

it confounds itself incontinently in the bad.

The Church will regard itself as constitutionally coterminous with secular society. The point is not that the Church will strive to reach the very low and bad people—it has been trying to do that for a long time, with curious and confused results; the point is that at last the dead-set to save souls will be abandoned; and instead of keeping up the haggard, weary chase, the Church will simply assume both the pursuers and the pursued—regarding them all alike as equal constituents of the commonwealth.

The religion of democracy takes in all the people without exception, not because it is indifferent to moral and spiritual distinctions, and not because it holds that men are naturally good, or even that everybody is sure to be saved. It is not because it makes light of the eternal and tragic issue between Jerusalem and Babylon, but because it would give its whole soul to that issue, that it has written upon its doorposts and the footpace of its altar: Judge not. Unto this last, and He was made sin.

And in the third place, the Church will abandon the attempt to truss up and underpin the Truth, and will, on the contrary, repose in quiet strength upon those sills and girders of the universal frame which have been or hereafter shall be discovered. It will appear that the Truth is not a sacred deposit to be kept in a box under guard of priestly seneschals, but a living, tremendous Thing—able to take care of itself as well as of all who will trust it. Such is obviously the case with the truth of physics; so it is also with the truth of metaphysics.

#### OUR SYSTEM OF TAXATION.

Old Sam Head made his millions running department stores. His method was simple. He would buy a building or take a long lease in the best part of a town. Then he would divide it up, allotting the front to fancy goods, the center to dry goods and the rear to groceries. He would entice merchants to hire of him sections of the store. He furnished light, heat, elevator service, detectives, caretakers for the building and cleaners for the aisles. For the best situations he charged the highest price, but being a good natured fellow, he gave a peanut man the privilege, for nothing, to sell his wares on the sidewalk.

One day he suddenly disappeared, and the boys took up the business. Wood Head, who was an observing fellow, took a point from the ways our cities

are run, and reversed the old man's methods. He charged a fee for bringing goods into the store and appointed officers who received the dues as they passed the door. Some of these fees were on the value of the goods, and some of them a fixed price for each article. He argued that, although this required a considerable number of officials, the customers who purchased goods never noticed that there was such a change, and the income derived from it relieved the seller of the goods from a part of his fees for the ground rent.

In addition to this, it induced some of the storekeepers to start making manufactures of their own, which seemed to make a demand for floor space; yet somehow, the receipts fell off and the store did not seem to be prospering.

Another brother, Bill Head, said the best thing to do would be to charge every customer who came to do business a fee based upon his estimated income. Customers seemed to object to this, and would never give their incomes correctly. They were dishonest. But Bill insisted that the principle was a just and fair one. He said "they pay according to their abilities."

Dick Head said he believed in internal revenue, and instituted a tax on all corsets worn in the store. He said corsets were injurious, anyhow. This tax was constantly evaded, however, by unscrupulous women, who said they wore only waists. The young men especially objected to being examined as to whether they wore corsets. Sharp Head, who was a far-sighted sort of chap, seeing that his brother's plans were not working as well as they might, and that a change in the management was bound to come, induced them to give him a lease (which he duly recorded) of the elevators, and charged everybody for going up or down. He put in an improved elevator, and pointed out to the firm what a public service he had done.

Big Head, taking a point from him, got a similar franchise for supplying light, and as he had not the capital to put in the electric lights that were needed, he got an agreement out of the concern that they would give him bonds for an amount sufficient to cover the actual cost of putting in an electric light plant, and he should charge a moderate fee for the service.

The custom of the store, however, seemed to be dwindling, and it was necessary to devise some new methods of raising revenue. A conference of the brothers decided that a proper source would be a small charge for the water in the drinking fonts and the

lavatories. By a happy inspiration, the firm also sold outright the exclusive privilege of supplying heat to the building, for which every storekeeper had to pay in accordance with the amount of floor space he occupied. This brought in a large sum which kept the firm going for some time. Nevertheless, the business declined.

Wood Head now admitted that his tariff on goods coming in was not working well, as it did not bring enough revenue. He claimed that it had done its work by establishing industries, and that it would now be well to establish licenses to do business. He urged that those departments which sold soda water and other things that people did not need, ought to pay for the privilege; that if customers did not wish to be taxed, they should not buy these things.

