NEW YORK JOURNAL AND ADVERTISER
W. R. HEARST.

AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

AN AMERICAN INTERNAL POLICY.

FIRST—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.
The Values Created by the Community Should Belong to the Community.

SECOND—DESTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL TRUSTS.
No Monopolization of the National Resources by Lawless Private Combinations More Powerful Than the People's Government.

THIRD—A GRADUATED INCOME TAX.
Every Citizen to Contribute to the Support of the Government According to His Means, and Not According to His Necessities.

FOURTH—ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.
The Senate, Now Becoming the Private Property of Corporations and Bosses, to Be Made Truly Representative, and the State Legislatures to Be Redeemed from Recurring Scandals.

FIFTH—NATIONAL, STATE AND MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.
As the Duties of Citizenship Are Both General and Local, Every Government, General and Local, Should Do Its Share Toward Fitting Every Individual to Perform Them.

SIXTH—CURRENCY REFORM.
All the Nation's Money to Be Issued by the Nation's Government, and Its Supply to Be Regulated by the People and Not by the Banks.

SEVENTH—NO PROTECTION FOR OPPRESSIVE TRUSTS.
Organizations Powerful Enough to Oppress the People Are No Longer "Infant Industries."

The Day We Celebrate.

This day a year ago the American squadron, under Rear-Admiral Winfield Scott Schley, smashed Cervera's fleet off Santiago, thus wiping the last remaining remnant of the Spanish navy from the seas and completing the glorious work begun at Manila by Dewey.

It was a victory that sent a thrill of pride through every American heart. It came at a time when our thin blue line of heroes were lying in the trenches overlooking Santiago, with the incapable Shafter planning a retreat. Its accomplishment made the fall of Santiago certain, and compelled Spain to sue for peace.

As Schley, with characteristic modesty and fairness, remarked, "there was glory enough in it for all of us," but it remained for the partisans of Sampson, whom fate denied a share in the conflict, to try and rob him of all credit.

This conspiracy, fostered in the Navy Department at Washington, and encouraged by unfair newspapers, has failed ignominiously.

It was not possible for it to succeed. It was conceived in envy. It had no reason for existence save the venomous fury of those who hoped to lift up the unfortunate Sampson by dragging Schley down.

There is only one safe arbiter in such matters—the people. They are never unfair when thoroughly informed. They believe in fair play. It did not take them long to unmask the cabal at Washington, to discern its vicious motives and to expose its underhanded work.

They did not have to be told that the Brooklyn was hit oftener than any other vessel in the fleet, and that the Spanish commanders unite in the statement that her guns did great damage to their ships. They knew that she was in the thick of the fight and that Schley was on the bridge directing her every movement.

The answer of the people to Schley's detractors is conclusive. That there shall be no mistake about it they have called this 3d of July "Schley Day," in honor of the real hero of Santiago, and all over this country a rousing tribute of admiration will be paid to one of the purest, worthiest figures of the war with Spain.

THE UNCONQUERABLE AMERICAN SPIRIT.

There is an object lesson in the recent boat races, in which Harvard scored three victories in one day, for American college men everywhere. They should learn from these triumphs, won by native skill and endurance, under the guidance of an American trainer, that it is folly to send to England, or any other country, to find out how to do things well.

Harvard scored repeated failures under an English coach. When the services of an American were secured they won handsomely. It is our destiny to lead, not to follow. We do not have to borrow ideas from abroad in any field of endeavor. We have the talent right here at home to meet any emergency, to overcome any obstacle.

Americans are a virile, progressive, creative people. If England has any ideas on any subject, from rowing a boat to sailing one, that we cannot improve on she has not given them out. We are on the crest of the wave of progress, while the older countries are laboring in the trough of the sea. And we want to remain there.

Our young men, particularly our college young men, must get over the notion that we have to look to England for instruction. The indomitable spirit of Americanism cannot afford to acknowledge supremacy in even so seemingly small a matter as the proper way to handle an oar, which is after all quite important.

Those young men will learn many things from books not half so interesting or instructive as the lesson taught by the Harvard boat races. These victories teach us pride in our own prowess; they impress on us the necessity of having faith in our ability to succeed, and they inspire us with a love of country and a belief in the strength and genius of the American character.

SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM DEFINED.

The Detroit Journal recently quoted something which we had said about the Filipinos, from the account of a certain prominent French newspaper man, to the effect that the Filipino leaders were "socialists." We were surprised to find its article headed: "Is Aguinaldo an Anarchist?"

We know that there is in the American mind a wonderful confusion between the terms "socialism," "communism" and "anarchism."

