

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1899.

Number 51.

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.

In connection with the irritation between Sweden and Norway, it may be of value to remember that it is due in no small part to the fact that aristocratic Sweden is for tariff protection, whereas democratic Norway is for free trade.

The Illinois Humane society is trying to justify the appropriateness of its name by pushing through the legislature a bill to transplant in Illinois Delaware's barbarous whipping post. John G. Shortall, the head of the society, argues that this punishment has been proved effective in lessening the kind of crimes to which it applies. Then why not apply it to all crimes, instead of confining it to crimes that are peculiar to impoverished classes?

Whether Judge Tuley's decision in the case affecting the use of revenue stamps on Chicago saloon licenses be confirmed by higher courts or not, it must commend itself to students of the American system of government as fundamentally sound. The federal war revenue law imposes the use of a revenue stamp on saloon keepers' bonds. But Judge Tuley holds this to be an interference by the federal government with state and municipal governments. Any other conclusion would, as Judge Tuley says, open the way for congress, by prohibitory taxation, to regulate all local government. If it could levy a small tax upon municipal licenses it could levy upon them a tax so high as to deprive municipalities of revenue from that source. In these days, when state lines appear to be vanishing and we to be growing into an Imperial Nation

with a big I and a big N, it is refreshing to encounter a judge like Tuley, who can remember judicially when the nation was a federation of sovereign states.

No one should grudge President McKinley a vacation. However reprehensible much of his work as president may be, it has been vexatious and arduous, and he may well need rest. Neither should anyone criticize his selection of Senator Hanna's southern resort for his retiring place, and Senator Hanna as his companion. Hanna is McKinley's closest personal friend, his confidant, and his adviser. They are political and business twins. Neither, again, should there be any objection to the gathering about Mr. McKinley during his vacation, of plutocratic politicians of the country, for the adjustment of their differences, for assignments of political favors to come, and for the arrangement of the next republican presidential ticket. It may be that such consultations are inconsistent with perfect rest, but of that Mr. McKinley himself has the right to judge. What is objectionable, however, is the publication from day to day by administration organs of snobbish reports of this vacation trip of the chief servant of a simple republic as if it were the progress of an absolute monarch and his retinue.

Mr. Bryan's letter to Perry Belmont must have stirred the Croker combination to its depths. Belmont is president of the club which represents in New York politics the corrupt, the corrupting and the plutocratic elements of the democratic party. The leading spirits of this club, notably Belmont, bolted the national party ticket two years ago, and now they invite Bryan to join them in celebrating Jefferson's birthday with a

\$10 a plate banquet on the basis of political principles at variance with the Chicago platform. Mr. Bryan replied with dignity, declining the distinguished honor, and giving in plain but polite terms his reasons for doing so. To this reply Belmont retorted with an angry screed. Perhaps the Tammany conspirators begin to realize that their plan for getting office by harmonizing principles until all principle is harmonized out of the democratic party is doomed to humiliating failure. Mr. Belmont's angry letter to Mr. Bryan would warrant such an inference.

Mayor Harrison, in his speech accepting the democratic machine nomination for reelection as mayor of Chicago, made two things quite plain. He showed himself to be, first, heartily in favor of the doctrine of municipal ownership of public utilities; and, second, heartily opposed to putting the doctrine in practice, so far as it applies to street railroads. "The ultimate solution," he said, "of all these questions of handling public utilities is municipal ownership;" but "now comes the question, is the time ripe for municipal ownership? Personally, for various reasons, I do not believe that at the present time it would be advantageous to the citizens of Chicago to institute municipal ownership, especially of street railways." Mayor Harrison would, therefore, "confer franchises for a limited period on street railroad companies on certain terms." That is what Mr. Yerkes, also, would do. These two gentlemen appear to be pretty much of one mind.

One of the best-known war correspondents in the world, James Creelman, wires from Hong-Kong a story of the American cable censorship at Manila, which discredits pretty much

all the news we have had from the Philippines since the outbreak of the 4th of February. Mr. Creelman had his experience in connection with the fight of March 13th, which the American press exploited as a hard won victory. Referring to this fight Creelman cables four days later:

The movement of Gen. Wheaton's flying brigade on Monday was grossly exaggerated. The censor refused to allow correspondents to cable the truth, that the insurgents ran away. He insisted that the dispatches represent a serious battle with the enemy resisting furiously, and allowed complaisant writers to represent the insurgent loss as enormous. Otis's advances simply consist of elaborate skirmishes, and few losses. He is making no vigorous or determined advance. As in the case of Weyler at Havana, correspondents are forced to represent the facts to suit Otis or be denied use of the cable.

Creelman himself was obliged in his Manila account of the fight to please the censor or say nothing. This censorship, let it be remembered, is not to conceal American military movements from the Filipinos. It would be useless for that purpose. Its sole object is to deceive the American public.

Owing to the Manila censorship, it is impossible even to conjecture the actual situation in the Philippines. The dispatches have all along told us that an aggressive American movement was to be made as soon as reinforcements arrived. And when reinforcements did arrive, such a movement was reported with many flourishes of patriotic rhetoric. Yet Gen. Otis now says that he was ordered not to be aggressive while the treaty remained unsigned. Then we were told that the Filipinos were on the verge of collapse, and that hostilities would soon end. But now comes word that the American troops have fallen back five miles from a town which they had captured after a hard fight. It is explained that they returned for ammunition; but as ammunition could have been sent to them easier than they could come after it, that explanation has a censorship flavor. We are also told that a large

detachment of American troops drove the Filipinos before them for 15 miles, over hard ground and under a hot sun, and then returned exhausted to the starting point. At the same time the authorities at Washington, as reticent as ever, have begun to show evident signs of concern. And meanwhile, the president's advisory commission is reported as preparing a conciliatory address to the Filipinos. What it all means is a mystery and will remain more or less a mystery until trustworthy correspondents are heard from through non-Russianized channels of communication.

Down to the close of February, the casualties in the American army from the beginning of the war, as officially reported, were as follows:

Killed in action.....	329
Died of wounds.....	125
Died of disease.....	5,277
Total	5,731

This report goes far to show how much more deadly than Spanish or Filipino ammunition, was American army management. Out of 5,731 deaths, 5,277 were caused by disease!

Early in the course of the bad beef investigation now being made by a board of inquiry of the army, it was widely reported in the press, as if from some inspired source, that the board was already prepared to report that Gen. Miles's chief charges were unfounded. Three inferences as to the origin of that report are now available. It may have originated from high quarters in a knowledge, prematurely divulged, of what the board of inquiry had been appointed to do. Or it may have been manufactured by newspaper correspondents, out of whole cloth. Or, again, it may have leaked out from the counsels of the board itself. Whatever the origin of the report, however, it is not likely to be confirmed by the event. Whether the board of inquiry, like the president's informal whitewashing committee which made a notoriously false report, was appointed for whitewashing purposes, or had actual-

ly decided on its own account to make a whitewashing job of the affair, it must now take a different course. A clean job of whitewashing is no longer possible. Thanks to Maj. Lee, and apparently to him alone, a little daylight has been let into the darkness of the army beef supply. Some proof has been drawn out which shows that "embalmed" beef did go to the army. Much proof has been laid bare of the bad quality of the canned beef. And altogether this proof points to moral corruption.

Doubtless there is much more available proof of corruption in furnishing beef to the army than what has thus far been disclosed. Ugly rumors are afloat in the neighborhood of the Chicago stock yards. It is said that when the war broke out, orders were given to unload unmarketable stock upon the government; and there are men with long memories, and possibly some inside information, who conjecture that a poor quality of canned beef sent to Europe a decade and a half ago in expectation of a European war, was brought back last spring and supplied to the American army. In connection with these rumors, there are shrewd suspicions, too, that the acceptance by army contractors of bad beef from the Chicago packers is not wholly unrelated to the large contributions which the packers made to the presidential campaign fund in 1896. For the truth of these rumors we cannot vouch. We only know they are afloat. But that the packers did contribute heavily, not for love but for business, to the Hanna campaign fund; that bad beef was furnished to the army; and that desperate efforts have been made by administration dependents to conceal the notorious fact that it was bad,—these things are matters of common knowledge.

A cowardly massacre of negroes by a white mob occurred last week at Palmetto, Ga. The negroes were under arrest, awaiting preliminary hearings upon suspicion—mere suspicion—of having caused incendiary fires.

when 150 masked men burst into the temporary jail and fired upon the begging, screaming, groaning, helpless group of prisoners until four were killed and five desperately wounded. Commenting upon this infamous crime, the Macon Telegraph makes some gratifying observations. It views the occurrence with horror, and boldly charges it to race antipathy. This antipathy, it says—

is deep seated, ineradicable, but it can be prevented from leading to atrocities such as this, and it must be prevented, or anarchy will one day reign among us. Were the blacks powerful, dreaded, challenging the other race to battle, the matter would have a different aspect. As it is, compared with the whites, they are weak and practically helpless, and therein is the chief horror of these wholesale slaughtering. The men who take part in them bring more evil upon themselves than upon their hapless victims. That they are ready to dip their hands in human blood lightly and recklessly, without any just provocation, implies a moral obliquity of mind and a brutal perversion of all humane instincts that should be a source of grave concern for their friends and their community. It means that the springs of compassion and human kindness are dried up to their source.

A brave sentiment from such a source. But a true sentiment from any source. If this masked mob was ready to dip hands "in human blood lightly and recklessly," what made them do so? The bloodguiltiness rests not upon these sanguinary wretches alone. It rests upon the community that cultivates race antipathies by denying to one race the common rights that are freely accorded to the other. Deny common rights to any class and—if they be weak and timid, as the negroes are apt to be—you invite every brute of a man whose accidents place him in the superior class, to assert his dubious title to superiority by cowardly acts like that at Palmetto. In the horrible butchery there by those masked men, whites everywhere, north as well as south, may see their own race antipathies in action. For brutal mobs are to the communities that generate them, what murder is to men who cultivate hate—living

pictures of their own cherished passions. The Macon Telegraph is profoundly right when it says that the tragedy at Palmetto "means that the springs of compassion and human kindness are dried up to their source."

