

THE FILIPINO GOVERNMENT.

A correspondent asks the Post: "Had the Filipinos any organized government prior to the battle of Manila?" And the Post replies: "The Filipinos had no more government prior to that time than the Cuban insurgents had prior to the landing of Shafter's expedition near Santiago—that is to say, none at all."

Can we not arrive at a more definite answer? United States Consul Williams wrote home from Manila February 22, 1898: "A republic is organized here." Faust says in "Campaigning in the Philippines:" "They had a well-defined form of government, which not only made provision for its permanence, but also for the social well-being of the property and person of the subject." United States Consul Wildman at Hong-Kong reported to Secretary of State Day, under date of November 3, 1897, (six months before the battle of Manila): "Since arrival at Hong-Kong I have been called upon by Agoncillo, foreign agent and high commissioner, etc., of the new republic in the Philippines. Mr. Agoncillo holds a commission signed by the president, members of the cabinet, and general in chief of the republic of the Philippines, empowering him to conclude treaties with foreign governments. Mr. Agoncillo offers on behalf of his government an alliance, offensive and defensive, with the United States, when the United States declares war with Spain, which, in Mr. Agoncillo's judgment, will be soon."

This looks very much as if there was a civil government in the Philippines before the battle of Manila, and civil government that was capable of doing things. And there is other testimony. A correspondent of the People's Paper, Minneapolis, Lieut. Martin E. Tew, U. S. V., speaking of the results of the revolution of 1897, says: "In each captured town or city the revolutionists immediately organized a local government, consisting of president and councilmen. Every important town or city had its police force and court of justice. Peace and good order prevailed. Schools were established." This looks very much indeed like civil government. Messrs. Wilcox and Sargent, who were sent through Luzon by Dewey just after the battle of Manila, testify to being cordially received by mayors, councilmen and judges, the successors of previous civil incumbents.

It would, I think, be more nearly correct to say that there never was a time before the battle of Manila when the Filipinos did not have a civil government. It is notorious that the military government of the Spaniards included only a few of the cities and seacoast towns. Is it conceivable that 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 people got along for years, generations, and centuries without a government? And the testimony which Messrs. Wilcox and Sargent bear to the prosperity, good order, happiness and intelligence of the people implies that they not only had a government, but had a very good government indeed. What kind of a government have they now?—W. A. Croffut, in Washington (D. C.) Post.

THE FIFTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.
REASONS WHY THE PEOPLE SHOULD
BE GRATEFUL TO THE REPUBLICAN
PARTY.

For The Public.

I was having a slight attack of the blues, on account of too much rain, and being on the wrong side of the market, when I met Congressman Boyman, of the Ninety-First district, the other night. He cured me of the blues in about ten minutes. He told me about the things the Republican party had done for the people, and, although he started the vibrations in the right direction, and broke up the blues, I can hardly believe the Republican party is as good as the Congressman thinks it is, and would like to have my doubts resolved, in one way or the other. The Congressman was confidential and smooth, but he did not impress upon me the necessity of secrecy, and perhaps some other poor man, out of a job, and trying to guess which side of the market is the right one, may get some comfort out of his revelations.

The first thing he told me was that the Fifty-seventh Congress, which is conceded to be a Republican Congress, had appropriated \$1,059,557,052 at the session just ended. I began to feel rich as soon as he mentioned this, and then I began to shudder as I thought how that statement would read if some ill-disposed person should put "stolen" in the place of appropriated. But the Congressman seemed real pleased with the dimensions of the appropriation (steal), and remarked that it was only about \$15 for each man, woman and child in the republic, and the man who was supporting a wife and ten children on \$11.40 a week couldn't feel it, much. If he did feel pinched, he wouldn't know

what hurt him, and then I felt richer than ever. My opulence became almost oppressive. But this was not a tithe of the things the party had done for the people. Look at the Panama-Nicaraguan-Roosevelt canal, and think of the many jobs and appropriations yet to come from that, and feel poor and blue if you can.

Then there are the war revenue taxes that were repealed. The people ought to be so very grateful to be relieved from the job of licking stamps that they would give the party a perpetual lease of power. It is probable they will, unless something should happen to mar the prosperity of the trusts.

"We have also redeemed other pledges made to the people," said the Congressman; and then I thought how they had busted up all the trusts (in their minds), and I felt richer than ever, and so happy that I didn't care which way the wheat market went.

The Congressman also remarked that what we had done for Cuba in the matter of reciprocity ought to entitle the Fifty-seventh to a gilt frame and the best place in the front parlor, and I didn't know whether to agree with him or not, because I can't see any way to reconcile the conflicting claims of the sugar refiners and the beet sugar combination, without bringing grief to somebody. I have become so used to paying two cents a pound, or thereabouts, more for my sugar to help out the suffering people that are starving to death in these twin INDUSTRIES, that I hate to give up the benevolent feeling that comes over me whenever I taste sugar, and wish the Congressmen wouldn't fool around the reciprocity buzz-saw any more.

But the revelation the Congressman made about the Philippines made me feel happier than anything. The great measure of good government and human liberty that we are giving to those down-trodden people never dawned upon me till the Hon. Boyman explained it to me. Any people on the face of the earth ought to be happy to be governed by a commission of the most expert republican politicians appointed by the President of the United States, backed up by the army and navy. Think of the trouble these appointees will save the poor Filipinos in the matter of governing themselves. It is a serious thing for a people to try to get along without somebody to look after them, and levy taxes on their property. When the commission takes hold of things out there, and gets through levying taxes and ap-

pointing office holders, the Filipinos will have no trouble at all about counting their money, and they ought to be happy. Then the Congressman told me of the good things the party is going to do for the people at the next session, which I will not reveal until I can borrow money enough to pay my rent, or pacify the landlord in some other way.

