

# WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVI.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1899

NO 45

Washington Sentinel,

Published and Edited by

LOUIS SCHADE.

Frederick Schade, Business Manager

APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.

TERMS

\$3 per year for single copy sent by mail to subscribers, payable in advance.

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

First insertion, one inch, \$1.00; second insertion, 75 cents. Liberal deductions made for annual advertisements. Special notices 25 cents a line.

Advertisements to insure insertion should be handed in not later than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

Office: No. 804 E Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Sample copies mailed upon application. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington, D. C.

THE PHILIPPINE CRIME.

Every true American cannot help but shed tears of anguish when he recalls how this Administration, which had at first been perfectly willing to receive the aid of the Filipinos against Spain, began early to ignore them; how despatches were sent calling down our consul in the Orient who had spoken well of them and had helped to enlist their services in our behalf; how we commenced to treat them with coldness and neglect, to separate ourselves from them. Possibly the President at that time contemplated turning them back to Spain when peace should come, and therefore thought that he had better not recognize them too far; that such a course might create embarrassment in negotiating a treaty of peace—an event then just ahead. Soon, however, came his resolution to deprive them of their liberty and take them into ourselves. They heard Spain sue for an armistice. They witnessed the signing of the protocol, leaving the disposition of their territory a subject for future determination.

They had by this time learned to suspect us, to doubt our integrity. They were filled with anxiety and alarm. They drew apart from us and unto themselves. They soon saw with indignation that President, who not eight months before had declared to the world that the Spanish War was not waged for the forcible annexation of territory, negotiate a treaty which robbed them of their soil, and annexed it to our own domain, and send it to the Senate of the United States for its approval. They listened with heavy hearts and kindly resentment to the same President's proclamation, couched in language as cruel as it was diplomatic, and in his honeyed phraseology they read the death knell of all their long cherished aspirations to be free. In this their great emergency, they dispatched to our shore a representative, whose mission was one of amity, and who came only to intercede with the Chief Executive and to implore him and us to do them no wrong. In what manner did the President receive this intelligent and inoffensive man, the messenger from our friends and allies at that time? He ignored him entirely. His respectful petitions were treated with silent contempt. When he knocked mildly and respectfully at the doors of the Department of State the silence within was like unto that of the grave; they were barred against him. Spies were sent to watch him at his hotel, as though he was a common malefactor. When he walked out into the streets his footsteps were dogged by the detectives of the Secret Service. He was denounced, misrepresented and mistrusted. Finally he was threatened with arrest, and then, when to avoid so great an indignity he fled our domain, we added insult to injury by falsely charging that he had telegraphed to Aguinaldo to attack our troops at Manila as a means of preventing the ratification of the treaty of peace in the Senate, and had left us to escape punishment for that offence. How would it be possible for this man to send such a telegram and escape prompt detection here, when his every act was under our constant surveillance and when we had established a strict censorship over all that he said or did?

What man not a driving idiot believes that Agoncillo was fool enough to precipitate bloodshed in the Philippines when he knew only too well that peace there was the only hope for the defeat of the treaty here? Then we ratified this

unjust treaty, voted down in the Senate the Bacon resolution, which disowned any intention of holding these islands permanently, refused even to consider a similarly worded resolution in the House, and, having provoked this unhappy people to attack us at Manila by our menace of them, we find ourselves now waging against them at all points not only a defensive, but an aggressive and bloody war to reduce them to our arbitrary wills. Now comes the Chief Executive of this nation, the one person responsible above everyone else for the whole wretched business, and in lugubrious accents repeated at every banquet informs us that every drop of blood around the trenches in these islands, whether of an American soldier or of a "misguided" Filipino, brings anguish to his heart.

How it must augment the agony of the great sufferer to reflect that his own hand has precipitated his all-absorbing grief upon him! Let him reflect upon the unaffected sorrow—the sorrow that dwells in the breast of the heartbroken wife, parent, or child as the terrible message daily is flashed to many of them over the ocean cable that a loved one has fallen far off in the East, under the hot skies of the tropics. Let him turn his face to the Orient and there in the lurid glare of their burning homes behold in the jungles the dusky bodies of the lifeless Filipinos, whose sightless orbs turn upward as though mutely appealing to high heaven for the justice which he denied them. And all these wrongs to which we have made reference, have been committed in the name of a people who boast of their free institutions, and who live under a written Constitution, every line of which fairly bristles with guarantees for the liberties of the citizen.

