

Uncle Mark has been making strenuous efforts to get an arbitration started in this case and says that the operators refuse to make any concessions, so that the strike will go on, the captains of industry will suffer from the unjust condemnation of the public, and Uncle Mark will lose some more reputation.

All because the public does not understand the situation.

It takes money to make a captain of industry. A very little money will do if some other things go along with it. It also takes brains. Just the common ordinary kind of brains won't do for the captain of industry. He must have the kind that runs mostly to acquisitiveness, and feels that the earth was made for those who know how to grab it.

But money and brains alone wouldn't make a captain of industry in a thousand years. It takes something else in combination to perfect the thing.

It takes a whole lot of people that agree with the captain of industry, that the earth was made for those who know how to grab it. Then the combination is complete, and it takes but a little while to bring around the conditions where we have a strike, and a committee of mediation on strikes that can't do anything because the operators will make no concessions.

To be reasonable about the matter, why should they make concessions? They have grabbed the coal mines—pretty much all of them—and the people agree that the coal mines were made for the brainy ones that know how to grab things. There is nothing to quarrel about so far.

They have grabbed the highways that the people must use in going to and fro, and the terminal locations that are necessary for the distribution of the coal, but the people agree that these things were made for those who know enough to get here early and grab them. In that view of the matter there is no ground for complaint. If there is any fault it is in the mutual agreement that the earth, including the coal mines, was made for the grabbers.

A superficial view of things shows quite a margin between 78 cents a day for coal miners and \$8 a ton for the coal, but between these extremes there are the captains of industry and the mutual agreement

of all parties, that the grabbing of things is righteousness, and that the ownership of the earth, whereby we can get something for nothing, is Christianity.

Here and there we have a befogged intellect that holds that the way to get wealth is to earn it, and that we should be ashamed to get wealth for which we render no equivalent, but most of the people agree with the captains of industry and go around looking for soft snaps.

Why should we, who believe in the religion of soft snaps, blame the people who have found what we are looking for?

The coal operators have certainly a firm grip on one of the soft snaps, but they have it under the rules of the game that the people hold as fair. The rules invariably work so as to give the miners the hovel and the crust, and the operators the palace and the porterhouse steaks.

It would seem that, when the crust becomes too hard and scant, the proper thing to do would be to move to amend the rules of the game.

Perhaps the soft snaps may be abolished.

It is not likely any such motion will be made at this time, but this plea on behalf of the captains of the coal industry is respectfully submitted.

JACKSON BIGGLES.

THE NATIONAL POLICY THAT WOULD ENNOBLE.

Extract from a paper on "Our Foreign Policy," read before the Philosophical Society, of Denver, April 10, 1902, by Louis R. Ehrlich.

Above the din and clash and jostle of our times we must keep our eyes fixed on the realities which are eternal. As Emerson says: "Great men are they who see that spiritual is stronger than any material force." We will indorse Ruskin's sentiment: "A nation's real strength and happiness do not depend on properties and territories, nor on machinery for their defense; but on getting such territory as they have, well filled with none but respectable persons." Let us recognize with Sumner that "our country, right or wrong," is "a sentiment dethroning God and enthroning the devil." Let us say with Garrison: "My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind," and with the eastern sage: "Let no man glory in this, that he loves his country; let him rather glory in this, that he

loves his kind." We must accept the noble thought expressed by the great political philosopher of all times: "There is one thing, and one thing only, which defies all mutation—that which existed before the world, and which survive the fabric of the world itself: I mean justice—that justice which, emanating from the divinity, has a place in the breast of every one of us, given for our guide with regard to ourselves and with regard to others, and which will stand after this globe is turned to ashes." Let history teach us, as bearing on our own fame in the eyes of posterity, that those nations only are cherished and glorified in the memory of mankind which have ministered to the higher spiritual possessions of the race; and may we realize that the living of to-day, who best represent the intellect, the conscience, and the truest ambitions, would rather have been a citizen of little Athens in the days of Pericles, than of Macedon under all-conquering Alexander, or of mighty Rome when she had the world at her feet. And, finally, as the world-test and time-test of the true relation of values, let us remember that above all the pomp of power and the adulation of force, above all kings and conquerors, above all the strenuous apostles of individual or national selfishness, the races of man, with unerring instinct, have, age after age, extolled and worshiped even as gods those prophets who humbly taught the law of love, the law of service, and the lesson "On earth peace, good will toward men." . . .