A member of the Oregon legislature, one of those who participated actively in defeating the Torrens system of land transfers, publishes explanations of his conduct that are astonishing. He calls the bill a "graft." The Torrens system, he says, has no advantage over the present system either in cheapness or convenience. And, then, to make his justification of his opposition to the bill complete, he explains that "the blooming innocents" who advocated it in the lower house, after it had passed the senate—got up and howled that there could be no graft because it was optional with the owner of the legal or equitable title to put the land under the system, or not, just as he wished; but the bill requires each county to purchase a large number of books and blanks assumed to be necessary whether any person in the county cared to put his land under the system or not. Then it was disclosed that these books and blanks are known as the "Torrens system," are all patented, and the county using them would be obliged to pay for them either at an outrageously exorbitant price, or pay an outrageous royalty.

As soon as that was discovered, concludes this Oregon statesman, the measure got its quietus.

That Oregon statesman, if not a very simple minded man, must be a rare specimen of "grafter" himself. If the bill he helped to defeat provided no cheaper method of transfers than that now in vogue in Oregon, the Oregon system must be extraordinarily simple and cheap, or the Oregon Torrens bill was badly framed. In Chicago, where the Torrens system is now in operation, it costs \$24 to register a title where there are no adverse interests, plus 1-10 of 1 per cent. of the value of the property to go toward an indemnity fund. After that, each transfer involves the payment of a fee of only \$3; and in two years the title becomes unassailable. In point of cheapness the old system cannot com-

pare with that. And as to convenience, a title once registered—a proceeding which involves no more inconvenience than the passing of a title once—it becomes as easy of transfer as a promissory note.

When the Oregon objector to the Torrens land transfer system asserts that the books and blanks required are patented, and that the system would therefore cost counties adopting it large sums in royalties or exorbitant prices for stationery, he is either imposing upon his constituents or is imposed upon by interests that seek the retention of the present system for the fees that are in it. His statement is manifestly false. The Torrens system is too old for anyone to have a patent on it. Even if it were not old, it is nothing but unpatentable book-keeping.

Upon being consulted upon the subject, Mr. Theodore Sheldon, of Chicago, official examiner of titles under the Torrens system, denied flatly that there are any patents of books or blanks. He himself prepared the Chicago forms, and turned them over to one of the city stationers who now provides the books and blanks at ordinary stationers' rates. Said Mr. Sheldon, further, the system is some 700 years old in Germany, where all land is transferred by the Torrens method; and in England it has existed as a voluntary system since 1875, and been compulsory since 1897. In London it is in universal use. The system prevails also in Australia, and in every province in Canada except Quebec. It has existed so long not only in Germany and England, but in Australia and Canada, as to make the notion that the books and blanks are patented ridiculous.

North Dakota is trying to outstrip all the other states in fool legislation. The lower house of the North Dakota legislature has passed a bill compelling applicants for marriage to undergo an examination before a board of physicians, and forbidding marriage to any who fail to pass.

Advocates of this measure explain its object to be the promotion of mental and bodily health. Hardly could the passion for regulating other people's lives go further. When the law undertakes to determine for individuals whether they shall marry or not, or whom they may or may not marry, a climax will have been reached. It is these things that suggest a brute origin for the race and make one wonder whether we are not swinging back to it. Brutal, materialistic, and degrading, indeed, is that conception of marriage which esteems it a mere license for propagating the human species.

Some of the school men of Canada have filled in their occasional leisure with academic defenses of trusts; and the people of Canada who have been accustomed to listen complacently, are now having opportunities to see how it is themselves. Our Standard Oil trust has been caught giving the Dominion ministry lessons in economics, and more recently the existence of a sugar trust has been unearthed. For this last discovery the Kingston Whig is entitled to the credit. Canada allows sugar refiners a protective tariff on sugar. It consists in the difference between 50 cents to the hundred pounds on raw sugar and \$1.14 on refined. But this protection of 64 cents to the hundred pounds fails to satisfy the refiners and they have organized a ring, which includes all the wholesale grocers save one firm, for the purpose of fixing sugar prices to Canadian consumers. The wholesale grocers agree to abstain from handling foreign refined sugar, no matter how cheap it may be, and to sell the Canadian article at uniform prices to be dictated by the refiners. To strengthen this conspiracy the refiners agree to blacklist wholesale firms that remain outside the confederacy, by refusing to give them the benefit of discounts allowed to firms within the ring. The Toronto Globe has taken up these revelations of the Kingston Whig, and a parliamentary inquiry is among the probabilities. Canadians are not so docile under the burdens of

private taxation as are we on this side the line.

When Prof. Geo. D. Herron, of Iowa College, Grinnell, addressed the Chicago Single Tax club last week, he made, for the first time, a specific confession of his social faith. Prof. Herron's ideal is evidently Christian communism, whatever may be the term, if any, which he would select for his label. He believes in the ultimate triumph on earth of the law of Christian love, when men will dwell together in unity, each inspired in his economic activities by a consuming desire to serve his brethren. But the individualistic method of attaining to a realization of his communistic ideal, Prof. Herron rejects. He conceives that no one can practice any social reform by himself. He also rejects the socialistic programme, as being founded in force. What he looks to, not as an ultimate, but as absolutely necessary to clear the ground and make a right beginning, is the reform advocated by Henry George.

W. A. Douglas, a leading accountant of Toronto, is authority for the statement that the premier of Manitoba reports the farmers of that province to be almost to a man in favor of the taxation of land values. Mr. Douglas also notes a rapid growth of single tax sentiment among the tax payers of the province of Ontario. These reports, coupled with the recent remarkable debate upon the subject in the English house of commons, are very significant. Apparently our cousins to the north of the lakes and across the Atlantic have grown weary of allowing the landed class to pocket the profits of public improvement and growth.

The Financial Reform Almanac for 1899, published by the Financial Reform Association, Hackins Hey, Liverpool, England, is a convenient and most valuable compendium of the tax statistics and legislation of Great Britain and her colonies and dependencies. One exceptionally interesting feature is a brief history of the

English land tax. Another is a collection of official statistics relating to the distribution of wealth in the United Kingdom for the year ending March 31, 1897. This makes a startling exposure of injustice. Dividing the total population into four classes, designated respectively as A, B, C and D, the collector of the statistics summarizes them as follows:

No. of persons.....	Average value of property owned by each person....	Average annual income at 3½ per cent.....	Percentage of persons in each class to total population.....	The percentage of wealth owned by each class.....
14,751	£938,040	£8,332	0.04 per ct.	27.71 per ct.
185,364	£28,958	£1,013	0.47 per ct.	42.35 per ct.
2,800,950	£1,340	£47	7.09 per ct.	29.63 per ct.
38,463,617	£1	£0	92.40 per ct.	0.31 per ct.

The value of this table might be considerably enhanced if it were possible to reduce to statistical terms the evident fact that the percentage of useful work done by each person is on the whole least in the classes of largest wealth. England could much better afford to spare the 3,000,000 people whose ownings average up in the thousands of pounds, than the 36,000,000 who own an average of but a pound apiece.

Our German friends are not so easily deceived as Americans are by statistics of inflated exports. This is evident from a speech recently made by Count von Posadowsky-Wehner, the German Secretary for the Interior, before the Handelstag, a semi-official commercial body of the empire. The count called attention to the fact that

although German industries have made great advances in recent years, the balance of trade is what is known as "unfavorable." That is, German imports exceed the exports. He observes also that in England, too, the balance of trade is "unfavorable." And he utilizes these great facts to point a moral. In his belief, excessive exports do not produce prosperity. His conclusion is that—

the lower the "favorable balance of trade" of a nation is, the more capable of activity must naturally be the purchasing power of that nation.

His meaning is clear and the truth he utters obvious. There can be no rational doubt that the more wealth a country receives the richer it becomes. But our business men and protection politicians cling to the opposite theory, that the more wealth a country gets rid of the more it prospers. Accordingly they hail with delight, as evidence of wonderful prosperity, the enormous volume of wealth we are sending out of the country in excess of what we get back—the balance of our exports over our imports. They call it a "favorable balance of trade." To these philosophers it must be a curious fact that poor Spain, during her misery and impoverishment of the past year, enjoyed the blessings of this same "favorable balance of trade." Her exports exceeded her imports.

Western newspapers furnished several estimable gentlemen in different parts of the United States with a genuine surprise, when they announced that Gov. Pingree was preparing to form a third party, the baptismal ceremonies to take place at Buffalo in June. Gov. Pingree himself was in consequence at once confronted with a new combination in the Michigan legislature to embarrass him. Other men whose names were connected with the affair—men like Prof. Ely—felt obliged to repudiate all intention of making a Pingree party. From the number of letters published from these gentlemen, the newspapers jumped to the conclusion that they had broken up the move-

ment, and began to commiserate Eltweed Pomeroy, its organizer upon his loneliness. That was indeed funny. For it had never occurred to Pomeroy or any of his associates in the movement referred to, to turn the third annual meeting of their politico-economic society into a republican third party convention. The newspapers did that all by themselves, and then chuckled over having broken up the third party programme which they alone had conceived and formulated. It is a great engine, the daily press.

There is nothing new in principle about the decision of the Virginia Court of Appeals, which holds that courts created by the constitution cannot be compelled by the legislature to submit to juries questions of contempt of court for acts committed beyond the presence of the court. Other state courts have held the same doctrine. Among them, we believe, the courts of California insist that the legislature cannot deprive constitutional courts of the power of summarily punishing newspaper publishers for publications alleged to be contemptuous. These decisions may be legally sound, though that is by no means a closed question. But whether sound or not makes no difference. Judges ought not to have the power to indict, try, convict, sentence and execute in their discretion, for conduct beyond the physical presence of the judge when holding court. Power like that is dangerously autocratic. And if constitutions buttress the power, constitutions should be amended. Nor does the legal soundness of the Virginia decision affect the question of requiring the use of juries in contempt cases in United States courts, as the Chicago Tribune would have its readers believe. For the Virginia decision refers only to courts created by the constitution; and, with the exception of the supreme court, no United States courts are so created. All inferior federal courts are created by congress. Since congress may make and unmake them, it would be strange if

congress could not regulate their proceedings.