But does an intelligent American newspaper like the Detroit Journal really not know that socialism and anarchism do not mean the same thing, but that they mean the very opposite; that they are just as opposed to each other as the north pole is to the south pole?

An anarchist says: "Every government is an evil."

A socialist says: "Every government—even the Czar's Government, or the Sultan's Government—is good."

Any kind of government, a socialist says, is better than anarchy, and, moreover, every nation has just as good a government as it deserves.

But what the socialist aims at is to achieve the very best kind of government.

The worst thing that can be said against the honest socialist is that he is in too great a hurry; he wants to accomplish at once what it will take centuries to achieve.

But still the socialist is far more sensible than the anarchist—we mean the philosophical anarchist. The latter considers mankind as they may be thousands of years hence; the socialist looks to conditions as they may be one or two centuries hence.

THE OCCURRENCES IN BELGIUM.

From the European dispatches the readers of American newspapers necessarily must gain the impression that it is the Socialists that are on the rampage in Belgium just as they are in Italy.

This, however, is a gross mistake.

In Belgium two parties are fighting each other, the Liberals and the Clericals.

Hitherto the Liberals have been fighting the Socialists, but now they are making common cause with them.

For many years, we may say from the foundation of the kingdom of Belgium, in the year 1830, the Clericals have been in supreme power. But in 1893 they received a considerable check. They were compelled to establish a much wider suffrage than formerly was known, which, however, was far from being equal, universal suffrage. To be sure they had to submit to universal suffrage—that is to say, every citizen received one vote—but those citizens who possessed a certain amount of property got two votes, and others who had received an academical education got three votes.

But now the Clericals have good grounds to fear that even under the present system they will lose their power, and so they propose a new electoral "reform," as they style it. That is to say, there are seven great electoral districts in Belgium where the Clericals are well aware that if their opponents, the Liberals and Socialists, should unite against them, they would necessarily be defeated, and their defeat in those districts would mean their defeat in the parliament of Belgium.

Hence they now propose in those seven districts, and in none other, to introduce proportional representation. This is a form of representation that is perfectly well understood in this country; it has been practised in the State of Illinois for a number of years. It means that the majority shall not govern in a given district, but that the minority shall be given a representation according to the number of votes they may furnish.

If the Clericals can now succeed in having such minority representation prevail in these seven large districts of Belgium, then they will maintain their supremacy in Belgium.

That is the turning point of the whole contest.

It is against this manoeuvre of the Clericals that all the liberal elements have united, and are making an energetic contest.

And the latest dispatches tell us that the Government—that is, the Clericals—has acknowledged its defeat.

THE SUNDAY JOURNAL.

There was no midsummer dulness about the Sunday Journal of yesterday. It was a sparkling number, filled with live topics handled vigorously and entertainingly. Nothing that could freshen a jaded palate or quicken a tired fancy was wanting. It touched on grave problems and gay ones. It illuminated every news item of current interest. It was a comprehensive newspaper, surpassing in charm and brightness all its contemporaries.

Let us briefly review its contents. Mr. James Creelman, the Journal's European correspondent, in a special cable, vividly told the dramatic story of Dreyfus's landing and the pathetic meeting with his wife. In another department was published Dreyfus's journal, written during his imprisonment.

The cable brought other stories of interest, interviews with Senators Hanna and Depew, and Mark Twain, and all the gossip of foreign capitals.

Mr. William Jennings Bryan, in an exclusive article for the Journal, reviewed the testimony of President Henry O. Havemeyer, of the Sugar Trust, before the Industrial Commission.

Ex-Senator John J. Ingalls diagnosed the Presidential symptoms of Governor Roosevelt in his scathing fashion, with illustrations by Homer Davenport.

Alan Dale's interview in London with Mrs. James Brown Potter was very clever. That charming and gifted woman confided to him how all London was at her feet, and what a glorious thing it was to be appreciated. As a coincidence, on another page was told how Mr. James Brown Potter will try and divorce her that he may marry the beautiful Miss May Handy.

There are other romantic and tragic episodes related in the lives of the "Four Hundred," with Cholly Knickerbocker's inspired chatter from the inner circles.

Mrs. Ella Wheeler Wilcox commented on the sensational sermon against divorce preached by a fashionable Newport minister.

M. Hanotaux, ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, described the splendors of the Paris Exposition.

Pictorially there was a special supplement in honor of the anniversary of the sinking of Cervera's fleet; a reproduction of "Love, the Conqueror," the most talked of painting in Europe; an amusing cartoon by Davenport on our Senators abroad; a roaring comic supplement.

This recital embraces only a few of the unique and striking features that made yesterday's Sunday Journal distinctive.

