

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1899.

Number 47.

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 enthusiastic reception of Prof. Herron's second course of religious-economic lectures in Chicago is significant of a gratifying awakening of public spirit. What was the dream of agitators yesterday, has become an object in practical politics to-day. Prof. Herron's voicing of the growing sentiment of radicalism is all that could be desired. His first lecture in the series on "Municipal Ideals" gives promise of even better work than he has ever done before, and nothing stronger than that could be said.

Gov. Lind, of Minnesota, takes high ground in vetoing an appropriation of \$20,000 for bounties on beet sugar. He rests his opposition to bounties upon principle. To find representative men like Lind resisting this form of corruption is encouraging. It should be understood that the legislator who votes for a bounty to assist private businesses, and the business organizations that solicit such benefactions out of the public purse, are engaged in furthering corruption. To take money for the use of others by legislation and in the form of taxes is as truly theft as to do so by means of a club or pistol and in the comparatively honest name of plunder.

The un-democratic democrats of North Carolina are attempting to disfranchise negroes in that state by an evasion of the 15th amendment to the United States constitution. That amendment guarantees that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. But the North

Carolina Solons think they see a way around this guarantee. Since the suffrage may be abridged on account of illiteracy or poverty, they propose an amendment to the state constitution imposing an educational qualification and a poll tax as conditions of voting. In that way they expect to shut out a large proportion of the negro vote. But it might also shut out the white vote, to avoid which, it is proposed to exempt all persons who were themselves entitled to vote prior to 1867, when the vote was restricted to white men, or are descended from persons who were so entitled. In plain English this plan contemplates the disfranchisement of negroes for reasons not applying to whites. Should the supreme court sustain so palpable an evasion, that body might as well adjourn for good.

It has been evident ever since the brilliant naval battle in which Cervera's fleet was destroyed, that a conspiracy has been on foot in high official quarters to transfer the credit for that victory from Schley, to whom it belongs, to Sampson, the navy department pet. For some more or less inscrutable reason, such plutocratic papers as Harper's Weekly and the New York Evening Post have lent their columns to the purposes of this conspiracy, which reached its climax when the secretary officially informed the senate not only that Sampson was entitled to the credit of the Cervera victory, but that Schley had been reprehensibly derelict in connection with locating Cervera's fleet in Santiago harbor six weeks before the battle. Through all the fuss over this matter, Schley has maintained a dignified silence. But having at last been offered an opportunity to tell his own story officially to the senate he has done so. Without evincing any spirit of controversy, he tells the sim-

ple facts in a simple and dignified way; and what he tells is as destructive to the naval office conspiracy as his maneuvering off Santiago on the 3d of July was to Cervera's fleet.

When the present congress goes out of office next week, it will have appropriated not much if any less than one billion five hundred million dollars. Look at the figures—\$1,500,000,000. It has been obliged, of course, to provide for war expenses; but they do not vary much from \$200,000,000, and if we put them at \$250,000,000, an ample allowance, we shall leave over \$1,200,000,000 as the amount appropriated by Hanna's "sound money" and "national honor" congress and president. It is only a few years ago—hardly more than a few months—when the congress that appropriated a billion was anathematized for extravagance; yet this congress adds a quarter of a billion to that, and jeers at its critics as "economists." Well may it jeer. Most of the extra money is spent to enrich the rich, while nearly all of it comes, by means of a sneaking system of indirect taxation, from the pockets of the poor and middle classes.

We do not often agree with Edward Atkinson, the Boston writer on industrial statistics and economics, but when he says of the Philippines, as he did at a meeting of the Workingmen's Political league in Boston, that—

we have neither the moral right nor the political right, and I hope we have not the physical power to compel the inhabitants of those islands to become our vassals and to submit to a rule under the pretense of Christian benefit to them at the point of the bayonet with the sacrifice of thousands of their numbers to this Moloch of expansion—

we agree with him most heartily.

A southern editor, discussing the Philippine question, speaks gravely of

"our 'disinterested efforts to obtain freedom for the Filipinos," and their "indecent haste to get us out of Manila." History repeats itself. No doubt when King George's armies set foot on American soil, there were editors in England who characterized this invasion as a "disinterested effort in behalf of freedom;" and the Battle of Bunker Hill was probably looked on as a "display of indecent haste" on the part of the colonists in getting their benefactors out of Boston.

President McKinley refused to intimate his foreign policy to the senate, the legislative body which is authorized by the constitution to deal with such matters in conjunction with the president; but he unbosomed himself with comparative freedom to the Boston "Home Market Club." The Philippines had been sent us, he told that club, as a trust, from which we must not flinch. Never was language used with greater agility to conceal thought. Sent as a trust, indeed! They were sent us precisely as Dick Turpin's plunder was sent him, and are in the same sense and no other a trust. We have grabbed for the Philippines, Filipinos and all; and there is in plain English nothing more to it.

"Our concern," Mr. McKinley proceeded, "was not for territory or trade or empire, but for the people whose interests or destiny, without our willing it, had been put in our hands!" But beyond this, he gave, even to the privileged "Home Market Club," no intimation of the policy which he thinks this country ought to pursue. Upon that point he was clear only as to one thing. We must not consult the Filipinos as to their future while they are shooting our soldiers. For the rest we must leave them to the mercy of congress. He was careful, however, not to recall the somewhat pregnant fact that for months, while his Asiatic real estate speculation was hatching, he refused to consult them, and offensively prevented them from consulting him, as to the future of their country, when they were not

shooting our soldiers. Had he then given assurances of our intention to deal with the Philippines as we are pledged to deal with Cuba, the blood of our soldiers and of the slaughtered Filipino patriots would not now be upon his hands. No blood would have been shed.

How utterly lacking in good faith were Mr. McKinley's words about the freedom of American motives from lust of territory and trade and empire, is exposed by the whole imperial press. It was specifically exposed a week before by the editor of McKinley's eastern organ, one of his peace commissioners—Whitelaw Reid, of the New York Tribune. Reid did not mince matters as McKinley did. Reid is malodorous, but he is neither a hypocrite nor a diplomat. In his Chicago speech on Lincoln's birthday, he saw and described in the conquest of the Philippines, territory and trade and empire. "Hold what you are entitled to!" he exclaimed. "If you are ever to part with it—

wait at least until you have examined it and found out that you have no use for it. Before yielding to temporary difficulties at the outset, take time to be quite sure you are ready now to abandon your chance for a commanding position in the trade of China, in the commercial control of the Pacific ocean, and in the richest commercial development of the approaching century.

That is Reid's view of the matter. It is opposed to the carefully guarded expressions of McKinley at Boston. The two speeches when compared show either that McKinley's was a pretense, or that McKinley and Reid disagree as to the American motive for doing the Filipinos good and regulating their lives for them. But recent history constrains us to doubt any disagreement, and to accept Reid's version as the true one. If we are not grabbing the Philippines for the sake of territory, trade and empire, why did we not provide in the treaty for the Filipinos as we did for the Cubans? Why did President McKinley refuse to assure the Filipino representatives of our fidelity in respect to them to our own principles of government? Why did he use the influence

of his office to prevent a declaration by congress as to the Philippines similar to that which, in spite of his opposition, congress made a year ago as to Cuba?

Again, the president in his Boston speech said:

"Could we, after freeing the Filipinos from the dominion of Spain, have left them without government and without power to protect life and property or to perform the international obligations essential to an independent state? Could we have left them in a state of anarchy and justified ourselves in our own consciences or before the tribunal of mankind?"

France gave us some substantial help when we freed ourselves from Great Britain. Suppose that after the treaty was signed she had said: "Now, we have freed you from the domination of Great Britain, but we cannot leave you without government and without power to protect life and property or to perform the international obligations essential to an independent state. We will just annex you, or take you under a sort of military protectorate until you learn to govern yourselves. Thereby we shall be justified in our own consciences and before the tribunal of mankind." Imagine what response the patriots of '76 would have made to these pious platitudes! Where is the spirit of '76 when American "patriots" applaud such utterances?

One of the motives at the bottom of the imperialistic upheaval, and which has helped to give it its impulse, is the same spirit of greed and grab which became incarnate in Mark Hanna nearly three years ago, and raised McKinley to the chair he would now turn into an imperial throne. A pointed suggestion of this is contained in a letter from John T. McCutcheon to the Chicago Record. Mr. McCutcheon's letters, from his exceptionally excellent report of the fight in Manila bay to his last, bear intrinsic evidence of being the work of a conscientious observer and candid reporter. In the suggestive one referred to he tells, quite as matter of course and not at all in the spirit of an ex-

posure, of the opportunities in the Philippines for monopolists. For others there are few opportunities, it seems. "Excepting for a few business ventures in the cities," writes Mr. McCutcheon, "the Philippines only offer alluring prospects for men who control a great deal of capital." But

there seems to be an almost limitless field here for big corporations that can enter the work of developing the slumbering riches. There will, as a result of the introduction of a period of development, be many opportunities for men who act in connection with the big money operators. Railroads will be built, new ports opened, great tracts surveyed, new cities laid out at railway terminals and recently opened ports, a great deal of electrical engineering done, newly developed districts entered, banks opened, docks built and navigable streams dredged and widened, bridges constructed, harbors deepened, steamship lines established for inter-island commerce, mining possibilities investigated, modern machinery installed in the sugar, hemp, tobacco, coffee and rice lands, quick methods of cultivation introduced and hot-weather resorts built in the mountains north of Manila.