Complaint is made in the insurance department of the New York Independent against the fining of fire insurance companies in Kentucky for combining to fix rates. Says the Independent—

If insurance is a commodity and underwriters are venders thereof, it would be hard to adduce a valid reason why they should not be left by the law as free as anybody to write themselves rich—if they can—by marking up the price of their goods.

That is sound doctrine, or would be, if the insurance business were open to free competition. In the case referred to by the Independent, 101 companies had combined to raise prices arbitrarily. If special permission were not a prerequisite to engaging in the insurance business, such an arbitrary combination on the part of those companies would have invited competition at once, and that would have brought the rates down. The very possibility of competition would have made the combination impolitic. But under the law, competition in insurance is not fully free. It is free only between the established companies. They combine with full confidence that no competition from without can molest or make them afraid.

One of the very best fire insurance organizations in this country, is under the ban of the law in many states for no other reason than that it is outside the insurance ring. So long as free trade in insurance is thus hampered by laws which the insurance ring itself maintains, it lies not in the mouth of agents or organs of that ring to complain of laws against insurance combinations. When the law prevents free competition, those who invoke its authority to that end must not complain if it also prohibits combination. "Laissez faire" is good economic doctrine; but in its full and wholesome sense it is not merely "laissez faire," but "clear the ways, and then laissez faire."

THE TREND OF TRUSTS.

When writing last week of the rage for trusts, we tried to distinguish the different kinds and to point out the probable fate of each kind. We wish now to indicate the general direction in which the rage for trust organization tends, and to consider briefly its economic and political possibilities.

I.

It will be remembered that we classified trusts in three categories—trusts without legal privileges; trusts with legal privileges; and trusts that have no legal privileges of their own, but secure such privileges through trusts that do have them.

The first class we described as weakest of all, and fated from their inception to perish; the third, as likely to rise and fall with the legally privileged trusts to which they are subordinate—those of the second class. As to the second class itself, we argued that these trusts also are doomed unless they establish themselves upon privileges that are fundamental—upon legal rights, that is to say, to natural sources of supply.

Our conclusion was that—in the end, no trusts will be left to rule in the economic field, but those that have their feet upon the earth.

Proceeding from this conclusion, let us first ask ourselves to what extent business can be thus securely monopolized by trusts.

II.

The control of trusts by trusts—in other words, the merging of many trusts into one trust, much as many kinds of business have been merged each into its appropriate trust—is clearly among the possibilities of trust development. Indeed, such a tendency has already become actually manifest.

At one time, for example, the West Shore railroad system, which from New York to Albany follows the west bank of the Hudson river, the New York Central system following the east bank, was a competitor of the Central.

The two systems, each made up of what had been originally independent roads, were in essence, if not in name, two independent trusts. But in time the West Shore system fell under the con-

trol of the same interests that controlled the Central. The Vanderbilts came virtually to own both systems. They operated the systems, however, as independent properties, preserving the form while destroying the substance of competitive operation.

This was not a difficult thing to do while railroad pooling flourished; but when that was outlawed by the supreme court, the Vanderbilts found it necessary, or at least expedient, to abandon even the form of competitive operation. Accordingly, the West Shore system is now operated avowedly as a branch of the Central. The two systems have become one system; the two trusts are consolidated.

It is rumored that the Erie system, like the West Shore, is also to become a mere branch of the Central. And shrewd observers confidently predict that in the not distant future all systems east of Chicago will be consolidated into two—the Central and the Pennsylvania. Should that come about, it is easy to foresee that a struggle for supremacy would break out between those two great railroad trusts, and that one of the two would ultimately absorb the other.

Such a struggle is now in progress between the Metropolitan and the Manhattan street transportation systems in New York. Another has practically ended in the acquisition by one of the Brooklyn systems of the others. And eventually, no doubt, the Brooklyn and the New York systems will all come under one control.

These are but examples of the tendency toward trusts of trusts. Nor need we look to railroading alone for such examples.

Telegraphy, telephoning, electric power and light supply, gas works, and the like, are all tending to consolidation.

First there are franchises to different corporations in a community. Then comes consolidation of franchises, until one corporation—essentially a trust—owns them all. That stage is followed by a consolidation of these interests in different communities under a central control—a central trust.

The best example of this stage of the disease, though it preceded in

point of time the stages that are logically first, is the Bell Telephone company, which is the central trust of all the local telephone trusts in the country.

Then, also, as to trusts generally, their evolution is similar.

Competing establishments in a given line of business, consolidate and form a trust. Their object, which may be in part to secure economy in production, is in other and perhaps greater part, to stop competition, and thus to limit production and increase or maintain prices, while holding wages in check.

Except as these combinations are buttressed with great legal privileges, they are, as we indicated last week, subject to a constant pressure, tending to produce disintegration. For competition is a vital social principle. Its operation may be obstructed by minor monopolies, but its force cannot be quite neutralized by anything short of perfect and complete monopoly. Consequently, until a trust or a series of trusts secures complete control of all the natural or landed resources which its operations require, it feels the force of competitive influences.

When one line of business, therefore, consolidates into one trust, and other more or less related lines consolidate into other trusts, these various trusts are by the same impulse that prompted them to form original trusts, prompted to form a trust of trusts. They thus consolidate under one control not only all the establishments in each line of business, but all the trusts in the different lines of business that are related, including the trusts that own the natural sources of supply.

This would make that trust of trusts invincible within its own sphere. Controlling the sources of its raw material, it could control the finished product. To use the expression we adopted last week, its feet would be upon the ground. But though it controlled its raw material, it might still be dependent for subsidiary products. In that case it would come into collision with the trust of trusts that had its feet upon the ground as to those products. Then a struggle would ensue, the result of

which would be the consolidation of these trusts of trusts.

Suppose, for illustration, that the steel manufacturing business were by processes of consolidation brought under the control of a trust which dominated the business, merely as a steel business, from beginning to end—owning everything, from finished product back to ore mines. That trust of trusts would have its feet upon the ground. But it must use coal; and here, let us say, is a trust of trusts which dominates the coal business, from delivery at your cellar door back to the mines from which coal is dug. That trust, too, has its feet upon the ground. In such a case the interests of these two trusts would certainly collide. They would bear somewhat the relation to each other that the Manhattan bears to the Metropolitan in New York; that the Central would bear to the Pennsylvania should they consolidate all minor roads under their management respectively; that different lines of business in the steel industry would have borne to one another before finally consolidating; that different establishments in that line would have borne to each other before the first steel trust. Collision or consolidation would be inevitable. And out of the collision, if it came, the steel trust and the coal trust would emerge as one.

That illustrates the trend of trusts. Following them from their beginnings, we find a tendency first to the consolidation of business of the same kind into trusts for those kinds of business respectively; then to the consolidation of trusts in kindred lines; then to the consolidation of those trusts as they come into collision with one another; and so on, each trust gaining power over its rivals as it secures a stronger and stronger foothold upon the ground.

Unhindered by fundamental reform, the organization of trusts and their absorption into trusts of trusts would eventuate in the ownership of all business by some gigantic trust, which would get its power as Antaeus got his, by planting its feet firmly upon the earth. Owning the earth, it would own men; and owning men, it would own all that they produce, from the simplest food to the most

marvelous machinery. The middle class would disappear, and only two classes would remain—beneficiaries of the trusts and their favorites on the one hand, and impoverished and dependent hirelings upon the other.

III.

To this triumph of the trust most socialists look forward with satisfaction. They see in it the opportunity of the people to take possession not only of the earth but of the artificial instruments of production also, by dethroning the few trusts or the single trust that may acquire this vast ownership. They are satisfied because in this trend they discover signs of the evolution of public ownership. But in the trust phenomena there is little real cause for satisfaction.

As the evolution of the trust proceeds, trust employes become in greater and greater degree mere voting machines, registering at the polls not their own convictions, but their employers' commands.

How noticeable this already is in connection with the railroad trusts! Consider Arthur, the wealthy head of the society of locomotive engineers, who secures favors for his loyal supporters in the society by plumping their votes according to trust dictation! Think of the performance of Chauncey M. Depew, who appeared before a corralled audience of railroad workmen at Chicago to admonish them that their interest as railroad employes depends upon their fidelity to the railroad trust as voters!

This condition, only worse, would be universal, should the development of trusts proceed even approximately to the point that we have indicated as possible. And when the time came to dethrone the trusts, the trusts themselves—through their army of dependent voters—and not the convictions or the interests of the people, would decide the issue.

It might be that the trusts would decide in favor of their own dethronement. But if they did, they themselves would fix the terms.

In that case we may rest assured that the dethronement would be nominal. All land and all machinery might by their consent be turned over to

the government; but it would be at a price which the trusts would dictate, and to a government which they would continue to control.

IV.

It is not by waiting until trusts own everything and then taking it from them, that the industrial question must be met.

The method of the doctor who managed a case of mysterious infantile illness by throwing the infant into fits because he was a fit specialist, and "death on fits," may be worthy the attention of schools of medicine; but the principle cannot be safely carried over into practical economics.

If the evils of the trust are to be overcome and its dangers avoided, the people must possess themselves in time of the point of vantage toward which the trust is advancing. Since the trust cannot survive without, Antaeus-like, getting its feet upon the ground, it is to be destroyed only as Antaeus was by keeping its feet off the ground.

That would be a simple matter. No revolution is necessary. No overturning of established customs or assault upon deep-rooted habits of thought is required. Nothing is needed but a transfer of all taxation from production to the value of natural opportunities to produce.

Let earth owners be taxed to the full annual value of their holdings, approximately, whether they use their holdings or not, and no trust could make money by restricting production. To restrict production would then bring speedy ruin upon whoever attempted it. Even railroad trusts, if rights of way were taxed well up to their monopoly value, would be compelled to utilize their opportunities to the utmost for the public good, or give way to men who would.

