

General Kitchener has authorized one Vilonel, who claims to be a Boer, to raise a corps of men to fight his countrymen. It is now in order for the British government to withdraw its objection to the installation of Colonel Arthur Lynch, the Irishman, who, while serving as a Boer colonel, was elected to parliament. If Vilonel has a right to lead a force of men against his countrymen, why may not an Irishman like Lynch lead a force of men who are struggling for liberty and for home? And if the people who elected Lynch are to be condemned for their choice, what shall be said of Kitchener who encourages a Boer to fight against his own people?



General Wheaton is reported to have said that in the Philippines men have been sent to prison for such remarks as were made by Mr. Jacob Schurman in his Boston speech. Mr. Schurman replies to General Wheaton with the statement that if this be true, "it is the saddest and most discouraging truth that has come to us for a long time from the Philippine islands." Mr. Schurman adds: "I am with President Roosevelt and against General Wheaton." But the indications are that Mr. Schurman has misinterpreted President Roosevelt's policy. Certainly Mr. Roosevelt has said nothing to indicate that he is by any means in sympathy with the suggestions made by Mr. Schurman in his Boston speech.



In his speech before the Iowa legislature, Senator Dolliver said: "Nobody is any longer blind to the fact that with many of the industries in the United States the rates of duty which in 1897 were eminently proper have, owing to the curious development of our commercial life, become unnecessary and in many cases absurd. They stand no longer on our statute books as a shield to American labor, but in many cases as a weapon of offense against the American market itself." What will Senator Dolliver do by way of destroying this "weapon of offense against the American market itself?" Will Senator Dolliver acquiesce in "these absurdities," or will he exert his great influence to correct the evils?



Before retiring from office Governor Shaw, the Iowan who becomes secretary of the treasury, made public his pardon list. This list shows that during the last two years Governor Shaw has pardoned 473 convicts. Of the number released 22 have been guilty of murder, 38 of offenses against women, 20 of fraud, 14 of manslaughter, 18 of forgery, 5 of perjury, 4 of embezzlement, and 128 of robbery. It is stated that the extensiveness of this list was a great surprise to the people of Iowa. It is eminently proper that an executive should exercise the pardon privilege, and yet it would seem that the republican party of Iowa owes the people of that state an explanation. Either something is radically wrong with the judicial machinery of Iowa, or something is radically wrong in the chief executive's office.



Commandant Scheepers of the Boer army, who was recently executed by the British, was arrested while he was an inmate of the hospital. Resolutions were introduced in the United States senate and the lower house protesting against the execution of this man, but before these resolutions were made public Scheepers' life had been taken. Scheepers' arrest, under the circumstances, is said to be in violation of the rules of civilized warfare, and his

execution is termed by those familiar with the circumstances, as a blot upon civilization. Senator Teller, who introduced the Scheepers resolution in the senate, announces that he will have something to say on this resolution, even though its original purpose has been defeated by Scheepers' execution. He proposes to use it not only as an expose of the unfairness and the brutality of the British authorities, but he will employ it as a text in protesting against the reconcentration plan proposed by General Bell of the United States army in the Philippine islands. Senator Teller will have the cordial thanks of the men and women who are opposed to barbarity, injustice and wrong, from whatever quarter they may come. It is significant that many of these evils are beginning now to attract very general public attention.



Speaking of the proposition that the greenbacks be retired, the Chicago Chronicle says: "The only demand of that kind comes from those patriots who wish to serve their country and incidentally put money in their own pockets by issuing bank notes not specifically secured to take the place of the greenbacks." What right has the Chronicle to assign ulterior motives to the men who lay awake nights in the effort to preserve the honor and integrity of the country? Did not the people in 1896 and in 1900 declare in favor of the single gold standard and is not greenback retirement an essential feature of that policy? Why then protest against the carrying into effect of the popular will? Why deny to the national bank patriots the privilege of realizing upon their twin victories? Democrats can protest against the retirement of the greenbacks, but the Chronicle cannot do so consistently.



