

STILL AVOIDING THE ISSUE

Governor-General Wright, of the Philippines, in his speech at the Taft banquet said: "Whether we are rightfully or wrongfully here is not to be discussed at this time, but when the American people take over the sovereignty of a people without their consent they will get a 'square deal.'"

Governor Wright suggests that this is not the time to discuss whether we are "rightfully or wrongfully" in the Philippines, but when was, or is, or will be, the right time to discuss that question? We were told we must not discuss the question when the Filipinos were in insurrection for fear it would prolong the insurrection and Governor Wright objected to the discussion last year (when there was no insurrection) for fear it would incite another insurrection.

It is now seven years since we took over "the sovereignty" of those people "without their consent;" when will it be proper to inquire whether we are "rightfully or wrongfully" there?

And then the promise of "a square deal." The employment of a card-player's phrase may possibly add some sanctity to the promise and yet it is the same old promise that the conqueror has always made to the subject. It is the same promise that George the Third made to the American colonists; the same promise that Spain made to her colonists, and the same promise that the czar is now making to his subjects. When the Philippine bill was before congress the democrats proposed amendments intended to protect the Filipinos from American land grabbers but these amendments were voted down.

We get our information in regard to the Filipinos from the American officials stationed among them and this information is not likely to be impartially gathered.

Aside from the tendency of every one to magnify his own work the carpet-bag official is peculiarly interested in justifying the payment of his salary.

No nation is selfish enough to want "to take over the sovereignty of a people without their consent" and at the same time unselfish enough to give the people a "square deal."

The difference between self-government and colonialism is that under the former the people have it in their power to secure a square deal, while under the latter the rulers say: "This is a square deal" and if the subjects fail to discern the squareness of the deal their vision is corrected by repeated applications of smokeless powder and hot lead.

A number of democrats have accompanied Secretary Taft, and it is to be hoped that they will not confine their study of the Philippine situation to the speeches made at the complimentary banquets.

THEY FEAR THE SHOCK

The tariff question is growing more and more embarrassing to the administration. The demand for revision is increasing and yet the republicans are afraid to commence revising for fear they can not find a stopping place. They seem inclined to take hold of the machine, but they dread the shock.

To refuse to do anything is to alienate the tariff reformers; to make any material reduction is to anger the beneficiaries of high tariff. Which ever way they turn they see trouble brewing.

The latest protest comes from the building associations. The representatives of these associations recently met in national conference and one of the conferees pointed out in an able paper that the tariff on building material was not only a heavy burden to home builders, but a hindrance to home building. The arguments made so commended themselves to those present that a committee was appointed to draft and present to congress a memorial asking for a reduction of the tariff on building material. The position taken is directly in line with the position which the democrats have consistently held for years. They have insisted that the republican leaders while prating about home industries have not only neglected but actually discriminated against the most important home industry—the industry of home building. The young man who, selecting some young woman who is willing to trust her future to his brain and arm, starts out to build for himself and wife a home is harassed at every step by the greed of the protected manufacturers. They demand a tribute on lumber, hardware, carpets, furniture—on every thing that enters into the home. When the democratic party says to them, "Hands off and let that home industry live," it is protecting the greatest home

industry that this or any other country ever had.

But the voice of the home builder will not be heard in republican councils—he does not contribute to the campaign fund. He simply votes and as long as he votes the ticket straight no matter what the party does his interests will not be considered. The protected interests send their representatives to Washington and threaten revenge if their subsidy is disturbed. The situation recalls the story of the tramp and the merchant. The tramp went into a clothing store and when the merchant was not looking picked up a coat and put it on and ran out. As he went out the door the merchant saw him and took after him, shouting, "stop thief," but the thief did not stop. Then a policeman joined the chase and shouted "Stop thief," but he did not stop. When the policeman drew his revolver and warned him that he would shoot, the merchant became excited, grabbed the policeman by the arm and begged, "If you do shoot, shoot him in the pants, the coat belongs to me."

The trouble is that the republican leaders are afraid to shoot anywhere for fear they will offend some of the corporations that furnish the sinews of war. They recognize that the tariff question is like an electric battery and they are afraid of it.

CARNEGIE AND MISSISSIPPI

Governor Vardaman of Mississippi has explained why the Mississippi university's trustees refused Carnegie's offer of \$25,000 for the establishment of a library. The offer was declined by a unanimous vote of the board. Governor Vardaman holds that donations from trust magnates serve as monuments to the wrong-doings of the donors. He says that these men have accumulated their money through unholy methods, and he protests against the acceptance by Mississippi of any gift that would have a tendency to cause the youth of that state to minimize the evils of the methods employed by these multi-millionaires. Governor Vardaman says:

We have in Mississippi the purest and best stock of men and women under God's heaven, and we do not want them warped from the broad spirit of fairness and integrity and purity which has made us the proud people we are today, by being taught to bow down in a thankful humbleness to such men as Andrew Carnegie and Rockefeller, and become subservient to the spirit of greed and commercialism which has bred the trust and fostered the slavery of the American workingman. I would rather see the walls of our state university and our colleges crumble into dust and the buildings be battered and grimy than that they should be built up and handsomely painted and furnished by this money which has been coined from the blood and tears of the toiling masses, "demanding the usury of self-respect," which we can not afford to pay.

