couraged him to organize the Federal party of the Philippines, a paper organization with officeholders under the American regime at the head, of which he is now the leader. The encouragement consisted in appointing him to a $3,500 office. And now he is imported into this country to pose as a Filipino orator and witness who, like Benedict Arnold and for similar reasons, loves the foreign invaders of his country, and wants them to remain in possession. He has testified before a committee of the lower house of Congress. But when the minority asked for the examination of Sixto Lopez, a Filipino who does not hold a $3,500 office at Manila, but who does voice the Filipino sentiment, the committee decided, by a strict party vote, not to call him. The boldness with which the party in power thus makes evidence to suit its purposes, and suppresses evidence that does not, is another testimonial to its confidence in the great capacity of its followers for being buncoed.

The Churchman, which may be fairly regarded as the representative of imperialists in the Episcopal church, those who turn with proselyting fervor toward the Philippines and preach that "God did it," commends the Senate bill for the government of our Philippine colony because it leaves "all courses open to the experience of the future." This is an excellent description of the policy of imperial drift. But does the bill make it imperative that the flag shall "stay put" no matter what course is taken? If not, how can President Roosevelt sign the bill without stultifying himself?

Another judicial assault upon the freedom of the jury was made in a Chicago criminal court last week. The culpable officer this time was Judge Kavanagh. A man charged with murder had been acquitted by the jury, Judge Kavanagh being on the bench. Whether the man was guilty or not, we do not pretend to know, nor is it material to the question. Judge Kavanagh did think him guilty, and if he had reserved an expression of this opinion until the jury had been discharged and he himself had left the bench and had then voiced it as a citizen and not as a judge, he would have been rendering a public service. It is the right and duty of private citizens, as such, to criticize both judges and juries for error and to denounce them for corruption, not in advance of a trial nor during a trial, but after the trial and for what they have done. In this way judges and juries may be held to the faithful performance of duty. But Judge Kavanagh censured the jury in this case for its verdict, while it was still in the box and he upon the bench. That was a gross violation of his duty. He seemed to know this, for he correctly prefaced his censure with the significant words: "Of course, it is in your province to decide upon the facts." That being so, it was not in the province of the judge to censure them from the bench for their decision. Yet he went on to say, with evident disappointment and displeasure—

but I am truly at a loss to understand how you arrived at such a verdict. This man was clearly guilty. I should not have been surprised, under the aspects of the case, if you had not inflicted the death penalty. You had every reason therefor, in spite of the facts and the considerable evidence. But to declare him not guilty simply passes my comprehension.

Now, the jury would have committed no greater impropriety, nor made so dangerous an innovation, if in the course of the trial the foreman had addressed Judge Kavanaugh in this manner, a mere paraphrase of his own remarks:

It is your province to decide upon the admissability of evidence, but we are truly at a loss to understand how you arrive at the conclusion to exclude the evidence which you have just rejected. It is clearly admissible. We should not have been surprised if you had admonished us to consider it cautiously, but to exclude it altogether passes our comprehension.

If the foreman had addressed the judge in that manner, there would doubtless have been a serious reckoning. Yet the foreman would have been no more censurable for such an unwarranted invasion of the judge's province than Judge Kavanagh is for his equally unwarranted invasion of the jury's province.

THE APOSTLE OF FREE TRADE—RICHARD COBDEN.*

If it be true that "whoever made two blades of grass or two ears of corn grow where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind than the whole race of politicians put together," the name of Richard Cobden must always be held in grateful remembrance by the friends of humanity the world over. Whether the political and economic doctrines with which his name has been identified are ever to receive that universal concrete recognition which he fondly hoped for or not, it may at all events be predicted that many future generations of reformers will derive courage and inspiration from the example of his life as well as from his teachings.

The message which Cobden conveyed to his contemporaries was an extremely simple one. Briefly, it amounted to this:

Men of all nations, I say unto you, trade freely with one another; let each of you buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest; by dealing thus with each other you will learn how interdependent you are, and how identical are your interests. Disband, therefore, your immense armies, your standing monuments of international distrust, and enter into the fullness of those peaceful blessings which can only be realized through intelligent and far-reaching cooperation and the mutual recognition of the principle of "live and let live.

