

legislation. That we cannot vote, no more really exempts us from responsibility than it would leave us irresponsible to help our soldiers sweep out of our land an invading army.

When women realize a personal responsibility in civics, and instead of shirking it, as now, decide to exercise it, they will not have to wait long for the ballot. The moral power of citizenship is the pressing need of our country. It is in the order of evolution that woman should contribute as a citizen to this moral power.

Awake and act, Sister Women, to make this a land of the free, and to establish justice.

LUCINDA B. CHANDLER,
Norwood Park, Ill.

GEN. MILES ON SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Portions of the remarks made by Gen. Nelson A. Miles at the luncheon given in Boston, Jan. 8, 1906, to welcome Mr. Fiske Warren on his return from the Philippines.

The problem of the Philippine islands is yet an unsolved one. I hope it will not remain so long, but it may for a number of months or years . . .

In 1897 and 1898 Spain had nearly if not wholly exhausted her resources. Hers was a decaying empire once the mistress of the world. She had gone down and had lost her possessions in the western hemisphere with the exception of Cuba. She was making a desperate struggle to retain control of that island. Spain had sent there 200,000 men.

The condition of the Philippine islands did not attract our attention so much, yet the same thirst for liberty and independence prevailed there as with the people in the Island of Cuba. The people in the Philippine islands numbered nearly 10,000,000 (now 8,000,000) as against the million and a half in Cuba. For months before the Spanish war the people of the Philippine islands had been resisting the Spanish power. They captured one of the largest cities in the islands. If you will read the dispatches of our own officials giving an account of the efforts being made in the islands for their independence you will see that the same spirit prevailed there as in Cuba, and from the time when the Spanish fleet was destroyed, up to the time when our troops landed, the Filipinos controlled the affairs of the islands absolutely, and I ask any gentleman here if he ever heard of a single case of violence or disorder during the time when the Filipinos had abso-

lute control? This is an evidence of their capacity for self-government. They certainly governed the islands with order, with security, with safety and intelligence.

As far as their capacity for self-government is concerned, if you will take the civil list published at Washington, from the governor general who draws \$20,000 a year and lives in a palace, down to the humblest employe, you will find on that list published the names of 5,000 men, and I was curious to see where the 5,000 men came from. Looking over the list which gives names and occupation, I saw the names of men who were governors of provinces, presidents, marshals, justices of the court, judges, attorney generals. I saw that some of these men were born in Massachusetts, some in Ireland, some in New York, Michigan, Ohio, but over 3,000 men out of the 5,000 were born in the Philippine islands. What stronger evidence do we require than this? I should like to ask how long were our forefathers schooled by any other power in the theory of self-government when they threw off the bondage and oppression of the British power? How long had the 17 republics of the western hemisphere been schooled in the methods of self-government to prepare them to govern their own affairs when they had thrown off the power of European control? Not a moment! The 50,000,000 of people now living south of the Rio Grande, how long were they schooled to fit them for self-government?

A people that loves liberty, and thirsts for it, and hopes for it, and prays for it, and is willing to die for it, is equally willing to preserve and maintain it. There is as much intelligence, virtue, honor, industry and integrity in the people of the Philippine islands as there is in the people of Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Chili, or any other of the Spanish countries, and I have no sympathy with that theory that we must allow a generation, or two, or three, to prepare them for self-government.

What right have we to say what the people of our country three generations hence from us will do? Will they have any more intelligence or honesty or less thirst for greed and avarice than we? Will they be freer from graft and thirst for gold or mines or railroads than we? Are our own affairs so pure and sweet that we are prepared to say that we are the only people that are capable of self-govern-

ment? Is there not room for a little missionary work here at home?

My friends, we have gone too far in our thirst for what we are going to get out of the Philippines and we are finding out that it has been an unfortunate enterprise. We find that the timber there is not so valuable as we supposed. We find that we can go down to the coast of South America and buy timber cheaper than we can bring the same kind from the Philippine islands. Why, the fact is that timber is being shipped from Puget sound in enormous quantities to build the government buildings in the Philippine islands. The mineral wealth of the Philippines is not what we expected. There is not a gold mine, or a coal mine, or a silver mine in the whole archipelago that is being worked to-day. We have found that our ideas of enriching ourselves there have been a great failure. . . .

Would it not be just as well for us to try the experiment of even-handed justice and humanity, and to do unto others as we would have others do unto us? I have no sympathy with the idea that because a nation is powerful and great it will take advantage of a nation that is weak, and poor, and timid. I would like the government of the United States to do exactly with the Philippines as we would like to have had done with us or as was done 100 years ago. Give them an opportunity to establish their own self-government. I hope to live long enough to see the people of the United States establish the first republic in the orient. As to how long it would require to do so—24 hours would be long enough to make a good beginning. A resolution of congress authorizing the government to call a convention to adopt a constitution similar to that of Cuba, and on the completion of that to recognize that government. That would be the end of it. It is like the man who buys his ticket and gets on the train to go to New York. There is nothing more to be done. A resolution of congress authorizing the governor general of the islands to call a convention for the purpose of adopting a constitution similar to that of Cuba having been adopted, the thing would be accomplished, and every man, woman and child in the Philippine islands would say, Thanks be to God that He has heard our prayers; and everybody in the United States would say, Amen!

