

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1899.

Number 50.

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.

It is a pleasure to record such acts of disinterestedness as those of Lieut. Aaron Ward and Rear Admiral Francis J. Higginson, of the American navy. Having been named for promotion for specially meritorious services, both these officers declined, on the ground that they did not regard their services as exceptional, and that their promotion would be to the prejudice of brother officers quite as worthy as themselves.

Somewhat of a flutter occurred in circles that may be better described as pious than as religious, upon an announcement this week that the Japanese government was planning to make Christianity the imperial religion. It appears now that the announcement had no foundation in truth. But even if it had been true, there would have been nothing in it to cause genuinely religious men to rejoice. To establish Christianity as a state religion is neither to introduce nor to promote Christianity, but more likely to strangle it. Christian ecclesiasticism is the only thing in the similitude of Christianity that can be set up by law, and ecclesiasticism is no more religion than a silk gown is a woman.

Tolstoi's confirmation of our views regarding the hollowness of the peace pretensions of the Russian government is strengthened by a recent public letter of Prince Krapotkin's. The prince appeals to the English speaking world against accepting the czar's peace manifesto as sincere. His reasons are impressive. While publishing this manifesto outside of Rus-

sia as an assurance of a desire to promote peace, the Russian government stops all agitation for peace at home. The press is strictly forbidden to discuss the question, and even the priests are put under a censorship to prevent their speaking against war. Meantime Russia is imposing imperial military service upon Finland, and is resorting to flogging and other torture to force the doukhobors into the army. When Prince Krapotkin and Tolstoi agree in denouncing as fraudulent the czar's peace proposals, we feel quite safe in not becoming ecstatic about them.

Sugar growers who imagine that bounties on sugar are for their benefit, may discover their mistake in a decision made about two weeks ago by the United States supreme court. It was held distinctly by this decision that the manufacturers of sugar, and not cane growers, are entitled to the sugar bounty. In rendering the decision Justice Brown remarked that cane growers would receive their share of the bounty in higher prices for cane. That would be more consoling to sugar cane and beet growers if they didn't know that higher prices for cane or beets would stimulate cane and beet production, and so press prices down again.

An enthusiastic advocate of manual training estimates that 97 per cent. of the graduates of Chicago public schools are unable to earn an adequate living, because they lack an industrial education. He fails to observe that as large a percentage of those who do not lack industrial training are also unable to earn, or at least to get, an adequate living. An extension of industrial training, under existing conditions, would make it harder, not easier, for the great mass of people to command decent wages.

Duns' Review of business and finance grows enthusiastic over the recent advances in wages. Acutely enough this sapient business review observes that these additions to wages put into the markets a new and vast buying demand. But while wages in the very industries it names were being reduced during the two years that have elapsed since the presidential election, it did not occur to Dun's Review to note that the reductions took out of the markets that same buying demand. Inasmuch as the recent wages advances hardly equal the reductions that preceded them, how, on the whole, can the buying market be benefited? That market would have fared better if there had been no advances, provided there had been no reductions.

It must have required no ordinary bravery on the part of Congressman Cannon to declare officially through the Congressional Record, that the Dingley bill has yielded sufficient revenues for the ordinary expenses of the government. This bold statement is made full in the face of the fact that federal revenues are running short of expenses, notwithstanding a war loan almost large enough to pay all the war expenses, besides the imposition of a war revenue tax. But for the war loan, the war taxes, and receipts from sales of railroads, though there had been no war, the treasury would by this time be well-nigh empty.

The total treasury receipts from all sources except sales of railroads, from July 1, 1897—a few days before the Dingley law took effect—down to December 31, 1898, inclusive of bond sales, were \$806,112,603.85, as appears from the treasury reports. During the same period the total expenses were \$773,085,058.96. Here we find a surplus of \$33,027,544.89. But the extra expenditures for war down to

December 31, 1898, were at least \$2,000,000 less than the receipts from war bonds; so that if there had been no war and no war bonds, the excess of receipts would have been only about \$31,027,544.89; and that excess would have fallen below zero but for the war tax. We should then have started out upon the new year of 1899 with a constantly growing deficit. Yet Mr. Cannon has the temerity to point with partisan pride to the Dingley law as a successful revenue raiser.

That the deficit is growing is admitted; and at the present rate of increase, it will soon rise high enough to make a bond issue necessary in the middle of the next presidential campaign. But that outrage upon the country and calamity to the Hannan ring may be warded off under the provisions of an obscure paragraph in the sundry civil bill which empowers the secretary of the treasury in his discretion to sell, at not less than par and accrued interest, any or all evidences of indebtedness of the Central Pacific Railroad company. Should the secretary exercise this power, he could tide over a deficit of something like \$60,000,000 without further exposing the utter failure of this administration financially, by another issue of bonds.

Deficits and toryism appear to be closely related. We have heretofore compared our prospective deficit with the English deficit which the imperialists over there have produced. How to deal with the latter is one of the new problems of British politics. Characteristically, the tory London Times proposes to put duties on corn and sugar, while reducing the income tax. Its argument for reducing the income tax has the one merit of being unique. The Times argues, and argues gravely, that such a measure would benefit the working classes, who pay no income tax. Its argument rests upon the idea that the rich support the poor. The prosperity of the poor depends, therefore, upon the amount of wealth which rich men can lay by! From which it follows that a

reduction of the income tax, by enabling the rich to augment their savings, would promote the prosperity of the poor. As the Manchester Guardian suggests, a really democratic application of this argument would lead to the total exemption of the rich from taxation. Government would then be supported wholly by the poor, so that the rich might the better qualify themselves to make the poor prosperous.

There is, however, another view of the matter, in England, and the liberal party in parliament is committed to it. In the form of an amendment to the address to the throne a motion was made in the commons by E. J. C. Morton, expressing the regret of that body that

there is no indication in your majesty's gracious speech that measures will be submitted to this house dealing with the ownership, tenure or taxation of land in towns.

This amendment precipitated a debate in which the right of the community to the value which its growth attaches to the land was discussed upon radical premises. Of course the amendment was defeated. In a tory parliament it could hardly have been otherwise. But it was defeated by a narrow majority, and resulted, according to the Financial Reformer of Liverpool, in bringing out

first, the strength of the case for the taxation of land values; secondly, the weakness of the case against this reform; and, lastly, it has absolutely committed the liberal party, as a party, to the principle that the value added to the land by the presence and industry of the people belongs to those by whom it was created and not to the landowners.

How completely the liberal party has been so committed may be inferred from the editorial assertion of the Manchester Guardian, the leading liberal paper outside of London, —

that a very great proportion of the increased wealth of the community, all that is known as "economic rent," must pass, under existing conditions, into the hands of a comparatively small class; that this element of wealth is due not so much to the exertions of any assignable individual as to the general growth and energy of the com-

munity; and that it is very desirable that the community should lay it under contribution for common needs.

Henry George himself could have asked nothing better of the English liberal party than that.

It is a little shocking, while English liberalism is moving so evidently toward the goal of Henry George's thought, to find a distinguished English liberal like James Bryce going out of his way to reflect upon the beneficent measure to which his party is giving in its adhesion. In the Century Magazine for March, Mr. Bryce, writing upon British experience in the government of colonies, implies that Henry George's single tax principle has been largely tried in the far east, and found wanting. He says:

Oriental empires have usually been "run" on the single tax principle, and have not found it so simple or easy to work as it looks in theory.

It is not to be presumed for a moment that Mr. Bryce would misrepresent. It is almost as difficult to suppose him ignorant of the facts about which he writes. Nor are we inclined to charge him with indifference to the right and wrong of important matters. Yet it is certain that Mr. Bryce's assertion that "oriental empires have usually been 'run' on the single tax principle," is a mis-statement. In all the oriental systems of taxation, nowhere does the single tax principle appear. There are taxes upon land, to be sure; but when examined these taxes prove to be either taxes in proportion to area, or taxes in proportion to production. The single tax principle is more distinctly in operation in the United States than anywhere in the orient. For in the United States, land is taxed in proportion to its value—at least that is what the law requires,—and nothing remains to perfect the single tax here, but to abolish all other taxes.

As a mere matter of fiscal reform, the abolition of taxes upon industry, enterprise and thrift, should be welcomed by all but monopolists. But the single tax would in its effects be more than a fiscal reform. It would open up unused land on all sides to the demands of labor and business.

Ex-Governor Bookwalter, of Ohio, was recently interviewed concerning the subject of population and land. The only significant thing in his interview, which was entitled "Back to the Land," was his recommendation that people who have to support themselves by individual efforts turn their backs upon the cities and get out upon the land. But Mr. Bookwalter offered no suggestion as to how landless men are to get out upon the land. He ought to know, if he does not, that in the vast domain of the United States, all the land worth living upon, except that which is publicly owned, is cornered; and that no man, however needy and however willing to apply his labor to the land, can do so without the consent of some land monopolist.

No one wanting land for use can get it for nothing, unless he goes where it is worth nothing. Thousands have done that, as a last resort; but what kind of life do they lead? They are virtually exiles from civilization and from all the pleasures and co-operative benefits of organized society. Yet in journeying from the cities to the wilderness, they pass millions of acres of unused but privately appropriated land in desirable localities, which they cannot get because they cannot pay the prices demanded. They are forced, therefore, to go on until they reach some spot where land is so poor that nobody wants it. "Back to the land," indeed! What wretched mockery to urge that retreat upon the comparatively destitute working classes. Under existing laws and customs the millions of idle or poorly paid men in our cities can no more follow Bookwalter's advice than they could cross the ocean in a washtub, with a straw hat for a sail and a fish-pole for a rudder. The land they could use is near at home, in the cities themselves or upon the outskirts. Here they would not be isolated from their fellows, with whom they could easily exchange what they know how to produce for the tools and comforts they need. And nothing stands between them and this land but a sys-

tem of taxation which discourages production and encourages land monopoly. Take taxation off labor and put it upon land values, and the cornered vacant land of civilized regions would soon be as free as that of the distant wilderness.

