispatches might properly enough have suggested a postponement of the vote upon ratification. In that behalf it could have been reasonably urged that the senate should know the true and complete facts about the situation at Manila before acting finally upon the treaty. And incidentally it could have been argued that no harm would come from the delay, inasmuch as the treaty before becoming operative must be ratified by the Spanish cortes, which do not convene until the 20th—two weeks in the future. But the suggestion that the ratification was secured through the influence of the censorized dispatches, reflects severely upon the mental balance and self control of senators who went over to the majority side. We are disposed to credit them with better judgment and a clearer conception of their official responsibilities.

---

The truth about the battle at Manila is not known even now. According to the dispatches, the Filipinos made an unprovoked attack upon the Americans. But of this there is no certainty yet, for the press dispatches were censorized at Manila, and the official dispatches are subject to emasculation at Washington. One of the press dispatches, in a paragraph which seems to have escaped the censor's scrutiny, somewhat discredits the story that the Filipinos were the aggressors. It came to our notice in the news reports of the Chicago Record. This paragraph indicated that American sentries precipitated the Filipino attack by firing upon Filipinos. Another respect in which the dispatches may be reasonably doubted is as to the casualties. The Filipino loss in killed and wounded is given at 3,500, the American loss being put at first at only 20 wounded. American losses, however, have been growing since the first report, and are now admitted to exceed 50 killed, with more than 150 wounded. But even this is out of all proportion to the reported loss of 3,500 on the other side. We are likely to learn in time, either that the Filipino loss was much less than that now reported, or that the American loss was much greater. In still another respect are the censorized dispatches to be doubted. They tell of a decisive victory. But reputable persons whose familiarity with the Filipinos and the nature of the ground about Manila enable them to weigh the censorized reports, dispute the probability of a decisive victory for the Americans, upon the facts so far divulged. We must wait for

Digitized by Google

news until the president removes his cable censorship at Manila, or full reports come from Hong-Kong. Till then it will be impossible to decide with any confidence, not only as to the results of the fight but also as to the immediate responsibility for it.

Although we cannot yet fix the responsibility for beginning the Manila fight, there is no difficulty in placing the blame for the conditions that really produced it. And that is more important. It makes little difference who actually began the fighting. The vital question is who provoked it. The blame for that rests primarily upon the president and his imperialistic advisers, and secondarily upon those republicans in the senate and the house who, though deploring his revolutionary policy, have in their weakness aided and abetted him in promoting it. The history of the past year puts the responsibility there so securely that it cannot be evaded.

Let that history be candidly interrogated. One year ago the Philippine islands were unknown to Americans except as an archipelago in their geographies. Then came the war with Spain. This was begun in defense of local self government. If that was not its purpose, not only was it without justification, but it was contrary to our most solemn professions. We at least pretended that our purpose in going to war was to free Cuba from the cruel tyranny of an imperial nation across the sea; and over the people of that long suffering island we expressly and officially disclaimed "any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control" except for pacification, promising that when that was accomplished we would "leave the government and control of the island to its people." Such was the solemn declaration of congress in a joint resolution to which President McKinley affixed his signature. And President McKinley himself, in his message to congress, scouted the possibility of what he called "forcible annexation." "That," he said, "by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression." This was the first stage in the historical development of our relations to the Philippines. It is replete with testimony to our hearty recognition, as a nation, of the American principle of local self-government. Though we recognized it directly in its application to Cuba, we did so as of a principle of universal application. It was not merely the forcible annexation of Cuba that our president officially denounced as criminal aggression, but the principle of forcible annexation itself.

The second stage in the historical development of our relations to the Philippines began with the destruction by Dewey's fleet of the Spanish fleet in the Bay of Manila. That was in the beginning of May—less than ten months ago. Then, for the first time, did the American people come to realize the Philippine archipelago as part of the living world. Of the propriety of sending Dewey there with his fleet there is no question. We were at war with Spain. A Spanish fleet rode the Pacific with the Philippines for a base. It was our right as a public enemy of Spain, our privilege in defense of our own coast and commerce, to destroy that fleet. It was our right and privilege, also, as an act of war for the weakening of our enemy, to capture any one or all of the Philippine islands if we could. But in this second stage we did no more than to destroy the fleet and take possession of Manila bay.

It is difficult now to see why we should have retained possession even of the bay. As events have proved, its destruction of the Spanish fleet exhausted the usefulness of the Manila expedition, as an act of war against Spain. But the events of the war had not all transpired then, and justice demands that criticism should now be silent as to Dewey's detention at Manila. It may have been necessary to hold the bay against the possible fitting out of another Spanish fleet for the Pacific. We did not then know so much of the weakness of Spain as we do now. And since it may have been necessary to hold the bay, so it may have been necessary to effect a landing for the purpose of establishing a base of supplies for the fleet, and desirable for the purpose of attacking and capturing enemy's territory. Against the shipment, therefore, of troops to Manila and their landing there in force—the third stage in the historical development of our relations to the Philippines,—no lay criticism can justly lie. Thus far, only military questions arise.

But the fourth stage brings political questions, fundamental political questions, into view. This began when Spain sued for peace. At that time we had her in our power. Two of her three fleets were destroyed, the third was demoralized, eastern Cuba and Porto Rico were in our possession, and we held a secure base for our fleet in the Pacific. Nothing remained but to dictate terms of peace. This we did in a general way, arranging for commissions to formulate a final treaty. At the time of the signing of the protocol by which that was done, the natives of the Philippine islands had established a government of their own. At intervals for many years they had been in rebellion against Spain, struggling for independence. One rebellion had but recently been put down, and another was in progress throughout the archipelago when Dewey's fleet sailed into Manila bay. Gaining strength daily, the rebels finally drove the Spanish from the open field into their fortifications at Manila, on the Island of Luzon, and at Iloilo, on the island of Panay. Elsewhere, with but few and unimportant exceptions, the rebels were in possession of all the islands, maintaining both the form and substance of civilized government. At the actual time of the signing of the peace protocol, the Spanish were still in possession of Manila, but about six hours afterward they terminated a battle by surrendering to the Americans. So the Americans, at the cessation of hostilities between Spain and the

Digitized by Google

United States, were to all intents and purposes in possession of Manila and Manila bay, while the Spanish retained possession of Iloilo and perhaps some unimportant points besides, and the Filipino republic held the remainder of the archipelago.

By the terms of the peace protocol, the treaty of peace was to "determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines." This clause, like pretty much everything that President McKinley dictates, was susceptible of as many interpretations as there were parties in interest. To describe it as having only a double meaning would be inadequate. But the Filipinos understood, and they had a right to understand, that it contemplated a complete surrender of the islands to their republic. For a time following the protocol, therefore, they maintained a peaceable attitude, not only toward the Americans, whom they regarded as allies, but also toward the Spanish, whom they regarded as enemies. Anticipating the transfer of undisputed possession of their native land to their own government, they suspended military operations and devoted themselves to civil affairs. But soon the fifth stage of the development of our Philippine question began. Reports from Paris indicated that the Americans were demanding the archipelago for themselves. Naturally, the Filipinos, then became suspicious and restless. Would Americans have been confiding and patient in similar circumstances? And when the treaty appeared, these reports were fully confirmed. While Cuba was to be relinquished by Spain, but not ceded to the United States, the Philippines were to be ceded. Meantime, disturbed by the rumors as to the American policy of conquest,—rumors that the treaty when it appeared confirmed—the Filipinos resumed military operations against Spain. It was clearly their object to make their sovereignty as complete as possible, to the end that Spain might have nothing outside of Manila to cede. In that they were wise. They thus gave evidence of the possession of at least one of the qualifications for self-government. And they so far succeeded in their enterprise as to take possession of Iloilo, where ever since the latter part of last year they have administered civilized government.

The sixth stage of the Philippine question more directly concerns the conduct of our own government, which has been in these respects under the arbitrary control of the president. He has assumed to be both the republican party and the American nation incarnate. To oppose his will is freely denounced as disloyalty to party and treasonable to country. It was President McKinley's insistance that the treaty provided for the cession of the Philippines to us, instead of their mere relinquishment by Spain as in the case of Cuba. President McKinley, in a public speech, asked significantly who would haul down the American flag from any place over which it had been raised. President McKinley ordered troops from Manila to Iloilo, to forestall the native republicans—a purpose which was happily frustrated by their superior administrative alertness. President McKinley sent a message to Manila threatening the Filipinos with severe discipline unless they would submit to American subjugation under the euphemism of "benevolent assimilation." President McKinley sent reenforcements by the thousand to the Philippines, when all necessity for troops in the Spanish war had ceased, and their mission could only have been to subjugate the natives and overthrow their republic. President McKinley placed all political communication between the Philippine archipelago and the United States under censorship, when no military purpose in the war with Spain was to be served thereby. President McKinley refused to receive an agent from the Philippine republic, who sought an opportunity to enable the president to ascertain and intelligently consider the propositions the new republic had to offer. President McKinley ignored the written communications of this agent which reached him through the state department. President McKinley scorned the Filipino commissioners—men of high intellectual grade—who had come here to confer with the American government. President McKinley has persistently refused to indicate either to the Filipinos, the American public, or to congress the policy he has in view for the future of the Philippines in their relations to the United States—whether to help them establish their republic, as the Filipinos desire, or to reduce them to the condition of a subject colony, as his imperialist supporters are urging. President McKinley used all his powerful influence as president, to prevent any declaration of policy in this respect by congress, in explanation of the treaty. In a word, President McKinley has deliberately placed this country in a position toward the Filipino republic which would have justified that republic in resorting to arms.

Whether the immediate aggressors at Manila this week were the Filipinos or the Americans makes no difference in principle. The aggressor all through the latter part of the fall and the whole of the winter, has been the American government, personified by President McKinley. Only savages or cowards would not have resented it. Writing a few days before the Filipinos, according to the reports, did resent it, the Springfield Republican truly declared:

> The American revolutionists had not a tenth part the moral justification for waging war on their king that the Filipino people would have in drawing the sword against a foreign government which had proclaimed sovereignty over them. King George, whatever his sins, did not attempt to sell our ancestors and their country to some foreign power. Samuel Adams, James Otis and Patrick Henry were not suddenly confronted with a claim of sovereignty by France, Russia or Spain. The state of civilization among the Filipinos does not affect their moral right to contest a sudden claim of sovereignty over them by the United States, any more than the lack of Parisian manners among the American colonists would have affected their right to rebel against the king of France had he claimed their allegiance after nine months' acquaintance.