In saying this we are saying only what Henry George demonstrated. Whoever will read his immortal book, "Progress and Poverty," reading it with intelligent care, and, as Lowell says, "with heart wide open on the Godward side," will find in his plea for communal justice an unanswerable argument for a fundamental though simple reform within the atmosphere of which no oppressive trust could come and live.

NEWS

The queen of Spain signed the Paris treaty on the 17th, and empowered the French ambassador at Washington to represent Spain in Washington at the exchange of ratifications, the only formality now remaining to complete the peace. Her signature was unauthorized by the cortes, and the act is criticised abroad as a monarchical blow at parliamentary government.

It is now definitely reported by responsible correspondents at Manila, that Philippine news is entirely untrustworthy. These correspondents have at last complained of the censorship to which they are subjected, sending their complaints by messenger to Hong-Kong, whence they have been cabled. James Creelman is one of the complaining correspondents. He says that the censor forbids the use of the cable for the transmission of the actual facts of the situation. Another, a staff correspondent of the Chicago Record, blames the administration at Manila for the outbreak of hostilities, and complains that true statements of the circumstances are forbidden by the censor. It may reasonably be suspected, therefore, that Philippine dispatches of the week are more in conformity with the censor's instructions than with the facts.

Our last week's report, based upon censored dispatches, left the Americans in complete possession of the Pasig river to its source, a large lake called Laguna de Bay, some eight miles east of Manila. The Filipino army was thus cut in two, communication between the north and south wings, except across or around the lake to the east, being interrupted. That was the situation on the 15th, when a night attack was made by the Filipinos along the whole northern line, but without much effect. The next morning the Americans advanced from Pasig, at the source of the river, upon Cainta, a fortified village about five miles to the east, near the northern shore of the lake. After four hours' fighting, part of it in the village streets, they captured this village, but subsequently withdrew "to replenish their ammunition." On the 17th an American gunboat, towing two lighters carrying troops, was dispatched from Pasig for a cruise against lake shore villages; and the

same day witnessed another attack by Filipinos upon the American line. They attacked the Americans again on the 18th, this time at Taguig, which lies upon the southern shore of the lake, a little to the south of Pasig. The fighting continued until darkness put an end to it. On the morning of the 19th, the Americans made a determined movement out of Taguig and down the southern lake shore, sweeping a path two miles wide and driving the Filipinos before them as far as San Pedro Tunasan, a distance of 15 miles. Ten villages were burned, the Filipinos applying the torch when forced to retreat, and the Americans resorting to it to dislodge their enemy. At the end of the day, the Americans returned to Taguig, exhausted by their hard work under a hot sun. On this day, also, the gunboat and lighters which had gone upon a cruise upon the lake, as reported above, completed the cruise, having shelled and destroyed several Filipino villages along the shore, and proceeded as far as Santa Cruz, a town of 1,200 inhabitants near the eastern extremity of the lake. The Filipinos were found to be strongly intrenched there, and guarded by two gunboats and several launches. Consequently no attempt was made by the Americans to land; but the town was shelled, with the effect of dislodging some citizens but no troops. Reinforcements were solicited for the purpose of returning and renewing the attack. No conflicts are yet reported as having occurred on the 20th, 21st or 22d, though there is desultory firing every day.

At Iloilo peace has not yet been established. Both the city of Iloilo and the village of Jaro have been again attacked by natives. Gen. Hughes is to relieve Gen. Miller at that point, the latter having reached the age of retirement from active service.

The Island of Negros, too, is reported to be in a disturbed state. As we related in Nos. 48 and 49, at pages 9 and 7 respectively, the inhabitants of the island of Negros had put themselves voluntarily under American jurisdiction, and affairs were proceeding smoothly. But dispatches of the 21st announce that threatening conditions required reinforcements, and that a battalion had been forwarded. It appears that the Negros commissioners who bore to Gen. Otis at Manila the information that Negros had acknowledged the United

States (See No. 48, page 9) and were returned to their native island in state after being handsomely entertained at Manila, took advantage of the opportunity offered by that mission, to enter into friendly communication with Aguinaldo. This fact is known. Whether it has any connection with the necessity of reinforcements in Negros is not reported. In the islands also of Leyte and Samar, lying near Luzon, hostilities were reported on the 22d as imminent.

Dispatches of the 21st from Manila, indicate the intention of the American advisory commission there to issue a pronunciamiento to the inhabitants of the Philippine islands explaining "the spirit in which the United States intends to fulfill the trust imposed," and calling "upon the people of the islands to lay down their arms and cooperate in the interests of good government."

Further reinforcements have started for the Philippines. The 9th infantry left its barracks at Sackett's Harbor, N. Y., on the 17th, 1,215 strong. The regiment goes by way of San Francisco. On the 22d the Sherman arrived at Manila with the Third infantry and four companies of the Seventeenth. Admiral Dewey has been reinforced by the arrival of the battleship Oregon.

American complications in Cuba are not yet out of the tangle in which we left them a week ago, when the impeachment of Gen. Gomez by the Cuban assembly had produced a conflict of Cuban authority and raised a question as to the distribution of the \$3,000,000 which the United States has forwarded for payment to the Cuban army on condition of its disbandment. Public sentiment at Havana appeared to be with Gomez, until Gen. Brooke officially announced his intention to ignore the assembly and recognize Gomez as the sole representative of the Cuban army, whereupon it seemed to veer around in favor of the assembly. Besides this embarrassment, Gen. Brooke is confronted with the discovery that the assembly has possession of the Cuban army rolls. That makes it impossible, for the present, without the assembly's consent, to pay off and disband the army.

Out of the clash between the Cuban assembly and Gomez, two political parties are expected to be born. The partisans of Gomez have formed what

they call the National Cuban party, with the intention of making Gomez the first president of the Cuban republic; while an opposing party is organizing to support the assembly against what it calls the Gomez dictatorship.

Besides the generation of political parties in Cuba, this clash between the assembly and the late commander-in-chief has precipitated rioting in Havana. A desperate fight occurred late at night on the 18th, between the Havana police and partisans of Gomez. Nearly 1,000 shots were exchanged. There were numerous minor disturbances of similar character on the 19th, but after that quiet was restored. The casualties chronicled for the two days were 7 killed, two of them being policemen and one a woman, and 50 wounded.

The discontent in Porto Rico, reported last week, gives no indication of having been allayed. According to mail advices received on the 19th, it is expected that the feelings of the Porto Ricans may culminate in open rebellion. Arms and ammunition are reported to have been smuggled into the island and secreted in the mountains for rebellious use; and 100 rounds of ammunition have been issued to the American troops.

There has been friction for more than two months between the natives of Porto Rico and the American military authorities. It seems to have had its origin in a growing conviction on the part of the Porto Ricans that their island is to be held as an American colony. About Christmas time a delegation representing several Porto Rican cities arrived in this country to protest against the continuance of the military administration. They claimed that they had enjoyed a higher degree of freedom under the old Spanish regime, and expressed an earnest wish for a reasonable civil government, asking to be accepted by the United States as brothers and not as subjects—to have the island made a territory the same as the territories that have come to be states. For Gen. Henry, the American military governor, they expressed respect and esteem, but insisted that his government was that of a man and not of the people. About a month after arriving, this delegation had an interview with President McKinley. Their formal petition to him requested the appointment of a civil governor, either a native or an American, with

provision for a legislative assembly. It complained that there were then two governments on the island—the American military government, rigid and exacting; and the island government, which was a mere relic of Spanish sovereignty. The president reassured the delegates in general terms; and promises of a colonial commission to administer the affairs of Porto Rico, were cabled to San Juan. The commission consists of Gen. Robert P. Kennedy, Maj. Charles W. Watkins, and Henry G. Curtis. Even at that time prominent Porto Rican officials were quoted as intimating that there would be trouble if the American government did not soon terminate the military regime upon the island.

Subsequently the dissatisfaction grew, and in the latter part of February, the mayor and the majority of the municipal council of San Juan resigned rather than comply with a decree of the military governor. This incident excited much local irritation. It is chiefly important as indicating the feeling of subjection which the Porto Ricans feel that they are under to the military power of the United States. Gen. Henry insists, however, that he has strenuously avoided giving cause for such a feeling. In a newspaper interview on the subject early in the present month, he said:

Military government is not the best kind. I do not believe in military government. The American people do not believe in it. The army does not believe in it, and, as far as possible, I wanted these people to govern themselves and keep militarism in the background. I put the alcaldes and municipal council in control of the towns and cities. I established a native police force. The army was invariably kept from interfering in civil affairs unless the actions of the alcaldes and councils became so outrageous, as it has become in many places, that I was forced to declare martial law in each one.

An adjournment of the German reichstag was taken on the 21st until April 11. Dissolution had been imminent, over the defeat of the emperor on a provision of the army bill. The budget committee had disallowed an item for increasing the infantry by 7,000 men; and on the 14th, against the protests of the war minister, the reichstag sustained the committee, upon the second reading of the bill, by a vote of 209 to 141. It was then predicted in Berlin that if the vote upon the third reading did not change

this result and override the committee, the emperor would dissolve the reichstag, he being determined upon having the full quota of infantry asked for by the ministry. But the threatened crisis was averted by a compromise. The reichstag adopted the report of the committee disallowing the increase of 7,000 infantrymen, but passed a resolution to the effect that if at the expiration of five years it should be found that the army cannot be maintained on a satisfactory footing without the increase, the increase shall be allowed. This compromise was reluctantly accepted by the emperor, as the alternative of dissolving the reichstag and changing the result of a new election. But the ministry formally insisted upon the increase, for the purpose, it is surmised, of leaving the emperor free to renew his demand at subsequent sessions before the expiration of the five years. The bill was adopted on the 16th, with the additional resolution noted above, by a vote of 222 to 132. This bill increases the peace footing of the German army for the seventh time since 1872.