Bill Head stuck to his income tax; but as it was very difficult to collect, he consented to modify it so that only the merchant should pay it. On these, however, he made them swear to the amount of their profits, or rather for the most part, swear that there were none.

Wood Head said that, in his opinion, Sharp and Big were making all the money that was in the business, and that the wise thing would be to charge them a fee for the privilege they had.

These plans, however, were of no avail, and the brothers despairingly concluded that there could be no natural and scientific plan of taxation, and made an assignment.—Bolton Hall, in Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat.

#### A FILIPINO'S PLEA FOR LIBERTY.

Extracts from an address delivered by Senor Sixto Lopez before a citizens' mass meeting in the New Century hall in Philadelphia, on the evening of March 12.

The question of importance to the people of both America and the Philippines is not whether certain things were done which many persons think ought not to have been done. It is not whether certain promises were made, or alliances entered into. These questions are interesting and important, but they relate to the past. The question of vital interest has to do with the present and the future—it is the question of Philippine independence.

There are two aspects in which this question can be viewed—that of right, and that of fitness. Have the Filipinos a right to independence? Are they fit for independent self-government? An affirmative answer to either or both of these questions will

settle those of subsidiary interest to which I have briefly referred.

Are the Filipinos fit for independence? Who has a right to be the judge? That is a question to which there is but one answer, namely: the Filipinos themselves. Let it once be established as a precedent that America or any other nation has the right to judge of another people's fitness for independence, and not only will the fundamental principles of human liberty be uprooted, but every weak and struggling nation will be placed at the mercy of the powerful and despotic. Had England the right to judge of the American colonists' fitness for independence? Has Russia the right to judge of Poland's or Finland's or Bulgaria's fitness for independence? Has England the right to judge of India's or Egypt's fitness for independence? I do not believe that there is a man in this audience, or in the whole of America, who will give an affirmative reply to these questions. Then I beg, on behalf of the Filipinos, to add one more question: Has America the right to judge of the Filipinos' fitness for independence? You cannot answer the former question and escape the latter. You may try to evade it; you may seek to arouse passion in order to blind the reason and stifle conscience; you may appeal to a false conception of patriotism as to the "hauling down of the flag;" you may attempt to dazzle the mind with glowing pictures of the richness of the acquisition and the spoils to be gained; you may talk of "benevolence;" of "destiny;" of "Providence;" of "world power," or of anything else in the heavens above or the earth beneath, but you cannot deny, without also denying your own principles, that the Filipinos, like the Americans, are, and of right ought to be, the sole judges of their own fitness for independence. . . .

You will observe that thus far I have been endeavoring to show that the Filipinos are fit for independent self-government. But I cannot allow this or any other opportunity to pass without reaffirming, on behalf of my countrymen, their right to independence. For we Filipinos "believe these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. . . . That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers," not from foreign nations, or by conquest or purchase, but "from the consent of

the governed." These are truths which apply not merely to some men, or to white men—not solely to Anglo-Saxon or to European, but to all men. They are truths from which you cannot depart without denying your own principles, and doing injury to the progress of liberty and civilization. The man who undertakes to write a constitution and to frame laws for a foreign people without their consent, or against it, places a crown upon his own head. The divine right of kings, except in so far as it comes from the divine right of the people, is a myth which became ill and feeble in 1776, and which is now endeavoring to recruit its shattered health in Germany and Russia. Liberty itself is the divine right. Liberty, according to that sublime Mosaic allegory, was conferred upon our first parents. That liberty implied the power to do wrong. If the Eternal had been no wiser than some men, He would have made Adam and Eve and the human race in the form of a machine, and ruled them by some such method as it is proposed to rule the Filipinos. But God in His wisdom knew that moral strength can come only by personal endeavor, that wisdom is bought with experience often bitter, and that virtue itself is born of trial and suffering. So, too, if the Filipinos are to succeed, if they are to become a free and independent nation, they must be free to stumble, and to gain their experience, their strength and their wisdom, as all men and nations have gained them.