Digitized by Google

But the responsibility of the present attitude of the Filipinos cannot be shaken from the shoulders of William McKinley. Not only has he negotiated a treaty which transfers their country for $20,000,000 to the United States, in spite of their most emphatic and long-continued protest, but he has publicly proclaimed to them his purpose of "assimilation." If he now persists in imitating the blundering old British king in refusing to adopt a more moderate policy, and thus drives the Filipinos to a struggle against foreign conquerors, his administration will have earned a terrible retribution at the hands of the American people.

---

Yet in spite of our long series of aggressions, one definite word from President McKinley would have prevented the slaughter that has just occurred. He had only to address congress in a brief but candid message of advice as to the Philippine question, a message such as presidents have before this addressed to congress, such as President McKinley himself addressed to congress on the subject of Cuba less than a year ago. If ever a president was called upon to reveal his purposes in that manner, President McKinley has been called upon to do so from the first day on which congress convened for the present session. He owed it to his country, to the Filipinos, to the civilized world to make it plain that "forcible annexation" of the Philippines is no part of the American policy, so far at least as he could control that policy as president. His neglect—nay his deliberate refusal—to give even unofficial assurances, coupled with the dispatch of troops to Manila, would amply justify and account for Aguinaldo's declaration of war.

---

President McKinley was warned in time of the possibilities of such an event, by an able and far seeing member of his own party—Congressman Johnson, of Indiana. Upon the floor of the house on the 25th of last month—long enough ago to have enabled the president to act in time—Mr. Johnson, whose speech is reported on page 1278 of the Congressional Record of January 28, said:

> Let the president of the United States open his mouth to-day or to-morrow—that mouth that he has kept closed in dogged silence ever since his Atlanta speech, in which he inquired who would pull down our flag—and say to the people of the Philippines that it is not his desire to force a government upon them against their will; that their rights and privileges shall continue unhampered and unimpaired, and we can in 24 hours discharge all of our volunteer soldiers and let them return to their homes.

And Senator Hale, also of the president's own party, has just given out an interview regarding the Manila fight in which he says:

> I am not surprised at the occurrence. If the treaty had been made as it ought to have been made, putting the Philippines on the same basis as Cuba, no trouble would have arisen; or if the managers of the treaty had consented to an amendment on this line there would have been no trouble of this kind. Or, still further, if they had agreed to the passage of a joint resolution declaring that congress did not expect permanent occupation, trouble would have been avoided. But the truth is that underneath the expansion newspapers and back of the movements of the leaders of the expansion cause lies the determination to be content with nothing but permanent annexation.
>
> This means a protracted war of subjugation against the people of the Philippine islands. The ratification of the treaty means, not peace, but immediate war. We must send more troops and more ships to Manila, and must undertake the immense job of conquering the people who are trying to establish a government of their own.
>
> Some of us have warned the expansionists against this from the beginning, and we have foreseen the consequence of refusal to accept the warning. I am sorry that the trouble has come about, but it was inevitable from the day that our commissioners to the Paris conference demanded of Spain the cession of the Philippines to the United States, instead of asking her to abandon her own sovereignty and leave the matter of the government of these islands to the inhabitants of them, as in the case of Cuba.

---

The blood of our soldiers in the far away Philippines, bravely shed in an ignoble cause, is not upon Aguinaldo's men. His men fought for their native country as we should fight for ours, and for the liberty that is no less dear to them than it is to us. They fought as our own fathers fought, against colonial subjugation and for the independence to which all men are entitled but which no men are accorded unless they do fight. That they fought bravely, even if ineffectively, our own newspapers testify. And they fought as patriots if ever men did. Not upon their heads is the blood of our outraged and slaughtered soldiers, whose enlistment to put down one tyrant is being taken advantage of to make them instruments in setting up another. This black deed is attributable not to them, but to President McKinley. He and the hungry land-grabbers who advise him in his imperial policy are the men to blame. They it is who have wantonly brought terrible sorrow and wrenching anxiety to many an American home, and made the blood of every true lover of this country—of every one, that is to say, who loves it for its noble ideals, and the advances it has heretofore made toward them—to tingle with shame. A war upon which we entered in behalf of humanity and for the promotion of liberty, has through them been degraded into a war of sordid conquest—a war which, according to our own code of morals as defined by Mr. McKinley himself, is "criminal aggression.".

---

Though this view of the terrible slaughter at Manila may not now find ready acceptance, we believe it to be the true view, and that the time is already near when it will be the view of civilized mankind. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? "Shall a people armed and in revolt for their freedom," says Charles M. Sturges, in his open letter of congratulation to Senator Hoar, "be pacified by a change of masters? Disdaining to wear the collar of one dictator beyond the seas, shall they take laws and control from another? Is there in the Tagal tongue no speech—if there be not, is there in the Tagal heart no unarticulated aspiration—which, being interpreted, shall say: 'My country, right or wrong'? Hearing on his own shores 'the clash of resounding arms' shall no Malayan Patrick Henry highly declare in council with his countrymen: 'As for me, give me liberty, or give me death'? Shall no Philippine

Digitized by Google

assemblage, deliberating for their freedoms, vow to each other, and for their country 'their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor'?" Or if there be such, let us then ask, will they not yet wear the laurel that the world delights to place upon the brow of the devoted patriot? Are we, even we of this country, who now play in the role of foreign potentate—are we to adopt in all seriousness the sentiment to which the Manchester, N. H., Union gives this bitterly ironical expression: "Base indeed is the man who fights for the liberty of his people when America is the oppressors"?

---

The river and harbor bill has passed the lower house of congress by a vote of 160 to 7. Though stuffed full of wild cat appropriations, and carrying $30,000,000 in all, it was railroaded through without a roll call. Everybody, almost, voted for it, and those who did were determined not to go upon record as having done so. All this is easily explained. The river and harbor bill is the great local corruption bill. Congressmen who can't get into this bill an allowance from Uncle Sam for their constituents, are labeled "no good" at home. Consequently most congressmen log roll, one with another, each seeking public money for his constituents, until the bill grows into a large mosaic of larceny. That is the reason it passes by an overwhelming majority. It is the reason also that demands for the "ayes" and "noes" are voted down. One may vote for a public steal, but he doesn't like to "go to the country" upon it.

---

The minority report of the house committee on Mark Hannah's ship bounty bill is worth reading and thinking about. It was prepared by Congressman Handy, of Delaware. Here is the explanation of the reason why the bill is "satisfactory:"

This bill is one that was prepared and brought to congress by a voluntary committee of ship owners and shipbuilders representing the gentlemen who will receive the bounty which the bill proposes to give from the public treasury. The bill as it is reported to the house is in almost the exact form and grants to a penny the bounties demanded by the gentlemen who are to receive them. The bill is therefore naturally and entirely satisfactory to the "interests" which have organized this movement to secure the vast sums carried in the bill as a gratuity to be used in carrying on their private business and enlarging the profits thereof.

As estimated by the report, the bounties provided for would amount to $165,000,000. The viciousness of the bill is thus summed up:

It is manifestly unequal and unjust to tax the farmers, carpenters, blacksmiths, masons, merchants, railroad men, miners and woodsmen of the country to pay a bounty to shipowners for every mile they sail upon the sea. The bill is the offspring of mere bounty beggars and should be repudiated by representatives of both political parties. It is vicious in principle.

---

Baltimore has the honor of having organized a "Future Voters' association." Its founder is F. C. Hall, 1005 North Stricker street, Baltimore, Md. The objects of the association are to inculcate a knowledge of the meaning of good government, to make clear the trade relations of countries, to study the subject of money, and generally to educate future voters into an understanding of the obligations of a citizen instead of leaving them to cast their votes at random or in mere obedience to family tradition. A thoroughly good association of that kind would soon make a much needed impression upon American politics.

---

Tom L. Johnson's recent public declaration that he had withdrawn from business and intended hereafter to devote his life and fortune to the promotion of the single tax movement, has created a general sensation. Yet he has been devoting his life and fortune to that movement largely for more than a dozen years. There is nothing new about his recent declaration except that his business—that of a monopolist—will no longer claim any of his attention. This will deprive hypercritical opponents of one of their little clubs. They can no longer talk about Johnson's inconsistency. But that was a very little club. It was much like a stuffed club. Monopoly is a social institution, and no man is inconsistent who while benefitting by it tries to induce the people to abolish it.

---

In the midst of the satisfaction which Henry George's followers derive from the sensation that Johnson's announcement has created, they are saddened by news of the death of the Rev. Chas. E. Garst, another of their prominent men. Mr. Garst was a missionary of the Church of the Dsiciples (commonly called Campbellites), and was stationed at Japan, where he supplemented his religious work by making known to the Japanese, as he did widely, the philosophy of Henry George. He died at Tokio, on the 28th of December, of pneumonia. Wherever in the world the George agitation flourishes, Garst's name is known. He was a clear thinker and a man of sterling intellectual honesty, who was devoted to his calling and faithful to all his convictions.

## THE STREET CAR QUESTION.

Some weeks ago, at the Sunset club in Chicago, Charles T. Yerkes spoke upon the street railroad question from the standpoint of a street railroad monopolist. Mr. Yerkes controls the Chicago street car system, and is besides a man of great bravery, not to say effrontery, in asserting the claims of franchise grabbers. No better representative, therefore, of the private monopoly side of the street car question could have been chosen for a debate upon the subject.

And Mr. Yerkes certainly did not allow the interests he represented to suffer for lack of dialectic art. Supplementing agility in argument with impudence and skill in the prompt distortion of facts, he proved a formidable antagonist to more scrupulous debaters.