It is announced that Mr. Roosevelt has decided to remove Mr. McClain, the internal revenue collector at Philadelphia. According to the same report, Mr. McClain is to be succeeded by Mr. McCoach, one of Senator Quay's lieutenants. It is said that no charges have been preferred against Mr. McClain, but he committed an unpardonable sin when he supported the reform ticket against the Quay machine at the recent election. It was generally admitted that the Quay machine should have been defeated. It represented all that was bad in politics; and when one recalls Mr. Roosevelt's boasted record with relation to the civil service, he is inclined to ask, "What mighty influence has worked so great a change in the gentleman now occupying the presidency, that he will yield to the clamor of politicians and remove a capable public official simply because that official was brave enough to oppose a corrupt political machine?"



Captain Richmond P. Hobson responded to the toast, "The Navy," at the board of trade banquet on the evening of January 28. Captain Hobson advocated an increase in the number of warships. Senator Hanna made a speech at the same banquet in which he complimented Captain Hobson upon his speech and said that he agreed with it. He desired to offer this amendment: "Do not spend all your money on warships; give us a few merchant vessels; give us something to protect. We ask a fair divide." It is not at all likely that the interests which Senator Hanna represents will fail to obtain a "fair divide." Senator Hanna did not mean that the government was to build and operate a "few merchant vessels." He meant that the ship subsidy bill should be passed, thus requiring the government to pay immense sums of public money to men in order to persuade them to engage in a profitable business. This is what Senator Hanna calls a "fair divide." There has

been altogether too much of the "divide" theory among republican statesmen. They have preached the "fair divide" theory until they have come to believe that the government is operated solely for the purpose of providing lucrative "divides" for republican statesmen having influence with the republican administration. But there are some people in this country who would like to make an amendment to the amendment. These believe that the people who support the government are entitled to a fair divide. And yet if one-tenth of the propositions for which republican statesmen stand sponsors are carried out, the people will not only fail to obtain a fair divide, but they will not even be participants in the division while being required to bear all the burdens.



In his message to congress President Roosevelt said: "We are extremely anxious that the natives (of the Philippines) shall share the power of governing themselves. We hope to do for them what has never been done before for any people of the tropics—to make them fit for self-government after the fashion of the really free nations." To be sure this sentence was fearfully and wonderfully made so far as the conveyance of any meaning is concerned, but Charles Emory Smith, former postmaster general, writing in his newspaper, the Philadelphia Press, explains President Roosevelt's meaning. In his Boston speech, Jacob Schurman interpreted this statement of Mr. Roosevelt as an explicit declaration in favor of independence for the Filipinos. Mr. Smith declares that Mr. Schurman has made a sad mistake. Mr. Smith, referring to Mr. Schurman, says: "He confounds liberty—ample, complete, inspiring liberty—with sovereignty. He confounds autonomous self-government with independence." Mr. Smith assures us that there is no difference between the position of Mr. McKinley and that of Mr. Roosevelt with respect to the Philippines, the people of the Philippines are to have "ample, complete, inspiring liberty." But to all this "ample, complete, inspiring liberty," there is to be attached a string—that old autonomous string, made hateful to men aspiring for liberty in every period of the world's history.



A newspaper correspondent, having interviewed Governor Shaw, the new secretary of the treasury, says:

Will Suit Wall Street.	Governor Shaw is not an enemy of "asset banking," neither does he advocate it. He thinks an elastic currency can be provided without resort to that method. At the same time he is not afraid of letting the bankers control the volume of currency.
-------------------------------	--

But the governor, in his own words, says that he is in favor of an elastic currency and adds: "If I believed there was no other way to secure an elastic currency other than asset currency, then I should advocate such an issue."

If, after this, any doubt as to the governor's position on the asset currency scheme exists, his later words would set all doubt at rest. Governor Shaw said:

I repeat that currency based on assets contains, in my judgment, no element of danger except prejudice. This will vanish as the question is discussed and explained by those who make a study of it, and the depositor would be in no worse condition than now.

Soon after Mr. Shaw's appointment was announced it was reported that Wall street was considerably exercised lest the new secretary of the treasury might introduce new methods in the department and might be inclined to repudiate the policies which Mr. Gage advocates. It seems safe, however, to say that Wall street has nothing to fear from the new secretary of the treasury. He seems to believe in the same things that Mr. Gage believed in, and unless all signs fail, the new secretary of the treasury will in short order become quite as much of a favorite in Wall street as was his distinguished predecessor.