Will Alger and Egan Escape?

The report of the court of inquiry on the beef scandal is in the hands of the President. No official statement of its contents has been made, but the Washington correspondents all agree that General Miles will be condemned for not making his complaints about the beef to the War Department at the time he claims to have discovered that it was an unfit ration, instead of waiting until it was too late to remedy matters.

If the court of inquiry shifts the blame on General Miles, and pronounces the canned beef nutritious and wholesome, thus acquitting Alger, Egan and the plundering beef contractors of all responsibility, it will be a most unjust decision. Ninety per cent of the testimony confined Miles's charges. The beef was rotten before it reached Cuba. The men ate the best of it at the peril of their lives. They sickened and died from the effects of the poisonous stuff. Hundreds of soldiers swore to these facts before the court, and they were supported by their officers.

Whatever may be the verdict of the court of inquiry, the public has formed its opinion as to the guilt of the beef contractors and the inefficiency of the Commissary Department. And the Administration, too, will come in for its share of condemnation for a tacit support of these blunders and conspirators.

The German, as well as the Irish-Americans, are opposed to the proposed alliance of England and the United States, and there is nothing to induce the belief that the people of the South are dead in love with it, much as the Administration and its supporters may be. With three such influential factors in this country opposed to Mr. McKinley's pet scheme, says the *Alexandria Gazette*, it is hardly possible it can succeed. Northern native Americans may repudiate the wise advice of General Washington, but the foreign born citizens of the country have too much good sense to do so.

The request of the Filipino General Luna for a three months' truce to enable him to consult with the Filipino Congress on the terms of peace demonstrates the possession of qualities which would lead to success in civil life—as a book agent or lightning-rod peddler.

As a remedy for the prevalence of unpunished crime in Chicago an eminent physician of that city recommends the establishment of a Tarpeian Rock on the ancient Roman model, from which criminals might be hurled to death.

What Are His Intentions? President McKinley, after he had negotiated the Peace Treaty and before it was ratified, said:

I do not discuss, at this time, government or the future of the new possessions. Such discussion will be appropriate after the treaty of peace shall be ratified.

Thus he at that time announced the essential doctrines of an unlimited tyranny. First we are to take the Islands, and then we are to decide how they are to be governed. The President assumes that the inhabitants have no rights, that all right was in Spain, and as we succeed to her jurisdiction we may also impose upon the inhabitants whatever form of government may be agreeable to us. We are to pursue the policy which we had condemned in Spain, and which has ended in unmitigated disaster. We do not now discuss the constitutionality of the projected colonial system, but it is manifest that its introduction leads to a departure, a wide departure, from the doctrine that all just governments derive their powers from the free consent of the governed. By this one step which the President is now taking, we pass from a republic to an empire. We abandon the doctrine that personal freedom and political equality in public affairs and self-government in communities are a common heritage, and we ally ourselves with the long line of despots who have seized power and jurisdiction, and then governed and misgoverned their fellow men according to their own sovereign will.

Enforced governments, says Hon. Geo. S. Boutwell, though temporary, are unjust governments, and leniency in despotic governments is far away from justice. These considerations, even if well founded, are no defence for the act of seizing ten million people and holding them for even a day. We are of the opinion if the President even at this late stage would recognize their republican form of government the fighting would cease instantly. General Luna's envoys last week informed General Otis to that effect—but Otis refused. Upon the President's plan the Philippines are to be under a military government until—until when? Assuredly until a civil government can be set up. Can any dreamer suggest a time when a free, republican, self-sustaining and self-supporting civil government can be set up in those islands? Can the President name such a time? Although no such time has been named, or can be named, yet, as a measure of public policy, the United States is urged to sanction in perpetuity a presidential government over ten million conquered people who occupy one thousand islands in pestilential climes, in unfrequented seas, ten thousand miles away. If we leave the islands the inhabitants will set up a government. It may not be a good government as we prize governments, but it will be their government. Any form of free government is better than our form of tyranny. A protectorate will suffice.

