

not the action of the recluse, but that of the citizen.

So Johnson solved his problem in the only way in which it could be morally and sensibly solved. He decided to devote himself to the destruction of the institution of land monopoly, by the method advocated by Henry George and now known as the single tax; and to do this without regard to its ultimate effect upon his personal fortune, and without any affectations meanwhile of an impossible consistency between his private business, in which monopoly was a factor, and his public work of abolishing monopoly.

He raised his lance not against millionaires nor monopolists, not against the rich because they are rich nor for the poor because they are poor; but against the institution of monopoly and for institutions of justice. The distinction he drew between utilizing monopolies in business and maintaining the monopoly institution, was sharply illustrated by him upon the floor of congress while he was a member. Congressmen representing the steel trust were struggling for the protective tariff on steel. Johnson himself was then in the steel business and his company was a member of the steel trust. He, therefore, like the others, was getting a tariff "rake-off." Yet he vigorously opposed the tariff measure. One of the steel trust congressmen, twitting him in the debate with his connection with the steel trust, implied that as he was getting part of the plunder he ought to support the law that secured it. "Gentlemen," retorted Johnson, "as a monopolist in the steel business I will take advantage of the bad laws you pass; but as a member of this house, I will not help you pass them, and I will try to get them repealed."

More in detail, and as a private citizen instead of a congressman, he made the same distinction at a public meeting in New York in 1891. A questioner in the audience asked him:

You have just advocated the abolition of land monopoly, of the tariff monopolies, of the patent monopolies, and of the street railroad monopolies. Is it not a fact that you have been, and are now, a shining beneficiary of

all these iniquities? And if you are, how do you reconcile your actions with your professions?

To that searching question Johnson replied:

I advocate now and have advocated the abolition of all these forms of monopoly, and yet I am and have been a beneficiary of them all. If there is any inconsistency in that it is not my fault. I preach what I sincerely believe to be the true and just social condition—the condition of equal rights, of real freedom. Yet I must live under such laws and usages as the majority of the people decree. They say that these monopolies shall exist; that bread-winning shall be a scramble; that there shall be many poor among us and comparatively few rich. I do not believe that this is right, and I am raising my voice wherever possible against it. But the people will not yet listen. They have different views from mine, and they hold to them. Now being compelled to live in this state of things where life is a scramble which the people will not stop, I am bound to do the best I can for myself. And so I rush in and grab all the monopolies I can get my hands on, firm in the purpose, however, to use the wealth so obtained to teach the people how misguided they are to permit themselves to be robbed in this way.

That purpose of using his fortune acquired by monopoly to break up monopoly has been faithfully adhered to. Not as an atonement, not as a means of satisfying his conscience for having got the fortune through monopoly. In no sense for personal reasons, but with the same motive that he gives to this work of his life what is incontestably all his own.

There is, indeed, a profound difference between getting rich through legalized monopoly, and supporting, either as private citizen or public legislator, the laws that legalize it. In the one case, we but adapt ourselves to an evil social environment which is forced upon us; in the other, we make ourselves personally responsible for the evils of that environment.

The men who were responsible for the perpetuation of slavery in the United States, and therefore the real sinners in that respect, were not the slaveholders as such. Slavery was perpetuated by men as citizens, by non-slave owners as well as slave owners, who used influence and vote to maintain the institution. Similarly the men who now perpetuate

monopoly are not the monopolists as such, but citizens who, whether themselves monopolists or not, contribute voice, pen, vote, even cowardly silence, to the maintenance of civic institutions that make for monopoly.

One such man as Tom L. Johnson, who profits by monopoly and excuses monopolists, yet denounces the institution of monopoly and makes relentless war upon it, is worth more to the cause of civic justice than a host of men who rail at monopolists as wrong doers merely because they are monopolists, yet allow the institution of monopoly to go unchallenged, or challenge it without intelligence. The true principle of civic ethics is that which Johnson exemplifies. It does not consist in rejecting profits which unjust institutions yield to the favored or fortunate. So long as social adjustments are such that those profits cannot be relinquished to the persons who earn them, justice is served neither by giving them to others nor by rejecting them altogether. It is not affirmatively ethical to get rid of them; consequently it is not unethical to keep them. What ethics does demand is that the beneficiary of such profits shall awaken to the enormity of the social institution that diverts them from their unidentified producers, and in his capacity of citizen aid his fellow citizens of like enlightenment and moral impulse to bring that vicious institution to an end.

## NEWS

Once more the war in South Africa becomes the chief subject of general interest, in consequence of a notable Boer victory. Such revivals at the holiday season seem to characterize this most remarkable war. In 1899 the British commander had announced his intention of eating his Christmas dinner in the Boer capital; but instead, the British were badly repulsed at the holiday season in the battle of Tugela river (vol. ii., No. 90, p. 8), and all their advancing columns were held in check. A year later, 1900, after what was supposed to be the final victory over the Boers had been celebrated throughout England, and public interest in the war had subsided, the holiday season brought news

of a brilliant Boer victory (vol. iii., p. 583), which suddenly revived general interest in the subject. And now, another year having elapsed, during which the South African war news had again dropped to a minor place, the holiday season has again restored it and made the South African war the news topic of principal interest.