[This question was asked from the audience: "I understand that the Filipinos were fighting for their independence when they

were fighting the United States. Now one principal reason why we have tried to prevent their becoming independent has been the fear that they would fall to fighting with one another if we made them independent. I should like to ask Mr. Warren or Gen. Miles how many we have killed off in battle of the Filipinos to prevent their killing one another?" Gen. Miles replied as follows:]

As to the fear of their killing each other or a civil war, it is a curious fact that our government was engaged in something of that nature for four long years, and there was more "blood-letting" in that great war of Americans against Americans in the four years from '61 to '65 than in all the wars where lives were lost in the whole western hemisphere for 100 years, and I think the less we talk about that the more becoming it would be for us, for when 500,000 lives, the very flower of American manhood, went to untimely graves in the civil war among ourselves, we are certainly not the ones to talk about peoples of other countries fighting each other.

DISINTEGRATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES.

Extract from the serial letter of March 10, 1906, by Lincoln Steffens, as published in the Chicago Record-Herald of March 11.

When I came down here I couldn't tell the difference between a Democrat and a Republican, and it hurt my pride to have statesmen tell me about their parties. The candid thieves who run our States and cities had ceased long ago to try to work off that sort of buncombe on me, and I thought that all talk of parties was for the "peepul," not for me and the railroads and the boodlers, who change parties as we change cars to follow the majority from State to State.

But still they would talk parties, and the speaker, Mr. Cannon, was especially annoying. He sat me down in a big chair, gave me a cigar, stuck another in his own mouth, and then he stood up over me and delivered a regular stump speech.

He called it an interview, but it was the sort of oration he delivers to his constituents out in Illinois. All about "the" party, "the great party which has made this great country what it is—great."

Since he is a humorist, I thought at first that he was "joking," but he seemed very serious, and I put it down to habit, till by and by it dawned on me that he was trying to deceive himself as well as me. I half believe he half believes the G. O. P. brings up good crops.

But he said one thing that is true:

"This is a government by parties." It is.

As I left the room John Sharp Williams, the minority leader, entered. They work together, these two, for government by parties. We have a bipartisan system here as well as in the cities and States. The pension bill graft goes to Democrats as well as to Republicans; no party difference there. If there's a river and harbor bill, the Democrats get their "divvy." They don't get so much as "the" party gets, but—there's no difference in "pork;" which, mind you, is treated as "graft."

So with the other pork barrel—the public building bill. Toledo needs right now a federal building, so does Atlanta, and other places, but they can't have what they need till there's enough money to go around to all the Congressmen of both parties who voted right. And they vote right here without any precise regard to party.

The speaker put his Philippine bill through only with the help of the Democrats, and Rice, the last special interest "taken care of" by "Uncle Joe" Cannon in his free trade measure, was expected to win over enough Southern protection Democrats to overcome the insurgent high tariff Republicans. The party line there is as confused as that sentence. And, as for the Hepburn rate bill, everybody voted to pass that measure up to the Senate to be fixed. So there's no difference there.

And, taking the Senate, what's the difference between Aldrich, the Republican leader, and Gorman, the Democratic leader? Or between Clark, Democrat, of Montana, and Wetmore, Republican, of Rhode Island?

Bailey, of Texas, is a Democrat, but he is not so much of a democrat as La Follette, a Republican, of Wisconsin. And, certainly, Dolliver, Republican, of Iowa, is at least as democratic as McLaurin, Democrat, of Mississippi.

There are differences among these men, and these differences are political. They are broad enough to build political parties on. But the old political parties are not built upon them. The new parties will have to be and, as a matter of fact, the new parties are being built upon them now, here as elsewhere in the United States.

What are those differences? What is the line the President and Mr. Aldrich could not draw in words? What is the American issue?

Out in Chicago some 12 years ago a group of reformers undertook to clear the boodlers out of their council. The street railways, which needed a corrupt council in their business, were in poli-

tics, and they fought reform. The fight has been waging ever since.

"Municipal ownership" is the form the issue has taken out there, but the fight is really between the public service corporations and the people for the control of the government; and men divide according as they are for special interests or the common interest.

In Cleveland the story is essentially the same. The form of the issue is "three-cent fares," but the fight, which has extended into the State, is between the railroads and other public service corporations on the one hand and the people on the other, for representation in the government, and the voters are dividing as in Chicago.

In Wisconsin Robert M. La Follette undertook to tax the railroads like any other property. They resisted. He taxed them. They were going to take it out of the people of the State by means of higher rates. He undertook to regulate rates. The issue there was, as in Chicago and Cleveland, representative government; the fight was between privileged business and the people, and the voters abandoned the old parties and took sides according as they were for the special interests or the common interests.

Everett Colby, Mark Fagin, George L. Record and their friends in Jersey are just beginning to tax the railroads. Their cry is "equal taxation." But the people of Jersey are really fighting against the special interests for the control of their government in the common interest of all of them.

In Wisconsin the common interest party calls itself Republican and it controls the Republican organization, but the La Follette half-breed party contains many Democrats. In Ohio the reformers call themselves Democrats, but they won with Republican votes. In New Jersey the Republican party is the party used, but in the last election the voters paid no heed to old party lines. They were for themselves.

And so it has gone in Pennsylvania, Missouri and elsewhere. Wherever the people have found a leader who would lead, they have crossed all party lines to follow, and they are forming a new party. For Folk (Dem.) and Colby (Rep.), John Weaver (Rep.) and Tom Johnson (Dem.), La Follette (Rep.) and Dunne (Dem.), all belong to one party.

Differ though they may in ideas, in wisdom, in the slogans they have raised and the symbols they vote under, they all are fighting one fight, raising one issue. They are dividing