

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1899.

Number 46.

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 protectionists of Germany, commonly known as agrarians, boldly give away the real character of protection. Their representative body has demanded a law of the German reichstag, forbidding peasants to leave their places of birth before 20 years of age. Such a law, these German protectionists argue, would settle the farmhand question. Labor would no longer be scarce, and wages could be kept down. This is the essence of protection, not alone in Germany, but also in the United States. Our protectionists, however, are more subtle in their methods than are the simple German landlords.

Chicago public school teachers have discovered that John D. Rockefeller contemplates drawing them into his educational net. His college president, Mr. Harper, has prepared a bill, now before the Illinois legislature, which would put the public school teachers of Chicago under the control of the Rockefeller university. Another measure originating from the same source would prevent the organization of any new college without an endowment of at least \$100,000. It looks as if an educational trust would soon figure among Mr. Rockefeller's assets.

It is gratifying to find our own view of the Russian peace proposal borne out by Tolstoi, whose devotion to the cause of universal peace is not open to question. In the London Chronicle he writes of the proposal as "only worthy of contempt and derision;" and sensibly says "it will be impossible to reduce armaments

while nations not only persist in acquiring new possessions, like the Philippines, Port Arthur, and the rest, but also keep what they have acquired, like Poland, India, Alsace-Lorraine and the rest."

With the thermometer at zero, nine men were exposed for an hour in a pillory, and then with bared backs were lashed with a cat-o'-nine-tails. The punishment was brutalizing alike to the miserable convicts who endured it and to the unfortunate man who administered it; and we should all so regard it, if the tragedy had occurred in the last century or in a barbarous country. But it occurred last Saturday in the city of Wilmington and state of Delaware. Let us not be too severe, however, in our thoughts upon the lawmakers of Delaware. Their instincts are no more brutal than those of the average lawmaker. They differ only in having the courage of their brutality.

It is a significant fact that only criminals of the poorer sort are pilloried and lashed in Delaware. On the occasion referred to above, one of the victims had stolen a pair of opera glasses, another had stolen a harness, another had taken money from his father, one had committed forgery, and two had been convicted of burglary. These are the kind of cases that are always reported—crimes which are peculiarly those of the poor. The pillory and the whipping post in Delaware are the poor man's punishment. The penalties for crimes to which the rich are addicted are of a different sort.

Publication has been made of the report of Mr. McKinley's committee on the mismanagement of the war. This report is of little importance. It is the unofficial opinion of a few friends of the president, based upon

such testimony as was voluntarily offered and they chose to consider. The committee possessed no more legal authority in the premises than the Grid-iron or the Beefsteak club would have had, if in one of its frolics it had undertaken to inquire into the conduct of the war. This presidential committee had no legal power to compel the attendance of witnesses, to order the production of papers, to enforce answers to question, or even to administer oaths. False testimony before it could not be punished as perjury nor punished at all.

The censorship which President McKinley has established over cable messages from the Philippines, continues to make it impossible to obtain reliable information regarding the war he is waging against the Philippine republic. The only uncensored report we have yet received comes through the Filipino junta at Hong-Kong from Filipino sources, and is doubtless colored in favor of the Filipinos much as reports from American sources are colored in favor of the Americans. But by considering the Filipino and the American reports together, in the light of known circumstances, it is possible to draw inferences that would seem fairly to describe the situation.

It is reasonably certain that the fighting at Manila began at about 8:30 on the night of the 4th. All American reports agree as to that. It is also certain that this fighting was precipitated by the attempt of three Filipinos to pass the American sentry, and the killing by the sentry of one of them and his wounding of another. The American reports agree that this first fighting was brief, and that hostilities were resumed about midnight and became general during the early morning of the 5th and through the fore part of that day, the fleet partici-

pating with deadly effect. In the Filipino report nothing is said of the first brief fight, but it is asserted that the American fleet unexpectedly and without provocation opened fire. A comparison of these apparently conflicting reports, with due allowance for coloring and censorship, leads with reasonable certainty to the conclusion that the first outbreak occurred as the American reports have it, but was local as well as brief, and that the Filipinos generally were unaware of hostilities until fired upon near midnight by the fleet. We believe that uncensored reports will substantially confirm this conclusion.

Another inference from the colored and censored reports of both sides is that most of the Filipino killed and wounded were either unarmed, or armed only with primitive weapons; and that these casualties were due almost wholly to the fleet which, according to our own reports, swept away whole villages and slaughtered natives by the hundred. In other words, it is a reasonable inference that the well equipped Filipino army withdrew before the American advance, and that the destruction of Filipino life was suffered in greatest proportion by the villagers whose homes were swept away.

This is asserted by the Filipino reports to be the case, and circumstances corroborate them. In the first place it is well known to be the Filipino mode of warfare to recede before the enemy's advance and draw him into marshes where he will be exposed to disease, into jungles where his men may be picked off, and before natural fortifications that are impregnable. All reports indicate that this is what the Filipino army did at Manila. In the second place, though Gen. Otis has reported enormous Filipino casualties, even specifying their extent with some approach to detail, he reports no capture of arms except in the vaguest manner. Two Krupp guns are all the heavy pieces he claims to have captured, though it is well

known that the Filipinos were much better equipped in this particular. And as to small arms, he tells of having captured "a great many rifles," but gives no indication of what he regards as constituting "a great many," nor as to whether or not they are the Mauser rifles, with which the Filipino army is known to be well supplied. The vagueness of this statement, along with the positive assertions of the Filipinos that aside from two obsolete Krupp guns which they had abandoned, no capture of arms had been made up to the 7th, is no slight evidence in confirmation of the inference that a real victory over the Filipinos had not then been achieved, and that their killed and wounded were largely civilian villagers.

Further confirmation of the same inference is found in the later reports from Iloilo, upon which the Americans have advanced and which they have taken. There was no resistance. The Americans did not suffer loss, and unless official reports have been emasculated for publication, neither did the Filipinos. What the Filipino troops did at Iloilo was what they evidently had done at Manila, and what they always did in their wars with Spain; they retired from the city and took up a position from which they can harass their enemy, but to which he cannot penetrate without getting into natural difficulties and dangers where his men who escape sharpshooters become a prey to disease.

That this is the kind of entertainment to which the American people have been invited by President McKinley's imperialistic land-grabbing policy, is at last coming to be realized by the imperialists themselves. An Associated Press dispatch of the 12th from Manila intimates that despite all the jubilant reports of the preceding week, discouragement among the men at Manila has set in. Says this dispatch—

A week ago those who took an optimistic view predicted that the terrible lesson just administered to the rebels would settle the question of Filipino independence in short order. But

this prediction has not been fulfilled. As a matter of fact, the rebels are now scattered throughout the country, bushwhacking, except at Malabon, where they are gathered in force. Even there their methods savor more of guerrilla than civilized warfare, every bush and clump of trees furnishing a cover for their sharpshooters.

It is to be regretted, of course, that the Filipinos adopt methods that savor of guerrilla warfare, instead of standing up before civilized killing machines to be shot down by hundreds and thousands in a reputable manner. Their conduct in this particular is extremely reprehensible. But there is no reason to expect them to reform. For, as the Associated Press dispatch continues—

Unfortunately, for miles around the land is studded with bamboo jungle, and open spaces are few and far between. This affords the natives, who fight better under cover, a distinct advantage. In many places the jungle is so dense that the eye cannot penetrate it, and only by the flashes of their rifles is the whereabouts of the enemy indicated.

That ought to be enough to suggest the kind of man-trap Mr. McKinley has prepared for American soldiers.

In confirmation of the pessimistic dispatch from which we have just quoted, we are authorized to publish an extract from a private letter of an American military officer at Manila. For obvious reasons his name is withheld. The letter was written about a month ago. So much of it as is pertinent to the Filipinos reads:

I believe we could drive back their whole line in a day, without much loss; but the country is such that they could fall back into the mountains beyond the possibility of danger, to reappear at any time when circumstances warranted, and the same condition be forced upon the United States that Spain has had to endure—the necessity of keeping an army of occupation to hold the large and important points, and the frittering away by disease of thousands of our men annually, without advancing the interest of our government.

That officer's judgment is being verified. Since he wrote, the Filipino line has been driven back in a day without much loss, as he thought it could be; but ever since, just as he predicted, the Filipinos have forced upon the Americans daily repetitions

of harassing and deadly guerrilla warfare. Our troops are winning daily victories—decisive victories, the reports have it—yet each succeeding day they have to win another “decisive victory” not far from where they had won a “decisive victory” the day before. Truly we have entered upon a career of national shame, which promises also to be for our soldiers a long drawn out career of inglorious suffering and death.

Senator Mason's complaint that he was “buncoed” by the imperialistic party in the senate appears to have more back of it than he has revealed. The gist of his complaint is that promises were made that upon the ratification of the treaty, one of the resolutions declaring against imperialism should be voted upon. But the promises appear to have been much more to the point. On the day before the treaty vote, Senator Perkins, in an interview sent to the Chicago Record, used this language:

I have been assured by republican leaders in the senate and by republicans who stand high in administration circles that it is the intention after the treaty has been ratified to urge the passage of a resolution declaring that the United States will deal with the Philippines exactly as it is now dealing with Cuba, and that the Filipinos will be assured of a stable independent government as soon as they are prepared for it, the United States to reserve a coaling and naval station in the islands, with a commercial arrangement advantageous to our trade. This statement has been made to me positively and directly by several gentlemen in whom I have the utmost confidence and who are high in the councils of the administration. With this understanding several senators who have been opposed to ratification of the peace treaty will vote for it to-morrow.

How honorably meant were those assurances, the proceedings in the senate on the 14th disclosed. The McEnery resolution was then taken up. Unless this resolution is designed to satisfy the Louisiana sugar planters with assurances of a protective tariff between our own country and our outlying provinces, it is meaningless, as an examination of its text in our news department will demonstrate. An

amendment was offered, however, which would have put this nation right before the world and its own conscience. The amendment disclaimed any imperialistic purpose. But upon that amendment there was a tie, which the vice president decided in favor of imperialism. That is the way Mr. Perkins's “republicans who stand high in administration circles,” kept their faith.

