

of high vitality and no personal experience of war's realities. The feeling expressed in a public speech earlier in the previous January by Gen. Gatacre—when he said that "he was in favor of supporting any society that would keep fighting going on all over the world, and, wherever it ceased, resuscitate it"—was not at all unique. Enthusiasts looked up all that had been said for war in literature—how the goddess in Aeschylus had blessed Athens—

Let there be foreign wars, not scantily coming,

and how Bacon had called foreign war "the heat of exercise" that "serveth to keep the body in health." Dignitaries of the church, with the besetting anxiety of many modern clergymen to show that they are really quite like other men, rushed in to advertise the virtues of war as a school for character. When one thinks of the rhetoric, the morals, the politics, the strategy, the very statistics, the whole chaos of delusive "imagination as one would" with which the country was deluged at this time two years ago, one almost understands the tragedy that has followed.

Sir Robert Reid took the generous line of not dwelling overmuch on personal or collective responsibilities for the train of calamities courted with so light a heart. He tried to do what every dutiful Englishman has now to try to do—to think out a possible positive alternative to this endless stumbling on from blunder to blunder and disaster to disaster, and the climax of his speech was a suggestion—heartily applauded, we are glad to see, by his audience of Scotch experts in sense and practicality—of certain specific terms in which the war should be acknowledged by the enemy to have ended decisively in our favor. That is one of the two alternatives—to endeavor to obtain the substance of everything for which we can honorably fight, and yet obtain it in a manner which leaves to a brave enemy his own self-respect. The other is to proclaim that we fight not for the mere defeat of that enemy, but for his extreme humiliation, not merely to make our own victory complete and our prestige secure, but to make his defeat intolerable to him—to make it such a defeat as Englishmen or any other white men would fight against as long as they could stand up. To mention the possibility of two alternatives is, we fear, to give scandal to the clear-sighted persons who asked for instant war in the summer of 1899, who said then that the Boer military power was the greatest bubble unpricked, and who said that the war was

over a year ago. But the question then arises whether the country has not paid heavily enough for trusting their clearness of vision. There is no one point of any moment in the whole record of the war and of its preliminaries at which they have not been positive that they were right and at which they have not been found to be wrong. Is there to be any limit to the country's renewals of its trust in these invariably mistaken prophets? And if so, might it not be better fixed at the loss of 17,000 English lives and £2,000,000 of English money than at the loss of 30,000 lives and £400,000,000? For to the expansion of our losses in South Africa there is no visible limit as long as there is none to the continuance of our credulity at home.

ARE THE FILIPINOS CAPABLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT?

An article written in Manila by the Hon. John F. Shafroth, member of congress from Colorado, and published in *The Commoner* of October 18.

If the intelligence of the Americans is to be taken as the standard by which the capacity for self-government is to be determined, then it is very doubtful whether any other people are capable of establishing and maintaining a republican form of government. Every country has peoples of high and low order of intelligence, and if we are to assume that the men of lowest order of civilization are to rule, we might exclude from self-government every nation on earth. It is the experience of mankind, however, that the intelligent classes in all countries rule. That being true, there are very few peoples who are not capable of self-government. It was Henry Clay who said that it was impossible for him to conceive of a people who were incapable of self-government.

Of the republics of Central and South America, it is safe to say that, although they may not be as perfect in the administration of affairs as the United States, yet they have given to the people governments far better and freer from acts of tyranny and oppression than the governments which preceded them.

The general impression exists among many Americans that the Philippine people are savages. A visit to the islands will certainly dispel any such delusion. The members of the uncivilized tribes of the archipelago are few in number, compared to the total population; they are fewer in proportion than were the tribes of Indians in America at the time of the establish-

ment of our republic. They rove in bands and are as hostile to the Filipinos as were the red men of our forefathers.

When I find behind the prescription desks of the numerous drug stores of the islands, even when kept by Americans and Englishmen, Filipinos compounding medicines taken from bottles labeled in Latin; when I see behind the counter of banks having large capital, natives acting as bookkeepers and as receiving and paying tellers; when I find them as merchants and clerks in almost all lines of business, as telegraph operators and ticket agents, conductors and engineers upon railroads and as musicians rendering upon almost all instruments high class music; when I am told that they alone make the observations and intricate calculations at the Manila observatory and that prior to the insurrection there were 2,100 schools in the islands and 5,000 students in attendance at the Manila university; when I find the better class living in good, substantial and sometimes elegant houses, and many of them pursuing professional occupations, I cannot but conclude that it is a vile slander to compare these people to the Apaches or the American Indians. Even the civilizing test of Christianity is in their favor, as a greater proportion are members of the church than among our own people. Of the 8,000,000 of inhabitants, Mr. Sawyer, in his work on the Philippine islands, asserts that 5,869,000 are Christian natives.

