

THAT WONDERFUL RIVER.

It is with an increasing sense of awe and wonder that the Chicago public will learn of the latest casualty in proof of the dread fatality which hangs over the Chicago river. Recent events in its history have tended to lift that classic stream far above the level of the ordinary rivers of commerce and give it a new and individual character. Only a few days ago it startled its admirers by the melodramatic feat of catching fire and very nearly burning up. Monday it still further distinguished itself by being struck by lightning, the shock causing it to writhe and tremble on its oozy bed. With only these instances in the public mind, to say nothing of the various collisions which the stream sometimes experiences with toppling bridges or falling trolley cars, it is impossible to say what extraordinary developments may not be forthcoming in future. It will not be at all astonishing to hear that the surprising stream has been held up by highwaymen or looted by porch-climbers, or that it has been carried off bodily by a cyclone. It may be dynamited or it may collapse and fall in upon itself. It is liable to get shot or tangled up in a coal-hole accident or be crushed in a grandstand disaster or a falling-elevator horror.

Evidently there is no sure way of securing protection for it against the fantastic caprices of its destiny. The only thing is to fit it up properly with fire-escapes, lightning rods, cork life-preservers and safety cogs, plaster it over with accident policies and wait in suspense for the next thrilling developments.—The Chicago Record.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST ECHOES FROM ENGLAND.

Letters published in London Morning Leader of Mar. 15.

A PRO-BOER.

Sir:—Your readers may be interested in this conversation:

First Speaker—Well, and what may be your opinion of this war?

Second Speaker—All I say about the war is this: God defend the right.

First Speaker—Ah! I see. You are a pro-Boer.

Yours, etc.,

NEW LEADERITE.

New Southgate.

IMPERIALISM.

Sir:—May I report two current aspects of imperialism? First, the raw material, popularly voiced:

There ain't another nation as can

touch us! France couldn't come nigh us; let her try, she'd get one! Nor Germany neither; we'd give Germany something if she interfered. And as for the Boers, look how cruel they've been to a lot of our poor fellows. But there won't be one of them left soon, I tell ye!

The polished version taught by the lady mother to her child:

And so, darling, one nation after another becomes English in order that they may enjoy the blessings of our civilization and religion. Even the Boers, who are so very cruel to the natives, will be good and happy when they are properly ruled by us.—Yes, mother, we shall make them Christians if we fight long enough!

Both these are from the life.—Yours, etc.,

C. E. PLAYNE.

27 Church-row, Hampstead, N. W.

MOB LAW.

Sir: In view of the promise made by Mr. Balfour, of consultation with the home secretary concerning the reign of mob law in England, it might be of interest to your readers if you were to print the following brief statement as to the nature and extent of the outrages against liberty which have been committed in England and Scotland in the last few weeks.

Paddington.—Attack on Liberal club, where peace meeting was being held. Windows wrecked.

Sheffield.—Private meeting abandoned owing to newspaper incitements to violence.

York.—Meeting abandoned owing to threats of violence.

West Bromwich.—Meeting broken up by rowdy mob.

*Canterbury.—Smashing of a Northgate tradesman's windows.

*Ramsgate.—Smashing of a local tradesman's windows.

Exeter Hall.—Abortive attempt to break up ticket meeting. Stewards assaulted.

*Midhurst.—Attacks on houses of local residents. Windows broken.

Gloucester.—Lecture in Cooperative hall. Promoters of meeting assaulted. Windows of two houses smashed.

Gloucester.—Member of "Stop the War" committee mobbed. Windows of house in which he took refuge broken.

*Weston-super-Mare.—Attacks on houses of alleged pro-Boers. Windows smashed.

Alveston.—Meeting of conciliation committee abandoned owing to disturbance in hall.

Highbury.—Open-air meeting broken up and dispersed by police.

Northampton.—Meeting at town hall prevented by violence. Speakers assaulted.

New-Cross.—Lecture by Dr. Clark abandoned owing to threatened rowdyism.

*Peterhead.—Attacks on houses of two residents; windows broken.

*Stratford-on-Avon.—Windows of two anti-war tradesmen smashed, and other damage done.

