

Bringing forth with brain and hand.
But, O God, we are forlorn.
From Thy sons the earth is torn!

On the land which Thou didst give
We have not the right to live;
Save by permit, may not toil
On Thy rich and fertile soil.
For, O God, Thy land is sold
For a price of sordid gold.

Grant, we pray Thee, open minds.
Dissipate the mist that blinds.
Show to man his highest right—
That 'tis good in heaven's sight.
Speak to man in thunder call:
"I have given the earth to all!"

STEPHEN BELL.

IF IN THE PHILIPPINES, WHY
NOT IN WASHINGTON?

From editorial columns of City and State,
of Philadelphia, for August 28.

Mr. Boardman's letter explains very clearly our view of why our military authorities in the Philippines used Spanish torture as a military means. He puts the case in a nutshell: "We give them the water cure, they give us the guns." We had to get the guns to win the campaign, and so get peace and all its manifold blessings,—and the friars' lands for corporate exploitation,—and so, of course, we had to use the torture. How simple it all is when Mr. Boardman explains it! So simple that even Judge Taft must be persuaded to abandon his attractive theory of "a few weak or bad men" retaliating upon a cruel enemy; and Secretary Root to let go his fond belief that General Order 100 has been the controlling prohibition and guide of our troops; and the President, that only a few of our soldier boys have gone astray under the maddening temptation of a tropic campaign. Surely the pithy epigram of Mr. Boardman must make these practical, clear-sighted men understand the matter: "We give them the water cure, they give us the guns." Mr. Boardman is the man of the hour. He has expressed the truth so tersely, so neatly, that even a way-faring man cannot help understanding it.

But a word more—a question for moralists that is suggested by Mr. Boardman's reasoning. The water cure, he reasons, was justified because the Filipinos lied about their hidden guns. But if the water cure is a punishment deserved by a man who tells an untruth when he has a military secret that he can keep in no other way, would not its application to the heads of our War Department be permissible, for they did just what Mr. Boardman says the Filipinos did? They denied the use of the torture explicitly and emphatically when they had abundant proof to the contrary.

No doubt they felt justified in so doing on the ground of military or political necessity. But the fact that they made use of deceit is a clearly proved fact. Now, if they deceive the people in this way, who have a right to know just what their servants have been doing, would the people be justified in applying torture to them when they suspect that these public officials are hiding the truth or making false statements?

The Filipino tells the falsehood to aid him in expelling a foreign invader. There would seem to be stronger moral justification for his course than for that of those who employ such methods to conceal a truth that it can scarcely be claimed that they are justified in concealing. Now, if it is not right to use torture on United States officials when they make use of the weapon of prevarication or actual false statement (which we hold to be true), then how can the use of this means be justified as a military weapon in effecting an Oriental conquest? And yet it is an undoubted fact that large numbers of army officers justify this use of torture. This is an interesting question for casuists.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN
BULL.

HE DICTATES A SPEECH TO THE
PRESIDENT.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: I'm gettin' aout of all patience with Theodore. He's not strenuous enough for me. Of course his tongue is out on the skirmish line; but—

"See here, Theodore!" says I; "stop this speech makin', it's gettin' flat; and do somethin'! Act once! If you'll have a little backbone and do somethin' for the people they'll put you in again all right. There is the finest kind of a chanet to fight right now. You can make a speech, too. Don't make it to the people; they'll catch on. Make it to the coal trust. Call 'em up and talk to 'em like this:

"Feller Stewards of Providence, controllin' all the heat: I've got my eye on you, and I don't approve of you. Stoppin' coal on the people means anarchy. It must be stamped out, and mine's the foot to do it. If the sheriff can't stop the riotin' he calls on the Governor. If the Governor can't stop it he calls on the President. That's the regular order. Now, if I have to call out the regular troops, it's martial law, and martial law don't mean killin' miners when it's up to me. I'll make a speech to the soldiers first thing. "Boys," I'll say, "black powder or white—no miner is to be hurt! No good ever

