

for their vitality. The list may begin with Pythagoras and comprise anyone in the more than 25 centuries since his decease. Then there is the defiance to produce the names of 20 vegetarians besides G. Bernard Shaw famous for their beauty. No limit as to time or place is imposed in this proposition. Then it is demanded, "What would Nansen have done with only a vegetarian diet permissible in his equipment for his polar expeditions?" And how would vegetarians have provisioned Columbus' vessel?

Flanking all these defiances and inquiries are letters from any number of actresses famous for good looks as well as ability testifying that they are firm believers in the joys and sustenance to be found in a mixed diet, with small birds not too scarce. The most interesting thing about all this is that vegetarianism has reached such proportions that those who, for reasons best known to themselves, oppose it think it advisable to mobilize.—Boston Evening Transcript.

HAMILTON ON LAND VALUES.

For The Public.

Here is an item for the admirers of Alexander Hamilton. In the Federalist, No. 12, on "The Utility of the Union in Respect to Revenue," advocating the adoption of the constitution because union would encourage commerce between the states which would otherwise interpose tariff barriers between one another, Hamilton says that the interests of agriculture and commerce "are intimately blended and interwoven," and adds:

It has been found in various countries that in proportion as commerce has flourished land has risen in value. And how could it have happened otherwise? Could that which procures a freer vent for the products of the earth, which furnishes new incitements to the cultivation of land, which is the most powerful instrument in increasing the quantity of money in a state—could that, in fine, which is the faithful handmaid of labor and industry in every shape, fail to augment the value of that article which is the prolific parent of far the greater part of the objects upon which they are exerted? It is astonishing that so simple a truth should ever have had an adversary, and it is one among a multitude of proofs, how apt a spirit of ill-informed jealousy, or of too great abstraction and refinement is to lead men astray from the plainest paths of reason and conviction.

And again: Personal property is too precarious and invisible a fund to be laid hold of in any other way than by the imperceptible agency of taxes on consumption.

"Two truths are told as prologues to the swelling act of the imperial theme," says Macbeth.

Strange that a man who could so clearly express two kindred truths should then proceed to advocate a revenue system which would restrict commerce and retard the increment of land values. Strange that even in that age he should fail to consider municipal as well as agricultural land values. And unfortunate that he should not have exerted his great influence to secure the total exemption of personal property from all taxation and the establishment of a revenue system which by freeing industry from all restrictions and raising public funds from a tax on land values would have tended constantly to increase at the same time the earnings of the individual and the earnings of society. Freedom of production increases land values and wages. Increased land values means more abundant social revenues. Increased wages means more abundant individual revenues. One hand washes the other.

WILLIAM S. RANN.

SPAIN TREATED PUERTO RICO BETTER THAN WE TREAT HER.

Extract from speech of Hon. William Sulzer, of New York, at the banquet of the Mohawk club in Detroit, Mich., Wednesday evening, May 2.

Since the ratification of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States the island of Puerto Rico has been and is now a part of the territory of this country, and the constitution applies to it, and should apply to it, just as much as it applies to the District of Columbia or the territory of Arizona. To contend otherwise is preposterous.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States, and entitled to the same privileges, the same rights and the same immunities under the constitution that the people of any other territory are entitled to in the federal union. The law compelling the citizens of Puerto Rico to pay a tariff tax on their goods, wares and merchandise to and from this country is unwarranted, unjustifiable, unprecedented, un-American, and, in my judgment, unconstitutional. In all our past history no political party ever dared to attempt to pass such a law—a law as inhuman as it is unfair.

The constitution regarding this matter is clear and plain. Section 8 of article 1 says in language that cannot be misunderstood:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The republican party has deprived

the Puerto Ricans of self-government and given them a military government. They have no representation in congress. Under Spanish rule they were represented by 12 representatives and four senators in the Spanish cortes. They had their own local legislature and absolute home rule. Why, under the circumstances, I ask, in the name of all that is fair and just and decent, should we now tax them and rob them?

Have we liberated them from monarchical tyranny only to enslave them in industrial oppression? The poor people of Puerto Rico will speak, and the great heart of the republic will answer and respond in the coming campaign. The American people will never repeat in the dying year of the nineteenth century the crimes and the blunders of George the Third in the closing years of the eighteenth century. In the sisterhood of states there must be no stepdaughters. The flag we all love must not be used as a cloak to rob and oppress our fellow citizens at the dictation of the trusts and to bolster up the falling republican protective tariff fallacy.

GOLDWIN SMITH ON THE BOERS.

Mr. Goldwin Smith, who gave up a place in British politics of considerable importance, and also a place as instructor in Oxford university, to live in Canada, has just returned from a visit of a few months in Italy. He expressed himself quite freely on the war in South Africa, and the place among the nations of the Boers, at the Fifth Avenue hotel this morning. Among other things he said:

"None of my English friends and correspondents," began Mr. Smith, "has ever doubted what would be the issue of a war in which the entire forces of the British empire were opposed to those of a population not half as large as the population of Liverpool. The Boers have put into the field decrepitude and childhood. They have no reserves. We shall win; and, having won, we shall, too, probably, reap in the judgment of posterity a measure of the same glory which we reaped in the burning of Joan of Arc. We shall be fortunate if we escape the guilt of opening an era of unscrupulous rapacity and violence which might throw back for a century the progress of moral civilization.

