

pinos, like the Americans, prefer to be men even in poverty, rather than subjects in luxury. They prefer self-respect even at the cost of great suffering rather than be serfs under a millennial government provided by a master."

"A self-imposed burden," says this Filipino, "however heavy, may be borne with cheerfulness; it does not crush the soul. But when one is compelled to bear even a feather weight the free spirit implanted by God in man begins to rebel. This was true of the American patriots of 1776. The tax on tea did not seriously touch any one's pocket, but it touched everyone's pride."

How very similar this is to some of the things said by our own forefathers!

Indeed, if one did not know that a Filipino were writing these things, one might suspect that they came from the pen of Benjamin Franklin. It will be remembered that when Franklin was asked who was to be the judge as to the propriety of a tax, he said: "Those who feel can best judge."

Read what this Filipino says of the determination of his people to obtain that which, according to American tradition, are their simple rights. "There is not a man," says this Filipino, "in the forty-five states of this great union who could or would suffer a foreign flag to wave in authority over his country;" and he adds, "In this respect the Filipinos do not differ from the Americans."

He declares that the Filipino knows that national freedom has always been paid for at the terrible cost of blood and tears, and that he knows also—and many years ago gave expression to that knowledge—that his would be no exception to the unvaried rule. Yet he determined to pay the price. And Lopez declares: "It is the most tragic irony of fate that the nation foremost in the defense of national liberty, the nation that has itself paid the penalty and obtained the prize, should be the one to exact this terrible penalty from the Filipino. There will be no glory in the achievement and no one will envy the victor. The penalty will fall with greater force upon the spoiler than upon the spoiled. The victims will become subject, the victors abject."

And this Filipino says that which is known by all intelligent men: "A promise of ultimate independence or even an intimation that such is the policy of the administration would remove not only all cause for a continuance of armed conflict, but all the sorrow of heart and bitterness of spirit on the part of the weaker contestant. Under such a promise the Filipinos would willingly yield everything that America is now demanding or can in righteousness demand and there would be additional mutual advantages. The Filipinos would learn of everything that is good in the institutions of America—in its religion, its morality, its wisdom and its law, while America would have a wider market for its products, a new field for commercial enterprises and a basis of trade and military operations in the far east. There would also be the rebirth of a republic in that quarter of the globe where liberty has been sought by one small struggling people and where despotism has been the nightmare of millions of the human race."

Does any intelligent man believe that these are the utterances of the representative of a savage race?

Did not every American breast swell with pride when the Cuban people, freed from oppression and helped on their way to the establishment of a republic, laid their tribute of love and gratitude at our feet?

Would not the American breast swell with pride; would not the American heart beat a bit faster, and would not the American pulse take on a new thrill if the same tribute which came to us from Cuba could come to us, in all sincerity, from the Philippines?

And why may not that tribute be paid?

Why may not this, the greatest of all na-

tions, justify its right to that high title?

There was no "scuttle policy" in Cuba and there need be no "scuttle policy" in the Philippines. It is the policy of genuine republicanism, the policy of Christianity, the policy of truth and of righteousness—the only policy which freemen can know.

Let this nation announce at once its purpose to give independence to the Filipinos as soon as a stable government is established—let this promise be given and it will be easy to establish a stable government there.

To Americans in Cuba.

On the afternoon of May 20 a number of Americans residing in Cuba assembled at the Inglaterra hotel to celebrate the birth of the Cuban republic. Senator Jones, chairman of the democratic national committee, Senator Money, Senator Mason, ex-Senator Thurston and Congressman De Armond, all of whom attended the inauguration as representatives of the New York Journal, were called out and made speeches appropriate to the occasion. A committee was then sent to the Pasaje hotel for Mr. Bryan. The substance of his speech is given below:

Gentlemen: It is always pleasant to meet American citizens anywhere, and it is especially pleasant to join them in rejoicing at the fulfillment of the promise made by our nation to Cuba. This has been a proud day for American citizens, and it has been gratifying to witness the affection manifested by the Cubans toward the Americans. You who are residing in Cuba and yet holding your allegiance to the United States will be the recipients of the good will entertained toward our nation, and as you will profit by this tribute of respect paid to the United States remember that it imposes upon you a responsibility.