That the newspaper man has not alone observed these opportunities for American monopolies, appears from a subsequent letter in the Record from Mr. McCutcheon, in which he announces the departure for Washington of a promoter—the Belgian consul, Edward Andre. Mr. Andre is after Philippine concessions from congress. But let Mr. McCutcheon tell his story:

Mr. Edward Andre, the Belgian consul who conducted all the negotiations for the surrender of Manila between Admiral Dewey and Gov. Gen. Jaudenes, has issued the prospectus of a gigantic development company which he has organized with a number of American capitalists. He leaves for Washington early in January to obtain various concessions for the company. Mr. Andre has lived in the Philippines for more than 20 years, is the only foreigner whom the Spanish government has ever permitted to make surveys, and knows the islands from personal experience from one end to the other. He has become very wealthy and is now one of the most active and prominent business men in the Philippines. . . . The object of the company will be to take advantage of the various opportunities for profitable investment of capital offered by the development of the Philippine islands. He considers that the re-

sources of the islands have hardly been touched. A few of these resources, such as hemp, sugar and tobacco, already produce large profits, but under Spanish rule it was impossible to handle any of these industries by businesslike methods, so that even those upon which the most effort has been expended can hardly be said to have reached more than the primary stage of their possibilities. There are scores of other fields practically untouched. The greatest of these is in the construction of railroads and the opening of ways of communication. Now the roads are in such a condition that it is only with the greatest difficulty that the produce of the provinces finds its way to market. The shipping interests are most inadequately handled. To one who has traveled among the islands it is easy to see that proper ports are needed in many places. The rich timber interests are entirely undeveloped. Rice cultivation is in such a stage that in a country which seems especially designed by nature for growing rice great quantities must be imported annually to supply the demand of the population. The difficulties of transportation at present divert what little traffic there is from its natural channels and render it impossible to open up rich fields. Only the surface of the mineral wealth has been scratched. There is a trade in copra, but the possibility of using the coconut husks and waste hemp, which now are thrown away, seems never to have been considered. The company proposes to center all its operations around a bank which will be established in Manila, with branches in other parts of the islands. This bank will be a national bank, issuing its own currency, and will handle the funds of the company and do a general banking business. The principal departments of the bank besides the central bank proper will be a credit and mortgage department, a commercial and marine department, a manufacturing and industrial department, engineering, railroads, ports, bridges or mines department and a general trust company department.

It is expected, also, Mr. McCutcheon adds, that

the franchise to be got from congress by the company will obtain the grant of a good deal of land and forest at present of absolutely no value, but which would be good property if traversed by a railroad. Districts now uninhabited and deserted would be covered with farms and the land sold or rented at a good price.

There you have an insight into one of the motives for the war we are waging against the Filipino republic.

Mr. Andre may not succeed in getting from congress the franchise he seeks. He may find his "pull" too

weak as compared with other "pulls." But the motive that actuates him is one of the motives of the whole imperialistic agitation. The Philippines are good plunder, and only by an American conquest can American monopolists make that plunder their own. It is for this that scores of American soldiers have already been killed near Manila, and that thousands are yet destined to die in those tropical islands unless imperialism can be put down.

For the war in the Philippines has not ended. It has but just begun. The "terrible lesson that brought the Filipinos to their senses," as we were told three weeks ago, has not in fact brought them "to their senses" yet. The "white man's burden" is already becoming as heavy to the American army as it ought to be to the American conscience. When the news of the first battle with the Filipinos reached Europe, the chairman of the Philippine committee in Madrid said that half a million American soldiers could not put down the Filipinos; for they were a united people now, and besides climate and disease would fight for them. The truth of his prediction is beginning to be felt. Already the jaunty Gen. Otis finds that he has on his hands more than the holiday expedition of which his first reports told. The climate has begun to tell. Disease does threaten. And Otis's reports are now so reticent as to make one wonder whether they do not withhold unpleasant facts; a feeling that is intensified by the carefully guarded admission of the driving in at one point by the Filipinos of the long drawn out American line. Gen. Otis himself is evidently not so happy as when he reported the slaughter of thousands of Filipinos. In an interview on the 18th, two full weeks after the outbreak and at the end of two full weeks of almost continuous fighting, replying to the question, "How many Filipinos are bearing arms today?" Otis concisely said: "Too many." Wholly aside from the shame of repudiating the basic principles of our nation and entering upon a war of

conquest, we have already, in loss of life actual and prospective, abundant reason to condemn the imperialistic land-grabbing regime that has involved us in it.

Whether the courts of Ohio ever succeed or not in making out a legal case of crime against John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil company, the fact of its criminality now stands confessed. For refusing to produce the books of the company, its secretary claims the privilege which all criminals are by law allowed. He pleads that "the books disclose facts which may be used against the Standard, tending to prove it guilty of offenses made criminal by an act of the legislature of Ohio," and that "they disclose facts and circumstances which may be used against" himself "personally as an officer of the said company, tending to prove" him "guilty of offenses made criminal by the act aforesaid."

Last week we referred to the attempt of President Harper, of the Rockefeller university, of Chicago, to draw the public school system into the Standard Oil monopoly net. Here are the facts: Mayor Harrison appointed a commission to revise the public school system. That was more than a year ago. One of the appointees was President Harper, of the Rockefeller university, who became chairman of the commission. The commission recently reported a bill, now before the legislature, the manifest object of which in one respect was to place the public school teachers of Chicago under Mr. Harper's domination. We refer here to that clause of the bill which would make the eligibility of public school teachers depend upon the report of a board of examiners, the majority of whom would almost of necessity be professors or other teachers in the employment of President Harper. Two of these examiners—there would be five in all—would be the superintendent of schools and one assistant superintendent, while the other three must be college graduates or have an equivalent educational training, and have

had at least five years' successful experience in teaching since graduation. As the language of the bill is here a little obscure, we reproduce it, so that our interpretation may be tested. It requires the examiner to "possess either a bachelor's degree from a college or university, or an equivalent educational training, together with at least five years' successful experience in teaching since graduation." Had the bill imposed no other limitation, this would have confined the choice of three out of the five examiners to professors or teachers in the Rockefeller-Harper university, and to public school teachers who were college graduates. Few other persons in Chicago have had "five years' successful experience in teaching since graduation" from a college. But the bill specified one other limitation, namely, that no person should be eligible as one of these three examiners if connected with the city school system. That would rule out public school teachers, and leave the virtual selection of Chicago teachers entirely to employes in the Rockefeller-Harper university. It will be seen that the bill was neatly contrived to make the public schools of Chicago another adjunct of the Standard Oil trust. The senate committee on education has wisely decided to return this bill with an adverse report.

Altgeld opened the speech making part of his Chicago mayoralty campaign with a broadside aimed at the administration of Mayor Harrison. Apart from his discussion of the question of municipal ownership of street car lines, the ex-governor confined himself on this occasion to administrative questions of purely local interest. And if the mayor expected to gain by declaring as he did before the Altgeld meeting that he would stand upon his record, he must by this time realize the weakness of his hopes. For not since the fall of the Tweed ring has an exposure of worse city administration been laid before a community. Since Altgeld's speech, the Chicago newspapers have not shown so much anxiety as they did before, to discuss

questions of good municipal government.

It is sometimes hard to tell whether statesmen are shrewd in diverting attention from questions they do not wish to discuss, or merely obtuse. This applies as well to Canadian statesmen as to the brand which the states produce. A case in point: Recently a delegation of single tax advocates waited upon the ministers of Ontario, and urged the adoption by them of the single tax policy. After the ministers had listened attentively for an hour, Mr. Hardy, the premier, replied. The subject was interesting, he said, though the government might not possibly agree with quite all that had been urged. Specifically, he thought—and this is the remark to which we call attention—that it would be unjust to let personal property go untaxed. The man with \$500,000, for instance, seemed to him a good mark for taxation. Et cetera. Surely, Mr. Hardy knows that it is the man with \$500,000 who now goes almost untaxed. Of all ineffective ways of taxing the rich, the personal property tax is most ineffectual. Can it be possible that a man of Mr. Hardy's well-known ability is ignorant of that?

The Kansas City Journal, which was established in 1854, and is therefore old enough to know better, denies The Public's contention that excessive exports tend to impoverish a country. Somewhat amusing is the Journal's confusion. It suggests for example that if we import into our own office "more type setting and editorial expense" than the sums we receive for exported papers, we will realize the fallacy of our reasoning. Import expense! Why, instead of realizing our fallacies, we should go crazy trying to strike a balance between "expenses imported" and papers exported, just as we should if we were foolish enough to try to reason out the effect of the pressure of an irresistible force against an immovable body. Since the Journal seems not to know the fact, despite its mature

age, we must inform it that expense is not an import, but an export. A man's exports are what he pays out; and expenses are certainly paid out.

The Journal's difficulty in this matter, aside from the mental confusion of its editor, lies in the fact that he supposes that for exports of merchandise, America is paid in gold and silver. If that were true The Public's contention would still hold good; for the gold and silver, being imported, would have to equal or exceed our balance of merchandise exports, or we should be playing at a losing game. But it is not true. We are not paid in gold and silver for our merchandise balance. On the contrary we export more of both gold and silver than we import. Since 1849, as the Journal may learn by reference to the treasury statistics, our exports and imports have been as follows:

EXPORTS.	
Merchandise.....	\$26,685,900,000
Gold.....	2,142,800,000
Silver.....	1,072,500,000

Total exports.....\$29,901,200,000

IMPORTS.	
Merchandise.....	\$24,836,500,000
Gold.....	1,141,100,000
Silver.....	541,700,000

Total imports.....\$26,519,300,000

Thus we find that during the 50 years beginning with 1849 and closing with 1898, our merchandise exports, our gold exports, and our silver exports have each exceeded the corresponding imports, and our total foreign trade has been as follows:

Exports.....	\$29,901,200,000
Imports.....	26,519,300,000

Excess of exports.....\$3,381,900,000

According to our theory that excess of exports is a loss. Does the Kansas City Journal count it as a gain?

How much more sensible than the Kansas City Journal, is the Washington, N. J., Star, though not so old. Here is its argument upon the same subject:

The popular conception of the "balance of trade" runs somewhat in this fashion:

A is a printer, B is a grocer. A sells B \$100 worth of printing. A buys \$50 worth of groceries from B. When a

settlement is made, B pays A \$50 in cash and the transaction is completed.

In the popular mind this \$50 in cash is the balance of trade in A's favor, the \$100 worth of printing is A's export and the \$50 worth of groceries is A's import. Now A, it is said, has bought more than he sold—he has exported more than he imported. Is this true? Let us see:

A has exported \$100 worth of printing. This represents the actual cost of production to A plus his profit, which we will assume is \$20. In other words, if a fire were to destroy the printing before it left A's hands he would consider he had lost \$80. Hence A's actual exports were \$80 in printing.

A's imports were \$50 in goods and \$50 in money, making \$100 in all. As his exports were \$80 and his imports were \$100 he is ahead just his profit—\$20. But the popular theory says a nation's exports must exceed its imports or the nation loses. Here we see that A's imports exceeded his exports and the printer was \$20 ahead. If it were not so, A would lose and finally cease to do business. It is so with international trade; and Uncle Sam can no more be said to be doing a good business when his imports are less than his exports than the printer A would be if he sold \$100 worth of printing for \$50.