comes of killin' the workin' bees—except to swell the Carnegie library fund, and that's no good. They make the honey, and we need 'em in our business. Do you twig me? No man is a good American soldier until he can shoot straight enough to miss a workin' man! Do you get it?" And I'll say to you: Dig coal in ten days, or, by the Eternal, I'll seize the mines and dig it myself and run 'em for the people! You can't furnish me cars? Oh, I know you can't; not a car! That's what I'm a-complainin' of; but don't worry! I'll seize the cars, too. Martial law is just as martial to a railroad company as it is to a tailor—or a miner. Your Uncle Sam did lots of business that way in '61, and he did it express, too. There is no trouble about cars under martial law. But the price? I'll make the price five dollars a ton delivered, till you can figure out to my satisfaction it's worth more. But this is anarchy? No; not in a cold winter. It's comfort and warmth; and when you can figure out you are capable of doin' business, can pay your miners livin' wages, find cars to haul coal, and can sell at a reasonable rate, I'll call off my soldiers and you may resume; but, beware of martial law! Now, play ball!"

"Say it that way, Theodore, and you are it," says I. "You can do as you please about sayin', 'by the Eternal!' I'm afraid that's swearin', but it'll waken up a lot of dead Democrats if you do; and we would hear in about twenty-four hours that, owing to the earnest efforts of the eminent J. P. Morgan, the great coal strike was settled at last."

But the President glanced at me with a far away fishy look in his eye.

"Sam," he says, "I'm really a peace man at heart; and, besides, Baer and the other poor fellows have their money invested in those mines."

UNCLE SAM.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.
A SPEECH TO THE LEGISLATURE.

Staff special dispatch from Columbus, Ohio, under date of September 10, to Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Senator Hanna some time since came to Columbus and in an interview proposed perpetual franchises as a solution of the franchise problem. To-day Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, came to Columbus. The Republicans of the legislature and of the state administration welcomed Senator Hanna to Columbus. In one interview he gave them more trouble than has the difficulty of a special session of the legislature on the eve of an election. His statement favoring perpetual franchises so complicated the situation that the Re-

publican leaders had to appeal to the state administration to end the special session in almost any old way by passing almost any kind of a code before the opening of the Republican campaign in order that they might then go before an excited public and assure them that their streets were in no danger of being taken from them in perpetuity and given to street railway companies.

Chairman Comings, when he announced Mayor Johnson and Newton D. Baker as the speakers of the morning, nervously supplemented his announcement with the statement that the franchise question had been practically settled and that no franchise legislation would be taken up at the special session. All the lightning rods were up and every Republican was safely ensconced in his cyclone cellar.

Mayor Johnson disappointed them. He came among them fresh from his campaign, but he left his politics behind him.

The critical and cynically scornful expression that set on faces of Republican lawmakers when Mayor Johnson mounted the platform softened gradually into plain ordinary interest. They came out of their cyclone cellars. And when he finished his talk in each house he was greeted with a hail of questions and a storm of honest applause, not confined to the minority side of the chambers. And when his talk was done he was the center of a throng composed of Republicans and Democrats alike who pressed forward to shake his hand. The former chaffed him pleasantly upon his "circus" campaign and he gave the invitation right and left to attend his tent meetings and use his platform to refute, if they cared to, what he said. The latter poured out congratulations and invitations to bring his tent down into their counties.

Of the two visits, that of Senator Hanna and of Mr. Johnson to Columbus, it is a question to-night whether the Republicans do not look back more pleasantly upon the call the mayor made them. And in their ranks it is a question whether his proffered solution of the franchise problem has not to-night as many advocates and more than that offered by Senator Hanna. At least there is a feeling among the members that they could adopt the former without running any danger from mob law enforced by wrathful constituents.

Mayor Johnson said in part:

"You are about to pass a municipal code bill. I wish you every success in

passing one that will last and that will be satisfactory to all. The greatest monument this legislature could leave behind it would be a code bill that could receive the support of every voter in both houses when it came up for passage. No party lines should be drawn in your work and no party questions should find a place in the code you draft.

"For myself, I believe in home rule; in the proposition of giving to each locality the local direction of its own affairs; the right to formulate its own government and to conduct it without interference; and I believe this idea is universally popular. But it is said that this cannot be done. If it can be done it will be the most satisfactory solution of your problem. It would give to Cleveland the kind of government she wants, and to Cincinnati the kind of government she wants. If you should give that degree of home rule to the state you would afford an opportunity for progress and development in municipal government. And municipal government is the greatest problem America has to face. We have come almost to be the United cities of America instead of the United States of America. The darkest blots on our civilization have been placed by the governments of our cities. From them will come the Goths and Vandals and the Huns to sweep over and destroy our civilization, if ever it is destroyed.