But even as to the Indians, as uncivilized as they may be, our government recognizes that it produces a better condition of things to let them govern themselves, and thereby we even recognize in them a capacity for self-government. We do not rule them—we make treaties with them as we do with nations. We do not appoint a governor or commission to govern them, nor judges to administer laws among them, nor a police force to maintain order. We let them select their own chiefs, punish their own criminals, and in every way govern themselves so long as they stay on their own reservations.

The instinct of self-government implanted in man makes him ordinarily a better agent in managing his own family and affairs than would be one of greater ability or higher education without that interest. And as with man, so with nations, that same principle of self-betterment ordinarily makes each nation most capable of managing its affairs to the advancement of its own people.

No better illustration of this can be found than in the action of the members of the civil commission of the Philippine islands in fixing official salaries to be paid out of funds collected from the people of a poor and alien race. They voted to the governor, who is a member of the commission, a salary of \$15,000 per annum and \$15 a day for subsistence, making in the aggregate a salary of \$20,375 a year. The governor is also furnished a fine house in which to reside. To each of the commission they voted a compensation, including subsistence of \$15,000 per annum. They voted a yearly salary of \$7,500 to the secretary of the commission, of \$7,000 to each of the six (an exceedingly large number) associate justices of the supreme court, of \$7,500 to the chief justice, of \$6,000 to the treasurer, of \$5,000 to the director general of posts, and of \$6,000 to the collector of customs. All of these salaries are payable in gold. I do not wish to impugn the honesty of the commissioners, but to call attention to the fact that such action naturally grows out of the attempt of one people to govern another. If that commission were responsible to a constituency, does anyone imagine that such salaries would have been voted?

The aggregate area of the Philippine islands is 115,300 square miles, a little less than that of the territory of New Mexico, yet the governor of New Mexico receives only \$3,000 per annum, and is not allowed anything for subsistence nor furnished with an executive mansion.

Think of a commissioner, appointed from Washington (a place 10,000 miles from the Philippine islands) composed of men who never saw the land they govern prior to the Spanish war, who do not speak or read the language of the Philippine people, and who are not even of the same race as their subjects, voting to each member a salary which is nearly double that of a cabinet officer of the greatest nation of the world, and three times that of a senator of the United States, and voting to a territorial governor a salary more than double that of the governor of the wealthiest state in the union. How must such action appear to the Filipino laborer, who, furnishing his own food and lodging, earns but 25 cents in gold a day! It must be remembered that wealth is nothing more than stored labor, and that in the last analysis labor in one form or another pays all taxes. Such action cannot but make the little brown man doubt the ability of

one nation to give good government to another. Does not the conflict of interest between us and the Philippine people, arising from the growing of competing staple products, render us incapable of governing them to their best interest? We know that it will be to the welfare of the islands to give free trade with the United States. American, Spaniards and Filipinos there unanimously agree that the islands can never be well developed without it, yet the very fact that we hesitate in the matter shows that we are consulting our own interest instead of theirs. No matter how learned and just the judge may be, the ethics of our jurisprudence has determined that he is incapacitated from deciding a case when his own interest might be affected. Nations are but aggregations of individuals and are subject to the same influences.

The Filipino is not a bold, warlike or unruly person; he impresses everyone as of a shrinking, submissive, kind nature and as one who will suffer great wrongs before he will resist. Such people always appeal to the law and support good government. They have not the tendency of the Spaniard toward revolution. The revolts in which they have participated have been to overthrow Spanish reigns of terror, almost equal in barbarity to that of the duke of Alva in the Netherlands.

The brief experience they had in self-government prior to the insurrection, was entirely in their favor. They established a government modeled after our own. Their state papers would have done credit to any nation. They inaugurated good judicial, school and revenue systems and preserved law and order.

Consul Barrett, a strong supporter of the present administration, wrote of the hundred men who composed the Philippine congress as follows:

"These men, whose sessions I repeatedly attended, conducted themselves with great decorum and showed a knowledge of debate and parliamentary law that would compare favorably with the Japanese parliament. The executive portion of the government was made up of a ministry of bright men, who seemed to understand their respective positions."

Consul General Wildman, an appointee of the president, speaking of the Philippine government, said: "Aguinaldo has made life and property safe, preserved order, and encouraged a continuation of agricultural pursuits. He has made brigandage and loot impossible, respected private

property, forbidden excess either in revenge or in the name of the state, and made a woman's honor safer in Luzon than it has been in 300 years."

