

ings of the war in all other cases, whilst the Americans often swerve from the law, which forbids, although it tolerates in serious cases, incendiarism, devastation and pillage, many of the persons present having been eyewitnesses of the lootings committed by the American forces, in the presence of their officers, in the towns of Lillo, Naykarlang, Pagsanjan, Kalauang, Paete, Rizal, Pila, Bay, Santa Cruz, Lumbang, Eavinte and Luisiana, besides the burning of hamlets in the towns of Santa Cruz, Naykarlang, Majayjay, Pagsanjan, Paete, Eavinte, without counting the entire destruction of the town of San Antonio. That the death of innocent and defenseless people stains with blood the formerly bright pages of the history of the United States of America. That the proposals and conditions under which Gen. Juan Cailles is intimated to surrender with all his forces must be rejected, and not even the honor of being remembered should be given to them, inasmuch as the mere thought of them sullies, because they are proposals of treason to a sacred cause, which all those present have sworn to defend at the cost of all sacrifices, even at the cost of life, for the Philippine people are entirely convinced that their future happiness depends upon the attainment and establishment of self-government in the midst of a free and independent country. Finally, the grand assembly enacted that the military government of La Laguna must not henceforward deal with emissaries from the enemy, as long as the object of their mission be the ending of the war; because, if the American rulers desire in a positive and sincere way the happiness and peace of the Philippines, the Philippine people have a representative in the person of Hon. President Emilio Aguinaldo, in whom they have trusted their faith, and whom they have made the arbiter of their fate. This has been agreed upon by the grand assembly, and this act has been extended for the consequent effects and signed by all present, after the military governor of which, I, Pedro Cueva, the secretary, certify.

To this act are appended 35 names of local presidents and prominent citizens representative of the populace in the province of La Laguna.

EDUCATION AS A FACTOR OF NATIONAL GREATNESS.

Extract from the Commencement Address of Judge Presley K. Ewing, at the University of Texas. Published in the University Record.

To you, in part, will be the task of preserving the integrity of the union, the ideals of the republic, the faith of the fathers. In discharging this high trust, no duty will be more imperative than that of infusing perpetual life into that wise provision of the Texas constitution which enjoins the support and maintenance of an efficient public free school system, declaring "a general diffusion of knowledge essential to the preservation of the liberties and rights of the people."

The preservation of the liberties and rights of the people! These are not idle words. Their thought burned

in the impassioned eloquence of Patrick Henry, glittered on the sword of Washington and inspired the pen of the immortal Jefferson. Think you that this thought would have so possessed orator, soldier, statesman, in the founding of our republic, without the influence of education in the highest and most ennobling sense? Who but one standing as "heir of all the ages," moving with majestic power "in the foremost files of time," inspired by knowledge from every fountain of the past, could have bequeathed to posterity the declaration of independence? The truths of that imperishable document were proclaimed as "self-evident," but philosophers of all the ages had groped in darkness for the formulation of its doctrine, hinting, like Locke, but as dreamers; and no nation had ever adopted its creed of the political equality of men, or the derivation of all just powers of government from the consent of the governed, and not a kingdom of the earth then believed that creed. It came as the real dawn of human liberty, the true herald of our country's greatness; and it is, to-day, whatever the recent shocks to its principles, the abiding hope in the throbbing breasts of millions for their country's future glory. The republic's constitution has been somewhere in effect described as the bond of our union, the shield of our defense, the source of our national prosperity, but, indeed, the spirit of its letter is the declaration of independence, which binds both constitution and people to the fundamental and immutable principles of our government.

It is these principles, born of the enlightenment of education, which must be perpetuated by that enlightenment. Never, perhaps, in the history of this nation was the demand so great for intelligent thought and action among the masses of the people; and greater and greater will that need become, if changes in the past few years may shape our prophecy of the future. Open and avowed advocates are now found of the doctrine that the sacred truths of the declaration of independence are but "glittering generalities;" and it is boldly maintained in certain quarters, under the influence of "the dollar above the man," that education ought to be withheld from the masses of the people. An ex-attorney general of the United States, a reputed aspirant for the chief magistracy of this nation, has, in a carefully prepared article

for a leading periodical, plainly sought to justify, for reasons of mere expediency, a violation of the plighted faith of these United States to Cuban independence, a transformation of that proclaimed war of humanity into one of brutal conquest, of mere commercial gain. Men high in place and power, in the brief space of two years, have sought to make criminality a synonym for benevolence, and to divorce from the folds of the flag the constitution of the republic. A principle, broad in its truth as the blue canopy of heaven over the habitations of men, has been sought by some to be so localized that we might, without inconsistency or breach of plighted faith, or assault upon our national ideals, salute Maximo Gomez as hero of liberty in the island of Cuba, while we hunted to the death Aguinaldo, our former ally in war, as a renegade in Luzon!

It might not be germane to the thought of this address, if, abstractly considered, it were only Aguinaldo and the archipelago of the Philippines. But when Aguinaldo shall fall as Kosciusko fell, when the Philippines shall fall as Sarmatia fell, both at the bayonet point of the only republic that ever realized the true blessings of liberty in the political equality of man—well may we recall, in mournful consciousness of their application, the familiar words of immortal thought:

Oh, bloodiest picture in the book of Time,
Sarmatia fell, unwept, without a crime;
Found not a generous friend, a pitying foe,
Strength in her arms, nor mercy in her
woe!

Dropped from her nerveless grasp the
shattered spear,
Closed her bright eye and curbed her high
career;

Hope for a season bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shrieked as Kosciusko fell!

It may be suggested that these sentiments sink into political partisanship, but it is denied. Questions like these, touching the tap-root of the republic, rise too high and strike too deep to be merely covered beneath the wings of political councils. Their place is here, everywhere the flag of the union floats, in every bosom where the lamp of liberty is lighted, on every monument dedicated to our heroes of patriotism, around all the shrines of our sainted soldiers, and wherever noble aspirations for the freedom of men may lead our way to deathless deeds.

