

perialistic tendencies, they are for the trust from start to finish. If their tendencies are socialistic, they advocate the appropriation of trusts by the whole people. If they are like Mr. Hadley, they would punish every trust beneficiary who forgets his obligations of honor to society, and punish him severely by striking him hard with a feather.

Yet, after all, the whole matter is a simple one. A little less minute learning and a little more broad common sense would soon solve the problem of the trusts, which does in fact turn on the question of competition.

Mr. Hadley had hold of the "clew end of the skein," when in his speech at Berkeley he distinguished individualistic from socialistic government. But he held the clew in an unfamiliar and awkward way. The true distinction is not between two kinds of government, but between two kinds of function. There is no such thing as individualistic government, unless in a loosely colloquial or very fanciful sense. But there are individualistic functions. There are also socialistic, or governmental functions. Let these functions be kept distinct in thought and in legislation, and many a perplexing problem will solve itself.

What are governmental or socialistic functions, then, as distinct from individualistic? There should be little difficulty in deciding, if individual freedom is really desired. They can all be summed up in the one word, "monopoly." The management of those things which are monopolies necessarily, is a social function if there is any. Delegate to private management the preservation of the public peace, and you have a destructive monopoly, such as feudalism developed. Turn over the highways to private control, and you have a destructive and multiplying monopoly, such as our corporate railroad system has developed. Make the earth private property, and you have a monopoly to which all others are as pigmies to giants. One of its marked manifestations in our day is a continent fenced in and barely used, with every city and town displaying more valuable vacant lots many times over than valuable buildings, while half the population is landless and the whole of it is

land hungry. Whatever other functions, then, may or may not be socialistic, these certainly are—the regulation of land tenure for the equal good of all, the maintenance of highways for the equal use of all, and the preservation of the peace for the equal safety of all. When those unmistakable social functions shall have been socialized, we shall be able to judge what other functions, if any, belong in the same category. Until then we can only guess.

The object of this socialization is to secure to everybody complete freedom to perform individual functions; to secure to all, in other words, the right of free bargaining, which means the right of free competition. This is the natural, the truly scientific way of escape from the dangers of which trusts are significant. We have but to distinguish the field of competition from the field of monopoly. Many monopolies are created by legislation. Let them be abolished. Many grow out of restrictive laws, such as the tariff statutes. Let restrictive laws be repealed. Some are necessarily monopolies. Let the appropriate government control them for the common good. This done, competition will be free; for then bargaining will be subject to the mutual desires and productive capabilities of bargainers.

NEWS

Philippine news looms up sensationally again, through the capture of Aguinaldo. This was accomplished by a trick invented and executed by Gen. Funston. Three weeks ago Funston, with four other American officers, set out for Aguinaldo's retreat, which had been revealed by a treacherous Filipino officer. Funston and his companions pretended to be prisoners of war in the custody of a body of Maccabebes (who bear to the Americans in the Philippines similar relations to those of the Indians to the British in the American colonies a century and a quarter ago), and the Maccabebes pretended to be Filipino "friendly," bringing their distinguished American prisoners to headquarters. The ruse succeeded. Access to Aguinaldo's presence was thereby secured, and when this had been done the Maccabebes and their prisoners

seized his person and brought him to Manila. The capture was made near the east coast of Luzon, about 200 miles northeast of Manila, and in the wild and mountainous province of Isabela. Aguinaldo's influence with the Filipino people is conceded by his captors to have been so great that they herald his capture as ending the war and making further enlistments of American troops for the Philippines unnecessary.

There have been during the week reports from Manila of occasional fighting in a small way at widely separated points. Surrenders of Filipinos are also reported. The surrender of a Filipino command at Antique, in the province of Panay, was announced by Gen. MacArthur on the 22d as ending "the insurrection in Panay." The arrest is reported from Manila on the 25th of Jose Lozado and Francisco Revera, prominent members of the Filipino junta at Hong-Kong. General progress is reported in regard to the organization of civil government, and it is semi-officially announced that the military system will be superseded by civil authority by the 30th of June. Five leaders of a secret society—the Mando-Ducat—have been sentenced to be hanged at Calamba on the 5th, another to imprisonment for life, and four others to imprisonment for 20 years, for the alleged murder of the native president of the town of Calamba. On the 27th MacArthur approved these sentences of the military commission.

The British-Russian difficulty at Tientsin, which we reported last week, has been amicably adjusted. Lord Lansdowne announced the agreement on the 21st in the house of lords. He explained that the dispute concerned an extensive area on the left bank of the Peiho river, upon which Russia had entered last fall and which had subsequently been ceded to her by China. As the area comprised property of the Northern Chinese railroad, Great Britain had undertaken to protect the construction of this road within the area in the interest of British owners of the railroad's bonds. Hence the difficulty with Russia. The agreement between Great Britain and Russia, regarding the matter, reserves the question of title and proprietary rights for future examination, Great Britain mean-