

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1902.

Number 218.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The treaty of peace with the South African Boers, falls far short of being the "unconditional surrender" which the Tory ministers of Great Britain had theretofore stubbornly demanded. Considered with reference merely to that imperious demand, it is not the Boers alone that have surrendered, but the British government as well.

Yet it must be confessed that in spite of the concessions which the British have made upon paper, their substantial victory over the Boers is complete. Not only do the two Boer republics pass absolutely away with this treaty, but the whole of South Africa becomes British. At the expense of conceding a few conditions, most of them only verbal and none of them vital, and thereby dropping from their high and lofty demand for "unconditional surrender," the British government has accomplished the substantial object of the war. The Boers have indeed surrendered.

As matter of sentiment—national, racial and republican—they surrendered abjectly by acknowledging allegiance to the person of an individual—Edward VII., king and emperor. Although this personal allegiance is a fiction under the British constitution, the difference between "subjects" of the British king and "citizens" of a republic being only formal, nevertheless nothing could be much more revolting to the sentiment of most republican citizens born and bred, than the ceremonial of swearing allegiance to the person of a sovereign. Even though it be

only a ceremonial, and the substantial change of allegiance be not from a republic to a king, but from a republic with republican forms to one with monarchical forms, this sentiment is outraged. Let the American who doubts it ask himself which would be easier for him, as matter of sentiment, to swear allegiance to the Republic of Mexico or to the person of King Edward? While almost any American would rather be British than Mexican, there are few who, though they would experience only a pang of regret at severing the ties of American citizenship in order to take an oath of allegiance to the Mexican republic, would not feel a sense of humiliation upon swearing allegiance to the person of the British king. And their humiliation would be intensified if the British king were also the conqueror of their country. That sentiment is doubtless as strong with the Boers as with Americans—if there is any difference, it is stronger with them,—yet they have consented to outrage it. To end the war and return to their homes they agree to swear allegiance to the person of a foreign king, whose army has conquered them.

But the Boers have surrendered more than sentiment. Except for the conditions reserved, their surrender is absolute in every respect. And what are those reservations. Prisoners of war captured by the British and carried to foreign lands must be transported home. But no British ministry would have dared to refuse transportation over seas to their native land, of prisoners of war whom they had expatriated, no matter how the war ended. So that reservation is in substance no reservation at all. Second, prisoners of war so returning are not to be deprived of their person-

al liberty or property. Does anyone suppose that Great Britain could have executed these war prisoners and confiscated their property if there had been no treaty? That reservation, also, is in substance none at all. In the third place, no civil or criminal proceedings are to be instituted against the surrendering Boers. But what civil or criminal proceedings could have been instituted against them if they had not surrendered? None. They were not rebels resisting the authority of their own government; they were soldiers resisting the advance into their own territory of a foreign foe. This condition, too, is therefore without substance. All the foregoing reservations in behalf of the Boers are referred for plausibility to the British proclamation of September, 1901, declaring the war at an end and denouncing penalties against the Boers if they kept on fighting. That proclamation was the laughing stock of the civilized world. It was a rank absurdity in warfare, which might as well have been issued at the beginning of the war as in the middle of it. Yet the foregoing reservations or conditions of surrender are nothing more than an agreement on the part of Great Britain not to enforce the penalties of that absurd proclamation. They seem to rest upon the familiar tory theory, as common with those of Great Britain, that two or more consecutive absurdities make a substantial plausibility.

Then as to the fourth reservation of the treaty, that the Dutch language shall be taught in the public schools, where parents desire it, and shall be allowed in the courts; and as to the fifth, that arms shall be allowed only under licenses. The latter is a restriction upon and not a reservation