This hour for you, young men and women, is the narrow isthmus between the two eternities—the miniature world of the alma mater your past, but the greater outer world

your future. In facing the duties of citizenship as patriots and lovers of liberty, temptations will beset your path. False philosophers and teachers are likely to appear at any step, and the seductive influence of money-gain to sing its siren song. It will need the vigilance of your faculties, sustained by educational strength, to withstand the trial and test. Over, beyond and above all, remember that there are different meanings for virtue and valor in individual and national life. Away with those words of misguided zeal: "My country, right or wrong!" Put in their place those other words of patriotic utterance: "My country, right—to be kept right; wrong—to be made right."

There is an eastern allegory that tells of those who attempt to climb an enchanted mountain for the talismen of power, as being assailed at each progressive step by every conceivable calumny and insult. If they falter, they fall as inert matter; but if one is found who presses forward, fearing neither death nor calumny, standing throughout for the eternal right, he transforms the faltering fallen into life, and as they crowd about him he becomes their leader.

May you, young friends, climb to the topmost height of the enchanted mountain, but, having grasped the talisman of power, wield it for the greatness of Texas, the glory of the republic! May you discover in your own educational advantages, that, after bread, education is the first want of the people; and, so imbued, strive to fulfill the public need by general diffusion of knowledge among the masses! May you, ever recalling the rise of the republic, avert its fall by striking, as at a deadly serpent, apostasy to the declaration of independence and the constitution of the union! May the spirit of education, blessing heart and mind, ever teach you that with the nation, as with the man, when honor's dead the life is dead! May you, finally, so shape your lives in the course of citizenship that all the ends at which you aim shall be your country's, your God's, and truth's! Then, indeed, though some supreme ambition may as the fabled apple turn to ashes at your touch; though it may be for you as with Cyrano de Bergerac to stand in the shadows as prompter for others climbing to kisses of Fame; you will yet in the final hour be able "to wrap the drapery of your couch about you, and lie down to pleasant dreams;" while, like him, above you there will wave

the white plume of a life's consecrated and exalted purpose.

OUR DUTY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES.

There are two branches to any inquiry into the subject of the duty of the American government toward the Philippines. We must first determine what it ought if possible to do, and then what, under the circumstances, it can do.

No difficulty is presented by the first branch. When congress declared the attitude of the United States toward Cuba it determined in advance what its attitude ought to be toward the Philippines. To that declaration, then, let us refer.

It is the fourth clause of the joint resolution adopted by congress on April 18, 1898, and signed by the president on the 20th—the same resolution that recognized the independence of Cuba and by authorizing armed intervention brought on the Spanish war.

In unequivocal terms that clause disclaimed "any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over" Cuba, "except for the pacification thereof," and asserted the determination of the government, "when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people." Cuba alone was named. But that was because the circumstances at the time happened to have brought Cuba alone into consideration. By naming Cuba, under the circumstances, the declaration did not exclude like cases; on the contrary, it invoked in behalf of Cuba a principle of general application. An analogy may be found in the practice of the law courts. Legal principles which a court applies in one case it is expected to apply in every like case. If, for instance, it decides that under certain circumstances John Doe is entitled to his liberty, it must decide that Richard Roe is under like circumstances entitled to his. That would be a queer lawyer who objected to the applicability of Roe's case of a principle applied in Doe's, merely because Roe had not been mentioned. Legal principles do not depend upon particular instances. Neither do principles of national polity and international morality. The principle governs the instance, not the instance the principle. What instances do is to illustrate. So, when the United States disclaimed all purpose of sovereignty as to Cuba and promised independent self-government to her people, it illustrated a general principle—the principle of duty which American polity imposes upon the American government in its attitude toward alien

peoples whom circumstances happen to place within its power.

This was the very principle that President McKinley himself, in two preceding messages, had put impressively and almost in epigrammatic phrase. It was the beneficent principle, to quote his words, that "forcible annexation * * * by our code of morality would be criminal aggression."

In the light of that elemental principle there can be no doubt of what the United States ought to do if it can. It ought to proclaim and promise as to the Philippines what it proclaimed and promised as to Cuba. It ought, in other words, to disavow "any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control," except for the temporary purpose of pacification; and to promise that as soon as the country is pacified American authority shall be withdrawn and the independent self-government of the people recognized. Besides this, it ought to redeem the promise promptly, fully and in manifest good faith.

That is what the United States ought to do if possible. The other branch of the inquiry: What can it do under the circumstances? may not be so simple.

In one respect, however, the second branch obviously offers no greater difficulty than the first. Without any embarrassment the United States could at once proclaim its disavowal of sovereignty except for purposes of pacification, and promise to leave the Philippines to their people as soon as pacification is accomplished. There are no existing circumstances, except an indefensible and ignoble desire for forcible annexation, to interfere with that.

If such a disavowal and promise had been made at the beginning and faithfully observed the remainder of this branch of the inquiry would also be simple. Nothing would now stand in the way of fully redeeming the promise. For the Philippine people had already established a pacific government, which, by this time, could have been trusted with the destiny of the islands. This assertion is borne out by Gen. Anderson in his article in the North American Review for February, 1900, and by Leonard R. Sargent, in the Outlook for September 2, 1899. Gen. Armstrong tells us that the Filipino government ruled over nearly all the archipelago in the late summer of 1898. "We held Manila and Cavite," he says; "the rest of the island was held, not by Spaniards, but by the Filipinos. On the other islands the Spaniards were confined to two or three fortified towns." So there was then an effective government. And Mr. Sargent assures us that it was not only effective,