The process of national nursing and spoonfeeding has always been, and always will be, a failure. God has trusted man with freedom to work out his own salvation. But petty kings and potentates have always feared to trust the people with the exercise of the divine right of liberty. Yet this great nation has stood before the world for more than a hundred years, a mighty testimony to the truth that the best government is that which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. Will you depart from this world-inspiring position for the sake of a few islands in the orient? Will you write the fathers of your nation down as Utopian theorists for the sake of obtaining lands which you and your descendants may never set foot upon? Will you depart from that noble mission as the greatest apostle and exponent of liberty, the sustainer of the charter of human rights which made kings and princes to tremble, and which changed the

destiny of a world, in order to obtain the worthless remnant of possessions which European greed has by chance overlooked?

I cannot understand how any American who justly prides himself upon his country's great achievement, and upon the principles by which it is sustained—how such an American can walk through Independence hall and read that charter of human liberty—the greatest ever penned—and then throw in his lot and his influence with those who are vainly seeking to subjugate by force of arms a people who are intelligent enough to desire independence, and brave enough to fight for it. For, a Filipino who did not prize liberty above everything else in the world would not stand up to fight against this mighty nation, with its illimitable wealth and power. . . .

But my mission in this country is not only to tell the truth about the Philippines, but, as I have frequently stated, to obtain peace. I should, therefore, be glad if you will permit me to state what I conceive to be the way out of this present difficulty. It may be summed up in one phrase: Do unto us as you desired that George the Third should do unto you. Be great enough to determine to do right, no matter what may be thought or said by other nations who are too busy doing wrong to ever regard it as dignified to do right. Admit that the Filipinos have the same rights which you yourselves enjoy. Admit that there have been mutual misunderstandings. If wrong has been done, admit that also, and rectify it. It is nobler to admit a wrong than to persist in it. Had congress declared intentions with regard to the Philippines, conformable with Philippine independence, the clash of arms would have been heard no more, and strife would have ceased between two peoples who ought never to have been other than friends. Let the Filipinos reestablish the government which they had instituted with the consent of the governed; take whatever means are necessary to protect your interests, and to discharge your international obligations. You will then be surprised, though perhaps it will not be a surprise to some, to find that all your fears about anarchy and disunity and failure will have proved to be groundless. Another example will have been given to kings, showing that the people may be trusted to govern themselves, and we shall be able to look up at

"Old Glory," knowing that it is the symbol of liberty—liberty, not only to this people, but to all mankind.

**COCK ROBIN'S SLAYER.**

For The Public.

"Who killed Cock Robin?  
'I,' said the sparrow,  
'With my bow and arrow,—  
I killed cock robin.'"

So sang Mother Goose,  
With her tongue running loose,  
But she either was blind as a bat,  
Or she'll need your last prayer,  
For cock robin's slayer  
Was the girl with the bird in her hat.

And never forget,  
She is wearing it yet!  
Some butcher may write her a sonnet;  
But a poet would urge,  
First, a funeral dirge,  
Apropos of the corpse on her bonnet.

From meadow and grove,  
O, merciful Jove!  
To a civilized planet afar,  
Take thy sweet birds unslain,  
Let the slaughtered remain  
To remind us how barb'rous we are.

ROBERT CUMMING.

There is a part of London known as the Inner Belt. It lies outside the limits of the city, and within the suburbs. This is the part, in East London especially, but also in other parts, which suffers most from overcrowding. The working class must be within easy reach of their work. Nearly all the industries, factories and works are situated in East London and in South London, so that in the former the Inner Belt extends as far as the river Lea. The overcrowding in some parts, in Spitalfields for instance, is so terrible that beds, not rooms, are rented; that children have to sleep under the beds; that a person who is on night duty will rent a bed by the day, while another sleeps in it at night; that the day is even divided into three watches of eight hours each, the bed being rented by three persons who occupy it each for eight hours.—Sir Walter Besant, in *January Century*.

**FREE TRADE POINTS.**

For The Public.

In his "Critical Period of American History" (Chap. IV., p. 134), John Fiske says:

The simple principle that when two parties trade both must be gainers, or one would soon stop trading, was generally lost sight of; and most commercial legislation proceeded upon the theory that in trade, as in gambling or betting, what the one party gains the other must lose.

On the following page Mr. Fiske remarks with one of his characteristic parentheses:

The sturdy race of smugglers—those despised pioneers of a higher civilization—thrived in defiance of kings and parliaments.

