

Because our mouths are choked with Filipinos' blood!

When Greece fought for liberty from the Barbaric Turks, President Monroe voiced American feelings by officially extending the friendship and sympathy of this country to the Greeks.

When Hungary warred for freedom from the Austrian monarch, President Tyler gave this nation's sympathy and greetings to the Hungarian patriots and received Kosciusko with open arms.

But when the huge British empire masses troops from the ends of the earth to conquer two tiny republics, when the soldiers of this empire burn and destroy and desolate, starve women and children and hang patriot prisoners, what says President Roosevelt?

Not one solitary word! Does the spirit of freedom no longer arouse a thrill in American breasts? Yes, but not in the breasts of American officials, because our officials are themselves engaged in subjugating a people whose only crime is a love of independence—Public Ownership Leader, of St. Louis.

ORGANIZED LABOR MUST CHAMPION ALL LABOR.

Extracts from a speech made by Robert Baker at a dinner given in Brooklyn, December 10, to M. J. Flaherty, by the Central Labor Union.

Organized labor must broaden out and come to see that the interests of the masses of the people are their interests.

Theirs must be the fight for freedom and not for restriction. To the extent that they throw any influence for restrictive measures, to that extent they are playing the game of their enemies, the monopolists; they are strengthening and supporting monopoly; they are making it easier for the Morgans, the Carnegies, the Rockefellers, the Vanderbilts, the Astors, et al., to rivet their grip on the people, in exploiting whom they are exploiting organized labor.

Through cunning, trickery and corruption the people have been robbed of their birthright. These strong, powerful, wealthy and unscrupulous forces have gotten possession of their immense wealth through the backstairs of legislative halls, but organized labor cannot, if it would, compete in that game. It has no immense corruption fund to grease the legislative machinery. Their cause to command success must be shown to be a popular

demand, the cause of the common people. That cause is always the cause of freedom, of equality, of justice, which can only be secured when we have succeeded in abolishing special privilege in every form.

In the nation, in the state, in the city; wherever monopoly has secured possession of a special privilege, there must organized labor make its fight. Make it openly, bravely, boldly. No matter how formidable its possessors may appear, no matter how influential in either or both parties its chief beneficiaries may be, wherever this hydra-headed monster of special privilege shows itself, there will the ablest and bravest of labor's champions find their fight, and there will they achieve their greatest triumphs.

The more organized labor champions the cause of all labor, unorganized as well as organized, the greater will be its victories; the more lasting, the more permanent, the more beneficial and the more far-reaching will be its successes. If it would extend and broaden its influences—aye, if it would accomplish most for itself—it must persistently and vigorously attack special privilege in every form; it must make the cause of humanity its cause.

HOW TO GET RICH, AND HAVE FUN DOING IT.

For The Public.

The following incident will show how easy it is to make money. It is really easier than falling off the proverbial log, for there's never any fun faking off a log, and there may be making money.

My young hopeful, aged nine, had his ambition to make money fired last summer by seeing other boys selling lemonade—a very common thing in the city of Providence—so he asked his mother could he do likewise, and her consent being given, here is what he did:

It was a lonesome job alone, so he induced his little chum—a boy of his own age—to go partners. They set up a stand outside my boy's, or his father's house (I'm not sure which), and sold lemonade, two and three cents per glass. The weather being hot, business was good; I should say very good, for in two days they had cleared three dollars each. Had they continued both might have had a nice little bank account, but they didn't. At the end of the second day they had a row. The partner made a big kick. Here's the kick:

Partner—I don't think this is a square deal.

My Boy—Why? (Indignant as a young hornet).

Partner—Why? Why? (His voice becoming staccato) I'm doing everything! I'm the whole bunch! And you're doing nothing! No, not one little bit! But you get half the money, all the same! I've supplied the stand; I've supplied the crock to hold the lemonade; I've supplied the lemons, the sugar and the glasses. Furthermore, I've sold every glass there was sold. I haven't left the counter for a minute; and you, what have you done? Nothing! Only went to the circus one day, to a ball game the other; and when you might have relieved me, you wouldn't do it, but went playing with the boys instead. That ain't a square deal! I ain't agoing to stand for it! Me do all the work, supply everything, and you get as much as I do! Not on your tintype!

My Boy—Ain't it my dad's sidewalk?

Partner—Yes.

My Boy—Well, if you don't like it, you just take your stand, and your crock, and your lemons, and—and yourself, too, and get out, and don't talk to me again, and I'll get Willie Jones to go into partnership with me.

When the young partner went home his mother spanked him, and his father said he did not know enough to go in when it rained.

Moral.—If you want to make money in the lemonade business, be sure your father owns the "sidewalk;" that's where the fun comes in.

"Now, do you see the cat?"

JOHN A. M'LAUGHLIN,
56 Benefit St., Providence, R. I.

PROF. SELIGMAN AND CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS ON THE SINGLE TAX.

Portions of a news report published in the Boston Evening Transcript of Jan. 11.

Seldom have the members of the Massachusetts Single Tax league had such an outcoming of listeners to their after-dinner addresses as they had at the Hotel Brunswick last night. Prof. Seligman, who was to have been the chief speaker, was unexpectedly detained in New York by illness, but he sent his address in abstract by special messenger, and it was read by Prof. Charles J. Bullock, of Williams college, and there was an extended discussion. . . .

Prof. Seligman made these points: "The tax on personal property at the present time is a snare and a delusion. As it is administered in the United States it is a tax not upon property, but upon honesty.