Surely this was no new discovery; it was simply the reiteration of an old-fashioned economic principle upon which plain, simple individuals have ever acted since the division of labor became a living principle in society. The only thing strange or epoch-mak-

*Born on a farm near Midhurst, in Sussex, England, 98 years ago—June 3, 1804. Died in London, April 2, 1865. Described by John Bright, on the floor of the House of Commons, the day after his death, as "the manliest and gentlest spirit that ever quitted or tenanted a human form."

Digitized by Google

ing about it was the fact that it was addressed to nations and not to individuals. Yet what could be more strange than that? Nothing could be more utopian than to expect the same standard of wisdom to be applied in the government of nations and in the dealings of the latter with each other as is habitually followed out between the citizens composing those nations. The best governed nation is probably not so well governed as the worst managed business establishment in New York or London. If the nations of Europe only displayed in their international relations as much common sense as is ordinarily displayed by the dullest country shopkeeper in the conduct of his business, how much more pleasant it would be for all of us? How much blood would be saved? How much misdirected human energy would be available for the uplifting of humanity.

Cobden saw with his clear, practical vision the commercial principles which he knew to be right trampled upon and ignored by the laws of his country. He saw that his countrymen were doing under legal compulsion what not one of them in his senses would have done voluntarily—buying their goods in the dearest market. They were paying 65 shillings a quarter and upwards for English corn—those of them who could afford to buy it at that price, while they could have got from France and Germany all the corn they wanted at a much cheaper rate, were it not for the protective tariff which forbade them to import foodstuffs from abroad. And while hundreds of thousands of English workmen and their families went to bed supperless, because they could not exchange cloth for corn, the same number of French peasantry went barefoot and half clad because they could not exchange their superfluous corn for the products of English looms. Such a state of things did not, to his strong, practical mind, require any heroic or philanthropic treatment. It simply needed the application on a national scale of qualities that are reputed ordinary, viz., common sense and self-interest. Carlyle has said that the utilitarian standard of self-interest was the lowest to which human nature could fall. But Carlyle was mistaken. Human nature, as exemplified in the government of nations, very often does fall lower than self-interest, and very rarely rises as high. Revenge and jealousy are grades of human nature not provided for in his moral thermometer, and both these motives have played and still continue to play a very large part in the government of the world.

Besides, the great common interest of a whole people, which was the thing that Cobden aimed at, implies the elimination of much of the jarring elements of individual selfishness, and is not to be confounded with the self-interest of a ruling oligarchy which is so often the dominant political influence even in the most democratic countries. England, in maintaining the corn laws and keeping bread dear, was not acting in the interests of her people as a whole, but only in the interests of a few thousands of landowning aristocrats—surely a much lower standard. "Protection for British agriculture" was the name given to this system of legislative robbery. How much of that protection went to the agricultural wage-earners may be inferred from the pithy sentence of a Wiltshire laborer quoted by John Bright: "I be protected, and I be starving."

"Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest!" What man ever rose to the rank of a prophet on the strength of a message so stale? The natural reply would surely be that Queen Anne was dead. But no. The fortress of commercial folly was not so easily shaken, nor was common sense so common as might be supposed. Lord Melbourne, prime minister of England, declared from his place in the House of Lords that to abolish the protection of agriculture was "the wildest and maddest scheme that had ever entered into the imagination of man to conceive." What the prime minister thought, the parliament, lords and Commons thought also, and so did the country so far as it had any articulate voice. The man who as good as told England that two and two make four was thought to be insane.