In taking up the question of the Philippines, I confess that I find it difficult to express myself in moderation. How can it be otherwise when we grasp the full and terrible import of the fact that a war begun to give freedom to one race should have led to the wanton sacrifice of fully 5,000 American lives, of 50,000 Filipino lives, and between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000, in a war to deny freedom to another race—a race of whose existence most of us were hardly aware, who had never done us any injury, who met us in the spirit of alliance and friendship, and whose only crime is that passion for independence which is our own proudest possession and boast. From that day nearly four years ago, when, with the full knowledge of our representatives in the east—our consul and our naval commanders—the Filipino insurgents issued their first proclamation, read-

ing: "Compatriots: Divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach, and in a way the most free and independent nation could hardly wish for. . . . There where you see the American flag flying, assemble in numbers; they are our redeemers;" from that day to this, our treatment of these unfortunate people has been one unbroken tissue of deceit, of bad faith, of savage cruelty, and of hypocritical cant. Shall I dwell on the consenting and deceiving silence of Admiral Dewey? Or on the early Machiavellian subterfuges of Gen. Anderson? Or on the extraordinary spectacle of Gen. Otis revising and sugar-coating the famous or infamous "benevolent assimilation" proclamation of his commander-in-chief, because, as he had the effrontery to say: "It was my opinion that I would be justified in so amending the paper that the beneficent (?) object of the United States government would be brought clearly within the comprehension of the people"? Even at this late hour we are winking at the circulation of a petition by the so-called Philippine federal party, of which the three native members of the Philippine commission are the leaders, in which the false and deceptive hope is held out that we may temporarily make the islands a territory of the United States, with intent, in course of time, to incorporate them as a state in the union.

Two years ago President Roosevelt published a work, containing the following sentence: "It may be the highest duty to oppose a war before it is brought on, but once the country is at war, the man who fails to support it with all possible heartiness, comes perilously near being a traitor." According to this extraordinary dictum the Filipino who refuses to support the war against the United States would come "perilously near being a traitor" to his country. In other words, it was the duty of every Filipino patriot to fight us. That is undoubtedly what Mr. Roosevelt would have done if he had been a Filipino. And yet, after having ruthlessly slaughtered these patriot Filipinos for three successive years, and although the slaughter continues, our president proclaims in his message: "We hope to do for them what has never before been done for any people of the tropics—to make them fit for self-government, after the fashion of the really free nations." A strange method this of making a peo-

ple fit for self-government—the killing of the very men whose loyalty and devotion to their country's cause must fitly stamp them as its noblest and most necessary leaders. Is it not the best, and, in fact, the only way, in which to fit a people "for self-government after the fashion of the really free nations," to give them the exercise of free speech, of free press, and of free thought-interchange? Yet the Philippine treason law, enacted a few months ago, punishes by severe fine and extended imprisonment, and without jury trial, any Filipino who continues membership in any society having for its object "the promulgation of any political opinion or policy," or any one who advocates "orally or by writing, or printing, or like methods, the independence of the Philippine islands or their separation from the United States, whether by peaceable or forcible means." Is there an American outside of the senate of the United States, "with soul so dead" that he can read such a proclamation without a sense of stinging shame and horror?

Our administration leaders are hopelessly floundering about in bogs and quicksands. This, because there is no solid ground of truth and honesty beneath their feet. Gov. Gen. Taft, frankly admitting that our presence in the Philippines is a mistake, and in himself bearing sad witness to the swiftly corrupting influence of irresponsible power, when employed in a wicked cause, says: "They (the Filipinos) have worn out the right to any treatment but that which is severe and within the laws of war." Congressman Cannon, a majority leader, lately declared in the house, amid loud applause: "Right or wrong, the United States owns the Philippine islands, and the Anglo-Saxon people, abroad or here, never have parted with an acre of soil when they have once owned it." Little wonder, when we are spending over one and one-half millions a week to extinguish liberty in the Philippines, that Mr. Cannon and his party should have refused an appropriation of \$50,000 with which, for an extended time, to keep the light burning in France's beautiful gift to the American nation, the statue of "liberty enlightening the world," because, in Mr. Cannon's own language, "commerce is not benefited by it." Senator Spooner, who, with his acute legal intellect, is enacting the same role that Lord Mansfield played in defense of the policy of George III., makes the

