

is not only an American principle; it is world wide, and the legality of a revolution depends upon its success.

Prior to the Spanish-American war, the people of Cuba and the people of the Philippines had taken up arms in defense of their liberty. Had our war with Great Britain been a failure, our own declaration of independence would have had no legal standing. But our rebellion against King George became a "revolution"—because we were successful; and it is generally agreed that our national era dates from our declaration of independence and not from the treaty which Great Britain made with us in declaring peace, and in conveying to our forefathers the territory for which they had fought.

So, long before the beginning of the Spanish-American war, the people of the Philippines and the people of Cuba had, by their own acts, laid the ground work for the record title to their native land. All that was necessary to make their declarations of independence the title deeds for the sovereign people of those territories was successful revolution against Spanish authority.

Were those revolutions successful? They were.

In the case of Cuba, the armies of the United States went to that island and with the aid of the Cuban soldiery, swept the Spanish army into the sea. Spanish rule in Cuba was destroyed, and the Cubans' title to Cuba was complete.

In the case of the Philippines, the United States navy and army went to those islands, and with the active assistance and co-operation of the Filipinos destroyed Spanish rule. With the destruction of Spanish rule, the Filipinos' title to the Philippine islands was complete.

In each instance the title dates back to a demand for, or a declaration of, independence.

That was the first link. The next was the government organized—on wheels, if you please—but organized, nevertheless, in both Cuba and the Philippines. The final link in the chain of title was the destruction of Spanish rule and the successful termination of the Revolution on the part of the Cuban and the Philippine people.

There is the chain of title; one that cannot be destroyed or broken, in conscience, whatever sophistry we may employ; one that cannot be questioned, in truth, whatever specious pleading we may adopt.

There is the title to Cuba resting in the Cuban people as firmly as our title rested in the colonist at the close of the war of the Revolution. There is the title to the Philippine Islands resting as firmly in the Filipinos as Cuba's title rests in the Cubans.

Our Commissioners did not dare to permit Spain to cede Cuba to the United States, because they knew that because the Cuban Revolution was successful Spain no longer had title to Cuba. And when Spain ceded the Philippine Islands to the United States, Spain conveyed to this country nothing more than the title she possessed; and that title, such as it was, was destroyed the moment that the American forces and Aguinaldo's followers took possession of the City of Manila.

This republican newspaper in one respect is right. "It is necessary that title must rest somewhere, and the abstract will always locate it." In real estate transactions many deeds have been placed on record—deeds that are of no importance

in determining title. Often these deeds are confusing, but the honest abstractor picks up his chain of title and follows it back in orderly lines, ignoring the inconsequential deeds in his search for the real title. So it is of no moment that there is on this record a quit claim deed from Spain to the United States with respect to the Philippine Islands. The chain of title leads directly to the people of the Philippines; and although there were a hundred deeds from a hundred kingdoms they would not affect the Filipino's title to the land of his nativity and to the soil which for a century has been baptized in the blood of Filipinos who have loved liberty enough to die for it.



Reaction Against High Tariff.

The reaction against a high tariff is manifesting itself in many quarters. Attention has already been called to the criticism of Ex-Attorney-General Miller and to Mr. Babcock's bill to put trust products on the free list. Now comes the New York Independent and registers its protest against the tariff duties which are being utilized by the trusts for purposes of extortion. It says:

If these duties are no longer protective, are they in any way injurious to the American people? We think they are, so far as they are abused by combinations that make them serve as instruments to support prices fixed by agreement for the home market. There is evidence that some American manufacturers are selling their goods abroad now, as they have sold them in the past, at prices lower than those which they demand, and are enabled by combination to exact, in this country. The American consumer can never be convinced that the business of those who supply his wants ought to be conducted in this way. He feels that the manufacturers for the encouragement of whom he has supported protective legislation and paid taxes imposed indirectly by that legislation, ought to give him prices as low as those which they give to the foreigner. But the repeal of unnecessary tariff duties will yield little or no relief if the restraint from possible competition from abroad cannot be applied. Everybody knows that foreign manufacturers in the iron and steel industry would not now be able to threaten our combinations with imports even if the duties should be repealed tomorrow. The prices which they must have are too high, and the cost of their raw material and labor will prevent any considerable reduction hereafter.

The protectionists have always assured us that competition would regulate prices at home provided the foreigner was excluded. Now we find that the trusts destroy competition at home and raise prices here while they compete with the foreigner in his home market.

Every trust will act as an object lesson to teach the people the injustice of a high tariff.



Government Ownership.

The Canadian government has decided to purchase all telegraph lines in the Dominion, paying therefor \$25,000,000. The New York World sees in this reassurance to those who fear the final outcome of the movement toward the consolidation of all our railroads and great industries. The World says:

Outside of the United States the movement of all English-speaking peoples is toward either the out-and-out ownership or the iron-handed control of all public utilities. Especially is this true of the large self-governing colonies of Great Britain. Canadian railways are partly owned by the Government, and those not owned are rigidly controlled by Parliamen-

tary law. The new Commonwealth of Australia has none but state-owned railroads. In New Zealand the government not only owns all the railroads but operates them on the principle that it is not desirable that they should yield a profit but only to make them of the utmost service to the people. The Prime Minister of New Zealand has declared that any profit over 3 per cent. on the traffic must immediately be wiped out by improvements in the service or by lower fare and freight rates.

Henry Demarest Lloyd in his "Newest England" declares that "such a thing as a rebate or discrimination in favor of one shipper against another is unknown in New Zealand." He shows that the railroad service works well because it is based on a non-political civil-service system. The Civil-Service Board in New South Wales can only be removed by a concurrent majority vote of both houses of Parliament, and its authority is such, says Mr. Lloyd, that not a single foreman can be transferred from one job to another without its consent. In England itself, where the Government ownership of telegraph lines is more than a quarter of a century old, and where the railroads are forced to run cheap working-people's trains at hours and fares arbitrarily fixed by Parliament, and are otherwise regulated very much as if they were Government property, the same condition precedent of a civil service out of the reach of the politicians has been long since secured.



Channing on Human Rights.

I repeat it, for the truth deserves reiteration, that all nations are bound to respect the rights of every human being. This is God's law as old as the world. No local law can touch it.

These are the words of William Ellery Channing, who was described by Samuel Taylor Coleridge as one having both the "love of wisdom and the wisdom of love." "The Man Above the State" was the subject of Channing's remarks, and he said:

There is a grand law of humanity more comprehensive than all others and under which every man should find shelter. He has not only a right, but is bound, to use freely and improve the powers which God has given him, and other men instead of obstructing are bound to assist their development and exertion.

Mr. Channing pointed out that these claims are not derived from any particular family or tribe:

They are not the growth of any particular soil. They are not ripened under a peculiar sky. They are not written on a particular complexion. They belong to human nature. The ground on which one man asserts them, all stand on, nor can they be denied to one without being denied to all.

The imperialist of today will do well to ponder upon these sentences of the eloquent Channing:

Man is not a mere creature of the state. He has rights which date before all charters and communities; not conventionable, nor repealable, but as eternal as the powers and laws of his being.

Those who imagine that the Filipinos' rights have been limited by our acts of oppression should listen carefully to Channing's reminder on this point:

Because a number of men invade the rights of a fellow creature and pronounce him destitute of rights, his claims are not a whit touched by this. He is as much a man as before. Not a single gift of God on which this right rests is taken away. If, indeed, any change takes place his claims are enhanced on the ground that the suffering and injured are entitled to peculiar regard. If any rights should be singularly sacred in our sight, they are those which are denied and trodden in the dust.