The corn laws were there; justice demanded their removal, and Cobden considered himself the fiting instrument of that justice. He might have said with Pitt: "I am quite sure that I can save the nation and that nobody else can." He and his sturdy friend John Bright made up their minds to convert the nation to free trade, and to leave no stone unturned till the odious enactment should be wiped off the statute book. It would have been difficult to imagine a more hopeless task at that time. The Whig and Tory parties—both of them recruited from the landlord classes—divided political power between them. Outside of these two parties there was, at the time of which I speak, no political power, and Cobden belonged to neither. Born the son of a farmer, trained as a commercial traveler, and eventually becoming a master cotton printer, he had so far as social and political advantages went but a scanty equipment for the task he had undertaken. He had in his life's busy pathway kept his eyes wide open; he had traveled largely both in Europe and the United States, and where others only observed scenery he took notice of the condition of the people and of their social and political institutions. To a clear perception of the interacting forces of social life he added the gift, if indeed it be not the same thing, of lucid common-sense exposition. Transparent earnestness and strength of purpose, seem to run through whatever he spoke or wrote—for he was a prolific pamphleteer as well as an orator. He and Bright were, each in his own way, towers of strength to such a movement; yet the prospect was such as might well have daunted even strong men. The people of the towns had first of all to be converted, and after that the farmers. It must have been relatively easy to convert the former class to free trade, seeing that it would give them cheap bread, and the money wherewith to purchase it, but to convince the general body of farmers—a class never very receptive to new ideas—that cheap wheat would, through the enhanced general prosperity of the country, be better for them than dear wheat, required considerable labor and tact. Everything, however, yielded to the indomitable purpose of the leaders of the Anti-Corn Law league, of whom Cobden was the guiding spirit. What the league accomplished during the short space of its existence (it was formed in 1839 and dissolved in 1846), the deluge of argument it kept up by means of meetings, tracts and pamphlets in all parts of the country—how it eventually created a tidal wave of public opinion which swept before it a prime minister and a parliamentary majority that had been elected to keep the obnoxious corn laws in force, must always be reckoned as the most remarkable example of triumphant agitation recorded in English history. Cobden won for his starving countrymen cheap bread, and from that day forth, the principles of free trade rapidly gained ground until they became the

Digitized by Google

fixed policy of the greatest commercial nation in the world.

The repeal of the corn laws was, however, only one step in Cobden's scheme of political reform. He wanted all custom houses abolished, all ambition of foreign conquest discarded, non-intervention in foreign affairs, reduction of armaments, all taxation to be paid direct by each citizen instead of indirectly through the consumption of dutiable goods and other reforms of a like tendency. He was, in fact, the father of that tribe which has since obtained the name of the "Little Englander," by way of reproach from their opponents. He saw the world through the commercial traveler's spectacles. The world was a big market. Nations were so many business firms. Citizens were shareholders, and governments were boards of directors with certain narrow and well defined duties to perform, which they were on no account to exceed. Of course no existing government came up to his standard. He writes to his friend Bright, touching the question of the French commercial treaty which was then in the air: "Governments seem, as a rule, to be standing conspiracies to rob a bamboozled people, and why should that of Louis Napoleon be an exception? The more I see of the rulers of the world, the less wisdom and greatness do I find necessary for the government of mankind."

He believed that the interests of governments differed from the genuine interests of the people they ruled; and all he asked was that the governments should stand aside and let the people go to and fro and buy and sell as they thought fit. Much of the evils of government arose, in his view, from the manner in which taxes were raised from the people. If each citizen only knew how much money he really paid to the state (which could be brought about by direct taxation) he would be sure to keep a watchful eye on all governmental folly and extravagance; but by taxing commodities and not individuals, and by dignifying the taxing of imposts with the name of "protection," governments were enabled to keep the people in the dark, so that the latter could exercise no effective check upon either the methods or the objects of national expenditure. He thought the best method of stopping wars, which were so recklessly entered into, and which generally brought evil to both sides, was to bring home to each individual citizen the exact measure of his responsibility, pecuniarily as well as morally, for the acts of his government. Swords would then end in plowshares, and men who went out to fight would finish up by making bargains. The idea of nationality would soon be lost, the nation would go the way of the tribe, and the human race would thus be knit together by the strongest of all possible ligatures, which, according to him, was "commercial interests."

This has been described as a bagman's millennium, and it certainly leaves out of account some of the most potent tendencies of human nature. There is more of the savage left in civilized man than Cobden made allowance for. Cobden's principles, if put in practice, would have given cheap bread to mankind. But he forgot that it was cheap blood and not cheap bread that mankind in its present stage seem to desire.

Cobden's ideals have been condemned as mean and sordid because he made self-interest the corner stone of his social edifice, and took no account of the sentimental side of human nature. But that was because he considered it no part of his business to deal with sentiment. If he could only construct a satisfactory basis for society—and no basis that left a large portion of his fellow-creatures without the necessaries of life was in his view satisfactory—the superstructure might be left to take care of itself, and he did not doubt that the free intercourse of nations would give rise to a loftier and purer sentiment than a narrow local patriotism which lived upon ignorance and blind superstition. They do Cobden an injustice who think that he meant to deify industrialism as typified by the factory system and the social degradation which it so often brings in its train. Ruskin himself could hardly have penned a more sentimental passage than the following:

We were born and brought up amidst the pastoral charms of the south of England, and we confess to so much attachment to the pursuits of our forefathers (always provided that it be separated from the rick-burnings* and pauperism of modern agriculture), that had we the casting of the role of all the actors in this world's stage we don't think we should suffer a cotton mill or a factory to have a place in it. . . . We think a system which draws children from home, where they formerly worked in the company of parents, and under the wholesome restraint incident to disparity of years—nature's own moral safeguard of domestic life—to class them in factories according to the equality of age, to be productive of vice.

