

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1899.

Number 48

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.

A pietistic convention in Boston adopted a resolution on the 23d which declared that the United States has incurred the displeasure of Jehovah by leaving Christ's name out of the constitution. If that isn't idolatry, where will you find any? We may safely enough leave Christ's name out of the national constitution if we make his principles of brotherhood part of our national life.

The Indian baseball player, Walla Tonka, has received a new lease of life. In accordance with Indian law, he was to have been shot at sunrise on the 27th, upon conviction for murder, but a reprieve arrived just in time. The most impressive fact about this case, more impressive than the dramatic postponement of the execution, is that the culprit has been at large all the time since his conviction, and when the date for his execution arrived he redeemed his promise to the authorities by appearing voluntarily at the execution grounds. Nor is his case in this respect peculiar. All Indians under capital sentence are set at liberty upon promising to appear for execution; and the promise is never broken. Anglo-Saxons boast their superiority to the Indian, but few of them could be trusted to keep such an appointment.

Farmers are quick to complain of the misuse of public money, yet they are as a class quite as ready as any other class to help misuse it. By a two-thirds vote the Illinois Farmers' Institute this week recommended the passage of a bill giving a bounty of one cent a pound on all beet sugar

manufactured in the state. That bill is dishonest. It would tax the many to give to a few. And from the point of view of the farmers' interests, it is a bunco. Farmers don't make beet sugar; they raise sugar beets. In order to help them, therefore, the bill ought to put a bounty on beets instead of sugar. But if the pending bill passes, the sugar manufacturers will get the bounty, while beet raisers will have to take what they are offered for beets. And they won't be offered anything extra either.

Upon all occasions when it is desirable to show that whether the rich are getting richer or no, the poor are not getting poorer, savings banks statistics are trotted out, it being generally assumed that large aggregates of savings bank deposits imply prosperity among the poor. This statistical fake has been exposed before. But that makes no difference; it is always thought to be a "good enough Morgan." For everybody cannot be expected to know that savings banks, instead of being places of deposit for the thrifty poor, are mostly conveniences for the rich and well to do. But that is what these banks are; and the Connecticut reports for last year again demonstrate it. The Connecticut savings banks increased their deposits last year by \$7,512,700. But only \$348,618 of this amount, less than 5 per cent., was in deposits of less than \$1,000 each. There were many single deposits in excess of \$2,000 each, while some exceeded \$20,000 each, and nearly 300 exceeded \$10,000 each. The truth is that savings banks are largely used by rich people for making their surplus cash draw a revenue while awaiting opportunities for permanent investment. No inferences as to the condition of the working classes can be drawn from savings banks statistics.

The papal letter on the alleged heresies of Father Hecker, founder of the Paulist Fathers, which were discovered, it is said, in the French translation of Father Elliott's life of Hecker, may be intended to condemn the liberal tendencies in the Catholic church in America; but if so, it would require an expert in ecclesiastical Latin to spell out the condemnation. The Corrigan's in the church of Rome in America will not find support in this letter from the head of their church in the fight for medievalism which they are making against the Irelands and McGlynn's. Some attempt has been made to construe the letter as a withdrawal by the pope from the unexpectedly advanced position he has for some time held on the subject of political liberty. The wish in this respect has probably been father to the thought. The letter does not appear to justify any such interpretation. Its tenor, however, is wonderfully suggestive of the tremendous play of action and reaction between the mighty forces that make respectively for and against liberty, in the whirl of which we of this time are living.

Another advance in wages is to be credited to the remarkable prosperity which this country, as represented by the monopolies and trusts, is enjoying. The advance comes as the culmination of a threatened strike of New England cotton mill operatives. After a few week's conference with their operatives, the employers agreed to increase wages on April 3 by 12½ per cent. This will bring back the cotton mill wages of New England to about what they were prior to January 3, 1898—a year after the beginning of McKinley's prosperity—when they were reduced 11 per cent. The restoration of cotton mill wages is the second instance of a wages increase

to be announced in these pipingly prosperous times. The other was proclaimed by some of the steel mills eastward of Chicago. In that case, as in the case of the cotton mill operatives, wages had been reduced after the presidential election, before being increased; but whereas the cotton mill operatives are to get their former rates of pay with the first increase, it will take yet another increase by those steel mills to put their workers in that position. Mysterious are the ways of McKinley's prosperity! A third wages increase was announced on the 1st of March. It was to take place in the steel mills of Illinois and Wisconsin. By this increase the wages of the common laborers are to be advanced one whole cent an hour—ten cents a day!

How absurd to assert upon the basis of such facts, that the working people of this country are prospering. It is a bald pretense. If further proof were required, it is to be found in the interest rates. "Never in the history of the country," begins a financial report in the Chicago Tribune, "was there so much money to loan as now, and never before were the rates of interest so low." And then the report specifies prevailing interest in the leading cities from New York to San Francisco, varying from 4 per cent. in the former city to 7 in the latter. These are low rates. But so far from proving that the country is prosperous, they go to prove the reverse. When interest is low, and capital—for it is not money, but capital that is offered—is begging for borrowers, the situation can have but one meaning, and that is that it does not pay to borrow capital and put it to use. To say that wages are low and laborers are hunting for work, would be an indication of hard times. To say that interest is low and capital is hunting for borrowers, is indicative of the same thing. Both conditions, in fact, exist. Labor, like capital, is plentiful and hunting for employment; while wages, like interest, are low. And

that is what Mr. McKinley and the parasitic monopolists call prosperity!

Horrible stories are reported from Europe of a recently discovered traffic in human skin. Jewelers who serve the rich leisure classes admit that they have made ladies' belts and card-cases from this material, and tanners say that they have recently prepared quantities of it after the fashion of alligators' and monkeys' skins, while women boast of the possession of articles manufactured from it. One sensational London correspondent cables a report that "nicely tanned human skin recently formed a novel though considerable portion of the trousseau of a fashionable bride." The skin is procured from bodies of the unclaimed poor, which have been turned over to scientific institutions for dissection; and to own articles made of it is a fad. A horrible story, indeed; not so much, however, on account of any injury to the poor which it suggests, as of the degradation of the rich which it implies.

To work up the skin of the dead poor into belts and card cases for the morbid rich, cannot hurt those whose bodies have supplied the material. Neither their nerves nor their emotions are any longer sensitive. What does hurt, is the working up, while they live, of their sinews and blood and sweat into comforts and luxuries for the rich who do nothing in return. We are told that there is great anxiety among the American rich to establish a titled aristocracy in the United States. Not one with empty titles, like the French; but one like the English, with titles that are united to power and wealth. And it is certain that the growing custom among the rich of leaving most of their property to the oldest son, has this ambition for its impulse. The rich are striving to strap themselves tighter to the backs of the living poor; and if, incidentally, they find amusement in owning curios made of the skins of the dead poor, that only goes to show the contempt as well as indifference which they cultivate toward the

classes that support them. But if the living poor are forced to give their lives to the idle rich, what harm can it do them if, after they die, their skins be taken also?

It is remarkable, the increasing resemblance between the tory party of England and the tory faction of the republican party of the United States. Not only is each at work with fire and sword conquering the dark peoples of the world "for their own good," but even in the matter of making national deficits each is running a race with the other. With a war revenue law, in addition to nearly enough proceeds from war bonds to pay for the war, the United States is nevertheless spending more than its income, and will soon have a magnificent deficit of a hundred millions or so in dollars. This deficit is to be modestly rivaled by the English tories. It is now considered as tolerably certain that there will be a deficit in the English accounts for the year of a million and a half in pounds. Small though that is, by comparison, yet the English tories may take heart of hope. If McKinley with increased revenues can run his government behind a hundred million dollars in two years, Salisbury may yet largely lessen the difference between that and only seven millions.

As to the proposed methods of making up their deficits the English and the American tories are again congenial spirits. In England as in the United States, the consumption of the poor, not the accumulations of the rich, is to be made to shoulder this "white man's burden." The old thunderer, the London Times, tory through and through, looks to a tax on grain and sugar. And of such are the taxes which our own tories impose. Taxation of the masses by the classes and for the classes is the principle of government upon which American McKinleyism and English toryism meet as upon common ground.

No one has yet been able to interpret the mystery of Dewey's urgent

request that the Oregon be sent to Manila at once, "for political reasons." The most plausible guesses, and they are not very plausible, are to the effect that Germany was indulging among the Filipinos in what American politicians call "mixing," and that Dewey wanted to impress her naval commander with the sight of a big American battleship. One report had it that Germany was planning the defeat of the American policy of expansion in the Philippines. For the honor—the real, and not the pinchbeck honor—of the United States, we should hope that this might prove to be true, and that Germany would succeed in that design. But it appears that whatever her original intentions may have been, Germany has concluded to leave the Filipinos to their fate.

Irrespective of the shame of our bloody attack upon Filipino liberties, of our sordid reaching out for real estate and "markets," the costliness of the enterprise is becoming apparent. There are now in the Philippines or on the way, nearly twice as many American troops as set foot in Cuba during the war; and with nearly 100 men killed and 300 wounded, besides suffering and death from disease, the campaign appears, nevertheless, to have only begun. Army officers say they expect a series of small battles throughout the summer, and believe that all the troops now in the Philippines will have to be relieved by fresh men before fall. On the mere question of profit, a "market" thus secured, after a first cost of \$20,000,000 purchase money, will be unprofitable enough. As William Lloyd Garrison says:

A gold brick swindle is economical in comparison. You can throw away a brick.

The recent lecture by Prof. David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford university, and a republican, in which he described the McKinley administration as conspicuous in its "inaptitude for divorcing politics from statesmanship," and characterized Mc-

Kinley himself as a president "with many virtues who never had an idea of his own," has been supplemented by the speech of Congressman Johnson, also a republican, upon the floor of the house, in which McKinley was condemned as no president ever was before officially by a member of his own party. Mr. Johnson denounced the president for having engaged in the prosecution of a bloody war against a poor and defenseless people in the Orient, engaged in the unsavory task of Christianizing them with the sword and civilizing them at the mouths of cannon.