Congressman Cannon, chairman of the committee on appropriations of the lower house of congress, has startled the country with his estimates of the treasury deficiency we are soon to face. Secretary Gage had placed the deficiency for the year ending next June at \$112,000,000; but on the 9th, in warning his party in the house against improvident appropriations, Mr. Cannon said that Secretary Gage's figure was too low. By Mr. Cannon's estimate, the deficiency next June will not be less than \$179,000,000 inclusive of the \$20,000,000 to be paid to Spain pursuant to the treaty. Exclusive of that item, the deficit will be \$159,000,000.

Judged by these deficiency estimates, the Dingley law has been a total failure as a revenue raiser, or else imperialism has already begun to cost us dear. To be sure, we became involved in a war which was not contemplated by the Dingley law; but the expenses of the war will not much exceed the amount realized from war bonds. War expenses and war bonds may therefore offset each other. So it appears that the tax receipts under the Dingley law, though supplemented by tax receipts under the war revenue law, will fall short of meeting ordinary government expenses up to June 30, 1899, by \$112,000,000 according to Secretary Gage's estimate, and by \$159,000,000 according to Mr. Cannon's estimate. Whether the fault for this is chargeable wholly to Mr. Dingley's tariff law, or partly to Mr. McKinley's imperialistic policy, it is chargeable altogether to the plutocratic regime which now controls the federal government.

All other objections aside, this condition of the treasury would not encourage men of genuine public spirit to increase the standing army to 50,000 and empower a thriftless administration to increase it in discretion by 50,000 more. Yet the lower house has passed with a hurrah a bill of precisely that character, and through administration channels it is announced that the president's clique in the senate intends to jam it through. For that purpose a special session is to be called if necessary. But the people are not to be allowed to suspect that the special session is for the purpose of establishing a large standing army. To mislead them the appropriation bills at the present session are to be held back. Senatorial opponents of the standing army measure have been warned that unless they allow the standing army bill to go through, no appropriation bills will be allowed to pass. Thus the president will have an apparently legitimate excuse for calling a special session, in which the standing army measure may figure nominally as an incident but in truth as the prime object.

Advocates of a standing army play upon the national desire for a drilled military force for defense. But what we need for defense is not a standing army. Standing armies oppress; they do not defend. The people defend. For that reason it is important not that we have a standing army, but that all the people have the benefit of military education and drill.

Chancellor McCracken, of the New York University, when speaking last week at the national military convention, indicated the true military principle for a republic. He said that we do not want a large standing army, but we do want the 80,000 men that every year leave the high schools of this country competent to drill companies. That is precisely what we want. And if imperialism continues to advance, and a standing army begins to menace popular liberty, we shall want it for nothing more urgently than to furnish drilled citizens to fight the standing army itself.

Lincoln's birthday was dishonored this year by as sordid and bloodthirsty a lot of speeches as were ever delivered outside the cabin of a pirate ship. Aside from his emancipation proclamation, the greatest of Lincoln's titles to the love of mankind was his expression of fidelity to government of the people, by the people and for the people. Yet this principle was scouted, in celebration of his birthday, by mushy elocutionists like Stewart L. Woodford, swashbucklers like Theodore Roosevelt, and ghouls like Whitelaw Reid. They made the great emancipator's birthday an occasion to clamor for the substitution in place of his political principle of self-government, of the imperial policy of British Tories. At the Chicago banquet, where Reid and Woodford spoke, the queen was cheered,—to such a pitch of Toryism had these coveters of other men's countries risen. Only one truly Lincolnian sentiment appears to have found utterance at this year's dishonoring Lincoln celebrations. For that sentiment Rabbi Emil Hirsch, a well-known western republican, was responsible. He described "a nation without an ideal" as "worse than a ship without a compass;" and to the question, What shall be a nation's ideal? he replied: "We should learn from such mentors as was he whose birthday brings back to us the beauty, pathos and strength of his life." Rabbi Hirsch's interrogative replies were still more direct, and they cut into the heart of the question of the hour. "Shall we cooperate," he asked,

to make this nation brutally strong? Shall it become a competitor for booty with dynasties now passing away? Shall the man on horseback be the incarnation of this nation's spirit? God forbid!

A listener unacquainted with Abraham Lincoln's history would have inferred from Hirsch's speech that Lincoln was among the noblest of men, as in truth he was. From Reid's speech, such a listener might have supposed Lincoln to have been a freebooter, or even a common thief.

Miss Estella Mae Davidson has com-

pleted a term of two years as prosecuting attorney of Brown county, Nebraska, and is now fighting for her second term. She claims to have been counted out by one vote last fall, though she was fairly elected. Her first term demonstrated exceptional fitness for the office.

The St. Paul Pioneer Press sums up the "prosperity" of 1898, in this fashion:

1. Largest wheat crop except that of 1891.
2. Highest price recorded for wheat except that of 1888.
3. Largest cotton crop.
4. Largest exports of breadstuffs.
5. Largest exports of manufactured goods.
6. Largest aggregate exports of products and merchandise.
7. Largest production of iron ore.
8. Largest production of pig iron.
9. Largest production of coal.
10. Largest production of copper.
11. Largest production of silver except that of 1892.
12. Largest production of gold.
13. Largest gold holdings.
14. Largest per capita circulation of all forms of money.
15. Largest aggregate bank clearings.
16. Largest aggregate railroad earnings.
17. Largest aggregate sale of bonds.
18. Largest aggregate sales of stocks on New York Stock Exchange since 1882.
19. Smallest number of failures and smallest aggregate liabilities since 1892.

Could there be a more perfect summary for the purpose? Everything that looks prosperous is itemized; everything that doesn't is omitted. So acceptable is this bit of Pioneer Press faking, that the prosperity touters among newspapers all over the country are copying it. The Macon Daily Telegraph has unconsciously offered a question by way of clinching the argument. Says the Telegraph—

If this does not indicate prosperity, and lots of it, it would be hard to say what does.

Hard to say what does? Yes, indeed. But not so hard to say what would. Two lines added to that summary would have indicated "prosperity and lots of it" in higher degree than all the other items together. These two lines should have read:

20. Highest wages ever paid before.

21. Smallest number of unemployed since 1872.

But such lines no man could add without both lying and being caught in the lie. For it is a notorious fact that workmen are losing jobs instead of getting them, and that wages if not falling are certainly not rising.

Prosperity! There is indeed prosperity for trusts and other monopolies; for speculators and bosses and millionaires; but for workers there is no prosperity. Returned soldiers in Chicago are supported by charity because they cannot get work. The same is true of returned soldiers in New York city. The wages of cloak makers in New York are reduced 30 per cent. In the steel mills wages have been reduced, twice in some places, since the presidential election. The papers all over the country are publishing abundant evidence of hard times among the workers in the very issues in which they pretend to be jubilant over prosperity. Money lies idle in banks; and interest which is always high when and where wages are high, and low when and where wages are low, has fallen. Workingmen know full well, if editors do not, that times with them are still hard.

The only pretense anywhere of rising wages is made by President Lambert, of the steel trust. He announces an increase to take effect March 1. And what an increase! It is to vary from 12½ to 15 cents a day—hardly enough to any one workman to buy his employer a cigar. But that might not be so important if the increase were not a mere gratuity but were due to greater demands for workmen. But confessedly this is not the case. According to the president of the steel company himself, the increase he proposes is a voluntary gift—or rather the payment of a promised bribe. He had, so he says, promised his employees that "if McKinley was elected there would be no cut in their wages, and that if times became prosperous they would receive an advance without their asking for it." This advance, he explains, is in redemption of

that promise. It is in payment of the bribe—an honorable thing as honor goes among bribe givers. The payment is purely voluntary. The worker has no say in the matter; the employer is under no pressure in the labor market. Wages raised under such circumstances may indicate an employer's generosity, or, as in this case, his fidelity to a corrupt promise; but it does not indicate that wages generally are rising. The labor market is still glutted, and labor as cheap as before. Moreover, steel workers' wages have been reduced since the presidential election more than the amount of this increase.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM.

In the face of the fighting near Manila, it cannot any longer be pretended that no one in the United States is seriously proposing for this country a policy of conquest and imperialism. The administration itself is committed to it—committed in blood. Apologists for the foreign policy of the administration may now join the frank advocates of imperialism, and put forth arguments in its behalf; but they cannot continue to claim credit for both intelligence and sincerity while insisting that questions of conquest and imperialism do not confront the nation.

Imperialism has already cost us the lives of scores of our patriot soldiers, whose enlistment against the Spanish monarch, in the cause of humanity, has been taken advantage of to send them to wounds, disease and death against the Philippine republic, in the cause of oppression. It has cost us the blood-guiltiness of slaughtering by machinery thousands of Filipinos—women and children as well as men—whose sole crime against us is resentment at our crime against them. It has placed upon us the shame of sweeping away with fire and shell the unfortified villages of a people whom our own investigators describe as peaceable and amiable when not oppressed.

And its advocates are arrogant. The temporary thoughtlessness of the American masses in appearing at first to welcome the glory of imperialism, has emboldened them to the point of denouncing as traitors

those public men who, faithful to the principles of our republic, use their influence against forcing an unwelcome government upon a foreign people. The flag is waved aloft as a fetich, and we are told that we must follow it whether it continue to represent republicanism or be turned into a symbol of piracy. The applause and offers of cooperation of the tory party of England—the same party that sneered at Washington as we are taught to sneer at Aguinaldo, and which is and always has been distinctly imperialistic—are made much of. Imperialism is the new policy that we are invited—no; ordered—to adopt. Having assumed to buy Spain's title to the sovereignty of a distant archipelago, the president issues his proclamation commanding the people to abandon their own republican government and submit to him; and he follows it with a carnival of slaughter and glorification of slaughter so shocking to the moral sense as to awaken the American nation from its hypnotic stupor.