It may be seen, therefore, that the so-called single tax is not inaptly called a protective tax for labor. It is so treated by Walter F. Cooling, a Chicago lawyer, who publishes from room 508 of the Schiller building, Chicago, an interesting pamphlet upon the subject. Declaring himself a free trader, Mr. Cooling nevertheless asserts that he is a radical protectionist. The conventional free traders, he says, are not free traders at all, because they advocate shifting taxes; and conventional protectionists are not genuine protectionists because they advocate protective tariffs instead of protective taxation. He argues that protective tariffs never have protected labor and never can, but that protective taxation—the single tax upon land values—would protect all legitimate private business, including labor, by exempting it not only from governmental taxation upon earnings, but also by shielding it from the exploitation of landlords. It is by advocating this kind of protection that Mr. Cooling, not unreasonably, expects to convert the world to free trade.

Taxation questions have occupied the attention of the public authorities of Missouri for a year or more quite seriously. In some of their aspects they are made possible by a peculiar provision of the Missouri bill of rights. It is asserted by this provision

That all constitutional government is intended to promote the general welfare of the people; that all persons have a natural right to life, liberty and the enjoyment of the gains of their own industry; that to give security to these things is the principal office of government, and that when government does not confer that security it fails of its chief design.

Taking advantage of that eminently sound declaration of the fundamental law of the state, the equal taxation

committee of the St. Louis Single Tax league, recently brought a long and vigorous agitation to a climax by demanding of the state board of tax equalization that it strike farms from the taxation lists. In support of this demand, it was shown that average Missouri farms cannot earn anything above the cost of operation; and, therefore, under the clause of the bill of rights quoted above, are not proper subjects of taxation. To make up the loss in state revenues that would be caused by exempting such property, Col. Dalton, ex-collector of the port at St. Louis, representing the committee, proposed the taxation of \$200,000,000 of untaxed values of transportation franchises, and uncounted millions of untaxed land values in cities. While Col. Dalton was making this demand of the state board of equalization, John J. McCann was proving to a senate investigation committee how largely in excess of the values upon which they are taxed are the annual ground rent earnings of St. Louis lots. The comparisons thus presented, which are now widely published in Missouri, are startling to farming communities. They show most plainly how farmers are bearing tax burdens which city land monopolists escape.

In the March number of the American Review of Reviews, an Iowa farm balance sheet is published for the purpose of explaining the extraordinary profitableness of the farming business. The balance sheet may be thus summarized:

INVESTMENT.	
Land—6,000 acres at \$30....	\$180,000.00
Buildings, stock and machinery	78,496.83
Total	\$258,496.83
GROSS RECEIPTS—1898.	
215,000 bushels of corn at 30 cents	\$64,500.00
20,000 bushels of wheat at 50 cents	10,000.00
	\$74,500.00
EXPENSES—1898.	
Labor	\$13,921.96
Other expenses, not including interest on investment....	9,722.82
	23,644.78
Net profit.....	\$50,855.22

No deduction for interest on capital is made from the above item of profit; but if that were done at the rate of 6 per cent, we should have to reduce the net profit by \$15,509. Depreciation of improvements and machinery also ought to be considered, and that would amount to at least half as much annually as the interest on capital; thus making with the interest a total of at least \$23,263 to be deducted from the asserted net profit of \$50,855.22. The true net profit, therefore, would be \$27,592—or \$4.50 an acre. So we see that a farmer with 150 acres of cultivable land under his control, would at the same rate have made less than \$700. It was not as a farmer, then, that the Review of Reviews' man made so much money in 1898; but as a great landlord.

This inference becomes the plainer when it is considered that to his laborers, the men who did the work of his vast farm—gangs and foremen all together,—and who received from him no other assistance than direction, if they received much even of that, this remarkably prosperous "farmer" paid only \$13,921.96. As an object lesson in agriculture, the Review of Reviews' Iowa farm balance sheet cuts a small figure. As a study in the pecuniary relationship of laborers to landlords it is truly immense.

The street railway question is disturbing the municipal quiet of Indianapolis. Franchise extensions are on the carpet, and a strong effort is made to provide in them for five-cent fares. In that behalf it is argued for the franchise seekers that first class accommodations cannot be furnished for a five-cent fare. When it is considered that the plant has cost less than \$2,500,000 and is capitalized at \$9,000,000, the fair interpretation of the claim is that five-cent fares are necessary, not to afford first class accommodations to the public, but to afford first class dividends on watered stock.

Glasgow is frequently referred to in discussions of municipal ownership

of street car systems; and opponents of municipal ownership presume upon the ignorance of foreign affairs in this country to misrepresent the financial results of the Glasgow reform. They repeatedly assert, for example, that the Glasgow reform is conducted at a financial loss. To show how baseless these assertions are, we append the official abstract of the Glasgow reports for 1896-97 and 1897-98. The reports are for the year ending May 31.

The Glasgow abstract for 1896-97 is as follows, verbatim:

Amount of traffic receipts.	£ 365,761.3.10
Amount of other receipts.	5,121.0. 6

£ 370,882.4. 4

Amount of working expenses	296,286.1. 3
----------------------------------	--------------

Leaving a balance of.....	£ 84,596.3. 1
Which has been disposed of as under:—	

Rent of Govan and Ibrox tramways..	£ 2,445.14.6
------------------------------------	--------------

Interest on capital	13,834.14.9
---------------------------	-------------

Sinking fund.	10,906.10.2
---------------	-------------

Payment to common good in lieu of mileage rate, &c....	9,000. 0.0
--	------------

Depreciation written off capital	13,510. 3.8
--	-------------

Permanent way renewal fund	15,000. 0.0
----------------------------------	-------------

General reserve fund..	20,000. 0.0
------------------------	-------------

£ 84,596.3.1

In making the foregoing report it was officially explained, that though the sinking fund would wipe off the debt in 33 years, it had been considered prudent to make an allowance besides for depreciation of plant. This was done, "in addition to keeping the whole plant and equipment in a thoroughly efficient state," and leaving £15,000 for the permanent way renewal fund and £20,000 for the general reserve fund, as the result of the year's operations.

For 1897-98, the abstract of revenue and expenditures of the Glasgow street car system was as follows, verbatim:

Amount of traffic receipts.	£ 389,216. 9. 6
Amount of other receipts	4,895. 2. 6

£ 394,111.12. 0

Amount of working expenses	293,572.17. 1
----------------------------------	---------------

Leaving a gross balance of	£ 100,538.14.11
----------------------------------	-----------------

Which has been applied as under:—

Rent of Govan and Ibrox Tramways	£ 4,891. 9. 0
----------------------------------	---------------

Interest on capital ...	13,497.18.10
-------------------------	--------------

Sinking fund	11,075.12.11
--------------	--------------

Payment to common good	9,000. 0. 0
------------------------------	-------------

Depreciation written off capital ...	22,684. 1. 3
--------------------------------------	--------------

61,149. 2. 0

Leaving a net balance of..	£ 39,389.12.11
----------------------------	----------------

Which has been transferred to—

Permanent way renewal fund	£ 3,955.11. 4
----------------------------------	---------------

General reserve fund	35,434. 1. 7
----------------------	--------------

£ 39,389.12.11

A comparison of the Glasgow reports copied above shows that the receipts in excess of working expenses were more than £15,000 (some \$75,000) greater in 1898 than in 1897. It also shows that the net profit passed to the general reserve fund was £35,434 (approximately \$170,000) in 1898, as against £20,000 (approximately \$97,000) the year before. Furthermore—and this is especially important—both reports disprove the common assertion of street car monopolists, that the profits of the Glasgow system make no allowance for interest and depreciation. It will be observed that the profits noted above are the residuum of income after deducting not only all actual expenses, but also interest on capital, a contribution to sinking fund sufficient to wipe out the capital in one generation, a large allowance for depreciation of plant, a substantial appropriation toward renewal of permanent ways, and a payment to the city for the common good of the amount formerly re-

ceived from the street car lessees on mileage. The reserve fund item of \$97,000 in 1897 and \$170,000 in 1898 is the clearest of clear profit. This fund aggregated, according to the report of 1898, as much as £71,693 8s. 10d.—approximately \$350,000.

Ex-Gov. Altgeld's campaign for the mayoralty of Chicago has all the appearances of healthy growth and probable victory. His meetings are large, and the principle for which he stands is manifestly gaining adherents. One of the encouraging facts about his campaign is that several office holders of the Harrison administration have resigned so as to be free to work for Altgeld. Joseph R. Finn, chairman of the board of examining engineers, is one of these. In his letter of resignation Mr. Finn showed the motive of his act in these inspiring words:

I believe that there never was a time in the history of our country when the great cause of human freedom called so loudly to the people to be loyal to the great principles upon which our government is founded. The dark days of our civil war, when nearly one-half of the states of this Union were in open rebellion against it, did not imperil the life of our nation one-half as much as the insidious tyranny and corruption which is an inseparable part of the principle of privilege and monopoly, which seeks to stifle the rights and liberties and the aspirations of our people and poisons all the streams of our social, political and industrial life. In such an hour I feel it my duty to make the pecuniary sacrifice involved in the surrender of an office as freely as I left my engine in 1894, when I considered the rights of 14,000 men, women and children of Pullman at stake. Whether Mr. Altgeld secures few or many votes in this contest does not influence me in this decision. I simply wish to exercise my ability and influence, such as it may be, in the furtherance of the cause for which ex-Gov. Altgeld stands.

In Toledo, Mayor Jones stands among republicans for what Gov. Altgeld represents at Chicago in the democratic party. He was defeated for the republican renomination by Hannaism. The amount at stake for the monopolists was enormous. During the next city administration franchises are to be asked for valued at

\$7,000,000. Jones's reelection meant the certain loss of these franchises. No wonder, then, that money was lavishly spent to defeat him. The corruption was successful at the city convention, and Mayor Jones is to be especially commended for his courage in giving the people of Toledo an opportunity to rebuke this instance of corrupt politics by voting for him as a protesting candidate.

The way of the imperialist is hard. No sooner does Gen. Otis get his reinforcements and begin to civilize our Philippine "subjects," than the Cubans drop some of their gratitude and get us into a snarl over Gomez, while even the Porto Ricans manifest a barbarous discontent with military government. Instead, therefore, of having one job of "benevolent assimilation" by means of "criminal aggression" upon our hands, we have three.

