

commit suicide, and fewer farmers' wives would go insane." His eyes gleamed, and I knew that, as he would put it, his pulse was going so fast that if it were revolutions of a locomotive wheel it would take only so long to go somewhere.

"And what is your remedy for all this?" asked I, with becoming, if not mock, interest.

"Let us help ourselves to no more than we want at table, buy our eggs a week earlier, drink our milk the day before, eat our bread before it is too dry, and in six months' time there will be a reduced state death rate, more vacancies in the insane asylums, 1,456,608 rosy cheeks where to-day there are that many pale ones—"

Just then the ferryboat's gates were lifted, and as we went our several ways, in the hurry that is characteristic of 7,098,111 Americans out of 8,000,000, I thought that, if all the brains of all the arithmetical cranks were used in place of wood pulp to make into paper, we writers would get our pads for nothing.—Charles Battell Loomis, in *The Century*.

SHALL THINGS BE MORE THAN MEN?

We of to-day tolerate and defend and champion a system of things which decrees that the question of what we shall eat and drink and wear shall be the question of supreme moment for ninety-nine one-hundredths of our population. And the great majority of us, whether in store or factory or farm, in the university chair or in the pulpit, declare our allegiance to a condition of things which gives not the smallest promise of change to something better.

We declare that the question of subsistence must increasingly in the coming years crowd all other questions to the background. We presume to call that a civilization in which are thousands and millions of people who are far worse off than birds and beasts, because they have no sure prospect of having even a subsistence except as it may be given them at the hands of that institution of the devil known as "charity."

We answer every question of Jesus in the negative, and we do it in the name of morality and a religion which we falsely call Christianity. We declare that the life is not more than the food, or the body than the raiment. We hold that men are not of more value than birds and beasts and flowers.

Why, there are any number of dogs that receive better treatment than thousands of men and women and children. There are quantities of alleged women who would scorn to have their

poodles buried in the potter's field, who care no more for their countless brothers and sisters whose emaciated bodies find their burial there than they care for so much refuse.

If the words of Jesus have one scintilla of truth in them, if they are not the senseless drivel of a madman, if the moral and spiritual consciousness which they imply is valid and just, we are conspiring to obliterate all faith and hope from men's hearts, we are attempting to make impossible all faith in a Divine Father and caretaker. We have already accomplished that end for hundreds of men and women.

The supreme end of our commercialism is not men, but things. Men weigh nothing at all in the balance of commercialism, which is the religion of this time. Nothing is subordinated to human life. We do not hesitate in our commercial or political enterprises and policies because of any possible effect they may have on the life or happiness of men.

Factories are not run for the sake of men, but for the sake of things. Indeed, it would be truer to say that men are run into their graves for the sake of factories. Men and women are worked to death—are robbed of all that can possibly make life human or happy, for the sake of making merchantable products.

Railroads are not run for the sake of men, for the contribution they may make to manhood, for the joy and cheer they may bring to humanity, but for the dividends. Our mines and shops and factories and railroads are all of them Molochs to devour the many, that the few may be enriched.—Rev. William T. Brown, of Rochester, N. Y., as reported in the *Rochester Herald*.

THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Apropos of the taxation question, the action of the liberal party in the British parliament in forcing at a recent sitting of the house of commons a vote on the taxation of land values is significant of the direction political issues are taking in that country and may offer an important object lesson here.

Mr. E. J. C. Morton, a writer of reputation and liberal member from Devonport, offered an amendment to the "address," which the house was about to make in reply to the queen's speech. His amendment regretted that the speech contained nothing dealing with the ownership, tenure or taxation of land.

In Devonport, he said, there is a street of 51 houses in which every room is occupied by a whole family. The

people crowd together in their living quarters in order to be as near as possible to their work. "They are decent people, too," said he; "they actually have asked me to say nothing about it, in order that they may not be put to shame." And what is bad for the workingman, he pointed out, is bad for the manufacturer and for general industry; for the evil of which he complains is that the land, and particularly the valuable land of towns and cities, is inadequately taxed, and in many instances not taxed at all, so that a premium is offered upon land monopoly and the burden of taxation is thrown upon production — upon the workingman and the capitalist. He cited one man in Devonport who drew £40,000 a year in rents from the ground alone and did not contribute a sixpence in local taxation; and in London, he said, £20,000,000 a year went into the pockets of a few individuals who were exempt from local taxation.

Sir John Brunner seconded the amendment, saying that examination of the conditions prevailing showed that rich men lived upon land that was lightly taxed and poor men upon land that was heavily taxed.

These speeches stirred up the government, and Mr. Chaplin, president of the local government board; Mr. Arthur Balfour, first lord of the treasury and conservative leader in the house of commons, and Mr. Goschen, first lord of the admiralty, followed each other in quick succession in the endeavor to belittle the Morton amendment. But a score were up on the liberal side in support, among them Messrs. Asquith, Billson, Spicer, Channing (son of the abolitionist), Haldane, Havelock Wilson, W. Redmond, Flynn, Foster, Monro Ferguson, Field and Provand. The honors were perhaps carried off by a member elected to the house at a recent by-election after a big fight and against heavy odds, Fletcher Moulton, who explained to the government the easy method by which it could levy a tax upon the value of land and exempt improvements.

Things got so warm that one conservative, Mr. Bartley, from a London constituency, who had heard from his electors recently, was constrained to rise and urge the government to make some concession to the principle, and some of his associates notified the leaders that they would have to take to the woods and not vote.

The new liberal leader, Sir Campbell-Bannerman, ordered the liberal whips to tell in the division, and made the amendment a party matter, so that when the house divided, not only did all

the liberals and all the Irish members present support, but many of the conservatives abstained; and with 280 members present and voting, the normal majority of which would have been 100, Mr. Balfour's side got only 34 majority.