Many exchanges have printed a paragraph announcing that the daily population of the Equitable building in New York is 3,100, and that the mail averages about 18,000 pieces a day. This record is outstripped by several buildings in this city, notably the Monadnock block, which at present has a daily population of close to if not quite 5,000. So vast is the postal business of this human hive that it was found necessary to establish on the main floor a branch post office with four mail carriers. The Monadnock block is 400 feet long, 70 feet wide, 16 stories high at one end and 17 at the other, and has in all 1,200 offices. In one day over 20,000 persons passed through the Jackson boulevard entrance alone.—Chicago Chronicle.

Miss Sensitive—"Oh, why doesn't the president do something to relieve the unhappy conditions in the Philippines? Our poor soldiers are dying or becoming insane; and the unfortunate Filipinos are being imprisoned or torn away from their families, and sent to desert islands. The—

Miss Factly—Oh, you are too unreasonable for anything! What can good Mr. McKinley do? You talk as if he had as much power as Mr. Morgan!

G. T. E.

Kind Old Lady—Why, my child, you must be nearly frozen.

Little Shivering Oliver—Yes'm. I had a soft job down ter de thee-ayter, but de S'ciety Pervenshin Cruelty ter Kids got me fired.

McHanna—Yes, we certainly should be pardoned for feeling somewhat elated over our success in the Philippines.

Hannamack—Especially when it is remembered that while the Spaniards in two hundred years of warfare, were unable to overcome the natives, we, in no more than one-hundredth of that time, have overcome them and ended their insurrection time and again.

G. T. E.

Beetz—I saw Mr. Carnegie, but he refused to assist me.

Optimitz—You should feel gratified, man! He probably thought you were too intelligent to need a library.

G. T. E.

**BOOK NOTICES.**

The Philippine Information society, which aims to place "within the reach of the American people the most reliable and authoritative evidence attainable in regard to the people of the Philippine islands and our relations to them," has issued the sixth number of its first series of publications. "Iloilo, an Episode of January, 1899,

and Strained Relations in Manila" (Boston: L. K. Fuller, secretary, 12 Otis Place. Price, 10 cents), containing the documentary history of the circumstances under which President McKinley declared war against the Filipino republic six weeks before the outbreak of hostilities. The documents consist chiefly of the president's war proclamation of December 21, 1898, and correspondence between Gens. Otis and Miller, showing the impatience of the latter to open fire and the anxiety of the former to wait until the time was ripe. This number of the Information society's publications, like all that have preceded, is entirely non-partisan. It consists of nothing but official documents, connected with colorless explanations, and it comprises all the documents that are available. It is an invaluable contribution to the ready reference literature of the Philippine question. The seventh number of the same series also is out. It deals with the efforts of the Filipinos to make peace.

From Slavery to Freedom (Aurora, Ill.: Charles H. Davies, Price, \$2.00), by Charles H. Davies, is a sociological treatise. For a book in which so many good things are so well said, its imperfect arrangement and its lack of unity are disturbing. These defects in construction, however, correspond with what we should regard as defects in the author's philosophy. Taken point by point, very much of the philosophy is sound and clear, and sustained by strong and pointed arguments. But there is such a lack of correlation that the treatise becomes little more, in our judgment, than a disordered collection of thoughts of varying value. Mr. Davies makes at one point an excellent refutation of the atheistic theory that human progress is the resultant of a fierce struggle for existence. But, calling that struggle "competition," he is misled, by the ambiguity of his term, into supposing that his preceding arguments are applicable to industrial competition. The truth is, as he himself, with his evident faculty for logical demonstration, would doubtless have concluded but for his slip in confusing terms, that the industrial concept to which the term "competition" is applied—that competition which is really "the life of trade"—is in no sense akin to the concept of a fierce struggle for existence. The industrial correspondent of the latter concept is rivalry between conflicting monopolies, not competition among equal traders. Industrial competition is best defined as "free bargaining among free men." When so understood, the theory that it involves a fierce struggle for existence loses all plausibility. So far from resulting in the survival of the strongest, it results in the leadership of the most useful. They set the pace. To assume that the leadership of the most useful can possibly injure anybody is to get close to the verge of the absurd. There is in Mr. Davies's book, however, a refreshing loyalty to the doc-

**THE PUBLIC**

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico,

**ON TRIAL**

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

**SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.**

Send subscriptions with addresses to **THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago.**