FETICH WORSHIP.

The tendency to represent principles by symbols began with the race, and will doubtless persist while the race lasts. It is as natural as breathing. By this means, spiritual realities which might otherwise be to mortal knowledge mere abstractions, are made visible and tangible.

Symbolism, however, is not the truest mode of giving material form to abstract principles. Nature herself supplies the true one. All that we see or feel in nature—sunshine, air, water, trees, animals; all that art applied to nature produces for the further or better gratification of our desires—clothing, houses, food, machinery, books, pictures, statuary; all that we do in satisfaction of natural impulses—eating, working, playing, sleeping, bathing—are material expressions of principles; of principles that we may call moral, mental, abstract or spiritual, as suits us best. What we call them is of little moment. The vital thing is that they themselves are eternal verities.

They are verities, too, that project themselves into the realm of matter in the material forms to which we have referred. Without them, these

forms could no more exist than could reflections in the mirror without objects to be reflected. No mere accidental analogies are these forms. They express or manifest different phases of eternal truth, much as fruit expresses or manifests the vital forces of the tree that bears it. And as the invisible and intangible forces of the tree become manifest and distinguishable to us in its fruit, so does invisible and intangible truth become manifest, distinguishable, apprehensible, in the phenomena of material nature which it projects. It is because these phenomena are expressions of principle, because they correspond naturally and necessarily with the respective truths they interpret, that they offer the truest mode of making abstract principles visible and tangible.

Nevertheless, artificial and arbitrary symbolism serves a great purpose in giving material expression to abstract principles. The spiritual significance of natural phenomena is not obvious to all. There is a logical philosophy there which requires maturity of mind as well as openness of heart to appreciate it; and where that is lacking, arbitrary symbolism may become a substitute for natural phenomena as an interpreter of what lies beyond. Arbitrary symbolism may, therefore, and in fact it does, serve the useful purpose of stimulating many minds to a recognition of the reality of abstract truth. It is thus in some sort a primer of spiritual knowledge.

The fraternity of free masons affords an example of the inculcation of moral principles by means of arbitrary symbolism. Between immortality and the sprig of acacia, between uprightness of human conduct and the mason's plumb, between morality and the mason's square, between the principle of human equality and the mason's level, there is no natural relation. The one does not produce the other. This is arbitrary symbolism and nothing else. Yet by means of such symbols, principles that might otherwise seem to be without form and void, are taught, perceived and felt.

So, only in a broader spiritual field, it is with religious worship. To inculcate principles, arbitrary symbols are adopted. Images have been set up

to represent deity, the Unknown and Unknowable being thereby brought within the range of human vision and the possibilities of human touch. Thus God becomes real to the simplest apprehension. In like manner, forms and ceremonies are established, that vital principles may become, as it were, visible and tangible. Worshipers kneel in token of spiritual humility. They hold a cross aloft to symbolize spiritual redemption. They join in the sacrament of the Lord's supper—that symbol of participation in spiritual good things, which is typified naturally by natural eating and drinking. They adopt the symbol of baptism, in token of that cleansing of the spirit by divine truth to which bathing with water for the cleansing of the body is in natural relationship. Church worship, even the simplest in form, is replete with arbitrary symbolism.

In still another sphere of human life in this world, arbitrary symbols are adopted to give tangibility to abstract principles. This is the sphere of patriotism, where the great symbol is the flag: A mere piece of colored bunting, a nation's flag is nevertheless the visible and tangible representation of national ideals. It is national principles, national traditions, national honor, national aspirations, materialized. What religious rites are to the true worshiper, that is the flag to the true patriot. It is the symbol to his eye of political principles that appeal to his understanding and enchain his affections.

Rational uses of symbolism need no defense. So long as the symbol retains its proper place as a symbol, its usefulness as an implement of religious and moral thought and instruction will hardly be disputed.

While the free mason finds in the level a crude representation of God's law of equality, which he adopts as his own, he is worshiping God. So with the savage who is reminded by the rude idol before which he bows of an intelligence and beneficence that he cannot comprehend and cannot otherwise even concentrate his thoughts upon. He is a worshiper as truly as if he were intelligent enough to dispense with symbols. It is the same with Christian churchmen. Their worship, however formal, how-

ever conventional, however symbolic in its ceremonies, is true worship so long as the forms and ceremonies and symbols are to them but convenient representations of spiritual truths that can be realized in the material world only by means of natural correspondences or symbols. In a similar category, if not the same, is the patriot who reveres the flag of his country because it symbolizes what to him is holy in the principles for which the government of his country stands.

But, when the symbol takes the place of the principles symbolized, when principles are ignored and their symbols are revered for themselves alone, then symbols become the detestable objects of mere fetich worship. What the savage is who makes his idol his god, precisely that is the free mason who prates about the level and the square regardless of moral obligations and the principle of equal rights; precisely that is the churchman who clings to forms and ceremonies regardless of the spiritual principles they are designed to symbolize; precisely that is the man who cheers on the flag of his country regardless of the cause in which it waves. They are fetich worshipers all.

And the worst of fetich worship is not merely that it is personally degrading. The worst of it is that it enables designing men to marshal fetich-worshipping people against the very truths their fetich originally symbolized. Thus hypocrites in the church have been able to turn temples of God into dens of thieves amid the hosannas of the faithful; and traitors to the commonwealth have won applause while overturning its foundations. The fetich of a fetich-worshipping people once secured, all the power of its superstitious worshippers is secured also.

Popular liberties never have been and never will be destroyed by the power of usurpers. They are destroyed by the free consent of the people themselves. When a free people turn from the principles of liberty to worship its lifeless symbols, they are in condition to become easy dupes of the first bold leader who has the shrewdness to conjure them with those symbols. No free people can

lose their liberties while they are jealous of liberty. But the liberties of the freest people are in danger when they set up symbols of liberty as fetiches and worship them.

At this moment the fetich worship that most concerns us is that of the American flag. The American flag symbolizes a great political principle, a great moral principle, a great religious principle. It is the symbol of noble ideals, toward the realization of which we have been growing for a century and more.

Equal rights before the law; equal rights to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness; equal citizenship, with no "subjects," wherever the flag floats and its authority is asserted; and no toleration of governmental powers not derived from the consent of the governed. These are the American ideals. And these ideals are what the flag has symbolized, and what have made it thrill our hearts when we have seen it float triumphant.

We have indeed fallen short of realizing our ideals. The flag has indeed been used to protect the piracy of slave trading, to sanction the institution of slavery, to exterminate the Indians, to outrage common rights. Nevertheless, it has on the whole truly represented our ideals. It has been our symbol and not our fetich. Under its shadow the slave trade at least was condemned and slavery abolished. Heretofore it has been used to lead us toward our ideals and not away from them.

But now we have come upon times when, in the name of the flag, we are called upon to repudiate the ideals it symbolizes. The flag, we are told, demands our loyalty, though it fly in the forefront of battles for the subjugation of men who themselves are struggling for liberty, which we are seeking to take from them. In the name of the flag we are called upon to make it the symbol of arbitrary power to a conquered and subject people. No real patriot can respond to that call. To do so is to worship the flag as a fetich.

There are patriotic pagans as there are religious pagans. The religious pagan banishes God from his religion and substitutes an ugly idol. The patriotic pagan banishes principle

from his patriotism and substitutes brilliant bunting. It is the patriotic pagan who calls upon his fellow citizens to follow the flag, though pirates send it forth upon a mission of destruction to all the good and true that it symbolizes. Real patriots will follow no flag upon such an errand. No truly patriotic American will cheer on his country's flag in a piratical crusade against his country's ideals.

NEWS

War in the Philippines continues. Last week we were able to present the substance of the press reports down to the 15th, when the Americans were in possession of Iloilo and the outlying town of Jaro, on the Island of Panay, and were holding a battle line 23 miles long in front of Manila on the Island of Luzon. Since then no fighting has been reported from Iloilo, though Molo, another outlying town, and Santa Barbara, an important neighboring town, are now occupied by the Americans. But in front of Manila the Americans have had fighting to do, and have suffered one repulse, besides being obliged to contract their lines. They have also had to do street fighting within the city itself.

The engagement of the 16th at San Pedro Macate, about 10 miles southeast of Manila, which we mentioned last week, proves to have been brought on by an attack upon a large body of Filipinos supposed to be reconnoitering. The attack was made by Gen. King's brigade to the right of which the Filipino force was first seen. The whole brigade turned out, but after an exchange of volleys the Filipinos disappeared in the jungle. No casualties are reported. On the next day, the 17th, a considerable Filipino force attacked the American outposts near the Manila water works. The Americans were soon reinforced and after a hot fight drove the Filipinos back towards Caloocan. American reports give the Filipino casualties as 50 killed, and the American as eight severely wounded and none killed. One of the wounded, however, died during the night. No engagements are reported for the 18th, but on the 19th another skirmish occurred near San Pedro Macate. In this affair the Filipinos attacked a church at Guadalupe which was oc-

cupied by an American regiment, and drove the regiment out. They then set fire to the church and retired. No reports of casualties have been given. The Associated Press account of this engagement states that the Filipinos "still hold the country in the vicinity of Guadalupe, Pasig and Patero, despite the efforts of the gunboats to dislodge them from the jungle on both sides of the river," and it adds that "the heat is intense and is increasing perceptibly daily." The same report tells of other fighting farther to the south, in which a gunboat opened fire at night upon Filipino trenches, drawing a few volleys in reply, but without other effect. During the night of the same day the Filipinos poured volley after volley into San Pedro Macate from a neighboring ridge, though without doing any reported damage. On the next day the American line was drawn in, it having become too difficult—because of the great heat, the limited forces, and the activity of the swarms of Filipinos—to protect so long a line. No movements are reported for the 21st. But on the night of the 22d, an outbreak occurred in the city of Manila, accompanied by an attempt to destroy the city by fire. There was severe street fighting, and the fire did great damage. At least 700 buildings are said to have been destroyed. Loss of life was suffered, but to what extent is not yet reported. The night is described as "one of terror."