He characterized the president's Boston speech as "the most disingenuous address that ever fell from the lips of an American president," an address which,

divested of its verbiage, considered apart from its platitudes and the ostentatious professions of virtue with which it was interlarded, was nothing more nor less than a carefully devised and studious misstatement of the issue between the chief executive and those of his own party who are opposed to his wretched policy in the Philippines. It was an effort to befog the subject, and to mislead the public judgment;

and which, "when read in cold print, in the light of the indefensible tragedy now being enacted near the shores of Asia," suggests

that creation of Charles Dickens, who was accustomed to roll his eyes piously to heaven and exclaim with great ostentation to those about him: "My friends, let us be moral," and who was the father of two daughters, one of whom he named Charity and the other Mercy.

Continuing, Mr. Johnson said:

I am determined that the president shall neither befog the issue between himself and those of the republican party who oppose his Philippine policy, nor mislead the public judgment, nor shirk the responsibility for the gross official blunders which he has committed in connection with this great problem. I insist that the whole policy is not simply an error, but that it is a crime, and that the chief executive of this nation is the one who has precipitated upon us the embarrassments and the difficulties by which we are now confronted. I insist that he did not simply hold the Philippines as commander-in-chief, leaving the question of the disposition and control of them to congress, but that he formulated and put into execution an affirmative and aggressive policy, that of their permanent annexation to this country, and

forced it through the senate with all the power and influence which his high office enabled him to employ.

The worst of this speech is not that it was made, as administration sycophants insist, but that it is true.

Chauncey M. Depew, whom Prof. Herron well describes as a "puerile mountebank," has been at Chicago speaking to a society of railroad employes which railroad bosses have organized to act as a buffer between railroad monopolies and anti-monopoly legislation. Mr. Depew took advantage of this opportunity to explain why he withdrew from the contest for the republican presidential nomination in 1888. It was

because the delegates from the so-called granger states told me that the feeling in their states against railway men in every branch of the service was so intense that a station agent or a locomotive engineer or a conductor could not be elected as trustee of any village on their line, and that the nomination of a railway official for president would disintegrate the party in their states.

Those delegates certainly understood the situation, and their constituents appreciated the power of railway monopoly. Nothing could be more dangerous to any community than to elect railroad employes to political office, and few things could be more disastrous to honest but dependent railroad employes than to accept such office. Railroad corporations expect their employes to be loyal to their interests, just or unjust, and in all relations, no matter what intervenes; and they make no exceptions of employes who also hold public office.

After eleven years' experience with the great railroad octopus, the interstate commerce commission virtually "gives it up." It reports that "the present law is wholly inadequate to deal with the situation." Yet the commission offers no specific remedy. It does not even suggest one, because none occurs to it that "would not involve resort to measures of so radical a nature as would doubtless preclude their adoption." This is an allusion, probably, to public ownership. Not courageous enough to propose the

only remedy it can conceive, the commission proposes "leaving the roads to regulate their own rates and their own competition, subject to some assurances that the rates would not be forced too high!"

We sympathize with the commission. It was invested by government with governmental functions, for the purpose of controlling an institution which had been invested by government with still more powerful governmental functions. The failure might have been predicted. "Let me control the highways of a country," the railroad magnate may well sing, "and I care not what commission you appoint to control me." To properly understand and effectually solve the railroad question, we must first realize that it is at bottom a highway question. When that is done, all the rest follows. It can then be seen plainly that government cannot turn over public highways to private corporations, and at the same time protect the people from the depredations of the modern type of what was once known as "road agents." Public ownership of all highways is the only solution of the railroad problem.

In connection with the railroad problem, J. Sterling Morton's outspoken Conservative wants to know why "homesteaders" should not be treated as they try to treat railroads. It asks—

If it is right to prescribe the limit of the income of a railroad because the government has done so much for it, why is it not equally proper to fix the price of corn, wheat, oats, cattle and hogs grown by homesteaders upon land donated to them by the general government?

The question is framed a little carelessly. To "limit the income of a railroad" is not at all analogous to fixing "the price of corn, wheat" and so on. But fixing the price of transportation would be, and it is that doubtless that Mr. Morton had in mind. The answer is that it is neither right nor practicable to fix by law the prices either of corn and wheat or of railroad transportation. But it is right and would be practicable to "limit the income"

of railroads; and it would be right and practicable to "limit the income" of homesteaders. So much of the railroads' income as is due to the value of its monopoly right of way—the "water" in its stock, that is to say—and nothing more, should be taken from the railroad company. That could be done by making railway lines, as distinguished from rolling stock, public property, and allowing competition to regulate prices of transportation. Likewise, so much of the income of the homesteader as is due to his superior location—the "water" in his deed, so to speak—and nothing more, should be taken from him. That could be done by substituting for his present taxes a tax not to exceed the value of his location.

There is a trick to which plutocratic editorial writers, and economic professors in colleges endowed by robber barons of the period, are addicted, regarding which the general reader must be on the alert or his common sense will be taken captive. These writers defend corporations, production on a large scale, and so on, propositions that are quite defensible, and then rush the reader, with a literary hop-skip-and-jump, to the conclusion that the attacks upon railroad, telegraph, gas, street car and similar corporations are answered. The trick may with a little thought be readily detected. Its secret lies in the assumption that all corporations are alike, and that trusts are a method of production on a large scale. But in truth, trusts are combinations to prevent production, and some corporations are monopolies. A corporation to work a farm would be unobjectionable and might be desirable. But a corporation to run street cars is something more than a corporation; it is the owner of an exclusive right of way through the public streets. The evil is not in the charter of incorporation, but in the street franchise. With a clear understanding of the principle of this distinction, any reader can for himself detect in the editorial and

magazine writings of plutocratic hirelings the place where their trick comes in.

Questioning our approval of Tolstoi's criticisms of the czar's disarmament conference, Charles T. Dole, of Massachusetts, asks if all who love peace ought not, even though there be reason for distrusting the czar's proposal, to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the conference to promote the cause. Doubtless they ought. But they should be wise about it. War is not the worst of evils. It is one of the worst; but liberty-suppressing governments are worse still. Now, Russia is under the domination of such a government, which is reaching out to grasp more territory and subjugate other peoples. Autocratic dominion over Europe and Asia is its aim. And to accomplish its ends the Russian government now proposes to the other European powers that the armaments of all stop where they are. If that were agreed to, Russia could and doubtless would go on perfecting her armaments in secret. For Russia muzzles the press. Let the czar's government abolish press censorship, and every lover of peace, who loves liberty even more than peace, will gladly promote the czar's peace proposals. As matters now stand, those proposals are like the request of Esop's wolves to the sheep, that they discharge the dogs.

Some idea of the plans of the Russian government may be derived from the plight of Finland. Though Finland adjoins Russia and has for nearly a century been a Russian dependency, it nevertheless in great measure preserves its autonomy. It retains a language and literature of its own, and comprises an educated, intelligent and thriving people; and withal is a sort of protection to Norway and Sweden against encroachments by Russia upon them. But now Russia, with evident designs upon Norway and Sweden, is about to deprive poor Finland of all autonomy, and to extend the absolute powers of the czar to the Scandinavian borders. Fin-

land is being Russianized. Language, liberty, and all are to be submerged in Russian despotism. And then the word will be, "Next!" On this side of the Atlantic, we need not fear Russia. But in Europe, where natural defensive boundaries are few, an agreement for general disarmament would be almost equivalent to the cession of the continent to the czar.

Our opinion published in *The Public* of February 4, in connection with the question of remitting the extreme penalty for murder in the case of a woman in New York, because she is a woman, has evoked an inquiry from one of the best known and justly loved executives in the United States. We said that "it is not one of the functions of an executive to determine whether a penalty is proper or not; it is his function to execute the law as he finds it." Referring to this, the executive to whom we have alluded, writes us, asking if we are certain that our position is a tenable one. He says:

Does not an executive have a duty as a citizen, as well as an executive? And might he not contribute quite as much to the education of the public mind by calling pointed attention to a law that was unscientific, and therefore wrong, and even using the powers of his office of executive clemency, if you please, or any other power that he may possess, in behalf of a better and more just law?

Upon further reflection we are confirmed in the opinion that the position we took regarding Gov. Roosevelt's possible use of the pardoning power regardless of the law, and which is questioned above, is tenable. Indeed, we think it unassailable from any other point of view than that of the monarchical theory of government. Upon the democratic theory of government, it is not a function of the executive to pass upon the propriety of laws. His single duty as executive is to execute. That he has also a duty as a citizen is true. But when that duty conflicts with his duty as an executive he must distinguish his functions by performing his duties as a citizen in his capacity of mere citizen, and his duties as executive in

his capacity of executive. To concede that the executive may in his individual discretion obey or disobey laws which he has been chosen to execute, is to put him above the laws which the people, whose servant he is, have made; and that is to establish what is in essence an absolute, even if elective, monarchy.

It must be observed, however, that there are circumstances in which executives are justified, upon democratic principles, in virtually abrogating laws that they have been appointed to enforce. But these are not "exceptions proving the rule;" they are really within the rule, and exceptions only in appearance. When, for example, offensive laws are superimposed upon a community from without—as when England undertakes to regulate the internal affairs of Ireland, or an American state attempts arbitrarily to regulate the purely local concerns of its towns and cities—it may be quite within the democratic right of locally elected executives to ignore those laws. In such cases, that is what they are elected for. Disregard of the law is then in a high sense obedience to the popular will. But when both the law and the executive are regularly chosen by the community to be affected, the simple function of the executive is to execute.

Joseph Edwards's fifth issue of his "Labour Annual," is more valuable than the best of its predecessors. What the Statesman's Year Book is to the general student of the world's politics, this annual is to students of the progress of social reforms. It keeps track of the men and movements and doctrines that are related to social, economic and political reform the world over. The book in paper is mailed to any part of the world, free of postage, for 31 cents, and may be had directly of Joseph Edwards, Wallasey, Cheshire, England.

