

structed and is still owned by an American life assurance society; the only good circus is known as the Paris circus. Most of the mines as well as the railroads are worked by foreigners; and the very garbage of Madrid is removed and disposed of by a Belgian company. Industrially as well as agriculturally, Spain, with the single exception of Catalonia, remains stationary, while the rest of the world moves on. And the question, what factor in the nation is responsible for this? is perhaps best answered by the proposal seriously made by the administration of finance, as late as the eighteenth century, to transfer to the crown the little property still devoted to public education.

THE PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC.

The so-called Philippine republic was first organized in October, 1896, with Andreas Bonifacio as president. When he died in 1897 Aguinaldo became president and commander-in-chief. The act of proclaiming a republic thus early involved a declaration of independence, proving that independence had been contemplated by the Filipinos long before Dewey's victory. The pact of Biaonabato in December, 1897, between the insurgent leaders and the Spanish government provided that comprehensive reforms should be granted by Spain, in consideration of which the insurgent generals agreed to expatriate themselves for three years. The conditions thus imposed on both sides were very similar to those of the treaty of Zanjon by which the Ten Years' war in Cuba was brought to an end. The only feature of the pact which does not seem creditable from the western standpoint is the fact that the insurgent leaders accepted from Spain a sum of money in consideration of their expatriation. Aguinaldo's defense against the charge of bribery is that the insurgent leaders had lost all their property by fighting Spain, and yet had families to support. They were to go as exiles into strange lands. It does not seem unnatural or necessarily proof of a lack of patriotism, that a payment of money should have been demanded under such circumstances by the men who were to exile themselves. Aguinaldo deposited the money in a bank at Hong-Kong in an above-board manner, thus letting the world know of his possession of cash.

At any rate, Aguinaldo was not regarded as a traitor by his own people because of that transaction. They rallied to his standard with enthusiasm when he returned to Cavite in May, 1898. He again proclaimed the so-called

Philippine republic on June 12, and in August last he and his chiefs appealed to the world's powers for recognition of independence. The full text of that appeal was printed in the New York Tribune, September 24, 1898, proving beyond a doubt to the United States government and the American people that the object of the insurrectionist party was independence. What do the contradictory reports of United States consuls detailing private, unofficial conversations with insurgent chiefs amount to beside that august appeal to the world for recognition of independence?—Springfield Republican.

AN ELEPHANT STORY.

For The Public.

Once upon a time a great menagerie company quarreled and fought with a much smaller similar company, and came out victorious. The more powerful corporation was called the Uncle Sam Civilization Company, and the weaker one was the Hispanola Animal Show.

After the fight, and the surrender of the conquered corporation, the former belligerents spent several months trying to agree upon terms for a permanent peace. The General Manager, who was also President of the Uncle Sam concern, insisted that more elephants were needed in its collection of wild animals. It already had several elephants on hand, which were named, respectively, Finance, Indian, Negro, Trusts, Strikes and Landlordism. These elephants caused the menagerie managers a great deal of trouble, for they were never in a settled condition, though sometimes it was supposed they were quieted permanently. The biggest, oldest and toughest elephant in the list was Landlordism, and that one caused more expense than all the others.

And yet the President and directors of Uncle Sam's menagerie decided that the corporation must have a big, wild elephant belonging to the Hispanola Show, called Philippines. Now, this animal was a reckless creature, with a notion that it had a right to be free, and could take care of itself. So it had long resisted Hispanola authority, and caused trouble.

Yet the managers of the Uncle Sam show demanded that elephant, and were determined to have it. The demand was refused, but the Uncle Samites said to the other fellows:

"We shall take possession of the animal, anyhow, whether you consent or not. We have whipped you, and can make such terms as we please. That elephant is ours by right of conquest.

However, there is nothing mean about the Uncle Sam company, for it is a highly civilized and Christian corporation. So we will give you \$20,000 when we take the elephant. Our stockholders will be assessed extra on their stock to make up this amount, but they are accustomed to such things and can stand another turn of the thumbscrew. Remember, that we have a right to take your elephant, money or no money; but here are the \$20,000 we decided to give you. We will now take possession of the animal, and proceed to whip him till he is submissive to our authority and thoroughly imbued with our kind of civilization."

At the present time the stockholders in the Uncle Sam Menagerie are divided in opinion as to whether the President and directors bought the Hispanola elephant, or stole it.

RALPH HOYT.

Los Angeles, Cal., Feb. 8.

SINGLE TAX NEWS FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

For The Public.

In Glasgow the single tax stands better than ever. We still have our majority at the corporation, which has not only petitioned parliament in favor of taxing land values, but prepared a bill to submit to parliament on the subject.

It took time to get this length. The political thought of the city is with us, however, and there was no help for the council but to pass the bill. The opponents of the proposition at the council did splendid service by their obstruction. The discussion of it from time to time by the Glasgow corporation has had a wonderful influence in educating the public mind all over the country. They did what we found it difficult to do for many reasons. They sent the question through the newspapers into the homes of the people, and now the man in the street is expecting the taxation of land values.

It even brought the question before our local professors (heaven save the mark) of political economy. One of these gentlemen was asked about a year ago by one of our vice presidents, James Stewart, how he treated the question of taxing land values at his class. "Oh," replied the professor, "I am dead opposed to that." "What have you read on the subject?" asked Mr. Stewart. "The speeches, at the town council," was the reply. These speeches, as you can imagine, account for many things. Is there not a grim humor in the fact that the Glasgow corporation, which is appointed to see that the streets are kept clean, should stir a pro-

fessor of the dismal science into some knowledge of land values?