Gen. Otis was interviewed on the 18th by a New York Journal representative, to whom, in reply to questions, he said:

The idea of the natives participating in the future American government of the islands has not been considered. Friendly natives will not be used as allies. No one understands the native character. The natives do not understand the American idea of liberty. They are blinded by unscrupulous leaders, the riff-raff of wandering Americans and foreign scamps of every kind, dumped down in Manila, while the Asiatic coast cities have aided the insurgents to secure arms, and agitate the idea of independence. The natives only fight when they are told to do so. They do not understand what they are fighting for.

Asked, "How many natives are bearing arms to-day?" Gen. Otis replied:

Too many, and they are not confined to the Island of Luzon alone. The Iloilo fight showed that. We must stop the unscrupulous rascals who furnished arms, and are sliding along the Asiatic coast from Hongkong, Sangapore, and

Shanghai. The outbreak of the Philippines was brought about by the machinations of corrupt Filipinos who control affairs. They did everything to inflame the natives and make them believe that American rule would be worse than the oppression of the Spaniards. The insurgent papers of Manila advocated independence and inflamed the natives with a desire for gain and plunder. They did everything to prejudice the people against the Americans. Aguinaldo is not so bad as he is painted. He does not control nor represent the Filipinos. His name is used simply as a blind. The people of the islands are skeptical of all things; and the leaders, for their own advantage, used him as a demigod. Shrewd, unscrupulous Filipinos used the name of Aguinaldo to influence the natives. He lost personal control and was forced to act by the men who surrounded him.

When asked how long it would take to subdue the Philippines, Gen. Otis is described as turning around in his chair, hesitating, and finally saying:

I can talk no more to-day.

Approximately 8,000 more troops are now on their way to reinforce Gen. Otis. There are five separate expeditions. Gen. Lawton, with 1,728 men, has passed the Suez canal. Gen. Wheaton with 1,268 men left San Francisco January 27; and Col. Egbert with one regiment left there early in February. Besides these, 2,000 men on board the Sherman left Gibraltar for the Suez canal on the 17th; and on the 19th the Sheridan with 2,100 men sailed from New York for Manila by way of Suez. One gunboat arrived on the 22d to reinforce Dewey, and another has just passed through the Suez canal.

President McKinley was the guest of the "Home Market Club" at its banquet in Boston on the 15th, and in his speech he discussed chiefly the Philippine question. It was the first time he had publicly referred to the subject since his trip to Atlanta, reported in No. 38 of *The Public*. The important parts of Mr. McKinley's speech were as follows:

The Philippines, like Cuba and Porto Rico, were intrusted to our hands by the war, and to that great trust, under the Providence of God and in the name of human progress and civilization, we are committed. It is a trust we have not sought; it is a trust from which we will not flinch. . . . We hear no complaint of the relation created by the war between this government and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico. There are some, however, who regard the Philippines as in a different relation; but whatever variety of views

there may be on this phase of the question there is universal agreement that the Philippines shall not be turned back to Spain. No true American will consent to that. . . . And yet, had we refused to accept the cession of them we should have had no power over them, even for their own good. We could not discharge the responsibilities resting upon us until these islands became ours, either by consent or treaty. There was but one alternative, and that was either Spain or the United States in the Philippines. The other suggestions—first, that they should be tossed into the arena for the strife of nations; or, second, be lost to the anarchy and chaos of no protectorate at all—were too shameful to be considered. . . . Our concern was not for territory or trade or empire, but for the people whose interests and destiny, without our willing it, had been put in our hands. It was with this feeling that from the first day to the last not one word or line went from the executive in Washington to our military and naval commanders at Manila or to our peace commissioners at Paris that did not put as the sole purpose to be kept in mind first, after the success of our arms and the maintenance of our own honor, the welfare and happiness and the rights of the inhabitants of the Philippine islands. Did we need their consent to perform a great act for humanity? We had it in every aspiration of their minds, in every hope of their hearts. Was it necessary to ask their consent to capture Manila, the capital of their islands? Did we ask their consent to liberate them from Spanish sovereignty or to enter Manila bay and destroy the Spanish sea power there? We did not ask these; we were obeying a higher moral obligation which rested on us and which did not require anybody's consent. We were doing our duty by them with the consent of our own consciences and with the approval of civilization. Every present obligation has been met and fulfilled in the expulsion of Spanish sovereignty from their islands, and while the war that destroyed it was in progress we could not ask their views. Nor can we now ask their consent.

Indeed, can anyone tell me in what form it could be marshaled and ascertained until peace and order, so necessary to a reign of reason, shall be secured and established? A reign of terror is not the kind of rule under which right action and deliberate judgment are possible. It is not a good time for the liberator to submit important questions concerning liberty and government to the liberated while they are engaged in shooting down their rescuers? . . .

The future of the Philippine islands is now in the hands of the American people. Until the treaty was ratified or rejected the executive department of this government could only preserve the

peace and protect life and property. That treaty now commits the free and enfranchised Filipinos to the guiding hand and the liberalizing influences, the generous sympathies and the uplifting education, not of their American masters, but of their American emancipators. No one can tell to-day what is best for them or for us. I know no one at this hour who is wise enough or sufficiently informed to determine what form of government will best preserve their interests and our interests; their and our well-being. . . . Until congress shall direct otherwise it will be the duty of the executive to possess and hold the Philippines, giving to the people thereof peace and beneficent government, affording them every opportunity to prosecute their lawful pursuits, encouraging them in thrift and industry, making them feel and know we are their friends, not their enemies; that their good is our aim; that their welfare is our welfare, but that neither their aspirations nor ours can be realized until our authority is acknowledged and unquestioned.

That the inhabitants of the Philippines will be benefited by this republic is my unshaken belief; that they will have a kindlier government under our guidance and that they will be aided in every possible way to be self-respecting and self-governing people is as true as that the American people love liberty and have an abiding faith in their own government and their own institutions.

No imperial designs lurk in the American mind. They are alien to American sentiment, thought and purpose. Our priceless principles undergo no change under a tropical sun.

We now pass from the Philippine question to the personal issue between Sampson and Schley, which has been brought before the senate. It has long been asserted on the part of Sampson's friends, including the secretary of the navy, that Schley was not only entitled to no credit for the victory over Cervera, but that he merited condemnation for negligence in hovering about Cienfuegos in May, while Cervera was safely hidden in Santiago harbor, a negligence which but for good fortune and the vigilance of Sampson might have permitted Cervera to escape. Schley remained silent throughout the controversy, and a prejudice against him had begun to take root. But when the secretary of the navy submitted a report with documents, to the senate, in which both directly and through Sampson's reports to him, he reiterated the complaints against Schley, Schley was given an opportunity to answer. This he did through a communication to the senate committee

on naval affairs, which was made public on the 20th.

As to his delay off Cienfuegos Schley says that he was then acting under orders from Sampson to blockade that port. These orders of Sampson are not given in the secretary's report along with Sampson's other orders; so Schley quotes from them. They are dated May 20, and were received by Schley May 23. By them Sampson requires Schley to

hold his fleet off Cienfuegos. If the Spanish ships have put into Santiago they must come either to Havana or to Cienfuegos to deliver the munitions of war which they are said to bring for use in Cuba. I am therefore of the opinion that the best chance to capture these ships will be to hold the two points, Cienfuegos and Havana, with all the force we can muster. If, later, it should develop that these vessels are at Santiago we can then assemble off that point the ships best suited for the purpose, and completely blockade it. Until we, then, receive more positive information we shall continue to hold Havana and Cienfuegos.

On the 24th of May Schley learned definitely that the Spanish fleet was not at Cienfuegos, and within two hours he started for Santiago where, after much difficulty, he succeeded in positively locating it on the 29th. His statement in this particular he verifies by a telegram of May 31st from Sampson, in which Sampson congratulates him upon his success in locating and blockading the enemy's fleet at Santiago. Schley takes occasion to contrast this compliment with Sampson's letter to the department of July 10—six weeks later—describing the same occurrence as "reprehensible conduct."

Turning then to the events of the battle with Cervera on July 3, Schley first shows that he and not Sampson, was by Sampson's own orders, in command of the fleet. At 8:45 on that morning, more than an hour before Cervera's ships emerged from the harbor, Sampson signaled his fleet to "disregard movements of the commander-in-chief," and steamed away eastward. This left Schley the senior officer present, and clothed him with the responsibility of command. That was the situation when the enemy appeared. Schley then directed the American fleet by signals from the Brooklyn, with which also he made a maneuver that he describes as "the crucial and deciding feature of the combat." It was not until after this

battle of July 3, Schley explains, that he heard any criticism, either from Sampson, the department, or anyone else, of his so-called "reprehensible conduct" prior to May 29.

Other aftermath of the Spanish war relates to charges made by Gen. Miles for the investigation of which, as reported last week, the president has convened a court of inquiry. The court met on the 17th at Washington, and on the 20th Gen. Miles appeared before it as the first witness. Since then several witnesses have testified as to the quality of the beef furnished the troops in the field.

In Europe the center of interest for the week has been in France. At our last report, a week ago, that country was in a state of great excitement over the bill which had just passed the chamber of deputies, to regulate the revision of the Dreyfus case; and in the midst of this turmoil, on the 16th, the president of France—Felix Faure—suddenly died. The cause of his death was apoplexy. It was feared at the time that this event might under the circumstances precipitate a revolution. But the fear was not realized. In two days a new president had been quietly elected. The election took place at Versailles. Emile Loubet, president of the senate, presided over the two houses. On the first ballot Loubet was elected. He received 483 votes out of 817 cast. The total number of members is 883.

The new president of France has been exceptionally noncommittal on the subject of the Dreyfus case. But as his election was due to the almost unanimous support of the senate, in which there is believed to be an overwhelming Dreyfus majority, and also because his election was bitterly opposed by the anti-Dreyfusites, it is assumed that he is rather favorable than unfavorable to Dreyfus. After the election, attempts were made in Paris to get up a demonstration against Loubet, but they failed. As we write, however, there is great nervousness lest a revolutionary outbreak may occur on the occasion of the late president's funeral. In his message to the chambers, delivered on the 21st, President Loubet spoke in general terms giving no indication of specific policies.

