

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

has ventured to declare a Philippine policy. For it was not as President but as private citizen that he spoke at Arlington on the 30th. What he said as orator of the day there does not bind him as President nor commit the country or even his party; and he scrupulously abstains from putting any declaration of policy into official form.

Even this unofficial declaration, which has been heralded by the imperialist press as a guarantee to the Filipinos, gives no assurance of any but an imperialist policy. Let us quote the paragraph upon which all the stress is laid:

We believe that we can rapidly teach the people of the Philippine islands not only how to enjoy, but how to make good use of their freedom, and with their growing knowledge their growth in self-government shall keep steady pace. When they have thus shown their capacity for real freedom by their power of self-government, then, and not till then, will it be possible to decide whether they are to exist independent of us or be knit to us by ties of common friendship and interest. When that day will come it is not in human wisdom now to foretell.

Instead of indicating an anti-imperialist policy, even indefinitely, those words confirm the worst suspicions that the secret policy of the Republican party is imperialistic. It would be impossible to outline more accurately a policy in imitation of British imperialism.

Not until the Filipinos have "shown their capacity for real freedom by their power of self-government" (according to the standard, of course, of the party in power in the United States), will it be possible to decide whether on the one hand they shall have independence or on the other shall be somehow "tied" to us forever. In other phrase, until that time, and "it is not in human wisdom now to foretell" when it will come, the Philippines are to be held by the United States as a dependency of the kind which in the British scheme of imperialism is called a "crown colony." Here is

a flat declaration, then, in favor of the adoption by this country of the same policy of imperialism which prevails in Great Britain.

Mr. Roosevelt laid special emphasis on what he called "the slowly learned and difficult art of self-government," describing it as "an art which our people have taught themselves by the labor of a thousand years." This art, he said, "cannot be grasped in a day by a people only just emerging from conditions of life which our ancestors left behind them in the dim years before history dawned." Mr. Roosevelt ought to know that it is a dangerous thing to subordinate the simple truth to fine rhetoric; but as orator of the day at Arlington he fell into that error when he referred to the Filipinos as people just emerging from the prehistoric experiences of our own race. Though there are some primitive tribes in the Philippines, they comprise comparatively few of the inhabitants. The remainder of the population of the islands consists chiefly of Mohammedans in some places and of Roman Catholic Christians in others; and the Mohammedans are not far behind the civilization of Islam, nor are the Christians far behind the civilization of Christianity. Such is the testimony of our own public records. The Arlington orator must have got his facts about the Filipinos from Republican campaign documents.

It is to Mr. Roosevelt's reference, however, to the "difficult art of self-government" that we wish especially to call attention; for this is a repetition of what has been the chatter of tyranny whenever and wherever self-government has been suppressed. That self-government is a difficult art is true enough. It is this kernel of truth that gives vitality to the falsehood in which it is always imbedded. For the point that Mr. Roosevelt really raises is not merely that self-government is a difficult art per se, which is true, but that superimposed government is not dif-

ficult, or at least not so difficult, which is false. Self-government is an easier art, even among the most primitive peoples, than superimposed government. Though Ireland, for instance, might find self-government difficult, who dare say it would be so great a failure as the superimposed government of Great Britain? Self-government among the Germanic peoples was not a model in many respects, but its survivals show it to have been better for those peoples than the superimposed government of Rome. Self-government among the American Indians prior to the European invasion had defects. They had not fully acquired it. But it was better for them than that which the governmental experts of our race substituted for it when they began, as rapidly as possible, to teach the Indians, what Mr. Roosevelt wants to teach the Filipinos, "not only how to enjoy but how to make good use of their freedom." Under self-government they thrived and were advancing; under our government they have been exterminated.

When Americans talk, as Mr. Roosevelt did, of their race as having taught itself the "difficult art of self-government" by "the labor of a thousand years," they really have in mind, as he had, something very different from learning the art of self-government. What our race has really been learning during the past thousand years has not been so much the art of self-government as the art of ridding itself of superimposed government—of government superimposed sometimes by foreign and sometimes by domestic tyranny. The whole struggle of the English from the beginning of their history down to the latest extension of the suffrage has been a struggle to overthrow tyranny and regain ancient liberties, and not to learn a new and difficult art in government. The same is true of this country. We have been so busy trying to unload superimposed tyranny, from the colonial conflict with the mother

country on down to the dominion of trusts of to-day, that we have had little time to learn Mr. Roosevelt's "difficult art."