There is no longer any mistaking the direction in which the administration is going. For the sake of opening up new fields of exploitation to American plutocracy, the principle of government by consent of the governed is to be abandoned. We are to file away the declaration of independence as obsolete, and Lincoln's noble ideal of government "of the people, by the people and for the people," is to perish in the flames of Filipino villages.

This policy of ours, we are told, is not new. Imperialism, it is urged, is only a new name for an American policy which is as old as the American government itself. And we are reminded of the Northwest Territory, of the acquisition of the Louisiana country and of Florida, of the annexation of Texas and the conquest of New Mexico and California, of the Oregon treaty, and of the purchase of Alaska, as instances of imperialism in the history of our country. The implication is that these incidents are precedents for the present contemplated conquest of the Philippines.

Even if that were true it would count for nothing. A free people, cherishing their freedom, will not allow themselves to be shackled with

any precedents that are morally bad. The real question is not what our country may have done on occasions in the past, but what it ought to do now. If it be wrong to subjugate the Filipinos, the fact that we have heretofore subjugated other peoples can neither justify nor excuse the wrong. As the Springfield Republican well says, "lapses from the strict rule of government by the people" do not constitute "a reason and argument for general indulgence in further lapses and finally for its abandonment altogether."

But in truth there is no precedent in the history of the American republic for the Philippine policy now being pursued.

Preliminary to an examination of the pretended precedents that are cited, let us briefly outline the Philippine policy which they are held to justify.

We were at war with Spain. Spain claimed sovereignty over the Philippine islands. Repeated rebellions against her authority had occurred, and one had been adjusted by treaty not long before the outbreak of our war. Spain having dishonored that treaty the rebellion broke out afresh. It was in progress when Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila bay. And this rebellion continued until the Spanish were subdued and nearly driven off the archipelago, a regular republican government having meantime been established by the Filipino people.

The latest Filipino victory was at Iloilo, the last point of importance which the Spanish held. This victory left Spain in possession of only about 50,000 square miles of territory, occupied by about 300,000 inhabitants; while the Filipino republic was acknowledged by the inhabitants of 167,000 square miles, numbering more than 9,000,000 souls.

That was the situation in the Philippines when Spain assumed to cede the archipelago to the United States.

The treaty by which the cession was to be made, reserved no rights to the inhabitants. By its terms "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the ceded territory were to be determined by congress, and no obligation was to be assumed by the United States either to

establish a free government for or over them, or to admit them to the constitutional rights and privileges of American citizens. From the terms of the treaty, from one public speech by the president, from the speeches of administration senators and representatives, from the refusal of the majority in the senate to adopt a declaration of policy guaranteeing self-government, from the manifest opposition of the president to the adoption of such a declaration, from the Napoleonic proclamation of sovereignty promulgated by the president through Gen. Otis to the inhabitants of the Philippines, from the futile attempt in December and the successful one this week to capture Iloilo from the Filipinos, from the aggressive warfare being waged now by the president in the islands of Luzon and Panay—from all these and numerous other considerations, not omitting the perpetual clamor of the administration press, there is but one inference to be drawn, and that is that it is intended to subject the Philippine islands to the arbitrary rule of congress, without giving to their inhabitants any representation, or throwing about them any of the guarantees of the American constitution. That would be imperialism.

Nothing of the kind was ever before attempted by the United States, as a brief examination of the history of its territorial growth will show.

Turn to a map of the United States. Draw a line from the Pacific ocean along the northern boundary of California, Nevada and Utah to the Rocky mountains and then northward along the Rockies to the Canadian line. The northwest corner of the United States thus cut off, together with a vast Canadian territory abutting it, was once known as the Oregon country. The right of sovereignty over it remained an open question until 1846. We shall recur to this section farther on.

Meanwhile, draw another line on the map. Beginning at the Gulf of Mexico let it skirt New Orleans to the east and then follow the Mississippi river to its source, running thence in the direction of Lake Winnipeg to the Canadian border. The territory to the west of this line belonged, at the outbreak of our revolutionary war,

to the kingdom of Spain; that to the east of the line belonged to England.

At the close of the revolution England relinquished to her former colonies all her American possessions south of the present Canadian line except Florida, then extending to the Mississippi river, which was transferred to Spain. Thus the United States, upon coming into existence as a nation, had Canada for its northern boundary, the Mississippi for its western, and a slightly irregular line running east to the Atlantic from the Mississippi river at the mouth of the Red, as its southern.

That part of this territory which lies between the Mississippi and the Allegheny mountains was then claimed by some of the states as their property; but they surrendered it to the general government. Pursuant to the terms of this surrender an ordinance was passed by congress, in 1787, under which so much of the country surrendered as lies northwest of the Ohio river was organized into the Northwest Territory. This was the first territorial government of the United States.

As the organization of the Northwest Territory is cited in support of the present policy of imperialism, it will be necessary to notice its character.

The ordinance under which the territory was erected, while providing a civil government and guarding civil rights, enabled the inhabitants, as soon as they should number 5,000 free males of full age, to organize their own territorial government, with the right, among other things, to send a delegate to congress. It moreover ordained that from three to five states should be formed of the territory, each to be admitted into the Union, when it should have 60,000 free inhabitants, "on an equal footing with the original states." Meantime the territory was to be part of the United States. Here, it will be observed, was a bona fide adoption of the American principle of government by consent of the governed.

It is true that Indian tribes were not reckoned among the governed. But neither were they governed. The regulation of Indian tribes by our government has always been by means of treaty. Though we have outraged

the Indians, we have nevertheless dealt with their tribes as independent nations. It is true also that among those entitled to self-government, only free men were counted; but at that time we had not grown morally as a nation up to the point of abolishing slavery, and it is not for us now to find in these shortcomings of our predecessors, excuses for receding from the advances that they did make. Taken as a whole, the Ordinance of 1787 is a precedent against and not in favor of the imperialism that would crush the Philippine republic and govern the Philippines as an American satrapy.

The same observations apply also to the steps by which the country south of the Ohio was advanced, in some cases directly to statehood and in others through the condition of territories into that of statehood. The idea of self-government was always in the foreground. It was the principal object aimed at, and it was accomplished with all possible speed. To the south of the Ohio as to the north, as soon as a territory had enough inhabitants to give it dignity as a sovereignty, it was admitted into the Union as a state upon an equal footing with the other states.

Up to this point there was not the least semblance of imperialism, nor even of territorial expansion. We were dealing exclusively with territory the inhabitants of which had freed themselves from that colonial system of Great Britain which we are now seeking to imitate in the Philippines. We had added nothing to our original domain. The Mississippi was still our western boundary, as it had been that of the colonies since 1763.

But early in the century we did adopt a policy of what may be called expansion.

Spain had secretly ceded the western valley of the Mississippi—the eastern part of the second division which the reader has been asked to mark off upon the map—together with the western arm of Florida, to Napoleon. This was called the Louisiana cession. It gave to the Corsican conqueror of the world a point of vantage at the mouth of the Missis-

issippi, and control of our whole western border, and could not be regarded by the United States with indifference. No question arose as to whether we should add to our territory or not; the vital question was whether we should rid ourselves of a menacing neighbor. A consideration of self-defense settled that question, and having opportunity to buy off Napoleon we did it. Thus the Louisiana country became ours. But in acquiring that country, we stipulated to vest in the inhabitants all the rights, advantages and immunities of American citizens.

We have since then, pursuant to the original intention, erected sovereign self-governing states throughout all that region, except in the Indian territory, where we recognize self-government among the Indians.

To refer to the Louisiana purchase as a precedent for the Philippine subjugation is to distort history to base uses. The Louisiana purchase may be called "expansion." But it was more like the expansion of a city which extends its borders, than of an empire which reaches across seas for possessions. In no sense was it imperialistic.

The difference between expansion and imperialism is distinguished by Bourke Cochran when he says:

Expansion is the peaceful development of our political system by widening the area of its authority. Imperialism is the forcible exercise abroad by our government of powers denied to it at home.

Under that sound definition, our Philippine policy is one of imperialism, while the Louisiana purchase was expansion.

The Florida purchase, also, was expansion and not imperialism. We bought Florida of Spain in 1821, under a stipulation to accord to its inhabitants all the rights, advantages and immunities of American citizens.

Immediately after buying, we organized a self-governing territory there, and within 25 years we exalted the territory to sovereign statehood. With the acquisition of Florida, as with that of Louisiana, we merely extended our borders, making the newly acquired country part of the United States. In no respect what-

ever was the Florida acquisition analogous to that of the Philippines.

The coming of Texas into the Union is the next event cited as an American precedent against the American doctrine of self-government. But Texas came voluntarily into the Union, as a full-fledged, independent state. If the Filipino republic were knocking at our doors for admission, the annexation of Texas might be cited as a precedent; but instead of knocking for admission it is fighting for independence.

We did not assert any sovereignty over Texas until she sought annexation; nor then until we had vested in her and her citizens the same rights that all our other states and their citizens enjoyed. The annexation of Texas may have been expansion; it was not imperialism.

Now comes an event of which, though it offers no precedent for imperialism, we may nevertheless be ashamed. It is the Mexican war. With a boundary dispute between Texas and Mexico for an excuse, but with slavery extension as our real purpose, we engaged in war with our southern neighbor. As a result of that war, we not only carried the Texas boundary from the Nueces river southward to the Rio Grande, but we acquired, mostly by conquest though partly by purchase, all that remained of what Spain had originally held in the territory now known as the United States. Again we stipulated, however, to accord to the inhabitants all the rights, advantages and immunities of American citizenship.

This stipulation has been honored; and, with the exception of Arizona and New Mexico, all the territory has been erected into independent states. Even in Arizona and New Mexico, there are territorial organizations which embody the principle of self-government in spirit, and conflict with it in practice only in slight degree.