The Spanish cortes met on the 20th. This occasion has been looked forward to with peculiar interest on

account of the pending questions relating to the war with the United States, including that of the ratification of the Paris treaty. The first meeting was very disorderly. A general uproar being provoked by random discussions of different phases of the war; and Premier Sagasta was compelled to withdraw his proposition to refer the bill for ceding the Philippines to the United States, on account of conservative opposition. Bitter accusations were made regarding the "shameful capitulation of Santiago." One deputy complained that although five months had elapsed no Spanish general had yet been shot. Similar scenes were enacted at the session on the 21st; and they were repeated on the 22d. The treaty has not yet been acted upon.

Greek politics are not so boisterous as those of France and Spain. The election, the approach of which we noted in No. 41, page 11, passed off quietly on the 20th. The ministry in power at the time of the dissolution of the chamber on the 9th of last January, which was led by Alexander Zaimis, appealed to the constituencies. The opposition was led by the former premier, Theodore Delyannis. Delyannis was badly beaten. He carried only 22 seats out of 207. Elections in Greece are by manhood suffrage, 21 years being the minimum age limit.

Friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States were supposed to have been disturbed by the sudden and long adjournment on the 20th of the Canadian high joint commission. The adjournment was taken until August 2. This commission was created pursuant to an agreement made May 30, 1897, by the British ambassador, the Canadian minister of marine, and two American special commissioners, its function being to frame a treaty between Great Britain and the United States for the complete adjustment of all controversies affecting the United States and Canada. Among the questions contemplated are those of North Pacific sealing, of Atlantic fisheries, of the Alaska and other indefinite boundary lines, of the transit of merchandise across boundaries, of alien labor laws, of mining rights, of customs duties, of war vessels on the great lakes, of the transportation of prisoners by either country through the other, of the use of currency, of trade reciprocity, and of wreckage and salvage rights. The joint commission met in Quebec on

the 23d of August last, from which place, after a few meetings, it adjourned to Washington, where the decision to take the long adjournment until next August has just been made.

Several reasons for the long adjournment were surmised, chief among which was the supposed inability of the commission to come to an agreement as to the Alaska boundary. This dispute arises out of the treaty between England and Russia, made in 1825, when Russia owned Alaska. Having acquired Russian rights under that treaty, the United States claims 30 miles in width of territory along the Pacific coast from the point where the boundary line leaves the 141st meridian to the point where it touches the 130th, being the territory which has been generally indicated on the maps as part of Alaska. Canada's claim, on the other hand, based upon her interpretation of the same treaty, would carry the line within much less than 30 miles of the coast, and give to her valuable harbors from which she is now excluded. The crucial question is whether in describing the line as 30 miles back from the coast, the treaty alluded to the main coast or to the outlying islands. If to the islands the Canadian claim holds good; if to the main coast it fails.

There was in fact, however, no real reason for supposing that the commission had encountered serious obstacles to an agreement, and this was made plain on the day of the adjournment by the publication of the following statement, signed by Senator Fairbanks, chairman of the American commission, for the United States, and by Sir Wilfrid Laurin, acting chairman of the British commission, in behalf of Canada:

The commission adjourned to meet at Quebec August 2 unless the chairmen of the respective commissions shall agree upon another date.

The commission has made very substantial progress in the settlement and adjustment of many of the questions upon which it has been earnestly engaged. But it has been unable to agree upon the settlement of the Alaskan boundary. This problem has been a complicated and difficult one, but the commissioners, acting in the utmost friendliness and cordiality, have been unable to agree upon a satisfactory adjustment.

The difficulties, apart from the immediate delimitation of this boundary by the commission itself, arise from the conditions under which it might be referred to arbitration. The British com-

missioners desired that the whole question should be referred on terms similar to those provided in the reference of the Venezuelan boundary line, which, by providing an umpire, would insure certainty and finality. The United States commissioners, on the other hand, thought the local conditions in Alaska so different that some modifications of the Venezuelan boundary reference should be introduced. They thought the reference should be made to six eminent jurists, three chosen by each of the high contracting parties, without providing for an umpire, they believing that finality would be secured by a majority vote of the jurists so chosen. They did not see any present prospect of agreeing to a European umpire, to be selected in the manner proposed by the British commissioners, while the British commissioners were unwilling to agree to the selection of an American umpire in the manner suggested by the United States commissioners.

The United States commissioners further contend that special stipulations should be made in any reference to arbitration that the existing settlements on the tidewaters of the coast should in any result continue to belong to the United States. To this contention the British commissioners refused to agree.

It was therefore deemed advisable to adjourn to a convenient date in order to enable the respective governments to further consider the subject, with respect to which no conclusion has yet been reached.

In the domestic politics of the United States the subjects of general interest are the renomination by the republicans of Cleveland of Mayor McKisson, against the active opposition of Senator Hanna; and the opening by ex-Gov. Altgeld of his mayoralty campaign in Chicago.

Mayor McKisson has persistently fought Senator Hanna's street car interests in Cleveland, opposing the extension of franchises and advocating public ownership. Upon this record he was nominated on the 20th for the third time, though his opponent, Judge Stone, is a popular man locally, in every respect except as to his political relations with Senator Hanna.

Altgeld's campaign opening in Chicago on the 18th was an astonishing success. The large hall was packed and thousands were turned away. The ex-governor's speech was a carefully prepared indictment of the city administration for official misfeasance and malfeasance, including the story of an evident and successful conspiracy to circumvent the civil service

law. The details of this conspiracy had already been made public by John Z. White in a speech the night previous, before the single tax club. It consists in the mayor's making "emergency" appointments for every position to be filled, care being often taken to see that the emergency appointees pass the civil service examination at the head of the list. Altgeld laid especial stress in his opening speech upon his policy of immediate adoption of municipal ownership of the street railway system, but did not discuss national politics.

American Catholics in the United States have for several weeks been expecting the publication of a papal letter to Cardinal Gibbons relative to disputed questions in the American church. Such a letter it now appears was written January 22. It was published in Rome, in the official organ of the church there, on the 22d of February, but has not yet appeared in full in the United States. Indeed, on the 22d, it had not yet reached Cardinal Gibbons. Cabled extracts from Rome indicate that it reflects upon Father Elliott's "Life of Father Hecker" as containing blame-worthy opinions regarding the Holy Ghost, passive virtues, and religious vows. Beyond this there is so far no indication of the attitude of the pope toward what is spoken of as "Americanism" in the church. The Rome correspondent of the London Chronicle says of it:

The pope's letter to Cardinal Gibbons will possibly be exploited by the anti-Americans; but on the whole it is not unfavorable to American Catholicism."

NEWS NOTES.

—The indictments against Gov. Tanner in connection with the Virden coal lockout have been dismissed.

—The Illinois supreme court holds the city of Chicago pecuniarily responsible for private damages caused by mob violence in the railroad strike of 1894.

—The legislature of North Carolina has voted to submit to the people a constitutional amendment requiring educational and poll tax tests of negro voters, but exempting white voters from the same tests.

—Mrs. Frances S. Lee presided one day last week as speaker pro tem. in the lower house of the Colorado legislature. Her service in the chair was entirely satisfactory to the body of which she is a member.

—On March 1st at Cincinnati a national conference in the interest of

direct legislation will be held at Cincinnati, O., under the auspices of the Ohio Union reform party. M. A. Neff, 34 East Sixth street, Cincinnati, has charge of preliminary details.

—Chairman Jones, of the national democratic committee, has appointed an advisory committee consisting of himself, Stephen M. White, of California; D. J. Campau, of Michigan; Norman Mack, of New York; John P. Altgeld, of Illinois, and George Fred Williams, of Massachusetts. The selection of Altgeld, instead of the national committeeman for Illinois, who is a supporter of Mayor Harrison, is regarded as significant.

—Prof. George P. Herron gave the first of a series of eight lectures on the evening of the 19th at Central Music hall, Chicago, before a large audience. The remaining lectures of the series will be given every Sunday night at the same place. His general topic is: "Between Caesar and Jesus." On the 20th Prof. Herron began, also at Central Music hall, a series of eight lectures on "Municipal Ideals." This series will be given every Monday noon at Central Music hall.

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 11 to 20, 1899.

Senate.

On Saturday, the 11th, unanimous consent was given to take up the Philippine resolution offered by Senator McEnery, and to dispose of it at two o'clock on the 14th. Consideration of the legislative appropriation bill was then resumed and the bill passed. The agricultural appropriation bill and the bill for the payment of state expenses for the volunteer army were considered. The latter was passed. On Monday the 13th the bill to remove disabilities of Confederates, the bill to create the office of admiral in the navy, and the agricultural appropriation bill were passed. The passage of the Confederate disabilities bill was reconsidered on the 14th, after which the McEnery joint resolution was debated and voted upon pursuant to agreement of the 11th. The resolution as proposed was as follows:

That 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. The following addition was offered by way of amendment:

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 therein, entitled in the judgment of the government 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.

The amendment was defeated—29 to 29, the vice president determining the tie by voting in the negative. The McEnery resolution unamended was then adopted—26 to 22. No business of general interest was done on the 15th. The 16th was devoted to consideration of the post office appropriations, and the 17th to the naval personnel bill, which was passed. Consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed on the 18th and continued on Monday, the 20th. On the latter day the bill for reorganizing the army was taken up for consideration.

House.

A joint resolution was passed on Saturday, the 11th, which authorized extra pay for hours in excess of eight per day, to laborers in naval yards. On Monday, the 13th, consideration of the sundry civil bill was resumed. It was continued on the 14th, 15th and 16th, when it passed. Before the vote upon this bill Mr. Hepburn moved in the house to amend by inserting a provision for the construction of the Nicaragua canal, which was ruled out of order. The naval appropriation bill was considered on the 17th and 18th, and on Monday, the 20th, under suspension of the rules, the senate bill for the purpose of reimbursing states for expenses in raising volunteers was passed with an amendment. Also under suspension of the rules the bill appropriating \$20,000,000 for the purchase of the Philippines under the Paris treaty was passed.

MISCELLANY

WASHINGTON'S NAME.

Lines written for the annual banquet of the Virginia Association at Washington, D. C., Feb. 22nd, 1899.

Washington's day!—and our memories dwell

On the pictured book of the past;
The fearless Congress; the Liberty Bell;
The wager of battle at last;
The blue and buff in a thin, thin line,
As it fronted the tyrant George;
The struggle from Boston to Brandywine;
The winter at Valley Forge;
The Yorktown siege—and the deathless fame
That settled forever on Washington's name!