And that precisely is the meaning of the Filipino struggle. The Christian Filipinos derived their civilization not from any benevolent discipline by the Spanish government, but from the early Catholic missionaries. The Spanish government was a corrupt and corrupting burden, and their energies for over 50 years were expended in trying to throw it off. When they had finally thrown it off, they set up a government, which, according to our own official reports now on file in Washington, was recognized by all the Christian population and stood for months as the only bulwark against anarchy. It was an attempt at self-government, and as long as we allowed it to last, a successful attempt. This peaceable government, this irrefutable exhibition which the Filipinos made of "their capacity for real freedom by their power of self-government," President McKinley assailed by his proclamation of sovereignty and destroyed by an invading army. So long as the arbitrary authority thus asserted continues, the Filipinos will have no opportunity to learn the "difficult art" of self-government. They will be too much concerned about ridding themselves of our superimposed government. And this will be so whether the burdens of foreign domination be light or heavy.

Sixto Lopez shows an infinitely better knowledge than Mr. Roosevelt of human nature when he writes in the June number of Gunton's magazine:

A self-imposed burden however heavy may be borne with cheerfulness; it does not crush the soul. But when one is compelled to bear even a feather weight the free spirit implanted in God begins to rebel. This was true of the American patriots of 1776. The tax on tea did not seriously touch any one's pocket, but it touched every one's pride. Surely the manly American must have temporarily forgotten this

when he speaks of "giving" the Filipinos "prosperity under American rule."

Mr. Lopez evidently understands what Mr. Roosevelt apparently does not, that "the difficult art" of self-government is to be learned not by precept under tutelage but by observation and practice in freedom.

Mr. Roosevelt's palliation, in his Arlington speech, of the army atrocities, by a "you're another" retort, was not happy, in whatever light it may be viewed. Because some of the more notable speeches in condemnation of these army atrocities were made by Southern senators and representatives, Mr. Roosevelt sought shelter for the army behind a denunciation of lynching. He did not use the words "lynchings in the South." He could not very well have done that, for he must know that the same spirit of race hatred that prompts the lynchings of Negroes at the South is felt in the North, and that it has expressed itself in lynchings in such states as Kansas, Colorado and Ohio. But he clearly implied that lynchings at the South are a sufficient rebuke to Southern senators who condemn army atrocities. On this point he said that the atrocities in the Philippines—

afford far less justification for a general condemnation of our army than these lynchings afford for the condemnation of the community in which they have taken place. In each case it is well to condemn the deed, and it is well also to refrain from including both guilty and innocent in the same sweeping condemnation.

The assumption here is that the communities are not responsible for lynchings and that the army likewise is not responsible for the Philippine atrocities. It is a false assumption in both cases. Communities that try to prevent and do adequately punish Negro lynchings are not responsible and ought not to be condemned for such as occur. Neither is an army to be condemned because some of the men in it commit crimes, provided the army tries to prevent the crimes and adequate-

ly punishes the criminals. But when, as in some of the Southern states, and in some parts of Kansas, Colorado and Ohio, the community encourages Negro lynchings and shields the lynchers, it does become responsible for the lynchings. Such communities are not innocent and it is not well to refrain from including them along with the lynchers in "the same sweeping condemnation." On the contrary, they ought to be included. Similarly with the army. When it encourages and its general officers even order atrocious crimes, and atrocious criminals are merely reprimanded upon conviction, it makes itself a partner in their guilt. There is only one difference between the army in those circumstances and a community which encourages lynchings. The army as a whole is not a free agent, while the community is. Consequently the guilt of an army is not the guilt of all its members but of those officers whose commands all the members must obey. When, therefore, an army encourages atrocities and shields offenders, the guilt rests upon the commander-in-chief who might enforce different conduct, but who at first suppresses the ugly facts, and when they finally leak out apologizes for the offenders and palliates the offenses. The honor of an army and the honor of its commander-in-chief are pretty much the same thing.

The policy of suppression practiced by the party in power with reference to American atrocities in the Philippines until the facts burst their confines and horrified the American people, is pursued now with reference to the general sentiment of the Philippine people. No Filipino witness not in sympathy with the policy of American imperialism is allowed to testify. But to give an appearance of a willingness to listen to the Filipinos, a live Filipino has been imported in the person of Felipe Buenacaminio. This man was in Aguinaldo's cabinet. He became a bitter enemy of Aguinaldo and was captured by the Americans. They en-

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 Kavanaugh. A man charged with murder had been acquitted by the jury, Judge Kavanaugh 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 Kavanaugh 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 Kavanaugh 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 admissibility 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 Kavanaugh 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."