*Redruth.—A prominent opponent of the war tarred in the public street.

Leicester.—Ticket meeting broken up owing to violence of mob, who obtained admittance by forged tickets.

*Brierley Hill.—House of local preacher broken into.

Dundee.—Meeting at Gilfillan hall broken up by mob. Attack on house of Rev. W. Walsh; windows broken.

Edinburgh.—Ticket meeting broken up and speakers brutally assaulted.

Glasgow.—Organized attempt to break up a public meeting foiled by physical force of stewards. Windows of "Labor Leader" afterwards smashed by mob.

Gateshead.—Ticket meeting abandoned by advice of police, who had to protect Dr. Watson's house from violence.

Derby.—Conference abandoned owing to printed incitements to violence.

*Norwich.—Firing into house of local resident.

Scarborough.—Private meeting in cafe attacked. Rowntree's cafe wrecked. Other premises smashed, soldiers called out. Ticket meeting abandoned.

Reading.—Ticket meeting abandoned under threat of violence.

At those places marked with an asterisk the attacks on person and property were not provoked by any meeting, public or private.

From this list it will be seen that the organized outrages upon the members of the minority have not been provoked by any attempt to challenge public opinion, with one exception; and at Glasgow, which was an open meeting, thanks to the precautions taken by the stewards, the efforts of the mob were futile, notwithstanding the strange inaction of the police. In all the other cases the meetings were either ticket meetings or private assemblies.

If this is persisted in, it will inevitably result in civil war. Englishmen, although in a minority, will not long submit to the rabbling of their premises and the suppression of the right of free speech without making resistance, which in the first case will take the form of free fights, rapidly developing into bloody riot. Yours, etc,

W. T. STEAD.

THE FILIPINO ASPIRATIONS.

Extracts from an article in the February North American Review, on "Our Rule in the Philippines," by Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Anderson, U. S. A., late major general, U. S. V., in command of the first expeditionary land force from the United States to the Philippine Islands.

On the 1st of July, 1898, I called on Aguinaldo with Admiral Dewey. He asked me at once whether "the United States of the north" either had recognized or would recognize his government. I am not quite sure as to the form of his question, whether it was "had" or "would." In either form it was embarrassing. My orders were, in

substance, to effect a landing, establish a base, not to go beyond the zone of naval cooperation, to consult Admiral Dewey and to wait for Merritt. Aguinaldo had proclaimed his government only a few days before (June 28), and Admiral Dewey had no instructions as to that assumption. The facts as to the situation at that time I believe to be these: Consul Williams states in one of his letters to the state department that several thousand Tagals were in open insurrection before our declaration of war with Spain. I do not know as to the number, yet I believe the statement has foundation in fact. Whether Admiral Dewey and Consul Pratt, Wildman and Williams did or did not give Aguinaldo assurances that a Filipino government would be recognized, the Filipinos certainly thought so, probably inferring this from their acts rather than from their statements. If an incipient rebellion was already in progress, what could be inferred from the fact that Aguinaldo and 13 other banished Tagals were brought down on a naval vessel and landed in Cavite? Admiral Dewey gave them arms and ammunition, as I did subsequently, at his request. They were permitted to gather up a lot of arms which the Spaniards had thrown into the bay; and, with the 4,000 rifles taken from Spanish prisoners and 2,000 purchased in Hong-Kong, they proceeded to organize three brigades and also to arm a small steamer they had captured. I was the first to tell Admiral Dewey that there was any disposition on the part of the American people to hold the Filipinos, if they were captured. The current of opinion was setting that way when the first expeditionary force left San Francisco, but this the admiral had no reason to surmise. But to return to our interview with Aguinaldo.

I told him I was acting only in a military capacity; that I had no authority to recognize his government; that we had come to whip the Spaniards, and that, if we were successful, the indirect effect would be to free them from Spanish tyranny. I added that, as we were fighting a common enemy, I hoped we would get along amicably together. He did not seem pleased with this answer. The fact is, he hoped and expected to take Manila with Admiral Dewey's assistance, and he was bitterly disappointed when our soldiers landed at Cavite. . . .