JACKSON BIGGLES.

THE SINGLE TAX.

Mr. Henry George published in 1879 his "Progress and Poverty." In this he sought to find the reason for the "persistence of poverty amidst advancing wealth." He said that had an eighteenth century man like Franklin or Priestley been able to pierce the future and foresee the mechanical triumphs of the nineteenth century he would have assumed that poverty must necessarily have disappeared like an evil dream. But it remains. The race is disappointed. They have assumed the failure to be temporary: to be due to monarchy, standing armies, defective money systems, tariffs and the like; but the situation exists amidst all forms of government, tariff systems, money and military systems. A common effect must be traceable to a common cause. What is it?

Strangely, the trouble seems to lie in the fact itself of industrial progress, the very object of our admiration and worship. In a new country, crude and undeveloped, the social problem does not exist. Great wealth is absent, but so is intense poverty. A substantial equality reigns. But with progress comes poverty. Behind the palace stands the hovel. Boulevard is balanced by slum; the companion-piece of the millionaire is the proletaire. Where progress has achieved its highest triumphs extremes meet. Why?

The authorities trace the trouble to our productive system. Too little capital, they say, exists; labor is dependent upon capital for a living. If wages are low and men unemployed the reason is that there is not enough available capital to employ them. The solution, then, must be found in our working harder, saving more closely and thus increasing the capital of the community with the hope that labor may obtain a portion of this capital in wages.

The weakness of this explanation is evident when we remember that in the new country where capital is absent extreme poverty is also ab-

sent, and that it is in the city where capital abounds that poverty festers and dark alleys breed the fiercer vandals and more hideous Huns which Macaulay prophesied would destroy our civilization.

The authorities next lay the blame on labor. This, they say, is too abundant. Animals multiply as fast as their food supply will permit; and man is but an animal. However great the annual output of wealth the supply of population will rise to meet it as the volume of a gas expands to fill its confining body, however much the size of that body may be expanded. Poverty thus lies in the nature of man himself, and, unless he can overcome the propensity whereby he increases like the beasts that perish, he must reconcile himself to the conclusion that "the poor we (shall) have always with us."

Like the first, however, this argument will not bear inspection. If men multiplied as fast as their means would permit we could have no comfortable class—which we have—to say nothing of a millionaire class. The little savings would promptly be swallowed up by the new mouths; the millionaire would count his family by the tens of thousands and soon all would sink back together into the social swamp.

Further, the very conditions which economists charge up to an increasing population can be found in their worst form in a country with a diminishing population. Ireland affords the classic example, and the famine-slaughter of millions in India leaves poverty there as gaunt and terrible as before.

Finally, in England, the home of Malthusianism, "in spite of an unexampled increase in numbers, the wealth annually produced . . . per head (during the nineteenth century, has nearly doubled."

If, then, neither insufficient capital nor superabundant labor be the cause let us turn from wealth-production to wealth-distribution. This, the economists have taught, separates wealth into three grand shares—wages for labor, interest for capital and rent for land. Further, one of these Ricardo has taught and George has emphasized tends like the lean kine of Pharaoh's dream to swallow up everything else. It is Rent. Every increase in population, every new invention, every improvement in industry, government, education or social condition tends to raise rent. This increase comes in large part out of the other two shares, wages and interest, as shown by the impoverishment of

labor and the fall in the rate of interest. Progress intensifies this condition. It is as though a great wedge were thrust horizontally through society, splitting it into two classes, a handful of rent-recipients rising ever higher in affluence and an army of producers, laborers and capitalists sinking ever lower under the resistless pressure.

What, then, is the remedy? To abolish rent? No; this is impossible. Rent is indestructible. It must be taken from the land owner and given to the people. This can be done by taxation. The resulting revenues will be so abundant as to make all other taxation superfluous. Further, no other tax is just. Gradually, then, abolish all other taxation, straight and crooked, and absorb all rent by the "Single Tax on the Value of Land." This, the public collection of rent, will break land monopoly, afford employment to labor and capital, release from the cities the pent-up thousands, open the social safety valve and prevent the coming explosion, solve the social problem, establish distributive justice and make possible the Golden Age.—Prof. Thomas Elmer Will, in the "Multitude."

DISINFECTION VERSUS VACCINATION.

In the April (1902) Arena, the editor, Mr. B. O. Flower, offered editorially the following interesting and suggestive account of "How Cleveland Stamped Out Smallpox."

Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, Ohio, is unquestionably the bravest, strongest, most sanely progressive and fearlessly true municipal chief in America to-day. He has achieved victories for honest economic and social government in the face of the most powerful and determined opposition, and the only reason that his victories have not been more sweeping and state-wide in influence has been due to the almost invincible influence of corrupt interests long entrenched in power and waxing great through injustice and at the expense of the people. The true statesmanlike qualities that mark Mr. Johnson's public work are as conspicuously illustrated in his wisdom in selecting men to assist him in municipal duties as in his magnificent personal fight made in the interests of juster social and economic conditions, and in his efforts to call American citizens back to the democratic ideals that are the hope of free government.

A striking illustration of this keen discernment in the selection of men charged with the most weighty re-