This vote was astonishing to both sides of the house, and reveals the weakness of the conservatives on the question. The vote's full significance is that the liberal party in parliament—that is, the practical politicians composing it—has now resolved to do what the party everywhere outside parliament is urging—present the taxation of land values as a leading, if not the leading, party measure.

This is not the single tax; that is to say, it is not also proposed to abolish all other taxes, but it is many steps in the direction of single tax, since the greater the tax on land values the less the burden upon industry and the fruits of industry. All that is needed is a continuance in this direction to concentrate the whole of taxation upon land values and entirely exempt everything else; and to that end many liberals in and out of parliament are working.—Henry George, Jr., in *New York Journal* of March 4.

TWO STRUGGLES FOR LIBERTY.

While Americans are asking whether the Filipinos deserve independence and are able to govern themselves, there may be interest or profit in a glance at some phases of the Philippine conflict which seem remarkably like certain conditions in the American revolution. It is said that the Filipinos are unworthy of independence or incapable of self-government because they are not a united majority; they are mercenary; they wage guerrilla warfare; they have a naked, poorly-armed crowd that cannot be called an army; they have no navy; they have no government but that of a dictator; they are dishonest; they try to advance their cause by bureaus of agitators, called juntas; and great numbers of them can never be persuaded to submit voluntarily to orderly government.

John Adams said that more than a third part of the principal men in America were opposed to the revolution against England, and of those who agreed with the principles of the revolution thousands thought them not worth fighting for. Twelve colonies, without New York, resolved for independence in July, 1776. Rhode Island had to be forced, by a threat of commercial boycott, before she would ratify the constitution in 1790. Vermont was never in the confederation that existed

previous to the government of the constitution. Lecky says: "New York privateers preyed on the commerce of the revolting states" in swarms over neighboring seas. "The ardent loyalty of the town of New York was exceedingly encouraging to the English," and "6,000 of its own armed citizens" were ready to defend the city against the rebels.

Washington wrote:

While our army is experiencing almost daily want, that of the enemy in New York is deriving ample supplies from a trade with the adjacent states of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut which has by degrees become so common that it is hardly thought a crime.

Is lack of patriotism charged to the Filipinos? Lecky says:

The great mass (of Americans) were indifferent, half-hearted, engrossed with their private interests or occupations, prepared to risk nothing till they could clearly foresee the issue of the contest.

Washington wrote:

Men may speculate as they will; they may talk of patriotism; * * * I know patriotism exists, and I know it has done much in the present contest; but I will venture to assert that a great and lasting war can never be supported on this principle alone. It must be aided by a prospect of interest or some reward.

Then he speaks of

the frequent defection of officers seduced by views of private interest and emolument to abandon the cause of their country.

Says Lecky:

In the face of an enemy of overwhelming numbers, in the very agonies of a struggle upon which the whole future of the contest depended, company after company came forward, claiming instant dismissal.

It was a common rule that troops would not serve without ample pay. Congress and the states continually offered bounties to get men, and then did not get them. Men were threatened with imprisonment if they refused to serve. Negro slaves and even children were enlisted. Washington says:

Excepting about 400 recruits from the state of Massachusetts Bay (a portion of whom, I am told, the children, hired at about \$1,500 each for nine months' service), I have had no reenforcement to this army since last campaign.

Again he says:

The large fortunes acquired by numbers out of the army afford a contrast that gives poignancy to every inconvenience from remaining in it.

Apathy and dissension existed in many quarters. Said John Adams:

I am wearied to death with the wrangles between military officers, high and low. They quarrel like cats and dogs. They worry one another like mastiffs, scrambling for rank and pay like apes for nuts.

The Filipinos are said to have swept the islands of Spaniards except for Manila. At no time, though in a longer contest, could this have been said of the Americans in the colonial war. The American way of fighting had been like

that of the Indians—from behind trees or singly—and not by skill in maneuver. Every American soldier was a sharpshooter.

As to guerrilla warfare, Marion, the "Swamp Fox," was a terror to the British in the south, and could not be forced to open battle. Washington declared once that he planned, in case the English whipped him in the coast region, to take to the mountains and the wilderness of the Ohio valley with his men and there defy the Britons. Washington's army never had a commissary department, and his men often starved or went ragged, while the country people were feeding the English troops. Mob law often ruled in Boston and elsewhere. Nobody seemed responsible for the Boston tea party or for the burning of the Gaspee. Aguinaldo's army is criticised as a body. The army of Washington was never uniformly armed and equipped. When he took command for the first time, Green says, many of the troops had only clubs and pitchforks for weapons! In 1776 the entire continental army was reduced to 2,700 effective men. During a great part of the war congress was either inefficient or unable to meet, and Washington was necessarily a dictator, to all practical purposes. There was no cabinet, a semblance of which Aguinaldo has. When Washington was trying personally to keep his men together during the awful winter at Valley Forge the congress was traveling about from place to place in an effort to keep out of the hands of the English.

Have the Filipinos been dishonest in their schemes? Was there not some ground for accusing Franklin of dishonesty in his publication of Hutchinson's private letters to an English friend? Timothy Pickering, United States quartermaster general, admitted that in 1782 he clipped coins for the gain of the American government.

There is a striking likeness between the Cuban and Philippine juntas and the American committees of correspondence, without which it is said the revolution would not have been possible.

It is affirmed that there is or has been more than one visible revolutionary party in the Philippines, and that a recognition of independence would induce public disorders. During our revolutionary period every state inclined toward a position of absolute sovereignty. The constitution was enacted because congress, during the war and under the confederation, was powerless over the various contending commonwealths. After the war there