Still this black cloud of imperialism is not without a silver lining. It has induced thought and discussion of the fundamental principles of liberty such as the American people have not experienced since the foundation of the government. Even plutocratic papers have been forced by the logic of the situation to take advanced democratic ground. Here, for instance, is the New York Evening Post which, in criticising the imperialistic idea that we must not treat with Aguinaldo until he submits, is led to lay down a profound general principle. It says:

But the rule of common sense which is recognized in modern times by people who have much occasion to deal with "rebels," is to grasp at any men or organization of men who are obeyed by the rebel community, and are capable of answering for it, in peace or war, without sticking at names or forms, or making any fuss about "dignity" or authority. The power which refuses to treat with or even converse with a man, whether rebel or rioter, who believes he is engaged in a creditable enterprise, does not behave as a civilized government.

We call attention especially to the last sentence, in which it is asserted that a government is not civilized if it refuses to treat even with a rioter who believes he is engaged in a credit-

able enterprise. That is sound doctrine. Yet the Evening Post would not have fathered it when Cleveland was obliterating state lines to put down a labor strike in Chicago with national troops. At that time the Post cried with the other imperialists of the day, that if the laborers had any grievances they must trust to a magnanimous public to redress their grievances after they had submitted to the military power.

It must not be overlooked that one important element of the present flagrant imperialism is the fact that its foundations were laid in the last Cleveland administration, and that such moulders of opinion in avowed opposition to imperialism as is the Evening Post, must share the responsibility. Those who have advocated a domestic imperialism must be held estopped from objecting to the logical consequences of expansive imperialism, unless they retract, as the Post has virtually done, in the extract quoted above. The action of the Cleveland administration during the Chicago strike was highly undemocratic and imperialistic, and people who upheld it must not wonder that those who were then persuaded that imperialism in domestic affairs was all right, are not now inclined to oppose the same policy in foreign affairs.

Let him who doubts the imperialistic character of Cleveland's military invasion of Illinois in 1894, send to Congressman Amos Cummings, of New York, for his recent speech in congress on the right of local self-government. Embodied in that speech is the correspondence between Cleveland and Altgeld at the time of the invasion. It speaks for itself, and places Cleveland in the class with McKinley on the general subject of democratic government.

THE RAGE FOR TRUSTS.

The daily papers now are burdened with stories about trusts. Hardly an issue appears without accounts of the organization or prospective organization of one or more. The air is full of these schemes for consolidating large

business competitors. That old business maxim, sound and wholesome, that "competition is the life of trade," has been discarded in industrial circles for the theory, for which no maxim has yet gained currency, that consolidation is the condition of success. This theory is the vital principle of trusts.

I.

The latest mode of trust organization is a vast improvement upon earlier ones.

Competitors no longer enter into agreements in restraint of competition. That primitive mode was proved by experience to be altogether incompetent. The agreements were evaded and sometimes openly violated; and, as they fell under the ban of the law, there was no redress in the courts.

What competitors aiming to organize a trust do now, is to form a legal corporation in which all become stockholders, paying for their stock with their respective business plants. Establishments that formerly competed for business, thus become part of one great concern under the management and control of one board of directors. If the former owners continue to operate their plants they do so no longer as owners, but as corporation employes. It is the corporation, too, that determines as to each plant whether it shall be operated at all.

There is no opportunity, therefore, as there was under the primitive mode of making trusts, for any party to the trust to evade his obligations to his confederates. The business is wholly in the hands of a corporation, which has all the legal attributes of a single person; and the trust, instead of being under the ban of the law, operates under its sanctions.

An effect, and one of the objects, of these combinations is to dispense with many employes and cut down the wages of others.

The journeyman mechanics and unskilled laborers may escape. Whether they do or no, depends upon whether the trust reduces its production. If it does not, these employes escape; if it does, they are prejudicially affected.

But whether mechanics and labor-

ers are affected or not, such employes as salesmen, bookkeepers, foremen, clerks and the like are sure to be injured. When many establishments are consolidated, even though as many mechanics and laborers be required as before, they can be governed by fewer foremen, and the output can be disposed of and accounted for by fewer salesmen, bookkeepers and clerks. The organization of a trust, therefore, involves the discharge of more or fewer of this class of employes; and that in turn involves the reduction of the wages of those who remain. This has been one of the notable facts in connection with the trust craze. The general public may not be aware of it, but foremen, clerks, bookkeepers and salesmen are painfully so.

Another object and effect of trusts is the destruction of competitors who are left out of the combination.

Since the motive for combining is to kill competition, outsiders must be crushed or the combination fails of its purpose. Many methods of accomplishing this are resorted to. It may be done by selling certain lines of goods for a time at less than cost. The trust can stand that longer than the small competitors; and when they are out of the way can recoup by charging higher prices than ever. Even while a price war is in progress, the trust may charge excessively for goods that are not in the field of competition, while selling below cost those that are in that field. But whatever the method the object is to crowd out all competition and make the whole field free to the trust.

Competitive business men are sharply admonished of this, by diminishing custom and decreasing profits. Some even of the best of them begin to look forward to retiring from business into high grade clerkships; and a vast number of them are contemplating the possibility, if they themselves fail to get into a trust, of competing with lower grades of clerks for their already precarious places.

II.

Whether or not the trust has come to stay, is an open question. Trust magnates have no doubt of it. The ordinary business man fears it. The social agitator proclaims it. And only here and there is doubt expressed.

Most significant, however, of all the opinions yet recorded, is that of the banks, which are beginning to look with suspicion upon trust certificates as collateral. In this opinion there is a suggestion of disastrous possibilities which cannot be ignored, a suggestion that derives peculiar force from the fact that the primary consideration with banks in passing loans is the question of safety. It may well be, then, that this making of many trusts is only an evanescent craze, and that the trusts are mere bubbles which must soon burst.

But any intelligent conclusion as to that point must rest upon an understanding of the differences in trusts. There are trusts and trusts. It cannot, therefore, be predicated of the trust generally that it must either succeed or collapse. Some kinds of trusts may succeed if well managed, while others, no matter how well managed, may be predestined to inevitable collapse. Some analysis, then, of the trust as it confronts us is necessary.

III.

We can conceive of a trust having for its object and effect economy in production, and neither aiming at anything nor effecting anything beyond that. By consolidating business plants, such a trust might lessen the cost of supplying goods to consumers. It would do this in part by reducing the number of managers, clerks, bookkeepers, and so on, necessary to supply a given demand; and in part through those innumerable other economies which, in favorable conditions, flow from operations upon a large scale. That kind of trust would be analogous to labor saving inventions. Indeed, it would be a labor-saving invention itself.

Familiar examples are offered by the department store, by farming on a large scale, by manufacturing combinations, by any business consolidation, however vast, which is neither directly nor indirectly buttressed by legal privileges.

Such a trust would, in the absence of legal privileges, be compelled, by fears of starting up competition if not by competition itself, to give to consumers the benefit of its economies. And though this trust would displace employes and independent employers, just as labor-saving ma-

chines do, just as all economies must, there would be nothing to deplore in that, if opportunities to work for others or to do independent business in other and related lines were inviting and insistent, as under free conditions they would be. The displacement then would be a simple and easily adopted change of occupation, not exile from the whole industrial field.

Trusts of that character are not essentially bad. On the contrary, like labor-saving machines, they are essentially good. If they operate prejudicially in actual practice, it is not because they are objectionable in themselves, but because they exist in conditions which operate, in greater or less degree, to bar out from other employments the workers and business men whom they displace.

There is, however, a class of trusts which are essentially bad. These are the trusts that rest upon or are buttressed by legal privileges.

The harmful power of a railroad trust is the ownership of great public highways, which it brings under a single control. That is true, also, of street car combinations; of telephone and telegraph monopolies; of gas and electric light and power trusts; in a word, of all consolidations of those business interests that spring out of the law instead of being evolved and regulated by unobstructed competition.

Mining trusts are in the same category. They are essentially oppressive because they consolidate titles to mining opportunities, and thereby enable the trusts to dictate to all industries that depend upon the mineral riches of the globe. And as with mining trusts, so with all other trusts which, so to speak, have their feet upon the ground.

Closely akin to highway and landed trusts are the trusts that bring under common ownership, important patent rights. By virtue of these parchments, those trusts arbitrarily and effectually prohibit the unprivileged, as a distinguished patent law writer puts it, "from using some of the laws of God," just as railroad trusts by franchises, and mining trusts by deeds, arbitrarily and effectually prohibit the unprivileged from using some of God's common wealth.

All these trusts are in character one. They are founded in legal privilege.

Subordinate to the privileged trusts, are trusts of still another class. These have the characteristics externally of those of the first class described above—those which we have likened to labor-saving machines. They appear to have the benefit of no monopoly whatever, but to be simple unprivileged business combinations. In fact, however, they derive legal privileges at second-hand and secretly from trusts that are founded in privilege.

Of this type was the Standard Oil trust at its inception. Under secret agreements with railroads, which enjoyed special highway privileges, the Standard Oil trust secured rates of transportation so much lower than its competitors were required by the same railroads to pay, that it thereby drove its competitors to the wall. Subsequently, it acquired highway privileges of its own. Other trusts that flourish now, doubtless also depend for their power upon discriminating freight rates. The cracker trust is said to be one of them.

To one or the other of the three classes of trusts mentioned above, all the trusts now organized, or in process or expectation or possibility of being organized, may be assigned. And according to the class into which a trust falls, will the probabilities of its success or collapse be determined.

IV.

The weakest of all the trusts are those of the first class, trusts which possess no legal privileges.

If capitalized at the true value of their plants, and conducted merely with a view to economy and not to keeping prices above the competitive level, they may succeed. The chances of success in such cases, other things remaining the same, are undoubtedly improved by the consolidation.

But which of those trusts is so organized and so conducted? It is safe to say none. In capitalizing, each plant is inventoried at double its value or more; and the consolidated business is conducted with a view to paying good dividends on the stock so watered.

The trust which does this, without

the aid of some kind of monopoly—land, highway, patent, or the like—can no more succeed than a boy can succeed in lifting himself by his shoe straps. And for like reasons. All such trusts are fated from their inception to perish.

It is probably true, however, that most trusts of the general character last described, are not of that character strictly. Very likely most of them are buttressed either with some special privilege or other of their own, or with contractual interests in the special privileges of other combinations. In that event their success will depend upon the power of the monopoly they so enjoy—to which extent they are in the category of trusts of the second class described above, those founded in legal privilege. As the latter rise or fall so may the former.