The most significant event of the week in American politics, is the publication of the correspondence between Perry Belmont and Wm. J. Bryan relative to an invitation to Mr. Bryan to attend a banquet of a Tammany hall social club at New York, of which Belmont is president, on the occasion of the anniversary of Jefferson's birthday. Mr. Bryan, in declining the invitation, expressed his appreciation of the compliment, but, referring to Mr. Belmont's having bolted the party at the late presidential election, he said:

Antagonism between our opinions is so great that we can't with propriety join in a political banquet in honor of Democracy's patron saint. Jefferson stood for certain well defined principles. If your views are a correct reflection of his ideas, I fear that my views would sound a discordant note at your banquet. If, on the other hand, the Chicago platform applies (as I believe it does) Jefferson's principles to present conditions, then your conspicuous presence at the Jefferson banquet would not honor the memory of the world's greatest Democrat. Do not misunderstand me. You may be right and I may be wrong, but I take it for granted that we are equally conscientious, and I trust that I may not show myself less courageous than you. You proclaimed to your fellow-citizens in 1896 that my election upon the Democratic platform would endanger the

nation's welfare. You will pardon me if I say that a banquet presided over by you will injure, rather than aid the Democratic party. I believe in harmonizing private differences, but differences in principle can never be harmonized; and in my opinion no party advantage is to be derived from communion of Jeffersonian Democrats who stand by the Democratic platform and Republican allies who masquerade as Democrats between campaigns, in order to give more potency to their betrayal of Democratic principles on election day.

To this Mr. Belmont replied:

Your purpose to be defamatory is obvious, and were it not that you have interwoven in your abuse reference to my opinions upon public questions as opposed to your own, to the Democratic club, of which I am President, and to its proposed celebration of Jefferson's birthday, I should have left your offensive statements unanswered. The Democratic club of New York has a membership of nearly 3,000 Democrats, who all hold to the main principles of Democracy, while their opinions may vary in regard to such political questions as are not fundamental, but merely local or transitory, like many of the vain conceits you have yourself espoused. But none of these 3,000 members is a Republican. As for myself, I never voted for a Republican candidate for either a great or small office. Your contention is that the Chicago platform applies Jeffersonian principles to "present conditions" and that because I criticised that platform in its application to conditions existing three years ago, and then resisted your candidacy for the Presidency, therefore my presence at the proposed dinner would not honor the world's greatest Democrat. It is not practical for me to recall in this letter the substance of what I have written or spoken during or since the last Presidential campaign in regard to the Chicago platform and its many phases, and, although I do not in any way recognize your right to question my Democracy, I am sending you by this mail a volume which correctly gives the text of everything which has been published, and you are at liberty to indicate and expose any portion that is unpatriotic, undemocratic, un-American, or in conflict with the Democratic creed as set forth in Jefferson's first inaugural address.

Mr. Bryan has expressed his willingness to attend another and more popular dinner at New York, in honor of Jefferson's birthday, provided it be postponed so as not to interfere with his engagement to speak at Milwaukee on the 13th, and be distinctly a Chicago platform affair in honor of Jefferson. The postponement has accordingly been made until April 19th, and Bryan has engaged to be present. This is to be a \$1 banquet;

it is to be held in a banquet room with a seating capacity of 3,000, and the applications for seats already indicate that overflow meetings will be necessary. The episode promises to be the beginning of organized opposition to the admission of Tammany hall delegates to the next national convention.

Another state legislature has adjourned sine die, with a senatorial deadlock unbroken. This is the legislature of California, which adjourned on the 18th, after the 104th ballot for a successor to ex-Senator White. Both California and Delaware are now left with a vacancy in the United States senate.

The municipal campaign in Chicago is now furnished with three full complements of candidates. Carter H. Harrison was nominated on the 15th for reelection as mayor, by the regular democratic organization. Zina R. Carter had been already nominated by the republicans. And ex-Gov. Altgeld's nominating petitions, signed by more than 26,000 names, were filed on the 18th. Altgeld is making the contest as a democrat against the local democratic "machine," upon the platform of "Municipal Ownership and the Chicago Platform." Carter stands, so far as local franchises are concerned, upon the principle of exacting compensation from highway corporations and looking vaguely to ultimate municipal ownership. Harrison advocates municipal ownership as a general proposition, but opposes it for the present as to street cars.

After the Harrison convention, William Prentiss, who was chairman of the last democratic state convention of Illinois, and is a strict party democrat, having heretofore refused to support Altgeld because he was running independently of the local organization, announced himself as opposed to Harrison and in favor of Altgeld. In his letter he declared, referring to the local democratic convention, that

Neither in its platform nor its proceedings was the least reference made to the Chicago platform of 1896, the last authoritative declaration of the Democratic party, or to any principle therein enunciated. Not only were the most sacred principles of the party ignored, but during the entire convention not even the name of any of the honored leaders of the party, living or dead, from Jefferson to Bryan, was mentioned. Apparently there was a

studied purpose to keep everything Democratic out of the convention, except the party name. Nominally a Democratic body, it deliberately absolved every Democrat from any party obligation to support its action. Much as I admired the great abilities and splendid Democracy of ex-Governor Altgeld, I did not favor his independent candidacy for Mayor up to last Wednesday. I hoped that I might be spared the sad duty of opposing a Democratic ticket bearing the stamp of regularity. But what was a sincere Democrat to do when confronted with a situation like the present? Were it not for the independent candidacy of John P. Altgeld there would be no real Democratic candidate for Mayor of Chicago to-day.

Several other prominent Chicago democrats have adopted Mr. Prentiss's conclusions, and followed his example; while the Altgeld meetings are crowded and enthusiastic. Altgeld says that in all his experience in Chicago politics, he has never known the city to be so thoroughly aroused over municipal questions as it appears to be now.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Eighth Illinois regiment, manned by colored men, returned on the 18th from Cuba.

—A new satellite of Saturn has been discovered at the Harvard observatory by Prof. William H. Pickering.

—Joseph Medill, principal proprietor and nominal editor of the Chicago Tribune, died on the 16th at San Antonio, Tex.

—A cyclone swept parts of Alabama, Arkansas and Mississippi on the 18th, doing much damage to property and killing many people.

—Benjamin P. Hutchinson died on the 16th at Lake Geneva, Wis. He was once famous on the Chicago board of trade, where he was known as "Old Hutch."

—The Danish government has begun allotting money to farm laborers for the purchase of small farms. The allotments are made as loans bearing interest at five per cent.

—On the 17th the Windsor hotel, located at Fifth avenue and Forty-seventh street, New York, burned to the ground. The number of killed and injured is large but unknown.

—St. Augustine, Fla., has taken up the subject of municipal ownership. An ordinance providing for a municipal electric lighting plant has passed the council and is to be submitted to popular vote.

—At the Sing Sing (N. Y.) state prison on the 20th, Mrs. Martha Place was legally killed by electricity,

upon conviction of murdering her step-daughter. She was the first woman in the world to suffer under that mode of capital punishment.

—The London district messenger boy, of whom we told last week as having been sent with messages to New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, with the idea that he would beat the mails, has successfully done his work. It transpires that he was employed for this mission by Richard Harding Davis upon a wager.

—A fatal encounter is reported as having occurred between Americans and Canadians near the disputed Alaska boundary line. The fight was for possession of a rich placer gold field. Americans to the number of 100 attempted to drive out 50 Canadians. Volleys were fired on each side, and several men were killed and wounded.

—A second delegation of prominent citizens of Finland, sent from Helsingfors to St. Petersburg to protest to the czar against his abrogation of the Finnish constitution, has met the same reception that was given a like delegation last February, as reported in No. 48 at page 10. It was denied an audience with the czar. And in addition its members were preemptorily ordered to return home.

MISCELLANY

A CHRISTIAN TOWN.

For The Public.

Jesus from home looked down

Into the midst of a Christian town:

Some were rich, and some were fair;

Some were worn with pain and care;

Some were naked, and some were wan;

Some were hungry since life began;

Some were idle and longed to toil,

But dared not touch the common soil.

Murder lurked in alleys dim;

Lust looked up and laughed at Him;

Monopoly, all in splendor, shone

Over pavements of blood and bone.

Honor's robe the garb of Crime;

Pelf the theme of prose and rhyme;

Greed the prince and love the slave;

Scorn the need of all the brave;

Self a god on gilded throne,

Truth a tramp at the door alone;

Mammon sitting in Power's chair

Saying: "I rule here, you rule there."

Oh! the pity of that fond face,

Stained with tears for the human race.

"Father! Father! I died for these;

I drank the cup to its very lees,

But even now they do not see

The truth that waits to make them free;

Now as then my cry rings true:

"Forgive them! They know not what they do!"

A. F. BROOMHALL.

THE MONOPOLIST'S PRAYER.

For The Public.

"I thank Thee, O Lord, for all the good gifts, of which Thou, in Thine infinite mercy, hast enabled me to deprive my brethren."

THAT MYSTERIOUS BALANCE OF TRADE.

The difference between the money value of the exports and imports of a nation is called "the balance of its trade;" according as the exports are in excess it is called by the mercantile world "in favor;" when the imports exceed the exports it is called "against." The Standard American Encyclopedia, however, points out that this is a mistaken view, and that the reverse is true. We quote from that authority: "This view is based upon a two-fold error, for, in the first place, the increase of national wealth is by no means to be identified with the immediate influx of hard cash; nor is gold the highest expression of national wealth, but only a means of turning real wealth and the faculty to labor to account. Further, the assumption that the excess of exports represents excess of income is completely false. It takes exports for income (because payment is received for them), imports for expenditure (because they must be paid for), while it would be more consistent with the truth to say that exports are identical with expenditures and imports with income; so that wealth increases in proportion as the value of the imports (what is received) exceeds that of the exports (what is given away), and that whether these exports and imports consist wholly of goods or partly of money."

To many of our readers this will doubtless prove an almost revolutionary view of the case, but a careful study of the subject will show that it is correct. The mistake lies in the idea that money is what the world wants, whereas money, being merely a medium of exchange, can serve no other purpose. What the world wants is food, clothing, shelter, books, recreation, travel, etc., and without ability to enjoy these, all the money in the world would be of no avail.—Editorial in *The Farmer's Voice*, of Chicago.