Admiral Dewey, it will be remembered, cabled: "These people are far superior in their intelligence, and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba; and I am familiar with both races."

The best evidence of the ability of the Philippine people to govern themselves is that they possess a large intelligent class, thoroughly identified in interest with the islands and capable of administering good government. The civil commission has recognized this ability by recently adding three native members to that governing body; by appointing three Filipinos judges of the supreme court; by selecting about half of the judges of the first instance and nearly all the governors of the provinces from that race; and by appointing a solicitor general and many other officers from the natives. Are these officials not in the governing business, and do they not perform their work as well as the Americans? Is it possible that they are capable of governing because they were appointed by the representatives of a distant nation? Would they lose that ability if elected or chosen by properly constituted authority of their own? In the latter event they would make far better officers, because they would consult only the interest of their own people instead of that of a nation 7,000 miles away.

The law of our being is that "the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed." Then why continue a policy which means the continuing loss of millions to the government, the weakening of the military power of the nation and the destruction of the policy under which we have grown so great? Why not be true to our nature and fulfill the prayer of Lincoln that government "of the people, for the people and by the people shall not perish from the earth."

Mayor Tom Johnson, of Cleveland, has been telling the Cass school of applied science there that college endowments from rich capitalists are closing the mouths of instructors in the teaching of cold economic truth. He gave an instance or two supposed to prove the point, but did not mention a case said to have come under his personal observation. Johnson, so the story goes, was asked by the president of one of the colleges to give \$100,000 to endow the chair in econom-

ics. He protested that the colleges were not teaching the truth about the subject, whereupon he was told that he could have anything taught from that chair he wanted provided only that the \$100,000 was forthcoming.—Springfield Republican.

THE LEADER STAYS WITH HIS PEOPLE.

For The Public.

Aguinaldo does not want his freedom until every Filipino is granted his liberty. He has written to his lawyer strongly objecting to efforts being made to obtain a writ of habeas corpus in his behalf. In his letter he says he prefers to remain a prisoner while there is one compatriot languishing in jail "suffering for the Filipino cause, and an infinity of Filipinos are deprived of the liberty which they are anxious to retain."—Dispatch to the daily press from Manila, under date of October 16.

Seek not for my release, for why should I be free

While brave Mabini pines in exile over sea?

While patriot hands are bound and patriot tongues are tied,

Speak not of my release—let me a captive bide.

Did I walk forth to-day, I'd be a bondman still,

Subject to foreign rule and to an alien will.

So think no more of me—what am I but a name?

A feeble spark that sprang from Liberty's broad flame?

Nor think the blood we gave has all been shed in vain;

The cause that seemeth dead shall leap to life again.

Our fondest hopes are crushed beneath th' invader's heel;

Our people bow before the menace of his steel;

Yet from each unmarked grave the voice of Freedom cries,

A protest and a prayer up to the silent skies.

ROBERT T. WHITELAW.

One day the Anglo-Saxon came.

"We bring you the blessings of liberty," said these.

"Your price?" asked the native.

"Your territory," said the Anglo-Saxon.

"Dirt cheap," said the natives.

"Only a limited amount to a customer at this price, of course," said the Anglo-Saxons.

"Of course," said the natives, for it ill beseemed them to haggle.—Life.

"Did you say those folks who just moved into the neighborhood were socialists?" asked the woman who was leaning over the back fence.

"Yes," answered the next-door neighbor.

"Well, I suppose you see by this time you are mistaken. We have had four socialists since they moved in and they haven't been to one of them."—Washington Star.

BOOK NOTICES.

CAINE'S "ETERNAL CITY."

"He looked for a city which hath foundations whose Builder and Maker is God." This motto on the title-page of Hall Caine's latest book, "The Eternal City," (published by D. Appleton & Co., New York), is the keynote to the career of the hero, David Rossi, whose mistakes—if he made mistakes—sprang purely from his love for humanity.

An Italian boy of noble birth, but shrouded in mystery, he was sold into the slavery of street beggary by his heartless keepers, and rescued from slow death in London by an exile of his own race who later became the victim of a treacherous call to return to his native country.

Initiated early in the doctrines of political economy, and passing through the many vicissitudes attending the self-sacrificing life of his benefactor, Dr. Roselli, David Rossi became in mature years the leader in an association known in Rome and elsewhere as "The Republic of Man." Possessed of the strong magnetic qualities that so often accompany the deepest and most resolute convictions of human rights, the people flocked hopefully after him into this organization, whose charter was the Lord's Prayer, as interpreted and explained by David himself:

"The Lord's Prayer contained six clauses—

Three of these clauses concern chiefly the spiritual life of men, the other three concern chiefly the temporal life of men.

