

same government. There in the Golden city were thousands of foreigners, from every country on the globe, jostling and running and climbing over each other in their pursuit of gold; here in Pretoria are the hundreds of easy-going, methodical, religious Boers, discussing affairs of state, driving lumbering ox wagons or attempting to conciliate an aggrieved uitlander. There were the cries of the stock brokers, the noise of the pounding stamp mills and the braggadocio of the gambler; here are the calm of the Christian home, the solemnity of a body of men in whose hands is the destiny of a republic, and the air of righteousness. There was Bedlam; here is the City of Peace.

Stretching away from the center of the city, where the statesmen, bankers and business men had their workshops, were the residential streets, the glory of Pretoria. There the clear mountain water, coursing in little rivulets between the sidewalks and the dwellings, fed the roots of the willows and the rose bushes, and vivified the landscape with the vari-colors of nature. Every cottage, with its rose fence and its smoothly cropped lawn, was a painting, and every Boer housewife's collection of flowers and plants was in an imaginary beauty contest, in which the admiring pedestrians were supposed to be the judges. Inside the cottages the tidiness and cleanliness that distinguished their Dutch ancestors furnished material evidence against the ruthless misrepresentation of the Boer's habits. Young women whose grandmothers assisted husbands and brothers in fighting against the savage tribes that attacked the pioneers, and who themselves were educated in European or South African colleges and seminaries, displayed their talents in the baking of bread, and the playing of pianos and other musical instruments. Young men fresh from European universities appeared, and with equal facility and knowledge discussed the latest phases of the eastern political question or the most recent advances in irrigation methods. The enjoyment which the old-time Boer, circumscribed as he was before the advent of telegraphs and railroads, found in the shooting of game, the young Boer of to-day finds in the same channels as the youth of other countries. He is a patron of the arts, loves open-air sports, dances, and, above all things, is an expert with the rifle.

"Do you know Gabbleby?"

"Well, I have a listening acquaintance with him."—Puck.

#### THE OTIS BRAND OF PEACE.

Judge Thomas Canty, of Minneapolis, arrived in Minneapolis from Manila, April 18. The Minneapolis Journal of April 20 contained an interview with Judge Canty, from which the following is taken:

I believe that it would take 500,000 men ten years to put down that insurrection, and that even then it would not be permanently done. The original cause of the insurrection was official tyranny and unscrupulousness and the attempt of Spain to put down the Kaputin organization, which had been formed with a membership of 100,000, chiefly among the Tagalos, to suppress them. It continues because the Filipinos have absolutely no faith in our word. The difficulty is not to defeat the forces of the islands in open battle, but to keep them driven when they have once been driven. This is impossible. By the time the pursuing force is back in quarters, the pursued and ostensibly defeated force is also back ready to resume guerrilla fighting.

When I went to Manila I asked Gen. Otis whether he considered that the war was about over, and he assured me that it was and that in a very limited time order would be restored. Acting on this theory, I began tramping through the islands, going out short distances from the towns, only to be halted on each occasion before I got outside the city limits, as you may say, by our own sentries.

The sentries assured me that if I went any further I should be knifed by the "niggers." This astonished me. I understood that the enemy had been decisively defeated and that there surely would be no danger to life in the immediate vicinities of the principal towns. I explained my ideas to the sentries, who assured me that the enemy had been defeated again and again, but that he was an enemy who would not stay defeated. He always came back again. This sort of thing happened on Laguna de Bay and in several places close to cities. The soldiers told me that the people making the trouble were ladrones, which is Spanish for thieves. Then I noticed that all the most pretentious houses in the towns were empty and that the small bamboo huts were inhabited. In other words, that the wealthy inhabitants had fled to the mountains, while a large proportion of the poorer element had remained. I asked the soldiers how this was, and they replied, referring to the wealthier class of natives who were missing from their homes, that they, too, were ladrones.

This and a number of other things brought me face to face with a conclusion that the wealthy class of Fili-

pinos were the ones running the war. I found this condition in all the principal towns outside Manila. The wealthy Filipinos and halfbreeds are ostensibly on the side of the Americans, but really are assisting to conduct the insurrection.

Our native secret service corps, for which we are paying a pretty penny, is engaged in rounding up ladrones, and in this service it does good work, being honestly assisted by the Filipinos of the better class themselves. In other words, we are doing police work for a people at war with us. But these secret service agents never discover anything of value concerning the actual movements of the enemy. If they do, they seldom report it. The fact is that if such a report was made the man making it would either have to remain thereafter in the American barracks or be assassinated.

In my opinion, the only progress that we have made in the Philippines is the substitution of guerrilla for regular warfare. Of course, our forces have opened up the railway and obtained possession of some cities where municipal governments with native officials have been set up. These officials are not loyal to us. Their existence is a continuous panorama of deceit.

#### TRUSTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Surveying the wide area of British industry in general, it cannot be said that we suffer in any appreciable degree from combinations of producers to keep up prices. That "trusts" exist in free trade countries as well as in protectionist countries is undeniable; but while in the former, the economy in production which results from their promotion goes to benefit the consumer in the shape of reduced prices, in the latter they are identified with high prices to the consumers and large profits to the producers. Our American friends are just now receiving a short lesson in the principles of free trade. They have built up high tariff walls in the interests of high prices. If the American workingmen want high prices, by all means let them have them, but surely it is a little illogical for them to complain when the "trusts" and combines have raised the prices to the limit allowed by the tariff. The "trust" in itself is a harmless institution; it is the tariff—the element of monopoly—that makes it harmful. If they want to cripple the power of the trusts they must attack them through the tariffs.

