

can be solved only "in the spirit of courage, common sense and high-minded devotion to the right." But he does not say whether he favors "such congressional action as shall determine whether by special discriminations the elective franchise in any state has been unconstitutionally limited." Can it be possible that Mr. Roosevelt is afraid that the "forgotten plank" is not popular even in the north?

Imperialism

Mr. Roosevelt devotes considerable space to the Philippine question and it is plain that he stands for imperialism and if elected will continue to favor that policy.

Referring to the democratic promise to grant independence to the Filipinos Mr. Roosevelt says that if promised independence they will expect independence and he adds that if the promise is not immediately fulfilled the Filipinos will regard it as broken and will not again trust to American faith. Then he exclaims: "It would be indeed a wicked thing to deceive them in such fashion."

To be sure it would be a wicked thing to deceive them in any fashion and they are not to be deceived in any way in the event the American people elect to power an administration pledged to grant independence.

It is strange that Mr. Roosevelt should be so alarmed lest the Filipinos be deceived under the promise of independence at this time when he was not in the least exercised because of the disgraceful fact that after we had made allies of the Filipinos we turned our backs upon them and wrested their country from them. There is something wicked about that.

Mr. Roosevelt insists that "even if the promise of independence were made to take effect only in the distant future, the Filipinos would be thrown into confusion thereby." He explains that "instead of continuing to endeavor to fit themselves for moral and material advancement in the present they would abandon all effort at progress and begin factional intrigues for future power."

During our occupation of Cuba and under our solemn pledge to deliver the island into the keeping of its people it was charged that "factional intrigues for future power" existed among the officers and politicians. If we remember history correctly, there were "factional intrigues for future power" before the ink was dry upon our own declaration of independence; and so long as human selfishness exists, so long as men are ambitious to obtain public place, so long will there be "factional intrigues for future power" during a government's constructive period, as, indeed, there is in all of the old established governments of the world.

Self-Government

Mr. Roosevelt objects to giving independence and self-government to the Filipinos on the ground that they are not qualified for self-government. He says that to give independence and self-government to the Filipinos would result in "a frightful calamity to the Filipinos themselves and in its larger aspect would amount to an international crime." He adds: "Anarchy would follow and the most violent anarchic forces would be directed partly against the civil government, partly against all forms of religious and educational civilization. Bloody conflicts would inevitably ensue in the archipelago and just as inevitably the islands would become the prey of the first power which in its own selfish interest took up the task we had cravenly abandoned." He further says, "every effort is being made to fit the islanders for self-government."

The very best answer to this proposition made by Candidate Roosevelt is provided in the statements of Author Roosevelt. The same man who as a candidate for president says that the Filipinos must not be given self-government until they have learned to govern themselves wisely according to the view of their masters, wrote a book entitled "The Winning of the West." In vol. 4, page 217 of that work it will be found that Theodore Roosevelt said:

The Jeffersonians believed in the acquisition of territory in the west and the federalists did not. The Jeffersonians believed that the westerners should be allowed to govern themselves precisely as other citizens of the United States did, and should be given their full share in the management of national affairs. Too many federalists failed to see that these positions were the only proper ones to

take. In consequence, notwithstanding all their manifold shortcomings, the Jeffersonians, and not the federalists, were those to whom the west owed the most. Whether the westerners governed themselves as wisely as they should have mattered little. The essential point was that they had to be given the right of self-government. They could not be kept in pupillage. Like other Americans they had to be left to strike out for themselves and to sink or swim according to the measure of their own capacities. When this was done, it was certain that they would commit many blunders and that some blunders would work harm not only to themselves, but the whole nation. Nevertheless, all this had to be accepted as part of the penalty paid for free government.

It will be seen that in his "Winning of the West," Mr. Roosevelt said that it was of little importance whether men govern themselves as wisely as they should; the essential point is that they must be given the right of self-government; they can not be kept in pupillage; like other builders of government they must strike out for themselves and sink or swim according to the measure of their own capacities; of course they would naturally commit many blunders and some of these blunders would work harm not only to themselves but to the whole nation; nevertheless all this must be accepted as part of the penalty paid for free government!

Parker and Roosevelt

Mr. Roosevelt does not appear in a creditable light when in his letter of acceptance he misrepresents his opponent's attitude upon the question of imperialism. Mr. Roosevelt undertakes to make it appear that the democratic party and the democratic candidate have occupied several different positions. He says that the democratic platform "declared for independence apparently, for their language is a little obscure, without qualification as to time," and that "in later and equally official utterances (Judge Parker's speech of acceptance) the term 'self-government' was substituted for independence, the words used being so chosen that in their natural construction they described precisely the policy now being 'carried on.'" Mr. Roosevelt says that "this caused trouble in their own ranks and in a still later although less formal utterance (Judge Parker's letter to Mr. Milburn) the self-government promise was recanted and independence at some future time was promised in its place. They have occupied three entirely different positions within fifty days. Which is the promise they really intend to keep?"