Trusts founded in legal privilege may be expected to succeed or collapse accordingly as their legal privileges enable them to control the original sources of supply of the goods they handle. Unless they acquire control of these, it is only a matter of time when another trust will. And if another trust does, it will either absorb or crush the first one.

Steel manufacturing trusts might for a time control the steel market. But let another trust secure the ore mines, and the steel trust would be at its mercy. Manufacturing combinations however complete, however wealthy, even though buttressed with patents and in combination with railroads, can retain their power only while the owners of the natural sources of their supply are not combined.

It is a sine qua non to success that a trust have its feet upon the earth. This has been discovered by the great trusts. The steel trust goes back to the land, and makes ore mines part of its property. The coal transporting trust of the anthracite region is careful to secure not only highways, but coal mines. And the trust that does not follow their example is doomed.

V.

To analyze this subject is to conclude that the rage for forming trusts will react and produce a stupendous crash. Trusts with much watered

stock and without much monopoly power, will go first to their fate. They will be followed by the monopoly trusts that fail to secure fundamental privileges. In the end, no trusts will be left to rule in the economic field but those which have their feet upon the earth. The trust question leads directly to the land question.

NEWS

At the close of our account last week of the American war for the subjugation of the Philippines, the Filipinos, after being driven on the 7th from a position near the water pipes that supply Manila, had forced their way back on the 8th, and at other points along the American line their sharpshooters were still annoying the American troops. No change in this situation was reported for the 9th; but on the 10th additional American reinforcements began to arrive at Manila, and immediately thereafter, Gen. Otis advised President McKinley of his plan to bring the war to a speedy close, by a vigorous aggressive campaign for the complete subjection of the island of Luzon.

This campaign began on the morning of the 13th, when Gen. Wheaton advanced from San Pedro Macati, eastward along the Pasig river, upon the town of Pasig, then held by the Filipinos. He was supported by an American gunboat which shelled the jungle along the banks of the river in advance of the American troops. In his advance Gen. Wheaton was reported as having captured three towns—Guadalupe, Pateros and Pasig. The Filipinos had retreated as far as Pasig, where they made a stand; but the Americans shelled the town, finally driving them out and taking possession. On the 14th, however, the Filipinos recaptured Pateros and Pasig, and threw up intrenchments, but only to be driven out again on the 15th, when the hardest fighting since the 5th of February occurred. The Americans now have complete possession of Pasig river to its source, Laguanda bay, a lake about 100 miles in circumference, some eight miles east of Manila. The Filipino army is therefore cut in two, with no opportunities for communication except around the lake.

During the fighting the heat was oppressive. Many soldiers were prostrated by it, both upon the firing line and in Manila. James H. Creelman, the well-known correspondent, cables that "the fight against exhaustion from this cause became as keen as that against the rebels."

Mail advices from Manila show that the conferences between Gen. Otis and Aguinaldo, preceding the outbreak of hostilities, were formal and official. Following is Gen. Otis's order pursuant to which they were conducted:

Brig. Gen. B. P. Hughes, United States volunteers; Col. James F. Smith, First California volunteers; Col. E. H. Crowder, J. A., United States volunteers, are hereby appointed a commission to meet a commission of like number appointed by Gen. Aguinaldo, and to confer with regard to the situation of affairs, and to arrive at a mutual understanding of the intent, purposes, aim and desires of the Philippine people and the people of the United States, that peace and harmonious relations between these respective peoples may be continued.

At the meetings of these commissions the Filipinos required independence under an American protectorate. They also insisted upon an arrangement meanwhile between the American and the Filipino armies for the prevention of disturbances. No mail advices have yet been received which relate to the beginning of hostilities; but it is clear from such as have so far arrived that a collision was daily expected long before it actually occurred.

A strong appeal has been made in the United States during the week, to "all lovers of freedom," to unite in an attempt to induce the American government to

take immediate steps toward a suspension of hostilities in the Philippines and a conference with the Philippine leaders, with a view to preventing further bloodshed, upon the basis of a recognition of their freedom and independence as soon as proper guarantees can be had of order and protection to property.

It is urged in this appeal that the United States

tender an official assurance to the inhabitants of the Philippine islands that they will encourage and assist in the organization of such a government in the islands as the people thereof shall prefer, and that upon its organization in stable manner the United States, in accordance with their tra-

ditional and prescriptive policy in such cases, will recognize the independence of the Philippines and their equality among nations and gradually withdraw all naval and military forces.

The appeal is signed by 29 men among the most representative in this country. Included in the number are ex-Governor Boutwell of Massachusetts, ex-Senator Edmunds of Vermont, John Sherman, Henry U. Johnson of Indiana, Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; Felix Adler, David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford university; Leonard Woolsey Bacon, Charles Francis Adams, Samuel Bowles, Edward Atkinson, Carl Schurz, Hermann Von Holst of Chicago university, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, ex-Senator John G. Carlisle, Charles Elliot Norton of Harvard university, W. G. Sumner of Yale college, and Rev. Dr. C. H. Parkhurst of New York.

American colonial difficulties are not confined to the Philippines. The situation in Porto Rico, also, is embarrassing. Affairs in that island were generally supposed to be in a satisfactory condition on all hands, until Col. Hubbell, of the 47th New York volunteers, which returned from Porto Rico on the 10th, publicly expressed his belief, based upon his experience as a soldier, that an insurrection of the natives of Porto Rico is bound to come sooner or later. Col. Hubbell explained:

We found that there is a latent determination among a large class to gain independence. There is no longer any use in trying to conceal the fact. Our troubles and annoyances increased toward the last. The demonstrations made at our departure convinced us that the majority of the natives were glad to get rid of us.

Col. Hubbell's opinion is reinforced by that of Gen. Henry, the American military governor of Porto Rico. Referring to the easy victory of our troops in the island and the apparent friendliness of the natives, as having given currency to a notion in the states that there is little necessity of a strong military force in Porto Rico, he declares the idea to be erroneous. "The conditions are alarming," he says, and adds:

These people have been given every opportunity, but they have thrown them aside. They are clamoring now for local self-government. They are no more fit for local self-government than I am to run a locomotive. More troops are needed in the island. The

seeds of discontent planted by professional agitators are rapidly growing, and can be kept down only by a strong military force.

In Cuba, too, new complications have arisen. The United States government was anxious to secure the disbandment of the Cuban army; and to accomplish that purpose offered Gen. Gomez \$3,000,000 as a gift, for distribution among his troops, conditioned upon their yielding up their arms and returning to peaceful pursuits. Early in February, Gen. Gomez accepted the offer, and regulations for the disbursement of the fund were agreed upon. Thereupon Gen. Gomez telegraphed President McKinley that he was now aware of and pleased with his wishes, and would go to Havana and confer with Gen. Brooke, with a view to cooperating in the work of reconstructing Cuba. Accordingly, about three weeks later, Gen. Gomez repaired with a large detachment of his troops to Havana, where the American military authorities received him with military honors, and the people went wild with enthusiasm. Meantime murmurs were heard among the Cubans against Gen. Gomez for having agreed to disband the army without permission from the Cuban assembly. And when the assembly met at Marianao to receive the report of the committee it had sent to Washington, Gen. Gomez, who had been expected to preside, neither attended nor sent any representative or message. A committee was appointed to wait upon him and ask explanations. This committee performed its mission on the 10th, and upon the basis of its report, Gen. Gomez having refused to answer, the assembly, on the 11th, impeached him and removed him from his office as general-in-chief of the Cuban army. There were 26 votes in the affirmative and 4 in the negative.

Before the official notification of his impeachment had reached Gen. Gomez, he accepted the decision of the assembly in an open letter, in which he said:

In virtue of the supreme power vested in it alone, the assembly, representing the army, has deposed me from my position of general in chief of the army, conferred upon me during the revolution just ended. In that high place I have been mindful only of the inspirations of my conscience and the necessities of my country. I have endeavored always and under all circumstances to do my duty. The assembly

esteems it an act of insubordination and disrespect in me not to aid them in their effort to secure a loan which would compromise the financial and political security of Cuba, which should come later to exercise its own sovereignty as a republic of union and concord, as proclaimed in the manifesto of Monte Cristo, and sustained and defended on the field of battle, free from all compromise and safeguarded in every point touching national honor. This is the fundamental cause of the decision which the assembly has taken toward me. For the rest, in all sincerity I confess I am full of gratitude; for the decision leaves me free to retire to my abandoned home, my only aspiration after 30 years of fighting for the welfare of Cuba, which I so much love. Alien as I am, I did not come to serve Cuba and the cause of justice in a mercenary spirit. Now that the oppressor is banished from Cuba, I am free to return my sword to its scabbard, believing that the mission which I voluntarily assumed is fulfilled. Cuba owes me nothing. I retire glad, satisfied at having accomplished my utmost in behalf of my fellow men. Wherever destiny may put me, there Cuba can always count on a devoted friend.

In mentioning the assembly's efforts to secure a loan, Gen. Gomez alludes to a measure of the assembly asking authority of the United States to contract a public debt of \$12,000,000, upon the security of Cuban revenues, in lieu of accepting \$3,000,000 as a gift from the United States, for the purpose of paying off the Cuban army. The assembly has replied to his open letter with a manifesto, and Cuba is at fever heat about the matter.

What the United States will do, now that Gen. Gomez's authority to distribute the \$3,000,000 and disband his army is terminated, is as yet matter of conjecture only. It is guessed, however, that Gen. Brooke will forcibly, however, that Gen. Brooke will continue to recognize Gomez as the only responsible agent through whom payments can be made; and that if the Cuban assembly interferes, he will disperse it by force. On the 15th, after an interview between Brooke and Gomez, it was announced that payment would begin promptly under the original agreement. The \$3,000,000 was sent, in coin, on the 13th, to Havana from New York, on board the transport Meade, under convoy of the cruiser Chicago.