startling self-contradictory statement: "I did not believe, nor do I now, in the permanent dominion of the United States in the Philippine archipelago. At the same time, I never expect the flag of the United States to depart from that archipelago." Senator Lodge, the evil genius of this time, as Lord North was the evil genius in our revolutionary struggle, who said three years ago: "I want to enter into a policy that shall enable us to give peace and self-government to the natives of those islands," now, like a political Micawber, advocates a from-day-to-day policy, and declares: "We are not prepared to say now whether we will make them a state or give them independence under a protectorate, or absolute independence, or make them a self-governing colony like Canada, or Australia, or whether we will keep them as a dependency. The time has not yet come for that. An attempt to settle the unknown future now would be dangerous to us and cruel to them. That is the question of another generation." Surely a noble representative this, of liberty-loving Massachusetts! Frederick Harrison, speaking of the men engaged in war, expresses the melancholy truth which applies to the defenders of our Philippine policy: "If their cause be bad, they become demons. And so they lie to themselves, they let men lie to them, they lie to one another, that their cause is good, knowing in their hearts that it is evil."

The Republican, and some of the Democratic leaders demand that the Filipinos lay down their arms before justice shall be done them. As Lord Mansfield said with reference to the treatment of our revolutionary fathers: "When you have established your authority, it will then be a time to show your lenity." Ought we not rather to apply the words of Chatham, so dear to the American heart: "I rejoice that the Filipinos have resisted eight millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves," would not deserve their independence. May we not further, with perfect fitness, quote from the noble earl by saying of the Filipinos: "They have been wronged; they have been driven to madness by injustice. Will you punish them for the madness you have occasioned?"

We cannot be too mindful lest we forget that we were once a weak and despised body, struggling against the tyranny of a rich nation across the

seas; that the blustering generals and carping statesmen of that time steadily misrepresented our character, our capacity, and our purposes; and that human nature has very little changed from what it was a century and a quarter ago. In those days that anti-imperialist Englishman, whose memory, even in England, is now cherished as the noblest, ablest and most philosophic statesman of his time, said, in words most applicable to our own present situation: "No conqueror that I ever heard of has professed to make a cruel, harsh and insolent use of his conquest. No! The man of the most declared pride scarcely dares to trust his own heart with this dreadful secret of ambition. But it will appear in its time; and no man who professes to reduce another to the insolent mercy of a foreign arm ever had any sort of good will towards him. The profession of kindness, with that sword in his hand, and that demand of surrender, is one of the most provoking acts of his hostility."

We can have immediate peace in the Philippines, and "peace with honor," if in simple honesty we say to the Philippine people: "These islands belong to you. The republic of the United States, mighty in its power, because the defender of human rights, guarantees you their possession. Create your own government! Embody your own national aspirations! If in temporary passion, swayed by the impulse of the war-spirit, we have done you wrong, we are ready to make amends. We are great enough to acknowledge our transgressions. The lands of the friars we shall purchase and bestow upon the Filipino nation as a christian gift. For the twenty millions with which we extinguished all title of Spain, we ask suitable coaling stations. Our loyal disinterested friendship shall be yours. For your sake and our own we must insist on guarantees of life and property. You may safely count upon our good will. Until ready to walk alone you may lean upon our strength. And in the words of him whom you revere as the patron saint of liberty, and whom we venerate as the father of our country: 'May the Divine blessing be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of your government must depend.'"

Freedom's abuses are tyrant's excuses.—Texas Farmer.

CHILDE HAROLD'S RECENT PILGRIMAGE.

(With Apologies to Lord Byron.)
For The Public.

I see before me the Tagal savage lie,
His hands are closely tied, his yellow brow
Does try, but all in vain, to conquer agony,
And his bound head is roughly forced more
low;
While into his pried mouth large drops do
flow
From a foul faucet—drops, not one by one,
But in a mighty rush, and now
The horrid scene swims round him—he is
gone
Ere ceased the inhuman act of those who
thought they'd won.

He suffered and he heeded, yet his eyes
Were with his heart, and that was far
away;
He recked not of his life—his captor's prize,
But where the embers of his rude hut lay.
There were his young barbarians (?) at
play,
There was their Tagal mother—he, their
sire,
Tortured—the white man's modern policy.

All this went with his life, and shall he thus
expire
And unavenged? Or will the Malay glut his
ire?

