

may be to Englishmen who are "whistling through the graveyard," can any intelligent man doubt that the truth of the situation in South Africa is being concealed from the English taxpayers?

Roosevelt on Self Government.

One of the most interesting chapters in "The Winning of the West," a work written by Theodore Roosevelt, relates to the Louisiana Purchase. On page 217, volume 4, of this work, Author 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 pupilage. 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 to the whole nation. Nevertheless, all this had to be accepted as part of the penalty paid for free government.

What has happened, since Mr. Roosevelt wrote these words, to destroy the correctness of the general principle which he here laid down? If the guarantee of self-government to the people of the Louisiana purchase was "the only proper ones (position) to take," why is it now entirely proper to deny the principle of self-government in its application to the people of our new possessions?

One of the stock arguments of the imperialist is that the Filipinos would not govern themselves wisely, that they are not capable of self-government, that disorder would prevail during the experimental stage. But Author Roosevelt answered this point well when he said that it mattered little whether these people governed themselves as wisely as they should. In the opinion of Author Roosevelt, "the essential point was that they had to be given the right of self-government," and he added, "they could not be kept in pupilage," a condition to which the republican leaders of today insist upon consigning the Filipinos.

In Author Roosevelt's opinion, "they had to be left to strike out for themselves, to sink or swim according to the measure of their own capacities." To be sure, as Author Roosevelt said, they would commit many blunders, exactly as all men who have engaged in the task of building governments have done; but in Author Roosevelt's opinion, "Nevertheless, all this had to be accepted as part of the penalty paid for free government."

Mr. Roosevelt, the author, had a habit of putting things very bluntly. He did not deviate from his rule in this instance. He made himself understood so clearly that the language he used in enunciating a general principle serves as vigorous condemnation of republican policies of today and on this point is impossible of misconstruction.

Prosperity Unequally Distributed.

Dun's Review has presented a statement seeking to show that "the few have not reaped the benefit of the marvelous advance of prices at the expense of the many." It presents a number of figures showing that prices on the average were 33 per cent higher in 1900 than in 1897. The Review points out that on the basis of prices for July 1, 1897, a man could live one year on \$72.46, while on the basis of present day prices, the feat

The Commoner.

could be accomplished by the expenditure of \$101.59.

The Review's statement is not a fair and candid one. On the contrary, it is thoroughly partisan and in its details does not commend itself to the intelligent man. For instance, one statement which the Review seeks to employ as argument in support of its position is that "Capitalists who formerly received 7 per cent or more on their money are now glad to take 4 or 5 per cent." This is given as one of the indications that the few have not reaped the benefit. The question of interest which capitalists have received on loans is of no importance in this consideration. The few who are benefited through the republican policy by the marvelous increase of prices in the things in which they deal, and increase by no means general, are not those famous "widows and orphans" who loan money, but they are the men who engage in great combinations. No one has ever heard of any of these trust magnates loaning out his money at a cheap rate of interest. The trust field is too inviting a one for him to waste his sweetness on the desert air.

A bulletin published by the United States census bureau just about the time Dun's Review article was made public throws more light on this discussion. The New York World directs attention to this bulletin and says it shows:

That while the capital invested in manufactures increased 51 per cent, the cost of materials 42 per cent, the total value of products 39 per cent, the miscellaneous expenses 63 per cent (which covers the cost of management and includes the higher salaries), the total wages paid increased only 23 per cent, the smallest increase shown in any item of the account.

It is pointed out that the claim of the trusts has been that they did three things; first, reduced cost of production; second, increased wages; third, lowered prices. Commenting on these claims, the World scores a strong point when it says:

But if the census figures and the Dun's Review tables are correct—and nobody has yet challenged them—the first and last of these three claims are both disproved by the cold facts. And as to the second—increased wages—it appears that they have only increased one-third as much as "miscellaneous expenses" (which means cost of production), only half as much as the capital invested or the cost of materials, and only a little more than half as much as the total value of the products.

