

plan had given them credit for being, and they kept open their line of retreat. Thus far the fighting has been with their rear guard; and that has been hard enough. But owing to the failure of the original plan for cutting them in two, much harder fighting must be undergone before the capital of the brave little republic falls. And even when it falls, if the Filipinos keep their line of retreat open, they will realize their plans; for their evident object is to draw the American troops into the interior, where they may be worried by hard marching, desultory fighting and disease. Meantime the American list of killed and wounded is sadly growing, and further reinforcements are demanded; while Filipino cities and villages are smoking ruins, and, if American reports be true, thousands of the people have been killed. It is a terrible lesson that imperialism has to teach. And to us it is a humiliating lesson also. Heretofore, if American warfare was sanguinary, it has with one exception been honorable in purpose, as well as courageous in execution. But in this war, the courage of our troops but emphasizes the shamefulness of the cause in which they die.

Further evidence of prosperity has been telegraphed from San Francisco. Leland Stanford's widow is richer by \$1,000,000 than she was four months ago—all on account of this era of marvelous prosperity. Four months ago her Central Pacific stock was worth only \$20 a share; but it has risen now to \$52, at which figure Mrs. Stanford has sold enough shares to give her \$1,000,000 more than she could have got for them four months ago. She certainly will not join the calamity howlers in complaining of continued hard times. With an increase in her fortune in four months equal to the earnings of 5,000 Central Pacific brakemen in that time, or as much as one brakeman would get in nearly 2,000 years, the business situation must be highly satisfactory to her. She ought to be gratefully willing to

contribute to the McKinley-Hanna campaign fund for 1900. We have yet to hear, though, of any increase in the wages of Central Pacific employes. The glorious sun of our marvelous prosperity shines only on stockholders; workers remain in shadow.

Fifteen hundred employees in the tin can factory at Maywood are testifying vigorously to their extraordinary prosperity by striking for a restoration of the higher wages that they received in the dark days of 1896.

Every now and again complaints are made of the superfluity of professional men. Not long ago a metropolitan paper, in calling attention to the subject, strenuously urged professional schools to advance their standards and expand their terms of study, so as to discourage the multiplication of doctors, lawyers and clergymen. Its idea was that this would force young men into "productive industries and scientific vocations" where they are needed." And that is a general supposition. The notion prevails that opportunities are few in the professions, but abundant in other callings. But it is a false notion. Opportunities are no better, if as good, in the so-called productive occupations than in the professions; while in the latter the prizes are more alluring and numerous. A lawyer or a doctor of ordinary abilities, has as good a chance of making a living, as a civil, mechanical or electrical engineer or even a mechanic, of ordinary abilities. If of extraordinary abilities, his chance of a prize in life is infinitely greater. There is nothing exceptional in the fact that the professions are crowded. They are crowded because all vocations are. Trade union restrictions in the mechanical trades are just as necessary for the protection of those already inside as they are in the professions.

Altgeld has made a strong fight, and the indications at this hour are that it will be successful. He has forced both opposing candidates into adopting the principle of municipal

ownership of public utilities, and he has made it clear that but for his candidacy there would be no democrat in the field for the Chicago mayoralty. The nominal democratic candidate avoids all reference to democracy either as a party or a principle. This fact alone caused such influential democrats as William P. Black and William Prentiss to come out for Altgeld as the only democratic candidate. That occurred last week. This week, the Altgeld forces are being strengthened by men who like to be on the winning side. Upon the result of this Chicago election depends in great degree the complexion of the democratic national convention; and it looks now as if that convention would again take its color from Bryan and Altgeld rather than from Flower and Croker.

In California, church property is not exempt from taxation; but some churchmen there are now agitating for exemptions. They would be offended if the essential similarity of theirs to other schemes for public plunder were frankly pointed out; yet such similarity exists. A church is not a public institution. It is private property. While it may be useful to the public, so are stores and factories. There is no better reason, then, for exempting the one than the other. And the exemption of either, unduly burdens the other. True, church buildings and books and furniture ought not to be taxed. They are produced by the congregation. The state does not provide them, nor give value to them, nor otherwise acquire moral rights in or to any part of them. But then that is also true of factory buildings and machinery and stores and store goods. It is not true, however, of church sites. Church sites, like factory and store sites, are secured to the occupants by the state, and their value is caused by the community without special effort on the part of owners. Those sites should be taxed in proportion to their value. The fact that a site is used for a church should make no difference. Exemptions on that account would unjustly discriminate not only

between church people and others, but between the churches themselves. When churches are exempt from taxation, rich congregations are favored in far greater degree than poor ones; and the members of poor ones have to help make up the difference.