When in the course of his speech he had occasion to reply to a suggestion that street cars could be run profitably upon a three-cent fare, if stocked and bonded only at actual cost, so as not to be under pressure to pay dividends upon water, Mr. Yerkes said, as officially reported in print by the Sunset club:

No, nothing of the kind. And when the statement is made here that Detroit

Digitized by Google

runs for three cents, there was a three-cent company started there and it was merged into the other company. That is what became of it. It went into bankruptcy and then was merged into the other company.

One member of the Sunset club, George A. Schilling, formerly at the head of the Illinois labor bureau, took the liberty of politely doubting Mr. Yerkes's assertions regarding the Detroit company, whereupon, as reported by the Sunset club, the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. George A. Schilling: I would like to ask the question, whether it is absolutely true that the road that ran at three cents in Detroit has gone into liquidation; and second, whether, even if it has gone into liquidation, it does not yet run for three cents?

Mr. Yerkes: That road did fail and went into liquidation. It was afterwards bought by one of the other roads; that part of the road is run now for three cents, but it is run by the other company, in connection with its other line, and there is very little three-cent fare about it.

Mr. Schilling: Is it not true that the road was bought out by the other company before it busted?

Mr. Yerkes: No.

Though Mr. Schilling said no more at the time, his doubts of Yerkes's veracity were not allayed, and he wrote to Gov. Pingree for the facts. Gov. Pingree's reply has just been published in the Municipal Ownership Bulletin of Chicago. The Michigan governor does not, in terms, denounce what Yerkes said as false; but he does so impliedly by merely recounting the history of the Detroit three-cent road. From that history no other inference than that of prevarication on Mr. Yerkes's part is possible. Gov. Pingree says:

Some years ago, during the street car agitation in Detroit, an application was before the common council for a franchise for a cross-town line, and after the managers of the old company had produced volumes of proof to show that three-cent car fares were impracticable, certain capitalists, among whom were Mr. Henry A. Everett and Mr. Albert Pack, came forward and agreed to take a franchise on the basis of a three-cent fare. A franchise was granted to them under the name of the Detroit Railway company, covering many miles of road. The system was immediately constructed and equipped, and a fine service established. The principal thoroughfares of Detroit all radiate from the center of the city like the spokes of a wheel. In addition to the regular north and south and east and west streets there are three main arteries running diagonally from the city hall far into the country. All these streets were occupied by the old company, and, in order to carry its passengers downtown the new company was obliged to lay more miles of track, and to place them upon back streets. Its whole system is full of crooks and turns. It is thus placed at an enormous disadvantage as compared with the old company. Mr. Everett told us that when he and his associates put their money into this enterprise they did not expect to more than pay expenses in the first three years; but he said that so far from this being the case, the system had made money from the beginning—and this in spite of its disadvantage in the way of location.

The other stockholders subsequently bought out Mr. Everett's interests, and about the same time the management of the road changed its policy. It pooled its interests with those of the old company. It inflated its capital and put a big issue of bonds on the market. It closed its power house, and its system has for some time been operated from the plant of the "competing" company. It certainly did not go into liquidation or bankruptcy; nor have its stockholders, so far as I am aware, sold out to the old company or to anyone else. I presume that its reports of late would not show a large dividend upon its capital, as it was absolutely to prevent such showing that its capital was watered. But that its system has paid a handsome profit upon the money actually invested I have no doubt whatever.

The statement of Mr. Yerkes that "it is run by the other company in connection with other lines" is true as far as I have indicated. But his next remark, that "there is very little three-cent car fare about it," is certainly not true. There is just as much three-cent car fare about it as there was when the road was started. There has been no change in the fare charged upon its lines, and the road is still in operation.

In a postscript to his letter to Schilling, Gov. Pingree added:

The Pack and Everett line, as a result of the campaign which we waged, now sells eight tickets for 25 cents, with transfers over 68 miles of street railway. The other line, the old line, as a result of the same campaign, now sells six tickets for 25 cents day and night; and, during one hour in the morning and one hour in the evening, it sells eight workingmen's tickets for 25 cents.

Thus Mr. Yerkes's assertion that the attempt to run street cars in Detroit upon a three-cent fare failed to yield a profit upon the basis of actual cost, falls to the ground, and with it his arguments, equally mendacious, that street car systems cannot be maintained profitably upon three-cent fares.

---

Upon another point, Mr. Yerkes at the same Sunset club debate, took advantage of his audience's lack of specific information, to distort inconvenient facts. One of the speakers, a Mr. Jones, referring to some strictures that had been made upon the municipal ownership policy said:

In Glasgow, Scotland, they have municipal ownership, and they give the people there a rate of fare which is less than two cents, and in addition to that they pay higher wages to the employes than they did under private ownership.

Asked what dividend they pay, and how much is charged up to loss, Mr. Jones replied:

They pay a dividend of $250,000 every year into the city treasury; they have no losses, they pay all the expenses.

Mr. Yerkes retorted that Mr. Jones was "entirely mistaken about Glasgow," and then went on to say, upon the alleged authority of the superintendent of the Glasgow system, that their fare is on an average a cent, that is to say a halfpenny, a mile, running for the distance traversed, from one cent up to six cents per passenger; and that the city has lost over $50,000 in two years in the operation of street cars.

The evident intention and unmistakable effect of Mr. Yerkes's remarks were to convey the idea that the municipalization of street cars in Glasgow has proved a financial failure. But this idea is controverted by excellent Glasgow authority. Without intending to refute Mr. Yerkes's assertion, without so much as knowing that it had ever been made, Mr. John Paul, editor of the Glasgow Single Tax, makes the following conclusive statement in a private letter:

Our Corporation tramways are a decided success. We have finer cars, a better service of cars, cheaper fares, and shorter hours and better pay for the men who work for them.

Moreover, they are a great financial success. In fact they are so great a financial success that the Corporation have made many extensions during the past two years, and are applying to parliament now for powers to open up a dozen new routes through the city and out into the suburbs.

The Glasgow people know so well how successful the cars are, that the carping criticism with which the venture was first assailed, even by our

Digitized by Google

most influential newspaper, has entirely ceased.

To corroborate Mr. Paul as to the financial success of the Glasgow system, we need only refer to the Massachusetts report of 1898 on street railways, prepared by Charles Francis Adams. This report gives the results of the Glasgow system for the year ending May 31, 1897. It may be tabulated as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total receipts | $1,804,800 |
| Expense of operation | 1,393,100 |
| Nominal surplus | $ 411,700 |
| Interest, sinking fund, depreciation and payment to the Common Good | 241,400 |
| | $170,300 |
| Accumulation for renewals of permanent way | 73,000 |
| Accumulation for general purposes | $97,300 |

Municipal ownership of municipal monopolies, such as street car lines, is fast proving its superiority over the prevailing system of ownership by private monopolists. Upon that issue the private monopolists are fighting a losing fight. Even the audacious prevarications of Mr. Yerkes cannot long be of any use to them.

---

But let no one be misled as to the general advantages of municipal ownership. Superior as that policy is to the policy of private ownership, it will not improve the condition of the masses of the people. This conclusion might be inferred from general economic principles, but the experience of Glasgow goes far to prove it as a fact.

Continuing his explanation of the street car system in Glasgow, in the letter already quoted from, Mr. Paul supplies the following interesting and valuable information:

These tramways have also proved a great success financially to many ground landlords, the value of whose land has gone up and is going up just as the car system is extended.

Some people have said that—now that the cars are going out into the country—the land along the new routes may be used for better and cheaper house accommodation, and the people will leave the congested districts to enjoy the pure country air. But, alas for their expectations, the ground landlords have also realized this advantage and have crystallized it into a monopoly price, which is prohibitive, so far at least as the working classes who dwell in the city slums are concerned. In this experience we recognize the truth of Henry George's words, that unless you lift the lowest class you cannot touch the fringe of the social problem.

As a matter of fact, if what is commonly known as municipal socialism could better the social condition of the people, the problem of poverty in Glasgow would have been nearly solved by this time. We have control of our splendid water supply. We have municipal gas and municipal tramways. Our river Clyde is in the hands of public trustees. We have municipal baths and washing houses. We have public parks, with music supplied in the summer evenings, and throughout the winter we have penny concerts in our public halls. We have provided a family home for widows and orphans. A people's palace, after the pattern of Sir Walter Besant's in "All Sorts and Conditions of Men," has also been set up; and we have opened common lodging houses where the "dosser" can secure a lodging for three pence a night. Besides all this, it is reckoned that a million pounds a year is given in charity in Glasgow. Yet in this same city you will find the poor huddled together in dense masses. Living in 30,000 hovels of one room, there are 110,000 persons, many of them so polluted and vicious that the school board officer hesitates to visit them; and in our fashionable streets you will encounter every day in the year, and every hour in the day, the most hideous evidences of poverty.

Do not misunderstand me. We all appreciate these municipal social conveniences, and feel sorry for the towns and cities throughout the world whose water supplies, tramways, gas, etc., are in the hands of companies whose concern is to secure as much money as they can and give as little service as possible in return. In London last summer, for example, the people in one of the most populous districts came through a severe water famine, causing terrible hardships, to say nothing of disease and death. The supply of the water there is in the hands of a syndicate. Here in Glasgow, where our water supply is in the hands of the Corporation, we have magnificent reservoirs containing several weeks' supplies and can cope with any probable spell of drought.

In the first instance, Glasgow had to pay the landlords, or water lords, for access to our beautiful natural reservoir, Loch Katrine. We turned the purchase to such good account that the proprietors, through their agent, afterward confessed that had they known the people of Glasgow would have made such profitable use of the loch, they would have charged a higher price for it. Having neglected to do this, they resorted to the meanest conduct. They threatened to build villas on the banks, the sewage from which would have polluted the loch. So the Corporation, to protect the purity of the loch, had to buy off these proprietors for $50,000 more. Landlordism is the very essence of meanness. Conduct like this only brings it out in bold relief.