We Britishers believe in cheapness. If we could get goods for nothing we would not be ashamed to take them. We are not ashamed to swallow the

bounty-helped sugar of France and Germany which we can buy for three pence (six cents) per pound, cheaper than the retail price in the country where it is produced. British sugar refiners have suffered thereby, but the confectionery, biscuit, jam, marmalade and sweet drink industries have received an immense stimulus owing to the cheapening of sugar. With the sugar which France sends us under cost price, and the cheap fruit she also sends us, we make jam, which we again export to her at a handsome profit. If we had a tariff of 40 per cent. on imported sugar that industry would be all gone, and we should no doubt have a "sugar trust" to control prices, as they have in America, under similar conditions. Under the natural regime of free trade we gain in one industry what we lose in another.

The protectionist looks at one trade alone—the one in which he is interested. It is like looking at only one wheel in a complex piece of machinery where there may be thousands of wheels that depend on each other. The final result of the working of the machinery is the one thing to be considered. We look to the whole world to supply our wants, and in a country whose commercial system embraces so wide an area it is absolutely impossible for a clique of capitalists to capture our industries and impoverish our people.

We are behind America in some forms of political freedom, but we are far ahead of her in industrial freedom. The adoption of the free trade policy in the middle of the century gave us freedom of distribution. The free and independent voters of America have surrendered their industrial freedom and independence. They went to bed thinking that they had shut the foreigner out; they are waking to find that they have only shut themselves in. They are ruled by a gang of commercial dictators in the prison house they have built for themselves. Whether the descendants of the men who fought at Bunker Hill and Lexington, at Gettysburg and Richmond will be equal to the destruction of the new tyranny remains to be seen. But, surely, if political liberty was worth fighting for, industrial liberty is worth voting for.—Thomas Scanlon, of Liverpool, England.

"Dobley has just bought the Century Dictionary for his wife."

"Yes; he said something might come up she'd want to know about some time when he didn't happen to be at home."—Life.

#### CAPITAL AND LABOR.

At the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, Sunday evening, April 8, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, delivered a lecture on the labor problem. What follows is an extract.

The deliverances of the pulpit on the labor problem may be boiled down to this: "Masters love your slaves; slaves obey your masters and keep sober."

The average preacher, if he is interested in the labor problem, thinks that the labor problem is only another name for the liquor problem. That is one good thing which prohibition might accomplish; it might demonstrate to the satisfaction of certain good folk that poverty has its roots, not in the drink vice, but in monopoly.

The real controversy is not one between capital and labor. It is between man and monopoly. It is all surface talk for a man to say that capitalists ought to give their workmen higher wages. If capitalists have the power to withhold from their men what is due them, then their men are slaves, and the remedy is to appeal to the voters to abolish the slavery, and not to appeal to the capitalists to be generous. But capitalists unless they are also monopolists have not the power to pay higher wages. They are in the position of the man described in the Bible: "He that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey." If the ordinary employer were to pay his men anything like a just wage, his business would be in the hands of a receiver in a month, unless he had a fortune to spend in charity. Charity is not what we want. We want reforms that enable men to be just without making a prey of themselves.

The labor problem will never be solved by preaching love in the pulpit. It can be solved only by practicing justice in the halls of legislation.

We must say to both labor and capital: "Confine yourselves to legitimate activities." When labor makes a pair of shoes, that is a legitimate activity. When labor employs itself going through another laborer's pocket, that is not a legitimate activity.

The great lesson for us to learn is that capital is doing things which are just as menacing to society as it would be if labor were allowed to employ itself in the highway business. Here is an illustration: Beneath one of the prominent business houses of our city there is a strip of land 16 feet in width which is owned by a woman who receives \$3,000 a year in rent for 20 years. Her contract binds her tenant to pay all the taxes during the term of the lease, and at the end of the 20 years the building erected on the ground reverts to her. She does not do a stroke of

work. Capital invested in a machine is capital invested for the purpose of aiding industry, and will perish if it is not useful. Capital invested in those 16 feet of ground is capital invested in the legal privilege of taxing industry and robbing the industrious to pension the idle. Wait until the people once see that. They will take the tax off from industry. They will put an end to that use of capital. They will stop this trafficking in man's right to live and work upon the earth. They will outlaw the capital that is engaged in the business of holding men up and robbing them of their wealth before permitting them to employ their labor and capital is useful employment.

Direct legislation will destroy the monopoly of the governing power. A scientific paper money will yet be found to abolish a monopoly of the money power. The nationalization of public utilities will abolish the railroad and telegraph monopoly. The single tax will abolish the land monopoly. That is the royal road of the reformer—to destroy monopoly; to break every yoke. Then, who knows, even the loftiest dreams of the socialist may blossom into being.

#### WHAT WE OUGHT TO DO FOR THE FILIPINOS.

Extracts from speech of Hon. William J. Bryan, in Los Angeles, Cal., April 10, as reported by the Los Angeles Herald.

There is a difference between expansion and imperialism. Expansion is the extension of the limits of a republic without a change of its character.

Imperialism is the policy of an empire. We have expanded before; we never had imperialism before. We expanded when we took in Florida; we expanded when we took in the Louisiana territory; we expanded when we took in Texas and New Mexico and California. But to-day it is not expansion. It is not taking in land that can be settled by American citizens and built up into American states. It is going across an ocean to get not land for settlement, but races for subjugation. Heretofore we have extended the area of the republic and every citizen has enjoyed the protection of the flag and the constitution, but the republican party now wants this nation to enter into a career of imperialism.

It wants the flag to be supported by the strength of the army, but it does not want the constitution to follow the flag when it goes into a distant clime.

What defense have you ever heard