Because our nation has acted honorably with the Cubans, American citizenship is admired and loved, but you must not forget that ultimately the feeling entertained toward our country will depend upon the manner in which American citizens behave in Cuba. You who desire to deal fairly with the Cubans are vitally interested in preventing any American from dealing fraudulently or unfairly with them, for the faults of the guilty will embarrass the innocent. If you desire to make Cuba a permanent home and identify yourselves with the Cuban people, you will doubtless receive a cordial welcome from the Cubans. If, however, you are here only to make money and then return to the United States, bear in mind that Cuba belongs to the Cubans, and that you have no right to expect a welcome here unless you bring as much in value as you take away. Your relations with the Cubans will be pleasant as long as the advantages are reciprocal, but if you attempt to secure a great deal and give little or nothing in return you will be sure to arouse resentment and antagonism.

When you are the recipient of a kindness you become obligated to return it. When you do a kindness you earn a return, and as a man is bankrupt when he owes more than he has or is due to him, so you will fail of real success here if you do not have more coming to you from the Cubans in the way of gratitude than you owe to them.

There is much that Americans can do for Cubans that Cubans will want done and will be willing to pay for, but there is nothing that we should attempt to do against the will, or to the disadvantage, of the Cubans.

The Cuban people have elected a president who is honest and well-meaning, and who feels kindly toward the Americans. Let the Americans who reside in Cuba hold up his hands and strengthen him by their sympathy and their counsel; let them ask of him nothing that he cannot grant with honor to himself and with profit to his people. In dealing with the officials of the Cuban

government do nothing that will make them think less of our nation or of the integrity of our public servants. If an American attempts to corrupt a Cuban official the Cubans will be led to measure our officials by the same standard. If any Cuban official departs from the path of integrity, let not the blame for his departure fall upon an American. It is as dishonorable to corrupt as to be corrupted.

I believe that the Cubans are able to govern themselves. If any failure comes it is more likely to come from the interference of foreigners and from the attempt of outsiders to monopolize the resources of the island than from the incapacity of the people.

In expressing the hope, therefore, that you who have come to Cuba will find your stay here profitable, let me add the wish that you may be as useful to the Cubans as their island is profitable to you, so that when you return to the United States they will feel toward you as they do toward the government which at noon today took its flag from the island.

Tariff and Trusts

The Chicago Tribune, republican, has concluded that it may be possible for the United States to learn something from New Zealand. New Zealand has in its protective tariff law a provision that in a case where evidence is forthcoming that a particular duty is leading to the formation of trusts or combinations, it may be suspended. The Tribune says,

Nobody, except a stockholder in a trust, can question the abstract justice of such a provision. Protection is designed to foster young and struggling industries and to keep them on their feet until they can walk alone. When a "trust," in the generally accepted meaning of the word, is formed the natural presumption is that the protection which has been given the industry controlled by the "trust" is misused. If the United States made the New Zealand amendment a part of every tariff law, the tariff on goods the domestic production of which is controlled by "trusts" could be suspended without awakening the fear of a general revision of the tariff. Today, for example, the average man believes that the tariff on steel is an injustice because it frequently enables the United States steel corporation to exact unreasonably high prices from domestic consumers. But he also feels that he would rather put up with the injustice for awhile longer than have business conditions upset by the wholesale overhauling of the Dingley law which would follow an attempt to modify the steel schedule. However, if the New Zealand amendment were already an integral part of the Dingley law the same man would advise its immediate application to the steel tariffs. Since history began, young men have learned from their elders and old nations have learned from new ones. It may be possible for the United States to learn something from New Zealand.

The Tribune could have found a similar hint in the Kansas City platform which declares that "Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of the trusts upon the free list, to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection."

But if the fear of a wholesale overhauling of the tariff law is to keep the republican party from adopting a plan of which the Tribune says "nobody except a stockholder in a trust can question the abstract justice of such a provision," why has not the republican party enacted a law authorizing the president, under certain conditions, to place the products of trusts on the free list?

When Mr. Bryan was a member of the house of representatives, he introduced a bill which provided that whenever any federal circuit court should find that a trust existed in restraint of any article upon which duties are levied by the tariff law, it should be the duty of the court to report the fact so found to the president specifying each and every such article. It was then made a duty of the president, upon the receipt of such report, to issue his proclamation placing each and every such article then imported into the United States upon the free list, and fixing the time, not exceeding thirty days from the receipt of the findings of the court, at which such article or articles should be admitted free of duty.

The Tribune might recommend that the republican party authorize the president to act upon the New Zealand plan, which is also the plan provided for in the Kansas City platform.