THE FATE OF FINLAND.

The guarantees of Alexander I. are virtually repealed. The ancient privileges of the land of a thousand lakes have vanished. The most prosperous and enlightened province of all the czar's domain will be administratively forced down to the level of all the rest. That, and no less is the meaning of the work of the extraordinary session of the seim which opened January 24 at Helsingfors. Ostensibly it was a meeting of the free and independent parliament of Finland. Practically it was a meeting of men under compulsion to register the will of the autocrat whose ukase summoned them, and that will

is that henceforth Finland shall be only "a geographical expression." The expressed purpose of this meeting of the seim was "to bring the Finnish law of military service into conformity with the law of the empire at large." That is to say, the seim has adopted, at the czar's dictation, a law permitting the garrisoning of Finland with Russian troops and imposing upon Finlanders the obligations of conscription and service in the Russian army in any part of the world.

When the new governor general of the grand duchy, Gen. Bobrikoff, assumed authority at Helsingfors, five months ago, he made the matter plain. He frankly told the Finns that all their notions of autonomy, of a mere "personal union" with Russia, and of a separate nationality, must be forever dismissed as perverted and fantastic. They must use Russian money and postage stamps, and the Russian language must be the official language, and the Russian church the state church, and they must look to St. Petersburg, and not to Helsingfors, for government. So the Finnish press will be subjected to Russian censorship, and the Finnish schools and colleges will be degraded to the Russian level, and in all possible ways the stalwart, handsome, moral and enlightened Finns will be assimilated with the Moujiks. The seim will be a mere Zemstvo. The czar will continue to be styled grand duke of Finland, but only in the same sense that he is called king of Poland. The end of Poland came a century and four years ago. To-day we see the end of Finland.—Boston Transcript.

CAPABILITIES OF THE FILIPINOS.

The Filipinos are evidently human beings, in some respects not unlike ourselves. Indeed, while the bulk of them (I have in mind, particularly, Luzon, where are five out of the seven of eight million making up the population of the islands) are uneducated and half-civilized, they have some of the marks of a superior people. They wish education. They are cleanly, are hospitable and obliging. They have a pleasing family life. Wives have an amount of liberty hardly equalled in any other eastern country, and they seldom abuse it. The men are self-respecting and self-restrained to a remarkable degree. The climate allows them to be indolent, yet they possess many fine branches of industry (making beautiful mats and elegant linen fabrics), and they imitate such branches of European industry as ship-building, leather dressing and carriage building with great success.

With their patriarchal system of living, they have not learned the art of forming a state and are commonly supposed to be destitute of the capacity of governing themselves; yet the stress of circumstances has developed leaders among them and during the past year an attempt has been made to organize a government. For three centuries they have been subject to Spanish rule, and it is absurd to deny the existence of capacities that have not been allowed to grow. What their capabilities are is shown in the nature and personnel and working of the extempore government they now have and which makes so much a part of the gravity of the present situation that I must give a few details.

Its seat is in Malolos, 45 miles from Manila. There the Philippine congress sits in an old Spanish church. It had 83 members when it declared the republic on the 16th of September last; more have since been added. Of these 83, 17 were graduates of European universities. The president studied at Madrid and Salamanca, taking degrees in theology and law, and is an author, his works on the life and manners of the inhabitants of Luzon having been translated into German.—Rev. Wm. M. Salter, before Society for Ethical Culture in Chicago, Feb. 12.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM ESSENTIAL TO SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Recognizing this important psychological law, the conclusion is logical and inevitable that, all actual and permanent expansion and integration of societies must proceed by the voluntary cooperative action of individuals. The statesman or social reformer who would work in harmony with the tendencies and laws of nature, must therefore direct his efforts toward convincing the judgments and converting the motives and moral natures of individuals, rather than toward forcibly changing the customs and institutions of society by legal enactment, military domination, or a majority vote under the white heat of an emotional political campaign. These customary methods of attempting to effect social changes may be of some service as educational influences, inciting thought in the unreflecting, but as means of finally solving and disposing of social or political problems, they are lamentable failures. It is the too exclusive dwelling on biological analogies by students of society which leads to socialistic and communistic conclusions to be enforced by the militant power of the state. Here psychology should come in as a corrective, showing that man, through his

voluntary action, is constantly reacting on his environment and recreating it in the image of his own ideals. * * *

It is a sound political philosophy, justified by scientific sociological principles, which is enunciated in the affirmation of the Declaration of Independence, that "all just government rests on the consent of the governed." This is as true in Cuba, Hawaii and the Philippines as it is in Massachusetts; it is as true of the older monarchical and aristocratic systems as it is of a democratic-republican form of government. While the evolutionary sociologist recognizes the different forms of government are adapted to varying degrees of culture and social development, he also knows that an autocracy which does not rest upon the actual consent of the governed, which finds no response in the hearts of the people, but is maintained solely by military compulsion, is a tyranny, unstable in its foundations, unadapted to its social environment, and destined to early destruction by peaceful or violent means.—From "Our Nation's Peril," by Lewis G. Janes.

REMEDIAL MEASURES—A FABLE.

"O, sir!" cried one of the prisoners in the "Black Hole of Calcutta," to the Maharaja, as he came to visit the jail, "pray let us out of this—we are in great distress and dying by the dozen."

"Dying?" replied the prince, "then something must be done! We must first find the extent and then the cause of your distress."

So he sent a friendly visitor, who took the measure and the weight of each one in the hole, and figured out how many feet of air he breathed; he made a scientific study of the case and noted the following valuable and interesting sociologic conclusions. (The friendly visitor had a large family):

"First—Competition is at the root of all this suffering. Had the prisoners taken turns at the peep hole in the door of the cell, all could have lived till now.

"Second—Underlying this is human greed; for the stronger ones had stopped up the breathing space with their heads, and so the weaker perished.

"Third—There is a maladjustment of the Social Force. If, instead of breathing in the air and returning it from their lungs into the cell, the prisoners would discharge it on the outside, a large number would survive.

"Fourth—Those poor people are prodigal of their water, they drink whole cupfuls at a time, whereas, were they persistently to breathe through the

nose, the desire for water would be greatly lessened.

"Fifth—There is no real scarcity of water, as the Ganges and the Mississippi hold an abundant supply, which is practically free. The heat is an unavoidable incident of human life, though aggravated by the vices and fever of the poor prisoners. To open the door as a panacea, is a fascinating theory, but I am constrained to say (else I should lose my job) that the only immediate and practical remedy is to mitigate their thirst by giving the lower strata rags to chew. Much might be done also by blowing through the key hole. But the only real specifics are: First, Education, so that they may make the best of their opportunities, but not so much as to make them discontented, and second and mainly, Moral Elevation."

When the Maharaja read the report, he sent to the prisoners a theological student and a book upon "The Pleasures of Content." And he raised the Visitor's salary.—Bolton Hall, in The Ram's Horn.

THE LATE LAND DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Anyone reading the speeches of Mr. Chaplin and Mr. Balfour would suppose that the housing question was at the best a matter of academic interest, and that the rating of land values existed mainly as a proposition for the employment of royal commissions. We hope that the overcrowded people of the towns, who pay from a quarter to a third of their wages in rent, will weigh these speeches well. Let them note the fact that the president of the local government board grudges an afternoon to the discussion of these vulgar matters, whilst Mr. Balfour looks upon overcrowding and rack-renting as mere incidents—trying, perhaps, but inevitable—in the growth of town life. The people in other parts of Europe and in America are overcrowded, says Mr. Balfour. Let us wait, then, until everything is in order in Hamburg or Warsaw before we touch the ground landlord at home. Mr. Balfour admits that overcrowding is a curse, but the phrase is meaningless on his lips. If multitudes of people are living under such a curse, why in the name of statesmanship is nothing to be done? Why this protest against hot haste? Why is the country forced to wait year after year upon the pleasure of royal commissions, each one more futile than the last? And how comes it that landlords and clerics are able to extort emergency reports, recommending doles for their comfort out of the public pocket, whilst

the "curse" is left to work itself out amongst the poor? These are questions which will want a good deal of answering. The government which came in on the cry of dealing with social reform is willing to take up "the white man's burden" in any part of the world except England. English people who have not water enough to drink or sufficient houseroom in which to live with common decency are referred to the royal commissions.

Mr. Asquith gave the opposition a strong lead in a speech which did not mince matters. He pointed out that under our existing system of tenure and rating, vacant land is being held up round our big towns, without contributing a penny to the rates. The owner is simply speculating for a rise, precisely as the man speculates who makes a corner in wheat. If he happens to own houses in the town so much the better for him. The more closely he can beleaguer it the higher his rents will rise, and if overcrowding follows, so much the better for him again, for the greater the crowd the greater the rent. This process is being exploited for all it is worth, and there is nothing for it up to the present but to submit. Sir J. Brunner mentioned the case of West Ham, which is a flagrant instance of this monopoly pressure. It seems that the rates in this part of outer London would be reduced by 1s. 6d. in the pound if vacant sites were brought into the account. But that is not all. The rents in West Ham, which are being screwed higher and higher, would go down as the vacant land was taxed into occupation, and the pressure of rent and crowding throughout London would be relieved. The housing question, as Mr. Asquith indicated, will clearly have to be attacked from this quarter. It is imperative, too, as Mr. Asquith said, that municipalities should have the power of compulsorily acquiring land on reasonable terms to be let for building purposes.

Mr. Balfour naturally chafes at proposals that appear to be aimed at his own class. The doctrine that the people exist for the town owners, and not the towns for the people, is a menace to the first conditions of civilized society. The rate-payers' power of paying for improvements by setting the housing acts in motion, and of buying out landlords at a fictitious valuation is not inexhaustible. Why not convoke a national meeting of representatives of municipalities and urban boards to call for the rating of ground values?—London Chronicle of Feb. 11.

THE CHURCHES ARE LOOKING OUT FOR THE BRICKS.

