

The Commoner.

mission reported that "the Filipinos, though recognizing the need of American intervention and tutelage, all desired and hoped for ultimate independence." This is a complete answer to those who vociferously assert that the Filipinos, especially the more intelligent ones, are longing to be subjects of the United States. No one who understands either history or human nature can doubt that the Filipinos, like all other people, love liberty and desire self-government. Those who are ignorant of the natural sentiments of the human heart and ignorant of the experience of empires may be deceived into believing that our sovereignty will be welcomed by the Filipinos; those who find a pecuniary profit in the exploitation of helpless people may even have the impudence to defend imperialism on the pretense that it is asked by the Filipinos, but President Schurman sweeps away the cobweb arguments used to justify a carpet-bag government in the Philippines. When he says that all the intelligent Filipinos desire and hope for ultimate independence he utters a truth which is entirely in harmony with both theory and fact. When he declares not only that the Filipinos want ultimate independence, but that "our progressive grants of liberty and home rule must eventuate in independence" he places himself squarely upon the democratic platform. The democrats have from the first contended that the Filipinos wanted independence, were entitled to independence, and should be given independence, not only for their own good, but for our good. The republican leaders, on the contrary, have scouted at the idea of independence; they have declared that we could not honorably surrender possession; they have said that European nations would laugh at us; that the Filipinos would fall to fighting among themselves and that other nations would gobble them up; they argued that "philanthropy and 5 per cent" united in commanding us to develop the Philippine islands and shoot down such Filipinos as object to our mode of development. There is no question that Mr. Schurman correctly describes the original purpose of President McKinley before he was overpersuaded by the commercial interests, and there is no doubt that he expresses the wish of a majority of the republicans today.

Why not promise "ultimate independence" and end the war in the Philippines? Why not assure the Filipinos that they are to have independence as soon as a stable government is established? If they are to be given independence after a while, why kill them first? If we are going to give them independence, it is better to give it to live men who can enjoy it rather than to dead men who have no further use for it. Why spend millions of dollars a month hunting fleeing Filipinos; why sacrifice the lives of our soldiers; why stain our flag with the blood of conquest when a simple promise will bring peace? If the Filipinos are to have ultimate independence, is it not more honorable to promise it now and make friends of the Filipinos than to conceal our purpose and keep them enemies?

President Schurman's admission is the most significant utterance that has recently appeared in connection with this subject. He is in position to know what Mr. McKinley's purpose was and what instructions he gave. If the republicans have departed from their original purpose they will find it difficult to defend their present position; if ultimate independence has been intended from the start and is now intended, the administration has spent over three hundred millions of dollars that need not have been spent; it has sacrificed thousands of lives that need not have been sacrificed; it has aroused suspicion abroad as to our love for self-government—and all this could have been avoided by a promise of independence! President Schurman's words justify the position taken by the democratic party; they vindicate the democratic platform, and they ought to encourage democrats in congress and out of congress to continue the struggle along the lines laid down by

the Kansas City convention. Let every reader of *The Commoner* bring President Schurman's words to the attention of his republican neighbors, and then read to his neighbors the following extract from the last democratic platform:

WE FAVOR AN IMMEDIATE DECLARATION OF THE NATION'S PURPOSE TO GIVE THE FILIPINOS, FIRST, A STABLE FORM OF GOVERNMENT; SECOND, INDEPENDENCE, AND, THIRD, PROTECTION FROM OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE, SUCH AS HAS BEEN GIVEN FOR NEARLY A CENTURY TO THE REPUBLICS OF CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA.

This is the solution—the only American solution—of the Philippine question.

From Prejudiced Sources.

Mr. Irving Winslow, secretary of the New England Anti-Imperialist league, makes a good point in a recent article when he suggests that our knowledge of the Filipinos comes to us from prejudiced sources. We must rely largely upon the carpet-bag officials who have a pecuniary interest in belittling the Filipinos. The carpet-bag governments which afflicted the southern states during the reconstruction period always made plausible reports of their doings and could always give strong reasons for their continued existence, but now we look upon those governments as a disgrace to the party responsible for them as well as a misfortune to the people afflicted by them.

Mr. Winslow points out that the Filipinos were shut out from the conference when the treaty of Paris was being considered, and that their embassies and petitions have been ignored. While the Filipinos' side of the controversy is being disregarded, the government printing presses are prepared to spread far and wide every criticism of them and every reflection upon them uttered by those whose official salaries depend upon a colonial system.

