

tion and to protect the small producer, the consumer, the merchant and the skilled laborer—these, not the trust magnates, are the real defenders of property rights.

#### THE BOXER TROUBLES AND THE "YELLOW PERIL."

This interesting article has been furnished to us by Dr. W. E. Macklin, for twenty years a missionary physician at Nanking, China.

First among the causes of the Boxer troubles I place race hatred, such as existed between the Jew and Gentile, the Greek and Barbarian.

In the character for the names of outside tribes the radical for "dog" is used. The radical gives the root meaning of the ideograph or character.

The Chinese hate outsiders, and even have very ugly nicknames for the various provinces in their own country. The presence and acts of foreigners have added to this hatred. The chief thing that has stirred up the intense hatred that led to the Boxer uprising is the plundering tendency of the Westerner, who desires mining privileges, railway concessions and mortgages on all the natural opportunities of the country. In fact, the foreigner was going to do what the spider does for the fly, but in a larger way. He was going to wrap China up in a net of railways, cornering of mines, and mortgage debt, so that when China awakened she would find herself only a mere shell, and all her nice, juicy portions, as liver, heart and brain, appropriated by the great spider; in fact, do just what the Standard Oil, Beef Trust and the spider "system" are so benevolently doing for this country. China began this when many of the crude forms of stealing were used, like grabbing great slices of territory, which looked more like the toad and fly than the spider and the fly.

When Kio Cheu was taken by Germany the Boxer trouble was fully hatched, and murders of unprotected white men, "foreign devils," began to occur.

Another cause was the great missionary movement, with the opening of schools, colleges, hospitals and various philanthropies. The missionaries translated the Bible, and, as in the time of Huss and Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Cromwell and William the Silent, revolution was unavoidable.

Men enlightened by the Bible, which speaks of one Father and equality of rights, must seek a change of the old absolutism and corruption.

The missionaries also published papers and periodicals, and translated

many of the best books of the West. This together with the general impact of the West, produced a renaissance which led to a great reform movement, in which great scholars, officials and even the Emperor joined.

The reformer aimed to give up all that was ancient and Asiatic, and adopt the methods of the West, as Japan has done. The wars with England, in 1842, and 1860, and that with Japan later, greatly hastened the fermentation of this great mass.

The Boxer movement was partly a reaction against reform. Renaissance and reform are justifiable, but franchise and concession grabbing are not so.

Another cause was extra-territoriality, that is, foreigners are not under jurisdiction in Chinese courts of law, but under their own consular management. This leads to an imperium in imperio, as mixed cases of foreigners and natives often come before the consul, and natives get under the protection of the foreign flag and bully their neighbors. Missionaries often cause ill-feeling by protecting native Christians under treaty laws. Slick black sheep may get protection in injustice, as well as good men in just cases. One needs to be wary of the wily Asiatic.

The introduction of Western machinery, as railroads and steamboats, scared the Chinese, for if one man can do the work of ten, what becomes of the nine? A great boating population has been ruined by steam. The carters and wheelbarrow men also feared that their trade would be gone, and would fight for their rights. All these and various minor causes had wrought the Chinese into a furor of excitement. The government reacted against reform, though the people were not so much opposed in this regard, but the greatest offense that made their blood boil was that they were being robbed of their land. The newspapers and the people said: "Our country is like a watermelon; it is going to be divided among the Western powers."

The Boxer trouble was largely a great patriotic effort of the people to protect their country from thieves, and there was no Good Samaritan nation to help the poor Emperor to save his country. The ministers were assisting their various nations to rob.

Why did the Chinese use their peculiar Boxer methods? Because China is almost as bad as Africa for fetishism and magic. They called on their gods and fetishes to give them miraculous powers. Hypnotists produced in the Boxer soldiers their trances and visions. Such methods have been used

for centuries in China and the Boxer tricks are not surprising to the student of Chinese history and romance.

Men who know China, predict another Boxer uprising away in the future. China cannot be plundered forever like the noble red man, or the Filipino under American rule. They will rebel and assert their rights to the bounds of their own habitation.

There is indeed a "yellow peril;" and woe betide the concession-grabber and oppressor. The Western thief is not dealing with Africa. Japan may lead or teach the Chinese in this affair. In fact, the Japanese are now everywhere in China, drilling armies, opening schools and colleges and propagating Japanese ideas. Germany, France and England will by and by find an eastern Monroe Doctrine established. It is hard to say whether Japan will have the moral courage to be a good Samaritan to China or not. If she appropriates Corea and Manchuria, she will gain the ill-will of the East. She now has the chance to be a saviour to China and India, and help them to get enlightenment and a free government. If she takes Manchuria as indemnity from Russia, she gains the hatred of the Chinese. She would be the first nation to really act the good Samaritan to another oppressed nation, if she took the opportunity.

At present Japan can dominate the East. The Chinese can produce the best and most hardy soldiers in the world, and those by the million. China is peace loving, but when it comes to fight, Europe cannot equal her. Revolutions in China, throughout her history, have lasted 20 and 30 years, killing off tens of millions of people. They are patient, but when they arise it is terrible.

There will be a Boxer movement in America soon (I hope peaceful), not the beef trust, the steel trust and all the other plundering and oppressive institutions will have to go.

How could France and Germany combined beat Oyama's army, recruited by China and fed by the Chinese? It is out of the question, and their hopes of territory and empire are smashed by Japanese success.