But as a practical philosopher he adds:

The factory system which sprang from the discoveries in machinery has been adopted in all civilized nations of the world, and it is vain for us to think of discontinuing its application to the necessities of this country. It only remains for us to mitigate, as far as possible, the evils that are, perhaps not inseparably, connected with this novel social element.

Next to the repeal of the corn laws, the greatest success that Cobden scored for his country was the commercial treaty with France. It was indeed, like all Cobden's work, a service rendered, not to one, nor even to two nations, but to the world; for as Sir Louis Mallet says, "the consequences of that treaty were not confined to France and England; it was an act which both by its moral effect and its direct and necessary influence on the legislation of continental countries, led to a general reduction of about 50 per cent. of the tariffs of Europe." That important treaty was the result of an informal understanding between two men, viz., Cobden and Louis Napoleon, without any of the pomp and circumstance of official diplomacy. The fact in itself forms one of the strongest arguments for Cobden's political views, for he held that if real business is wanted it is to individual enterprise and not to official statecraft that one must have recourse. Cobden was not an accredited diplomatist; he was simply a private individual; although the British government tacitly approved of his action, and Mr. Gladstone, then chancellor of the exchequer, gave him active support, the fact was that the two governments were not at all on good terms. The English people had become very suspicious of Louis Napoleon's intentions. The cry was that the French were going to seize Morocco. This did not in the least disturb Cobden's equanimity. "For my part," he wrote in 1859, "if France took the whole of Africa, I do not see what harm she would do us or anybody else

*Rick-burning was a kind of incendiarism resorted to by the peasants of the south of England during the distress which preceded the repeal of the Corn Laws. By burning the ricks of corn they sought to raise their own wages because "high prices make good wages."

Digitized by Google

save herself." And so Cobden pegged away at the treaty, not caring for the raging of the political storms. He found Louis Napeoleon not nearly so black as he had been painted. It was a case of giving a dog a bad name. The emperor's chief motive was to give the British people some earnest of the pacific nature of his intentions, and so to rehabilitate his character, which the English press had vilified. He was therefore all the more ready to listen to Cobden's arguments. But he had his fears for the result. Cobden writes that the emperor in one of his interviews repeated to him the petition of M. Magne, his minister of finance: "If you make a serious reduction (of tariff) then for every piece of foreign manufacture admitted into France you will displace a piece of domestic fabrication." "I told him," says Cobden, "that nearly one-fourth of his subjects did not wear stockings, and I begged him to remind M. Magne that if a few thousand dozens of hose were admitted into France, they might be consumed by these bare-legged people without interfering with the demand for native manufacture." Common sense and perseverance ultimately prevailed, and the treaty became an accomplished fact. France undertook to abolish the prohibition on all staple manufactures, and to reduce the duties on English coal, iron, tools, machinery, textiles, etc., while England agreed to take off all duties on manufactured goods and to lower the duties on French brandy. The two peoples were being brought closer than ever together, and made to feel their identity of interests, until France took another convulsive political fit, and abandoned the pathway of international conciliation and commercial freedom.