Commercialism or Loyalty? Prof. J. Lawrence Laughlin, of the University of Chicago, speaking about the Philippine wars, says: "Commercialism has sunk its fangs deep enough into our political life. It cannot go much further without stirring the righteous indignation of justice loving Americans. Too long has public office been given, not to selected fitness, but to service in advancement of personal ambitions. Great fortunes, rather than great statesmanship, too often fill the Senate. Arrogant wealth buys legislation, which should be as cheap to the frugal consumer as for the powerful producer. We send up an appeal—which will be followed by a shout of approval from the American electorate—for equality in treatment of all, both rich and poor, and for justice to the weak, whether white or brown.

"Approach the problem any way you may, it ever harks back to a question, whether it is our policy to subjugate or to free the islands. We are opposed to the further war, because we are opposed to the subjugation of the people under a foreign yoke; we propose a cessation of slaughter, because we believe that the Filipinos are of right ought to be free and independent under a protection by the United States, which will save them from foreign aggression.

"They tell us we are disloyal, if we do not agree with any and every policy of conquest which may be arranged for us by the government;

that we should not increase the difficulties of a bad situation; that we should not shake the arm of the man when he is taking aim. Is it disloyal to keep our nation in the path of honor? We who love our country most wish most that its flag shall be sustained.

"They tell us there is nothing now to be done. Is it nothing to change war to peace? Is it nothing to stay the horrible slaughter of natives? Is it nothing to stop the operations by which our brave fellow citizens are killed by bullets and equally deadly disease? The assumption that the war is inevitable is gratuitous. If we have not promised the natives a free and independent government, try that at once. That is the crux of the whole matter. So, when they tell us there is nothing now to be done, I say the principal thing remains to be done—to assure the Filipinos as to the policy of the United States in regard to their liberty."

A Mighty Protest.

At the great Anti-Imperialist meeting held in the Central Music Hall at Chicago, last week (April 30), to protest against the course of the Administration with reference to the Philippine islands, the following truly American resolutions were adopted:

The frank expression of honest convictions upon great questions of public honor is vital to the health and even to the preservation of representative government. Such expression is therefore the sacred duty of American citizens.

We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends to militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it is now necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We still maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the forcible subjugation of a purchased people is a criminal aggression, and that the duty of the United States is to maintain the distinctive principles of our government.

We honor our soldiers and sailors in the Philippine Islands for their unflinching bravery; and we mourn with the whole nation for the American lives that have been sacrificed. Their duty was obedience to orders, and they were diligent and fearless in their performance. We hold that our own government created the conditions which have brought about the sacrifice.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present National Administration in the Philippines. It is the spirit of '76 that our government is striving to exhibit in those islands; we denounce the attempt and demand its abandonment. We deplore and resent the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror, a deep dishonor to our nation.

We protest against the extension of American empire by Spanish methods, and demand the immediate cessation of the war against liberty, begun by Spain and continued by us. We believe that a foolish pride is the chief obstacle to a speedy settlement of all difficulties. As Mr. Gladstone said to England: "We are strong enough to cast aside all considerations of false shame walking in the plain and simple ways of right and justice." Our government should at once announce to the Filipinos its purpose to grant them, under proper guarantees, the independence for which they have so long fought, and should seek by diplomatic methods to secure this independence by the common consent of nations. It is today as true of the Philippines as it was a year ago of the Cubans, that they "are and of right ought to be free and independent."

What Are We Coming To? Are our people really at this end of the century degenerating at a rate of which we had no conception at its beginning? Here are two young men, belonging to the highest social and professional circles in Philadelphia, of whom one had been United States District Attorney and the other expected to be, and meanwhile making \$16,000 a year in their law practice, charged with attempting to bribe other United States officials in order to defraud the Government by issuing counterfeit money and revenue stamps!