Wants a Better Word Than "Automobile."

Editor of the New York Journal:

If you desire to do something which will please every American reader of the Journal, begin a crusade against the use of the French word "automobile," applied by some to the motor carriage. It is a clumsy word, which we have no excuse for adding to our nomenclature. The word "motor" preceding the word truck, surrey, runabout, etc., tells the whole story in plain English. It indicates in the most simple and direct manner a vehicle which carries its own motor, and no other word, French, German or Irish, will prove so handy. For example, there will come a time when livery men will keep both kinds of vehicles for hire—motor carriages and the present kind. Now fancy, in giving an order over the 'phone for a motor surrey or motor runabout, etc., to say instead, "Send me an automobile runabout."

It seems ridiculous to my mind for Americans to adopt a French term for the motor carriage. There is certainly no excuse for so doing. We are destined to be the largest makers of motor vehicles in the world, and we should refuse to borrow a French word to designate them.

CHARLES G. PURDY.

No. 381 Franklin avenue, Brooklyn.

The Tax Dodger a Public Enemy.

Editor of the New York Journal:

Blackstone, in speaking of smugglers and tax evaders in general, says: "That a person who saves money by evading the payment of a tax does exactly the same injury to society as he who steals so much money from the public treasury, and is, therefore, guilty of as great immorality or as great an act of dishonesty."

He compares them to a person "who would invite a party of friends to dinner at a tavern, and after the festivities and gratifications of the day were over should sneak away, leaving his guests to foot the bills."

In these foolish, money-grubbing days the person who robs an individual is punished severely. But you can rob the community with impunity.

D. CAVANAGH.

No. 120 East Twenty-third street.

ROCKEFELLER CANNOT GAG THEM.

CHICAGO UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS WANT FREE SPEECH.

CHICAGO, July 2.—As mentioned in yesterday's dispatches to the Journal, the Chicago University professors have won their point against the gag rule of President Harper and Mr. Rockefeller.

Professor Edmund James said to-day: "There is need for university teachers to express themselves freely on public questions. The public expects this, but these expressions should, as a matter of course, be guarded more or less. The reason for this is that the public cannot dissociate them from the institution they represent. The idea of gagging the free speech of professors is nonsense. Educators as a rule will say nothing which will reflect on the good name of their school."

Head Professor Hale, of the Latin department, said: "It is ridiculous to talk of muzzling professors. No one will take such an idea seriously. Such a reason hits only one class of professors—those who took part in the Quadrangle Club dinner last May. Laughlin and I at Central Music Hall did not represent the university in any sense, but those club fellows at the dinner were trying to establish the university's politics."

Dean Judson said: "A member of a faculty should be careful to have it understood that his expressions don't represent his university. Many cases in the history of the university have led the public to think that the remarks of the individual professors reflected the opinion of the institution as a whole."

Professor T. C. Chamberlain said: "A debate between professors in our institution is harmless and often profitable, but there is no doubt that discussions of public questions in the past have injured our institution. The public too often makes the university responsible for the individual opinions publicly expressed of our professors."

HOW DR. MARY WALKER WILL LOOK WHEN DEAD.

DR. MARY WALKER IN HER DRESS OF DEATH.
(PHOTOGRAPHED FROM LIFE.)

DR. MARY WALKER is not through with doing freak things. On a bicycle she is about one of the most amusing sights in Washington, with silk hat, red necktie, Prince Albert coat, and without "pants" guards. Recently she wished to see how she would look when laid out for burial, so she hired a photographer, fixed herself up for the cold and silent grave, and here is the picture she had taken.

Flowers are strewn about her person, and on the lapel of her coat is a bronze medal which, she says, was presented to her by Congress shortly after the civil war. She is a pleasant-looking corpse, and is determined not only to enjoy life, but to enjoy death in her own peculiar way.

LETTY LIND'S TURN AT THE 'ALLS.

ALAN DALE SEES HER AND IS SORRY FOR IT.

LONDON, June 24.—For the trifling consideration of something like $600 a week, Miss Letitia—otherwise Letty—Lind has consented to do a little "turn" at the Alhambra each night. You see, "The Greek Slave" has closed, and Letty has her evenings unemployed. So what's a poor girl to do? Better the Alhambra at $600 a week than nothing at all. Of course, the strain and all that sort of thing is very terrible indeed. Poor Letty comes on at 10:05 p. m. (schedule time) and works her little voice and larger limbs until 10:25—thus giving up twenty minutes of her valuable time to a thankless and an exacting public. But women must work, and men must weep; so runs the world away!