Though some indications of revived energy among the Boers was given last week, in that report the British appeared to have offset their losses somewhat by an important capture on the 24th. But later advices show that on the same day on which this capture was made in the Pietersburg district, the Boers were making a capture of much greater importance and winning one of the most encouraging successes of the year. This was at Zeefontein, in the Orange Free State, northwest of Bloomfontein and between Bethlehem and Lindley. Under DeWet they attacked four companies of British yeomanry, commanded by Col. Firman. Firman was absent at the time, and during the battle Maj. Williams was in command. The British lost 56 in killed, including Maj. Williams, and 250 in wounded and prisoners. The two guns in possession of the British at this point were captured by the Boers. After the battle the Boers were pursued by reinforcements of British horse, but unsuccessfully. Subsequently they released their prisoners.

The British casualties at Begin-deryn, reported last week (p. 602) prove to have been 10 killed and 15 wounded.

Boer leaders at Amsterdam are said to have decided to send C. M. Wessels to the United States, accredited by President Kruger to President Roosevelt, with a view to making peace overtures. American sentiment being regarded as friendly. This impression derives further support from the fact that pro-Boer meetings are becoming markedly successful. A large one was held in Topeka, Kan., on the 29th, and was addressed by prominent leaders of both political parties. The resolutions urged an offer by President Roosevelt of his friendly offices as an arbitrator. Other meetings of similar character are being arranged for, following the example (p. 568) of the great meeting last month at the Auditorium, in Chicago, which was pre-

sided over by Judge Tuley and addressed by Burke Cockran.

Curiously enough there comes a holiday message from the Philippines (the last previous reports from which were summarized at page 568), which resembles that from South Africa, though in minor degree. On the very day of the British disaster in the Boer war, Christmas eve, the Americans in the Philippines suffered seriously in an engagement in the island of Samar. An American detachment of 18 men, while scouting near Dapado, was attacked by Filipinos, and a hand-to-hand fight resulted. The American loss was seven killed and six wounded.

Other Philippine news is not so disheartening to the Americans. In an engagement in Batangas province, Luzon, only one American was badly wounded, while several Filipinos were killed. In Laguna province, Luzon, the Americans have made what the dispatches describe as a "clean sweep." They have burned not only all the Filipino barracks they could find, but also several little villages or hamlets. Still another item of Philippine news is the sentence to hanging of several Filipinos, by American courts-martial, upon allegations of murder, one of the accused being a commander of Filipino forces charged with aiding the assassination of prisoners.

The birthday of Jose Rizal, Filipino poet and patriot, who was executed by the Spanish before the occupation of the Philippines by the Americans, was celebrated at Manila on the 30th, by his countrymen. They decorated the spot upon which he died, and held a mass meeting on the site where a monument to his memory is to be erected.

The American civil governor, Taft, sailed from Manila for home on the 24th, on the United States army transport Grant, leaving Vice Gov. Wright at the head of the American civil government in the archipelago.

Warfare is not altogether the order of our time, but wars and rumors of war are the prominent facts which meet the eye in whatever direction it turns. South America, already furnishing news from two wars, is looked to now for news of a third. Chili and Argentina are the countries involved. We have already noted the possibility of this war (pp. 584, 602); supposing,

however, that it had been averted by the signing, reported last week, of a protocol between the quarreling countries. But news of the current week is to the effect that the government of Argentina has rejected this settlement.

The dispute between Chili and Argentina is over a boundary line. By treaty in 1881, the boundary line between the two countries southward to the fifty-second parallel of south latitude, was laid along the highest summits of the Andes mountains, between the watersheds on each side; and it was agreed that disputes as to its course should be decided amicably by experts chosen by the two governments. Disputes did arise, and in 1892 an attempt was made to fix the line in accordance with the treaty; but the experts could not agree, the Argentine government declaring that the line proposed by Chili fell far within Argentine territory. Disputes continuing, a new treaty on the subject was entered into in 1898, under which the definition of that portion of the boundary which is south of latitude 26 degrees, 52 minutes and 45 seconds, was left to the decision of the British government. In 1899 the British government accordingly appointed as arbitrators Baron Edward McNaghten, Gen. Sir Charles Ordagh and Col. Sir Thomas H. Holdich. Although the arbitration proceedings are still pending, Chili has opened roads in the disputed territory. She is also—and this is the immediate cause of the present friction—fortifying disputed territory in the region of the Straits of Magellan, south of the fifty-second parallel, territory which she claims to be outside the territory involved in the pending arbitration proceedings; and as a countermove Argentina has sent troops into the same territory, and is making active preparations for war.

The good offices of the United States were offered to Chili and Argentina early in December of this year, but they have not been accepted. Great Britain and Brazil made a like offer at about the same time, which as yet is also unaccepted. On the 13th Chili forwarded diplomatic proposals to Argentina, to which the latter replied on the 16th. On the 21st Argentina ordered her minister to Chili to withdraw if the terms of her reply were not complied with. An arrangement was made, however, on the 25th, whereby both governments agreed to