Bad as were our motives for bringing on the Mexican war, there is nothing in the whole history of our territorial expansion that grew out of it, which can in good faith be cited as a precedent against the doctrine of self-government.

Recurring now to the Oregon country, the northwesterly of the three parts into which the territory now comprised in the United States was divided at the outbreak of the revolution—as at the outset of this little historical excursion we asked the reader to indicate them upon his map—we shall find that the United States and Great Britain were in dispute over it until 1846. Great Britain then withdrew her claims to so much of the Oregon country as lay north of the forty-ninth parallel, and the United States withdrew hers to so much as lay south of that parallel. Thus the United States completed the extension of her area from ocean to ocean and from the gulf to Canada. But a self-governing territory was immediately organized in the Oregon country, and with the growth of population independent states were erected there.

The Oregon treaty, also, is referred to, as a precedent for imperialism. It is as weak a precedent as any of the others. There was no element even of conquest in this case; and as in all the others the self-governing principle was recognized from the start.

The next and last precedent is that of the purchase of Alaska in 1868. In this there is some resemblance to the Philippine project. Alaska is separated from the rest of the United States, as the Philippines are; no territorial government has been erected there; no exaltation to statehood was contemplated at the time of purchase. If Alaska had had a population of several millions; if they had been resisting Russian tyranny and had about succeeded; if they had organized a republican government and were seeking recognition as a self-governing sovereignty—if in these circumstances we had bought Alaska and had treated the Alaskan republic as rebellious and insisted upon subjecting the people to a state of vassalage, then the Alaskan acquisition might with some show of reason be cited as a precedent for what we are trying to do in the Philippines. But there was no such condition. Only a few thousand people inhabited Alaska when we purchased that country; and they did not then make nor have they since made, even so much as a protest. We did not con-

quer them; we have exercised no autocratic powers over them. What we really hold there is not a people but an uninhabited country. That country is regarded as part of the United States, not as an unannexed estate; and such of the inhabitants as are not members of tribes, are vested, under the treaty of cession, with all the rights of American citizens.

The analogy between the Alaskan purchase and the Philippine conquest disappears upon comparison.

The great fact that runs through the history of our territorial development, is the plain recognition shown therein of the fundamental principle of American government. The so-called precedents for imperialism are in reality monuments to our fidelity to the doctrine of the declaration of independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and to the spirit of the federal constitution that all men who come within the jurisdiction of the United States shall come as citizens and not as subjects.

The manifest intention as to the Philippines, is, on the other hand, to take the islands as American property in perpetuity, and to reduce their inhabitants to a state of vassalage. This intention is obvious from the treaty alone. It is the first treaty of cession to the United States which has not in terms secured to the inhabitants who wished them all the rights of American citizenship. The Filipinos are to depend upon the good will of congress, not for rights, for they are to have none, but for privileges. What their political condition was under Spain, what the condition of the American colonies was under England, what her conquered provinces were to Rome, that in principle is to be their condition under the United States. Their autocratic ruler is to be a congress sitting thousands of miles away, a congress in which they are to have no representative and to whose constituents they are to be not fellow citizens, but alien subjects.

There is no precedent in our history to lend color of right to such a policy; and to every principle of government to which we have appealed, and profess still to appeal, it is revolting.

NEWS

The center of interest is still in the Philippines, the most important event of the week being the capture of Iloilo. Immediately after the battle between the Americans and the Filipinos at Manila, reported last week, orders were received by Gen. Otis, from Washington, to reenforce Gen. Miller at Iloilo, on the distant Island of Panay; and on the 9th reenforcements were accordingly sent, with instructions to Gen. Miller to take the town. Upon receiving his instructions, Gen. Miller demanded the surrender of Iloilo by the evening of the 11th, at the same time warning the Filipinos to make no demonstration in the interval. But the Filipinos prepared to defend, whereupon an American gunboat opened fire upon them. They replied, and Gen. Miller then bombarded the place. There was no effective reply, and the American troops suffered no loss. The casualties among the Filipinos, if any, are not reported. They withdrew from the town, and the Americans took possession. At last reports the Filipinos were entrenching themselves in the suburbs, out of effective range from the warships, with the purpose apparently of resorting to the same harassing tactics that they have pursued near Manila. In the afternoon of the 12th, the day after the capture, the Americans made a reconnoissance in force toward the outlying town of Jaro. They were met, say the reports, with "a severe and well directed fire;" but, advancing, drove the Filipinos through Jaro to the open country beyond. No reports of casualties have been received.

Gen. Otis's official report of the taking of Iloilo, which bears date the 13th, is as follows:

Gen. Miller reports from Iloilo that town taken on the 11th inst., and held by troops. Insurgents given until evening of 11th to surrender, but their hostile actions brought on engagement during the morning. Insurgents fired native portion of town; but little losses to property of foreign inhabitants. No casualties among the United States troops reported.

Following is Admiral Dewey's report:

Petrel just arrived from Iloilo. That place taken by our force Saturday and now occupied. No prisoners. No casualties on our side. Insurgent loss not known, but believed to be slight. They attempted to burn town, but foreign property generally saved by our force.

This is the second movement of the Americans upon Iloilo. The first occurred in December and was reported in No. 39 of The Public. On that occasion American troops were dispatched from Manila to take Iloilo from the Spanish; but the Filipinos forced the Spanish to surrender before the Americans arrived, and the latter made no attempt to drive the Filipinos out. But with their warships they remained in a hostile attitude before Iloilo until the bombardment and capture of the 11th, reported above.

At Manila, fighting has been continuous since the battle of the 4th, which we reported last week. According to the dispatches received at the time of that report, the Filipinos had then been driven from their former line on the outskirts of Manila to distances several miles into the country; and the last fight, which occurred at Caloocan on the 8th, had resulted in their complete rout. It was stated also, in the official report of this fight, that Aguinaldo had applied for a cessation of hostilities, an application which Gen. Otis declined to answer. It now appears, however, upon Gen. Otis's authority, that no application for a cessation of hostilities has been made, and that no accredited representative of Aguinaldo has yet entered the American lines. It also appears that Caloocan was not captured until the 10th.

Taking up the thread of the Philippine war where it was dropped in these reports on the 8th, we find that on the 9th Admiral Dewey drove the Filipinos from San Roque, a village on the neck of land that connects the peninsula of Cavite with the mainland south of Manila. Following is the report he gives, bearing the same date:

After continued interference and intimidation of our workmen I ordered armed insurgents to leave San Roque by 9 this morning. They left during the night, a few remaining, who burned the village this morning. It is now occupied by our troops. All quiet.

At this time Filipinos were concentrating between Caloocan and Malabon, two villages about six miles north of Manila, and but a short distance inland from the bay shore. On the following day, the 10th, in the afternoon, the American fleet shelled Caloocan, and soon afterward an attack was made from the land side, the Americans burning the native houses as they advanced. If the Associated

Press report is to be relied upon, Filipinos "were mowed down like grass, but the American loss was slight." After two hours of fighting, Caloocan was taken and burned. Gen. Otis's official report of this engagement, dated the 10th, is as follows:

Insurgents collected considerable force between Manila and Caloocan, where Aguinaldo is reported to be, and threatened attack and uprising in city. This afternoon swung left of MacArthur's division, which is north of Pasig river, into Caloocan, driving enemy easy. Our loss slight; that of insurgents considerable. Particulars in morning. Attack preceded by one-half hour's firing from two of Admiral Dewey's vessels.

No official report of the promised particulars of the Caloocan fight has yet been published.

The American line now extended from the bay shore near Caloocan, some 6 miles north of Manila, in a half circle east and south around Manila to the bay shore below Fort Malate,—a distance of 23 miles. The point in the line farthest inland from Manila was at Santa Ana, on the Pasig river.

Malabon, a village lying a short distance north of Caloocan was selected by the Filipinos for their next stand. This was shelled on the 11th by the American fleet, under the protection of which the left of the American line was extended to Malabon, and the Filipinos driven out. They were understood to have retreated to their capital, Malolos, and an American war vessel has moved up the coast to a point opposite that city and about 8 miles away. Another fight occurred on the same day. It was at the right of the line, from ten to fifteen miles in a direct course from Malabon. The Filipinos, according to the press reports, "fell back upon the main line of the insurgents," which would indicate that their main line then enclosed the American line from the left at Malabon to the right below Fort Malate. Gen. Otis's official report, in which these two engagements are alluded to, bears date the 12th, and is as follows:

Reported that insurgent representative at Washington telegraphed Aguinaldo to drive out Americans before arrival reinforcements. Dispatch received Hong-Kong and mailed Malolos, which decided on attack to be made about 7th instant. Eagerness of insurgent troops to engagement precipitated battle. Very quiet to-day on

lines from Caloocan on north to Pasay on south. Yesterday small reconnoitering party twelve miles south of city fired on, two men slightly wounded. Two insurgents with arms captured. Affair of 10th, MacArthur's division very successful. Enemy's loss considerable; have collected seventy dead bodies; more not yet discovered. Insurgents reported to be gathering force twelve miles north on railway, but evidently perplexed.

The Filipinos deny Gen. Otis's assertion in the above report, that Agoncillo, the Filipino representative at Washington, had telegraphed Aguinaldo to drive out Americans before arrival of reinforcements; and Agoncillo challenges Gen. Otis to produce the dispatch he mentions.

On the night of the 12th the Filipinos opened fire at long range upon the American left, but without effect or evoking a reply; and on the 13th they are reported as throwing up entrenchments opposite the American line inland to the east of Malabon. They worked under the cover of their sharpshooters, who operated in the jungle. Several skirmishes took place on the 15th near Manila, in which the Americans were assisted by a gunboat, and on the 16th there was an engagement about ten miles southeast of Manila at San Pedro Macate. No casualties have yet been reported.