"But you may make mistakes in this section of your code. You may enact a board system of municipal government that time will condemn. I believe personally in the federal plan, but any plan you make should have a fair trial. However, a mistake here can be corrected. I believe in civil service. Extend it to all departments of the city government. Place the waterworks department under its rules as well as the departments of fire and police. Remove politics entirely from the question of filling positions in any and all of these departments. But you may leave this civil service provision out of your code and your mistake can still be cured.

"But, gentlemen, on franchises you may make a blunder you can't cure; you may make a mistake it will be impossible to correct. Perpetual franchises have been suggested and in support of this proposition it has been said that the gas companies all over the state hold perpetual grants. This is not true. The law of Ohio limits gas franchises to ten years. At the end of that time the council fixes a rate for a new term of ten years. If no price is fixed the company can

charge no rate for its product. This is different from a provision for a ten-year revision on terms to which the company must agree. Again there is no limit to the number of pipes a gas company or any other company can put in the street. But with street railways, when you have placed two tracks, or at the most four, in the street you can put down no more. And you can't put street car tracks in all streets. The cases are not parallel. The ten-year gas grants are in no sense perpetual.

"On these propositions the Nash code is more vicious than the present law. There are in the Nash code amendments that make it easier than at present for the old companies to extend their tracks into new territory. Now, the consents of the property owners to such extensions are required before the ordinance is passed to extend the tracks into new territory. This code provides that the ordinance shall be passed first and the consents be secured sometime afterward. Ninety per cent. of the street railway lines are built under this extension provision and not under new grants requiring competitive bidding. Of 200 miles of existing street railway lines in Cleveland not 20 miles were bid on.

"It is made harder for competing lines to get in. Propose to establish a three-cent fare line and you will find out how difficult it is. The present law is so strict that not a competing company has succeeded in 20 years. Not a grant given in that time to a competitive company that has not been contested. Possibly there is one exception. A line in Toledo that fought its way forward for a long time, but was at last absorbed by the old company. It is hard for the competitor under the present law. The Nash code makes it harder. The men who drafted that code know this and they drafted it for this purpose. It ought to be entitled: An act to prevent the building of competing street railway lines in the cities of Ohio.

"There seems to be a feeling in the air that but for the long time grants there would be no feeling of security among investors, that no street car lines would be built. That is not true. The best street railways in the United States exist under grants that can be terminated in a moment at pleasure. Every grant in the city of Washington is that way, and there is no trouble about selling 50-year four per cent. bonds on this property. Brooklyn bridge has the best street railway property in the United States, but the grant of that company can be termin-

ated by the superintendent of the bridge at a moment's notice. If a street railway is careful it lives because it is so. If it is good it will live; if it is bad it ought to die. Only a few years ago every railway in Massachusetts was living on franchises terminable at 90 days' notice. It is not true that capital will feel insecure under such conditions. Capital feels insecure when trying to hang on to antiquated schemes of horse cars when the public demands electricity, of five-cent fares when the public demands lower ones. The best franchise is that with the shortest life because it will live if the people want it to live, and if not, not.

"Under the present law it is almost impossible to build competing lines. With a friendly administration in Cleveland an attempt to introduce a three-cent fare line was knocked out in the courts. We went back and did it over again. It stied up again. Now all the municipalities in Ohio and all of their governments are equally unconstitutional. There is but one, and that, Cleveland, that could not grant a franchise for three-cent fare, for two-cent fare, for one-cent fare to any company to enjoy ten minutes. There are pages of restrictions in the present law for new grants. It is almost impossible to get a new grant. It is easy to extend existing lines, but renewals—that provision can be found in a line. No competition is provided for, no property owners' consents are required. When the interests of these powerful corporations are at stake, a way has been found to protect them. In Cincinnati a renewal was even granted for 50 years, and the law says 25. To secure a renewal they have merely to win one council and they have won their fight. They don't have to wait for their grant to expire. They can get the renewal at any time. They can pick the time to make their fight. You would not allow a little city to be placed in debt by its council without making the people say whether or not they approved of this burden.