Missouri Democrats.

If United States senators were elected by direct vote of the people there would be no doubt that the next senator from Missouri would be a firm believer in the Kansas City platform. Under the present system of electing senators, however, the reorganizers have a great advantage. First, they try to create discord and contention between candidates who stand on the Kansas City platform, and in the second place they scheme to nominate for the legislature men who are under secret pledge to the corporate interests. It behooves the democrats of Missouri to be on the alert. No one should be nominated for the legislature whose position on public questions is in doubt, and it is the part of wisdom to discourage bitterness and criticism between the friends of such candidates as stand upon the Kansas City platform. A democrat can advocate the election of a Kansas City platform democrat without using harsh language against another Kansas City platform democrat. The real democrats will have plenty to do watching the reorganizers and fighting the republicans; they cannot afford to waste their strength in stirring up or aiding a quarrel between men whose fidelity to democratic principles has been tested.

The Cuban Elections.

A republican paper says that now that Palma has been chosen president of Cuba, the "Cuban capacity for self-government is to be given a fair test." At the same time this republican paper predicts that turmoil and contention and disturbances will exist and that the result will be failure.

It is not fair to say that the result of the Cuban election, considered in the light of the evidences of the campaign, justifies the claim that this will be "a fair test." In the first place, Maso, Palma's opponent, retired from the contest and his adherents claimed that his retirement was due to the interference of the United States authorities

in the election and the fear that because of this interference a fair election could not be had. As a result of Maso's retirement a very large number of Cubans absented themselves from the polls.

Without being informed as to the correctness of this accusation, it is not difficult to understand that the new government will take up the discharge of its duties under serious embarrassment. The very fact that a large number of Cubans believed that United States authorities were interfering in the Cuban campaign to the disadvantage of one candidate, and the fact that a large number of Cubans remained at home on election day because of this charge—these do not place the Cuban people in a very happy frame of mind for the beginning of "a fair test" on the lines of self-government.

It is to be regretted that any grounds for the charge of United States interference existed. It would have been far better had the people of Cuba been permitted, even in their demonstrative way, to have settled upon a choice for president without the slightest hint or suspicion of outside interference.

Under the circumstances, however, it must be admitted that the outlook is not entirely reassuring, and yet if President Palma proves equal to the emergency, if he determines to discharge his duties for the benefit of the people of Cuba, he may overcome much of this prejudice.

Cranborne's Statement.

Some republican newspapers declare that the announcement made by Lord Cranborne in the house of commons tending to show Great Britain's friendship for the United States during the late war, was made at this time for the purpose of mellowing the enthusiasm of the reception to be accorded Prince Henry of Prussia.

Those who have carefully watched the trend of affairs on this side of the Atlantic within the past three months, and with relation to the Boer war, will not believe that Prince Henry's proposed visit had anything to do with Lord Cranborne's announcement. The British ministry recognize, even before some of the statesmen in our own country do, that the sympathy in this country for the Boers is beginning to assume substantial and practical form. Something must be done to check the tide, else the politicians at Washington may be persuaded that they cannot afford to ignore this strong popular sentiment.

Lord Cranborne's statement is to the effect that immediately before our war with Spain, the British minister received a communication from other European powers suggesting the presentation of a note to the president. According to Lord Cranborne, the British ministry agreed to join with the other powers in a note expressing the hope that the negotiations might lead to a peaceful settlement, acceptable to the United States, for the preservation of order in Cuba; and Lord Cranborne added that the British government first took steps to ascertain whether the presentation of such a note, as well as its terms, would be acceptable to the United States. The British government, however, according to Lord Cranborne, declined to associate itself with the other subsequent proposals which seemed open to the objection of putting pressure on the government of the United States and offering an opinion on its actions.

It is alleged that Austria took the lead in this affair and British statesmen would have it appear that but for England's opposition to it, the plan would have been carried out.

Germany, however, denies that she had any part in anything partaking of the spirit of intervention, nor did she support any such proposition made by any other power. Austrian authorities make frank confession. They say that the relations of Austria and Spain led Austria, before the declaration of war, to begin a "peace propaganda" which was carried on not only in England, but throughout Europe. Germany and Russia main-