The theory of the church to-day is that it must devote the whole of its attention to men simply as individuals; that if we can succeed in bringing to bear on each individual such influences as will lead him to consecrate himself in loyal fealty to his highest ideals of duty, then every one in society being right the whole of society must necessarily be right. This is exclusively individualistic. This statement looks so true that most people at once accept it as a self-evident truth. Everyone being right, must not the whole be right? . . .

Does the goodness of every brick insure the goodness of the building? Do arrangement, adjustment and architecture count for nothing? Does the goodness of every soldier insure the goodness of the whole army? Do organization, adaptation of parts and strategy count for nothing? Is an army merely an unorganized assemblage of soldiers, a mere mob? Does the goodness of the type insure the intelligence and goodness of the book? Do arrangement and relationship count for nothing?

As a building is not a mere pile of bricks, as an army is not a mere collection of men, as a book is not a mere mass of type, so society is not a mere assemblage of individuals. Society is an organization, a relationship of part to part, an adaptation, an adjustment, just as a building, an army, a machine or a book. "No man liveth unto himself; we are members one of another."

The church founds its faith exclusively on the goodness of the individual parts, and gives no heed to the relationship of the parts—a fatal mistake. For, just as bad architecture will ruin any building, no matter how good the parts; just as bad adjustments will insure the defeat of any army, no matter how good the soldiers; just as bad adjustment will wreck any machine, so will bad relationship or bad adjustment vitiate humanity in spite of all we may do for the goodness of individuals.

We are placed in charge of the architecture of humanity, in comparison with which the grandest architecture of earth's proudest temple shrinks into insignificance; we are placed in charge of a campaign for the overthrow of all that is wrong and for the triumph of all that is lovely in goodness and beautiful in holiness; and how are we fulfilling these duties? According to a theory, which, if applied to architecture, or to generalship, would be the sheerest madness.

To-day the church expects the employer to pay the stipulated wages honestly according to the standard of the market, but it makes no effort to find out why the market is such that men and women are compelled to work like beasts for the living of a dog. Respecting the land, the Bible says: "Take it and till it, that ye may enjoy the fruits thereof." But our churches to-day utter no protest or condemnation of the use of the land for the robbery of industry by speculation. Christianity came to draw men together into the bonds of a brotherhood, but the church gives no heed to the fact that our cities are now huge forces that destroy brotherhood—that sever men into hostile ranks, master and servant, lord and serf, palace and hovel—and the greater the city, the wider this severance, the more pronounced the injustice. Industry, by every possible means, strives to bless the world with abundance; but it is doomed by our social maladjustment to suffer scarcity, while the claimant of an area in a large city, on which he need not raise a pound of goods in a century, procures wealth and affluence far beyond the point of satiety. As to the eternal injustice, the church is not merely silent, but it actually condones and gives its moral support to this perennial crime by surrounding the wealthy recipient with every mark of consideration and seeking a share in his spoils for its ecclesiastical institutions.—W. A. Douglass, in *Citizen and Country*, of Toronto.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

March 13, 1899.

The full ratification of the treaty with Spain will cause a technical change in the relations of the United States to the Philippine islands, but will afford no reason for any change in the views of the anti-imperialists in regard to the future of the islands, nor will it in the least affect the clear duty of this republic.

We are now engaged in warfare with the inhabitants of those islands. It is unprofitable to discuss the question as to which party began hostilities. No other result could have been expected, when the lines of two opposing military forces were held so close and in such tense condition that little was needed to cause an explosion.

The evidence is very clear that Aguinaldo was brought to the islands by our own warship; that his aid was accepted and desired in our military operations against the Spaniards; that hopes of independence were encouraged by our consuls and other officers;

that a parliament of the islands, organized by representatives elected by 186 towns and provinces, chose Aginaldo president and framed a constitution, which was promulgated, defining the powers and duties of the separate departments of the government with remarkable clearness and ability and that the government so formed fairly represented the intelligence of the people of the islands.

It is also undeniable that on January 5 President McKinley issued a proclamation through Gen. Otis declaring that on the 10th of the previous month the Philippine islands had been ceded to this country by Spain by the signature of the treaty of Paris, and further ordered him to extend the military government of the United States "to the whole of the ceded territory," and to demand the surrender of Iloilo, which was then held by the Filipinos in an orderly manner by capture from the Spaniards.

It cannot be claimed in law that this assumption of power was warranted in advance of the ratification of the treaty by both parties, and there can be no doubt that the arbitrary claim greatly aggravated the people of the islands, whose hope of independence seemed thus rudely destroyed.

No declaratory resolution as to the future of the islands was assented to by the administration before the ratification of the treaty by the senate, and none has been made since.

Any right that we assert to ownership of the Philippines must rest, therefore, either upon conquest or upon purchase from their Spanish oppressors, or upon both, and in any case it is, as we believe, inconsistent with the principles of this republic and fraught with danger to its peace and to the peace of the world.

The first result we already witness, a war of subjugation, which must embitter the people we seek to rule, and which, however successful, must bring disaster and death to our soldiers and unmeasured cost to our people.

Profoundly impressed with the seriousness of the situation it is the purpose of the anti-imperialists to continue the circulation of literature, to assist in the formation of leagues, and by public meetings, and every proper means known to a free people, to agitate for the revival in the land of the spirit of Washington and Lincoln, to protest against a spirit of militarism and force, to oppose the colonial idea and a permanently large standing army and to assert the vital truths of the Declaration of Independence embodied in the

constitution and insolubly connected with the welfare of this republic.

They urge, therefore, all lovers of freedom, without regard to party associations, to cooperate with them to the following ends:

First. That our government shall 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.

Second. That the government of the United States shall render 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 its traditional and prescribed policy in such cases, will recognize the independence of the Philippines and its equality among nations, and gradually withdraw all military and naval forces.

George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts.
George F. Edmunds, of Vermont.
John Sherman, of Ohio.
Donelson Caffery, of Louisiana.
W. Bourke Cockran, of New York.
William H. Fleming, of Georgia.
Henry U. Johnson, of Indiana.
Samuel Gompers, of Washington.
Felix Adler, of New York.
David Starr Jordan, president Leland Stanford, Jr., university.
Winslow Warren, of Massachusetts.
Herbert Welsh, of Pennsylvania.
Leonard Woolsey Bacon, of Connecticut.
Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts.
Samuel Bowles, of Massachusetts.
I. J. McGinly, of Cornell university.
Edward Atkinson, of Massachusetts.
Carl Schurz, of New York.
Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland.
Hermann Von Holst, of Chicago university.
Moorfield Storey, of Massachusetts.
Patrick A. Collins, of Massachusetts.
Theodore L. Cuyler, of New York.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, of Massachusetts.
Andrew Carnegie, of New York.
John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky.
Charles Elliot Norton, of Harvard university.
W. G. Sumner, of Yale college.
C. H. Parkhurst, of New York.

ONE OF THE CAUSES OF FRENCH CHEERFULNESS.

An extract from an article entitled "Studies in Cheerfulness," by Max O'Rell, published in The North American Review for January.

One of the causes of French cheerfulness is to be found in the settling of the land question by the French revolution, not in the way I should like it to

be, for I hold that the earth was meant for the human race, and not for a few privileged ones, even if these few were many. Yet, for a hundred years the land in France has been marketable, with the result that we have a contented peasantry, who own their bit of land, live in it and on it, and work it themselves. If the land is not to be nationalized, at any rate it should not be meant to keep three kinds of people, landlords, who do nothing for it, tenants who improve it for landlords, and laborers who starve on it. However, as it is, we have a landed proprietary, happy and contented.

Before the French revolution the land belonged, as it does in England now, to a few dukes, marquises and earls, who, to possess it, only took the trouble to be born. Their ancestors had been given that land as a reward, some for great services rendered to king and country, others for some bellicose exploits that would probably be rewarded to-day with 20 years of penal servitude. But those worthy ancestors of our dukes, marquises and earls were not given that land for nothing; they had some duties to perform in return. In time of war they had to levy troops at their own expense for the defense of the land against a foreign invader. That was the price for their tenure of the land. Their descendants went on keeping the land, but ceased to pay for its defense, and the people found that they had to do this themselves at the price of their own starvation. The difference between the merits of those ancestors and of their descendants is well illustrated by an interesting and amusing incident in Voltaire's life.

Voltaire had taken a box at the opera and was installed in it with ladies, when the duke of Lauzun, one of the worst libertines in the time of Louis XV., arrived and asked for a box. He was respectfully informed that all the boxes were taken. "That may be," he said, "but I see Voltaire in one, turn him out." In those times those things could happen, and Voltaire had to be turned out. No doubt he preferred that to being turned inside the Bastille. He brought action against the duke to recover the price he had paid for the box. "What!" exclaimed the advocate for the duke, "is it M. de Voltaire who dares to plead against the duke of Lauzun, whose great-grandfather was the first to get on the walls of La Rochelle against the Protestants, whose grandfather took 12 cannons from the Dutch at Utrecht, whose father captured two standards from the English at Fontenoy, who—" "Oh, but excuse me," interrupted Voltaire in the court,

"I am not pleading against the duke of Lauzun who was first on the walls of La Rochelle, nor against the duke who took 12 cannons from the Dutch at Utrecht, nor against the duke who captured two standards from the English at Fontenoy; I am pleading against the duke of Lauzun who never captured anything in his life except my box at the opera." It seems to me that this is the whole thing in a nutshell. In spite of warnings coming from all sides, the aristocracy would not see what was going on around them and what was slowly, but surely, coming. The great preacher Massillon, 90 years before the revolution, predicted the downfall of the nobles, but they took no heed. Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau, 70 years later, wrote books. The latter wrote one that was called "The Social Contract." The aristocracy laughed at it and called it a mere theory; but, as Carlyle once said in his own brutal way: "Their skins went to bind the second edition of that book," their land was put up to auction, and the people acquired it. The aristocracy ceased to be a power in the country.

Before the revolution the French peasant was a sort of wild animal, dark, livid, burnt with the sun, bound to the soil, which he dug and stirred with unflagging patience. At night he retired to his den and fed on black bread, water and roots. No wonder that Mme. de Sevigne was able to exclaim: "These people save other men the trouble of sowing, digging and reaping, and deserve not to lack of that bread which they have grown." To-day the French peasant lives in his own cottage and cultivates his own field. His ideal of life is the independence which is the fruit of labor and economy.