G. T. EVANS.

A story heard in the house of commons is of some one's meeting Sir Wilfrid Lawson, the temperance leader and radical, and asking him: "Well, Lawson, and what do you feel about the war?" Whereupon Sir Wilfrid replied: "I try to feel about it as our Captain Christ would wish us to feel." "Ah," rejoined the other, in a disgusted tone, "I might have guessed that you'd be a proboer."—Chicago Chronicle.

"Do you indorse the sentiment that war is hell?" asked the reporter.

"I do, in a measure," replied the veteran from Samar, "but I think that the sentiment conversely expressed would be a base hyperbole."

G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "Poverty: A Study of Town Life" (Macmillan), Mr. B. Seebohm Rowntree has given us a book at first-hand; that is, one made from life, and not out of other books. It is not so interesting in style as first-hand books of the type of Young's "Travels in France" or Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia;" but what it loses in style it gains in painstaking, scientific treatment. The author selected York, England, which has a population of about 75,000. There is every evidence that he made a thorough, personal investigation. His conclusion is that in that city about 28 per cent. of the people live in poverty; and from his statistics it appears that nearly half of the working class, even if you include the wages of fathers, mothers and children, have to live below the standard of "merely physical efficiency." In plain English this means that they have not enough to eat. There is never an extra halfpenny to buy a newspaper, or doll, or marbles, or sweets, or a postage stamp, or a bit of ribbon. "Should a child fall ill, it must be attended by the parish doctor; should it die, it must be buried

by the parish. Finally, the wage-earner must never be absent from his work a single day. If any of these conditions are broken, the extra expenditure involved is met, and can only be met, by limiting the diet."

Consider that these conditions are found in one of the richest and most enlightened countries the world has ever seen, and that there is nothing peculiar in the location and circumstances of the city which was chosen for investigation. Gen. Booth, it will be remembered, found a higher percentage of poverty in London.

Is anything being done in the way of amelioration? Charity organization is becoming more effective in picking up the remnants that fall below the lowest margin of living. Here and there individuals are being more and more touched to help the special case of suffering that lies in sight. But what can "charity" do for the forty-odd per cent.? The question is, are the law-makers of the nation doing aught that will help these toilers to change their hard life? Is imperialism helping them? Has the Boer war, with its increase of taxation and public debt, helped them? Are the thoughts and energies of those in power directed to-

The Australasian Tax System.

Believers in home rule in taxation, have had their attention called to the campaign now in progress in Colorado, for an amendment to the state constitution. This amendment provides that any county so electing may levy a tax on land values for local purposes. An appeal for funds to assist the workers in Colorado was recently mailed to all known friends of the movement in the state of Illinois; but the responses have not been as numerous as we had hoped they would be. Many, no doubt, have intended to contribute, but have allowed the matter to escape their attention. The committee cannot believe that the neglect is intentional on the part of those who understand the import of the Bucklin amendment.

Advocates of taxation reform in this state should make a generous contribution to this worthy cause. It is not often that so good an opportunity is presented for work along practical lines. We trust, therefore, that no personal reminder will be necessary on our part to the friends of this important movement. It is a privilege to be allowed a place in this opening fight on monopoly. Much depends upon the fate of the first battle. Victory in Colorado this fall means an easier fight wherever the next stand is made. The result should be decisive.

A vigorous campaign is being made in Colorado, but the workers are few in number; and, although they are making personal sacrifices for the cause, they are crippled for lack of money. Already they have circulated 100,000 copies of Senator Bucklin's report, but this is less than half of the number of voters in the state. They are looking to us for aid, and they have a right to expect it, for it is our cause as much as theirs. If the amendment is defeated for lack of finances to make a thorough campaign, the failure will be due, partly, to those who neglected to aid to the extent of their ability.

If you intend to make a contribution, please advise the committee at once. Do not wait for a personal solicitation, as that requires time and money on our part which cannot well be given. Subscriptions in any amount may be made, payable either in a lump sum or in monthly installments. If the latter way be chosen, it is desired that remittances should reach us not later than the 10th of each month, on which day our collections are forwarded to the secretary of the national committee. There are no expenses in connection with the Illinois committee, and the entire amount collected will be used for the purpose intended by the contributors.

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the treasurer and mailed to the secretary.

Illinois Committee for the Promotion of the Australasian Tax System.

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN,
Chairman & Treasurer.
U. A. H. GREENE, Secretary,
No. 128 Jackson Blvd., Chicago.