The American difficulties in Samoa, the beginning of which we reported in No. 42, page 11, are now in all probability adjusted. Samoa

consists of 14 volcanic islands in the South Pacific, which were formerly known as the Navigators' Islands. The population is about 34,000, all but a few hundred being natives, though they are nominally Christians. By treaty of June 14, 1889, between Great Britain, Germany and the United States, signed at Berlin, the independence of these islands was assured, and the equal rights of citizens of the three treaty powers to residence, trade and personal protection, guaranteed. The treaty provided for the election of a king by the natives, pursuant to their own customs, and established a supreme court, consisting of one chief justice, to be appointed by the treaty powers, for the adjudication of disputes of common concern. It also provided for the administration by the treaty powers of the municipal district of Apia, the only town. At the time of the disturbances reported in No. 42, and mentioned again below, the chief justice was William L. Chambers, an American, while the municipal president of Apia was Dr. Raffel, a German. The disturbances arose over the election by the natives of a new king. Malietoa Laupepa had been king from 1880 to 1887. In the latter year he was deposed on a charge of robbing and maltreating Germans, and Tamasese took his place. An insurrection broke out against Tamasese in 1888, led by a chief known as Mataafa. Mataafa was victorious over Tamasese, but the Germans interposed, and in consequence of their declaring war against Mataafa, the treaty of Berlin, which is mentioned above, was signed. Pursuant to that treaty, Malietoa was restored to the native throne. Rebellious again, in 1893, and being subdued, Mataafa was exiled by the powers. But upon the death of King Malietoa Laupepa, which occurred August 22, last, Mataafa and his followers were allowed to return. He forthwith entered the contest for king, being opposed by Malietoa Tanus, son of the late king. Mataafa was the choice at the election, of 75 per cent. of the voters; but a contest was instituted which came before Chief Justice Chambers for decision. Proceedings began before the chief justice December 19. He produced at the outset a draft agreement for the two contestants to sign stipulating to abide by his decision. Young Malietoa readily did so, but Mataafa declined. The trial proceeded, however, and on December 31, the chief justice declared Malietoa Tanus to

have been elected—notwithstanding that he had received but 25 per cent. of the votes—on the theory that Mataafa was disqualified under the treaty. What the basis for this theory may have been is unknown. Mataafa is not disqualified by the terms of the treaty; and the probability is that the chief justice spelled out a disqualification under the treaty from the fact of Mataafa's subsequent rebellion. Upon the announcement of Judge Chambers's decision, Mataafa gave battle to Malietoa Tanus and conquered him. In this he appears to have had the support of the German representatives; and when the chief justice sought safety on a British warship the German president of the Apia municipality, Dr. Raffel, assumed the functions of the supreme court, which, however, he soon relinquished. These events gave rise to diplomatic complications between the United States and Great Britain on the one hand and Germany on the other. After numerous conferences and the exchange of many notes, a satisfactory agreement between the treaty powers was reached on the 13th. Dr. Wilhelm Wolf has been nominated by Germany, and recognized by the United States and Great Britain, as president of the municipal council of Apia, in place of Dr. Raffel, whose actions caused the international misunderstanding. Prior to this adjustment the German government had instructed its consul at Apia to recognize the authority of Chief Justice Chambers. It may be concluded, therefore, that the three powers have agreed upon regarding Malietoa Tanus as king. He is a boy of only 15. The vice king, elected with him, is Tamasese, who occupied the throne when in 1889 the treaty powers restored the late King Malietoa.

Passing on to China, we find that the actual seizure of San Mun bay, by Italy, reported last week, is officially denied. It was reported from Peking on the 11th, however, that the Italian minister had on the 10th made a request for the cession of the territory in question, which was in the nature of an ultimatum. This was confirmed two days later; but with the additional information that Italy had disavowed the ultimatum by recalling her minister. She has temporarily confided her Chinese interests to the British ambassador.

The quarrel of England and Russia, regarding their Chinese interests,

has been put at rest for a time at least. An outline of this quarrel was given in Nos. 19 and 20, at pages 10 and 9 respectively. It grew out of the New-Chwang and Tient-sin railway loan. The Russians claimed that the Chinese foreign office had pledged itself to grant to no other power the contract of any railway in Manchuria, the province in which New-Chwang lies. Regardless of this pledge, if it existed, the Chinese gave to British capitalists a lien on the railway mentioned, to secure a large loan. Russia accordingly disputed the validity of the lien at first, and England refused to abandon it. At last, however, Russia has yielded. On the 10th the czar's government advised the Chinese foreign office that as a result of negotiations between Russia and Great Britain, Russia would withdraw her protest. Negotiations between Russia and England are said to be now in progress for the amicable adjustment between themselves of all their interests in China.

Besides settling her Chinese quarrel with England, Russia has this week arranged for the czar's peace congress. It is to be held at the Hague on May 18. The plans involve an exchange of views with reference, first, to seeking means for putting a stop to the progressive increase of military and naval armaments; and, second, to the preparation of the way for a discussion of the questions relating to the possibility of preventing armed conflicts by the pacific means at the disposal of international diplomacy. Should this preliminary interchange of views prove satisfactory the congress is then to proceed to the arrangement of an understanding—

1. Not to increase for a fixed period the present effective of the armed military and naval forces, and at the same time not to increase the budgets pertaining thereto.
2. To prohibit the use in the armies and fleets of any new kind of firearms whatever and of new explosives, or any powders more powerful than those now in use, either for rifles or cannon.
3. To restrict the use in military warfare of the formidable explosives already existing, and to prohibit the throwing of projectiles or explosives of any kind from balloons or by similar means.
4. To prohibit the use in naval warfare of submarine torpedo boats or plungers or other similar engines of destruction; to give an understanding not to construct vessels with rams in the future.

5. To apply to naval warfare the stipulations of the Geneva convention of 1864 on the basis of the articles added to the convention of 1868.

6. To neutralize ships and boats employed in saving those overboard during or after an engagement.

7. To revise the declaration concerning the laws and customs of war elaborated in 1874 by the conference of Brussels, which has remained unratified to the present day.

8. To accept in principle the employment of the good offices of mediation and facultative arbitration in cases lending themselves thereto, with the object of preventing armed conflicts between nations; an understanding with respect to applying these good offices, and the establishment of a uniform practice in using them.

American politics yields no news of national concern except the failure of the Delaware legislature to elect a senator. That body has adjourned without day with the senatorial deadlock still on. Upon the 15th and final ballot the vote stood: Addicks, 21; Gray, 4; Hardy, 5; Salisbury, 3; Dupont, 9; Biggs, 6; Higgins, 2. The senatorial deadlocks still hold in Pennsylvania, Utah and California.

Altgeld's mayoralty campaign in Chicago gains force every day. His meetings are packed, and people are turned away for want of room. Even his Wednesday noon-day meetings in the central business district overflow. A full city ticket is being nominated by petitions now in circulation. While Altgeld's subjects of discussion relate to national politics and to honest local administration, the great strength of his position lies in his demand for municipal ownership of public utilities. How strong Chicago sentiment upon that subject has become may be inferred from the fact that a resolution memorializing the state government to enact legislation allowing the city to own and control gas and electric works was adopted by the Chicago council on the 13th by a vote of 50 to 2.

NEWS NOTES.

—The heaviest snowstorm in the history of Michigan occurred on the 12th.

—Prof. Herron's Sunday night and Monday noon lectures continue at Central Music hall, Chicago.

—President McKinley left Washington on the 13th for a ten-days vacation with Senator Hanna at Thomasville, Ga.

—The net profit of the municipal gas works at Baden, reported for the fiscal

year just closed, was 180,000 marks—about \$43,000.

—More than 500,000 penny-in-the-slot gas meters are in use in London. Among the poorer people they have almost entirely displaced the use of oil lamps.

—The citizens of Helsingfors, Finland, wear badges of mourning in silent protest against the abrogation of their constitution by the Russian government.

—Herbert Putnam, librarian of the Boston public library, has been appointed by the president to be librarian of congress, in place of the late John Russell Young.

—Judge Gibbons of Chicago has decided that the Illinois civil service law giving preferences to veterans of the civil war is unconstitutional because it grants exclusive privileges.

—The strike at Colon, republic of Colombia, reported in No. 44 at page 10, has been defeated by the importation of laborers under contract for wages lower than the prevailing Colon rate.

—A district messenger boy was sent on the 14th from London to New York, Philadelphia and Chicago to deliver private letters, with the idea that he would be more expeditious than the mails.

—Ex-Congressman James G. Maguire, democratic and populist candidate for governor of California last fall, addressed a special meeting of the Chicago Single Tax club on the 14th, advocating the single tax. Maguire has stood for this reform for 23 years, having been one of Henry George's earliest converts.

During the month of February, 1899, the exports and imports of the United States were as follows:

	Imports.	Exports.
Merchandise	\$ 80,260,032	\$93,894,149
Gold	5,148,906	324,840
Silver	1,427,027	4,562,196
Total	\$86,835,965	\$98,771,185
Excess of exports.....		\$11,935,220

—A college to educate labor leaders has just been established at Oxford, England, by Walter L. Vrooman, formerly of Kansas, and Charles A. Beard. It is called the Ruskin Hall. The only qualifications for admission are good moral character and ability to read intelligently. The cost of residence is \$125 a year. Tuition expenses are \$30.

—At the legal hanging of a man and a woman at Scholastique, Quebec, on the 10th, more than 600 men were present, and 2,000 more tried to batter their way into the jail yard. They yelled and howled, and when the drop fell they cheered. The police had to hold them back with threats to shoot, while the officiating priest exhorted them in the name of Christianity and decency to desist.

MISCELLANY

TRUTH'S NEED.

For The Public.

Why waste our heroes on the battlefield?
There is a dearth of courage everywhere—
Dearth of the fortitude that will not yield
To Falsehood and her promises so fair,
But false as fair. Such courage is our need
As dares the heights of truth; that will
not blanch
Though all the world cry out against the
deed,
And hurl its fury like an avalanche.
Truth hath her need of heroes more than
these
Arms of the lands and navies of the seas!
JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE IN WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Judge Samuel T. Corn, of the Wyoming Supreme Court, in reply to questions as to whether in that state the bad and ignorant women vote more generally than the good and intelligent, and whether any of the other predicted evils have happened, has written the following letter, which we reprint from the Woman's Journal, of Boston:

I can answer your questions in the negative, without any reservation whatever. And, while there are a few men here who do not thoroughly approve woman suffrage, I do not think there is one in the State who would seriously answer them otherwise.

Women of all classes very generally vote. Bad women do not obtrude their presence at the polls, and I do not now remember ever to have seen a distinctively bad woman casting her vote.