Washington's name! Time only endears
That name to our patriot pride;
He draws our hearts through a hundred years

As the moon draws upward the tide!
And we thank our God for the plan
Of a providence, strange and great,
That brought together the time and the man

In a swinging pivot of fate
That turned and turned till Liberty came
And the whole world thrilled with Washington's name!

He knew no section, he served no class,
No patron, no secret control;
And felt-shod plunder could find no pass
To the tall Virginian's soul!
True to his trust, in deed and in word,
He spurned the bribe of a crown—
For freedom he lifted his vallant sword,
For freedom he laid it down,
For freedom he ruled—till freedom became
An answering echo of Washington's name!

The years have sped! We stand at the gate
Of a century new and strange.
We know we are reaching a crisis of fate
In the drift of a ceaseless change;
But we dare not, must not, will not fix
A bound to the hopes we bear;
We reach the fountains of seventy-six
And drink a new courage there!
The years have sped—but our cause is the same,

And we challenge the future in Washington's name!

HOWARD S. TAYLOR.

THE END OF PROGRESS.

The consummate fruit of civilization and Christianity and the culmination and end of human progress is to approximate justice. An immutable law of the intellectual advancement, and the moral development of mankind, is that we must nearer and nearer come to the right interpretation and dispensation of justice.

Therefore the advocates of a just cause may with sublime faith predict its ultimate triumphs. The consciousness of being right; and the unfaltering belief that their words and works will have certainly achieved benefactions for posterity, anticipate all the happiness and satisfactions of the praise of posterity.

The intellectual exultations of right-doing are a feast to the soul—an invisible and everlasting luxury. The denunciations of the mob cannot lessen this supreme felicity. The plaudits of the multitude cannot enhance it.

The coward may live and enjoy to-day. But the brave and the wise live for to-morrow and for the betterment of those who shall then exist. Justice for all humanity in all the world is the aim and end of progress. When justice shall have encircled the globe, Heaven will have begun upon earth and man will have reached his highest possible evolution.—The Conservative.

JOBS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

A few days ago a couple of strong, hearty young men stopped at our house and staid all night. One of them was the son of an old army comrade of mine

—a man who had shared the varying fortunes of war with me in '64 and '65.

Now these young men were both able and willing to work. They both live in Los Angeles, and possess unusual acuteness for detecting a "job," if one should be out looking for them.

But they assured us that, so far from the "job" being out looking for them, they had been for days and weeks looking for the job, and utterly failing to find even the shadow thereof,—and not only they, but scores of others, good honest workmen, who walk the streets all day, ready and willing to do anything to earn bread for themselves and families.

I can mention a couple of instances that happened within the last few weeks.

A neighbor of mine told me of a certain man, the head of a family, who offered to work for ten cents a day and his board. And there were no takers!

In another instance, a man living in Santa Monica went to Los Angeles to work, cleaning away a lot of rubbish where an oil tank had been burned. He worked faithfully for a week, when the "job" left him, and went away, presumably to "hunt" some one else.

When the "horny-handed son of toil" figured up his assets at the close of the week, the account stood about like this:

H. S. T.	
By 6 days' labor.....	\$4.80
To 6 days' board.....	4.50
Balance	\$0.30

On the whole a very fair showing for a week's work in these piping times of prosperity.—Extract from letter dated Santa Monica, Cal., Jan. 21.

A PENITENT NATION.

For The Public.

Our nation a month ago had before it a great opportunity and a great temptation—an opportunity for moral leadership by showing an example of magnanimity and self-control, in acknowledging in the hour of victory the right of the Filipinos to self-government, and offering our assistance in helping them to achieve it by protecting them from foreign interference while they were establishing their government, and then after a reasonable time withdrawing;—a temptation to sacrifice the very soul of our nation, the principle of the right of self-government, for false prestige, bloody philanthropy, and supposed commercial advantage.

It has yielded to the temptation, and sacrificed the opportunity, so that we are to-day a fallen nation, waging murderous and unjust war against a people fighting for those rights which until now it has been our boast that we cherished and protected. Many are asking

themselves: How shall the black and shameful chapter of our history, which we are now writing, be blotted out? How shall our flag, polluted by being made the standard of piracy and rapine, be cleansed? Is there any atonement for national sin?

These questions can have but one answer, the atonement for national sin is through repentance, confession, reparation and amendment. Our moral leadership, so wilfully abandoned, can be regained by our standing before the world as a penitent nation. Let us confess our fault to those whom we have wronged (the Filipinos); make such reparation as is possible by offering our aid in helping them to establish a government of their own, absolutely free from any foreign domination; and then, taking to heart the bitter lesson learned, resolve never again to be false to the principles of liberty and self-government.

J. T. RIPLEY.

A DREAM OF EMPIRE.

I dream of an Empire vast, sublimer than Rome of old,
A giant to make the past seem petty and poor and cold.
I see in the lengthening years the nation's shadow grow
O'spreading the hemispheres, as Freedom's sun sinks low.
The pulse of pride is thrilled at the thought of the things to be,
And Caesar's soul is filled with a vision of Destiny.
The fetters are broken made for us by the Fathers gone,
And Jefferson's ghost is laid with the spectre of Washington.
Now welcome the Empire grand cemented in blood and might!
At last shall our country stand, emancipate from Right!
Farewell, the sun, now setting, that rose on the nation's birth;
His pitiful race is run—our heritage is the earth.
I dream of an Empire vast, divided by robbers twain;
Yet oft I awake aghast with a sting of shame and pain,
For, what if a Judge there be of nations as well as men,
And a real eternity with laws beyond our ken?
And what if He fall to see in the scales His fingers hold
An ounce of supremacy for Color or Caste or Gold?
'Tis sweeter to dream or drink, as the joyous feast goes on;
For, should we awake and think, we might think of Babylon.
—James Jeffrey Roche, in *The Criterion*.

THE COOPERATIVE KITCHEN.

Now that so large a number of advanced and farseeing men and women are awakening to the scope of domestic science and studying combinations of food material with reference to hygiene, they will not long continue to

relegate such important interests to a body of ignorant office-holders. For the abundantly rich the problem presents but few difficulties. Wealthy families will always be able to secure a satisfactory resident cook who has been trained in the best European or American schools, but for families of moderate means it looks as if the cooperative kitchen would be the ultimate way out of the difficulty. At present there is a waste of fuel, of cooks, of kitchens in household economics, and in order to make a cook worth her keep and her wages she is often obliged to act as laundress. Thoroughly skilled labor in all departments of living is becoming more and more specialized. A cooperative kitchen would have to be convenient to a number of houses; perhaps later an architect will build houses around a block and a kitchen for the use of all in a central courtyard. Such a kitchen could well be conducted by a representative of the refined and educated class who would understand "moral cooking," and would also have a cultivated taste for edibles and seasoning. She or he, as might be, would want to do away with the hot ranges of the past and their clumsy adjuncts and to substitute gas stoves, spirit lamps and electricity. An improvement in the personnel of cooks and their environments, a demonstration of the worthiness of the profession, would present it in a different light to all wage-earners, and the American sovereign would no longer affix a stamp of odium to cooking as a business, and further adaptations and changes would take place which cannot be foreseen from this distance. The trend of the times toward having less food prepared in home kitchens is plainly visible in the quantity of bread, meats, and salads, pies, cakes and desserts purchased not only from bakers, caterers and confectioners, but from industrial exchanges in which private housekeepers of the most honorable grade have made an entering wedge as cooks for the public market.—F. A. Doughty, in *January Chautauquan*, as condensed for *Public Opinion*.

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

The intimation is being quietly made that the wage-workers and laboring classes of the city have not quite the right to vote on the question of bonding the county for \$100,000 to buy a new court house site possessed by those who are property owners and direct tax payers. The assumption on which this intimation rests, that the man whose

name does not appear on the assessment rolls does not pay taxes, is entirely erroneous. On the contrary, the fact is that the average man whose name does not appear on the assessment rolls pays more in proportion to his means than those whose names do so appear.

Business is so organized that the property owner, unless he uses his own property, is able to transfer the tax levied upon him to the person to whom he sells. Speaking generally, the renter, not the landlord, pays the tax on the house he occupies and the customer, when he buys an article at the store, pays all the charges that have accumulated against that article, including taxes. The wage-worker generally purchases for consumption, and as such consumer the accumulated weight of the public burden falls upon him. It would be possible to have a tax system in which this condition did not prevail—for example, an income tax is not capable of being transferred—but under the system we now have taxation rests upon consumption, and in proportion as a man buys shelter or necessities of life, he contributes to the city, county, state and national governments. Moreover, inasmuch as the average wage-worker comes more nearly to expending his entire income than does the well-to-do or rich person, the wage-worker proportionately is more burdened by public taxes.

It would be well if all classes, especially the wage-workers themselves, more clearly perceived this simple and primary fact of taxation incidence. It would save us from many a foolish public act. As it is now many wage-workers really think it to their interest to have large public expenditures by moneys raised through tax levies. Forgetting that sooner or later the tax will come around to them as consumers to pay, they permit themselves to be deceived into thinking that the tax will rest only upon the citizens whose names appear on the assessment rolls. At a low estimate, nine-tenths of the tax which it is proposed to levy for the purchase of a new courthouse site will in the end be paid by those who have never been visited by an assessor.—*The Des Moines (Iowa) Leader*.

HAVE YOU PRESERVED YOUR RESPONSIBILITY?

An extract from a sermon on "An Inhuman Civilization," delivered by the Rev. Wm. T. Brown in Plymouth Congregational church, Rochester, N. Y., Jan. 22, 1899, as reported in *The Rochester Herald*.

I suppose most of us think that when in this republic we dispensed with a King altogether, we freed ourselves of the social danger which is involved in

the unjust usurpation of power which kingship everywhere means. We did nothing of the kind. We could do nothing of the kind. We may say that the poor French King was innocent of any purpose to do harm, and that is no doubt true. And we may think that it was an exhibition of nothing but brutality which led the people of France to take the life of Louis XVI. But we shall make a mistake. Where there is power there is responsibility. He who dares to exercise the one must accept the full measure of the other. There is no escaping the conclusion. That power which presumes to rule a people must be held responsible for the welfare of that people. It is right that it should be so.