"The Lord's Prayer says: 'Our Father who art in Heaven.' If God is the Father of all men, all men are our brothers, and as brothers all men are equal. Therefore all authority arrogated by man over man is wrong. All government of man over man is wrong. Hence kings have no right to exist.

"If all men are brothers, all men should live as brothers. To live as brothers is to live in peace and concord. Therefore, all war between nation and nation is wrong. Hence armies have no right to exist. National frontiers have no right to exist. The national spirit which is called patriotism has no right to exist.

"The Lord's Prayer says: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' Our daily bread comes from the land. No man made the land. It is God's gift to mankind. It belongs to all men. Therefore, individual ownership of land is wrong. Individual control of the fruits of the land is wrong.

"The Lord's Prayer says: 'Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is done in Heaven.' If we may pray 'Thy Kingdom come,' we may expect it to come. If God's Kingdom is not to come on earth as it is in Heaven—if it is only a dream, then the Lord's prayer is a delusion, a cruel mockery, and a 'betrayal of the hopes and hearts of the human family.'

"The church has spent centuries over the theology of the Lord's Prayer. Time it began to think of its sociology also," says David Rossi.

And now for the creed he deduces from it:

"We believe that the source of all right and all power is God.

"We believe that government exists to secure to all men equally the natural rights to which they are born as sons of God.

"We believe that all governments must derive their powers from the people governed.

"We believe that no artificial differences among men can constitute a basis of good government.

"We believe that when a government is destructive of the natural rights of men it is man's duty to destroy it.

"We believe that all forms of violence are contrary to the spirit of God's law.

"We believe that prayer and protest are the only weapons of warfare which humanity may use—prayer addressed to God, protest addressed to man.

"We believe that they are the most effectual weapons humanity has ever used against the evils of the world.

"We believe that they are the only weapons used or countenanced by Christ.

"We believe that when we do not take effect in themselves, they take double effect in suffering.

"We believe it is the duty of all men to use the Lord's Prayer—to believe in it, to live according to its light, and to protest against everything that is opposed to its teaching.

"We believe that this is the only way that man can help to bring to pass the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in Heaven.

"Therefore, in the sure and certain hope of that Kingdom—by the love we bear to the brothers whom God has given us, by the hate we feel for injustice and wrong—we dedicate ourselves as subjects and servants of the Republic of Man."

The reviewer offers no comment on this charter and creed of the "Republic of Man." It speaks for itself.

To live out to the fullest the principles inculcated by Christ was David Rossi's aim, but there were gathered under his standard of freedom men of all races and tempers, who thirsted for the downfall of power, and were ready to do the deed which won for them the name of lawless anarchists. More than once Rossi stood between them and the violence to which they were incited by wrongs and oppressions and bitter privations, admonishing them in words like these:

"Our gospel aims at founding a kingdom on earth as deep as human need and as pure as the Kingdom of Heaven, and in that prayer which some of us have taken as the charter of our association, the Founder of our faith has turned a light upon the world of hunger, poverty, misery and disease. My weapon is knowledge, not gunpowder. Educate!—Educate!—Associate!—Associate! These are our weapons of warfare."

An incident recorded during David Rossi's term as member of parliament in Rome suggests a state of affairs with which we ourselves have recently had some painful experience:

"David Rossi was on his way to the office of his newspaper, and, dropping into the Corso from a lane that crossed it, he came upon the king's carriage returning to the Quirinal. It was entirely surrounded by soldiers, the military commander of Rome on the right, the commander of the carabinieri on the left, and the cuirassiers, riding two deep before and behind, so that the king and queen were scarcely visible to the cheering crowd. Last in the royal procession came an ordinary cab containing two detectives in plain clothes.

"To David Rossi it was a painful sight. 'Miserable and doomed wherever it flourishes was the institution that had to be maintained by such a retinue.

"A throne broad-based on the love of the people might be strong and right, but a throne that had to be protected from their hate, or even from the dagger of an assassin, was weak and wrong. Not to be king of all the kingdoms of the earth should a true man live an abject life, such as that procession gave hint of. The young king, who had just spoken as if he were a god, was being taken home as if he were a prisoner."

The following excerpts from an address to the priests of the church have a peculiar interest:

LANDMARKS OF LIBERTY

...AND...
ASSASSINATION AND ANARCHY.

Reprints of editorials in THE PUBLIC on these subjects, now ready in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage.

Single copies, delivered at office.....	50.00
Quantities delivered at office, per 100....	1.00
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid.....	.05
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100.....	3.00
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100.....	1.25