It is difficult to conceive of a public man, occupying Mr. Roosevelt's position, making such a plain misrepresentation of an opponent's attitude.

Bear in mind that Mr. Roosevelt says that the language of the democratic platform is "a little obscure," also that Judge Parker deliberately substituted the term "self-government" for "independence," charging that the words were so used in order that Judge Parker might convey the impression that in the event of his election the Roosevelt policy would be his policy. Also that because of "trouble in their own (the democrats') ranks, Judge Parker recanted the self-government promise and substituted independence." Also that the democratic party and its candidate "have occupied three entirely different positions within fifty days."

One glance at the record will convict Mr. Roosevelt of marked lack of candor in dealing with his opponent's position on this great question.

The language of the democratic platform on this subject is not at all obscure. It plainly denounces the policy of imperialism and insists that "we should do for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans," and it adds that "it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet and free and independent to work out their own destiny."

In his speech of acceptance Judge Parker said that the "admirable platform" adopted by the democratic convention "clearly states the principles which were condensed in the first inaugural address of President Jefferson and points out with force and directness the course to be pursued through their proper application in order to insure needed reforms in both legislative and administrative departments of the government." He pointed out that that platform guaranteed the enforcement, for the benefit of all of man's inalienable rights, among which, as said in the Declaration of Independence, are 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of

happiness.'" He said that it was difficult to understand "how any citizen of the United States, much less a descendant of revolutionary stock can tolerate the thought of permanently denying the right of self-government to the Filipinos." He admitted that we are not at liberty to disregard the responsibility we have in the Philippines, but he added that that responsibility will be best subserved by preparing the islanders as rapidly as possible for self-government, giving them the assurance that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it.

In his letter to Mr. Milburn, Judge Parker did not change his position. He simply cleared away all doubt that might have been entertained concerning his position and so he said:

You are entirely right in assuming that as I employed the phrase, "self-government," it was intended to be identical with independence, political and territorial. After noting the criticism referred to by you, I am still unable to understand how it can be said that a people enjoy self-government while another nation may in any degree whatever control their action. But to take away all possible opportunity for conjecture, it shall be made clear in the letter of acceptance that I am in hearty accord with that plank in the democratic platform which advocates treating the Filipinos precisely as we did the Cubans; and I also favor making the promise to them now to take such action as soon as it can prudently be done.

Russia's Awakening

The czar has made the birth of his first son and heir the occasion for inaugurating a number of important reforms.

1. He grants a general amnesty in the case of all political offenders except those charged with murder.

2. He abolishes corporal punishment among rural classes and for the first offense for sea and land forces.

3. He remits arrears due the state for the purchase of land.

4. He grants amnesty to those Finlanders who have emigrated without authorization.

5. He remits the fines imposed on the rural and urban communes of Finland which refused to submit to military conscription in 1902 and 1903.

6. He sets apart one million and a half from the state funds for the purpose of forming an inalienable fund for the benefit of landless people of Finland.

7. He remits the fines imposed on Jewish communes whose inhabitants avoided military duty.

8. He provides for a general reduction in sentences for common law offenses.

It will be seen that the reforms announced are of vast importance. They point to radical change in policy and can not fail to effect a tremendous influence upon the country. It indicates an abandonment of the policy of exiling political offenders—a policy which has done much to arouse the criticism of civilized nations. The abandonment of flogging as a punishment for the peasants is a great step in advance and will be hailed with delight throughout the empire. The cancelling of the debts due for the land is equivalent to an enormous donation to the former serfs. The relief granted the Finns and the Jews is as important for what it promises as for what it does. Russia has her face toward the light and her czar and his infant son will share the blessings which will flow from the reforms just instituted. The benedictions which follow their announcement may draw forth other and more sweeping measures.

What Russia needs most, and will some day have, are constitutional government, free speech and a free press. It is strange that any ruler can be blind to the advantages of constitutional government. Certainly Nicholas must find the responsibility and the burden heavy enough to make him wish for assistance. Self-government is the panacea for discontent. The people will bear with patience evils for which they are themselves responsible, but will complain bitterly of evils of no greater magnitude when those evils are brought upon them by the arbitrary action of a monarch. Paradoxical as it may sound, a monarch increases his authority as he shares it with the people. The fear that the people may not be capable of participation is an ungrounded one. The very desire to participate indicates capacity and that capacity is still further developed by exercise.

A ruler is likewise short-sighted if he imagines that he can increase his own security by silencing criticism. Opposition expressed is less dangerous than opposition suppressed, just as powder is less harmful loose than when its pent-