One of the Washington correspondents has discovered in the record of American exports and imports from the beginning, what he naively calls "an interesting showing of stupendous prosperity." According to this exhibit, the people of the United States, from the adoption of the constitution to the present time, have exported more than they have imported, to the amount of \$972,241,493 in merchandise, and \$1,460,473,261 in gold and silver—an aggregate excess of exports of \$2,432,714,759. That is called "stupendous prosperity"! But in what does the prosperity consist? If we have sent out more than we have taken in, for a century, it can hardly be argued that a debt has been accumulating abroad in our favor. For if our foreign debtors do not balance accounts in a hundred years, but "get into us" in that time to the lively tune of \$2,432,714,759, we have no reason for ever expecting a settlement. And as to having the balance paid to us in gold and silver, why, of gold and silver as well as of merchandise, we have been sending away more than we have been getting back.

The truth about our exports and imports is that our excess of exports goes largely to pay dividends, interest and rents to foreign owners of American stocks, bonds and lands. Instead of implying that we are growing prosperous, our excess of exports goes to prove that we are being drained. For 100 years our wealth has been flowing to Europe in a steady stream at the rate of nearly \$25,000,000 a year in excess of the return stream; and our business men tell us that therefore we are prosperous! If this indicates the quality of business brains, it is not strange that 95 per cent. of our business men fail every generation. Men

who think that they prosper by their outgo instead of their income might be expected to fail.

It is observed in Washington official circles that a strong sentiment in favor of annexation to the United States is spreading through Cuba. Washington official circles would be the most likely place for observing the Cuban pulse in such a matter. Let us hope, though, that the Manila method will not be adopted at Washington for promoting the Cuban sentiment.

THE MENACE OF HERRONISM.

In George D. Herron, professor of applied Christianity at Iowa college, plutocracy recognizes a dangerous character. He says too much, writes too much, thinks too much, and worse than all else stimulates too much thought among the impoverished people. Therefore plutocracy sets out to silence him.

Before we speak of this in detail, however, let us stop to explain what we mean by "plutocracy." We do not mean the rich merely because they are rich. It is quite possible for men as rich as Croesus to be democrats; and it is certain that there are men as poor as Job's turkey who are plutocrats. Plutocracy means not the rich class, but government by or for the rich; and he is a plutocrat, be he rich or poor, who gives aid and encouragement to that idea of government.

It is, then, not to the rich that we allude when we say that plutocracy has set out to silence Prof. Herron. Far from it. There are among the rich those who sympathize with his work, just as 19 centuries ago some of the rich stood by the Carpenter whose message Herron bears. But rich men who regard their wealth as giving them authority to govern, in state and college and church, together with a host of middle class and even impoverished worshipers of wealth, do fear the effect upon disinherited mankind of Herron's searching moral probe and his bold social diagnosis. It is to them that we refer. They are the plutocrats who aim to silence him.

For more than a year plutocratic

efforts have been made to oust Herron from his chair in Iowa college. The ostensible reason is that his theories of Christianity as applied to modern life prevent graduates of the college from getting employment as teachers and preachers, and consequently deprive the college of student material. This, however, is evidently only a pretext. The real reason comes now and then to the surface like a whale to blow. Prof. Herron's teaching in the college discourages plutocratic rich men from making endowments. It is lack of endowments and not of students that gives offense. The fact that Iowa college is the only western college of wide repute which is under no obligations to mammon, is felt as a blemish. It is in truth a glorious distinction.

Some idea of what it is in Prof. Herron's teachings that so disturbs the placidity of plutocrats and staves off coveted endowments, may be derived from a Chicago episode of the past week.

Herron had been invited to supply the place temporarily of Rev. Dr. Thomas before the congregation of the People's church, which meets Sunday mornings in McVicker's theater. Dr. Thomas is a man of liberal ideas, a democrat in the fundamental as distinguished from the party sense, and a religious as distinguished from a pietistic preacher; while his congregation has regarded itself and been regarded as devoted to the truths of Christianity rather than the pretenses of churchianity.

Meetings of this congregation, filling the large theater, sat under all the sermons that Herron preached. The congregation was not only satisfied; it became enthusiastic, as all audiences do that surrender to the persuasiveness of Herron's arguments and the charm of his oratory.

But on the last Sunday but one that Herron was to supply Dr. Thomas's place, he made some of his offensive applications of Christian principles; and upon the demand of one aggressively plutocratic trustee, seconded by others of the subservient type, he was forbidden to complete his engagement with Dr. Thomas.