

[New York Evening Post, August 31.]

A PHILIPPINE CATECHISM. Q. What is the chief argument for the retention by

the United States of the Philippines? A. The value of the trade to be developed with these Islands.

Q. Is there any way of calculating the comparative cost and profit of holding them as a colony? A. The cost can be got at by an estimate of the expenses of a military occupation.

Q. How? A. Every soldier receives about \$200 a year in pay. His subsistence cannot be provided for less than \$300; consequently, every soldier sent out to police the Philippines will cost at least \$500, and every thousand men will cost \$500,000 a year.

Q. Supposing, then, that the Philippines could be held by a thousand men, how much must there be in the way of trade, commerce, and industry to make the account balance? A. \$5,000,000.

Q. Why do you say \$5,000,000? A. Because \$500,000 is ten per cent of that sum, and 10 per cent is a very high rate of profit in any business. If a trade of \$5,000,000 actually produced \$500,000 every year, every trader would grow rich beyond the dreams of avarice.

Q. With a trade, then, of \$5,000,000, we could afford to support a thousand troops in the Philippines? A. Hardly; because this leaves out of view the pay of the officers and all expenses for rent, wages of servants, transportation and communication, to say nothing of the ordinary expenses of civil government.

Q. But for every 1,000 men you must have at least \$5,000,000 of trade? A. Yes, and on that basis the profit is all consumed in the expense.

Q. What is the actual trade of the United States with the Philippines? A. Exports for the year ending June 30, 1897, \$94,597; imports into the United States, \$4,383,740.

Q. What is the population of the islands? A. About 8,000,000, mostly savages, given to crimes of violence and piracy.

Q. What estimate is made of the number of troops necessary to hold them? A. From 10,000 to 20,000 is the smallest number suggested by any good military authority.

Q. How much would it cost to keep that number of troops there? A. Ten thousand would cost \$5,000,000. Twenty thousand would cost \$10,000,000.

Q. Why do you call these low estimates? A. Because they make no account of the pay of the officers, rent, wages of servants, transportation, communication, and the expenses of civil government.

Q. Would there be any other expenses? A. There would be a large annual expense for a naval establishment.

Q. How large must this establishment be? A. The usual estimate is

that it must be large enough to compare respectably with those of other nations in Asiatic waters.

Q. How large would that be? A. It is altogether impossible to say, because the partition of China is going on, and war may break out at any moment.

Q. Would \$10,000,000 be a low estimate for the whole expense? A. A very low estimate.

Q. Show this. A. The regular army of the United States in 1897 consisted of 27,532 officers and men, and the appropriation for the support of this army for the year ending June 30, 1898, was \$23,129,344.30. This had been about the amount of the annual appropriation for several years. This would show an expense of nearly \$1,000 per annum for every man and officer, and on this basis a force of 20,000 for the Philippines would cost about \$20,000,000 a year.

Q. Assuming the expense to be limited to \$10,000,000, how much trade must there be to make it economically possible for the United States to hold the islands? A. \$100,000,000.

Q. How much profit would there be to the people as a whole if such an expansion of trade could be effected? A. Not one cent.

Q. To whom would the profit go? A. The profit would go to those engaged in the trade, while the expense would fall upon the whole people in taxes.

Q. Upon whom has the expense hitherto fallen? A. Upon Spain.

Q. What prospect is there that our share of the trade of the Philippines will increase from \$5,000,000 to \$100,000,000? A. None whatever.

Q. Will not our military occupation and the substitution of our government for that of Spain give such a stimulus to trade and industry that there will be a phenomenal expansion? A. There is no reason to think so. The English government has been substituted for bad government throughout India, which has 250,000,000 inhabitants, and there has been no phenomenal expansion. The country is still a burden to England.

Q. What would you call a man who undertook to manage a property producing \$500,000 a year profit, and to pay \$10,000,000 a year for the chance of its turning out a good bargain? A. A born fool.

Q. What would you call a people who did the same thing, and taxed themselves to do it, in order that a few speculators should see what they could make out of it? A. They must be fools, too.

Q. Are the American people fools? A. Far from it.

Q. Then why do they countenance such projects? A. No one knows that they do. They have never had an op-

portunity to express themselves about it. They have not been consulted.

Q. Who have any interest in furthering the scheme? A. The speculators, who hope to make money out of it, and saddle the expense on us.

Q. When it is said that a great "pressure" in favor of the project is brought to bear on the administration, who bring it to bear? A. The speculators.

Q. Is there any other reason for holding the Philippines? A. The jingoes want them held, because as long as we hold them we must keep up a larger military and naval establishment.

Q. Of what use is that? A. It promotes war, and the jingoes want as much war as possible.

Q. What makes more noise than a hundred sensible men? A. One jingo.

Q. Would any other class profit? A. Congressmen, senators, and other politicians would, through having more places at their disposal.

Q. If all that you say is true, why is it that expansion within the limits of the United States has always proved profitable? A. Because it has gone on without increased military expenditure.

Q. Under what circumstances will colonial expansion, accompanied by a military establishment, be profitable to the community as a whole? A. Only if the profits of the increased trade are greater than the expenditure. Otherwise the countries which have the trade without the burden will get all the profit there is in it.

Luck never serves any man with any degree of certainty. But pluck is a servitor who never fails brains and industry.

The philosophers of discontent depend largely upon the mistakes of those who earn a living, for material out of which to weave the theories for a redistribution of the wealth of the country. There is no critic of labor so cruelly critical as the fellow who never works at all. He is always mad at the small compensation of those who do work. He would have them paid twice as much and take half of the increase for himself as a royalty for having suggested it. He is the walking delegate, the "friend of the poor man."

When a man deliberately drinks intoxicating beverages knowing that they will continue rambling down his throat until he becomes drunk, what claims has he upon sober people for money to take the place of that which he might have earned if he had kept sober? But we are told that the man is not to blame for being a drunkard and that the organization of society is to blame. And yet on this question society is divided into only two classes—those who do get drunk and those who do not get drunk. Certain kinds of reformers and false philanthropists would have us believe that the non-drunken are the cause of the drunken class.