

to form the first government, but Reid will probably oust him when the tariff comes up for final adjustment.

Adelaide, S. A., Nov. 8, 1900.  
CRAWFORD VAUGHAN.

#### WHAT WAS NOT SETTLED AT THE LAST ELECTION.

You cannot vote down the Decalogue. No moral question was ever settled until it was settled right. None ever will be. That is the only way to kill it off as an issue. Every man in America might vote that two and two make five; but the multiplication table would outlast them all, and be just the same as though they had never lived. For the truth is eternal, whereas man is a snippy and ephemeral little ex-monkey who has done as many wrong and foolish things as he could, by himself. His only salvation is that having nothing else to tie to, and being much more "wobbly" than any other animal, he finally drifts to the unvarying truth.

Men who are still young can remember when the United States voted overwhelmingly to maintain human slavery. Men who are only middle-aged can remember when the few Americans who stood up for the abolition of slavery were alone and despised and even mobbed. But even the election of Buchanan did not prove slavery right, nor yet "settle the question" in politics. The very next campaign brought Abraham Lincoln and the downfall of slavery. The election of 50 Buchanans would not have made slavery right—it would not even have proved that the American people deemed it right. All men that God has made have conscience; the Americans, we trust, as much as the next. That is the reason why whoopings-up, and torch-light processions, and tin badges and full dinner pails never settle a question. An American votes for president one minute in four years; but his mind and his conscience he has to sit up with all the time. Not only that. Truth never fails of sons; and the sons of truth never say die. Every real cause begets men to fight for it; and they always win. It was only a few men, at first, who overcame the colonial Tories and defied the king. Only a schoolboy thinks that even in 1776 the colonies were unanimous. And '76 was the outcome of a long uphill campaign. Only a few men were they who, in time, overturned the slave-holding south and the slave consenting north. But they were right. And it was then, as it shall still be, that "One man on God's side is a majority." It seems incredible to us to-day that Americans ever cringed under the brutal rule of

George III.—but they did. We can hardly realize that for more than four-score years this nation defended and practiced human slavery. Even to the elderly men who used to own 500 "niggers" in the United States, it seems a dream. But it was no dream. And men now living will see the time when our present comparable policy of subject races will seem as unreal. I myself, who am no chicken, expect to see this bad dream forgotten in our waking.—Chas. F. Lummis, in *Land of Sunshine*.

#### THE LONDON TIMES UP AGAINST AMERICAN HUMOR.

An editorial note in the number for November 17 of *Literature*, published weekly by the *London Times*, runs as follows:

The popularization of history can, of course, be carried to excess. Chicago university is gaining a reputation for "fads," and this seems to be one of them. Here is a literal report of part of a lecture by Prof. Thatcher on Charles I.:

Charles was a good many different kinds of a chump. He couldn't play a square game, and made ducks and drakes of everything he got his hooks on. He had a first-class show at the king business, but he slipped his trolley every time he undertook to touch the democratic bosses. He tried a lot of monkey business with parliament, but it landed him in the soup; and when he tried to tackle old Pym, who was a tough proposition, he found himself up against it to beat the band. Pym took a fall out of him every round. He had no more chance to win out than a pair of deuces against a straight flush, and though he put up a first-class bluff it didn't go. It took him a good while to drop to it that the old gag of divine right was well enough when playing to the gallery, but that the orchestra and boxes were on to it, and that it was played out anyway. Cromwell and Ireton were too fly to be scooped by any such tommyrot. Charles had always been a high roller, and when his gang got scrapping with the Roundheads he was dead broke and had to pull the leg of all the dead-easy tenderfeet in the kingdom. The ante was too much for him. Cromwell finally sized him up and got the district attorney to press the indictment of his royal nibs for everything that was out. Charles worked his pull for all it was worth, but he got the razzle-dazzle just where the chicken got the ax. They waltzed him off to the bone-yard p. d. q., and Cromwell had the innings. See?

The professor's study of the American language and its resources would seem to be more profound than his study of English history.

In *Literature* of December 15 appeared the following editorial note, supplementary to the first:

We seem to have done some injustice to Prof. Thatcher, of Chicago, in a note which we recently published on a lecture he was supposed to have deliv-

ered on Charles I. Mr. Edward Osgood Brown, counsellor-at-law, writes to us from Chicago to assure us that the professor's "worst offense in the way of 'slang' was an instance or two of colloquial expressions, in his teaching work, which would have passed entirely unnoticed if uttered from any chair in England; but which the 'priggishness,' so to speak, of certain of his female auditors made a subject of criticism which accidentally reached the newspapers." The quotation which we gave was, as Mr. Brown supposes, "taken from some American newspaper, where it was jocosely credited to Prof. Thatcher." This, says our correspondent, is "a very common form of American humor." The jocosity of the newspaper which gave the extract had, we fully admit, escaped us. For us in the old country the true inwardness of the Chicago humorist is somewhat subtle; we have hardly yet risen to what may be called "the higher jocosity." But we are much obliged to Mr. Brown; and the more so because he assures us that "those of us in America who have most attachment to the 'old home' and its people are often obliged to defend your fellow-countrymen from the charge that they have a very poor sense of humor, and find it difficult to take a joke."

#### THE POWER OF THE TAFT COMMISSION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

For The Public.

We are told by the news dispatches that the Philippine commission has enacted legislation for the establishment of provincial civil government under American sovereignty in the Philippines. I find, also, upon reference to the report of the secretary of war for 1900, page 83, that a decree of the commission assumes to be a civil enactment. It begins with these words: "By authority of the president of the United States, be it enacted by the United States Philippine commission, that—" etc.