But after all, how does the great advantage of freedom thus secured by Glasgow from the "bloated capitalist" work out? The result is easily stated. The people of Glasgow have good water and cheap; but the less they pay in rates for water, the more they pay in rent for land. It means good water and better health to the people, to be sure; but the economic advantage goes to the "last robber" labor has to deal with—the ground lord.

We have killed the water capitalist and the tramway capitalist; we have weakened the power of the house capitalist by erecting suitable house accommodations for the poor; and incidentally we have damaged a few other more or less important capitalistic classes. But all this progress, so-called, in the direction of emancipating labor, has been in that direction but so much humbug. The price of the ground where it is urgently wanted has stiffened, and labor is rendered more helpless than ever.

---

To summarize the street car question, in the light both of general principles and of actual experience, we should consider municipal ownership of street car systems, not so much a general social reform as a civic reform. Essentially it is a resumption by the municipality of a public function of which municipalities are divested.

It is this that distinguishes municipal ownership of monopolies like street car lines, from the programme of socialism. Such municipal ownership is not socialistic. That socialists advocate it, is quite true. That it is part of the socialistic programme is also true. But socialists likewise advocate, and of necessity it would be part of the socialistic programme, that the police force shall be a government institution. Yet no one would pretend that a government police is socialistic in any distinctive sense. It is one thing to advocate the exercise by government of governmental functions; but quite another to advocate the exercise by government of private functions.

The management of factories, banks, stores, and the like, is a private function. Anyone may engage in these businesses without the aid or permission of government, except as government may have previously in-

Digitized by Google

terposed obstacles. An example of such obstacles is a license tax. When licenses are arbitrarily required, government permission must be obtained before individuals can engage in these occupations. But the requirement of licenses is arbitrary. It is in itself a governmental interference. In the absence of that, these businesses are open to all who choose to engage in them. That is the natural test of a private function, and such businesses are therefore in their nature private.

But no one can go into the street car business without the active cooperation of government. It is not a question of taking out an arbitrarily required license; it is a question of the nature of the business itself. No one can engage in it unless he obtains from government permission to prevent other people from doing the same business. He must, in other words, obtain from government the authority to exercise a governmental function—the function, in this case, of regulating the use of the highway.

The question, therefore, of municipalizing street car systems, is not a question of socialism. It does not call upon us to say whether government shall assume new functions, but whether it shall resume old ones. It is not a question of having government go into private business; but one of ending the custom of enabling private corporations to go into the government business.

---

To argue, as is often done, that American municipalities are too corrupt to resume these functions, is to argue in a circle. In what does municipal corruption chiefly consist? Is it not in accepting bribes from the beneficiaries of our street railway systems? Abolish the briber, and the public corruption would go with him.

Would the corruption then take on the new form of spoils in the appointment of municipal street car employes? A simple civil service system would be a protection against that, as in great degree—in as complete a degree as the application of the system—it has been in the post office, which at one time was among the most viciously corrupt of all our spoils institutions.

But even without a civil service system, politicians would find street car employment under municipal ownership no better field for spoils than it is at present under private ownership. Any alderman, any mayor, who favors street car corporations unduly, can now appoint and discharge street car employes at will. Where could you find a worse example of spoils than that?

---

It is no answer to the arguments for municipal ownership of street car systems that a tax on gross receipts, or even a reduction of fares, would accomplish the beneficial objects as well.

A tax on gross receipts is but a method of levying taxes upon street car passengers. It would tend to benefit real estate tax payers, by shifting part of their taxes upon great masses of people, usually on the poorer classes, in such manner as to keep them in ignorance of the fact that they were paying taxes, and so make it possible to refer slightingly to them as "non-taxpayers."

To reduce fares would directly benefit street car passengers. But the question would always be debatable as to how low the fares ought to be; and over that question the private companies, in their efforts to get as high fares as possible, would continue to demoralize local politics.

It is only by means of municipal ownership that passengers can be served at reasonable fares, without indirect taxation, and the most corrupting element of modern local politics be stamped out. So long as municipal functions are performed by private corporations, just so long will those corporations debauch municipal politics.

---

But even municipal ownership will not ultimately better the condition of the masses of the people. As soon as it begins to work smoothly, the money that the passengers save in reduced fares they will have to pay their landlords in augmented rents. Land values will rise as car fares fall, and as in a great transformation scene, the landed interest will take visible shape as the street car interest dissolves.

That is what has happened in Glasgow. It is what under similar circumstances, must in the very nature of things happen everywhere.

# NEWS

The treaty of peace between Spain and the United States, signed at Paris December 10, by the commissioners for the two countries, and of which a full abstract is given in No. 41 of The Public, was ratified on the 6th of February by the United States senate. There were 57 affirmative and 27 negative votes. Six absentees were paired—two negatives against four affirmatives. As the constitution requires a two-thirds vote of the senate for the ratification of treaties, the treaty here in dispute was carried with three votes to spare. The opposition to it hinged entirely upon the clauses ceding Porto Rico and the Philippine archipelago to the United States. It was insisted, either that the treaty should be so amended as to place these countries on the same footing as Cuba, as to which Spain merely relinquishes sovereignty, or that congress should make a declaration disclaiming any intention of forcible annexation. Neither was done. The opposition in the American senate having been defeated by the vote summarized above, nothing now remains to make the treaty operative but ratification by the Spanish cortes, which are summoned to convene at Madrid on the 20th.

---

On the eve of the ratification of the treaty at Washington a bloody conflict was started between American and Filipino troops at Manila. Of the origin, extent and result of this conflict it is as yet impossible to give an entirely trustworthy account. Press reports come under the censorship of cable messages which our government has recently established at Manila, and official reports from army and naval officers are not divulged completely. We offer, however, as full and intelligible an account of the affair as the circumstances permit.

---

The first news of the fight with the Filipinos came to the American public through the New York Sun, in a dispatch purporting to have originated in Manila on Sunday, the 5th. According to this dispatch the Filipinos had attacked Manila at 8:30 o'clock Saturday evening, and had fired upon the American outposts Sunday morning. Immediately upon the making of the attack, Gen. Otis had conveyed many of the women and children to vessels in the harbor. The attack was general and stubborn, but

Digitized by Google

was instantly repulsed, and Gen. Otis then had the situation well in hand. The same dispatch reported that Admiral Dewey had shelled the Filipinos while they were making the attack. Twenty Americans were reported as wounded, with none killed, while the Filipino loss was believed to have been considerable.

In response to a cablegram from the president requesting advices, Gen. Otis replied on Sunday. Whether the full message was given out at Washington is not known, but so much as was given out is as follows:

The insurgents made an attack upon the city of Manila at 8:30 o'clock Saturday evening. They fired upon the outposts all around the city. At this hour, nine o'clock Sunday morning, the fighting continues. The American troops have been successful in repelling the assault of the native troops.

The cruiser Charleston, the Monadnock and the gunboat Calino, which latter vessel was captured by Admiral Dewey during the war, are throwing shells into the insurgents' ranks north and south of the city, from which the severest attacks were made.

The American wounded number 20 at this writing. The loss of the insurgents is not known, but is believed to be far greater.

There has been no outbreak among the natives in the city.

The American women in the city, wives of the officers and others, have been taken on board the United States transports.

Spent balls from the insurgent lines are falling into the city. The situation is well in hand.

It should be observed that the similarity of the Sun's report to Gen. Otis's message is such as to suggest either that the former was taken from the latter, or that both were constructed under the same control.

The official report from Gen. Otis to the adjutant general, cabled also on Sunday, is, as the same was given out for publication, as follows:

Insurgents in large force opened attack on our outer lines at 8:45 last evening; renewed attack several times during night; at four o'clock this morning entire line engaged; all attacks repulsed; at daybreak advanced against insurgents and have driven them beyond the lines they formerly occupied, capturing several villages and their defense works; insurgent loss in dead and wounded large; our own casualties thus far estimated at 175, very few fatal. Troops enthusiastic and acting fearlessly. Navy did splendid execution on flanks of enemy; city held in check and absolute quiet prevails; insurgents have secured a good many Mauser rifles, a few field pieces and quick-firing guns, with ammunition, during last month. Situation is most satisfactory; no apprehension need be felt. Perfect quiet prevails in city and vicinity. List of casualties being prepared and will be forwarded as soon as possible. Troops in excellent health and spirits.

Two other official reports given out at Washington had been cabled from Manila on Sunday, the 5th. One was to the secretary of the navy from Admiral Dewey, who said:

Insurgents here inaugurated general engagement yesterday night, which has continued to-day. American army and navy generally successful. Insurgents have been driven back and our line advanced. No casualties to navy.

The other report was to Gen. Greely, chief signal officer, U. S. A., from Chief Signal Officer Thompson, of Gen. Otis's staff. He said:

Action continues since early morning; losses quite heavy; everything favorable to our arms.

The next official report was to the secretary of the navy from Admiral Dewey. It bore date at Manila, the 6th, which was Monday, and as given out was as follows:

Insurgents have attacked Manila. The Boston leaves to-day for Iloilo to relieve the Baltimore, which will return to Manila. Two men wounded yesterday on board Monadnock, one seriously.

A second official report from Gen. Otis bearing date, Tuesday, December 7th was given out as follows:

The insurgents' army concentrated around Manila from Luzon provinces, numbering over 20,000, possessing several quick-firing and Krupp field guns. Good portion of enemy armed with Mausers of latest pattern. Two Krupp guns and great many rifles captured. Insurgents fired great quantity of ammunition. Quite a number of Spanish soldiers in insurgent service, who served artillery. The insurgents constructed strong intrenchments near our lines, mostly in bamboo thickets. These our men charged, killing or capturing many of the enemy. Our casualties probably aggregate 250. Full reports to-day. Casualties of insurgents very heavy. Have buried some 500 of their dead and hold 500 prisoners. Their losses killed and wounded and prisoners probably 4,000. Took waterworks pumping station yesterday, six miles out. Considerable skirmishing with enemy, who made no stand. Pumps damaged; will be working within a week. Have number of condensers set up in city, which furnish good water. Troops in excellent spirits. Quiet prevails.

