

tenance and perpetuation and transmission to posterity?

What better strain of blood could heredity have to pass on and down to succeeding generations than a generation of youth trained in life-saving service rather than in life-destroying militarism? And how far-reaching is this method! Training to preserve life soon sweeps in methods of rescuing life from moral perils is well as physical, from perils of ignorance, perils of poverty, perils of hopeless degradation.—Rev. Samuel Richard Fuller, in *The Coming Age*.

MONEY NOT CAPITAL.

Money is never capital. It simply commands capital. If every dollar in money should be destroyed the world would have just as much capital as before, but those who now have the money would lose their power to command capital through that medium. If this conception be correct, then capital is always good, and never a menace to the people, although its improper use may become so. We cannot have too much capital, and it would make but little difference who owned, if only the results of its use were fairly divided between those who owned and those who performed the labor. It is the use of capital that is of vital importance, and not its ownership.

There must be public capital, such as parks, public buildings, streets, etc. And with this kind of capital I class railroads. I maintain that they are public capital, simply held in trust for the people, and the time is coming when they will be public capital in the fullest sense. Private ownership of land has been undoubtedly best under the civilization we have had, but advancement in civilization is teaching us more and more that even the land is simply held in trust by the owners for all the people, and it is theirs as soon as they demand it. No man's land is exempt from condemnation for public use now.—Gov. John Lind, in *St. Paul*, Apr. 22.

THE TENDENCY OF COMMERCIALISM.

It is the essential vice of aggregated wealth to oppose every movement which makes for the betterment of humanity in the mass. It was so in the evil days of slave-driving in our country; it has been so always; it will be so ever.

In 1850, when Mr. Seward was pleading with his fellow senators not to vote for the slavery compromise of that year, he used these prophetic words:

Slavery has, moreover, a more natural alliance with the aristocracy of the north,

and with the aristocracy of Europe. So long as slavery shall possess the cotton fields, the sugar fields and the rice fields of the world, so long will commerce and capital yield it toleration and sympathy. Emancipation is a democratic revolution. It is capital that arrests all democratic revolutions.

It does not wholly nullify this charge of crucifying the "enthusiasm of humanity" to say that the commercialism which I condemn rears splendid charities and opulent endowments for the cultivation of letters, and builds libraries and equips schools. Too often the process is but a disgorging of a small part of that which has been acquired by some of our various robberies under the forms of law for the benefit of a small portion of those from whom it was in the first instance abstracted, and too generally from the low and unworthy motive of quieting the public pulse and stifling the public conscience while the legalized spoliation is still going on. This constitutes what, in the estimation of the donors, the late Mr. Fernando Wood used to call "pandering to the moral element."—Judge Charles R. Grant, in *Akron (O.) Daily Democrat*.

WHY DO WE NEED A GREAT ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES?

I hardly could trust my eyes when I read in the president's annual message this amazing statement:

I had every reason to believe, and I still believe, that this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people.

And this, in the face of the fact that we need there for the enforcement of that sovereignty the largest army this republic has ever had in active field service, except during our civil war—an army twice or three times as large as any we had in the revolutionary war, or in the war of 1812, or in the Mexican war, or in Cuba in the late war—an army ten times as large as that which is thought necessary to keep order in Cuba now.

Why do we need so tremendous a force? To beat the Filipino army which, as our secretary of war told us, in a speech at Chicago, represented almost too infinitesimally small a portion of the Filipino people to be mathematically expressed by way of percentage? Or did we need it, as others tell us, to protect the "good Americans" among the Filipino people against the so-called "rebels?" But if, as the president says, "this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people," why do we not put arms into the hands of the

great mass to enable it to tackle that small rebellious minority and hand it over to the police? Why not? The reason is simple: Because, as everybody knows, there is too much reason to fear that this great mass of "good Americans" would, upon occasion, turn out to be good Filipinos and eventually use those arms against us.—Hon. Carl Schurz, at Anti-Imperialist Conference in Philadelphia.

OUR OWN SELF-GOVERNMENT IS NOT ABOVE REPROACH.

Neither have we a right to say that the Philippine people must be held to be incapable of independent government if they cannot form an ideal republic, in which liberty, and peace, and order, and honesty will reign in unclouded sunshine. They may easily be as orderly as Kentucky and as honestly governed as the city of New York. What if they have their troubles and turmoils? They may be like some South American republics, or develop into something like the orderly dictatorship in Mexico. Do we question the title of those countries to their independence? Let us not indeed "scuttle away" from the Philippines, like baffled thieves, but assist and protect them until they stand upon their own feet; and if this is done in perfect good faith, difficulties now deemed ever so formidable will vanish like morning mist.

Besides, it is not the most important question how perfect their government will be. More important is it that their government should be their own, and more important still that the American people should not become unfaithful to the fundamental principles of their democracy; that they should not lose high ideals of liberty, right and justice, and that they should wash from the escutcheon of the republic the foul blot with which the great perfidy to our late allies has defiled it.—Hon. Carl Schurz, at Anti-Imperialist Conference in Philadelphia.

THE POWERS OF PRESIDING OFFICERS.

The power of a presiding officer of a parliamentary body to thwart the will of the majority is considered in the somewhat novel case of state, ex rel Southy, v. Lashar (Conn.) 44 L. R. A. 197. Here the mayor of a city presiding in a meeting of the board of public works declined to entertain a certain motion, whereupon one of the members of the board took it upon himself to put the motion, and, upon its receiving a majority of the votes, declared it carried. The contention was made that the presiding officer of any deliberative board or assembly