Woman suffrage has no injurious effect upon the home or the family that I have ever heard of during the 12 years I have resided in the State. It does not take so much of women's time as to interfere with their domestic duties, or with their church or charitable work. It does not impair their womanliness, or make them less satisfactory as wives and mothers. They do not have less influence, or enjoy less respect and consideration socially. My impression is that they read the daily papers and inform themselves upon public questions much more generally than women elsewhere.

Woman suffrage has certainly had no bad results. On the other hand, it has not revolutionized or reconstructed society. But it has had the effect almost entirely to exclude notoriously bad or immoral men from public office in the State. Parties refuse to nominate such men upon the distinct ground that they cannot obtain the women's vote.

The natural result of such conditions is to increase the respect in which women are held, and not to diminish it. They are a more important factor in affairs, and therefore more regarded. It is generally conceded, I think, that women

have a higher standard of morality and right living than men. And, as they have a say in public matters, it has a tendency to make men respect their standard, and in some degree to attempt to attain to it themselves.

I have never been an enthusiastic advocate of woman suffrage as a cure for all the ills that afflict society; but I give you in entire candor my impressions of it from my observation in this State. It is difficult to make anyone not residing here understand the entire absence of the objectionable features which it is supposed must attend the institution. They simply do not exist.

WELL QUALIFIED FOR THE POSITION OF UNITED STATES LABOR STATISTICIAN.

My friend Bings is one of those habitual calculators—one of the kind that says if all the teeth that have been extracted since the first dentist began business were to be used for paving purposes in Hades, the good-resolutions contractor would be out of a job for 10,000 years. He thinks in numbers, and if he were a minister he would get all his texts from the same source.

The other day he saw me first on a ferryboat, and immediately button-holed me. Said he: "How sad it is to think that so much labor goes for naught!"

I knew that I was in for one of his calculations; but I also knew that it would be useless to try to head him off.

He stroked his beard and said, with an imitation of thoughtfulness:

"Every day in this Empire state 1,000,000 human beings go to bed tired because you and I and the rest leave butter on our plates and don't eat our crusts."

I told him that I was astonished, but that he would have to elucidate.

"The farmers sow 8,000,000 bushels of useless grain—grain that eventually goes out to sea on the refuse scows—they milk 50,000 cows to no other purpose than to produce sour or spilled milk, they allow their valuable hens to lay 1,654,800,001 eggs that will serve no better purpose than to spatter some would-be Booth or lie neglected in some out-of-the-way corner, while their wives are making 1,008,983 pounds of butter that will be left on the edges of plates and thrown into the refuse pail. If they didn't sow the useless grain, or fuss over the hens that lay the unused eggs, or draw the milk that is destined to sour, or make the butter that is to ornament the edges of the china disks, they would be able to go to bed merely healthily tired instead of overworked, and fewer farmers would

commit suicide, and fewer farmers' wives would go insane." His eyes gleamed, and I knew that, as he would put it, his pulse was going so fast that if it were revolutions of a locomotive wheel it would take only so long to go somewhere.

"And what is your remedy for all this?" asked I, with becoming, if not mock, interest.

"Let us help ourselves to no more than we want at table, buy our eggs a week earlier, drink our milk the day before, eat our bread before it is too dry, and in six months' time there will be a reduced state death rate, more vacancies in the insane asylums, 1,456,608 rosy cheeks where to-day there are that many pale ones—"

Just then the ferryboat's gates were lifted, and as we went our several ways, in the hurry that is characteristic of 7,098,111 Americans out of 8,000,000, I thought that, if all the brains of all the arithmetical cranks were used in place of wood pulp to make into paper, we writers would get our pads for nothing.—Charles Battell Loomis, in *The Century*.

SHALL THINGS BE MORE THAN MEN?

We of to-day tolerate and defend and champion a system of things which decrees that the question of what we shall eat and drink and wear shall be the question of supreme moment for ninety-nine one-hundredths of our population. And the great majority of us, whether in store or factory or farm, in the university chair or in the pulpit, declare our allegiance to a condition of things which gives not the smallest promise of change to something better.

We declare that the question of subsistence must increasingly in the coming years crowd all other questions to the background. We presume to call that a civilization in which are thousands and millions of people who are far worse off than birds and beasts, because they have no sure prospect of having even a subsistence except as it may be given them at the hands of that institution of the devil known as "charity."

We answer every question of Jesus in the negative, and we do it in the name of morality and a religion which we falsely call Christianity. We declare that the life is not more than the food, or the body than the raiment. We hold that men are not of more value than birds and beasts and flowers.

Why, there are any number of dogs that receive better treatment than thousands of men and women and children. There are quantities of alleged women who would scorn to have their

poodles buried in the potter's field, who care no more for their countless brothers and sisters whose emaciated bodies find their burial there than they care for so much refuse.

If the words of Jesus have one scintilla of truth in them, if they are not the senseless drivel of a madman, if the moral and spiritual consciousness which they imply is valid and just, we are conspiring to obliterate all faith and hope from men's hearts, we are attempting to make impossible all faith in a Divine Father and caretaker. We have already accomplished that end for hundreds of men and women.

The supreme end of our commercialism is not men, but things. Men weigh nothing at all in the balance of commercialism, which is the religion of this time. Nothing is subordinated to human life. We do not hesitate in our commercial or political enterprises and policies because of any possible effect they may have on the life or happiness of men.

Factories are not run for the sake of men, but for the sake of things. Indeed, it would be truer to say that men are run into their graves for the sake of factories. Men and women are worked to death—are robbed of all that can possibly make life human or happy, for the sake of making merchantable products.

Railroads are not run for the sake of men, for the contribution they may make to manhood, for the joy and cheer they may bring to humanity, but for the dividends. Our mines and shops and factories and railroads are all of them Molochs to devour the many, that the few may be enriched.—Rev. William T. Brown, of Rochester, N. Y., as reported in the *Rochester Herald*.

THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Apropos of the taxation question, the action of the liberal party in the British parliament in forcing at a recent sitting of the house of commons a vote on the taxation of land values is significant of the direction political issues are taking in that country and may offer an important object lesson here.

Mr. E. J. C. Morton, a writer of reputation and liberal member from Devonport, offered an amendment to the "address," which the house was about to make in reply to the queen's speech. His amendment regretted that the speech contained nothing dealing with the ownership, tenure or taxation of land.

In Devonport, he said, there is a street of 51 houses in which every room is occupied by a whole family. The

people crowd together in their living quarters in order to be as near as possible to their work. "They are decent people, too," said he; "they actually have asked me to say nothing about it, in order that they may not be put to shame." And what is bad for the workingman, he pointed out, is bad for the manufacturer and for general industry; for the evil of which he complains is that the land, and particularly the valuable land of towns and cities, is inadequately taxed, and in many instances not taxed at all, so that a premium is offered upon land monopoly and the burden of taxation is thrown upon production — upon the workingman and the capitalist. He cited one man in Devonport who drew £40,000 a year in rents from the ground alone and did not contribute a sixpence in local taxation; and in London, he said, £20,000,000 a year went into the pockets of a few individuals who were exempt from local taxation.

Sir John Brunner seconded the amendment, saying that examination of the conditions prevailing showed that rich men lived upon land that was lightly taxed and poor men upon land that was heavily taxed.

These speeches stirred up the government, and Mr. Chaplin, president of the local government board; Mr. Arthur Balfour, first lord of the treasury and conservative leader in the house of commons, and Mr. Goschen, first lord of the admiralty, followed each other in quick succession in the endeavor to belittle the Morton amendment. But a score were up on the liberal side in support, among them Messrs. Asquith, Billson, Spicer, Channing (son of the abolitionist), Haldane, Havelock Wilson, W. Redmond, Flynn, Foster, Monro Ferguson, Field and Provand. The honors were perhaps carried off by a member elected to the house at a recent by-election after a big fight and against heavy odds, Fletcher Moulton, who explained to the government the easy method by which it could levy a tax upon the value of land and exempt improvements.

Things got so warm that one conservative, Mr. Bartley, from a London constituency, who had heard from his electors recently, was constrained to rise and urge the government to make some concession to the principle, and some of his associates notified the leaders that they would have to take to the woods and not vote.

The new liberal leader, Sir Campbell-Bannerman, ordered the liberal whips to tell in the division, and made the amendment a party matter, so that when the house divided, not only did all

the liberals and all the Irish members present support, but many of the conservatives abstained; and with 280 members present and voting, the normal majority of which would have been 100, Mr. Balfour's side got only 34 majority.

This vote was astonishing to both sides of the house, and reveals the weakness of the conservatives on the question. The vote's full significance is that the liberal party in parliament—that is, the practical politicians composing it—has now resolved to do what the party everywhere outside parliament is urging—present the taxation of land values as a leading, if not the leading, party measure.

This is not the single tax; that is to say, it is not also proposed to abolish all other taxes, but it is many steps in the direction of single tax, since the greater the tax on land values the less the burden upon industry and the fruits of industry. All that is needed is a continuance in this direction to concentrate the whole of taxation upon land values and entirely exempt everything else; and to that end many liberals in and out of parliament are working.—Henry George, Jr., in *New York Journal* of March 4.

TWO STRUGGLES FOR LIBERTY.

While Americans are asking whether the Filipinos deserve independence and are able to govern themselves, there may be interest or profit in a glance at some phases of the Philippine conflict which seem remarkably like certain conditions in the American revolution. It is said that the Filipinos are unworthy of independence or incapable of self-government because they are not a united majority; they are mercenary; they wage guerrilla warfare; they have a naked, poorly-armed crowd that cannot be called an army; they have no navy; they have no government but that of a dictator; they are dishonest; they try to advance their cause by bureaus of agitators, called juntas; and great numbers of them can never be persuaded to submit voluntarily to orderly government.

John Adams said that more than a third part of the principal men in America were opposed to the revolution against England, and of those who agreed with the principles of the revolution thousands thought them not worth fighting for. Twelve colonies, without New York, resolved for independence in July, 1776. Rhode Island had to be forced, by a threat of commercial boycott, before she would ratify the constitution in 1790. Vermont was never in the confederation that existed

previous to the government of the constitution. Lecky says: "New York privateers preyed on the commerce of the revolting states" in swarms over neighboring seas. "The ardent loyalty of the town of New York was exceedingly encouraging to the English," and "6,000 of its own armed citizens" were ready to defend the city against the rebels.