The American casualties reported by Gen. Otis up to Tuesday, were 205—killed 51, wounded 154. The insurgent casualties were then estimated at 3,500 killed and wounded, and 500 prisoners. The American list is not yet complete.

Gen. Otis's third official report to be given out for publication bore date Wednesday, the 8th. It is as follows:

Situation rapidly improving. Reconnoissance yesterday to south several miles to Lagunade Bay, to southeast eight miles, driving straggling insurgent troops in various directions, encountering no decided opposition; army disintegrated and natives returning to villages displaying white flag.

Near Caloocan, six miles north, the enemy made a stand behind intrenchments; charged by Kansas troops led by Col. Funston. Close encounter, resulting in rout of the enemy with heavy loss. Loss to Kansas, Lieut. Alford killed, six men wounded.

February 4 Aguinaldo issued lying proclamation, charging Americans with initiative and declared war. Sunday issued another, calling all to resist foreign invasion. His influence throughout this section destroyed; now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference; have declined to answer.

Insurgent expectation of rising in city night of 4th unrealized. Provost marshal general, with admirable disposition of troops, defeated every attempt. City quiet, business resumed; natives respectful and cheerful; fighting qualities of American troops a revelation to all inhabitants.

Descriptions of the fighting are given in press dispatches. From these, as from the official reports, it would appear that the Filipinos were the aggressors. They tell of an attack by the Filipinos about 8:45 o'clock Saturday night, which was brief. The fighting was resumed, however, at about 10 o'clock. Then came another lull between 3 and 4 Sunday morning, followed by sharp fighting for 20 minutes. After that the battle subsided until daylight, when the Americans made a general advance, and fighting continued during most of the day. Early in the afternoon the Filipinos appeared to have been routed, and the Americans were in possession of several villages and of the Manila water main and reservoir, which the Filipinos had theretofore controlled. Hundreds of native huts were fired by the Americans to dislodge their occupants. One church, in which Filipinos had fortified themselves, was set on fire by the Americans, and the escaping Filipinos were picked off with rifles as they were smoked out.

Digitized by Google

Though the Filipinos appeared, according to the press dispatches, to have been routed on Sunday, yet according to subsequent press dispatches they were still stubbornly resisting the American advance on Tuesday. At that time, according to the press dispatches, they had been driven back, after three days and nights of fighting, as far as ten miles to the east and south of Manila, and five miles to the north. The fighting is described in the press dispatches as having been "tremendously hard at times." Repulsed and driven back from their first positions with terrible loss, due chiefly to the sweeping fire from the warships in the bay, the Filiponos rallied in new positions and made stubborn resistance. The loss of life they suffered appears to have been terrible. American burial parties found hundreds of dead Filipinos in the rice fields, lying where they had fallen, or in the shelter of native huts which had escaped the conflagrations in which whole villages had been enveloped. Even as late as Tuesday, Filipino corpses were said to be lying thick in many places, in the heaps in which they had fallen. Among them were women who, with hair cut and in men's clothes, had fought to the death beside their husbands and brothers. Tottering old men and little boys armed only with knives were found shot down in the Filipino trenches where they had gone to participate in the fighting. The deadliest work of the Americans seems to have been done by the war vessels, which poured a withering fire into the Filipino trenches within range. To account for the comparatively slight American losses reported, it is explained that the Filipinos fired too high. But for this, it is said, the Americans could not have escaped appalling slaughter.

---

All the American reports imply, it will be observed, that the Filipinos were the aggressors. There have come from Filipino sources, however, positive denials of this, which are not without some confirmation from American sources. One American correspondent, Cowen, of the Chicago Record, gives this account of the beginning of the fight:

> It was 8:30 o'clock Saturday evening when three venturesome Filipinos ran past the pickets of the First Nebraska volunteers at Santa Mesa. They were challenged, and retired without replying. Once more they tried the experiment, were challenged and thrust back beyond the picket line. A third time they approached the Cossack picket maintained by the Americans at that point. Corp. Greely challenged them and then opened fire, killing one and wounding another. These shots aroused the insurgent line, stretching from Caloocan, near the bay, north of Manila, to Santa Mesa, in the rear of the city, and a fusillade was started at many points. The pickets of the First Nebraska, the First North Dakota and the First Montana regiments replied vigorously, and hot work began.

---

An examination of dispatches prior to the conflict shows other occurrences of like kind, except that no general conflict resulted. On the 20th of January an American sentry killed a captain of Filipino artillery, an act which was then denounced by the native press as "cowardly assassination." Five members of the dead captain's company attempted to enter the American lines to revenge his death, and one of them was killed by another American sentry. Other evidences of friction between the troops on each side have occurred from time to time.

---

But from Aguinaldo's proclamation of Saturday, the 4th, issued before the battle began, and mentioned in Gen. Otis's dispatch above, it would appear that whether or not he intended to precipitate a fight that night, he did intend to make war. Having been empowered by the Filipino congress to declare war in his discretion, Aguinaldo then proclaimed as follows:

> I order and command:
>
> First. That peace and friendly relations with the Americans be broken, and that the latter be treated as enemies, within the limits prescribed by the laws of war.
>
> Second. That the Americans captured be held as prisoners of war.
>
> Third. That this proclamation be communicated to the consuls and that congress order and accord a suspension of the constitutional guarantee, resulting from the declaration of war.

This proclamation was preceded by recitals, which do not appear in full in the American dispatches. Enough of them is given, however, together with the recitals of a second proclamation, issued on Monday, the 6th, to indicate that Aguinaldo complained of the attitude of the American government toward the Filipino republic, as intended to overthrow the latter, and that he charged the Americans with provoking hostilities. He referred in these recitals to the grievances specified in his proclamation of January 8, in which, in response to the proclamation of President McKinley promulgated by Gen. Otis, he accused the American government of bad faith. In his second proclamation Aguinaldo is reported as declaring that the outbreak at Manila was "unjustly and unexpectedly provoked by the Americans," as refering to "constant outrages and taunts" which had been causing misery to the Manilans; and as mentioning the meetings with American officials as "useless conferences." He speaks, too, of the "contempt shown for the Filipino government" as proving a "premeditated transgression of justice and liberty." He insists, further, that he tried to avoid, so far as possible, an armed conflict, but that all his efforts "were useless before the unmeasured pride of the Americans," whom he charges with treating him as a rebel because, to quote his language, "I defend the interests of my country, and would not become the instrument of their dastardly intentions." In conclusion, addressing his countrymen, Aguinaldo says:

> Be not discouraged. Our independence was watered freely by the blood of martyrs, and more will be shed in the future to strengthen it. Remember that efforts are not to be wasted that ends may be gained. It is indispensable to adjust our actions to the rules of law and right and to learn to triumph over our enemies.

---

That war was contemplated and prepared for by both sides long before the Manila fight, is evident from mail advices received on the 8th. They bring the Philippine news down to January 14. From these advices it would appear that Gen. Otis's Proclamation, made by order of President McKinley early in January, in which he asserted American sovereignty over the archipelago, was the chief cause of the resentment of the Filipinos, which culminated in the Manila fight.

---

From Washington it is announced that the war is to be prosecuted relentlessly with a view to securing complete control of the Philippines. To that end orders from Washington have been received at Manila, so it was reported from there on the 9th, to reenforce the Americans at Iloilo. Washington press dispatches announce, apparently by authority, that the Americans are now to move upon and capture Iloilo.

---

There is a better outlook in Cuba than in the Philippines. President

Digitized by Google

McKinley has communicated through a representative, with Gen. Gomez, and arranged for contributing $3,000,000 toward the payment of insurgent troops, upon their surrendering their arms to the Cuban assembly or its representatives. In testimony of his satisfaction, Gen. Gomez wrote from the headquarters of the Cuban army at Remedios, to President McKinley, on the 1st, as follows:

It has been a great pleasure to me to confer with your commissioner, Mr. Porter, introduced by my friend Quesada, and I am now aware of and pleased with your wishes. In a short time I shall go to Havana and confer with Gen. Brooke, so that everything will go well. Following your advice, I am willing to cooperate in the work of reconstructing Cuba.

---

England's Australian colonies are at last getting together. The colonial premiers who have been in conference upon the subject at Melbourne, Victoria, announce a unanimous agreement which promises to remove the objections to federation that have heretofore kept the colonies apart. Pursuant to this agreement the federal capital will be established in New South Wales, but at least 100 miles from Sydney, the colonial capital. The parliament is to consist of a senate and a house of representatives, and an absolute majority of the members of both houses is to decide all differences between the two. The Australian federation bill vests the legislative authority in the queen, who will be represented by the governor-general, and in two houses of parliament, the members of each being elected on the basis of manhood suffrage and each elector having only one vote. Each colony or state will return six members to the senate, for six years. The house of representatives will consist of sixty-four members elected for three years—twenty-four by New South Wales, twenty-three by Victoria, seven by South Australia, five by West Australia and five by Tasmania. The executive government is to consist of seven ministers.

---

With the English home government, legislative business is now resumed. Parliament met on the 7th. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had already been chosen liberal leader in place of Sir Wm. Vernon Harcourt, whose letter refusing to continue in that position was published some weeks ago. The Queen's speech, which foreshadows the policy of the party in power, was not especially significant. The new liberal leader, in replying to the address in response to the queen's speech, criticised the government's policy in China and in foreign affairs generally. In answering liberal questions in the house of lords, the premier—Lord Salisbury—announced that England did not contemplate the acquisition of territory in China nor the dismemberment of that empire; and he put forward as the most easily understood title of England to dominion in the Soudan, the title of conquest. At a meeting of the anti-Parnellite members of the Commons on the opening day, John Dillon resigned as chairman of the Irish parliamentary party.

---

Returning to American affairs we have to note the sentence imposed by the president upon Gen. Eagan, convicted by court-martial, of applying foul epithets to his superior officer, Gen. Miles, when testifying before the president's committee on the mismanagement of the war. The sentence is that Gen. Eagan be suspended from rank and duty for six years. This enables him to resume his rank a few days before the time for his retirement under the age limit. He will therefore be ultimately retired with the same rank and pay as if there had been no conviction. Meantime, during suspension, his pay, but not his allowances, will continue.

