

sovereignty of the United States no longer exists in the Philippine islands, it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate, orally or by writing or printing or like methods, the independence of the Philippine islands or their separation from the United States, whether by peaceable or forcible means, or to print, publish or circulate any handbill, newspaper, or other publication, advocating such independence or separation. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$2,000 and imprisonment not exceeding one year."

✦

Now, it may be that the American Declaration of Independence does not in strictness fall within the proscription of that decree. For the Declaration does not advocate in precise terms "the independence of the Philippine Islands" nor "their separation from the United States." It advocates only in general terms the independence of any people governed as the Filipinos then were. Whether in such matters the general does not include some of its particulars, would therefore have been open to administrative interpretation, had some all too literal military subordinate "pinched" somebody for publishing the American Declaration of Independence in the Philippine Islands.

But let us ask what man of common sense and a prejudice against paying \$2,000 worth of fine and lying in Philippine jails for a year—what American anti-imperialist traveling through the Islands, for instance,—would have ventured to circulate copies there of the American Declaration of Independence while that decree remained in force, without first getting a special dispensation from the man highest up?

That decree and its observance—over-prudent though the observance were—may not improbably have generated and fostered the mistake to which Mr. Carnegie gave publicity in 1902 and into which we fell in 1911.

V.

In the files of *The Public* we find the following articles with an historical bearing upon the subject, more or less direct:

Suppression by Gen. Otis of a play, "For Love of Country," because it referred to independence.—*The Public* of March 31, 1900, vol. ii, number 104, page 1.

The sedition decree under which it might have been imprudent to publish the American Declaration of Independence without a special dispensation.—*The Public* of February 1, 15 and 22, 1902, vol. iv, pages 675, 718 and 723.

Fourth of July in the Philippines.—*The Public* of July 6 and 13, 1901, vol. iv, pages 199, 217; and *The Public* of July 12, 1902, vol. v, pages 209, 215.

Any further verified contributions to the question thus raised by Mr. Carnegie's apparent error of 1902 and our adoption of it in 1911, will be gladly received and used for the purpose of establishing the whole truth.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

ECONOMIC CONTRASTS.

Providence, R. I., June 20.

The World Almanac gives the population of Chicago for 1900 as 1,698,575, and for 1910 as 2,185,283, being an increase of 28.7 per cent. The population of New York City in 1900 was 3,437,202 and in 1910 was 4,766,883, being an increase of 38.7 per cent. As it has long been the boast of the good people of the western city that the freer life and more vigorous society of that breezy burgh was bound to overtake the eastern metropolis, is it not time to take note of the facts expressed in the above figures?

A less percentage on a smaller quantity, is not likely to outrun a larger percentage on a greater quantity. This assertion is safe unless Chicagoans have discovered some new sort of calculus.

Has Chicago acquired a spirit of retrogression? Will the next census show that the fate of Iowa is to be repeated in the history of our city? Land in Iowa has increased in value in spite of a declining population. In Chicago the small increase in population has been attended by a large increase in the value of land.

Does increase in land value have a tendency to keep people away from Iowa and Chicago? Does New York use a larger percentage than Chicago of the land within the corporate limits? Would a higher tax on vacant land in Chicago cause its owners to part with it at a lower price, and thereby facilitate its use? Would such higher tax on the value of vacant land permit a lower tax on buildings, stocks of goods—on business generally—and thereby encourage men to locate in Chicago? Would such procedure afford some hope that the aforesaid boast may be realized?

Is there the remotest reason for such hope in the present situation? Would the Initiative and Referendum be handy tools for use in changing the existing tax laws? Is there ground for belief that the Lorimer-Deneen-Sullivan-Hearst-Harrison combine will exert their utmost energies to secure those same tools, or use them to the end that Chicago shall achieve its rightful destiny? Or, may we look for more taxes on industry in Chicago, that it may become more and more uninviting? Not even protection calculus can induce 28 per cent to overtake 38 per cent.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

✦ ✦ ✦

Being of a hopeful disposition, we believe the time may come when we shall have individual door knobs.—Chicago Record-Herald.