Filipino accounts, down to the 7th, received in London by way of Hong-Kong, are to the following effect:

For several days before the fight of the 4th the Americans had been endeavoring to provoke hostilities. The attack by the Americans was made under protection of shelling from the ships, and was unexpected. The ships destroyed a number of villages, and after a severe fight captured the waterworks. The Filipinos, under instructions from Malolos, acted strictly upon the defensive, and finally retired in good order without any loss of arms, artillery or ammunition except two Krupp guns of obsolete pattern. The fighting was stubborn and lasted continuously from the 4th till the 7th. The Filipino loss is 1,050 killed and wounded, "including 600 Ygorotes who were barbarously mowed down when the Americans saw they were armed only with bows and arrows." At the time of the original outbreak, no Filipino general was present, nor was the Filipino ammunition in place; whereas the American army and navy acted on a preconcerted plan.

A resolution on the subject of the Philippines was acted upon on the 14th in the senate. It is known as the

McEnery resolution and is as follows:

By the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands, to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.

An attempt was made by the anti-imperialists to amend this resolution by adding to it the following clause:

That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands, and assert their determination when a stable and independent government shall have been erected there, entitled in the judgment of the United States to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and to thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

But the amendment was defeated. There were 29 votes in the affirmative and 29 in the negative, and Vice President Hobart determined the tie against the resolution by voting in the negative. The McEnery resolution was then adopted by a vote of 26 to 22. Mr. Hoar and other anti-imperialists voted against it, on the ground that it gave no assurances as to allowing self-government in the Philippines, but rather the contrary. It is a joint resolution and amounts to nothing unless passed by the house and signed by the president.

Resolutions are being offered in civic bodies protesting against the war in the Philippines. At a meeting of the Anti-Imperialist league held at Boston on the 10th, at which Gov. Boutwell presided, immediate suspension of hostilities was demanded, and congress was urged to give official assurances to the Filipinos of the intention of the United States to adhere to the principle of self-government. On the 10th the Chicago Single Tax club requested all other single tax clubs in the United States to join it in condemning "the war which the United States, for the manifest purpose of advancing the private interests of American franchise promoters

and land-grabbers, is now waging against a struggling sister republic in the Philippine islands."

A long report has been made by the president's committee for the investigation of the mismanagement of the war. It was presented to the president on the 9th and made public on the 12th. This report finds in substance that Secretary Alger was honest but incompetent; that the army beef was good and Gen. Miles's charges unfounded; that the commissary department was well managed, and the quartermaster's department fairly so except in some particulars; that the medical department was demoralized, but that the signal service was efficient; that the camp at Montauk Point was well managed, while the other camps were good on the whole, though some were bad. Gen. Shafter is complimented.

Before the making of the foregoing report, President McKinley had decided to convene a court of inquiry to investigate Gen. Miles's charges regarding the quality of beef furnished the army; and on the 9th he issued an order accordingly. The court is to consist of Gen. Wade, Gen. Davis and Col. Gillespie. It is ordered to investigate the charges made by Gen. Miles in respect to the unfitness of articles of food furnished by the subsistence department to the troops in the field during the operations in Cuba and Porto Rico; and in addition to its findings of fact the court is to submit an opinion upon the merits of the case "together with such recommendations of further proceedings as may be warranted by the facts developed in the course of the inquiry." It is understood that if Gen. Miles's charges are not substantiated a court-martial may be recommended to discipline him for having made the charges publicly. Gen. Miles refused to submit his evidence to the non-legal committee which has just reported to the president as stated above.

Civil war has broken out in Nicaragua. It began on the 3d; but what are its specific causes is not yet known in this country, though they are supposed to have relation to labor troubles. The rebellion is led by Gen. Reyes, and its headquarters is at Bluefields. Gen. Reyes promises that in the event of his success, Nicaragua shall have free and fair elections for national officials. President Zelaya issued a decree on the 15th declaring

the republic in a state of siege, and at that time a battle was expected at a point west of the Chile mountains toward which troops were hurrying. American gunboats have been sent to the Nicaragua coast to protect American interests. British interests have secured the presence there of a British warship.

Japan is in trouble over what may be called her Philippine question. She holds sovereignty over the Island of Formosa, formerly part of the Chinese empire, and the Chinese inhabitants are in rebellion. On the 9th the rebels were reported by mail advices to have won a battle in January at Taipehfu, after three hours of hand-to-hand fighting; and, advancing after their victory, to have captured Tzu Lan, about seven miles from Lopeh. Later advances are conflicting. Official Japanese reports are to the effect that the rebellion is ended, whereas advices from Hong-Kong indicate that it is still raging. It is attributed by the Chinese to harsh government and exorbitant taxation.

France is again in turmoil over the Dreyfus case. When we last had occasion to refer to this case (No. 41 of *The Public*), M. Quesnay de Beurepaire had publicly charged the criminal section of the court of cassation with conspiracy to exonerate Dreyfus and thereby dishonor the French army. That was early in January. On the 28th of the same month, acting under the pressure to which Beurepaire's charges had given a new impulse, the cabinet decided to introduce a bill regarding trial revisions by the court of cassation, the preamble to which identified the bill with the Dreyfus case and showed it to be hostile to him, by declaring that it "will not be wise to intrust the revision of the Dreyfus affair to the criminal section alone." This bill was introduced on the 30th, and referred to a parliamentary committee, which reported, on the 6th, by a vote of 9 to 2, against it. This was a setback to the ministry. But on the 10th the bill was adopted in the chamber of deputies, despite the adverse report of the committee, by a vote of 332 to 232. The republican ministry were thus sustained; but at the expense of dividing the republicans. The majority included anti-republicans as well as republicans, and the minority was exclusively republican. Before becoming operative, the bill must receive the assent of the senate.

Should it pass there, the question of revising the Dreyfus conviction must first be decided by the whole court of cassation, and if that body decrees a revision, Dreyfus must be tried not by the criminal branch of the court, but by a court-martial. The victory thus far is with the anti-Dreyfusites.

In the British parliament no affirmative action of general interest has yet been taken, but two negative votes have been called out which touch upon issues that are rising to the surface in British politics. One of these votes related to the church question. Feeling is growing in England against a tendency on the part of clergymen of the state church to adopt rites and ceremonies that are peculiar to Roman Catholicism; and a liberal member introduced an amendment to the address to the throne which condemned what it called the "lawlessness of the church." This amendment was rejected on the 9th by a vote of 221 to 89. The other vote referred to above, was upon an amendment to the address to the throne, moved by Labouchere, which aimed at limiting the veto power of the house of lords. In the course of the discussion, the new liberal leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, declared that in the face of a representative system the house of lords is an anomaly. The point involved is that the house of lords obstructs legislation when liberals are in power, and promotes it when conservatives are in power, thus securing conservative policies under either party and making government by the people through parties impossible. Labouchere's amendment was lost by 223 to 105. A milder one also was lost, 257 to 157.

The past week has been remarkable for the extreme cold and terrible blizzards from which the country has suffered. The thermometer fell below zero in many places far to the south. Even at Washington it was 2 degrees below on the 9th, and at Memphis only 6 above, while at Chicago it reached 22 below, and at Kansas City 20 below. At Burlington it fell on that day to 26 below. The 10th was the coldest day in New York city since the establishment of the weather bureau there. The thermometer for hours marked 6 degrees below zero, and for a short time it registered a still lower temperature. On the 12th a blizzard struck the Atlantic coast, which lasted several days, blocking

city streets and forcing a suspension of railroad travel. It rivaled the great blizzard of 1888. This snow-storm reached as far to the south as Vera Cruz, one of the hottest places in Mexico, where the tropical foliage was blanketed with snow. In New Orleans the Mardi Gras festivities were celebrated in a snowstorm. Many disasters at sea are reported, and others are feared. The coldest point was in Kentucky. For a week at Louisville the thermometer was not above zero for more than two hours at a time, and on the 12th it dropped to 30 below. On that day it was down to 32 below at Springfield; to 34 at Carlisle, and to 39 at Cynthiana. On the same day at Birmingham, Ala., the record was 10 below, and in exposed places 15.

NEWS NOTES.

—The national military convention met at Tampa on the 9th.

—Samuel J. Barrows, of Massachusetts, has been nominated by the president for librarian of congress.

—Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, of Chicago, has been called to the congregation of the Temple Emanuel, at New York.

—President McKinley left Washington on the 15th to attend a banquet of the Home Market club in Boston.

—The Rev. J. Stitt Wilson, of Chicago, sailed from Boston on the 15th to make a study of the conditions of the impoverished in Europe.

—The National Council of Women met on the 13th at Washington. May Wright Sewall presided, and Susan B. Anthony was one of the delegates.

—The first class at West Point graduated prematurely on the 15th with 72 members. The premature graduation was made necessary by scarcity of officers in the army.

—A fire in the Brooklyn navy yard on the 15th destroyed the machine shops, causing a loss of \$1,500,000. The drawings and patterns of the machinery of the Maine were consumed.

—Sir Wm. Martin Conway, a British explorer, claims to have established the fact that Mount Sorata or Illampu, north of La Paz, Bolivia, is the highest peak in South America. He says it is 1,000 feet higher than Mount Aconcagua, in Chili, which is 24,000 feet high.

—Prof. George D. Herron will give a series of lectures at Central Music hall, Chicago, on Sunday evenings, beginning February 19, upon the subject "Between Caesar and Jesus;" and at the same place on Monday noons, beginning February 20, on the subject of "Municipal Ideas." During the period of these lecture courses he will occupy

Dr. Thomas's pulpit on Sunday mornings.

—The treasury report for January gives the following statistics of exports and imports:

EXPORTS.	
Merchandise	\$115,515,954
Gold	2,330,503
Silver	5,368,900
Total exports.....	\$123,205,357
IMPORTS.	
Merchandise	\$58,472,315
Gold	6,066,080
Silver	2,591,718
Excess of exports.....	\$56,075,244

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.

February 4 to 10, 1899.

Senate.