Letty is a gorgeous, unusual thing in a George Edwardes show. In the provinces and among the unitiated, Marie Studholme, who is younger and prettier, and whose voice has not been canned, like Letty's, is infinitely preferred. But in London it is Letty who is adored. She is an acquired taste—like olives, and caviare, and sweet potatoes. She can scarcely sing two consecutively audible notes, but her very voicelessness is a charm. Her old specialty—dancing—is of course her strong point, but Letty has grown Terpsichoreanly lazy of late, and the constant speaking of songs has talked her legs into comparative silence. I will confess that I have always worshipped at Letty's shrine. I liked the "je ne sais quoi" of her manner—the little unspoken something that suggested the unconventional. Letty has always seemed to me a sort of rest from the loud-voiced, padded-hipped, hugely-bediamonded comic opera siren.

At the Alhambra, however, I discovered that I had lost my Letty. Take a little, dainty Madison-Square-Theatre manner and put it in the Metropolitan Opera House and you can imagine what the effect would be. When Letty slipped on the stage at 10:05, sumptuously garbed in a gown that defies analysis, I wondered what on earth she was going to do, and how she was going to earn her little $600 per. She was not embarrassed. Her turn was simplicity itself. She uttered the old-time "Hi-di, di-di" song from "Go Bang" in a meek and Moses-like manner. I happened to be at the back of the house, and I wasn't quite sure whether she was singing or whether she was merely posing. The mob gazed at her in awe, for she was Letty Lind. If somebody had called her Lizzie Jones methinks that the mob would have said rude things. Letty's tiny tones seemed to catch in the footlights and stay there. The footlights must have enjoyed her song immensely. It was levelled at them exclusively. Her second number, I am almost ashamed to say, was that antique "Gay Tomtit," from "The Artist's Model." If a tomtit ever reaches the moulting age this particular bird must have got there long ago. But Letty, for a new "turn," seemed bent upon offering old subjects, and there was no use complaining. Miss Lind is not the only lady on the stage who is thankful to her early reputation. Even the mob seemed rather disappointed at this chestnut given them to crack by a lady specially engaged.

For her last effort she changed her dress and donned a Spanish skirt in honor of a Spanish song and dance. But Letty was undeniably indolent.

Letty Lind, Whose Twinkling Toes Are Getting Weary.

On a small stage she would have made a great hit, for, thanks to a powerful opera glass, I was able to see her inimitable smile, and that little mannerism that has made her popular. But in the teeming Alhambra the multitude merely witnessed an easy dance, negligently danced, and heard a feeble song that would have been inaudible but for frantic efforts to catch it on the wing.

This was Letty Lind's "turn" at the Alhambra, I am told that New York managers have bidden heavily for it, and that Letty has been offered for New York just twice as much as she gets in London. I don't think that the New York public would go crazy over her. Of course, every chivalrous New Yorker would try very hard to do so, and I can imagine our jeunesse doree turning up their trousers in glee as they went to listen to her. But it would be a great effort to appreciate her. We succeeded admirably in pretending that we revelled in Yvette Guilbert, but then, you see, it is always easy to appreciate what we don't understand. We should never be able to say that we didn't understand Letty Lind, for she speaks our language, and sings—or tries to sing—our songs. A few of the Americans who have listened to Letty's exquisite work in "The Geisha" would naturally rejoice to see her in New York, but the mob would wonder what it was all about.

I am always sorry for people who go to see an attraction that has been greatly boomed and are compelled to wonder why it is so. A fellow feeling makes one wondrous kind. I have been there myself on various occasions, and although I am not afraid to tell you when I think that anybody has been overrated, I always spend hours of agony making up my mind to shatter fond hopes.

Letty Lind is a joy in her own particular line. But she needs a nice little theatre, some pretty scenery, a number of associates who are not as clever as she is, and various little illusions, such as those which are even employed to display pictures in the galleries. Take her away from her nice little theatre and put her in a huge barn with nothing to distract one's attention from her, and—unless you have known her before—she will appear like Cinderella in rags and tatters. It is a cruel thing to do. In London, however, it doesn't matter very much. The name of Letty Lind draws, and, although at the Alhambra she does something less than nothing at all, she is worth the salary that she receives.

As I said before, women must work, and men must weep. Letty wants to improve the shining hour, and she is quite right to do so while the sun lasts. She is wise not to try New York until she has something startling to offer. Before I saw her at the Alhambra I was inclined to imagine that she was just the thing for our 'alls. After having witnessed her feeble "turn," however, I must take it all back.

There are a great many stage ladies who, like diamonds, need a setting. To blaze forth as a sunburst, a careful manipulation of jewels is necessary. The stage ladies themselves don't realize this. They don't like to believe that their beauties depend upon an artistic arrangement of chairs and young men. But it is a fact, nevertheless, that away from everything, alone in the magnitude of the 'alls, they are desolate and unadorned.