"The expiring franchises in Cleveland and Cincinnati could be sold for 25 years for more than the combined debts of those cities, in addition to paying the present owners the full value of their property.

"Make no grant valid until it has been ratified by popular vote. The council can't sell out the people then. This is safe and wise. With that one provision you can leave the rest to the city. If citizens vote to grant franchises on a five-cent fare basis

that will be their concern. You require a two-thirds vote to make valid the bonding of a community, but you will give away 50 to 75 millions of the people's money without their consent if you leave the law as it is now. Don't let men ask for perpetual franchises and then come in and say: 'Leave the law as it is.' Don't let men come in and ask to perpetuate a 50-year franchise in Cincinnati that men tell me was granted through fraud. I believe it was. You need not waste sympathy on the men who hold that franchise. They took it as men buy a stolen horse, on their own risk.

"This curative act that has been proposed goes further than the present law. It gives the right of renewal before the expiration of the franchise. With a 20-year franchise a corporation under this proposed law could ask and receive an extension from the date of the expiration of its franchise for 25 years more. Or, in other words, it would be possible to obtain a 45-year franchise at any time. You have the brightest minds among the politicians to deal with. They are trying to get 45-year franchises if not franchises in perpetuity.

"Provide that in addition to the franchise becoming valid only when approved by the vote of the people that also when a grant is renewed the company shall secure the renewal that will carry passengers for the lowest rate of fare. I would treat the old companies much more fairly than their heads would treat tenants of theirs. If you should lease land of one of them for 25 years and build a house upon it, he would take the house when your lease expired. But I don't think that is right. I would do better by them than that. I would provide that the old companies should be paid a fair price on the valuation of its tracks and cars and power houses, plus some. If you provide in your code for the facilitating of the giving away of property of people you will leave behind you a code that will still be a monument to you, but anything but an enviable one."

Henry Thomas Buckle's thoughts and conversation were always on a high level. Once he remarked: "Men and women range themselves into three classes or orders of intelligence; you can tell the lowest class by their habit of always talking about persons; the next by the fact that their habit is always to converse about things; the highest by their preference for the discussion of ideas."—Chicago Chronicle.

SENATOR BUCKLIN'S REPLY TO AUSTRALASIAN TAX CRITICS.

Hon. J. W. Bucklin, in the Denver Daily News, of August 24.

At the special session of the legislature held this year the privileged classes of Colorado made a most strenuous effort to induce the legislature to repeal the Australian tax amendment. Those who were leading in that campaign denounced the amendment and its author in the most violent manner. They charged that the amendment was a fraud and freak, that it had passed the legislature and been submitted by dishonest methods and arguments, and was unworthy of respect or even decent consideration. Through the newspapers I was told the State was getting too hot for me, and I would have to skip out. It was said that the bill was an anarchist bill, and that "we do not agree with anarchists, we kill them."

This style of campaign, however, proved unsuccessful. The legislature did not pass the repeal bill, the courts would not take the question away from the voters, and for the first time the privileged classes began to realize that there was some vitality in the measure which would require respectful treatment and intelligent opposition. They, therefore, began to call out their reserved forces. Corporation lawyers and professors of political economy are now appearing in the fray, anxious to defend the owners of social values from their just burden of taxation.

OUR OPPONENTS.

The two ablest gentlemen who have yet appeared against the amendment are Hon. L. F. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol. As a rule their arguments are similar, and I shall treat them jointly.

Mr. Twitchell says that the amendment "has none of the fiscal economical or philosophical features of the Henry George theory," while Prof. Rossignol says that "it is about half single tax." Mr. Twitchell says it is "the peculiar product of its author," and bears "no resemblance to the Australasian land tax law," while the professor says that it is "similar to the system in operation in New Zealand, and to some extent an imitation of it."

Both gentlemen studiously ignore the fact that a similar law is in force in South Australia, another in New Wales, and still another in Queensland. The existence and character of the laws in these other colonies is a complete answer to the argument that the Colorado amendment is not similar to the Australasian tax laws. Messrs. Twitchell and Rossignol assert correctly that the New Zealand state tax