On Monday the 6th, after Senators Allen and Gorman had discussed the treaty question, the senate went into executive session and ratified the treaty by a vote of 57 to 27—3 more than the necessary two-thirds. Upon its resuming public session, Senator Hoar endeavored to amend one of the resolutions as to the acquisition of the Philippines by providing that the American government there should be subject to the consent of the people, and also by disclaiming any intention of forcing a government upon them. Both motions were laid upon the table. The next day, the 7th, Senator Tillman spoke at length upon the question of annexing new territory, with particular reference to the Philippines; and Senator Mason insisted upon a vote upon some one of the resolutions as to annexation now pending. The Indian appropriation bill was then considered. The same bill was further considered on the 8th, when as amended, it was passed, and the legislative appropriation bill was taken up. Consideration of the latter bill was continued on the 9th and 10th. On the latter day Senator Allen introduced a resolution providing for an amendment to the constitution requiring the election of senators by the people.

House.

On Monday the 6th Mr. Grow offered a resolution of amendment to the constitution, providing that the president, as commander-in-chief of the army and the navy of the United States, shall have power to negotiate treaties in any war in which the United States may be engaged, provided that a majority of the senators present ratify such treaty. The resolution was referred to the committee on the judiciary. A bill for taking the 12th census was then passed, as was one for extending to Hawaii the law against importing alien contract labor. Only routine business was transacted on the 7th. On the 8th a bill granting a railroad right of way through Oklahoma and the Indian territory was passed; also a bill author-

izing the use of voting machines in congressional elections. A joint resolution interpreting the war revenue law so as to require but one stamp in the case of a bond or note and an accompanying mortgage was passed on the 9th, and the sundry civil appropriation bill was considered. Consideration of this bill was resumed on the 10th. Representative Hepburn offered a Nicaragua canal bill as a section, by way of amendment, to the appropriation bill.

MISCELLANY

"THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN."

Dedicated to Rudyard Kipling and all Imperialists.

For The Public.

From Egypt's freshly blood-soaked ground
The canting tones of England sound:

"Take up the white man's burden."
The things that Clive and Hastings
wrought,

That native legions vainly fought—
These are the white man's burden.

What though the Orient's strand run red
And vultures feed on countless dead?

Take up the white man's burden.
The savage fools know not their friends;
They sore mistake our Christian ends.

It is the white man's burden.

From God on high our duties are—
Thus slaughter turns to righteous war.

Take up the white man's burden.
When once they're down we'll rule them
well,

Rum, Bibles, soap, and opium sell—
The white man's sacred burden.

Our pious care must yield returns.
Our guiding hand some guerdon earns

For taking up the burden.
And so we'll take, as wages small,
Their lands, their crops, their ore, their
all—

A rich and splendid burden.

Freedom? It is a white man's right,
And black and yellow in God's sight

Are but the white man's burden.
If wise, they'll bend before our will;
If not, we've guns and bullets still
To make them bear the burden.

Yes, Uncle Sam, forget your past—
Your Declaration's but bombast.

It's not the white man's burden.
Retract the words the fathers spoke,
Re-forged the chains that Lincoln broke—
Take up the devil's burden.

F. C. W.

THE ROUGH RIDERS AT SEA.

Many of the men from the far west
had never seen the ocean. One of them
who knew how to swim was much inter-
ested in finding that the ocean water
was not drinkable. Another, who had
never in his life before seen any water
more extensive than the head-stream of
the Rio Grande, met with an accident
later in the voyage; that is, his hat
blew away while we were in mid-ocean,
and I heard him explaining the accident

to a friend in the following words: "Oh-o-h Jim! Ma hat blew into the creek!"—Theodore Roosevelt, in Scribner's for February.

THE OCTOPUS, THE SHARK AND THE LITTLE FISH.

A Shark, while swimming at a great distance from his Home, came upon a small Fish which was struggling in the Grasp of an Octopus. The Spectacle roused his Moral Indignation, and biting off one arm of the monster he compelled it to relinquish its grasp. Impressed with the tenderness and edibility of the Fish, he was on the point of swallowing it, when the latter protested, and seeing escape impossible weakly tried to bite. "Base wretch," cried the Shark, "have you no feelings of Proper Gratitude." Therefore a policy of Benevolent Assimilation was immediately ratified.—Springfield Republican.

THE IMPERIALIST, THE MUGWUMP, AND THE ETHIOPIAN.

An Imperialist and a Mugwump while traveling together (for a short distance) came upon an Ethiopian who was attacked by a Robber. Running quickly to the rescue, they threw stones at the Robber, and made him surrender his Booty. Struck by the beauty and value of his possessions, the Imperialist said to the Ethiopian, "All these things were Ceded to us by that Robber, and we will extend to them a Benevolent Assimilation. In return, let me give you this Bible." The Ethiopian, on this announcement, desisted from his Protestations of Gratitude and picked up his Club. The Mugwump, who had listened to the Conversation, timidly protested against robbing him of what he had been fighting for. While they were still debating the question, the indignant Ethiopian began to lay about him with his Club. "There," said the Angry Imperialist to the Mugwump, "your treason has excited this man to Open Rebellion." Then he made an end of the Ethiopian.—Springfield Republican.

ONLY CERTIFICATES OF OWNERSHIP.

"Last week," says the New York Journal of the 4th inst., "Mr. Rockefeller made \$5,000,000 in one day by the rise in the price of Standard Oil certificates. Yesterday he lost \$18,000,000 by a drop in the price of the same securities. And the country was neither a cent richer nor a cent poorer any of the time, nor did the amount of actual, tangible property owned by Mr. Rockefeller vary by the weight of a feather."

Stocks and bonds certify that the holders may lawfully collect toll from labor and property. But in the true sense they are not property. There are billions upon billions of them in existence, yet everyone of them might be destroyed and there would be just the same amount of property and wealth in the world as before.—Dubuque Daily Telegraph.

THE REPUBLIC THREATENED.

In what cause do Dewey's cannon roar? In the cause of human disfranchisement. The Filipinos demand the right to select their own government by popular election. They have been fighting for it for years. Dewey's guns are shooting down that demand.

In what cause do Dewey's cannon roar? In the cause of a government which does not "obtain its just powers from the consent of the governed."

The first gun fired in Manila on last Saturday threatened the extinction of the republic, and the elevation upon its ruins of a colonizing empire, whose acquisitions of territory will be in defiance of the will of its people. A republic whose attempts to rule a people without its consent or extending to it the franchise is a political inconsistency, a civic paradox, an economic hermaphrodite, a state doomed to decay in infancy or to develop into an imperial monster.—Judge E. F. Dunne, President of the Monticello Club of Chicago, before the Club, Feb. 11.

A PARABLE.

A certain very rich man said unto himself: "I have many interests, and I will turn over the most important of them to a body of men whom I'll choose for a year or two years, and I'll call them a legislature." And he did it, and went on his way. And the body of men met, and they made money with the rich man's goods, and sold some and mortgaged others and despoiled others. And the sutlers and lobbyists flocked around as vultures around a carrion, and the rich man remonstrated and held a mass meeting and screamed himself hoarse. And the body of men looked at him derisively and said to itself: "Surely we have worked for these offices, and they are ours, and you can't put us out, nor reverse our acts, but are bound by them." And they laughed in their sleeves at the rich man.

Again an election came round, and the rich man chose another set of men of the same sort, and having untrammelled power. They did likewise. And many moons waxed and waned, and the rich man did not seem to learn by ex-

perience, but really he was growing very angry; and at last he rose up and said: "I will choose you as councilors, but you shall do naught that I do not wish, and you shall do the things I wish, and I'll veto any acts of yours that I do not like by the referendum, and if you will not pass the laws I wish I myself will start them by the initiative."

And the latter end of that man was better than the former.—Eltweed Pomeroy.

WHERE SPAIN IS DEGENERATE.

An extract from an article entitled "An American in Madrid During the War," by Edmond Kelly. Published in The Century for January.

It is not the Spanish people which has degenerated; it is its governing class. The Spanish peasant is the finest fellow in the world. He is thrifty, sober and industrious, the only peasant who produces wine and drinks water. He makes, or used to make, the strongest infantry in Europe; until the battle of Rocroi it was proverbially unconquerable. Since then defeat has for centuries attended Spanish arms. The reason is not far to seek. The Spanish peasant is to-day almost as ignorant and as bigoted as he was in the sixteenth century; the opportunities which have been extended by wise governments in other nations have been refused to him; he remains poor when those of his neighbor France grow comparatively rich. He still plows with wooden plowshares, he does not know the use of manure, and a somewhat infertile soil hardly leaves him the barest necessities of life. Spain produces an average of 11.13 bushels of wheat to the acre, while England produces 29. Now, if the peasant is the best thing in Spain, and the government the worst, what must the government be?

The first thing that struck me on crossing the frontier—and the impression deepened as I advanced—was that Spain is industrially as much in the hands of foreigners as Egypt. The gage of Spanish railroads is not the same as that of France, so there is a change of cars at the frontier; but the Spanish car bears upon it in the middle the arms of England, and at one end the words "dining car," and at the other the word "restaurant." The name and place of its manufacturers are also inscribed upon it, namely, "Societe Internationale des Wagons-Lits, St.-Quen, Seine." Upon the engine we read the name of a Glasgow firm. In Madrid the finest private building was con-

structed and is still owned by an American life assurance society; the only good circus is known as the Paris circus. Most of the mines as well as the railroads are worked by foreigners; and the very garbage of Madrid is removed and disposed of by a Belgian company. Industrially as well as agriculturally, Spain, with the single exception of Catalonia, remains stationary, while the rest of the world moves on. And the question, what factor in the nation is responsible for this? is perhaps best answered by the proposal seriously made by the administration of finance, as late as the eighteenth century, to transfer to the crown the little property still devoted to public education.

THE PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC.

