

particular case their interests and ours happened to be identical.

"Who saved us," therefore, is a question that is securing more attention than its importance justifies.

### Extinguishing Liberty's Torch.

An Associated press dispatch under date of New York, February 14, conveys this information:

Liberty's torch is to be put out.

The lofty light in the hand of the bronze goddess, standing on Bedloe island, in the upper New York bay, that has been allowed to grow steadily dimmer since Bartholdi gave the magnificent statue to the United States, is to be permanently extinguished.

Sentiment, it is said, which has kept the beacon burning all these years, can no longer keep it alight, and now the government will snuff it for all time.

News of the contemplated extinguishment of the torch has been received here in the form of a notice to mariners, sent out by the lighthouse board of the treasury department at Washington.

It states that on March 1, 1902, the light will be discontinued.

Installed on the island to furnish current for the torch there is a powerful electric plant, but it is unused. A few lamps of small power furnish barely enough illumination so that the beacon can be made out by passing mariners.

Lack of a congressional appropriation is said to be the cause for discontinuing the light.

At one time the representatives of the American people were very ready to do anything that would keep alive those fine American sentiments, the cultivation of which has had much to do with the preservation and progress of this republic. But now we are told that liberty's torch is to be "put out" on Bedloe island. "Lack of congressional appropriation is said to be the cause for discontinuing the light."

To be sure. Where is the reason for making an appropriation to direct public attention to the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World" when the same body that would make the appropriation has gone out from "liberty's unclouded blaze" and has become a panderer to monarchical notions and old world fads?

With what reason shall we ask a republican congress to make an appropriation for the Bartholdi statue when we have no protest to make against the encouragement by that body of a war of conquest, the refusal of that body to do anything to give hope to the two republics of South Africa, and the readiness with which that body makes appropriations and does acts designed to show a partiality on the part of this republic for the empire that is battling against our brethren in South Africa?

If "liberty's torch" in the hearts of men has been extinguished, perhaps it is just as well that "liberty's torch" on Bedloe island be "put out"; but let us hope that the people will yet make an effective protest against imperialism.

### Oppose Colonialism.

A memorial brought from the Philippines by Governor Taft has been transmitted to the senate by the secretary of war. The memorial was adopted by the federal party in Manila at an extraordinary session held last November. The federal party represents those Filipinos who favor American sovereignty, but the memorial clearly shows that even the most friendly Filipinos are opposed to colonialism. They want the islands to be a territory with the promise of statehood and point out that the colonial system is working great hardship upon even those Filipinos who have surrendered to the American authorities. The memorial will prove a great educator. The republican leaders have refused to consider the

necessary alternative presented by the Philippine situation. The democrats have pointed out that if we hold the Philippine islands we must either make citizens or subjects out of the Filipinos. If we make subjects out of them we will have to abandon our American principles, plant ourselves upon European doctrines and accustom ourselves to insurrection, uprising and eternal hatred from our subjects. If, on the other hand, we make citizens out of the Filipinos it must be with the idea of full participation in the destiny of the nation. Nothing short of this will be satisfactory—there is no middle ground.

If independence is not to be granted to the Filipinos we must choose between colonialism and the incorporation of the Filipinos into full citizenship. When the rank and file of the republican party understand that there is no escape from these alternatives, they will rise up and demand the independence of the Filipinos not less for the Filipinos' good than for our own safety.

If we attempt to make a territory out of the Philippine islands it will be a territory governed by the Filipinos, for we cannot keep a handful of white men in authority over eight millions of Filipinos without the maintenance of a large standing army there all the time.

The race question which we have in the south will sink into insignificance in comparison with the race question that we will have to meet in the Philippines if we give them a territorial form of government and attempt to insure white supremacy.

Democrats may well thank Governor Taft for bringing this memorial. Nothing could better show how utterly the colonial idea is repudiated in the Philippines. If the only party in the Philippines which is friendly to the United States is thus hostile to a colonial system, how does the republican party expect to defend that system? And if it abandons the colonial idea, will it dare to invite the evils that would follow the giving of a territorial government with the promise of statehood?