The Outlook proposes an experiment in the Philippines with the

single tax. We have no right to experiment there with the single tax or anything else. If the justice and practicability of the single tax commend it, here among ourselves is the place to experiment with it. Let the Filipinos learn from our teaching and our experience, not from enforced obedience to our irresponsible authority.

LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

I.

It is remarkable if not significant that the advocates of Philippine subjugation have been so very reticent about the application to our Philippine question of the principles of international law. They have not lacked occasion to refer to those principles. But their speeches and writings will be examined in vain for any appeal to that source of authority.

There is no accounting for this upon any theory of the nice technicalities of international law, which might make the subject too obscure for ordinary citizens to understand. International law is not at all a highly technical subject. While it includes numerous specific rules and precedents which only special students are familiar with, yet in its broad applications it need not be at all mysterious to the ordinarily intelligent citizen. No branch of legal science is so free from technicality; none rests so solidly upon simple apprehensions of right.

We do, indeed, look to the international practice of governments for expressions of international law; but no such practice is accepted as authoritative unless it has been adopted deliberately and from a persuasion that the practice is right. A practice is no part of international law, if it have nothing to support it but force.

With a knowledge, then, of the facts in a given international problem, the citizen of reasonable intelligence, provided he be a just man, can without much difficulty or danger of going wrong, discover and correctly apply the principles of international law. He can at least readily understand and estimate the value of a coherent explanation.

II.

For the purpose of inquiring into the rights under international law, of the United States in the Philippine islands, the central point of observation now must be the peace protocol. Before that was signed, the United States had no legitimate political relations whatever with the Philippines, except as the armed enemy of Spain. Since then, the United States has had no such relations except in virtue of the protocol.

So much is obvious to any intelligent person. It is hardly more than a statement of historical fact.

Had a treaty been ratified by both the United States and Spain prior to our difficulties with the Filipinos, the present political relations of the Filipinos to this country might have been determined by the treaty instead of the protocol. But no treaty has been ratified even yet. To validate the Paris treaty, the approval of the Spanish government is still needed. Doubtless that approval will be given. Spain can hardly help herself. But when given, it can make no difference, so far as concerns the relations of the United States to the Filipinos up to the present time. Whatever our government has so far done in the Philippine islands, has been done, regardless of any treaty that may yet be ratified, either as the enemy of Spain before the protocol, or as a contracting power with Spain under the protocol. The protocol is the great central fact.

III.

It was on the 12th of August, 1898, that the protocol became operative. At that time, though the American fleet possessed the harbor and bay of Manila, and occupied a bit of land south of the city of Manila, all the rest of the archipelago was in possession of either the Spaniards or the Filipinos. The city of Manila itself was in possession of Spaniards whom the Filipinos had penned in there.

At about the same time the Americans bombarded Manila and received its surrender from the Spanish commandant. This event actually occurred after the signing of the protocol; but as it did not secure to the Americans any advantages in excess of what the protocol had conferred, that fact is immaterial to the purposes of the present inquiry. The Americans, we may therefore say,

were in possession, upon the signing of the protocol, of the bay and harbor of Manila, and of the city of Manila with its suburbs. But they had no foothold elsewhere in the archipelago.

How was it at this time with the Filipinos?

As far back as the 19th of March, 1898—six weeks before Dewey's naval victory, and a month before hostilities between Spain and the United States—the old rebellion against Spain in the Philippines had blazed up anew; and, in the language of the American consul general at Manila, in a letter of that date, it was "never more threatening to Spain." On the 21st of March, also upon the authority of Consul General Williams, the rebels menaced Manila itself. There was, moreover, abundant evidence of the fact that the Philippine rebellion was again in full swing before the American war with Spain, in the news reports of the time. It was noted on page 12 of the first number of *The Public*, that of April 9, 1898—ten days before our war began. This notation was upon the authority of the American daily press. It was noted again in the issue of April 23, on page 11, upon the authority of a private letter of April 14—six days before the war—which had appeared in the American daily papers, and which described Manila as panic-stricken, owing to the strength of the rebellion. That letter reported over 20,000 well-armed men as in the field against Spanish authority. Aguinaldo, the president of the former republic, though not then in the islands, was again directing the rebellion.

Upon Aguinaldo's return to the islands, the rebellion became still more formidable; and in a little while the Spanish were driven into the principal cities, outside of which they were thereafter unable to exercise either civil or military authority.

On the 1st of July, as the American papers at the time reported, the rebels formally re-proclaimed the republic. It had been organized in 1896; and upon a treaty with Spain, promising reforms, had been dissolved. On account of Spain's violation of this treaty, the rebellion broke out again in 1898, as told above. Having proclaimed the republic anew on the 1st of July, 1898, and established

local governments in many of the districts, President Aguinaldo formally announced to foreign governments on the 6th of August, that independence had been declared. In doing this he asserted, what subsequent events have substantially verified, that the republic maintained "on a war footing more than 30,000 soldiers, organized, commanded and acting as a regular army;" and that it held "nearly 9,000 prisoners of war," who were "treated according to the rules of war of the most civilized nations, and the laws of humanity."

Besides this, the government so proclaimed did in fact exercise the only civilized authority—except at Manila, where the Americans may be considered to have been in possession, and at Iloilo and other coast cities of similar importance, where the Spanish were hemmed in by rebel troops—that was recognized or submitted to by the inhabitants of the Philippine islands at the time of the signing of the Spanish-American protocol.

It is true that no foreign governments recognized the Philippine republic as one of the family of nations. But that is not conclusive. Two kinds of government are known to international law—governments "de jure," and governments "de facto." Governments "de jure," or legalized governments, are those which are in general recognized as having all the attributes of sovereign power, whether able to enforce their sovereignty over the territory they claim or not. Governments "de facto" are those which, without being recognized abroad as possessing the legal attributes of sovereignty, nevertheless actually exercise the powers of sovereignty at home. All rebellious governments are at first necessarily governments "de facto." Upon achieving complete success they become governments "de jure."

Clearly the Philippine republic was not, at the time of the signing of the Spanish-American protocol, a government "de jure." But just as clearly it was at that time a government "de facto." Its resistance to the authority of Spain had passed beyond simple or temporary acts of treason, mutiny or sedition, and assumed the character and proportions of a permanent rebellion or insurrection. It follows, upon reasonable and acknowl-

edged principles of international law, that it was maintaining civil war—a fact which conclusively testifies to its having achieved the dignity of a government “de facto.” For only governments can wage war; and when civil war exists, the contesting government that is not such “de jure” must be such “de facto.”

IV.

We find, therefore, that on the 12th day of August, 1898, when the protocol was signed, the Philippine islands were occupied and governed, in different parts, by three sovereignties. The city, bay and harbor of Manila, were under the jurisdiction of the United States; Iloilo and a few other coast cities, were held by Spain; all the rest of the territory was held and governed by a “de facto” government, the Philippine republic, which, in prosecuting a civil war, had to that extent expelled the “de jure” government of Spain from its former possessions.

V.

By the protocol, Spain authorized the United States, as she had the right and power in international law to do, to occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila. Only this. Nothing more.

True, it was stated in the protocol that the treaty of peace, when concluded, should “determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines.” But as that treaty has not yet been concluded, all that the United States has so far done in the Philippines, since the signing of the protocol, has been done by virtue solely of the authority given in the protocol to “occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila.” There is absolutely no other authority now, of which international law can take notice.

VI.

Being in lawful possession of Manila, we are entitled under the protocol to resist aggressions, on the part of the Filipinos or anyone else. For the time being Manila is American territory, and the Filipinos cannot attempt to seize it without making war upon us.

On the other hand, we cannot attempt to seize any territory which their “de facto” government holds against Spain, without making war upon them. We are, and ever since

the protocol have been, bound to restrict our occupation to the harbor, bay and city of Manila, leaving Spain and the Philippine republic to fight out their civil war upon the remaining territory between themselves.

VII.

Now consider the events that followed the protocol. The civil war between Spain and the Philippine republic continued, and the republic increased its power and extended its authority. From nearly all the cities and towns she occupied, Spain was driven out. The whole island of Luzon, outside of Manila, came under the authority of the Philippine republic, as did also the island of Panay, where the Spaniards surrendered Iloilo. Nothing was left to Spain in the whole archipelago but a few distant and scattered garrison posts of no importance.

Meanwhile, the United States demanded of Spain the cession, for a price, of all the Philippine territory; not only that which the United States already occupied and that which Spain still held, but also those much more extensive and populous parts which recognized the sovereignty of the Philippine republic. This demand, moreover, was made in defiance of the “de facto” Philippine government.

Then, troops in large numbers were hurried to Manila. They were not needed for the defense of that city, and the necessary inference was that they were sent out to enable the United States to take Spain’s place in the civil war.

A little later, and an overt act was committed. The American authorities sent a military expedition to Iloilo to relieve the Spanish garrison which the Filipinos were closely investing.

Finally, the president of the United States ordered the secretary of war, under date of December 21, to extend the military government of the United States to the whole Philippine archipelago, an order which was promulgated by proclamation to the Filipinos.

The natural result followed. Its existence thus directly menaced, the Philippine republic—the “de facto” government in possession of all the important territory of the islands except Manila,—prepared to defend itself.

Six weeks later the American war with the Philippine republic began.

Who struck the first blow is immaterial. The crucial questions are only two. First, Was there then a “de facto” government holding adverse possession to Spain in the islands? If so, second, Was the United States then vested with any legal right, other than the mere naked right of inaugurating a war of conquest, to assail that government, directly or indirectly, outside the limits of the bay, harbor and city of Manila?

VIII.

Those questions are not now difficult to answer.

That ever since the protocol, as well as before, there was a “de facto” government holding possession in the Philippines adverse to Spain, we have plainly seen. It was the Philippine republic, which, at the time of President McKinley’s order, held two-thirds of all the territory of the islands, and governed more than nine-tenths of the inhabitants.