AGUINALDO.

For The Public.

A brave young patriot of heroic brand,
Who seems devoted to his native land—
Long may he live to guide that land aright,
In tranquil peace or in the torrid fight;
In council or in battle may he be
Ever victorious and forever free,
And may he lead his people out of strife
To law and liberty and peaceful life.

CHARLES J. BEATTIE.

THE PHILIPPINE TANGLE.

Extract from an article with the above title, by Prof. William James, of Harvard university, published by the Evening Transcript, of Boston, Mass., dated March 1.

What was only vaguely apprehended is now clear with a definiteness that is startling indeed. Here was a people towards whom we felt no ill will, against whom we had not even a slanderous rumor to bring; a people for whose tenacious struggle against their Spanish oppressors we have for years

past spoken (so far as we spoke of them at all) with nothing but admiration and sympathy. Here was a leader who, as the Spanish lies about him, on which we were fed so long, drop off, and as the truth gets more and more known, appears as an exceptionally fine specimen of the patriot and national hero; not only daring, but honest; not only a fighter, but a governor and organizer of extraordinary power. Here were the precious beginnings of an indigenous national life, with which, if we had any responsibilities to these islands at all, it was our first duty to have squared ourselves. Aguinaldo's movement was, and evidently deserved to be, an ideal popular movement, which as far as it had time to exist was showing itself "fit" to survive and likely to become a healthy piece of national self-development. It was all we had to build on, at any rate, so far—if we had any desire not to succeed to the Spaniards' inheritance of native excretion.

And what did our administration do? So far as the facts have leaked out, it issued instructions to the commanders on the ground simply to freeze Aguinaldo out, as a dangerous rival, with whom all compromising entanglement was sedulously to be avoided by the great Yankee business concern. We were not to "recognize" him, we were to deny him all account of our intentions; and in general to refuse any account of our intentions to anybody, except to declare in abstract terms their "benevolence," until the inhabitants, without a pledge of any sort from us, should turn over their country into our hands. Our president's bouffe-proclamation was the only thing vouchsafed: "We are here for your own good; therefore unconditionally surrender to our tender mercies, or we'll blow you into kingdom come."

Our own people meanwhile were vaguely uneasy, for the inhuman callousness and insult shown at Paris and Washington to the officially delegated mouthpieces of the wants and claims of the Filipinos seemed simply abominable from any moral point of view. But there must be reasons of state, we assumed, and good ones. Aguinaldo is evidently a pure adventurer "on the make," a blackmailer, sure in the end to betray our confidence, or our government wouldn't treat him so, for our president is essentially methodical and moral. Mr. McKinley must be in an intolerably perplexing situation, and we must not criticise him too soon. We assumed this, I say, though all the while there was a horribly suspicious

look about the performance. On its face it reeked of the infernal adroitness of the great department store, which has reached perfect expertness in the art of killing silently and with no public squealing or commotion the neighboring small concern.

But that small concern, Aguinaldo, apparently not having the proper American business education, and being uninstructed on the irresistible character of our republican party combine, neither offered to sell out nor to give up. So the administration had to show its hand without disguise. It did so at last. We are now openly engaged in crushing out the sacredest thing in this great human world—the attempt of a people long enslaved to attain to the possession of itself, to organize its laws and government, to be free to follow its internal destinies according to its own ideals. War, said Moltke, aims at destruction, and at nothing else. And splendidly are we carrying out war's ideals. We are destroying the lives of these islanders by the thousand, their villages and their cities; for surely it is we who are solely responsible for all the incidental burnings that our operations entail. But these destructions are the smallest part of our sins. We are destroying down to the root every germ of a healthy national life in these unfortunate people, and we are surely helping to destroy for one generation at least their faith in God and man. No life shall you have, we say, except as a gift from our philanthropy after your unconditional submission to our will. So as they seem to be "slow pay" in the matter of submission, our yellow journals have abundant time in which to raise new monuments of capitals to the victories of Old Glory, and in which to extol the unrestrainable eagerness of our brave soldiers to rush into battles that remind them so much of rabbit hunts on western plains.

It is horrible, simply horrible. Surely there cannot be many born and bred Americans who, when they look at the bare fact of what we are doing, the fact taken all by itself, do not feel this, and do not blush with burning shame at the unspeakable meanness and ignominy of the trick? * * * *

Shall it not in so far forth be execrated by ourselves? Shall the unsophisticated verdict upon its hideousness which the plain moral sense pronounces avail nothing to stem the torrent of mere empty "bigness" in our destiny, before which it is said we must all knock under, swallowing our higher sentiments with a gulp? The issue is perfectly plain at last. We are cold-

bloodedly, wantonly and abominably destroying the soul of a people who never did us an atom of harm in their lives. It is bald, brutal piracy, impossible to dish up any longer in the cold pot-grease of President McKinley's cant at the recent Boston banquet—surely as shamefully evasive a speech, considering the right of the public to know definite facts, as can often have fallen even from a professional politician's lips. The worst of our imperialists is that they do not themselves know where sincerity ends and insincerity begins. Their state of consciousness is so new, so mixed of primitively human passions and, in political circles, of calculations that are anything but primitively human; so at variance, moreover, with their former mental habits; and so empty of definite data and contents; that they face various ways at once, and their portraits should be taken with a squint. One reads the president's speech with a strange feeling—as if the very words were squinting on the page.

The impotence of the private individual, with imperialism under full headway as it is, is deplorable indeed. But every American has a voice or a pen, and may use it. So, impelled by my own sense of duty, I write these present words. One by one we shall creep from cover, and the opposition will organize itself. If the Filipinos hold out long enough, there is a good chance (the canting game being already pretty well played out, and the piracy having to show itself henceforward naked) of the older American beliefs and sentiments coming to their rights again, and of the administration being terrified into a conciliatory policy towards the native government.

NATIONALIZING THE TELEPHONE IN ENGLAND.

According to cable dispatches in the daily papers from London the government has announced its intention to engage in the telephone business, and an appropriation of \$10,000,000 has been asked for the purpose of beginning the work. The details of the government's policy have not been given in the meager dispatches alluded to, but it may be taken for granted from the enthusiastic support which the proposition received in parliament that the enterprise will be given a fair trial by the government. The attitude of the National company in England to-day is somewhat similar to that of the Bell company in this country at the time of the expiration of the fundamental Bell patents. Equally arrogant and hostile to the public, they command little re-

spect and no sympathy in their trial. In this country the result of the policy of the old Bell monopoly is plainly seen in the encouragement that is everywhere extended to independent enterprises. Judging from the expressions of opinion in the English press, the same condition would confront the National company if the field had been thrown open to competition. Whatever the plans of the government may be, it is safe to assume that the public will welcome any change that will promise relief from the obnoxious corporation which now controls the field.—Western Electrician of March 18.

THE TALE OF A FROG WHO LOST HIS TAIL.

For The Public.

I sing of a frog, once a polliwog,
Who his loss did thus bewail:
"Ah, woe is me! Ah, woe is me!
For I have lost my tail.
'Tis not so gay, Dame Nature's way;
I do not like her notion.
I'd rather sail with my polliwog tail;
It helps in locomotion.
And tailless frogs, unlike polliwogs,
On the shore must frisk.
Dangers stand thick; It makes one sick
To think of the awful risk.
For wicked boys, with dreadful noise,
Toward us appear disdainful.
With rocks they whack us on the back;
The shock is very painful."

Said a good old saint, who heard his plaint
(Saints feel for others' woes):
"They re-tail your race; I know the place;
My cart right by it goes."

Scores jumped in the cart, and went to the mart.

Those frogs the saint whole-saled.
Mirabile dictu! Let doubts not afflict you;
Every frog the buyer re-tailed.

Moral:

Ne'er pin your faith on what man saith,
When selfish interests bide.
In nature find infinite mind;
She's safe and honest guide.

BENJAMIN H. DAVIS.

"Why do the roses fade slowly away?"
she inquired, poetically.

"Well," replied the bald-headed young man, "it's more comfortable to have them fade slowly away than to go off all of a sudden like a torpedo."—Washington Star.

Finance and Transportation

BY

JAY D. MILLER.

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

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

"This publication presents in their true light, questions that immediately concern the American people."

Mayor S. M. Jones, Toledo, O.

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

Prof. Geo. D. Herron, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.

"Its facts are presented in a very unprejudiced and helpful spirit, and can not be set aside. I use it among my students and recommend it everywhere."

Louis F. Post, Chicago.

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

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

THE REIGN OF THE PEOPLE BY DIRECT LEGISLATION.

A new lecture by Rev. Samuel P. Dunlop.

In proper cases, no fee charged. For dates, etc., consult Mr. Dunlop by mail or personally, at Maywood, Ill.

OLD SINGLE TAX PAPERS WANTED.

To complete the sets for gift to public libraries there is NOW (April, '99) needed of:
STANDARDS, 1897: Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18; Vol. 2, No. 1. Mail what you can, no matter how mutilated; they are very hard to obtain.
1898: 56, 68, 79, 81, 1289: 108 (Jan. 12), 108, 113, 118, 120, 122, 125, 127, 127, 143, 144, 152, 154, 1890: 181, 186, 190, 191, 190, 202, 1891-92: 216 (Feb. 18), 208.

COULBIERS (old name of present National Single Taxer): 1898-9: Any of first 119 numbers, and No. 148.

THE PUBLIC: Nos. 3, 15, 28.

Please mail to my care any of the above copies that will be spared for this purpose. If sender's address appears on package, postage will be returned, sc. a lb. Will anyone knowing of any portion of an index please inform me.

Ellery Ware Ellis, 26 Morris St., Everett, Mass.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

1101 Chamber of Commerce Building . CHICAGO

The Public Leaflets.

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

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

The following pamphlets are now ready:

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

The Public

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

Subscriptions, 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 522,
Schiffel Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.