Now, when we set up a government on these shores, though we got rid of a King, we did not get rid of one smallest fraction of the power and responsibility vested in a King. Wherever there is a government, no matter what its form, there is all the power and all the responsibility that inheres in any other government. Government in the United States does not incur less responsibility than government in Russia or Germany or China. The attempt was made here to distribute responsibility. But he would be exceedingly rash who would say that that attempt had been very successful. In theory, the responsibility of government is distributed among our seventy or eighty millions of people, or our fifteen or sixteen millions of voters. But in practice that is not altogether true.

The sum and substance of the matter is that this nation is not half so much a democracy as it is a plutocracy. I cannot imagine any sane man denying the statement that for the most part it is money rather than men that carries elections and determines government here. I say I cannot conceive a sane man doubting that proposition. It is true, whether we know it or not. That is to say, money has arrogated to itself in this country the precise function which was vested in a King in France.

You may say that the people submit to it, and are therefore responsible for it, that they decree it. That is not true. Under existing conditions the people cannot help themselves. It would be just as true to say that in the days of slavery in this country the slaves were responsible for the power exercised by their masters. That was not true. Conditions over which the slave had no control had made him a slave and the other man was his master. The condition of mastership was a usurpation. Upon the master rested all the responsibility which his power implied.

MUNICIPAL IDEALS.

Extracts from an address delivered in Chicago, Monday noon, February 20, under the auspices of the National Christian Citizenship league, by Prof. George D. Herron, of Iowa college, as reported by the Chicago Record.

The individual life of man is more and more made up of relations of fellowship. More and more it is becoming true that the quality of the individual depends upon the quality of his relations to his community and to his fellow-men. In nothing can a man be any longer separate unto himself. He is the most truly individualistic who makes the widest possible contribution to his fellow-men. The city is best governed and is the best home for man in which all citizens rejoice or suffer at the same thing. That city in which something works to make some happy and others sad, or causes some to prosper and others to be injured, is the habitation and culmination of all misery. The city is to-day the nerve center of human life. The association which city congestion produces is better in its worst phases than the highest form of separation and loneliness. "Fellowship is heaven; the lack of fellowship is hell," has been said. I feel like adding that fellowship in hell is better than separation and individualism in heaven, if any sort of a heaven is a subjective condition that comes from the harmony of man in right relation. It is in the city, therefore, that ideals in the common life can be realized, and only in the city. The city is the communal unity, the communal soul, in modern life. The citizens of a city working together for the common good can make a communal heaven even out of Chicago—and that is a great stretch of spiritual imagination. . . .

Every child born into this city is entitled to be surrounded by all the resources of the common life, the best that is possible, the highest that is conceivable, in opportunity for living out all possibilities of his life. Every man is entitled to life, liberty, land, air, art, education, the opportunity to do what he can best do. To all these men are equally entitled. To give them the city is really created. . . .

A city which permits its resources to be centralized in the hands of the few, so that the few have power and luxury, is a hideous caricature. It is irrational, unnatural, profane, irreligious, that the common resources should be given away as a field of exploitation for the few. If you can picture a condition that would permit corporations to control the air and sunshine, consider the matter of public franchises. If a few men can own the

city, they doubtless own the citizens. Is it not true in this city that the few men who own your public resources and franchises own its moral being and its citizenship, whose souls become at last but grist for the capitalist mill? I am not interested in your discussions whether street car companies should have 25 or 50-year franchises. The granting away of franchises of any sort for any time whatever is public immorality. Private ownership of public resources is inherently and elementarily immoral. It reduces the municipality to a sort of splendid slavery. It is a violation of nature. I do not blame Mr. Yerkes for owning the city. I blame Chicago for allowing him to do it.

The conservative and respectable reformer, from which the Lord deliver us, asserts that citizenship for the city's good may be practical a generation from now; that we are not ready for it yet. No ideal was ever born into the world out of its time. The moment that ideal comes into the vision of the common life, then and only then is the safe moment to realize it.

TOM JOHNSON'S DECLARATIONS.

The single tax proposes to abolish all taxes placed on consumption, all taxes that fall on men measured by what they consume.

Sugar does not pay taxes. Steel rails do not pay taxes. Men and women pay taxes.

When you measure how much they pay by what they consume you have adopted a scheme of taxation that falls on weak and strong alike, rich and poor alike, that taxes the head of a family alone more than an old bachelor, though he might be many times a millionaire.

That is the kind of a tax that you collect at a custom house. Single tax proposes to abolish that. It proposes to take away from the statute books every scheme of license tax. Living would be doubly easy.

The next step would be to abolish the tax that falls upon personal property, the tax that falls on bonds and stocks, the tax that the widows and orphans pay.

A tax on stocks and bonds is a tax on mere evidence of ownership, and it is as absurd as to tax a man on his house and lot and also on the deed for his house and lot.

The single tax would abolish the tax on improvements and leave the tax on the land values from which we now raise a part of the revenue. We say, raise it all from that source.

The single tax proposes to raise every

single cent of revenue required for the nation, for the state, or for the municipality by a tax upon land values and upon land values only. That is single tax.

We propose leaving land in the private possession of individuals, with full liberty on their part to give, sell it or bequeath it; simply to levy on it for public uses a tax that shall equal the annual value of the land itself irrespective of the use made of it or the improvements on it.

We do not propose to assert equal rights to land by keeping land common, letting anyone use any part of it at any time. We do not propose the task, impossible in the present state of society, of dividing land in equal shares; still less the more impossible task of keeping it so divided.

We would accompany this tax on land values with the repeal of all taxes levied now on the products and processes of industry, which taxes, since they take from the earnings of labor, we hold to be infringements of the rights of property.

God cannot contradict Himself nor impose on His creatures laws that clash. If it be God's command to men that they should not steal—that is to say, that they should respect the right of property which each one has in fruits of his labor—all these taxes violate the moral law. They take by force what belongs to the individual alone; they give to the unscrupulous advantage over the scrupulous; they have the effect—nay, are largely intended—to increase the price of what some have to sell and others must buy.

They corrupt government; they make oaths a mockery; they shackle commerce; they fine industry and thrift; they lessen the wealth that men might enjoy and enrich some by impoverishing others.

I am convinced that single tax is the only remedy for existing evils and am willing to dedicate the balance of my life to advocating the cause.—Chicago Times-Herald.

WHAT THE NEWSPAPERS HAVE TO TELL US ABOUT TOM L. JOHNSON.

Tom Johnson is 45 years old. He was born in Kentucky, but his blood and parentage is of Virginia origin. The Johnsons of Virginia are as famous in their way as the Robinsons. One of Tom Johnson's grandfathers was a distinguished soldier under the first Harrison. Robert Johnson was a pioneer still honored by Kentuckians. Tom's father was a military man of great force of character.

Like innumerable other poor boys of

the world's history the young Johnson received his education in the common schools and then became a messenger boy for the Louisville Street Railway company. His marked characteristic at that time was—all ears and no mouth. He was a prodigious listener, but a very poor talker. The Louisville company was having a struggle to convince the general public that street cars ought to be patronized. On its own part the public was apparently convinced that street cars would never supplant omnibuses.

Johnson, first messenger, then clerk and finally an assistant in the one office of the Louisville company, had knowledge of all the obstacles which the corporation was forced to overcome. He mastered the details of a street railway business before he reached his majority. He listened and listened and said little until he began to feel the strength of his own will, and then he acted. His family was poor and he was one of its financial stays.

The Louisville road and certain other struggling western street roads were in great need of a new style of switches and certain improvements in the car machinery. No inventor had yet supplied these wants. Johnson tried his own hand at designing what was needed, and as rapidly as he believed that he had succeeded, patented his discoveries. He went to bed one night to awake in the morning to find himself famous and on the way to wealth. His nickel-in-the-slot box for collecting fares was a success. His automatic switch was adopted by all the street roads at once.

At 22 his patents had brought Tom Johnson sufficient money with which to place his parents in comfortable circumstances and to enable him to buy the only street railway that Indianapolis possessed at that time. The Indianapolis cars were then pulled by mules and the service was wretched. Johnson supplanted the mules with horses, painted the cars, introduced comfortable seats, uniformed his employes and by the attractive appearances of all his property brought the public to rapid and profitable patronage of his investment. With the money he made from this line he purchased a bankrupt horse line in Cleveland. . . .

Strange as it may seem, Tom Johnson carried on this fortune-making without making bitter enemies. He was shrewd, calculating, a hard worker and a hard hitter, but no one was to be found at that time nor now who cherishes against him the memory of one treacherous action or the doing of a thing that could be called unmanly.

He fought his battles in the open. He kept his temper when he was the hardest pressed. He always paid close attention to his digestion. He never hurried as nervous men hurry. If there was seeming occasion for worry he laughed. If business cares should have kept him wakeful at night he slept. His equipoise was and is marvelous. . . .

The patent steel rail used in the automatic switches invented by Johnson was not approved of by the big rolling mills of those days. They did not believe the rail could be made a success, and were not inclined to make them. Johnson desired the rail for use on his lines, but it was with difficulty that he persuaded the mills to turn them out. Once though that any considerable number were on the market the demand for them became great, and the mills could not produce them fast enough. The price charged for them was high. Johnson objected to this. His objections were of no avail.

Then it was that he organized the Johnson steel works at Lorain, O., and Johnstown, Pa. After that he manufactured his own rails at prices that met his own views. The previously greedy rolling mill owners were forced to bring their prices down to his or quit the market.

From owning the street railway lines of Indianapolis and Cleveland Johnson became the chief of the system of trolley lines which now center at Allentown, Pa., and which gridiron all of that section of Pennsylvania. Later with a brother he purchased a controlling interest in the Nassau Electric company, of Brooklyn. On this line he established a five-cent fare to Coney Island. In time he owned nearly all of the Brooklyn lines, with extensive holdings in the street railway systems of Detroit, Chicago and Boston.

The determined character of the man is shown in the story told of his sale of his Brooklyn lines to the Whitney-Flower syndicate. At that time he was the master mind of the 17 street railway systems of Brooklyn. He was asked by representatives of the syndicate desiring to purchase what he considered the upset price to be. He named the sum—a total represented by millions of dollars. An afternoon was agreed upon when the syndicate and he should meet and reach a final settlement. The time came and \$200,000,000 of traction capital intimated to Mr. Johnson that his price was too high. He was affable, but unyielding.

"It is my price, gentlemen," he said. "Not a dollar less can I take for the property."