Although such a firm believer in the principles of government by the people, Cobden did not attach much value to the form of government, so long as the prosperity and happiness of the people was amply secured. He wanted the people to be taught to think and act for themselves, and not to rely upon the aid of governments, believing with Thomas Paine that all governments are bad, and that the form of the badness is a minor matter. Thus in his pamphlet, "England, Ireland and America," he says: "We don't advocate republican institutions for this country; we believe the government of the United States to be at this moment the best in the world; but then the Americans are the best people." In a foot note he explains: "We mean individually and nationally. As individuals, because in our opinion the people that are the best educated must morally and religiously speaking be the best. As a nation, because it is the only great community that has never waged war except in absolute self-defense—the only one which has never made a conquest of territory by force of arms." Whether, if he had been living in these days of annexation and imperialism, his judgment would have undergone no alteration may well be questioned. At all events, he saw that it was not republicanism that made the American people good, and that a republic was quite as capable as a monarchy of sheltering tyranny and oppression if only the people were to relax their vigilance, or cease to act for themselves. On American questions his judgment was unusually sound. He had visited the United States more than once and had weighed carefully the trend of public feeling and the condition of society. The consequence was that while most Englishmen, especially the upper classes, thought (and no doubt wished) that the South would triumph, Cobden confidently held the opposite opinion. Events after awhile began to confirm his judgement, and he knew that with English society nothing succeeds like success. Accordingly we find him at this time writing to his friend, Mr. T. B. Potter:

> In a few months everybody will know that the North will triumph, and what troubles me is lest I should live to see our ruling class—which can understand and respect power better than any other class—grovel once more, and more basely than before to the giant of democracy. This would not only inspire me with disgust and indignation, but with shame and humiliation. I think I see signs that it is coming. The Times is less insolent and Lord Palmerston is more civil.

He was spared the shame and humiliation which his sensitive spirit dreaded. The civil war was scarcely ended when he was laid to rest in an English country churchyard, amidst the truest indications of national sorrow. Parliament joined in honoring the memory of the great reformer, and both Palmerston and Disraeli made sympathetic allusions to the loss of an opponent who, they knew, had never attacked them except upon the loftiest grounds of principle. He had left behind him an example of consistency and incorruptibility which, apart from the value of his teaching, gave him exalted rank among statesmen. During his parliamentary career he never accepted office, although often pressed to do so. Mr. McCarthy relates that when Lord Palmerston offered Cobden the presidency of the board of trade—a position he was so eminently qualified to fill—Cobden called upon the prime minister and told him that he could not think of taking office because, amongst other things, he had called Palmerston the worst foreign minister that England ever had. "But," said Palmerston, "Milner Gibson has often said just the same of me." "Yes," replied Cobden, "but then I meant it."

He no doubt felt that he was in his proper place as an independent educational and reforming force, operating upon the wide field of public opinion, untrammeled by the conventional retraints which official responsibility would have involved, and that he was better employed in preparing the ground and sowing the seed than in the more formal and showy work of administration. But the fact of his never having been an official statesman did not prevent him from being the most remarkable and the most powerful political force of his time.

Since Cobden's death fully a generation has passed away, during which his doctrines have received a severe sifting at the hands of fate. The dream of peace and good will in which he indulged has not been realized. Wars have become more numerous than ever. France has rejected the boon of the commercial treaty, and reverted to the gloomy path of protection. The United States—Cobden's model country—not only has gone in for a policy of protection, amounting in some cases to prohibition—but it is actually waging war upon other countries for purposes other than that of self-defense. England after half a century's devotion to free trade is about to resort to the "protectionist" trick to help to defray the expenses arising out of the cruel and wasteful war in which she is now engaged. Even Manchester may be said to be going back upon the "Manchester school." Of "peace, retrenchment ment and reform," nothing is now heard or heeded. The extension of the franchise to the English working classes has not conduced to economic government, but the reverse. And if we turn to the armaments of Continental Europe we find that the

Digitized by Google

oppressive weight of military taxation is so great as to fill with alarm the minds of the monarchs and potentates themselves. And so forth.

This sort of evidence is frequently adduced to show that Cobden was a false prophet, that his standard was a vulgar and unsound one, the result of an imperfect knowledge of human nature, and that the future commercial policy of nations must, as in the past, be determined by expediency—that is, upon the judgment of governments as to whether in any given case the simple formula of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market, irrespective of political boundaries, is to be applied. But to say that the world has not adopted Cobden's advice is not to prove that advice unsound any more than the fact that the world has not followed Christ's teaching thereby proves Christ's doctrine unsound.

Suppose other nations had their Cobdens; suppose public opinion were as well enlightened in, say France and Germany, as it was in England, and the war of 1870-71 had not occurred,—that war which gave such a fatal impulse to militarism and compelled the adoption of the subterfuge of "protection" as the smoothest way of robbing the wage-earners to pay the idle soldiers; suppose free trade had been given a trial by these three nations during the last few decades. What a happy Europe there would be compared with what we now see! It was militarism that checked free trade and prevented the realization of Cobden's dream. Militarism and protection go together.