## NEWS NOTES.

—Count von Caprivi, former chancellor of the German empire, died near Frankfort on the 6th.

—James A. Sexton, commander in chief of the G. A. R., and one of President McKinley's war investigating committee, died on the 5th at Washington.

—The Washington state department has decided to decline to recognize the Austro-Hungarian claim for indemnity on account of the death of the Huns killed by Sheriff Martin's posse at Hazelton, Pa., during the coal strike in 1897.

—The Rev. James Monroe Taylor, D. D., president of Vassar college, has been unanimously chosen as president of Brown university, to succeed President Andrews, who resigned to become superintendent of the Chicago public schools.

—The grand jury of Cook county, Ill., in which is Chicago, reports that although the responsible officers of the street car companies deny that money is advanced by the company for jury bribing yet the grand jury is "loath to believe that anyone, court bailiff or other person, has the interest of street railroad companies so much at heart, or that there is a concert of mania among a number of individuals to contribute money for the purpose of debauching juries and robbing plaintiffs of their just rights of action." Indictments have been found against court bailiffs for bribing jurors in the interest of the companies.

---

## 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 February 4, 1899.

**Senate.**

On January 30 the senate considered the Bacon joint resolution disclaiming any intention on the part of the United States to exercise sovereignty over the Philippines and asserting its determination to leave the islands to the government of their people when a stable and independent government shall have been erected therein. It considered the same matter on the 31st, and also on the 1st, when Senator Lindsay submitted a resolution on the subject. Senator Spooner spoke on the 2d in opposition to the Vest resolution, and in the course of his speech was interrupted by Senator Tillman, who obtained consent to place in the Record an official report from Manila signed by Maj. J. T. Bell, of the engineer corps, dated August 29, in which Maj. Bell said:

There is not a particle of doubt but what Aguinaldo and his leaders will resist any attempt of any government to reorganize a colonial government here. They are especially bitter toward the Spaniards, but equally determined not to submit any longer to being a colony of any other government. What they would like best of all would be a Filipino republic with an American protectorate, for none realize their inability more clearly than they to maintain a republic without protection of some stronger power.

On the 3d the report of the conference committee on the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill was agreed to, and Senators Money and Daniel spoke at length on the Philippine question. On the 4th Senators Chilton and Wolcott spoke upon the same subject.

**House.**

Discussion of the army reorganization bill was continued on the 30th and 31st. On the latter day Representative Cummings offered the following amendment:

That no part of the army constituting the organization under this act shall be used for, or shall do the duty of, a posse comitatus, or be employed in putting down strikes or riots, or doing any police duty whatever, in any state in this union, except upon application of the legislature, or the executive of such state (when the legislature cannot be convened), in accordance with section 4, article 4, of the constitution of the United States.

The amendment was voted down, 121 to 93. The bill was then passed—yeas 168, nays 125, not voting 58. As passed, the bill fixes 50,000 as the minimum limit of the regular army, and empow-

Digitized by Google

ers the president in his discretion to increase the number to a maximum of 100,000. The river and harbor appropriation bill was taken up on the 1st, and considered at length, but without result. The consideration of this bill was continued on the 2d, when it was passed by a vote of 160 to 7. A call for the ayes and noes was voted down. The bill appropriates about $30,000,000. No business of general interest was transacted on the 3d except the adoption of the conference report on the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, carrying appropriations to the amount of $1,714,533.76. The West Point military academy appropriation bill was passed on the 4th; and statues of Thomas H. Benton and Francis P. Blair were formally received.

# MISCELLANY

### ILOILO.

"Heaven save us from our friends."

"Our freedom has been bought too dearly;
Our eyes have learned to see too clearly
To be cajoled by friend, who merely
Would take the place of vanquished foe!"
Cries unannexed Iloilo.

"Your sympathy bade nations wonder;
Not less your war's victorious thunder;
Your greed, the while, held meekly under,
Left for the last triumphant show,
Well might have warned Iloilo.

"Against our will you would control us,
Under your stars and stripes enroll us.
Therewith for freedom's loss console us.
Is it because you love us so?"
Questions astute Iloilo.

"Your mission work, already brewing
Abundant cause for bitter rueing,
Should hold you from renewed pursuing—
Should clearly bid your zeal forego
Salvation for Iloilo.

"Your wrongs at home cry for repairing,
Your hungry poor may grow more daring,
While you in foreign feuds are sharing.
Hands off, good friend Americo,
From much obliged Iloilo."

D. H. INGHAM.

### NO PRISON IN ICELAND.

In Iceland there are no prisons, and the inhabitants are so honest in their habits that such defenses to property as locks, bolts and bars are not required; nor are there any police in the island. Yet its history for 1,000 years records no more than two thefts. Of these two cases, one was that of a native who was detected after stealing several sheep, but as he had done so to supply his family, who were suffering for want of food, when he had broken his arm, provisions were furnished to them, and work was found for him when able to do it, and meanwhile he was placed under medical care; but the stigma attached to his crime was considered sufficient punishment. The other theft was by a German who stole 17 sheep. But as he was in comfortable circumstances, and the robbery was malicious, the sentence passed upon him was that he should sell all his property, restore the value of what he had stolen, and then leave the country or be executed; and he left at once.—The Coming Nation.

### WHERE SOME OF THE MONEY GOES TO.

William C. Whitney's new mansion will surpass almost every other in town in the magnificence of its interior fittings. Mrs. Whitney's rooms will be the most supurb and costly in this country. The walls will be covered with silk that cost $35 a yard. The furniture was made to order in France at an expense of $50,000.

The bathroom is snow-white marble, with the tub cut from a block of the stone and carved outside like a cameo. The faucets are of gold and the floor a work of rare art in mosaic. The ceilings of all the rooms were painted in France at a cost of $50,000 more. There are four of the rooms—a bedroom, a boudoir, dressing-room and bathroom.

The drawing-room will be far more gorgeous than any other in New York, and on its walls will hang the famous tapestries for which Mr. Whitney paid the fabulous sum of $1,000,000 in Paris. In no museum of all France is there anything like such a splendid collection of webs. They were made at the Louvre palace before even the days of the Gobelins, and for exquisite execution are unsurpassed in the world.—Telegram from New York to Chicago Chronicle of Feb. 2.

### THE NEGRO IN PROFESSIONAL LIFE.

The field secretary in the south of the American Missionary association, Rev. George W. Moore, of Nashville, has made a protracted and detailed investigation concerning the negro in professional life. He reports that in 1895-96 there were 1,319 students in professional courses in colored schools, and of these 126 were women.

There were 703 students and 76 graduates of theology, 124 students and 24 graduates in law, 286 students and 30 graduates in medicine, 6 graduates in pharmacy, and 126 students and 40 graduates in nurse training. There were 25 schools of theology, five schools of law and six schools of medicine.

In addition to these schools, which have been established for the negro in professional life, the doors of the north, east and west are open to them.

Since 1895 there have been 196 graduates who received diplomas from reputable medical colleges, making a total of 805. This list does not include the large number of negro men who have been graduated from northern institutions. There are 12 schools for training colored women as nurses. Two hundred nurses have been trained and are in training. Provident hospital, of Chicago, is the pioneer school in this work. The Freedmen's hospital, of Washington, D. C., is the largest hospital in the country open to colored people.

Colored medical associations exist in several southern states. There is also a national association of colored physicians. A number of colored physicians and surgeons are in the United States army with the rank of major.

There are about 400 colored lawyers in this country. They practice in all the courts.—Chicago Chronicle.

### WHY A SINGLE TAXER?

Religiously: The earth is the gift of the Creator to all his children, hence it is poor religion to make it an object of barter and sale, and particularly to speculate in it, or to use it as a means of oppression.

Ethically: Anyone but a robber or a beggar would scorn to take from another anything without rendering an equivalent. All honest exchange is an exchange of services, but economically human service is expressed in labor, or labor's product, wealth; land is neither, hence the payment of rent to a landlord, not being either wages or interest, can only be blackmail.

Sacredness of Property: Land. being the Creator's gift, the rent belongs to the owners of the land, the community. Again, the presence of the population in any given area, gives the rental value to that area, land values follow population, hence the payment of rent to the community is a payment for value received, that is, there is an exchange of services, the sacredness of social property is preserved. When labor and labor products are untaxed likewise the sacredness of private property is preserved.

The community has no right to private property, at any rate in time of peace, and should not tax wealth. Private parties cannot have a right to land rent because it is, in its nature, common property.

Liberty: Liberty consists in the right to use oneself to the extent it does not interfere with some one else, but a man cannot use himself, so long as land is private property, without permission of the land owner. The

Digitized by Google

owner of the land owns the user of the land.

Private property in land is slavery.

Labor question: The land question is the labor question. Wages depend upon access to land. A tax on the rent of land makes it impossible to keep it out of use hence it makes the best land available for use, which gives the highest wages, making oppression impossible.

"The bad economic condition of men is on account of tyranny, and the instrument of tyranny is taxation."

The Ideal Tax: The single tax is the only one that has ever been suggested that fulfills all the requirements of an ideal system. It is religious because it honors the Creator; it is moral because it fulfills the law, equal exchange of services. It preserves the sacredness of property, both that of the community and of the individual. It beautifully coordinates with socialism and individualism, giving them both their ideal perfection at the same time.

It gives the two great economic liberties, the liberty of production and the liberty of exchange. These two are the basis of the liberty of conscience, religion, thought, speech and action.

If a man is not free to live, all other liberty is mockery.

It settles the labor question. As it frees labor and capital at the same time, the seeming antagonism between them will disappear forever.

Under the single tax a man gets what he works for and he works for what he gets! Hence it cuts the tap root of covetousness.

"The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil;" the temptation to covetousness is in the easy possibility of getting something for nothing, in the present land system, and in other special privileges.

Special privileges can only be granted except by taking from the many their normal rights.

The single tax is the discovery of the nineteenth century; it will give us a new world in the twentieth century.—By the Late Rev. Charles E. Garst, of Tokyo, Japan.