"A civilian can have nothing to say about this dispute as to the conduct of our generals. The generals were distinguished men. The British sol-

dier has shown his wonted valor. Canadian and Australian have fought gallantly at his side. Our military administration seems also to have really done well and put into the field with striking rapidity an unexpected amount of force. But besides the difficulties of the country, we have encountered in our enemy a moral force on which we did not reckon, and which escaped the discernment of Mr. Cecil Rhodes. We have encountered in its greatest intensity that enthusiastic patriotism which turns the slug-gard's blood to flame. Can history show a more memorable fight for independence than that which is being made by the Boer? Does it yield to that made by Switzerland against Austria and Burgundy, or to that made by the Tyrolese under Hofer? The Boer gets no pay, no comforts and luxuries are provided for him by fashionable societies; he can look forward to no medals or pensions; he voluntarily endures the utmost hardships of war; his discipline, though unforced, seems never to fail. Boys of 16—a correspondent at the Cape tells me, even of 14—take the rifle from the hand of the mother, who remains to pray for them in her lonely home, and stand beside their grand-sires to face the murderous artillery of modern war. A newspaper correspondent the other day saw a boy of 16 lying mangled on the field, and saying: 'It does not hurt much; only I am so thirsty.' Rude, narrow-minded, fanatical in their religion, these men may be; so were the old Scotch Calvinists; so have been some of the noblest wildstocks of humanity; but surely they are not unworthy to guard a nation.

"Ax on shoulder the Boers twice went out to make for themselves a home in the wilderness where they might live their own life. Who had a right to take it from them? Her Britannic majesty did not create Africa. There is too much truth in the saying that this is the second Jameson raid. It makes me sad to think into what hands my country has fallen. Had Lord Salisbury kept the matter in his own hands, as he ought, for it was really a foreign, not a colonial question, there would have been no war."—New York Evening Sun of April 23.

THE IMPERIALIST RELIGION. THE CREED.

1. I believe in the old war taxes to prevent trade with Europe and the new war taxes to force trade with Asia.

2. I believe in excluding uneducated Europeans who wish to enter our territory, and in including uneducated Asiatics who wish to keep out.

3. I believe in home rule for Ireland, but in alien rule for the Spanish islands.

4. I believe that whites and blacks have a right to govern themselves, but not browns.

5. I believe in a Monroe doctrine which forbids Europe to interfere with self-government in America, but permits America to interfere with self-government in Asia.

6. I believe that governments get their just powers from the consent of the governed in America, but from contempt for the governed in Asia.

7. I believe that taxation without representation is tyranny when applied to us, but philanthropy when applied by us.

8. I believe that forcible annexation is criminal aggression, but that payment to non-owners makes it benevolent assimilation.

9. I believe that militarism and foreign broils strengthen despotism abroad but republicanism at home.

10. I believe that American policies have made a little America, but that European policies will make a greater America.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me and only gold above me.

2. Thou shalt not worship any graven image except on bank notes.*

3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, but shalt use it profitably to sanctify thy greed.

4. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. On the seventh day thou shalt do no labor, but thy man servant and thy maid servant, thy freight trains, thy blast furnaces and thy sweat shops must be kept going.

5. Honor thy father and thy mother but disregard the fathers of thy country.

6. Thou shalt not kill except to extend trade.

7. Thou shalt not commit adultery, but may enter into entangling alliances.

8. Thou shalt not steal, but shall annex.

9. Thou shalt not bear false witness, but censor the dispatches.

10. Thou shalt not covet, but grab.

THE PRAYER.

O Thou, who dost exalt the mighty and put down those of low degree, crush, we beseech thee, the struggles of the Filipinos for independence. Force them to recognize that, although

they are willing to die for freedom, they are not fit to live in freedom. May they and all men forget the declaration of independence, or if they remember it may they also remember that it was not intended to apply to Malays. Strengthen in us the pride of race and the exalting conviction that we are not as other men are. Help us to scorn the Filipinos as children unworthy of the rights which our ancestors had from the days of barbarism. May we subject them to alien military rule, knowing that this is the school in which self-government and manhood are developed. May our people forget that the Filipinos had established a government in which life and property were secure before we commanded them to lay down their arms, and enable the voters to rejoice when they read of villages destroyed for the preservation of property and men killed for the preservation of life. Forbid, O Lord, that we should treat the Filipinos as we have treated the countries of Spanish America in the past, protecting them against foreign aggression and permitting them the government of their choice. Aid us in our war of subjugation to the end that we may use the Filipinos to extend our trade—and thy glory—in the orient. All this we ask in the name of Him who said: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."—Charles B. Spahr.

"THE CHRISTIAN."

The following is an extract from an address delivered Sunday evening, April 22, at the Vine Street Congregational church in Cincinnati by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

There has been a revival of interest in Mr. Caine's book, "The Christian," owing to the drama based upon the novel, which has been presented to the Cincinnati public during the week just passed.

What Glory was to Father Storm, the theater is to the church—a gay child surrounded by many temptations. For the church to taboo the theater because its influence may be bad would be as irrational as it was for Father Storm to shut himself up in a "salvation zoo" and leave Glory alone in the world. The surest way to make a thing bad is to call it bad names. The function of the theater is to reach the mind through the eye, to convey truth by example. Let us recognize that function as natural and legitimate. Let us insist upon its noble possibilities. Let us frown upon the bad by expecting and encouraging the good. Mr. Caine's play