We have also seen that under the protocol, the United States had no right to assail any power, not even Spain, much less the Philippine republic, beyond the limits of the harbor, bay and city of Manila. Nor has any such right been even yet acquired by treaty. For wholly apart from Spain’s power to cede territory which a “de facto” government has expelled her from, there is as yet no effective treaty. Spain’s ratification is still lacking. There is not, therefore, and since the signing of the protocol there has never been, any legal right vested in the United States—other than the mere naked, brutal and abhorrent right of inaugurating a war of conquest—to advance upon territory held by the Philippine republic.

The forwarding of troops, then, and the Philippine negotiations at Paris, together with the expedition to Iloilo and the president’s order of December 21 for the immediate military occupancy of the whole archipelago, were unwarranted acts of aggression.

If the Filipinos attacked the American line on the 4th of February, the Americans did have the legal right to resist the attack, and to do anything, even to the extent of invasion, to make that resistance effectual. They had this right under

the protocol, for their occupancy of Manila was lawful. And they had it, even though the Filipinos were goaded on to the attack by the manifest disposition of the Americans to subjugate the whole archipelago.

But they had no right to go further. Having secured Manila, their legal authority to fight the Philippine republic ended. Consequently, the subsequent capture of Iloilo, 350 miles from Manila and on another island, and the later capture of Cebu, still farther away and on still another island, were as utterly without lawful warrant as if no attack upon the American line at Manila had been made. These captures were not defensive. They were made in execution of the president's order of six weeks before the Manila attack. There is not and cannot be any serious pretense to the contrary.

IX.

To sum up the whole matter—

The United States has made war upon the "de facto" government of the Philippines.

It has done so for the purpose of making conquest of the whole Philippine archipelago, under the guise of purchase from the expelled "de jure" government.

It has based its claim of purchase upon a treaty with the "de jure" government, a treaty which—aside from the question of the selling government's legal right to sell what it does not possess—has as yet no legal existence.

It can set up for that claim no other legal sanction than the protocol, which distinctly restricts the occupancy of the United States to the harbor, bay and city of Manila, and therefore is no sanction at all.

X.

If the Philippine republic had a powerful friend in the family of nations, or if its rights could be adjudicated by an impartial tribunal, the United States would, upon principles of international law, be compelled to withdraw from the position it has taken, and to abandon all Philippine territory outside of the harbor, bay and city of Manila. The case of our nation rests now solely upon superior force, not upon legal right.

What, then, is our duty?

Honor demands that what authority or power could rightly compel the

United States to do, she should do voluntarily. Our country can get no real credit by winning from the Philippine republic by force of arms what we could not lawfully demand as a right under the law of nations. It is our duty, then, in justice and therefore in honor, to restore to the Philippine republic the territory we have wrested from it, and to assure it of our future friendliness.

NEWS

The American war in the Philippines is now in its fourth week. It began on the 4th of February and has been in progress ever since, with almost daily fighting. Our last account closed with the press reports of the fire and fighting on the 22d in Manila, when some 700 houses were burned and a loss of life was suffered, the full extent of which has not yet been reported. On the 23d there was desperate fighting at Tonda, a suburb of Manila, with great slaughter, say the press reports, of Filipinos.

The movement of the Filipinos upon Tondo, mentioned above, began at dawn. They opened fire with cannon upon Caloocan, between two and three miles north of Tondo. This fire was silenced by American cannon; but meantime the Filipinos emerged from the marshes inside the American position between Manila and Caloocan, where they had been concealed, and endeavored to break the American line. The Americans resisted this movement, surrounding the Filipinos from the city on the south and from Caloocan on the north, and being assisted by the warships in the bay, which swept the marshes and the burned district of Tondo with shell. Though completely surrounded the Filipinos fought stubbornly, throwing up numerous barricades, but they were cut to pieces, and finally driven back into the marshes. During this fighting, two Englishmen were shot, one being wounded and the other killed, by American soldiers.

While the fighting was in progress in the Tondo suburb of Manila, other detachments of Filipinos were engaging the Americans farther south and east, at the Manila suburbs known as Santa Cruz and San Sebastian. All the detachments were composed of Filipino militia organized within the American lines, which responded to

signals from the regular Filipino troops outside.

The official report of the engagements described above, and of similar ones in the two days preceding, was made on the 24th by Gen. Otis as follows:

Scandia arrived last night. On nights 21st and 22d and yesterday morning insurgent troops gained access to outskirts of city behind our lines. Many in hiding and about 1,000 intrenched themselves. Completely routed yesterday, with loss killed and wounded about 500 and 200 prisoners. Our loss very slight. City quiet; confidence restored; business progressing.

The mention by Gen. Otis of the arrival of the Scandia refers to the arrival of the first reinforcements of the 8,000 or more that have been recently sent to Manila. The Scandia had on board the Twentieth infantry, which embarked January 26, at San Francisco.

On the 24th, the day following the occurrences reported above, frequent volleys were fired at the Americans by Filipinos, the latter being most active in front of the southeastern section of the American line. They were shelled from a gunboat in the Pasig river. Farther north, in front of Caloocan, Filipino sharpshooters were active all day. They continued their work through the 25th; and in the evening a skirmish occurred at the village of Mariquina. On the 26th the sharpshooting at Caloocan continued at close range. On that day also a significant dispatch to Gen. Lawton, who is on the way to Manila with further reinforcements, was repeated from Colombo, Island of Ceylon, where he received it. It was from Gen. Otis at Manila, and reads:

Situation critical. Your early arrival necessary.

An attack was made on the 27th from the jungle near Malibon, to the north of Caloocan, which was replied to with shells by an American gunboat. The shelling destroyed the Malabon church. Throughout the day desultory firing upon the American line at other points continued, as it did also on the 28th; and on the 1st of March an attack was made on the waterworks, and a sharp skirmish occurred at San Pedro Macati, near the American center. At night on the 1st it was unusually quiet, the Filipinos being apparently busy preparing defenses in anticipation of the arrival of American reinforcements, when

the Americans are expected to advance.

The American casualties in the Philippine war, reported down to the 27th, were 83 killed, and 347 wounded. Of the wounded, 43 were regulars and 304 volunteers; of the killed, 8 were regulars and 75 volunteers.

Since the fire in Manila and its suburbs the Americans maintain a strict curfew system. All the inhabitants are required to be in their houses by 7 o'clock each night, to remain there until daylight.

On the 26th, news was brought to Manila, of the occupation by the Americans of Cebu, a city of 35,000 inhabitants. It is the principal city of the Island of Cebu, which lies to the east of the Island of Panay, with the Island of Negros between. The occupation was effected on the 22d. The commander of the American gunboat Petrel sent an ultimatum ashore declaring the intention of the Americans to take possession, peaceably if possible, but by force if necessary; and the Filipinos vacated without resistance, taking their arms with them into the neighboring hills. Cebu is the third Philippine city to be occupied by the Americans; Manila and Iloilo being the other two.

It was reported from Manila on the 22d that four native commissioners had arrived from the Island of Negros, which lies between Cebu and Panay, to report that the native inhabitants had put that island under the protection of the United States. They informed Gen. Otis that the American flag had already been raised, and asked his advice and help. On the 1st of March they returned to Negros on the St. Paul, accompanied by an American battalion.

A startling dispatch was received at Washington on the 24th from Admiral Dewey, saying that "for political reasons, the Oregon should be sent" to Manila "at once." The Oregon, at that time on her way to Manila, was detained at Honolulu for repairs. She has since resumed her voyage. No explanation of Dewey's dispatch has yet been given. Dewey himself has refused to be interviewed upon the subject. It was guessed that he wished to anticipate some interference by Germany, a German war vessel, the Kaiserin Augusta, having put into Manila bay. But

the German ambassador at Washington, on the 28th, requested the American government to undertake the protection of German subjects in the Philippines, explaining that it might be necessary to withdraw the Kaiserin Augusta. Another guess related to a meeting, on the 24th, of foreign consuls at Manila, from which the British consul—possibly on account of British friendship to the United States—was absent. Dewey's present strength is 22 warships, with 3,359 sailors and 304 marines.

A formal declaration of policy regarding the Philippine question was adopted in caucus on the 27th by the democratic members of the lower house of congress. It was in full as follows:

We hold that the constitution of the United States was ordained and established for an intelligent, liberty-loving and self-governing people, and cannot be successfully applied to a people of different virtues and conditions. We therefore hold that a colonial policy is contrary to the theory of our government and subversive of those principles of civil liberty which we have been taught to cherish. We believe with the declaration of independence that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and we are unalterably opposed to the establishment of any government by the United States without the consent of the people to be governed, and in conformity with these principles we instruct the minority members of the foreign affairs committee to introduce and urge the following resolution:

Resolved, That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over the Philippine islands, and assert their determination, when an independent government shall have been erected therein, to transfer to said government upon terms which shall be reasonable and just all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and thereupon to leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

We, the democratic members of the house of representatives, in caucus assembled, commend the signal loyalty and valor of our soldiers and sailors in the performance of every military duty to which they have been assigned by proper authority, however much we may deplore the policy of the administration now directing their movements; and we pledge to them our hearty support and sympathy under all circumstances wherever engaged.

The American standing army bill has been passed by both houses of congress. Before its passage, however, it had been divested by the senate of the feature of permanency. As the bill originally passed the house it required the president to enlarge

the regular army permanently to 50,000 men, and authorized him in his discretion to increase their number to 100,000. In the senate an amendment was added limiting the duration of the bill to July, 1901, when the army is to be reduced to the old number of about 25,000 men. The amended bill passed the senate by a vote of 55 to 13; and the lower house adopted it on the 1st by a vote of 203 to 32. Democrats very generally supported the bill as amended, on the ground that if this temporary measure were defeated an extra session of congress would be called and a large standing army be established permanently.