They pleaded with him. Men with certified checks in their hands sat around all that afternoon and waited for him to yield. National banks were kept open long after their regular closing hours in the hope that Johnson would change his price. Trust companies held their clerks until nine o'clock at night, waiting for the final papers to be signed. Every skillful argument possible on the part of the great financiers was advanced to make Johnson yield. He listened politely, manifested no annoyance, but would not change his figures.

Ten o'clock came that night before bowing to his will the representatives of the traction kings paid over what he demanded and the deal was concluded.

"Gibraltar would be easier to subdue than Johnson," commented one of the traction lawyers, as he reluctantly signed his name to a paper which gave the Kentucky boy what he believed to be right and just to himself.

The price paid him for the Brooklyn lines was \$30,000,000, or \$10,000,000 more than this government gives to Spain for her possessions in Asiatic waters.

In his growth from poverty and a clerkship to the position of trolley king of the United States, Tom Johnson mentally did not develop along the lines so many self-made men follow. Conservatism in thought—a conservatism that in time becomes a disease—did not grow with his wealth. Where by all the traditions of the past and all the recorded history of past financiers his hand and his mind should have shut tighter and tighter as his wealth increased, they opened, expanded.

As a manufacturer of steel rails he should have been a protectionist; as an extensive real estate owner and corporation creator he should have regarded Henry George as an enemy of the republic and a most dangerous man. On the contrary, Tom Johnson came to the full tide of his manhood regarding the protective tariff as an enemy of the republic and Henry George as a prophet foretelling the end of things and systems now revered by some people.

A protective tariff was certain to enhance his profits. Yet he took what seemed to be the anomalous position of being satisfied with his profits as they were and of standing convinced that free trade, while possibly diminishing his individual profits, would increase the good standing of thousands oppressed by the other system.

In a speech which he delivered at Boston he said:

"We believe that free trade, when carried out, removes every obstacle to the

production and distribution of wealth. Protection is born of the same narrow spirit that fines men for building houses, that puts the tax gatherer in the position to charge a man more for a lot on which he has built a home than for a lot on which he merely raises goats and tin pails. That is as much a charge on trade, to fine men by raising their taxes because they build a house, as it is to levy a tax at a custom house, whether for revenue or for protection.

"Free trade, if carried out, means the pulling down of every artificial barrier of wealth; it means the placing of the burden of taxation on monopoly and special privileges, on land values and franchise values, those values created by the whole community."

Mr. Johnson was a free trader before he became a disciple of Henry George and the closest adviser of that eminent single tax advocate. His conversion to the theories of George serves as an illustration to how he transacts all the affairs of life that come within his sphere. Chance, fate or something else brought a copy of George's "Progress and Poverty" into the hands of Johnson. He read the book, and was disturbed as well as pleased. He said to a friend:

"The book is as true as the gospel, but—"

There was a doubt, and that doubt lingered. Finally he took the volume and gave it to his lawyer with the request that he read it. That gentleman glanced at it and remarked:

"Why, I can refute every argument in it."

"Do it," replied Tom Johnson, "and give me the result written out."

"I have no time for such employment. The book isn't worth it," answered the lawyer.

Johnson then said to him:

"You are my attorney. Read that book; review it carefully. Answer its arguments, which you say are fallacious, and when you have finished hand me your report with your bill for services."

The lawyer accepted the proposition only to return the book in a short time with the statement:

"I cannot do it. It is a great work."

From that time on Tom Johnson was the friend of Henry George and the advocate of his theories. He sought the acquaintance of George both by correspondence and personal meeting. He gave freely and intelligently to the single tax cause. But that the hour would come when he would turn his back on his business career and say, "I have finished; now for a fight for a principle," no one believed.

One of his first steps after he came to full faith in single tax was to seek a seat in congress as a single tax representative. He was nominated in Cleveland on a single tax ticket and came so near to being elected that he frightened every man opposed to him. This was in 1888. In 1890 he tried the same thing again, and, to the utter astonishment of every machine politician on both sides, was elected by 3,400 majority. He went to congress and he preached single tax every day that he was in Washington. People would have called him a madman if it were not for the proof before them that he was one of the foremost business men of the day.

To get rid of him Ohio was restricted, and it was believed that his particular district was so shaped that he could not return. The statement was freely made that he would be beaten by at least 2,000 majority. Again he fooled his adversaries. He was reelected to congress by 3,200 majority. As soon as he was in Washington again he and his friends began speaking "Progress and Poverty" on the floor of the house in such a manner that practically the better part of George's work was inserted in the Congressional Record and scattered over the country to the extent of 1,000,000 copies. Johnson spoke for free trade also and gained for his speeches the same wide circulation that he had for the single tax sermons. He tricked and fooled in his propaganda every old-timer in Washington and held his own personal popularity at the same time.

He left congress through defeat in 1894 at the polls. Now it is said that in the future good of the single tax cause he will stand once more for a seat with every prospect of being elected. As he puts it:

"My business has been sufficiently wound up in various ways to make me practically free now, and I have no idea of engaging in any more money-making schemes that will interfere with giving practically my entire time to the promotion of the interests of single tax. The question of taxation in any form involves the discussion of the philosophy of Henry George, which I am convinced is the only way to remedy the evils which oppress the people and the country."

When he is in the political field he makes his campaign with a tent and a band. His views on street railroads are valuable—most valuable just at this time. He says:

"I do not want to tax the bonds and stocks of street railroads. If your purpose is to tax the railroad, put your tax on where it belongs, where you can see

it and measure it. Do not attempt to put in these mere evidences of ownership that drift all over the world. I do not think that is the best way to reach the street railway question. The wiser way would be to have the municipalities own the street cars and run them free. If enough people in the community think they ought to own the street railways, I think you would find that they would own them soon. They would begin by refusing grants for 999 years and adopting the rule laid down in Massachusetts, where no street railroad has a franchise for more than 60 days. That is probably quite long enough. If the railroad is a public servant under our present scheme of private ownership that is worth while to remain, it will stay. If it fills a public office and does a useful service to the community, it will be upheld. If it does not, it ought to go."—Chicago Times-Herald of Feb. 12.

An excellent story is told of a certain prominent director, who is equally renowned for his ability to make or take a joke. An employe whose house is in the country applied to him for a pass to visit his family. "You are in the employ of the company?" inquired the gentleman alluded to. "Yes." "Well, now, suppose you were working for a farmer, instead of the company, would you expect your employer to take out his horses every Saturday night and carry you home?" This seemed a poser, but it wasn't. "No," said the man, promptly, "I would not expect that; but if the farmer had his horses out, and was going my way, I should call him a very mean fellow if he would not let me ride."—Coming Nation.

A curious example of the reward of excessive virtue, which is often its own undoing, is thus given: The English pickle manufacturers have been making their pint bottles hold a little more than a pint, to be on the safe side of an English law on the subject. But when they sent these pint bottles to Canada they ran against a law which provides that any package measuring more than a pint must pay duty as a quart.—Chicago Chronicle.

A Sussex laborer who was giving evidence in a case of manslaughter arising out of a quarrel of two companions, one of whom had been killed by the other hitting him with his pickax, gave the following lucid description of the act: "You see, he pecked he with a peck and he pecked he with a peck, and if he'd pecked he with his peck as hard as he pecked he with his peck he'd a killed he instead o' he killin' o' he."—Chicago Chronicle.

THE BROWN MAN'S BURDEN.

After Rudyard Kipling.
Pile on the brown man's burden
To gratify your greed;
Go clear away the niggers
Who progress would impede;
Be very stern, for truly
'Tis useless to build
With new caught, sullen peoples,
Half devil and half child.

Pile on the brown man's burden;
And if ye rouse his hate,
Meet his old-fashioned reasons
With Maxims up to date.
With shells and dum dum bullets
A hundred times make plain
The brown man's loss must ever
Imply the white man's gain.

Pile on the brown man's burden;
Compel him to be free;
Let all your manifestoes
Reek with philanthropy.
And if with heathen folly
He dares your will dispute,
Then in the name of freedom
Don't hesitate to shoot.

Pile on the brown man's burden,
And if his cry be sore,
That surely need not irk you—
Ye've driven slaves before.
Seize on his ports and pastures,
The field his people tread;
Go make from them your living,
And mark them with his dead.

Pile on the brown man's burden,
Nor do not deem it hard
If you should earn the rancor
Of those ye yearn to guard.
The screaming of your eagle
Will drown the victim's sob—
Go on through fire and slaughter,
There's dollars in the job.

Pile on the brown man's burden,
And through the world proclaim,
That ye are freedom's agents—
There's no more paying game!
And should you own past history
Straight in your teeth be thrown,
Retort that independence
Is good for whites alone.

Pile on the brown man's burden,
With equity have done;
Weak, antiquated scruples
Their squeamish courses have run.
And though 'tis freedom's banner,
You're waving in the van,
Reserve for home consumption
The sacred "rights of man!"

And if by chance ye falter,
Or lag along the course,
If, as the blood flows freely,
Ye feel some slight remorse,
Hie ye to Rudyard Kipling,
Imperialism's prop,
And bid him, for your comfort,
Turn on his jingo stop.

—H. A. Labouchere, in Truth, of London.

What is sadder than the way in which the Poles of Polish Russia were forced to greet the coming of the centenary of their great poet, Mickiewicz. They were permitted to give money for the erection of a monument which was to keep alive the memory of Mickiewicz, but were not allowed to print or mention in any way his name. The day the monument was unveiled speeches were

prohibited, and no applause was heard. What the crowd did when the monument was seen was to keep a dead silence, but every head was uncovered.—New York Times.

Finance and Transportation

BY

JAY D. MILLER.

Paper; 96 pages; Single Copies, 10c.,
50 Copies, \$1.00.

Gov. H. S. Pingree, Lansing, Mich.

"This publication presents in their true light questions that immediately concern the American people."
Mayor S. M. Jones, Toledo, O.

"It is one of the most comprehensive statements of our social and economic problems that has come to my hands."

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

Louis F. Post, Chicago.

"It is an intellectual mine which all parties to the controversy may profitably explore."

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

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

1101 Chamber of Commerce Building . CHICAGO

The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office.	\$0.02
Quantities delivered at office, per 100.	1.00
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid.	.03
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100.	2.00
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100.	1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. A Business Tendency (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. That Favorable Balance of Trade (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. Now-Then, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. Department Stores (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

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.