The saddest features of our conditions are that in the beginning of the century all our prominent men, and especially those in Government employment, were honorable men, particularly in money affairs. Now when such a case like this Philadelphia one occurs it rouses no indignation; a little bit of surprise that these people allowed themselves to be caught—that is all.

German Americans Continue their Hostility to Expansion.

The *Westliche Post* has printed an article defining the policy of a German American paper in this country regarding Americanism against imperialism. "Time and again," the article reads, "the attempt has been made to supplant American republicanism with imperialism. Time and again American patriotism, and that high and far seeing love of mankind which unites men of all countries in a common brotherhood, have rallied and won against it. When half a century ago, we had the same cries of 'manifest destiny,' the 'conquering Saxon,' 'expansion' and all the rest we are hearing over again now, Americans as radically opposed to each other in most things as were Calhoun and Corbin, joined with Clay, Webster, Lowell, Clayton, and Clemens against it.

"What American can read this without an indignant refusal to consent that the blood of those once our allies shall saturate the soil on which they were born, that we may be praised by the *London Times* for our noble work for progress in furthering British plans for dismembering and robbing China. John M. Clayton himself, the author of the Clayton Bulwer treaty, and openly in favor of co-operating with England in business, was only opposed to having anything to do with the political methods of British imperialism.

"What is there in stalwart Americanism (its native Americanism, if you will) except what German-Americans are saying now in declaring that they gave up home and friends and came thousands of miles into an unknown country for the deep love—

not of English colonialism, but of American republicanism? To that they are loyal now and always. To Americanism, to liberty, to progress; to freedom from militarism, to the expectation of a time to come when the world will be no longer shackled by imperialism, with its bayonets and fetters—to that German Americans who renounced imperialism in Europe are as devoted now as they were fifty years ago, when they listened to Seward as he said of these same 'expansionists': 'Sir, they have sent the American Eagle abroad, bearing not the olive branch, but a shackle in his talons.' The flag of this great republic stands now—not for what the *London Times* approves—but for what it meant when Seward stood under it to utter this immortal sentence.

"Such republicanism as that was not his, nor is it that of any local German American or of any other American, who is loyal to his flag and to his country. May heaven forbid that it should ever be. May the time never come when the American people will applaud those who drabble a flag dedicated to freedom and human progress in the blood of men who die on their own soil, resisting the same principle of British imperialism against which America triumphed at Yorktown and New Orleans.

England has Never Been a Friend of this Country.

We are at present, says Bishop J. L. Spalding, of Peoria, Ill., in the midst of a crisis in which lack of thought and deliberation may lead us far from the ideals which, as Americans, we have most cherished, and expose us to evils of which we scarcely dream. We stand at the parting of the ways. It is not yet too late to turn from the way which leads through war and conquest to imperialism, to standing armies, to alliances with foreign powers, and finally to the disruption of the Union itself. It is not too late because it is still possible, probable even, that the American people will reconsider the whole question of the complications in which our victories over Spain have involved us, and calling to mind the fact that they did not enter into this war for the purpose of becoming an empire, but for the purpose of helping others to throw off the yoke of a tyrannical imperialism, will see that to be blinded and led away by success is to be weak and foolish; or, rather, since here the highest interests of humanity are at stake, it is to be wicked and criminal. If this may not be, then the American people have degenerated; they have lost their hold upon the historical causes and the political habits which led to the founding of our institutions and to the marvelous growth and prosperity of our country.

We shall not believe, continues the bishop, that the gain of a few naval battles over a weak and unprepared foe have power to throw

us into such enthusiasm, or such madness, as to turn us permanently from the principles and policies to which we owe our national existence, our life and liberty; or that destiny, the divinity of fatalists and materialists, can weaken our faith in the God of justice, righteousness, and love, who scorns and thrusts far away those who, having the giant's strength, use it to oppress or destroy the weak and ignorant.

We have never looked upon ourselves, he concludes, as predestined to subdue the earth, to compel other nations with sword and hell to accept our rule; we have always believed in human rights, in freedom and opportunity, in education and religion, and we have invited all men to come and enjoy these blessings in this half of a world which God has given us; but we have never dreamed that they were articles to be exported and thrust down unwilling throats at the point of the bayonet. We have sympathized with Ireland, Greece, Armenia, Cuba. To emancipate the slave we gladly sacrificed the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers. And now the American soldier, who should never shoulder a gun except in a righteous cause, is sent 10,000 miles across the ocean to shoot men whose real crime is that they wish to be free, wish to govern themselves.