We may not have in Mississippi the scientific equipment for imparting knowledge and all the modern accessories that make up the great institutions of learning, but we have the means of making strong and stalwart men and women, who scorn the slavery of wealth and stand unequalled in their proud independence of thought.

The chief beneficiary of the steel trust is beginning to get his share of the lime light. To avoid the disgrace of dying rich Mr. Carnegie may yet have to get out of the trust business.

THE SMALL COLLEGE

President Harper announces that the Chicago University is going to be divided up into a number of small colleges. He says: "Along with the recognized advantages belonging to a large institution, it is well understood that some of the undoubted advantages of a small college are in danger of being lost. In order, if possible, to combine some of these benefits which are found in a small college with the resources and cosmopolitanism of a great institution it is intended that beginning with the next autumn quarter the junior colleges shall be divided into small colleges."

This confession coming from so high a source ought to convince parents of the wisdom of allowing their children to secure the earlier part (at least) of their college training at the smaller and nearer institutions. The small college furnishes education at a lower cost than the larger institution; it keeps the boy nearer home, thus enabling him to visit home and his parents to visit him; it brings the teacher and student closer together and gives the student the benefit of the teacher's ideals. The small college, if under Christian in-

fluences, also gives more attention to ethical culture.

Mr. Bryan, as president of the board of trustees of Illinois College, (Jacksonville, Ill.) is especially interested in that institution and loses no opportunity to bring it to the attention of the parents who have children to educate, but there are a great many excellent small colleges scattered over the country and other things being equal, the nearest one is the best.

NOT "A FOOLISH STRUGGLE"

An Indiana girl of seventeen recently took her own life, leaving a note in which she described life as "a foolish struggle" adding "the sooner we get out of it the better." How can any one so regard life? Ask the patriarch who sits amid the falling shadows and recounts the achievements of the well-spent years; ask the matron whose declining days are made glad by the companionship of virtuous children and grandchildren; ask those who, strong in faith, are devoting themselves to the world's work or ministering to the needs of those who require assistance—ask any of these and the answer will be that life instead of being "a foolish struggle" is a glorious drama in which, pain and pleasure, joy and sorrow are so mixed that the love of a heavenly father shows forth with increasing clearness as the acts and scenes succeed each other.

Only those can look upon life as "a foolish struggle" who view it from a selfish standpoint and, pursuing false ideals, are blind to its splendid possibilities and its great rewards. Because so much depends upon one's conception of life—upon one's ideals—it is the duty of the parents, the school teacher, and the religious instructor to set before the people—and especially the young—ideals that will inspire to noble endeavor.

NO DANGER OF THIRD TERM

Some of the democrats are expressing fear that the president may be persuaded to run for a third term. There is no need for alarm. He has said that he will not under any circumstances be a candidate to succeed himself and there is no reason to believe that he has changed or will change his mind on this subject. He has declared that he regards this as his second term and his own construction has been accepted. Having served nearly three and a half years of Mr. McKinley's second term he could hardly justify any other construction.

Without questioning the good faith of the president it may be added that he would have a great deal of assistance in avoiding another term if assistance were necessary. The republican party is divided as the democratic party was in 1896 and he can not pass through the next three years without alienating one element of the party. He is now counted among the reformers. If he lives up to the promises he has made, the corporations would fight his re-nomination, if he falters he will lose the popularity upon which another nomination is predicated.

Neither is it sure that he would be a strong candidate, if nominated. His large majority in 1904 was not so much a personal or party victory as a democratic defeat. He received only about one hundred and fifty thousand more votes than the normal republican strength while Judge Parker received about a million and a half less than the normal democratic vote. If this was the president's experience when he had on his side the feeling that he was entitled to an endorsement what would be his experience if he had to carry the odium of a third term? The sentiment against a third term was so strong that Grant had to bow to it. Could Roosevelt overcome it? The names of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson are still potent and they refused to consider a third time. Would the people admire an ambition which would disregard their example?

No, Mr. Roosevelt does not want a third term and if he did want it he would find the anti-third term sentiment an insuperable obstacle.

Let him serve the people with an eye single to their welfare and the gratitude of his countrymen will be a richer reward than a dozen terms could bestow.

NORWAY FOR INDEPENDENCE

At a referendum recently held the people of Norway, by a vote of about three thousand to one, declared for separation from Sweden. As Sweden has virtually consented to the separation, independence is now assured. If our nation had not strained its diplomatic eye-sight in its recognition of Panama it might find it easier to recognize Norway as the latest addition to the sisterhood of nations.