The so-called Philippine republic was first organized in October, 1896, with Andreas Bonifacio as president. When he died in 1897 Aguinaldo became president and commander-in-chief. The act of proclaiming a republic thus early involved a declaration of independence, proving that independence had been contemplated by the Filipinos long before Dewey's victory. The pact of Biaonabato in December, 1897, between the insurgent leaders and the Spanish government provided that comprehensive reforms should be granted by Spain, in consideration of which the insurgent generals agreed to expatriate themselves for three years. The conditions thus imposed on both sides were very similar to those of the treaty of Zanjón by which the Ten Years' war in Cuba was brought to an end. The only feature of the pact which does not seem creditable from the western standpoint is the fact that the insurgent leaders accepted from Spain a sum of money in consideration of their expatriation. Aguinaldo's defense against the charge of bribery is that the insurgent leaders had lost all their property by fighting Spain, and yet had families to support. They were to go as exiles into strange lands. It does not seem unnatural or necessarily proof of a lack of patriotism, that a payment of money should have been demanded under such circumstances by the men who were to exile themselves. Aguinaldo deposited the money in a bank at Hong-Kong in an above-board manner, thus letting the world know of his possession of cash.

At any rate, Aguinaldo was not regarded as a traitor by his own people because of that transaction. They rallied to his standard with enthusiasm when he returned to Cavite in May, 1898. He again proclaimed the so-called

Philippine republic on June 12, and in August last he and his chiefs appealed to the world's powers for recognition of independence. The full text of that appeal was printed in the New York Tribune, September 24, 1898, proving beyond a doubt to the United States government and the American people that the object of the insurrectionist party was independence. What do the contradictory reports of United States consuls detailing private, unofficial conversations with insurgent chiefs amount to beside that august appeal to the world for recognition of independence?—Springfield Republican.

AN ELEPHANT STORY.

For The Public.

Once upon a time a great menagerie company quarreled and fought with a much smaller similar company, and came out victorious. The more powerful corporation was called the Uncle Sam Civilization Company, and the weaker one was the Hispanola Animal Show.

After the fight, and the surrender of the conquered corporation, the former belligerents spent several months trying to agree upon terms for a permanent peace. The General Manager, who was also President of the Uncle Sam concern, insisted that more elephants were needed in its collection of wild animals. It already had several elephants on hand, which were named, respectively, Finance, Indian, Negro, Trusts, Strikes and Landlordism. These elephants caused the menagerie managers a great deal of trouble, for they were never in a settled condition, though sometimes it was supposed they were quieted permanently. The biggest, oldest and toughest elephant in the list was Landlordism, and that one caused more expense than all the others.

And yet the President and directors of Uncle Sam's menagerie decided that the corporation must have a big, wild elephant belonging to the Hispanola Show, called Philippines. Now, this animal was a reckless creature, with a notion that it had a right to be free, and could take care of itself. So it had long resisted Hispanola authority, and caused trouble.

Yet the managers of the Uncle Sam show demanded that elephant, and were determined to have it. The demand was refused, but the Uncle Samites said to the other fellows:

"We shall take possession of the animal, anyhow, whether you consent or not. We have whipped you, and can make such terms as we please. That elephant is ours by right of conquest.

However, there is nothing mean about the Uncle Sam company, for it is a highly civilized and Christian corporation. So we will give you \$20,000 when we take the elephant. Our stockholders will be assessed extra on their stock to make up this amount, but they are accustomed to such things and can stand another turn of the thumbscrew. Remember, that we have a right to take your elephant, money or no money; but here are the \$20,000 we decided to give you. We will now take possession of the animal, and proceed to whip him till he is submissive to our authority and thoroughly imbued with our kind of civilization."

At the present time the stockholders in the Uncle Sam Menagerie are divided in opinion as to whether the President and directors bought the Hispanola elephant, or stole it.

RALPH HOYT.

Los Angeles, Cal., Feb. 8.

SINGLE TAX NEWS FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

For The Public.

In Glasgow the single tax stands better than ever. We still have our majority at the corporation, which has not only petitioned parliament in favor of taxing land values, but prepared a bill to submit to parliament on the subject.

It took time to get this length. The political thought of the city is with us, however, and there was no help for the council but to pass the bill. The opponents of the proposition at the council did splendid service by their obstruction. The discussion of it from time to time by the Glasgow corporation has had a wonderful influence in educating the public mind all over the country. They did what we found it difficult to do for many reasons. They sent the question through the newspapers into the homes of the people, and now the man in the street is expecting the taxation of land values.

It even brought the question before our local professors (heaven save the mark) of political economy. One of these gentlemen was asked about a year ago by one of our vice presidents, James Stewart, how he treated the question of taxing land values at his class. "Oh," replied the professor, "I am dead opposed to that." "What have you read on the subject?" asked Mr. Stewart. "The speeches, at the town council," was the reply. These speeches, as you can imagine, account for many things. Is there not a grim humor in the fact that the Glasgow corporation, which is appointed to see that the streets are kept clean, should stir a pro-

fessor of the dismal science into some knowledge of land values?

Since Glasgow took action on land value taxation, a great many assessing bodies throughout the country have followed suit. Chief among these are the Lanarkshire county council, which issued a report on the subject that might have been drafted by your own Tom L. Johnson. It was a straight single tax pronouncement. The Aberdeenshire county council also petitioned parliament; and so have the town councils of Paisley, Greenock, Killmanrock, Hamilton, Awdrie, Coatbridge and Cunnock. Over the border in England, the town councils of Stockport, Halifax and Bradford are among those that have joined the movement, along with over 200 local bodies. All this is splendid work. It has taken the question out of mere political organization, and thereby lifted it immeasurably in the public mind.

During the past year, three important public conferences have been held. One met in Bradford, under the auspices of the English Land Restoration league, the Scottish Land Restoration union, and the Financial Reform association. The other two were held in London. One of these, which met in the early part of the year, was called by the Battersea vestry; the other was called by the Land Law Reform association. These meetings were highly successful, and we are now arranging for a fourth national conference to be held in June at Glasgow, Edinburgh or Liverpool.

That this work can be done, and is being done, speaks volumes for the progress of the single tax movement in Great Britain. A few years ago we could not have hoped to carry out such propaganda. But our work all over the country for years is at last bearing fruit. A few years ago the single tax men of Great Britain were mostly unknown to each other; but the work went on quietly and persistently, and at last it has blazed out into the open.

Sir William Harcourt has just said that "had he remained in office, he would have tried his hand at the taxation of land values." Other political leaders in the reform movement have also spoken out boldly on the question. We are all winning. How true are Henry George's words: "Interest the people, and the leaders will tumble over each other to take up this question."

It is difficult now to say when the question will be taken up in Great Britain; but it is coming along, and not slowly is it taking its place as the first reform to which the masses of the people can look for relief.

Time is on our side. Events are on our side. All the forces that make for progress are on our side. Those who are with us never had higher hopes of the realization of Henry George's glorious dream of freedom. In the sentiment of this country for the taxation of land values as a means to the overthrow of land monopoly, and it is gaining as the days go on, Henry George is victorious to-day. We who stand for the reform, are but those who have responded to his call to action, and every day his beautiful passionate appeal is bringing others to our assistance. So his work progresses even while his body rests in the grave. "Such is the power of truth."

We sympathize much with our American friends in Judge Maguire's defeat; but we think more highly of him than ever. We cannot expect to win every battle. We shall probably lose many in the days to come. But the enemy will learn that we do not know the meaning of defeat. Even now we recognize that Maguire has won, as Henry George won in his first great mayor fight—won by forcing our ideas upon public attention.

JOHN PAUL.
Glasgow, Scotland, Jan. 9, 1899.

THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

The balance of trade one way or the other does not create either losses or gains. It simply shows them.

If an individual or a nation is receiving more than it parts with, that fact shows gains. If more is parted with than received, that fact shows losses.

The men who have been boasting that the big balance of trade in favor of this country showed immense gains have been claiming that we received the difference in gold. That claim was false, as clearly shown by the statistics.

Had it been true, it would only have shown that we had been exchanging things for real use for a metal which is of very little use.

No intelligent man would claim that if a man handed out five dollars and got back four he was being made rich.

But the idea of money in an exchange has made it possible to blind the people.

The idea is that money is something valuable in itself, and that if we export a billion dollars' worth of goods we get a billion in money for them and if we import half a billion dollars' worth of goods we pay half a billion in money for them, and have half a billion as our profit.

The matter would be much clearer if people would get rid entirely of the idea of money as property, and recognize the fact that it is simply a repre-

sentative of property, used in effecting exchanges of property, and that all trade is really and ultimately an exchange of property for property.

Then they would see that what we export is what we sell and what we import is what we get for it, or to put it the other way, that what we import is what we buy and what we export is what we pay for it.

England has for a long time been importing immensely more than she exports. That is to say that her arrangements with other nations are such that she gets more than she gives. She has piled up wealth in consequence, notwithstanding her limited natural resources.

America has been exporting more than she imports; that is to say she gives more than she gets, and but for her immense natural resources she would have been impoverished.

The fact is that English people own an immense amount of property in other countries. The profits on this property comes to them in the form of other property and constitutes the excess of their imports.

Men in Europe own a large amount of property in this country and the profits on this property makes a large part of our excess of exports.

England is the gainer by her profits on property in other countries.

America is the loser because the profits on property in this country go to men in England and other countries.

The balance of trade against England shows that property from other countries is flowing to her shores and that she is giving less than she gets. It does not create this condition, but it shows it.

The balance of trade in favor of this country shows that property is flowing away from our shores and that we are giving more than we are getting. It does not create this condition, but it shows it.

Balance of trade one way or the other is a result and not a cause. If a country is gaining in its trade with other countries it will import more than it exports. If it is losing it will export more than it imports.

It is so clearly evident that if a country sends away more than it gets back that there is a loss somewhere, that those who have been trying to make it appear that we were getting rich under our present economic system have tried to make the people believe that we were getting gold back, and that the gold we received made up the difference. But the statistics we have published punctured this humbug.

It is suggested that it would be a good thing for us to produce at home all we consume and then produce more and send it abroad.

Stop and think.

What would be the use of laboring to produce goods and send them abroad unless we get something in return for it?