The readers of *The Commoner* are urged to call the attention of their republican friends to this memorial and then quote the Kansas City platform, which says:

The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperilling our form of government, and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization or to convert the republic into an empire, 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.

### Roosevelt vs. Protection.

When Theodore Roosevelt wrote "The Life of Thomas H. Benton," he had something to say concerning "protection." On pages 66 and 67 of that book will be found the following:

The vote on the protective tariff law of 1828 furnished another illustration of the solidarity of the west. New England had abandoned her free trade position since 1824 and the north went strongly for the new tariff; the southern seacoast states, except Louisiana, opposed it bitterly; and the bill was carried by the support of the western states, both the free and the slave. This tariff bill was the first of the immediate irritating causes which induced South Carolina to go into the nullification movement. Benton's attitude on the measure was that of a good many other men who, in their public capacity, are obliged to appear as protectionists, but who lack his frankness in stating their reasons. He utterly disbelieved in and was opposed to the principles of the bill, but as it had bid for and secured the interest of Missouri by a heavy duty on lead, he felt himself forced to support it; and he so announced his position. He simply

went with his state precisely as did Webster, the latter, in following Massachusetts' change of front and supporting the tariff of 1828, turned a full and complete somersault. Neither the one nor the other was to blame. Free traders are apt to look at the tariff from a sentimental standpoint, but it is in reality purely a business matter, and should be decided solely on the grounds of expediency. Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice; but if the majority of the people interested wish it, and it affects only themselves there is no earthly reason why they should not be allowed to try the experiment to their heart's content. The trouble is that it rarely does affect only themselves; and in 1828, the evil was peculiarly aggravating on account of the unequal way in which the proposed law would effect different sections. It purported to benefit the rest of the country, but it undoubtedly worked real injury to the planter states and there is small ground for wonder that the irritation over it in the region so effected should have been intense.

What did Mr. Roosevelt mean when he said that "a good many men in their public capacity are obliged to appear as protectionists?" What did he mean when he said, "Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice?" What did he mean when he referred to protection as "the evil" and used the expression "peculiarly aggravating" in citing a specific instance?

Was Author Roosevelt a protectionist or a free trader? In his advocacy of protection today are we to understand he is in the position of a "good many men who, in their public capacity, are obliged to appear as protectionists?" Are we to understand that he gives his support to a policy that is "vicious in theory and harmful in practice," to a policy to which he refers as "the evil" and against his honest sentiment, and is he "obliged" to do as he does in order to maintain his hold upon public office?

### Yes, Why Not.

The Boston Traveller is propounding to its eastern constituency a question which has been propounded in the west for many years and never satisfactorily answered.

The Traveller comments upon ex-Congressman Walker's recent interview and discusses the asset currency plan. Mr. Walker says that the banks are decreasing their circulation because the bonds are selling at too high a premium; to remedy this so-called evil he wants the banks to have authority to issue bank notes on their capital. This is what is called an asset currency. The bank notes instead of resting upon government bonds as they do now are to rest upon and be secured by the bank's assets. The Traveller asks:

Will Mr. Walker kindly tell us why the government does not issue enough greenbacks to cover the deficiency? Surely, if the banks issue their own bills upon the credit of the government, it would be safe enough for the government to issue its own notes direct, without subsidizing the banks.

We are whipping the devil around the stump. Bank bills wouldn't be worth much without the guarantee of the government. Why, then, shouldn't the government replace the bank bills with United States notes? Will Mr. Walker answer this question?

Yes, why not? If bank assets are a good enough basis for currency, why not have the government issue greenbacks based upon the nation's assets? If it is necessary for the government to guarantee a bank note, why can't the government issue the note itself? There is just one answer; because the banks want the government to furnish the security and let them (the banks) make the profit. Sooner or later the people will realize that the government is being run in the interests of the banks, and when that time comes there will be a shaking up of the dry bones.