Russia's policy of expansion with reference to Finland is apparently about to culminate in the obliteration of the autonomy of that country and its complete absorption by Russia. Finland is now an autonomous dependency of Russia. It extends from the Gulf of Finland almost to the Arctic ocean, and is bounded on the west by Sweden and the Gulf of Bothnia, on the north by Norway, and on the east by Russia proper. In length it exceeds 750 miles, and in breadth 185, its area being 144,255 square miles. The population of Finland in 1897 was 2,483,249. Its factories, which in 1894 numbered 6,963, large and small, employed 58,233 hands, and yielded an annual product of \$33,000,000. There were then in the country 68,670 small farmers. Finland's imports in 1896 amounted to \$43,150,000 and her exports to \$39,750,000. In 1895 there were 694 post offices, the profits of which were \$47,993; and 153 savings banks reported 85,915 depositors with deposits aggregating \$11,143,400. The educational institutions of Finland are a university, a polytechnic school, and a variety of other schools, including places for instruction in navigation, commerce, and agriculture, as well as lyceums and private schools. Out of 470,382 children of school age—7 to 16 years—in 1896, only 21,523 received no education. The university is located at Helsingfors. It was attended in 1896 by 2,010 students, of whom 158 were women; and its diplomas are respected in the educational circles of the world. The people of Finland are of Turanian origin. They are the only Turanian remnant in Europe with a distinct nationality, unless the Magyars and the Turks be excepted—the Lapps having always been nomadic, and the Basques of Spain having long since lost distinct-

ive national character. Swedish is the language of the aristocracy of Finland, but the Finns have a distinct language and literature of their own.

Politically, Finland is a grand duchy, the czar of Russia being the grand duke. The country came under the general control of Sweden in the twelfth century, retaining, however, rights of local government. For a long time prior to the early part of the present century it was a battlefield for the wars between Sweden and Russia; but in 1809, by the treaty of Frederickshamn, Sweden ceded to Russia so much of Finland as Russia had not already wrenched from her. Immediately afterward, in 1810, the czar was constrained to make constitutional guarantees to Finland of its ancient autonomous rights, among other things exempting the Finnish army from service outside of Finland, and setting up a local parliament. These constitutional rights have been confirmed from time to time by succeeding czars. The parliament of Finland consists of four chambers—nobles, clergy, burghers and peasants. It is empowered to discuss all schemes of laws proposed by the czar, as grand duke, and no changes can be made in the constitution, nor any new taxes be levied, without the assent of all four chambers. We may see, therefore, that, limited though it be, the self-governing power of Finland is enviable as compared with the absolutism of Russia.

Russia has long been intent upon withdrawing this self-governing power from Finland and wiping out both the form and the substance of Finnish nationality. That intention has been especially marked ever since the parliament, or landtag, of Finland has been convened in its present session. At first Russia's demands were for the assignment of Finnish troops to serve outside of Finland, under Russian generals. This aroused suspicion and intensified the anti-Russian feeling. To allay that, the czar transmitted to the parliament a conciliatory message. He insisted, nevertheless, that the Finnish army be Russianized. Quickly following that message, and in the latter part of January of the present year, the czar made his hostile intentions still more apparent. He transmitted to the parliament propositions for making Russian the official and school language of Finland. The change was to be observed at once by the senate, the administrative author-

ity in Finland, and by the judges within five years. Finally, about the middle of February, an imperial manifesto was published by the czar, depriving the Finnish parliament altogether of its constitutional right to discuss schemes of laws proposed by the czar.

Meantime Russia maintains a strict censorship of the press, all criticisms of the proposed aggressions being forbidden. But reports from Stockholm, Sweden, show that the people of Helsingfors are convulsed by the evident intentions of the czar. And a deputation of the Finnish parliament was sent in February to Petersburg to protest in person to the czar against his manifest abrogation of Finland's constitution. News of the disagreeable reception of this deputation reached Stockholm on the 24th. An audience with the czar was positively refused.

The czar's evident purposes regarding Finland are noticed with great concern in Norway and Sweden. Naturally so, for upon the subjugation of Finland by Russia, the Scandinavian border would be exposed to the Russian frontier. The press of Norway and Sweden, therefore, urges the immediate dropping of all quarrels between the two countries, for the purpose of presenting a united front to Russia. The quarrels between Norway and Sweden grow out of their peculiar union. The two countries are distinct nations, except as to the power of declaring war and making peace. This power is a joint affair and is vested in the one king who is common to both nations. In declaring war and making peace he acts for the two jointly. But in the exercise of all other functions, he acts for each nation separately; for Norway in Norwegian affairs, and for Sweden in Swedish affairs. When the union took place, however, Norway had been obliged to accept if not to seek that relation, and consequently, though the two countries are nominally equal, Sweden has always maintained an attitude of paternal superiority. This has been all the more natural because the common king is primarily the king of Sweden. Still, until 1885 there was no serious difficulty. But in that year Sweden withdrew to a great extent from the king the administration of Swedish foreign affairs, and gave over that function to a Swedish min-

ister responsible only to the Swedish parliament or riksdag. Norway has therefore demanded also a separate minister of foreign affairs, but the king has vetoed the demand. Consequently Norwegian foreign affairs are controlled by the king, while Swedish foreign affairs are controlled by the Swedish parliament. This disturbs the equality of the two countries, and by that disturbance a great deal of friction is caused. Norway complains, for instance, that under existing conditions Sweden monopolizes the whole consular service. A superficial manifestation of the feeling between the two countries is the adoption by the Norwegian parliament, or storting, of a distinct flag for her merchant marine. It eliminates the union symbol of the Norway-Sweden flag. The Norwegian storting had twice before made this change—in 1893 and again in 1896—but the king each time vetoed the bill. Having now been passed for the third time, each time by a newly-elected storting, the bill becomes a law, notwithstanding the king's third veto. At the sessions of the Swedish riksdag during the past winter, speeches against the action of the Norwegian storting, as to the flag, have been very bitter. The difficulty between Norway and Sweden is manifested also in Norway's resisted claim to the right to maintain an army of her own, for which the storting has voted a large sum of money. The two countries have for a considerable time been upon the verge of civil war.

The expectations in Paris, noted in our report of last week, of an outbreak on the occasion of the late President Faure's funeral, were disappointed. The event passed off on the 23d quietly. An attempt to create disturbance was made by three members of the chamber of deputies—Paul Deroulede, Marcel-Habert and Lucien Millevoe. Both were arrested; but the latter was discharged the next day, he having merely opposed the police in preserving order. Deroulede and Marcel-Habert were held, and the chamber of deputies suspended their parliamentary privileges, leaving them to the courts for trial. They were charged with attempting to lead troops into a revolutionary movement for the purpose of replacing a parliamentary republic by a plebiscite republic. Since the Faure funeral a large quantity of documents

incriminating the monarchist party have been seized, and several monarchists have been arrested.

Two weeks ago, in connection with French affairs, we told of the passage by the chamber of deputies of a ministerial bill to regulate the Dreyfus revision. It would require the question of revision to be passed upon by the whole court of cassation, instead of the criminal branch; and in the event of a revision being ordered, would send Dreyfus for his new trial again to a court-martial. The senate has now taken action on this bill. On the 28th it adopted the principle of the bill by a vote of 155 to 125, and on the 1st passed the bill itself by 158 to 131.

In Spain the cortes have been acrimoniously debating the American peace treaty and collateral questions, but on the 1st proceedings were stopped by the resignation of the Sagasta ministry. The ministry decided to resign because they believed that the vote in the cortes on the question of ceding the Philippines to the United States would go against them.

The civil war in Nicaragua, the outbreak of which we reported two weeks ago, has collapsed. On the 26th the British and American naval commanders at Bluefields guaranteed that the revolutionists would disarm if the established government would guarantee their lives and property and maintain order at Bluefields. The leader of the rebellion, Gen. Reyes, had sought refuge at the British consulate at Bluefields, and announced his willingness to surrender without further resistance.

A copy of the papal letter mentioned last week as having been briefly reported by cable, was published on the 23d in the United States. It relates to the "Life of Isaac Thomas Hecker," written by Father Elliott, "especially as interpreted and transmitted in a foreign language," the French; and it condemns certain views described and commented upon in the letter at length, which "in their collective sense are called 'Americanisms.'" Archbishop Ireland, whose name is identified with what is colloquially referred to as the American movement in the Catholic church, wrote a letter to the pope on the 24th, in which he expressed his hearty

agreement with the papal letter, saying that—

they are enemies of the church in America and false interpreters of the faith who imagine there exists or who desire to establish in the United States a church differing a single iota from the holy universal church, recognized by other nations as the only church Rome itself recognizes or can recognize as the infallible guardian of the revelation of Jesus Christ.

NEWS NOTES.

—Senor Cuestas has been elected president of Uruguay.

—Baron Reuter died on the 25th at Nice. He was the founder of the world-famed Reuter news collection agency.

—Ex-Secretary Day has been appointed by the president as the United States circuit judge for the Sixth circuit.

—Prof. Herron's Sunday night and Monday noon lectures at the Chicago Central Music Hall are attended by increasing audiences.

—A conference of negroes was held at Tuskegee, Ala., on the 23d, for the purpose of discussing the relation between whites and negroes in the south.

—Baron Herschell, British member of the Canadian-American commission which has recently adjourned until next August, died at Washington on the 1st.

—The state of Illinois chooses a statue of Frances E. Willard as one of the two statues it is invited by congress to place in the capitol rotunda at Washington.

—The senate of Colorado on the 18th killed the bill against department stores. Anti-monopoly senators voted against the bill as an unwarranted interference with free competition.

—The second of ex-Gov. Altgeld's Chicago mayoralty campaign speeches was made on the North side on the 24th before an immense audience over which Edward Osgood Brown presided.

—The Fairhope Industrial association, which controls a cooperative colony at Fairhope, Ala., publishes its fourth annual report, which shows it to be in a satisfactory financial condition.

—Senator Quay's trial for embezzlement, which was to have begun on the 27th, was adjourned until April 10, at the request of the prosecuting officer. The reasons have not been divulged.

—A large single tax mass meeting was held on the 22d, at Tremont Temple, Boston. It was presided over by William Lloyd Garrison, and the speakers were Thomas G. Shearman and Tom L. Johnson.