Cobden had the exaggerated fancy of the zealous reformer, but beneath it lay an indisputable mathematical proposition. As it is safe to bet that under any conceivable circumstances two and two will make four, so it is safe to conclude that nations, which are only numbers of individuals, will be acting in their own best interests by exchanging their commodities freely with each other, and that the wider the area within which freedom of trade is allowed to operate, the more advantageous it will be for all within the area. Even protectionist nations understand this. Their actions in this respect speak plainer than their words. Do they not, while refusing to trade with their neighbors, still make foreign conquests in the interests of trade extension? Only instead of suiting their products to their customers, they too often force their customers at the point of the bayonet to buy the products they have.

T. SCANLON.

NEWS

At last the British war in South Africa has come to a definite end, a peace agreement having been signed at Pretoria on the 31st of May.

At the time of our last previous reference to this war (p. 55) news had stopped. There were no reports either of fighting or of peace making. But peace negotiations were then known (p. 41) to be under way, and the details have since been officially disclosed by the British government. They may now be recited as the events occurred. In consequence of the correspondence between Great Britain and the Netherlands (vol. iv. p. 694), in which the Netherlands undertook to act as an intermediary for peace, Gen. Schalk Burger, vice president (and in Mr. Kruger's absence acting president) of the South African Republic, informed Lord Kitchener of his desire to make peace proposals. This was on the 12th of March. The conference with Lord Kitchener, heretofore reported in these columns (vol. iv. p. 808) resulted. It took place at Pretoria, as then stated, on the 23d of March, and was attended in behalf of the Boers by Schalk Burger, Botha and Reitz. Arrangements were there made for a meeting of these leaders with Steyn, De Wet and Delarey, of the Orange Free State, which came off on the 12th of April. At that meeting the Boers proposed terms which Lord Kitchener forwarded to London. The British government rejected them because they contemplated the independence of the republics. The Boer leaders then protested that they were incompetent to surrender the independence of their country, but offered to submit the proposition to their people if Great Britain would state the terms which subsequent to relinquishment of independence she would grant. Out of the replies to this offer came a representative conference or assembly of the Boers at Vereeniging. It met on the 15th of May, and on the 17th appointed a commission, with plenary powers, consisting of Louis Botha, Christian De Wet, Hertzog, Delarey and Smuts, to confer with Kitchener. The conference took place at Pretoria on the 19th, when the commission offered to surrender independence as to foreign relations, retaining self-government under British supervision, and to make over absolutely part of the territory of the two republics. This offer was refused by Gen. Kitchener and Lord Milner, the British lord high commissioner for South Africa, who was present; and Lord Milner prepared a document for submission to the Vereeniging conference for a yes or no vote to be taken not later than the 31st. This document, having first been approved by the British ministry, with some minor amendments, was communicated to the Boer commissioners on the 28th, and by them submitted to the Vereeniging conference, which adopted it on the 31st by a vote of 54 to 6. It was formally signed late at night of the same day at Pretoria.

The document referred to defined the terms of peace. In substance it provides:

1. The Boers are to surrender all arms and ammunition under their control, and acknowledge King Edward VII. as their lawful sovereign; the details of surrender to be managed by Kitchener for the British and Botha, De Larey and De Wet for the Boers.

2. Exiles and prisoners of war are to be transported by the British back to their homes as soon as transportation can be provided, upon their declaring their acceptance of the status of subjects of King Edward VII.

3. Persons so returning are to be secure in person and property.

4. No proceeding, civil or criminal, is to be taken against them, or any Boers surrendering, for any acts in connection with the war, except in certain specified cases involving conduct contrary to the usages of war, which are to be tried by court martial after the cessation of hostilities.

5. The Dutch language is to be taught in the public schools of the former republics (now the Transvaal and Orange River Colony) when parents desire it. It is also to be allowed in the law courts.

6. Persons needing rifles for protection in either colony are to be allowed them only on taking out a license.

7. Civil government is to be established in the colonies by the British as early as possible, and representative institutions leading to self-government are to be introduced as soon as circumstances permit.

8. The question of giving voting rights to native races is not to be decided until after self-government is established.

9. No special land tax is to be imposed to defray the expenses of the war.

Digitized by Google