in favor of the Boers. Calculated to prevent rebellion, it is the same old restriction that the British Tories of a century and a quarter ago imposed upon our own ancestors in the American colonies. But the former clause is a substantial reservation, or would be if it could be enforced; for it is by means of distinctive language that the traditions, aspirations, characteristics and other peculiarities of a people are preserved. Distinctive language, not peculiarities in the life fluid of individuals, constitute the blood of peoples. Consequently, if the Dutch language were perpetuated in South Africa, the Dutch race would be perpetuated there and Dutch characteristics be preserved. But no language can be perpetuated anywhere as a language "on the side." The public schools are to be English, with permission to parents who demand it to have Dutch taught. This incidental teaching of Dutch will not make Dutchmen in South Africa, any more than the incidental teaching of German in American public schools makes Germans in the United States. As to the courts, the inevitable tendency where two languages are used is toward the abandonment of the incidental one. In this connection it is to be observed that there is no reservation in favor of the Dutch language in legislative bodies. The whole scheme looks to the decay of the Dutch language and Dutch sentiment. This is welcome, of course, to the British mind, and Americans are apt to sympathize in that respect with the British. But it is from the point of view of the Dutch mind that we are considering this surrender; and from that point of view we cannot see but that the surrender is in substance absolute and complete.

There is a reservation, to be sure, in favor of the displacement of military by civil government, and the establishment of representative institutions leading up to self-government; but this is so indefinite as to time and circumstances that the Boers would have been as well as-

sured of representative institutions without the reservation as with it. The only substantial concessions to the Boers are financial. They are to have compensation for certain war losses, and loans at three per cent. for the repair of others; and no war indemnity is to be exacted by Great Britain. Beyond this, the British have made no substantial concessions whatever.

Evidently the Boers were unable to resist any longer. It is not conceivable that a people who had made so brave and patient a fight for nearly three years—with all the governments of the world, including our own, either actively or passively aiding their invading enemy,—would have surrendered so completely had any fighting energy been left in them. They must have been irrecoverably exhausted. In that condition they are entitled to universal sympathy, and it would be hard to blame them even for sacrificing their Natal and Cape Colony allies. These are left to be dealt with as rebels and traitors under British law, with the single reservation that the punishment of non-officials shall be limited to deprivation of voting rights for life and the concession that that of officials may be anything short of death. It is to be regretted that the Boers might not have secured for their allies, self-sacrificing volunteers in their cause, at least the same assurances as to personal and property rights which they secured for themselves. But when it is considered that their fighting power was exhausted, condemnation for abandoning their Natal and Cape Colony comrades must come slow-footed, while the great service they have rendered mankind is recognized with ever increasing clearness. They have given all imperialists a lesson in the expense of invasive empire which will not soon be forgotten. Though they have lost their independence, and will soon have lost their language and their distinctive civilization, the English language is rich enough in the vocabularies of freedom to per-

petuate the sad story and the great lesson of their lost cause.

This unhappy close of the Boer struggle recalls the fact that the late Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, that great democratic-Republican, who died about a year ago, made a pilgrimage to South Africa. He died while on his way home. It is not so well known that he had completed a book on his experiences and observations, in which he protested against the British war of conquest. The manuscript of his book was delivered last month, so says the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, to Tom L. Johnson, Gov. Pingree's intimate friend. It was sent, continues the *Plain Dealer*—

by Mrs. Pingree, in accordance with the wish of her dead husband. The tribute of Mr. Pingree's esteem was received just a year and a day after its dedication on the waters of the Atlantic. It had been Gov. Pingree's intention personally to deliver the manuscript to his friend upon his return to America, but he was destined never again to set foot upon his native land. Mayor Johnson was deeply affected when he received the manuscript. It was almost a voice from the dead. Gov. Pingree and Mr. Johnson had many ideas in common and grew to be sincere friends during the mayor's stay in Detroit. The dedication of the book, however, was a surprise to Mr. Johnson.

As reproduced by the *Plain Dealer* the dedication is as follows:

To my friend, Tom L. Johnson, that unbending foe of inequality, that champion of honest government, of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, I dedicate as a token of sincere esteem this story of an oppressed and outraged people battling heroically against terrific odds for freedom and civic unity.

H. S. Pingree,

On board the Melbourne, Messageries  
Maritime Service.  
May 22, 1901.

The admirers of both these men, as well as all sympathizers with the Boers in their ill-fated struggle, cannot but be interested in this impressive testimony to the common aspirations for human liberty of two such distinguished characters, who, though of opposite parties in politics, were bound together in the same fundamental political faith.

As a private citizen Mr. Roosevelt