The origin of our controversies and conflicts with the Filipinos can, as already explained, be traced back to our refusal to recognize the political au-

thority of Aguinaldo. Our first serious break with them arose from our refusal to let them cooperate with us. About nine o'clock on the evening of August 12, I received from Gen. Merritt an order to notify Aguinaldo to forbid the Filipino insurgents under his command from entering Manila. This notification was delivered to him at twenty minutes past ten that night. The Filipinos had made every preparation to assail the Spanish lines in their front. Certainly, they would not have given up part of their line to us unless they thought they were to fight with us. They, therefore, received Gen. Merritt's interdict with anger and indignation. They considered the war as their war, and Manila as their capital, and Luzon as their country. . . .

There is a great diversity of opinion as to whether a conflict with the Filipinos could not have been avoided if a more conciliatory course had been followed in dealing with them. I believe we came to a parting of the ways when we refused their request to leave their military force in a good strategic position on the contingency of our making peace with Spain without a guarantee of their independence. From what was known of the situation, our government was justified in not recognizing Aguinaldo's authority as a de facto government. For, even if it had been determined to recognize an independent Filipino government, it did not follow that we should recognize a self-appointed junta as constituting a government. On the other hand, the dicta of international law that, in war, the powers of the military occupant are absolute and supreme and immediately operate upon the political conditions of the inhabitants—which the president made the basis of his instructions to Gen. Merritt—could only be made to apply to the Philippines by a very liberal construction.

Was Luzon a conquered country? We held Manila and Cavite. The rest of the island was held not by the Spaniards, but by the Filipinos. On the other islands, the Spaniards were confined to two or three fortified towns. At the time referred to, we could not claim to hold by purchase, for we had not then received Spain's quit-claim deed to the archipelago. Making allowance for difference of time, we took Manila, almost to the hour when the peace preliminaries were signed in Washington. . . .

To return to the question of conciliation, one of Aguinaldo's commission, who was subsequently a member of his cabinet, said to me: "Either we have a de facto government or we have not.

If we have, why not recognize the fact? If not, why have you recognized us at all?" This last remark referred to Gen. Merritt's conceding them the control of the Manila water-works, and to Gen. Otis's attempts to negotiate with them without committing himself.

There were other causes of antagonism. Our soldiers, to get what they considered trophies, did a good deal of what the Filipinos considered looting. A number made debts which they did not find it convenient to pay. They called the natives "niggers," and often treated them with a good-natured condescension which exasperated the natives all the more because they feared to resent it.

Thus it happened that the common people, from at first hailing us as deliverers, got to regarding us as enemies.

THE MAN WITH HIS EAR TO THE GROUND.

For The Public.

Bowed by the weight of policy he bends
One ear unto the ground, to note the hoarse
Vox populi, or what he thinks is that.

The other ear he holds aloft to catch
The faintest coolings of the subtle Trusts.
The willness of ages in his face,
And in his back a double curvature.

Who made him numb to sense of right and
wrong,

An apt time-server, skillful caterer,
Crafty and cunning, a brother to the fox?
Ye gods and fish, mark well that attitude!
Who put the limppness in that spine,
That he doth face two ways at once,
And still more ways, if policy demands?

O, emperors, kings, and rulers in all lands,
This is th' American you long have sought
And mourned because you found him not.
Your wish would never straighten up this
shape,

But keep it thus through all eternity,
A stranger to the music and the dreams,
The inspirations of the patriot dead.

O people, only sovereigns of these States,
Is this the pilot Nature-formed to guide,
Whose hand unsteady on the helm,
And mind alert to catch the passing whim?
How fares the Ship of State in storm-
vexed times?

Will this gyrating Thing lead safely past
The shoals and breakers, into quiet seas?

X. C. DINGPOOR.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Land Question from Various Points of View," published by C. L. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, Pa.), contains an interesting collection of essays on this subject from the pens of different writers. On the title page the collection is described as "a study in search of the highest truth and best policy and not a propaganda print." The opening essay, by C. L. Taylor, gives briefly a history of land tenures and titles, and makes suggestions for land tenure reform. This is followed by an account of the distribution of land in various countries; while ex-Congressman Davis, of Kansas, contributes a paper on alien landlordism in America. The American system of distributing the public