—The president has appointed Senator Gray, of Delaware, the democratic member of the Paris peace commission, to the judgeship of the newly created circuit, which comprises Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware.

—A syndicate has purchased the Chicago & Alton railroad. The syndicate represents controlling interests in the Baltimore & Ohio, the Missouri Pacific, the Union Pacific and the Missouri, Kansas & Texas systems. The price was \$74,505,675.

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.

Senate.

February 21 to 25, 1899.

The joint resolution passed by the house on the 9th relative to revenue stamps in cases of instruments accompanied by other instruments by way of security, was adopted by the senate on the 21st, with an amendment; and thereupon consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed and the bill with amendments passed. The army reorganization bill was then again brought up, but not disposed of. On the 22d Washington's farewell address was read in celebration of the day, and memorial addresses on the late Senator Morrill were delivered. Both the river and harbor appropriation bill and the Alaska code bill were taken up on the 23d. On the 24th consideration of the river and harbor bill and also of the army reorganization bill was resumed. The river and harbor bill, with amendments, was passed; among the amendments being a clause providing for the construction of the Nicaragua canal. No disposition was made of the army reorganization bill, and on the 25th its consideration was resumed.

House.

The Naval appropriation bill was further considered on the 21st; and Washington's birthday was celebrated on the 22d by the reading of Washington's farewell address, after which the report of the conferees with the senate on the legislative appropriation bill was adopted. Consideration of the naval appropriation bill was then resumed, but was suspended to make way for the delivery of memorial speeches on the late Senator Morrill. Its consideration was again resumed on the 23d, when the bill was passed. The army appropriation bill was taken up on the 24th, and its consideration continued on the 25th until the business was suspended for memorial speeches on the late Senator Walthall and Representative Love.

It is as much a theft to steal with a long head as with a long arm.

MISCELLANY

TO HENRY GEORGE.

A Tribute.
For The Public.

Come, "House of Want," where life is
guest of death,
Come ye whose living has been tragedy,
Our time is come to bear him flower and
wreath,
And treasure memories fragrant of his life,
That he may dwell with us as sacred story.
And Mother Earth will join the unison,
For when men said that she was old and
hoary
And had not food for every one,
He said her breasts had milk for all,
So she too loves him for the filial story.
And they who know that man's despairing
night
Will break ere long into a day of glory,
And they who see its coming light
From mountains that are nigh God's sanc-
tuary,
These all will come to tell our Prophet's
story.

SAMUEL S. MARSH.

NOT CENTRALIZATION, BUT UNI-
FICATION.

No centralization is good except a centralization of function. We sometimes make a great mistake because we say that centralization is the order of the day. Unification may be the order of the day, but not centralization. The centralization of wealth has never taken place in human history without the absolute destruction of the civilization in which it took place. Now, mark you—the more property is centralized in any municipality, the stronger and more necessary the police force will be. Policemen and police systems exist, not to protect men, but to protect property. The legions of the Caesars existed not to protect men, but to police the plunder of the Roman politicians. The standing army that is called for in America to-day is called for—as we everyone of us know—to police our vested interests.—Prof. George D. Herron, in Chicago, Feb. 27.

WILL FRANCE ADMIT WOMEN TO
THE BAR?

M. Trouillot, ex-minister of the colonies, and advocate by profession, is the president of the parliamentary committee appointed to examine the claims of the lady lawyers who want to be allowed authorization to plead in courts of justice. The ex-minister and his colleagues on the committee are thoroughly in favor of the admission of women to the bar. They do not see why a lady advocate should be prevented from practicing her profession, since there are women who have been empowered to heal the sick or to act as professors and teachers after they have passed stiff examinations and ob-

tained high degrees in arts and sciences. Accordingly, Mlle. Jeanne Chauvin and those who, like her, are clever and studious enough to wade through the pandects and the codes in order to obtain degrees and honors from the faculty of law are now gradually advancing toward their desired goal. The big-wigs of the Palais de Justice, animated by professional motives, may be against them, but they have a strong backing among the legislators, and can include on the list of their champions the names of influential politicians like M. Leon Bourgeois, M. Deschanel (president of the chamber of deputies), M. Poincarre, and others who have held high offices in the state, and are eligible or available for important administrative posts in the future.—Paris Cor. of London Telegraph.

ENGLAND IN 1776: AMERICA IN
1899.

England in 1776 was trying to subjugate a people who were contending for rights of self-government. But there was no lack of protest from some of her noblest sons. The duke of Richmond hoped the Americans might succeed. Fox spoke of Gen. Howe's first victory as the "terrible news from Long Island." The whigs habitually alluded to Washington's army as "our army." Burke declared he would rather be a prisoner in the Tower than enjoy liberty in company with those who were seeking to enslave America. The whigs discouraged enlistments. Lord Chatham withdrew his eldest son from the army. As late as 1778 Chatham would have withdrawn every British soldier from our soil. We Americans are apt not to remember these things. We have especial need to remember them at the present time. America in 1899 is in England's place; it now is trying to subjugate a people who are contending for rights of self-government. England had a semblance of right, for the colonists were her children. But the Filipinos are not our children. We have not even liberated them; we have only given them a new master. England disregarded the rights of Englishmen; we disregard the rights of man, which we have hitherto professed to defend. Burke urged that an Englishman was the unfittest person on earth to argue another Englishman into slavery. An American is the unfittest person on earth to argue another man into slavery. We can only hold a people against their consent as we turn the declaration of independence to the wall. I hope America will not succeed. I should rather be a "traitor," like Burke, than a supporter

of the dastardly business now going on—or even be silent under it, as so many are.—Rev. William M. Salter, before the Ethical Culture Society of Chicago, February 26, as reported in the Chicago Record.

WHAT OUR SOLDIERS IN MANILA
THINK OF THE PHILIPPINE
QUESTION.

In a letter received February 20 from Mrs. Reeve, wife of Gen. C. McC. Reeve, who is with her husband at Manila, she refers with evident anxiety to the threatened outbreak of hostilities between the American troops and the Filipinos. The letter was written the day following Aguinaldo's proclamation. Says Mrs. Reeve:

"There has been a council of war. Great numbers of the Spaniards are coming into the walled city, while the insurgents are leaving. It is really funny, they are so frightened. Our soldiers are in their quarters and all the guards have been doubled. Carriages are rushing in all directions, and everywhere there is an air of illy suppressed excitement. . . .

"As I have already said, the insurgents are leaving the city as fast as they can get away, and are taking their families with them. This is very significant, and can only mean that they are going to attack us. No one wants to fight these people, who ask only for their liberty. They should have it. None of the officers or men here are in a position to say anything regarding the president's course, but everyone knows that Aguinaldo was furious at the nothings contained in the president's message, and that he has issued a response which augurs ill for the maintenance of peace here. Our men will fight the Filipinos with a very different grace than they employed against the Spaniards, although they will, of course, obey orders, even though their hearts are not in the cause.

"The leaders of the insurgents are men of education and ability. Since they went into Iloilo without disorder and immediately settled down to good government and humane care of their prisoners, it looks to us, here on the scene, as though they were fully capable of taking care of themselves.

"When the people of the United States know that these natives do not want us, and that the army is very much opposed to occupying this place fit only for the 'Indians' now here, we trust that the president will decide to let the Filipinos take care of themselves. Out here we are not expansionists. We know too much about the country, the people and the climate."—Minneapolis Times of Feb. 21.

JUST GOVERNMENT IS OF GOD.

"For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administered is best."
—Pope.

Nay, charming Pope, whose strains like
music swell,
Entrance the ear and charm the sense as
well,

Whose genius taught the Muse substantial
speech,

And sped Philosophy on wings to teach—
Nay, Government is not a thing of chance,
A scheme of England, or device of France,
A human scheme, no ordered part to fill,
But formed and functioned howsoever we
will;—

Nay, genial Pope, the Architect of Man
Left not that work an incompleated plan,
But made of human needs the guide and
chart
To common council and the public part.

In savage state let village life attest
The social instinct in the savage breast,
And in the needs of village life, behold
The Public Part, called government, unfold.
When Trade, the civilizer, came to earth,
She called for streets, and Government had
birth;

(For who should make the streets for
which she yearned?

And who the highways build, save All Con-
cerned?)

Council was held at the behest of Trade;
Courts were suggested when decrees were
made.

Thus Government took form; but from
that day,

Greed-blinded knaves have led the world
astray,

And still like vultures on the public prey.

In vain kind Nature hears her children cry;
They spurn her guidance, struggle, starve
and die.

Man's needs are such, and such are Man's
desires,
They lead and prompt as Order's Law re-
quires;

But Self perverts what God through Na-
ture planned—

Nature, whose ways the child can under-
stand.

'Tis Nature's self that leads the child in-
tent

On fullest measure for the penny spent.
In every purchase it is plain to see

God's wisdom guiding human industry.
The greatest bargains catching every eye,
Lead to the source of Nature's best supply.
This is the Law yon statesman, "Labor's
friend,"

Wiser than God, professes to amend!

Those forms of government whose rule de-
crees

Woe, want and misery, are deformities;
The "best administered" cannot be best,
Unless it on Eternal Justice rest;
Best government is surely unattained,
Short of the order which is God-Ordained.
The form evolved with social needs en-
twined—

That form, called government, is God-De-
signed.

This simple truth let Nature wide pro-
claim:

The public realm is everywhere the same.
Each public part, performed aright, 'tis
clear,

Just governments one common form must
bear.

ROBERT CUMMING.

Peoria, Ill.

A CASE IN POINT.

It seems to be assured that if we have
a struggle with the Filipinos the great
power of this country will make it a
trifling affair. It might be well for
those who think so to recall a bit of the
history of Santo Domingo, as told by
Hazard and by Thiers.

In 1793 the English invaded the is-
land. They abandoned it in 1798, after
expending in the invasion \$100,000,000
and 45,000 lives. In February, 1802, 22,-
000 French veteran troops, sent by Na-
poleon, landed there. They met with
a feeble resistance, and were soon in
control of nearly the whole island. They
were conquered by the climate. In
the autumn of 1802 Napoleon sent 10,-
000 more troops, making 32,000 in all.
Three-quarters of the French army per-
ished, and the remnant abandoned the
island in 1803.