Washington wrote:

While our army is experiencing almost daily want, that of the enemy in New York is deriving ample supplies from a trade with the adjacent states of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut which has by degrees become so common that it is hardly thought a crime.

Is lack of patriotism charged to the Filipinos? Lecky says:

The great mass (of Americans) were indifferent, half-hearted, engrossed with their private interests or occupations, prepared to risk nothing till they could clearly foresee the issue of the contest.

Washington wrote:

Men may speculate as they will; they may talk of patriotism; * * * I know patriotism exists, and I know it has done much in the present contest; but I will venture to assert that a great and lasting war can never be supported on this principle alone. It must be aided by a prospect of interest or some reward.

Then he speaks of

the frequent defection of officers seduced by views of private interest and emolument to abandon the cause of their country.

Says Lecky:

In the face of an enemy of overwhelming numbers, in the very agonies of a struggle upon which the whole future of the contest depended, company after company came forward, claiming instant dismissal.

It was a common rule that troops would not serve without ample pay. Congress and the states continually offered bounties to get men, and then did not get them. Men were threatened with imprisonment if they refused to serve. Negro slaves and even children were enlisted. Washington says:

Excepting about 400 recruits from the state of Massachusetts Bay (a portion of whom, I am told, the children, hired at about \$1,500 each for nine months' service), I have had no reenforcement to this army since last campaign.

Again he says:

The large fortunes acquired by numbers out of the army afford a contrast that gives poignancy to every inconvenience from remaining in it.

Apathy and dissension existed in many quarters. Said John Adams:

I am wearied to death with the wrangles between military officers, high and low. They quarrel like cats and dogs. They worry one another like mastiffs, scrambling for rank and pay like apes for nuts.

The Filipinos are said to have swept the islands of Spaniards except for Manila. At no time, though in a longer contest, could this have been said of the Americans in the colonial war. The American way of fighting had been like

that of the Indians—from behind trees or singly—and not by skill in maneuver. Every American soldier was a sharpshooter.

As to guerrilla warfare, Marion, the "Swamp Fox," was a terror to the British in the south, and could not be forced to open battle. Washington declared once that he planned, in case the English whipped him in the coast region, to take to the mountains and the wilderness of the Ohio valley with his men and there defy the Britons. Washington's army never had a commissary department, and his men often starved or went ragged, while the country people were feeding the English troops. Mob law often ruled in Boston and elsewhere. Nobody seemed responsible for the Boston tea party or for the burning of the Gaspee. Aguinaldo's army is criticised as a body. The army of Washington was never uniformly armed and equipped. When he took command for the first time, Green says, many of the troops had only clubs and pitchforks for weapons! In 1776 the entire continental army was reduced to 2,700 effective men. During a great part of the war congress was either inefficient or unable to meet, and Washington was necessarily a dictator, to all practical purposes. There was no cabinet, a semblance of which Aguinaldo has. When Washington was trying personally to keep his men together during the awful winter at Valley Forge the congress was traveling about from place to place in an effort to keep out of the hands of the English.

Have the Filipinos been dishonest in their schemes? Was there not some ground for accusing Franklin of dishonesty in his publication of Hutchinson's private letters to an English friend? Timothy Pickering, United States quartermaster general, admitted that in 1782 he clipped coins for the gain of the American government.

There is a striking likeness between the Cuban and Philippine juntas and the American committees of correspondence, without which it is said the revolution would not have been possible.

It is affirmed that there is or has been more than one visible revolutionary party in the Philippines, and that a recognition of independence would induce public disorders. During our revolutionary period every state inclined toward a position of absolute sovereignty. The constitution was enacted because congress, during the war and under the confederation, was powerless over the various contending commonwealths. After the war there

were such threatening insurrections that Washington declared he seemed under the "illusion of a dream." Shay's rebellion in Massachusetts was a revolt against the government. The speaker of the Massachusetts convention of 1788 said of the American soldiers:

They would rob you of your property, threatened to burn your houses, obliged you to be on your guard night and day.

Vermont withdrew from New York in 1777 and remained during the entire confederation "without representation either in the New York legislature or in congress." Commercial tyranny caused the revolt alike in the Philippines against Spain and in America against England. Distance from the mother country and natural obstacles in the rebellious territory were problems that both England and Spain had to face. France, according to some authorities, aided the colonists secretly while protesting neutrality, just as today Germany is accused of playing double with the United States. English sympathizers sent assistance to the Americans, and now it is said that Americans in China may possibly have sold arms to the Filipinos.

Some points of unlikeness in the two struggles are noticeable. The Americans declared independence and were aided openly by France and Spain; the Filipinos declared independence, but their belligerency even is not recognized. France intervened at a time when, without her help, the colonists must have been defeated, but France did not take possession of the American colonies; the United States intervened, to the defeat of Spain, and has assumed sovereignty over an unwilling people. The Filipinos destroyed Spanish rule in their islands, but are compelled to repeat their struggle with the intervening power.—William P. Lovett, of the University of Chicago, in *The Chicago Record*.

AMERICA'S RECESSIONAL.

With Acknowledgments to Rudyard Kipling.

Faith of our fathers, loved of old—
Inspired of their noble plan—
Whose strong yet gentle hands uphold
The ever sacred rights of man—
O God of Love, wipe out the blot,
We have forgot—we have forgot!

The horrid sounds of battle rise—
The captains and the hosts are red
With blood of glory's sacrifice
On plains thick-strewn with heaps of dead.
O God of Peace, wipe out the blot,
We have forgot—we have forgot!

Far sail our ships to many lands,
On sea and bay they spread death palls;
Struck by the power of mailed hands,
Lo! Freedom in her temple falls,
Lord God of Wrath, wipe out the blot,
We have forgot—we have forgot!

Drunk with the wine of power we loose
Tongues that extol imperial sway—
Such boastings as the conquerors use,
Whose hearts from pity turn away—
Lord of the Law, wipe out the blot,
We have forgot—we have forgot!

For brutish pride that puts its trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All vallant dust that bulds on dust,
And fails the righteous law to guard—
For cruel deed and frantic word,
Have mercy on Thy people, Lord!
Amen.

—George S. Johns, in *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

JOSE RIZAL, FILIPINO PATRIOT.

Selections from the address of the Rev. H. S. Bigelow, delivered at the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, Sunday night, February 12, 1899. From the author's manuscript.

There came into my hands the other day a pamphlet containing a biographical sketch of a great man. Very few will ever see this pamphlet, yet its contents should be known to every American. I consider it to be my duty, therefore, to assist in publishing the facts of this life.

The pamphlet contains a translation from a life of Rizal, written by a German professor in the University of Leitmeritz, Austria. It is translated by a man who knew personally both Rizal and Aguinaldo. It is dedicated to Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, who is characterized as "the liberator of his country, a chivalrous and brave warrior."

Jose Rizal was a native of the island of Luzon, of which Manila is the capital. He was therefore a Malay, with the brown complexion, black eyes and straight, black hair which are the physical characteristics of his race. He graduated from the University of Madrid as doctor of medicine and philosophy. He pursued his graduate studies in Paris, Heidelberg, Leipzig and Berlin. Returning to his home in Manila he wrote and published a novel which excited the wrath of the government by its anti-Spanish sympathies, and by its exposure of the corruptness of the church on the islands. For the crime of telling what he believed to be the truth he was banished. He came to the United States, and from here he went to London, where he devoted himself to further study. About this time he produced another political novel. He then settled as a practicing physician in Hong-Kong. From here he went to Borneo, where it was his intention to found a colony of Filipinos. In 1892 he returned to Manila, presumably for the purpose of recruiting his colony. He went at once to the home of his family, leaving his baggage in the customhouse.

This baggage was opened, and in it there were found certain pamphlets of an anti-Spanish character. It has been charged that these pamphlets were smuggled into the baggage by some fanatical monks, and that the type from which they had been printed were found, still set up and in the possession of these monks. However, Rizal was banished a second time. This time he was sent to the island of Dapitan, where he was held a political prisoner under the close watch of Spanish guards. While he was on this island and under the eyes of his guards, another insurrection in the Philippines broke out. Though for the last four years he had been a prisoner on a distant island and under the constant surveillance of the authorities, still, when the insurrection broke out, he was taken to Manila on the charge of having incited the uprising; and, after the forms of law had been complied with, he was condemned to death, and shot on the 30th of December, 1896. Such is the brief outline of the story of his life.

Rizal was a profound student of anthropology and ethnology. He was incited to master these studies by the behavior of the Spaniards, who always treated the natives as though they were by nature inferior. As a schoolboy he was often cut to the quick by their arrogance toward his people. He could not see why he should be despised because his skin was brown and his hair straight. He took delight in standing at the head of his class, just to prove to himself that the Spaniards were no better than his own people. He observed that when Europeans came to the islands they seemed to regard the natives as a species of animal fit only for menial service. What moral right, he asked, has the white man to look down on the men who have similar thoughts and studies as they and similar abilities, just because their skin is brown or their hair is straight? He resolved to probe the matter to the bottom and see if there was any foundation for the claims of the haughty Spaniard.

In the schools of Manila he came to the conclusion that ability did not depend upon color. While pursuing his studies abroad he kept his eyes open to see what truth there was in the doctrine that he was an inferior being—a doctrine which his soul hated. In Madrid he became very bitter when he saw how great a contrast there was between the freedom which Spain enjoyed and the theocratic absolutism of his fatherland. He became disgusted with the selfishness of the Spanish politicians.

He noticed, also, that ninety-nine out

of every hundred Europeans believed without criticism all that the editors of their favorite newspapers chose to tell them. "That also happens to my Tagals," said he, "although they have no white skin." In France and Germany he lived among the peasants for months at a time for the purpose of studying their race characteristics. He came to the conclusion at last that "the human races are distinguished in their outward habits and in their build, but not in their psychology." "White, brown, yellow and black feel and are excited by all the same passions and emotions." He repudiated the doctrine of colonial politicians, that there are races of limited intelligence who can never rise to the level of Europeans.

