

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FETICH WORSHIP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NEWS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When asked how long it would take to subdue the Philippines, Gen. Otis is described as turning around in his chair, hesitating, and finally saying: I can talk no more to-day.

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

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

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