When Napoleon contemplated send-
ing these troops, if any person had
suggested to him that it was beyond his
power to subdue Santo Domingo, the
reception which the adviser would have
met with can easily be imagined; and
I will not offend the bumptiousness of
our people by insinuating that they
lack power to do anything in the heav-
ens above or the earth below or the
waters under the earth. But when
we see that the strongest naval power
in the world, and the strongest mili-
tary power in the world, attempted in
turn to subdue Santo Domingo, and
gave it up, after enormous expense and
loss of life, the possibilities of our hav-
ing a similar experience in the Phil-
ippines cannot be denied.

If a collision with the natives, or a
portion of them, should unfortunately
occur, our problem may become a more
difficult one than the Santo Domingo
one. Both climates are tropical and
dangerous to unacclimated troops. But
the Philippines are four times as large
as Santo Domingo in area and popula-
tion; and neither England nor France
had to contend with the jealousy of
powerful nations which could easily
supply the insurgent army with arms,
ammunition and food to keep up a
guerilla warfare for years.

Is it worthy of a sensible and busi-
ness-like people to pursue an enterprise
involving hazy chances of profit, a cer-
tainty of enormous cost, and a possi-
bility of humiliating failure?

I know it would be said that we are
committed to it and cannot let go now,
but this argument is fallacious. Where
there is a will there is a way, and if
our people and our government were
unanimous in the desire to withdraw
from the Philippines a way to do so

would surely be found.—Francis H.
Peabody, in Boston Transcript.

THE ONE PRISON IN ICELAND.

For The Public.

The item which has been going the
rounds of the press, and which ap-
peared in The Public of February 11,
entitled "No Prison in Iceland," does
not state the facts quite correctly.

As the penal code, based upon Roman
law, and the industrial situation in Ice-
land are much as they are in other
Scandinavian and Germanic countries,
the social student will properly con-
clude that human nature there is also
not different. While it is true that
there are some gratifying aspects of
the situation in Iceland, the situation
itself does not differ. It is true that
"such defenses to property as locks,
bolts and bars" are hardly required
anywhere in Iceland. That there are
no police required would not be con-
cluded by one who knows that there
are also people from other countries
there.

The prison is in Reykjavik, the capi-
tal of Iceland. The present, and vir-
tually the first, jail in Iceland, a sub-
stantial, two-story structure of stone,
was built about 25 years ago. It is jail
and penitentiary both. It is also the
town hall of Reykjavik, and was for
many years used for a house of parlia-
ment, that is, for the meeting place
of the national legislature, which has
now erected a separate building.

The management of this Iceland
prison deserves special description.
There is hardly, I think, a penitentiary
in the world where prisoners receive
more humane treatment. With the ex-
ception of being deprived of their free-
dom, many of the prisoners are better
provided for in jail than out of it, to
which some of them have confessed.
Here they get all the food, clothing
and warmth necessary to keep them in
comfort; they are not hard worked,
and receive a premium for anything
they may do over a day's work.

The laws of the country are not so
much to be thanked for this as the good
management of the keeper of the peni-
tentiary, who has had that position
since its establishment. Never has
there been heard a single complaint of
bad treatment of prisoners in the peni-
tentiary of Iceland.

The moral sentiment of the people
may also have something to do with it.
A little insight into that may be
gleaned from the following stanza, by
a favorite clergyman-poet of Iceland,
the English rendering of which is of
course defective:

In erring man 'tis easy finding flaws,
His errors to condemn, but slight their
cause;

For fools see not the proofs that are not displayed,
 And blame the tree, but not the roots decayed.
 From this, howe'er, the friend of truth refrains;
 He overlooks an individual's stains,
 And never strikes with might a withered bloom;
 But national sin will get its dreadful doom.

AN ICELANDER.

PURPOSE IS DESTINY.

The people have not voted for imperialism; no national convention has declared for it; no congress has passed upon it. To whom, then, has the future been revealed? Whence this voice of authority? We can all prophecy, but our prophecies are merely guesses, colored by our hopes and our surroundings. Man's opinion of what is to be is half wish and half environment. Avarice paints destiny with a dollar mark before it, militarism equips it with a sword.

He is the best prophet who, recognizing the omnipotence of truth, comprehends most clearly the great forces which are working out the progress, not of one party, not of one nation, but of the human race. History is replete with predictions which once were the hue of destiny, but which failed of fulfillment because those who uttered them saw too small an arc of the circle of events. . . .

The ancient doctrine of imperialism, banished from our land more than a century ago, has recrossed the Atlantic and challenged democracy to mortal combat upon American soil. Whether the Spanish war shall be known in history as a war for liberty or as a war of conquest; whether the principles of self-government shall be strengthened or abandoned; whether this nation shall remain a homogeneous republic or become a heterogeneous empire—these questions must be answered by the American people—when they speak, and not until then will destiny be revealed.

Destiny is not a matter of chance; it is a matter of choice; it is not a thing to be waited for; it is a thing to be achieved.

No one can see the end from the beginning, but every one can make his course an honorable one from beginning to end by adhering to the right under all circumstances. Whether a man steals much or little may depend upon his opportunities, but whether he steals at all depends upon his own volition.

So with our nation. If we embark upon a career of conquest, no one can tell how many islands we may be able to seize, or how many races we may be

able to subjugate; neither can anyone estimate the cost, immediate and remote, to the nation's purse and to the nation's character; but whether we shall enter upon such a career is a question which the people have a right to decide for themselves.

Unexpected events may retard or advance the nation's growth, but the nation's purpose determines its destiny.

What is the nation's purpose? That purpose is set forth clearly and unmistakably in the first sentence of the constitution: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." —William J. Bryan, Washington, D. C., February 22.

JAPANESE FARMERS.

So much has been said recently of the industrial development of this country that one is apt to take us as an industrial nation. The fact is, we are essentially an agricultural country, having 70 per cent. of our people in pursuit of agriculture.

As yet, the farming industry in this country is largely carried on by peasant proprietors, and the land is quite evenly distributed among them. It is officially estimated that 56 per cent. of the whole farming population are those who own land of less than two acres each, 29 per cent. are those who own between two and three and one-half acres each, and the remaining 15 per cent. are those who own over three and one-half acres each. Although industrial development and social progress is slowly but irresistibly forcing us to the era of landlordism, only 26 per cent. of the farming population are cultivating on tenancy at present.

As a rule, life conditions prevalent among peasant proprietors as well as tenant farmers, represent the lowest type of Japanese life. For our present purpose, we select one typical case from the province of Owari, one of the fertile districts in this country. The family under our observation consists of five members—husband, wife, parent and two children, one of whom is old enough to assist his parents in the field. This family cultivates, on a tenancy, one and a half acres of rice field and one acre of dry field, both of good fertility and capable of yielding two crops in a year. The rice field yields on an average 60 bushels. Seventy per cent. of the yield is given in kind or

in cash, according to the market value at the time, to the land owners as rent. In other localities this percentage varies, but in no case does it amount higher than 75 per cent. or lower than 60 per cent.

The farmer's share, therefore, amounts to 18 bushels, which, estimated at the ruling price of one dollar per bushel, will bring \$18 as the farmer's income. Besides this, there is an additional income of \$4.50 by disposal of bundles of straw accrued. This brings the total amount to \$22.50 as the farmer's earning from the cultivation of rice.

The winter crop, for which no rent is paid—or, rather, is paid in advance by the rice crop—is a source of far more important income to the farmer. It is the general practice among farmers inhabiting the districts in question to lay out rice plots, drained of water, of course, for the cultivation of rape-seed plants. The yield of the farmer by this means comes to about 41 bushels, and estimated at the rate of 61 cents per bushel, it represents an income of \$25. The stalks are not valueless. They fetch about \$1.50 for the whole area. Thus, the winter crop of the farmer brings to the pocket of the farmer a sum of \$26.50 as his net earnings.

[The writer then enumerates the crops raised as the dry field spoken of above. First is barley, valued at \$24, of which \$14 goes as rent for the field. From the stalk the farmer gets \$1.50. From the various summer crops planted after the barley has been harvested he obtains \$30.75, a total income of \$91.25. The article continues:]

On examining the living expenses of the farmer's family, we find that owing to the higher cost of rice, they subsist on rice evenly mixed with barley. Fish, which is one of the common foods with other classes of our countrymen, is a thing of luxury for them, and they partake of it on the occasion of village festivals only. The chief item of food is mixed rice, which costs for the whole family \$3 per month. For fuel 90 cents is spent, for clothing 45 cents, for repair of furniture and tools 45 cents, and other expenses, including public burdens, foot up to \$1.25 monthly. The whole expenditure thus comes to \$6.05 per month, or \$72.60 per year. To this, the outlay on account of manure, amounting to \$15 per year, must be added, and there remains \$3.65 to be expended for incidental purposes.

Turning our attention to peasant proprietors, we observe no marked difference in their life conditions in comparison with tenant farmers. True, they are not liable to give up the greatest

part of their income to landowners, but instead they are heavily taxed by national and local governments. The national tax on land amounts to about \$5 per acre, and local tax comes to about \$6 per acre. Thus, supposing the tenant farmer we have above depicted as owning the land, we will find his yearly income is added to by \$56, or his total income will amount to \$147.45. Deduct from this the national and local taxes, aggregating \$27.50, and there remains in the hands of the supposed peasant proprietor a sum of \$119.75 for his living expenses, or \$28.50 more than that of the tenant farmer. It is quite apparent that this small additional income is insufficient to materially improve the life conditions of peasant proprietors.—From an article in *The Coast Seamen's Journal*, by Fusataro Takana, of Tokyo, Japan, as republished in *Justice*, of Wilmington, Del.

COMMENT OF "JUSTICE" ON THE FOREGOING.