Why Fool Ourselves Longer?

Stephen Bonsal, the well-known correspondent for the New York Herald, has recently returned from the Philippines. Mr. Bonsal says:

The time has come when we can no longer fool ourselves. It is many months since we were able to fool the world at large about the Philippines. It was all very far away, but it is coming very near to us all now. We can not afford to be "sick" of the Philippines any longer. It has become a question which seriously affects our national health. We had better pay attention now than later on when it may be too late; when we shall have more Balangigas to deplore.

Mr. Bonsal says that Governor Taft, in the construction of the civil government, has done the best in his power with the materials at hand. But, according to Mr. Bonsal:

The flaw in the whole construction is that the civil government edifice is built upon the quicksand of sedition and treason. No matter how cleverly he may build, the whole structure will be overturned some day, and not the day of our choosing. The Filipinos are solidly against American supremacy in any shape or form. If we do not wish to govern them rigidly and by force, for ten or twenty or thirty years, we had better hit upon a scheme to "scuttle," saving appearances as much as possible.

Mr. Bonsal points out that the reported surrenders of conspicuous officers are not in the least significant. The whole archipelago is a hotbed of insurrection and he does not understand "how Governor Taft could have spent last November in

Manila and yet state that all the provinces are pacified with the exception of Batangas and Samar." Mr. Bonsal explains that it is only fair to say of the governor that "he spent this month in the hospital and so could not be so well informed of what was the situation as under other circumstances he probably would have been."

The report of this correspondent must be very discouraging to those who insist that it is the duty of this government to permanently hold possession of the Philippines. The people have been deceived, and deliberately deceived for several years, but as Mr. Bonsal well says, "The time has come when we can no longer fool ourselves." The truth is coming to the surface and men who form conclusions from a patriotic standpoint, must begin to realize that both from the practical and the sentimental point of view, it is to the interest of the United States that they promise to the people of the Philippines independence, which, according to the highest testimony, is the one thing with which they will be content.

Following Convictions.

The Nashville American quotes with approval that portion of Mr. Bryan's speech at Boston in which he commended moral courage and praised Senator Hoar's action in opposing imperialism. The American uses this sentiment as a text for rebuking those who criticised the democratic papers which left the democratic party in 1896 and 1900. The American adds that this has been Mr. Bryan's position on the subject for years. It is true that Mr. Bryan has held and still holds that it is the duty of every one to follow his convictions, and he has never criticised those who left the democratic party because of their convictions. He makes a distinction, however, between those who followed their convictions and those who were under the secret control of corporate interests and spoke not as they thought, but as they were commanded.

If the editor of the American will examine the list of prominent democrats who left the democratic party in '96 (many of whom have since openly joined the republican party), he will be convinced that in many cases it was not a matter of conscience, but a matter of occupation. They were employed by, or interested in, corporations which live by government favoritism and enjoy special privileges to which they have no moral, and should have no legal, right. Many of the democratic papers which left the democratic party in 1896 and have since that time given more space to the abuse of democrats than to the criticism of republican policies—many of these papers are published in the interest of great business enterprises which absolutely control the editorial policy, not in the interest of any party, but to aid or protect the investments of banks, railroads, street car lines or something of that kind. Many railroad and corporation attorneys have sold their citizenship along with their professional services, and instead of honestly admitting the reason for their change of heart, have tried to lay the blame upon their former associates.

Mr. Bryan is grateful to The American for its approval of his sentiments, but he does not want to be placed in the position of excusing those "democrats" who have been more attached to the corporations than to the democratic party.

Senator Gebhardt of New Jersey has introduced a resolution asking for the calling of a constitutional convention proposing an amendment to the constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. Good for Gebhardt! The convention ought to be called if the senate refuses to act, but if the New Jersey legislature will ask its senators to support the bill now pending in the senate a convention may be unnecessary.