Perhaps he will say we would get money.

There is no such thing as international money. Suppose we receive the money of those countries. It would be no use to us unless we bought goods from them with it and that would be imports. We would be paid for our exports in imports, and unless the imports were worth as much as the exports we would be losing on the transaction.

Suppose they sent us gold bullion in exchange. That would be importing gold, but when we got it what could we do with it? We would be exchanging property that is of use and benefit to mankind for property that is of very little use or benefit.

But we could use the gold in buying other things.

If we bought them from ourselves we would be none the better off. If we bought them from other countries they would be imports; the gold would have served only as a representative of property to effect the exchange between the property we exported and the property we imported. And unless the property we finally received was worth as much as that which we had exported we would be the losers in the trade.

The true policy for nations in the matter of trade is exactly the same as the true policy in trade between individuals. In fact there is no such thing really as trade between nations. What is called "international trade" is simply trade between individuals of different nations.

Let each individual produce that which he can produce to the best advantage. If he can produce more than he himself needs let him exchange his surplus with his neighbor for that which his neighbor can produce to better advantage than he.—National New Era, of Springfield, Ohio, for Feb. 3.

THE ADVANCE OF DEMOCRACY.

One of the most dangerous experiments that a thinker and a historian can make is to use current political tendencies as a basis for wide sociological generalizations. The experiment can only succeed on one condition—that the writer has first taken care to

place himself outside the arena of conflict, so that he may be certain to understand the motives and forces at work on all sides, and to keep clear of the vulgar mistake of identifying the narrow and temporary contentions of a particular party with profound philosophical truths by which the arguments and actions of all parties may be judged as an unerring standard. The experiment was made by Mr. Lecky in his treatise, or perhaps we may say his jeremiad, on "Democracy and Liberty," first published nearly three years ago; but that Mr. Lecky has not yet learnt the conditions of success may be seen from the Introduction which he prefixes to the new edition just published by Messrs. Longmans. A political pamphlet is a legitimate and may be a useful form of literature. The same may be said of a philosophic treatise on politics. But a party pamphlet which takes the form of a philosophic treatise is an undesirable form of literary effort. It cannot be said that Mr. Lecky brings forth any fruits meet for repentance in the new Introduction. Take, for example, his view of the attitude of democracy towards property. It is easy to understand and sympathize with the pure partisan of the "rights of property," who makes no pretense to being a philosopher, but simply stands out as stoutly as he can for the rights of his class. It is also easy to see how interesting and valuable it would be to have a really scientific analysis of the ethical basis of property and its relation to democratic ideas and principles. But we do not like the mixture of the two things. As a little instance, take this account of the "Silver" movement in the United States. This is quoted as an example of the evils which have "rather increased than diminished" since Mr. Lecky's book was first published.

The admirable provisions in the American Constitution guaranteeing the security of contracts have been indirectly menaced on the largest scale by the Silver party, which advocates the payment of all debts in a depreciated coinage.

But what of the principle of paying debts in an appreciated coinage? The silver party may be right or wrong, but when their views are taken as menacing the security of contracts, when the ground for this interpretation is that they advocated the payment of debts in a depreciated coinage, and when this is put forward without the slightest reference to the opposite injustice, for which they contend that they are proposing a remedy, it is clear that no attempt is made to appreciate the real motives or principles of the party to which the writer happens to be op-

posed. There is no effort to secure the detachment from party prejudices, which is the first condition of success in such a work as the present. The writer's interpretation of the party opposed to him is thus made a standard, not merely for judging that party, but for judging the democracy, which, it may be, places upon the motives of the party quite a different interpretation.

Mr. Lecky has naturally much to say of the deviation of both parties from the "orthodox" conception of property and economics in this country, and he says it in much the same spirit. A conspicuous fact in our current politics is

The complete reconciliation of the Unionist and Conservative party with democracy. . . . Within wide limits the two parties move on the same lines, and are more like competitors in a race than adversaries in the field.

There is a measure of truth in this, but a writer with more insight would, we think, have brought out a deeper truth. In one sense both parties accept democracy because they must. It is there, and it is of no use to treat a fact which stares one in the face as though it did not exist. Democracy being a fact, there still, we think, remain two ways of showing "acceptance" of it. One is by rubbing along so as to keep on terms with it, conceding this point today and that to-morrow as soon as the demand becomes irresistible. This is the method which, in softer phrase, Mr. Lecky attributes to conservatism. It is a method eminently suited for retaining power. The other method is that of thinking out and following out the natural development of democracy from the political to the social and economic sphere. If Mr. Lecky had made this attempt himself he would better understand why his own party find themselves obliged to accept Sir William Harcourt's budget, to extend the principle of graduated taxation and to develop still further "the Irish land legislation, which is the most evident instance of confiscatory violation of contract in modern legislation." "Confiscatory legislation" may pass in a party speech, but before anyone uses the phrase as the deliverance of austere and impartial philosophy he is surely bound to submit the economic conditions of modern society to a very rigorous analysis. Is it not possible that what passes as "free" contract may result in great unfairness, which only legislation can remedy? If so, on which side is the confiscation? The taxation of the "unearned increment" appears as confiscation to one party, while to others it is precisely the absorption of this increment by private owners which appears as a confiscation of wealth produced.

by and justly due to the community as a whole. To provide pensions (or, for that matter, bare maintenance in a workhouse) for the aged poor at the expense of other people is confiscation if the rights of individual property are absolute. But if property is an institution maintained by society for its own purposes, and therefore within limits and upon conditions which society from time to time prescribes, then the same measure may equally well appear as a partial attempt to remedy an economic inequality. We do not complain of Mr. Lecky for rejecting the democratic view of property, but for apparently making so little effort to understand it before he rejects it. It is only a profound understanding not merely of democracy but of the whole movement in ethical thought—which has gone some distance since the publication of Mr. Lecky's extremely valuable work on European Morals—that could justify Mr. Lecky in the attitude of assurance and finality with which he comes to judgment upon the dealings of democracy with property.—Manchester (Eng.) Guardian, of Jan. 10.

SEE HOW PROTECTION DESTROYS MORALS.

Extracts from a speech made before the Marquette Club of Chicago, Feb. 13, by the Hon. Whitelaw Reid, editor of the New York Tribune, and one of the strongest advocates of protection in the United States.

It is a bugbear that the Filipinos would be citizens of the United States, and would therefore have the same rights of free travel and free entry of their own manufactures with other citizens. The treaty did not make them citizens of the United States at all; and they never will be, unless you neglect your congress. It is a bugbear that anybody living on territory or other property belonging to the United States must be a citizen. It is equally a bugbear that the tariff must necessarily be the same over any of the territory or other property of the United States, as it is in the nation itself. . . .

First, hold what you are entitled to. If you are ever to part with it, wait at least till you have examined it and found out that you have no use for it. Next, resist admission of any of our new possessions as states or their organization on a plan designed to prepare them for admission. Stand firm for the present American union of sister states, undiluted by anybody's archipelagoes.

Make this fight easiest by making it at the beginning. Resist the first insidious effort to change the character of this union by leaving the continent. We want no Porto Ricans or Cubans to

be sending senators and representatives to Washington to help govern the American union, any more than we want Kanakas or Tagalos or Visayas or Mohammedan Malays. . . .

Resist the crazy extension of the doctrine that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed to an extreme never imagined by the men who framed it, and never for one moment acted upon in their own practice.

LINCOLN IS OUT OF DATE.

In a speech delivered in Peoria October 17, 1858, Abraham Lincoln—a man of some influence in his day—said that "no man was good enough to govern another man without the other's consent." But like the declaration of independence Abraham Lincoln is obsolete—extinct. We know now that the other man's consent is not necessary if he is not equal to the man who proposes to govern him.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

THE POOR MAN'S BURDEN.

Pile up the poor man's burden—
The weight of foreign wars;
Go shrewdly yoke together
Great Mercury and Mars,
And march with them to conquest,
As once did ancient Rome,
With vigor on her borders
And slow decay at home!

Pile up the poor man's burden,
Accept Great Britain's plan;
She does all things for commerce—
Scarce anything for man.
Far off among the Pagans
She seeks an open door
While Pity cries in London:
"God help the British poor!"

Pile up the poor man's burden—
His sons will hear our call,
Will feed the jungle fever
And stop the Mauser ball;
Will fall far off unnoted,
For spoils they may not share,
And spill their blood to water
A laurel here and there!

Pile up the poor man's burden;
Keep in the old, old track!
Let glory ride, as ever,
Upon the toiler's back.
Lay tax and tax upon him,
Devised with subtle skill—
Call forth his sons to slaughter
And let him pay the bill!

Pile up the poor man's burden!
The lords of trade, at least,
May drink, like King Belshazzar,
In comfort at the feast;
May boast, as did the monarch
Within his palace hall,
While God wrote out his sentence
In fire upon the wall!

—Dr. Howard S. Taylor, before the Monticello Club, of Chicago, Feb. 11.

We must never allow ourselves to even appear to say to the world that we confine the love of country and freedom to ourselves. That we punish with

death in others that which we dignify among ourselves. That we are nationally unjust. That, being strong, we oppress the weak. That, being free, we would make others slaves. The policy that the president has entered upon is unjust, un-Christian, un-American. The American people will never give it their indorsement. It is our duty to defend our nation's honor. The president is not our country.—Kansas City Times.

"Is there any difference between 'sick' and 'ill'?"

"Why, it's just like this; the man who gets sick sends for a doctor, while the man who becomes ill summons a physician."—Puck.

Now, Bobby, don't let me speak to you again!

Bobby (helplessly)—How can I prevent you, mamma?—Puck.

God Winning Us.

BY

REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:
GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US (Incarnation)
GOD WINNING US (Atonement)
GOD OPENING OUR EYES (Faith)
GOD GROWING IN US (Regeneration)
GOD ACTING THROUGH US (Religion)
GOD CARING FOR US (Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
GERMANTOWN, PA. 11

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 622,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.