## OBJECTIONS TO BUYING KINDLING WOOD FROM CHARITY ORGANIZATIONS.

For The Public.

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been in the kindling wood business for the past 35 years, am fairly well experienced in it and have served the families in this neighborhood and have never had a complaint of any kind; but my trade has been greatly reduced in the last few years on account of a so-called Charity Organization, where the customers that have left me order their kindling wood now; as my drivers tell me, when they come to the yard after delivering an order, that they have seen a charity wagon delivering an order at one of my former customer's. Well, I tell them that after awhile we will all have to go to the charity yard to work, as my business is growing less and I will have to let my men go accordingly.

I have had some of my men working for me from 15 to 20 years, and it came very hard for me to discharge them. I told them I could not help it, as I had no work I had to let them go, and if business would pick up again I would take them back. A few years ago I had from 50 to 60 men working for me, and now I have only ten, which shows the falling off of trade on account of the Charity Organizations.

Most of my men were married and had families of from five to fourteen children. After discharging those men on a Saturday night, when they would receive their pay, their wives would come to me with one child on their arm and another one tugging on their dress and ask me, with tears in their eyes, what their husbands were discharged for, and the little babies would look at me as if I was robbing them of their bread and butter. They told me that their husbands worked so long for me and that they never worked anywhere else. It would be the cause of breaking up their little home and separating their little family, which I found to be true, as in a short while there was a Gerry agent at my office and would ask me about my family so and so. I would tell him they were a good family, but times were very hard and I had to let him go. The agent told me some neighbor had written a letter that the children have been neglected, as they were always on the street in a filthy condition. I told him I supposed their mother was out working and could not give them the proper care, and that turned out to be the case.

Then some ladies from other institutions came to me, inquiring about other children whose parents could not support them, and therefore had to give them up to some place until they could make a home for them again.

I told some of the men to go over to the Charity Organization and try to get work, but they told me they could only earn 50 cents a day, and it was of no use. One man went to them and they put his name in the books and sent an agent to find out why I discharged him, and I told the agent it was on account of their organization taking my customers away under disguise of charity, when in fact it was creating pauperism, as the families of these men had to break up house and send their children to live on the charity of others.

I have always paid my men the best wages I could afford, so as to make them self-supporting, which is what every man wants. When he works his week he wants his wages, that he may use it to the best advantage for himself and family, and not live on charity of others. I always hire honest men, that I can recommend to anyone, and think that every family ordering wood wants none but men that can be depended upon, as their servants cannot watch a man in the house all the time, as there have been a great many mysterious robberies of late in private houses.

I always inform my men to be very careful when going in and out to be sure and close every door tight, as I myself was in a cellar, and when I went to where the wood was generally kept there was a washtub, and in removing it a man came out from under. He pleaded for me not to say anything, but I brought him upstairs and told one of the servants to tell the lady of the house to come down. She, having a soft heart, let him go, but, having done my duty, it was all I had to do.

I have supplied wood to the Bon Secour sisters for ten years free, St. Luke's hospital at a reduction of two dollars per cord for ten years, paid all doctor bills for my men. See Bradstreet and R. G. Dun & Co. for my rating.

I gave a great deal of money to other charitable purposes, and tried to give what I could to the families that formerly worked for me.

This is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I may have served you with wood, and you left me to do charity. If you were aware of the kind of charity it was, you would be with me yet. If you would read the New York World of May 13, 1894, it would give you the true facts.

This paper has a full account of the full working of the so-called Charity Wood Yard, and by reading it you can see that it does very little good to those actually deserving of charity.

The men who do get work are often picked up from the streets, and are apt to have contagious diseases or vermin, and their character may be such as to be dangerous to let them enter or become familiar with a house while delivering wood. Yours respectfully,

EDWARD J. M'CLUSKEY.
Cor. 36th St. and First Ave., New York.

Digitized by Google

## THE STATUE AND THE QUARRY.

A sermon recently delivered in Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, Ohio, by the Dean, the Rev. Chas. D. Williams. From Author's MS.

Isaiah LI:1. "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord; look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and the hole of the pit whence ye were digged."

The prophet who uttered the discourses recorded in the latter part of our book of Isaiah, was addressing a people in exile upon the eve of their return to their Father-land. They had been passing through novel experiences. They had been sojourning in a foreign land. They had been mingling with alien peoples. The national isolation of centuries had been rudely broken down by the captivity, and they had for a time been brought into most unusual and intimate contact with the world. One danger of that new experience was that they might be so absorbed into this larger life of the world as to lose their own national identity and forget their own national mission. Therefore as the people are about to take up once more their career as a nation, the prophet exhorts them to take up also again their ancient traditions, to get into closer touch with their past, to remember and be true to their ancestry and lineage. "Look unto Abraham, your father, and to Sarah that bare you; for I called him alone and blessed him." In introducing that exhortation, he uses a beautiful figure in the words of our text. "Hearken unto me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord; look unto the rock when ye were hewn, and the hole of the pit whence ye were digged."

Here is some beautiful statue or pillar of costly marble or granite, carved, polished, finished and set in its place in the temple or the palace. Now that pillar or statue bears a double relation, so to speak, and has a double duty. It must fit into its present surroundings. It must belong to the temple, the palace where it finds its present home. It must fulfill the intention which placed it there. It must enter harmoniously into the architectural and artistic plan of which it is now a part. It must give its beauty and strength to the structure. It cannot be a mere mass of unshapen and unshapely marble, such as one might find in the hillside quarry. No, it must be the statue, the pillar of the temple, the palace. That is its duty to the present.

But it must also remember its past. Indeed, it can be true to its present only by being true also to its past. It must "look continually unto the rock whence it was hewn, and the hole of the pit whence it was digged." Even in the temple it must never forget the hillside quarry whence it found its origin. Whatever change of form it undergoes, it must maintain the integrity and identity of those native elements which make its substance. It must not in a false ambition to assimilate itself to its present environment, be ashamed of being granite or marble and strive to become like the plaster or stucco work that surrounds it. Nay, it must ever be itself. That is its duty to its past, its history, its ancestry and lineage.

So Israel, the prophet implies, must in a sense be a new Israel in that new world which it had entered. New relations surrounded it, new obligations pressed upon it and it must adapt itself to them. But yet if the nation were rightly to fulfill its mission to that new world, it must still be the old Israel. It must be true to its past. It must maintain its traditions. It must remember its ancestry and lineage, and be faithful to the high calling of God that had come to it thereby. It must not lose its national integrity and identity in a false ambition to become as one of the peoples of the world about it. Nay, it must be Israel still, the elect of the Lord, the people of religion.

There are two forces at work everywhere in human society upon the due and proportionate combination of which depends the best development of that society. We call them respectively the conservative and the radical or progressive forces. They arise out of two characteristic attitudes of the human mind. One is the attitude which is continually looking backward, which maintains traditions and makes much of the past. The other is the attitude which sets the face ever forward, which is always adapting itself to the present and looking eagerly toward the future. Some one has aptly illustrated the nature of these two forces and their effects upon society from the life of a tree. The progressive or radical force corresponds to the growing power of the tree, its vitality. The conservative corresponds to the encircling bark. Given a tree with great vitality but with little or no bark, and you have lush and luxuriant growth but a soft, spongy porous texture. Given a tree with tough, unyielding bark and feeble vitality, and growth is throttled. But given the two in due and just proportions, and you have the towering and majestic oak, with its firmly knit texture, its hard and solid wood, its tremendous strength.

It is this need of a due conservatism, or rather the need of the right combination of these two forces, that I would emphasize this morning; and I would illustrate it in three applications; first, to the life of the church; second, to the life of the nation; and the third, to the life of the individual.

* * * * * * * *

I do not know where this need of a due conservatism, or rather of a proportionate combination of the conservative and the progressive elements, is more apparent than in the life of our nation just at this juncture. We are very much in the condition of Israel when the prophet addressed to it the exhortation of our text. A long period of national isolation is behind us, and from it we are emerging into the life of the world. Expansion is in the air. Along with that expansion comes a great danger, the danger of losing ourselves and being absorbed into the life of the world, of letting go our individuality and being assimilated too much to the peoples about us and so losing our national identity. We are under a great temptation just now to forget our ancestry and lineage, to let slip our ideals, and adopt those of the nations about us and so fail of our mission.

I recognize that a new era requires new methods and new policies. Providence is unmistakably leading us as a people out into a larger, broader, and I hope, deeper national life than we have ever known before. And we must follow fearlessly that leading. To refuse would be to prove faithless in our destiny and recreant to our trust as a nation. We must adapt ourselves to the new environment in which God has set us. We must take up the new work he has laid upon us. And that means necessarily new methods, new policies. Because George Washington and Thomas Jefferson rode in stage coaches is no reason why we should scorn the express train or the electric motor for fear of being set down as unpatriotic. Neither should we incur the accusation of disloyalty and un-Americanism because we find unavailable to-day the policy of isolation which they deemed necessary to the life of the infant republic. Such ultra-conservatism would throttle the nation's fast developing life with the swaddling bands of its infancy.

No, new days require new policies, new tasks new methods; a new environment demands fresh adaptations. All that we grant most assuredly; but mark you, not new ideals, new purposes, another spirit, another conception of the nation's mission. And we are in danger of forgetting that.

The ideal for which this nation of

Digitized by Google

ours stands and has always stood most singularly and preeminently among the peoples of the earth, is the democratic ideal. That ideal is often mistaken. It is not merely a matter of arithmetic. It does not mean simply that each one should count as one. At heart it is rather an ethical ideal. It means essentially that every man, high or low, rich or poor, should count according to his manhood. It is a mistake to suppose that in the most democratic of democracies, with the most universal of suffrages, every man armed with a ballot affects equally the policies and the legislation of his country. No, that depends upon his influence. And the influence which the ideal democracy would emphasize is the influence of character. Each man should count according to his manhood.

But that democratic ideal is greatly imperilled among us in these days. Indeed I doubt if anywhere else in the world it is so imperilled as it is to-day in these United States of America. No where, I am persuaded, are the simple fundamental rights of manhood, the rights of men as men, in greater danger than in this land of the free.