Now, I do not understand how that commission can legislate, i. e., make laws as a civil power. It is merely a branch of the military rule enforced by the president. The executive order appointing it instructed it to report to the secretary of war.

As the good McKinley has frequently told us, we all know that until congress acts, the military arm of the government is supreme in the archipelago. Congress has not acted, because the Spooner bill, which was to authorize a civil authority, was withdrawn by the administration for fear that its enactment would make more

trouble in the middle west, like that which the Puerto Rican act had aroused. When the commission was appointed, its members were promised that their authority would be supplied by the Spooner bill, which was withdrawn while they were on their way to Manila. The censor permitted us to know from the Manila dispatches how the chairman of the commission anxiously asked on arriving at Manila: "Has the Spooner bill passed?" We have learned many things in the past two years of what a president may do in defiance of the law and his official oath, but I do not think he can legislate either directly or vicariously. He no doubt may try to do so, and his deputies may go through all the motions. If necessary to accomplish his ends, he would probably also assume to have, and would try to exercise, judicial powers, but the validity of his judgments would be as doubtful as is, in my opinion, the legality of his legislation through the commission. As commander in chief of the army he is the ruler of the Philippines, and can delegate his military power to Gen. MacArthur or anyone else. And if this commission has any authority, it seems to me it is only as a part of the president's military authority.

The president announced when he appointed the commission that beginning with September 1 they should have authority to establish a civil government in the Philippines. We had understood that Gen. MacArthur was the commanding officer in the Philippines. The authority given to the commission may mean that so much of the government of the archipelago is taken from the hands of the commanding officer; or it possibly means that the commissioners are his staff or advisers on civil matters, and very good advisers on such matters they no doubt are; but when they advise him or his superior officers, this cannot accurately be called legislation, nor, I submit, is any civil law enacted when their advice is taken and promulgated.

The measures which the commissioners adopt or suggest for enforcement by the military power, which is the only American power in that unhappy land, are, when approved by the commanding officer and shorn of the McKinley verbiage, merely military edicts or decrees. I suppose these orders should appear in that officer's official record and report as "General Order No. —." On the other hand, if the commanding offi-

cer has nothing to do with the matters which are delegated by his chief to the commissioners, then, notwithstanding the McKinleyesque use of misleading terms importing civil authority, the alleged laws enacted by the commission are, I submit, none the less merely military edicts or decrees.

If I am wrong about all this I should be glad to be informed. My error, if one, arises from some old-time notions as to the nature of our system of government, and I am not unprepared to hear that these primitive ideas of mine are obsolete.

CHARLES B. WILBY.  
Cincinnati, Dec. 22, 1900.

#### THE SCHOOLS DO NOT TEACH OF SOCIAL RELATIONS.

An extract from a paper on "The Duty of the Schools to Society," read by Prof. Charles Lischer, of New Athens, Ill., before the meeting of the St. Clair County Teachers' Institute at Belleville, Ill., Dec. 8.

It is important that teachers should inquire whether the schools are in any degree responsible for the [present] unfortunate [social] conditions. I am compelled to acknowledge that I think they are, though other agencies are also responsible. The responsibility of the schools is not a blame-worthy responsibility, for the forces of no other agency have been guided with purer motives. Hence, there is no room for condemnation. The relation of the schools to society, however, is so intimate, and their influences are so potent in their formative effects, that it would be folly to claim that they are entirely free from responsibility in this grave matter. Even if the schools have not contributed directly or purposely to it, they have not studied how to prevent it. They have cultivated, unintentionally, of course, those characteristics which have produced it, and have failed to cultivate, except incidentally, those better characteristics which must correct it. Throughout the whole course of the development of our public schools, their relation to the child as an individual with personal ends in life to be attained has been an all-determining factor, while their relation to the child as a member of society has never been sufficiently emphasized. The effort, therefore, on the part of the schools has uniformly been to enable the child, when grown to manhood, to successfully guard his personal interests and secure his personal ends. There is no general or continued effort to so train and develop him that he will contribute to

the welfare of society. Why has the child been taught to read, to write, to cipher? Primarily, because a knowledge of these has seemed to be absolutely essential in securing his so-called rights among his fellows. His ethical side is now demanding cultivation more loudly than ever. So far as education is purely intellectual, it only trains him for a fiercer part in the great struggle for personal ends, and tends to diminish the severity of that struggle in such degree only as purely intellectual culture indirectly contributes to the ethical, through attention to subjects related to the ethical.

Back of all social discontent, and back of all forms in which it appears, we find the primary cause of social disorders in the presence of erroneous ideas among men, particularly the presence of erroneous notions concerning the relations which exist among men. There are certain fundamental ideas upon which the social edifice is built. In each of these a thousand others germinate, and the thousand are wrong if the one is wrong. Thus, in treating of the natural rights and duties of the individual, we should impress the ethical relations between individuals which arise from the fact of birth. All are in the world through no fault or merit of their own, hence no blame or credit attaches to the fact of being here in any case. No man brought anything with him which every other man did not bring; hence, all are by nature endowed with equal rights and equal opportunities. This opens up an immense field of thought in the direction of modifying the existing conditions of unequal rights and unequal opportunities, which all students of social questions recognize with serious misgivings. . . .

Nothing is more important for our children and youth to understand than the nature and character of human relations; but these are ignored as if there were no such relations, lest the existing abnormal ones be disturbed. Here, in my judgment, is the most serious defect of our schools, and not in the lack of proper correlation of studies.

To correct it we must form more comprehensive standards of patriotism, call it patriotism, religion, sympathy, the enthusiasm for humanity or the love of God—give it what name you will; there is yet a force in human nature which may overcome the powers of darkness; a chemical force, if you please, which melts, and fuses