

nothing prejudicial. And when we consider the matter further there does not appear to be anything wrong or prejudicial in the discharge of men by an employer. The men do not suffer because they are discharged. They suffer because they cannot get other employment. This is what Mr. Lee suffers from. If jobs in general were abundant he would not be worried. He would only step out of one place to step into another. But jobs are not abundant. That is a patent fact. But why not? Everybody wants things done, and the more they get done the more they want. It is impossible to do work enough to satisfy the natural demand for workers. Why, then, should anybody suffer from general deficiency of working opportunities? The plain reason is—but, as Kipling says, when he is crowded for space, “that is another story.”

Commenting upon Mr. Bryan's statement of the political issue as an irrepressible conflict between plutocracy and democracy, the Chicago Tribune says that—

if by plutocracy Mr. Bryan means the maintenance of law, of sound money, and of the right of every man to enjoy the fruits of his own ability and property, then plutocracy, according to his definition, will always triumph.

It must have been difficult to express in so few words so many glaring ambiguities. “The maintenance of law” may mean a good thing or a bad one. Laws calculated to foster natural rights are to be maintained. That is democracy. But what of laws which foster special privileges and defy natural rights? It is certainly not democratic to maintain them, even though they be enforced while on the statute books. Democracy would repeal them. What would plutocracy do? “The maintenance of sound money” may also be good or bad. It depends upon what is meant by sound money. Some of the worst things in the world have at times been called “sound.” It was “sound” doctrine once in this country to guar-

antee every man the right “to wallop his own nigger.” Another ambiguous phrase is “the right of every man to enjoy the fruits of his own ability and property.” “Ability” at what? “Property” in what? Shall any man be secure in the enjoyment of his ability as a pickpocket, as a bank burglar, as a forger, as a briber of legislatures, or as an expert in securing the privileges of class laws or of laws creating special privileges? Shall he be secure in the fruits of property so acquired? The Tribune dare not defend these interpretations of its statement. Yet it justifies the interpretations by its deliberate ambiguities. Its object in using words with double meanings is to confuse unjust property rights with just property rights, predatory ability with productive ability. Under democratic principles productive ability and just property are sacred, and the Tribune slyly appeals to the sentiment that holds them sacred by putting forward in ambiguous verbiage those very legal privileges which rob productive ability and menace just property rights. It tries to pass off the wolves in the fold as part of the sheep.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL CURIOSITY.

The McKinley administration has made a remarkable discovery in the Philippine islands.

It has discovered a peculiar psychological condition among the Filipinos with which the administration seems to be wholly unfamiliar. Gen. MacArthur, who reports it, does not seem to know the name of the peculiar mental state he has discovered. He says this strange state of mind, which he calls madness, has been caused by “rhetorical sophistry and stimulants applied to national pride.” That by reason of this madness the power of the Filipinos to discriminate in matters of private interest has been almost suspended. He says they are not a warlike or ferocious people, but that “they are animated by certain inchoate ideas and aspirations which by some unfortunate perversion of thought they conceive to be threatened by America.” He says

this peculiarity of the Filipinos has raised difficulties and obstacles in the way of pacification, and that the success of the guerrilla system depends upon the complete unity of action among the native population caused by this madness. “As a substitute for all other considerations,” MacArthur says, “the people seem to be actuated by the idea that in all doubtful matters of politics or war men are never nearer right than when going with their own kith and kin, regardless of consequences.” The general thinks that intimidation accounts for this condition to some extent, but not fully, and he adds: “It is more probable that the adhesive principle comes from ethnological homogeneity which induces men to respond for a time to the appeals of consanguineous leadership, even when such action is opposed to their own interest and convictions of expediency.” He says this madness prevails in the entire archipelago, except in a portion of one island occupied by the savage polygamous and slaveholding friends of the United States.

The idea that the Filipinos should allow this “consanguineous ethnological homogeneity”—which he calls madness, produced by a stimulation of national pride—to unite them against a foreign invasion, and to lead them to put aside private interests in order to satisfy this madness seems so strange and unreasonable to our representative of the McKinley administration that he finds it hard to understand, and innocently reports it to his chief with the encouraging information that this perversity of the Filipinos will necessitate a large American military and naval force in the islands for many years to come. This is indeed encouraging, when we recall the preelection assurance by the administration that if McKinley were elected there would be peace in the islands within 60 days!

In view of the rarity in administration circles of this newly discovered passion, and the fact that the administration deems it such a novel monstrosity, it is certainly entitled to representation in the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, D. C. Some Filipino who is so thoroughly imbued with the madness referred to that he could be said to personify it ought to