The democratic ideal has long been imperilled from within. Go, listen to the talk of the drawing-room, the counting-room, the club, or read our periodical literature, and you will find it frequently burdened with sneers at democracy. Universal suffrage is pronounced flippantly a universal failure. An aristocracy is boldly proposed, and that the worst sort of an aristocracy, the aristocracy of wealth, a plutocracy. There is something softening, humanizing, refining about high birth and ancient lineage; but the pure and simple power of money is utterly coarsening and hardening in its effects on character, and its tyranny is the most heartless and ruthless of oppressions. And yet men are saying on every hand: "Let those who pay the taxes rule. Let the men of weight and worth decide our policies and make our legislation." But the weight meant is in gold, not in character; and worth is estimated not in manhood, but in stocks and bonds. That standard has fixed itself on our popular speech. When you ask: "How much is so and so worth?" the answer comes invariably in terms of the stock market, in dollars and cents, not in moral and ethical values. Already colossal individual fortunes and vast aggregations of capital in the hands of combinations do more than threaten our liberties. They over-awe courts of justice, legislatures and governments. Against them the rights of the common man cannot stand.

And that democratic ideal is now threatened also from without. The fortunes of war or the act of Providence has put into our control certain islands of the sea. We dare not surrender them to the ancient tryanny under which they have groaned for centuries. We must protect them from the rapacity of European powers. We may have to hold them for a time with a firm hand until their child people shall have learned the difficult art of self-government, which they shall exercise either as independent states or as parts of our own greater republic. All that is just, right, inevitable. But there is an ambition abroad to ape the military peoples of Europe in their greed of conquest. There is a thought in many minds to hold these lands permanently simply as conquered territory to be exploited for commercial purposes only, and so to write down in our permanent vocabulary the word "subject" in place of "citizen" and "colony" or "province" in place of "sovereign state." When that day comes, as God forbid it should ever come, the democratic ideal will be dead, and our nation will have failed of her mission.

It is not the business of the pulpit to meddle with politics, or to deal with the methods of public administration. I am sure that some of you are thinking of reminding me of that. I need not the reminder. But my friends, it is the business of the pulpit to deal with ethical principles, and that too in the national as well as the individual life. And the time has come, it seems to me, when the pulpit and the press, ay, and every loyal citizen, should raise again the old watchwords of our national ideal and mission: "Every government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," "A government of the people, for the people, and by the people," and "Let every man count according to his manhood, and not according to his accidents of possession." Yea, the time has come in this our Israel when we need anew the old exhortation: "Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and the hole of the pit whence ye were digged." Policies may vary and methods change, but let us ever keep true to the principles and the spirit of the democratic ideal into which this nation was baptized at its birth in the blood of the revolution, and rebaptized in the blood of civil strife. The statue must belong to its niche in the temple, the pillar to its site, ay, but let it be still in substance and essence the same granite or marble that it was in the original hillside quarry.

Just a word before I close as to individual application of my lesson. There are men and women who get all their beliefs and principles simply by inheritance. They accept them without question and hold them without revision, just because they have so received them. They believe thus and do so, merely because their fathers believed thus and did so. For them the faith of authority never passes up into the higher faith of personal conviction. It is always something to be held tightly in the hand; it is never incorporated organically into the soul. They never live their own lives; they never are themselves. They are ever the slaves of precedent, custom, authority, tradition. In such ultra-conservative lives no liberty, no individuality, ay, no spiritual life worth the having, is possible. Their very peace is stagnation, if not paralysis.

There are others who are perpetually restless. There is nothing fixed or permanent about them. There is no continuity or consistency to their lives. Nothing is settled. There are no definite beliefs about which the life may crystallize and find solidity. All is in a perpetual flux. Everything is always an open question with them. They are always analyzing and testing the very foundations of their belief. They accept nothing on trust. They are always following the latest fad or ism in fashion. Consequently they have no "joy or peace in believing," and they make no progress. What scientist could accomplish aught who never took anything as settled, who had no fixed first principles to which he held fast even as working hypotheses, who was forever overturning and questioning all things? How much less the Christian? Neither have they any settled principles of conduct. Their ideals are always dancing and fluctuating before them like wills-of-the-wisp, or dissolving like phantasmagoria. Consequently their characters are spongy and porous, if not viscous and fluid. They are ready to yield to every religious or irreligious surrounding, every moral or immoral environment in which they find themselves. In such a life there can be no true growth, no real character.

The true rule of the Christian life is this: "Prove all things." Let your radicalism be as searching as you will. Go to the roots of things. Be satisfied with nothing until you have made it your very own. Let your principles and beliefs be your principles and beliefs, and not somebody's else. And when you have done that, "Hold fast that which

Digitized by Google

is good." Let some things be settled, the fundamentals of faith and conduct at least. Get something fixed about which life and character may grow solidly and surely. The counsels of your father, the instruction learned at a Christian mother's knee, the visions and ideals of your own pure and clear-eyed youth—after all you are not apt to find anything in life much better than those. Experience may shed new illuminations upon them, wisdom may give you wider and deeper interpretations. Be ready to accept them all with glad thankfulness. Yes, but hold fast to the substance. The man, who, while ever welcoming with large spiritual hospitality the wider views, and the more adequate beliefs which the years bring with them, can yet say at the end: "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith;" the man who, while gladly conscious of broadening, mellowing and refining influence of experience, has ever kept the vision of his youth unblurred before him and his eye single to its chosen ideal, that man is the truest type of the Christian. In such a life only there runs throughout that persistence, that continuity, about which alone a strong and consistent character can grow.

## THE REFERENDUM IN PRACTICE.

This little bit of local discussion, translated from the "Journal de Geneve," of Switzerland, for The Direct Legislation Record, of Newark, N. J., shows how simply the initiative and referendum are applied in practical affairs. The seriousness with which the Journal debates the probable result of demanding a referendum on a bicycle tax, is delightfully humorous to the American. Imagine referring a little bicycle tax back to the people for approval or disapproval! Why, we can't even refer back to the people the question as to whether we shall enslave 8,000,000 people!

The Swiss Touring Club, by its president, —the stir caused by this association undertaking an initiative in the matter of the Referendum against a cycle tax. The S. T. C. is not a political organization. One might say that is not a political issue, but a tax that touches the cyclists. But without quarreling with the honorable president of the S. T. C., we do not advise a Referendum under the present circumstances. We believe it would meet a certain check.

There is in fact a portion of the public that is hostile to this sport—a feeling more or less justified by the numbers of accidents caused by fools and those who practice riding and who should be prohibited from this dangerous exercise. Unfortunately the public doesn't distinguish between these hard-brained people who abuse the hygienic sport and the crowd of amateurs who use the bicycle as a simple recreation, or a useful means of locomotion for the laboring classes living out of town. Under these conditions a Referendum is a two-edged sword. It is better to accept the five franc tax with a good grace, and put more energy into demanding good roads. However, it is needless to say that if a Referendum is demanded, we shall favor it.

## SPOLIATION.

She hits her brothers and takes their tops,
  And wheedles them out of their toys;
And I think, how like us great grown-ups
  Are the tricks of the girls and boys!

When May takes Dorothy's doll away
  And Johnny's seven cents,
It's clear that May is following out
  "The logic of events."

As Johnny is very small and weak,
  It follows, as we may see,
That May can't shirk, if she even would,
  Her "mighty destiny."

But children, being of candid mind,
  Not even by implication,
Call acts like these "benevolent,"
  Or speak of "assimilation."

When little May with her stronger arm
  Takes from her sisters and brothers,
She never even pretends it's done
  For the greater good of others,

Nor seeks with a canting phrase to cloak
  Spoliation a little thinly—
And that's the difference exists
  'Twixt May and Mr. McKinley!

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

In his speech at the trial of Warren Hastings Edmund Burke has this to say of the right of conquest: "The title of conquest makes no difference at all. No conquest can give right, for conquest, that is force, cannot convert its own injustice into a just title by which it may rule others at its pleasure." No sophistry can overcome this plain proposition of righteousness. It is affirmed in the conscience of every man. And if this country is to escape the ruin which overtakes wrongdoers it must test its policy by the standards of right. This is the essential principle of true American policy.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"Two months ago," says a private letter from Denver, Col., to a well-known lawyer of this city, "we had four daily papers in Denver howling for territorial expansion, and I am very happy to say that two of them have completely changed in their position on the question, another occupies a neutral position, while the fourth has refrained from a discussion of expansion." Denver is an exceptionally alert community and often sends to Washington the first tidings of cold waves.—Boston Transcript.

Did you ever hear of an unemployed rabbit? That is to say, did you ever hear of a rabbit waiting for some other rabbit to give him an opportunity to go into the field and gather something to eat? No, you never did. And the reason for it is that you never met a rabbit that has as little sense as you have. —Living Issues.

If we pay Spain $20,000,000 for her equity in the Philippines, how many times $20,000,000 should we pay the Filipinos for their equity in the Philippines?—Omaha World-Herald.


# Finance and Transportation

BY

JAY D. MILLER.

**Paper; 96 pages; Single Copies, 10c., 20 Copies, $1.00.**

**Gov. H. S. Pingree, Lansing, Mich.**
"This publication presents in their true light, questions that immediately concern the American people."

**Mayor S. M. Jones, Toledo, O.**
"It is one of the most comprehensive statements of our social and economic problems that has come to my hands."

**Prof. Geo. D. Herron, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.**
"Its facts are presented in a very unprejudiced and helpful spirit, and can not be set aside. I use it among my students and recommend it everywhere."

**Louis F. Post, Chicago.**
"It is an intellectual mine which all parties to the controversy may profitably explore."

JAY D. MILLER'S SONS, Oak Park. Ill.

# 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 .......... (Religion)
God Caring for Us .......... (Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
GERMANTOWN, PA tf

*HARRIS F. WILLIAMS*

*ATTORNEY AT LAW*

*1101 Chamber of Commerce Building . CHICAGO*



# 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 687, Chicago, Ill.**


Digitized by Google