"Any attempt in the direction of freeing the individual as an individual

from the burden of taxation, and of levying the taxes on the sources of the income rather than on the income or the property itself, is an attempt in the right direction.

"To the extent that the single taxers are showing the iniquity of the personal property tax and the essential injustice of our present methods, there is a substantial agreement between them and the economists.

"But, whereas, the single taxers desire to have all taxes on the land, the ordinary economist will supplement this land tax by a tax on inheritance in the hope of reaching in that way some of the forms of privilege.

"So far, however, as the next step in tax reform is concerned, the reduction and the final abolition of the individual tax on personal property, there is a substantial agreement between the economist and the single taxer.

"Let us not look too closely into the fundamental theories of private property. Let us be willing to unite on a practical scheme of tax reform."

Among the letters was that of Hon. Charles Francis Adams, who wrote in part:

"I am, after long and deliberate consideration, a thorough believer in what is known as the 'single tax;' that is, in the system of raising all the revenue required for the economical administration of public affairs from ground rent. In this connection, however, there is one point I wish, now and always, to emphasize. While the principle at the basis of public revenue from ground rent is correct, it must in my judgment be very carefully connected in the legislative mind with the two following principles: First, the exclusiveness of that tax; second, that the amount to be raised shall be only what is required for meeting public expenses necessarily incurred under an economical administration of affairs."

NO COLOR LINE IN HAWAII.

The Literary Digest of December 14 says that "According to the Honolulu correspondent of the Boston Transcript, the color line is something that in Hawaii is absolutely unknown. 'Black and white and yellow and brown,' he says, 'are on a social equality.' The news of the Booker T. Washington dinner incident caused no stir there, where 'American, Hawaiian and negro sit down at the same table with Japanese and Chinese, and with never a thought of the proprieties.' The social conditions, continues the correspondent, 'are probably the most peculiar of anywhere in the United States.'" The Literary Digest then quotes the following from the Transcript correspondent:

The Hawaiian has, it is true, a skin of somber hue, but the darker the

color the prouder he is of his social status. There are innumerable wealthy natives here who move in the best society circles, and the issuance of the "Blue Book," for the first time, a few days ago disclosed that the "Four Hundred" of the city was made up of both black and white and yellow and brown.

The most prominent attorney and the best speaker in the islands is a negro, and he is much in demand upon every public occasion. This is T. McCants Stewart, who is also prominent in the high councils of the republican party, which is due not only to his own undoubted ability, but also because of his color, which gives him a powerful influence over the natives. There are four score at least of Chinese citizens, and the like, who move in the best society, and who are rated at anywhere from \$10,000 to \$3,000,000 when wealth is taken as a factor. The hospitality of the famous Ah Fong family is well known, particularly among army and navy officers, who have often been their guests.

The Japanese are also no small factor in the prosperity of the islands, and there are many with large accumulations of wealth. There is not the slightest social distinction made upon their own account, though they very rarely entertain. Among the Hawaiians, however, there is the greatest rivalry for social distinction. Princess Theresa, who is the wife of Delegate to Congress Wilcox, by her official position, claims the honors. Ex-Queen Liliuokalani is still the recognized leader among her own people, and Mrs. Wilcox's claims are disputed by several other ladies. Princess Theresa is the real leader of the home rule party, which is dominant in local politics, and is said to far exceed her husband, the delegate to congress, in her ability to control the party.

There are in all hardly more than 10,000 whites in the city of Honolulu, and a good part of that number is made up of transients, who cannot be called citizens. The prominent society people are among the descendants of the old missionaries, and they mingle freely with the other nationalities in a social way. The social peculiarities of the place are further augmented by the unlimited number of queer marriage mixtures. A man's color here is no index to his nationality. Hawaiian, Chinese, American, French, Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish and African blood are so intermingled that an attempt to accurately distinguish one from the other would be absolutely impossible.

IT'S UNWORTHY OF US.

The message of President Roosevelt was accepted as an able one, coming from a president in the midst of situations brought about by others than himself. In his remarks under the caption: "The Monroe Doctrine," he quotes from President Monroe in these words: "The American continents are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power." Mr. Roosevelt follows this up by saying: "In other words, the Monroe doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil."

Now, if the career of Great Britain as a colonial nation has been beneficial as a whole wherever she has exercised such policies (and in certain instances, at certain periods she has not been the very worst), what objection did President Monroe have, and what has President Roosevelt now, to England, for instance, exercising colonial rule over some of the turbulent South American countries, such as Venezuela and Colombia? Is not the answer clear, that both these presidents believed that: These South American countries can work out their own governmental problems better than "foreigners can for them, who are not in touch with their wants or surroundings? Yet, it will not be doubted but what more "stable" governments would be the rule were certain "European powers" to be in control at such times as "anarchy" and revolution take place in some of the countries mentioned to our south.

These people, and every people, are entitled and capable of self-government to the extent of their needs. Their requirements are not of the same standard as are ours; and are never likely to be. If, therefore, as President Roosevelt says in his message, "the peoples of the Americas can prosper best if left to work out their own salvation in their own way," why cannot that same broad, fair minded and true statesmanship extend to the Philippines?

How does it happen that the Asiatic legacy of Spanish rule and civilization is inferior and less capable of "working out their own salvation in their own way" than the legacy of Spanish rule in South America?

To maintain and defend the American proposition—the Monroe doctrine—as applying to the South American countries, we are practically at no cost at all; to maintain and force