I think the Chinese will not go out of their own land to conquer other nations. They will simply, under Japanese assistance, establish their autonomy, and then make laws gradually to take back their mines and railways, by taxing them out of the hands of the plunderer. They know the method, as it is their old classical one. They will round out their empire by taking in Kiao Cheu from Germany, Siam from

France, and gradually Hong Kong and Wei Hai Wei from England, and later Manchuria and Corea from Japan. Then the real estate man won't be able to foreclose his mortgage on the poor old "sick man" of the far East. The supposed carcass will get up and walk and run, and the carrion crows will fly to their own cover, where they will likely be unmolested by the ex-carcass, if there is no further aggression.

#### CITY OWNERSHIP KILLS MONOPOLY.

Henry T. Rainey, Congressman from Illinois, in the New York American and Journal of May 21, 1905.

In a short time the question of municipal ownership will be directly presented to all the great cities of the country. In spite of strenuous objections, made principally by men who have a pecuniary interest in the private control of public utilities, it must be admitted that there is a growing tendency on the part of city governments to perform for themselves what has long been done by private corporations.

Within the last year or two the demand for municipal ownership in some of our larger cities has assumed almost irresistible proportions. Several weeks ago the question of municipal ownership of traction lines was directly submitted in the city of Chicago to the voters, and the proposition was carried by a majority of 85,000—a full set of city officials was elected upon a platform which declared in favor of immediate ownership of traction lines.

The argument against municipal ownership of public utilities always centers about two propositions. In the first place, it is insisted that "politicians" cannot run a business as well as private individuals who have a direct interest therein; and in the second place, it is insisted that a government which "governs least is best." It will always be necessary for the citizen, in his examination of this question, to determine just how much weight these propositions carry. I purpose to discuss each of them briefly.

It is also contended by some that a city should "regulate," not own; but this is made a part of the proposition that a city cannot run a business as well as private individuals.

Our cities are constantly growing in importance. In the State of New York over one-half of the population lives in cities of 10,000 and over. As our cities increase in population and

extend over more territory, the more remote do people live from their friends, their places of business and amusement, and their dependence upon street cars and telephones correspondingly increases. In the very nature of things the operation of street cars, telephones, waterworks, gas plants and electric lighting plants become monopolies. There can be no competition in the production of any of these things.

Occasionally we have a "war of rates." This is not competition. For a time consumers get the benefit of reduced rates—but the fight always results in the absorption of one company by the other—or in a division of the territory between the contending companies, and the old prices are restored. The consumer must either pay the price demanded and submit to the service rendered, or do without. He can buy only in one place.

In order to obtain for the consumer the service to which he is entitled there must be an efficient method of regulating these quasi-public corporations, or the city must own and control its own public utilities. At the present time the corporations are taking the absolutely indefensible position of opposing both regulation and ownership.

The difficulties of regulating these monopolies of situation are almost insurmountable. There is always present the danger that the corporations will regulate the cities—not the cities the corporations. These monopolies with millions at stake employ the best legal assistance—they build up great political machines and control thereby city governments, and all too frequently resort to a corrupt use of money in order to obtain legislation favorable to themselves. Monopoly in private hands has always taken advantage of the public, and it always will.

There is always the danger that one of these great corporations will steal a march on a complacent public and obtain long time contracts or franchises that will tie the hands of many future city administrations.

The tendency on the part of these corporations is to create insufficient or corrupt city governments. The weaker or more corrupt the city government becomes, the easier it is to obtain those important privileges and franchises which result in large profits to the companies. The apparent weakness, inefficiency and corruption of city governments becomes disgusting to many of our best citizens and they decline to enter city politics and to

make the necessary effort to better conditions. The large profits accruing to the owners of these monopolies attract others of our abler and best citizens and they are likely to become interested in them. They, therefore, become indifferent to good government, and, in fact, unconsciously perhaps to themselves, secretly prefer the other kind of government. In our attempts to regulate these monopolies of situation we are, therefore, face to face with the destruction of our highest civic ideals. As a matter of fact, you cannot keep monopoly in private hands out of politics—and it becomes and is a much more dangerous political factor than public ownership could ever be.

Is there anything in the objection that "politicians" cannot run a business as well as private individuals? This objection assumes that if we have municipal ownership the "politicians" will control these matters. It excludes from consideration the classified civil service idea, which now obtains to such a large extent in the administration, not only of our national government, but also of the government of our cities. But if we admit that the "politicians," as the term is sometimes used, will control a municipal venture, we must admit that the "politicians" now control the administration of these monopolies. They are now controlled in the interest of the companies. The "politicians" are answerable to the corporations which keep them in office and which can defeat them at will. They too often carry out, not the ideas which will be of most benefit to the greatest number of people, but those things which will benefit most of the corporations.

If the "politicians" were answerable to the people direct, and if the corrupting influences of the corporations were no longer a factor, they could hold their offices only by administering these utilities so that the public could get better service—a lower rate, better and more comfortable cars; so that there would be shorter hours and a better wage for labor. It is said that city officers would appoint their relatives and friends to desirable positions—but so do private companies. It cannot be assumed that private management of municipal monopolies is always honest. Some companies are managed honestly—some are not. Public ownership can never develop more dishonesty than has been developed by private ownership.

The strenuous opposition on the