American Ignorance of Filipino Affairs.

A. H. Meyers writes from Shanghai: No one here can understand why the American public are so thoroughly ignorant of the true state of affairs; why so many gross misrepresentations have been made. The papers coming out here from the United States contain all kinds of vague rumours as to expeditions of arms sent to the Philippines, and statements that the Germans are assisting the Filipinos. The bald headed statement is made that a large expedition of arms intended for the Filipinos was confiscated in Hongkong in December by the British Government. This information was cabled to the State Department by Consul-General Wildman. I have made inquiries, and I can assure you that a cablegram addressed to the Colonial Secretary of Hongkong will elicit the information that there is no truth whatever in the statement. I have had the privilege of meeting the leaders of the Filipino Junta in Hongkong, and I have learned for a positive fact that the only arms in their possession are forty-two rifles presented by Admiral Dewey and the arms and ammunition presented by Admiral Dewey which were found in the Arsenal at Cavite. Besides these they have 183 rifles with 200,000 rounds of ammunition that were sent over to the Philippine Islands by Consul General Wildman, bought with their money in May; and 92 rifles, two Maxim guns and 500,000 rounds of ammunition for rifles that were contracted for with them in June by an American. This latter contract was made with the full knowledge of the American officials, and in fact the details were closed in the office of the Consul General at Hong Kong. Rousseau, a prominent merchant here, has been closely connected with the Filipinos from the start of the war; and although he shipped this one lot of arms, it was done with the consent of the American officials, and it was generally recognized at that time to be of considerable benefit to the Americans. This same gentleman has advised the Filipinos on many of their difficulties, and has been responsible for the settlement of many questions that have arisen; and the quiet submission of the Filipinos to the many insults and abuses they were compelled to submit to is to a great extent solely due to his counsel and influence. He has advised them that the American people as a whole sympathized with the weak and oppressed, but that unfortunately for their cause, their case was not known to the American public; and he tried to impress upon them that if they left their cause in the hands of the American people that it could only have one result—liberty and freedom, the same as every citizen enjoyed in the United States. He was responsible for the sending of Agoncillo to Washington to explain everything to the American people, not to demand, but to beg of them for justice; he induced them to send a later commission to strengthen Agoncillo; to establish a bureau in Hong Kong; to make use of the press; and to beg of the American people, through their Government, to instruct their officials in the Philippines to treat them less harshly.

Agoncillo has often said to this same gentleman, "I have every confidence in the ultimate justice and fairness of the American people. I recognize it at unfortunately they know very little of me or my people; but what I fear is that out of the thousands of men under my command that some of them, being aggravated, will turn about, fire a gun, and then the mine will be exploded. But if your people (meaning the Americans) will only help me just a little I am sure that there will be a peaceable settlement with justice to all. Consul General Wildman knew of this gentleman's work in the interest of peace, and yet he was responsible for the sending to the United States of different articles asserting that this party was supplying arms and ammunition to the Filipinos, and as grave an injustice has been done to this gentleman as to the Filipinos themselves.

Each nation of the civilized world finds a separate inspiration for its sentimentality, and the sentiment of France is inspired by her Army. The sound of the trumpet stirs the Frenchman's blood to day well nigh as potently as in the hour of Napoleon's triumph. The National Fete of July, when Paris is packed with troops, is of all festivals the most adored by patriotic Parisians. At every season the sight of a uniform quickens enthusiasm, if it does not arouse a cry of "Vive l'Armee. Even when the Generals are in disgrace, the heart of France beats in loyalty to its favorite institution. The lamentable casualty of M. Cavaignac, the powerless to alienate this profound affection as the narrow dogmatism of General Roget. Justice is nothing, truth is nothing, exclaims the average citizen, but the Army is inviolate and inviolable. When flagrant abuses are gently pointed out, a shameful attack is made, in the cant phrase, upon the silent and sacred defences of France. An officer, being incapable of wrong, is seldom called upon to defend himself, unless, indeed, he commits the wickedness of believing in Dreyfus's innocence; and the mere title *la Grande Muraille* proves at once the strange sentiment that Frenchmen cherish for their Army, and the complete confidence they guard in their Army's honor.