Since Glasgow took action on land value taxation, a great many assessing bodies throughout the country have followed suit. Chief among these are the Lanarkshire county council, which issued a report on the subject that might have been drafted by your own Tom L. Johnson. It was a straight single tax pronouncement. The Aberdeenshire county council also petitioned parliament; and so have the town councils of Paisley, Greenock, Killmanrock, Hamilton, Awdrie, Coatbridge and Cunnock. Over the border in England, the town councils of Stockport, Halifax and Bradford are among those that have joined the movement, along with over 200 local bodies. All this is splendid work. It has taken the question out of mere political organization, and thereby lifted it immeasurably in the public mind.

During the past year, three important public conferences have been held. One met in Bradford, under the auspices of the English Land Restoration league, the Scottish Land Restoration union, and the Financial Reform association. The other two were held in London. One of these, which met in the early part of the year, was called by the Battersea vestry; the other was called by the Land Law Reform association. These meetings were highly successful, and we are now arranging for a fourth national conference to be held in June at Glasgow, Edinburgh or Liverpool.

That this work can be done, and is being done, speaks volumes for the progress of the single tax movement in Great Britain. A few years ago we could not have hoped to carry out such propaganda. But our work all over the country for years is at last bearing fruit. A few years ago the single tax men of Great Britain were mostly unknown to each other; but the work went on quietly and persistently, and at last it has blazed out into the open.

Sir William Harcourt has just said that "had he remained in office, he would have tried his hand at the taxation of land values." Other political leaders in the reform movement have also spoken out boldly on the question. We are all winning. How true are Henry George's words: "Interest the people, and the leaders will tumble over each other to take up this question."

It is difficult now to say when the question will be taken up in Great Britain; but it is coming along, and not slowly is it taking its place as the first reform to which the masses of the people can look for relief.

Time is on our side. Events are on our side. All the forces that make for progress are on our side. Those who are with us never had higher hopes of the realization of Henry George's glorious dream of freedom. In the sentiment of this country for the taxation of land values as a means to the overthrow of land monopoly, and it is gaining as the days go on, Henry George is victorious to-day. We who stand for the reform, are but those who have responded to his call to action, and every day his beautiful passionate appeal is bringing others to our assistance. So his work progresses even while his body rests in the grave. "Such is the power of truth."

We sympathize much with our American friends in Judge Maguire's defeat; but we think more highly of him than ever. We cannot expect to win every battle. We shall probably lose many in the days to come. But the enemy will learn that we do not know the meaning of defeat. Even now we recognize that Maguire has won, as Henry George won in his first great mayor fight—won by forcing our ideas upon public attention.

JOHN PAUL.
Glasgow, Scotland, Jan. 9, 1899.

THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

The balance of trade one way or the other does not create either losses or gains. It simply shows them.

If an individual or a nation is receiving more than it parts with, that fact shows gains. If more is parted with than received, that fact shows losses.

The men who have been boasting that the big balance of trade in favor of this country showed immense gains have been claiming that we received the difference in gold. That claim was false, as clearly shown by the statistics.

Had it been true, it would only have shown that we had been exchanging things for real use for a metal which is of very little use.

No intelligent man would claim that if a man handed out five dollars and got back four he was being made rich.

But the idea of money in an exchange has made it possible to blind the people.

The idea is that money is something valuable in itself, and that if we export a billion dollars' worth of goods we get a billion in money for them and if we import half a billion dollars' worth of goods we pay half a billion in money for them, and have half a billion as our profit.

The matter would be much clearer if people would get rid entirely of the idea of money as property, and recognize the fact that it is simply a repre-

sentative of property, used in effecting exchanges of property, and that all trade is really and ultimately an exchange of property for property.

Then they would see that what we export is what we sell and what we import is what we get for it, or to put it the other way, that what we import is what we buy and what we export is what we pay for it.

England has for a long time been importing immensely more than she exports. That is to say that her arrangements with other nations are such that she gets more than she gives. She has piled up wealth in consequence, notwithstanding her limited natural resources.

America has been exporting more than she imports; that is to say she gives more than she gets, and but for her immense natural resources she would have been impoverished.

The fact is that English people own an immense amount of property in other countries. The profits on this property comes to them in the form of other property and constitutes the excess of their imports.

Men in Europe own a large amount of property in this country and the profits on this property makes a large part of our excess of exports.

England is the gainer by her profits on property in other countries.

America is the loser because the profits on property in this country go to men in England and other countries.

The balance of trade against England shows that property from other countries is flowing to her shores and that she is giving less than she gets. It does not create this condition, but it shows it.

The balance of trade in favor of this country shows that property is flowing away from our shores and that we are giving more than we are getting. It does not create this condition, but it shows it.

Balance of trade one way or the other is a result and not a cause. If a country is gaining in its trade with other countries it will import more than it exports. If it is losing it will export more than it imports.

It is so clearly evident that if a country sends away more than it gets back that there is a loss somewhere, that those who have been trying to make it appear that we were getting rich under our present economic system have tried to make the people believe that we were getting gold back, and that the gold we received made up the difference. But the statistics we have published punctured this humbug.