While the inhabitants of the Philippines belong to the mildest and most cultured branch of the Malay race, the race as a whole has been described by travelers as deceitful. To this charge of moral inferiority Rizal replies:

Merchants come to the tropics to enrich themselves as soon as possible. This they can do only when they buy at extremely low prices in the country. The natives, however, consider such transactions as not fair business; believing that the white race are trying to deceive them, they take their means, also, to get the advantage of the Europeans, whilst among themselves they show far more honesty. The Europeans, consequently, denounce them as liars and deceivers; but that they, as Europeans, prey upon the natives, never appears to enter their heads. On the contrary, the white race believe they are morally entitled to trade with them in immoral ways.

These reflections of Rizal require no comment. Race pride and rapacity are the charges which Rizal brings against the Spaniards. And yet, as for race pride, I think history proves that the Spaniards have been not quite so bad as the Americans. There is no other nation so hopelessly prejudiced against the colored man as we. When, right here at home, the laws are ignored and men are lynched, almost daily, because of race prejudice, he must be an optimist indeed who believes that Americans will be less prejudiced 3,000 miles away from home. There are places in our country where men are supposed to enjoy all the rights guaranteed by the constitution, where, nevertheless, the colored man who should dare to vote his convictions would be shot down with impunity. This can occur at home where the rights of the negro are protected by powerful political interests. What, therefore, may the Philippines expect who are to be ruled as subject people, without even a nominal claim to the protection of the constitution; who are to be ruled by men that will have 3,000 miles of ocean between them and

the government to which they are responsible; and who are to exercise control over people who cannot look to great political interests, as the negroes can, for protection? Maybe there is some alchemy in the Pacific breezes which will neutralize the race pride for which we have become infamous; but if I were a Filipino I should not care to put faith in it.

A Spanish newspaper, commenting on the death of Rizal, said:

What a misfortune parliament was not sitting when the Filipino insurrection broke out! Romero Robledo would have raised his voice as he is now doing in defense of those who have fallen victims to unjust outrages; he would have closed the road to calumny and perhaps have prevented the soil of the Philippines from being stained with the blood of Rizal, impiously shot by the authorities in cold blood. . . . Injustice has always been the mother of odium and future wars.

And this from a Spanish newspaper! Perhaps some will ask why if any considerable number of Spaniards felt in that way the authorities were permitted to carry things with such a high hand. Our author answers the question for us. And in his analysis of the situation in Spain I see a very close analogy to our own situation.

There are Spaniards and Spaniards; some who represent the worst phases of official corruption; others who are keenly sensitive of the existence and deleterious effects of the vices that have crept in and are undermining the virility of the nation. These have no sympathy with the excesses committed by, or with the connivance of, the ruling authorities, but denounce them in far stronger language than I have used; unfortunately they are at present powerless to effect any improvement, and whilst the constitution of Spain remains unchanged, and the people exercise no direct control in the management of their affairs it is useless to look for any reform. Some day, perhaps, the Spanish laity will assert itself in Spain and make a clean sweep of the foul, reeking hotbed of official corruption, together with the parasites that habitually live on the budget. Then and only then will Spain be able to lift her head and take her proper place among the nations of the earth.

This is indeed an unexpected place to find a demand for direct legislation; yet it appears that even Spaniards are waking up to the truth that until the people have the right to vote on these questions they are at the mercy of the designing politicians whose very existence depends upon the multiplication of offices as opportunities for plunder.

In spite of the protests of humane Spaniards, then, Rizal was shot. One hour before his execution this gifted Filipino married his betrothed, a charming Irish girl, who afterward became a Philippine Joan of Arc. What a time for a wedding! How this reminds us of the last hours of Robert

Emmet! The bride followed her lover to the place of execution. What a wedding march! Yet they would not permit her to give his body a decent burial. His own countrymen were compelled to do the shooting. Back of this row of Filipinos stood Spanish soldiers, ready to cut them down if they shrank from their cruel business. "Never," says an eye-witness, "never shall I forget that awful morning, nor the horror-thrill that came with the report of crackling rifles as his mangled body fell on the public promenade, amid the jeers of Spaniards and monks, who had consummated thus one of the most cold-blooded crimes registered in history since the tragedy of Golgotha. My blood boiled, and from that hour I espoused the Filipino cause."

Why did Spain shoot Rizal? Because he was found guilty of encouraging his countrymen to take up arms to secure their independence. Why are we shooting the Filipinos? Because, now that we have bought from Spain the right to lord it over those people, they are guilty of taking up arms against us to secure their independence. Our right to control the Filipinos is no better than Spain's right, unless might makes right. If Spain committed a crime in shooting Rizal, then, before God we are criminals. The fact that we believe ourselves able to govern the islands better than Spain, or better than the people themselves, does not change the moral status of the question a hair's breadth. If the conqueror is justified in conquering because he has implicit faith in himself, then there never was an unrighteous war. If national conceit, backed up by superior force, is sufficient justification for a war of conquest, then there is no such thing as right in this world and no safety whatever for any man's liberty who has not the power to defend it by brute strength. If our right to shoot down Filipinos is to be sustained by the necessities of trade and our own good opinion of ourselves, then our patriotism is only a maudlin sentiment and our Christian professions are a shameless mockery.

On the day following Rizal's death his widow passed the Spanish lines at Manila, and made her way on foot to the camp of the insurgents. There she met Aguinaldo. He gave her command of a company, at the head of which this Irish bride gained more than one victory. To-night this modern Joan of Arc may be dying on the battlefield, slain by American soldiers. Oh God! that we should have lived to see fair America, mad with visions of world-kingsdoms and their glory, kneeling at

the feet of him whom to serve is greed and hate and hell and death.

Before he died Rizal wrote a poem which was his dying message to his native land. Can you listen to these words and not wish that all this horrid dream were over, and we were standing once more on the side of the oppressed? Can you listen to the lofty words of this gifted Tagal, and not blush for shame at our hypocritical doubts about the ability or the right of these men to govern themselves?

Farewell, adored Fatherland; our Eden lost, farewell;
Farewell, O Sun's loved region, pearl of the eastern sea;
Gladly I die for thy dear sake; yea, thou knowest well
Were my sad life more radiant far than mortal tongue could tell,
Yet would I give it gladly, joyously for thee.

On blood-stained fields of battle, fast locked in maddening strife,
Thy sons have dying blest thee, untouched by doubt or fear.
No matter wreaths of laurel; no matter where our life ebbs out
On scaffold or in combat, or under torturer's knife,
We welcome death, if for our hearths, or for our country dear.

Pray for those who died alone, betrayed, in wretchedness;
For those who suffered for thy sake torments and misery;
For broken hearts of mothers who weep in bitterness;
For widows, tortured captives, orphans in deep distress;
And pray for thy dear self, that thou may'st finally be free.

Farewell, adored country; I leave my all with thee,
Beloved Philippines, whose soil my feet have trod,
I leave with thee my life's love deep; I go where all are free;
I go where are no torturers, where the oppressor's power shall be
Destroyed, where faith kills not, where he who reigns is God.

Farewell, my parents, brothers, friends of my childhood days,
Dear fragments of my heart, once to my bosom pressed
Round our lost hearth. Give thanks to God in glad tranquillity,
That after day's long weary hours, I sleep eternally.
Farewell, beloved friends and stranger sweet; to die is but to rest.

THE IMMIGRANT DOUKHOBORS.

With the incoming Doukhobors we have given welcome to the living widows and orphan children of Christian martyrs whose blood still reddens Russian soil, and who died for the same high and holy faith as did St. Stephen. And further, we are assured that even in their direst oppression—shall we say, perhaps because of it—the Doukhobors have neglected not to treat all men in the belief of the truth of the Master's

teaching, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me."

The press informs us that some of the religious denominations in Ontario contemplate sending out some missionaries to these Doukhobors. By all means, and let wise men be carefully selected—men who will prove their adaptability for teaching by their ability for observing and learning. And when they return to us let these missionaries instruct the Canadian churches generally how it comes to pass that the Doukhobors find it possible to put into daily practice what we by both word and act largely proclaim to be impracticable, Christ's sermon on the mount.—John F. Baker, in the British Whig, of Kingston, Ont.

WILLIAM THE ONLY—HIS SPEECH. For The Public.

Translated from a German memorandum found in the emperor's personal waste basket. The original has been presented by the finder to the British Museum.

Oh Me!

Oh My!

And likewise I!

Sit still, ye churls, whilst I orate—
Me, I, Myself, the Throne, the State.
I am the Earth, the Moon, the Sun,

All rolled in one.

Both hemispheres am I.

Oh My!

If there were three, the three I'd be.
I am the Dipper, Night and Day.
The North and Southern Poles, the Milky Way;

I'm they that walk or fly on wing,
Or swim or creep—I'm everything!
It makes me tremble like the aspen tree

To think I'm Me.

And blush like stars up in the sky

To think I'm I.

And shrink in terror like a frightened elf
To realize that I'm Myself.

Ye blithering slaves beneath my iron heel,
What know ye of the things I feel?

Didst ever walk at dead of night
And stand in awe of thine own might?

God took six days to make the land and sea,
But centuries were passed in making Me.

The Universe? An easy task; but I—
Oh My!

I can't describe Myself. Why, take
The speech the ancient peoples spake;

And then again take every tongue
By moderns spoken, writ or sung;

And every tongue that is to be
Mix in with these—you cannot picture Me.

So do not try, ignoble worms, to grasp
A greatness that can only make you gasp;

But look and silence keep, unless some whim
Compels an utterance, then whisper

"Him!"—

An awesome "Him!"

Whilst I forevermore content will be
With "Me,"

The simple, yet majestic, pronoun "Me!"

A lady of Somerset bewailed the loss of a somewhat ill-bred but extremely wealthy neighbor, who had been liberal in his help to her country charities. "Mr. X. is dead," said she. "He was so

good, and kind, and helpful to me in all sorts of ways. He was so vulgar, poor, dear fellow, we could not know him in London; but we shall meet him in heaven."—Wave.

A West African, on a visit to England, in connection with a missionary society, was shown a collection of photographs. "What is this?" he asked, gazing wonderingly at one of them. "That is a snapshot, taken during a scrimmage at a Rugby football game." "But has your church no missionaries to send among these people?" he demanded.—Chicago Chronicle.

Land is opportunity—opportunity to learn, to labor and so to live and love.—Father Huntington.

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. *Nero-Tees*, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. *Department Stores* (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago, Ill.