OUR FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading European papers for the SENTINEL.

ENGLAND.

FRANCE AND HER ARMY.

Spectator.

Noble, brave, unselfish, proud, insulted—these are, so to say, the counters of debate; they are put upon the table whenever the game of controversy begins, and they are handed from one player to the other as solemnly as if they were the sound and current coin of the realm. But they are not mere counters; they have at least the value of half-sincerity. No institution has ever been so lofty in character and achievement as the French Army is represented by its worshippers. The sentiment is as overcharged as the Spaniard's love of etiquette or the German's adoration of flaxen hair and blue eyes. And yet France does not lie when she employs words which have long since lost their meaning. For the truth is, she does love her Army, and she loves it with its faults of falsehood and dishonesty thick upon it. Or rather, she lightly brushes away the faults, and tries to believe that the object of her idolatry is honorably pure. When General de Gallifet, the one great General of France whose name is still remembered, declared his faith in Colonel Picotet, a group of his colleagues implied him not to give evidence in the Colonel's favor, because they felt assured of Esterhazy's innocence. Of course they are not assured of Esterhazy's innocence at all, but they recognize that the corporate army could not defend itself, and they are prepared to defend its most worthless member. Such is the anomalous view which France takes of her Army, and it is worth while to consider upon what ground, however shifty, this view is based. In the first place, France and the Army are indivisible. France is the Army, and the Army is France. With us the soldiers form a class apart, and our Army is, as it were, something not ourselves, for which we are proud to pay, and which defends our shores and keeps our Colonies. But our pride comes from the outside; a smart regiment is a splendid possession, which stirs a legitimate enthusiasm. The French citizen, on the other hand, worships his Army because, however humble he be, he forms part of it. For him to insult this national institution is to insult himself—a vice akin to cannibalism. So he is quick to avenge the slightest word of reproach, and by an intimate vanity to declare that the Army of which he is a willing or unwilling member, can do no wrong. Nor is the Frenchman's keen partisanship born of a Jesuit father who to day, of course, is ranged upon the side of the soldiers, condemned the system of military service in even stronger terms than those employed by M. Gobier, and he was deported from France. The justice of the punishment was never questioned; every citizen knew that the Jesuit Father spoke the truth, and every citizen resented his interference. But in the years when the sabre and stoup were as yet unalloyed, the priest was not permitted to express an opinion on that which did not concern him, and no sympathy was shown for the exiled Father.

And here we are encountered by a curious contradiction. The intelligent youth of France detests the compulsory service, and rebels furiously against the enforced discipline, as long as he is under the yoke. "Moi je suis pas patriote," said a French private to other day to the present writer, and he explained his lack of patriotism by the long march and the short commons of the day before. Thereupon he began, after the wont of the French private, who is a student and who reads the reviews, to inveigh against the insolence of his non-commissioned officers, and the infamous food habitually set before him. "It is wonderful," said he in effect, "that a Frenchman ever keeps his self respect." And may it be it is. But the point of interest is that three years hence this same private will in all probability applaud the system, which he now denounces with his best eloquence. Though now and again a man of letters, like M. Descaves or M. Courtelaine, may carry out of the Army a hatred of the military system, the vast majority of

Frenchmen soften its bitter judgment. Time assuages the harshest impression, and egotism comes to the aid of kindly feeling. "I have gone through it myself," murmurs the soldier, "and it did me no harm, and I am convinced that it is for the good of the country that every man should be a soldier." Possibly involved with this new born optimism is the selfish feeling, that which one man has endured may be endured by the rest. After all, where is the use of supporting hardship if others are to escape? So have we heard the English boy, whose early years at a public school were not mere happiness, explain the advantages of a public school education, and it is the same spirit of unalloyed altruism which preserves the general exaltation which pervades the French Army. This, then, is the primary reason why France cherishes a military ambition. Every man of full age is or has been a soldier; his sons have served or are serving, and there is not a single citizen of the Republic, be he Senator or conciliator, who does not know his drill and has not shuddered at the raucous voice of an intimidating sergeant.