ALAN DALE.

COMMON SENSE ON THE PHILIPPINES.

SHOWING HOW AGUINALDO DIFFERS FROM WASHINGTON

WHILE the Congress but lately adjourned was an important one from a historical point of view, and justly celebrated for its patriotism on account of the practical unanimity with which, regardless of party lines, it reflected the wishes of the people and supported the Administration during the trying times of an international war, yet the coming Congress of the United States will also have questions of momentous importance to consider. Paramount among these is the Philippine problem—namely, the settlement of questions concerning the future government of those islands on the other side of the globe lately acquired by us from Spain.

The question of the desirability of the acquisition of territory so remote from us is one on which men honestly differ, and neither of the great political parties can be considered a unit on either side of the proposition. Whether or not we should keep the Philippines is a question calling for calm and careful judgment, and developments of the future will settle the question; but that we have the right to possess the islands admits of no argument. This, it seems, is so plain a proposition that even the most rabid "anti-imperialist" not shackled with party bias and looking to selfish ends will grant its correctness.

Our war was with Spain, a power that had owned and governed those far-away possessions for many years, a fact admitted and recognized by all the governments of the world. By a fortune of war, we will call it, Dewey was compelled to put into the bay of Manila and engage the Spanish fleet in order to secure a refuge for his war ships, a plan so admirably executed as to command the admiration of the world, and in the subsequent events there he proved himself no less a diplomat than a fighter.

Also, after the declaration of war, prompt measures were at once taken in this country to carry the war into Cuba and Porto Rico, and the short campaign of our land and naval forces was the wonder of the world, and wrote another brilliant page in the history of America's military achievements.

The weakly sentimentalists who are shedding tears and decrying the position assumed by us in the Philippines are subjects for commiseration and those who insist upon a comparison between George Washington and Aguinaldo have either an ignorant or debased opinion of George Washington.

Spain having the title to the islands, we could only treat with her, and her alone, and now, by virtue of her enforced surrender and our voluntary and accepted proffer of twenty millions of dollars, the title to the group of islands became vested in us.

Immediately that our Government took possession of the islands its rights were disputed by those who never gained possession of them by right of conquest, purchase or in any other manner. Our acquisition of the territory was in accordance with the recognized rules of civilization, and our title being clear, a revolt against the authority of our Government should be treated as a similar revolt was at one time treated in these United States.

Maudlin spluttering, of course, will occur and tearful eloquence be expended in behalf of Aguinaldo and his followers, and the awfulness of our "crime" will be held up before the people chiefly for political effect. However, the "weeping willows" should not lose sight of the fact that at the present time it is not a question of what our future policy will be.

The pertinent question is the putting down of a horde of savage and half-civilized rebels, led on by the cupidity of one man, who never for one moment before he fired on our soldiers stopped to inquire what we would be willing to do in the way of good government for them in the future. He might be excused for not appreciating fully the blessings of civilized government, they never having come under his observation, but we in this country should not place ourselves on his level by believing that our policy in the Philippines will result in anything but the betterment of the inhabitants of those islands.

Now as to Aguinaldo and George Washington. A man capable of inducing his regiment to massacre its officers in order that he might command is not to be compared for a moment with our illustrious patriot. A man who beheads some of his followers for suggesting the advisability of surrender will never be regarded by civilized nations as a man whose name is worthy to be written on the same page of history as the name of the immortal Virginian, and a man capable of such acts is not to be intrusted with the management of any government. In fact, his actions justify our Government, even if it was not originally our intention, in holding the Philippines until they manifest their ability to rule as civilized nations want them to rule.

Read what Colonel Alexander Hawkins, of the Tenth Pennsylvania, says of these immortal patriots:

"The Filipinos are mildewed with the superstition of centuries, and ungrateful and unreliable in the superlative degree. Their highest ambition is cock fighting. Duplicity and vindictiveness are paramount features in their character."

Imagine a horde of that kind let loose upon the world to rule themselves and bring to their homes the blessings of civilization! Our course with them, we regret to say, has been made necessary by their own actions, but it is one of those thousands of instances in the history of the world where civilization and humanity had to be preceded by the sword.

History will justify the past, present and future course of the American nation in the Philippine problem, and the time will come when education and all the benign influences of a civilized government will bring the Filipinos to that condition where they will rise up and call us blessed. When that time arrives the maudlin sentimentalists who are now in love with Aguinaldo will be looking around for excuses to justify their present narrow and unpatriotic course.

S. H. GRAY.