Small as the difference in favor of the peasant proprietor appears, it is as \$2.90 a week for him against \$1.75 a week for the tenant. The landowner takes as rent nearly 40 per cent. of the tenant's earnings, nearly as much as Delaware landlords, but pays more taxes. It will be noticed that the tax is apparently levied on the area of land, and bears heavily on the working farmer who owns his land. It should also be remembered that landlordism is a modern institution in Japan, and that 20 years ago there was a vast amount of free land open to the people, now mostly fenced in for speculation.

GEN. EMILIO AGUINALDO.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by Edwin Wildman, United States vice-consul-general at Hong-Kong. Published in *Harper's Weekly* of February 25.

In the nineteenth century there has not been a more unique figure among the native races of the earth than this Tagalo patriot—or rebel; call him what you will. Philosophers call silent men wise; superficial people call them ignorant. Aguinaldo is wise among his people, ignorant among Europeans. A man must be judged by his environments, his compatriots, his race. Aguinaldo is not a Napoleon nor a Washington; neither is he a Tecumseh or a Sitting Bull. He is Aguinaldo, and his name stands for no metaphor. He has the astuteness of his race, the fearless bravery of the savage warrior, the sphinx-like imperturbability of the Indian, the straightforwardness of childhood, and the innate sense of justice that characterizes all aboriginal races. It may be premature to sum up a man's character while his career is at the zenith.

Some trick of circumstance or expediency may shift the kaleidoscope, for no man can stand under the microscope of the historian until the last page of evidence has been turned in; but Aguinaldo, as he is to-day, commands the consideration and respect of all who have taken the trouble to study his character and watch the trend of events of which he is the central figure.

That he loves pomp and opera-bouffe, ludicrous though it seems to the European, cannot condemn him to the showy nobility of the kingdom that taught his people to reverence gold braid and plumed cockades, nor to the gaudy monarchies of the old world, nor to our own bemedaled, brass-buttoned and gold-chevroned army and navy. Aguinaldo is but a feeble imitator of a civilization a thousand years his senior. The cost of all the insignias of his 300 officers would not equal the expenditure for the full-dress regalia I have seen worn by the English colonial governor at Hong-Kong. His much-advertised gold collar pales into insignificance in comparison with the ones worn by the British dignitary.

Aguinaldo takes himself seriously. It is a primitive old-fashioned idea, and never fails to arouse the amused smile of a foreigner. If we set that same representative of a higher civilization down in the presence of the Tagalo chieftain at Malolos headquarters, the smile will vanish from his face, and he will begin to ask himself why he feels ashamed at his thoughts.

Aguinaldo holds his councils of state, directs his army of 20,000 or more natives, and lives at Malolos—a quaint little town made up of nipa huts, a dozen whitewashed brick structures, including a great church and convent, 30 miles eastward of Manila in Luzon. He has appropriated to his use the convent of Malolos; and a half-dozen soldiers, and two natives with Mindanao spears, all doing guard under a Filipino flag at the convent's entrance, inform you of the fact.

When I made my visit to Aguinaldo I was accompanied by a native Filipino of Manila who stood high among his people, and when he made known my desire to meet the general we were ushered through the lines of the well-worn storied stairs of the old convent into the council room of the Filipino government. It struck me as incongruous that there, in the heart of a palm-enhanced village of bare-placed, scantily furnished native huts, I should find myself suddenly in a great well-furnished reception-room, laid with a handsome French carpet, gorgeously frescoed and decorated, and hung with

oil paintings, though of native masters, creditably done; yet I could not help admiring the attempts to ape European grandeur. At one end of the council chamber hangs a life-size portrait of Aguinaldo, painted, I suspect, by a Chinaman. The portrait looks younger than the general, and does not give a correct idea of his face, but it serves to remind the writer that he is in the hot-bed of insurrection—in the very home of the little rebel who has focused the attention of the world. Along the sides of the room are a number of skillfully carved miniature images illustrating various methods of torture and abuse to which the Filipinos were subjected by the Spanish friars in order to extract the secrets of the masonry which was the preliminary organization that united the natives of the islands for the purpose of subverting the Spanish rule. . . . A pair of red curtains separated the inner sanctum of the commander-in-chief of the insurgent forces from the council room. They were deftly held back by the aid-de-camp as I passed into the presence of the famous Aguinaldo. . . . Nothing in the chieftain's dress suggested his rank, but a glance at his serious bronzed countenance stamped him, in my estimation, as a leader. His head is large, but set well upon his rather slight body. His hair is the rich shiny black of the Tagalo, and is combed pompadour, enhancing his height somewhat. He was neatly dressed in a suit of fine pina cloth of native manufacture, and as he stood there straight and dignified, one hand resting on his desk, despite his under-size and mock-heroic surroundings, he impressed me as a man capable of all he had undertaken, and the possessor of a will and determination equal to the task set before him, and I made up my mind then and there that he was genuine; that his dignity was natural; that his aim was lofty, and his character trustful and worthy of being trusted. True worth shines through the eyes, will show itself in the mouth, ability in the curve of the nose. There is a look in the faces of men who lead, men who command, that no student of character can fail to note. There is a something in the make-up of this little Tagalo that inspires more than respect—something that commands without words. I do not think that I am overestimating Aguinaldo when I say that he possesses the attributes that go to make up greatness as it is understood among men. There is something out of the ordinary in a man, born in the wilds of an outlying island, uneducated, uncultured, untraveled, who

possesses the power to inspire men to heroism and self-sacrifice; who can muster an army out of men who never fought but with the knife or the bow and arrow; who can hold in check the violent passions of revenge, plunder and destruction in a race which has never known anything but cruelty and oppression from the white man, and which does not forget that the soil must be tilled and the crops harvested, and that there is a God in Heaven who will listen to the petition of a Tagalo cure and will reject the mock prayers of a Franciscan pharisee.

Aguinaldo's generalship shows itself in his resolute chin and overshot jaw. If he were a bull-dog a fancier would call him a thoroughbred. In Malolos the natives told me that Aguinaldo never slept. While the Filipino takes his siesta from 12 o'clock until 3:30, the priest from 12 until 5, Aguinaldo grapples with the problems of war and peace. Over a thousand miles of telegraph wires (captured from the Spanish) terminate at his desk. All parts of Luzon, and even beyond, are within his ready reach, and every regiment receives its orders daily. He is an enigma to his people, and to the foreigners who would probe his thoughts. Among the natives he is held as a demi-god who leads a charmed life—even far back among the hills the yet untamed Negrito tribes fear his name. He knows every inch of Filipino soil, and can hold the outlying districts loyal, for his purpose is never questioned, and the ethics of right and wrong are not discussed. His flag flies over every group of huts, every petty pueblo, and every junk and barge that plies the rivers and bays of Luzon, and it is not a stranger among the southern islands. His people, in the general acceptance of the word, are Indians; but they must not be confused with the North American product. They are advanced in the arts of civilization far beyond the native races of our own continent. They are industrious; they make the soil productive; they understand the method of developing to their best maturity the native fruits, the cocoanut, the betel-nut, the banana, the mango, and even raising potatoes and apples of an inferior quality. They build substantial houses; they make and mix paints; they carve in wood; they work in iron; they make skillful machinists, good mill-hands, barbers, servants and day laborers, and they worship God. They respect morality; they love their homes and their children. They make successful merchants, scholars, divines, and in music their talent is universal. As manufac-

turers and weavers their skill is wonderful. They utilize the palm, the bamboo, the abaca-plant, the cocoanut fiber, for food, clothing, and household utensils innumerable. All this I assert from observation and investigation, and not from hearsay. As soldiers they have shown themselves capable of splendid achievement, daring, and heroism for a hundred years and more.

Aguinaldo is a native among natives. He belongs to the common people, superior only in the one gift that makes him the chosen leader of them all, and the question naturally arises, what has he done for his people? . . . Whatever the outcome of our policy in the Philippines will be, the islands will ever owe a debt of deep gratitude to Aguinaldo. He has made life and property safe, preserved order, and encouraged a continuation of agricultural and industrial pursuits. He has made brigandage and loot impossible, respected private property, forbidden excess, either in revenge or in the name of the state, and made a woman's honor safer in Luzon than it has been for 300 years. . . . I have taken Aguinaldo as he takes himself—seriously; and it is the highest compliment I can pay him, and the only way I know of to do justice to a man whose achievements stand preeminent in aboriginal warfare in the world's history.

FROM THE PRIMER.

Here is the Dog. Since time be-gan,
The Dog has been the friend of Man.
The Dog loves MAN be-cause he shears
His coat and clips his tail and ears.
MAN loves the Dog be-cause he'll stay
And lis-ten to his talk all day,
And wag his tail and show de-light
At all his jokes, how-ev-er trite.
His bark is far worse than his bite,
So peo-ple say. They may be right;
Yet if to make a choice I had,
I'd choose his bark, how-ev-er bad.
—Oliver Herford, in *The Century* for December.

No nation ever lived or will live that can be trusted with the liberty of another people. Commercialism, which has depleted the chivalry of this nation, when our manhood and womanhood were crying for liberation of other peoples from the Spanish yoke, and we stood nationally pledged to the world to seek only a war for humanity, now bids us fight the Filipinos into submission, and we stand to-day a perjured nation.—Prof. George D. Herron.

It is time that corporations, combines, trusts and multi-millionaires were requested to leave the front seats, at least, and let the men who can speak for the great body of voters, the men who believe in the republicanism of Abraham Lincoln, have room and part

in the conduct of public affairs. I do not even suggest that men be ignored and humiliated simply because they are rich, but the legislative and executive offices of this nation cannot much longer be filled with men whose claims are based solely upon their devotion to corporate interests.—Gov. Pingree.

"What have we to do with this Samoan squabble?"

"Can't say, exactly. I don't know whether it's a case of duty, destiny or humanity, or merely an old-fashioned scrap."—Puck.

What is charity anyway?

Anything that we do for others that makes us think less of them and more of ourselves.—*The Coming Nation*.

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. *Here-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 creditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with *THE PUBLIC* will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

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

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.