THE RISE OF ENGLISH SHIPPING.

Lecture Hour.

By the defeat of their Army Spain lost the command of the sea, and thus English trading vessels ran less danger on long voyages. The founding of the East India Company was another aid to London's greatness; and the sailing home of the ships of war by James I. and their employment in colonizing expeditions, was the beginning of a further increase of prosperity that was not at first apparent. In 1615 the outward customs of the kingdom yielded £87,000, of which London was responsible for £51,000; and the inward customs yielded £61,000, of which London paid £48,000. Note that the export duties realized more than the import duties; but also note that the exports of all England were only worth £1,090,000, while the imports were £2,147,000; that is, the balance of trade was against us in the days of James I.

London suffered much from loss of trade during the Civil war; and Amsterdam rose at her expense. There is little difficulty in accounting for the rise and decline of Holland. She flourished so long as she was at peace with herself, while neighboring countries were at war; and she decayed as soon as she herself went to war, as she had no produce or manufactures, and had to tax her commerce, thus driving away her capitalists, who left her, like the Hopes of Amsterdam, to do business in other countries. For a few years her advance was seriously threatened, a heavy blow being dealt her by the Rump Parliament in passing the Navigation Act, prohibiting any merchandise being imported from Asia, Africa or America, except in English built ships. The result of this was Cromwell's war of 1652, in which England captured 700 Dutch merchantmen, and for a time brought the trade back to the Thames; to be lost again under Charles II., who, following his father's example, seized upon the Londoners' money deposited in the Exchequer, thus losing the good will of the city and preparing the way for the coming of William III., when London began to thrive again. At the close of this reign, in 1702, London had 550 ships, with a gross tonnage of \$4,882, manned by 100,000 men; Bristol coming next with 165 ships of a tonnage of 17,335, and Yarmouth coming third with 143 of much smaller average tonnage. Altogether the mercantile fleet of England consisted of 3,281 vessels, totaling up to 261,222 tons. Since then the ships have increased three fold and their tonnage forty eight fold.

Under Queen Anne and George I., the London shipping trade went ahead, as might have been expected in that age of speculation. Among other causes of its advance was the establishment of the South Sea Company, whose history is so persistently misrepresented. In 1715 they launched their first ship, the Royal Prince, named after the Prince of Wales (George II.), who was magnificently entertained on board, but they did not get into full work till the war was over. Then—but let us quote from Charles Capper, to whose valuable book we owe so much—"Peace being established in 1721, the South Sea Company sent out a rich ship to trade with the Spanish settlements at Porto Bello and Carthage, and in 1723 they sent another ship, with a rich freight, to trade at Vera Cruz. In 1725, stimulated by the success of the Dutch in the Greenland whale fishery, the same company commenced sending ships to fish for whales. This trade they carried on for eight years (until 1732), when finding there had been considerable losses, they were obliged to lay it aside.

The East India Company in the spring of this year (1730) sailed seventeen ships from India to the Thames, but they did not arrive until late in the year. The South Sea Company's great ship Prince Frederick returned to the Thames from Vera Cruz this year with a loading of 400,000 dollars of Spanish pieces of eight, in specie, 150,000 lbs. of cochineal, 47,000 lbs. of indigo, and 170 tons of logwood. The cargo was valued altogether at £350,000 sterling. Our colonial trade with America and the West Indies had also begun about this time to be large. The total value of the imports of England this year was £17,780,019, the exports £18,247,000. Apart from the occasional depressions due to the commerce of the country made more progress under George II. than at any period up to the time of Victoria. In 1760 the Port of London possessed nearly 2,000 vessels, our total imports being over ten millions and our exports over fifteen millions. With many vicissitudes we prospered during the long reign of George III.; and in 1800 when the old state of affairs ended and the dock era began, our imports were thirty millions, our exports forty three millions, and London carried a third of the trade of the empire.