

too; while they are not numerous and while they are not large in membership, they enjoy all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Catholic church or any other church, and the protestant missionaries who go to Mexico are just as free to preach their doctrines in Mexico as a Catholic priest is to present his views and the beliefs of his church to protestants in the United States. The same can be said of Cuba, which is also a Catholic country.

The doctrine that "God is using the wars of our times for the evangelization of the nations" is not only an assumption, but it is an exceedingly dangerous doctrine. If those who believe in the protestant form of the Christian faith have the right to wage war against a Catholic country for a religious purpose, then the people of a Catholic country have a right to wage war against a protestant nation for a religious purpose. Who will defend such a barbarous doctrine? If the United States can justify the subjugation of a Catholic country for a religious purpose, then is there not danger that people who apply that doctrine to our nation's dealing with other nations, may apply the same doctrine in the United States, and attempt to justify the forcing of one form of religion upon those of another denomination or religion?

Christ's gospel was a gospel of peace. While its introduction creates a contest between the Christian ideals and the ideals of Mammon, it does not justify the use of force in the propagation of that gospel. If there is not something in the heart to which the religion of Christ can successfully appeal there is certainly no way in which it can be introduced into man by a surgical operation.

A line must be drawn, and it is a distinct line, between the utilization of an existing condition and the creation of that condition. No one would attempt to justify the burning of a town, and yet after the town is burned people, accepting the situation, may take advantage of the burning to improve the town in a way that they might not have been able to do before the fire. Instances have been known where a disastrous season has turned attention to new crops that have proved greatly beneficial to the people of that section, and yet no one should justify the sending of a drought or a flood in the hope that good might come out of it. So with wars. It is proper to make the most of the condition which follows a war, and yet no one could afford to assume responsibility for a war in the hope of producing the condition. It is proper for the representatives of all branches of the Christian church to present their ideas and to give expression to their beliefs, but no one can justify a colonial policy on the ground that it may be utilized to advance any form of religion.

Those who attempt to interpret Providence often make the mistake of considering the good that comes out of the evil, without considering the good that might have been done without the evil. In order to make a fair comparison one must understand what can be done peacefully as well as what is done violently. It is impossible to see both what has been done and what might have been done, and, therefore, comparison is difficult. The only sound method of argument is to reason from the individual to the collection of individuals. We can understand a thing when we see it emphasized in an individual better than when we attempt to look at it as exemplified in a nation. If an individual went about with a club beating people and bruising them and commanding them to live in a certain way, inspiring not love, but terror, we would describe him as a bully and as a braggart. If he acted thus merely because he found pleasure in it, we would condemn his disposition, but if he made money out of his brutality we could call him a robber. No pretense that he was benevolently inclined or that he was only exacting a reasonable compensation for the good that he was doing, would palliate his crimes. If he did this in the name of Christianity we would accuse him of adding hypocrisy to his other sins. But when a nation acts upon the principle of a bully or a highwayman it is sometimes applauded as a world power by those who desire to exercise the power. Sometimes the action is applauded as Providential if a grain of good can be found in a bushel of evil.

We have no difficulty in contrasting the example of an upright man with the example of an evil doer. We recognize the virtues of the man, we recognize the good influence which he exerts upon his community, and we know that the benefits flowing from such a life go on increasing with each new generation forever. Can we doubt that a nation which applies its measure of individual worth to its national greatness does more good than a nation which risks the corruption of

its individual ideals by brutalizing its national purpose?

Imperialism strikes at the principles of our religion as well as at the principles of our government. Love, not force, is the foundation of our religion—love that sacrifices and persuades, not that robust selfishness which boasts of its brute force or hides its mailed hand in the glove of benevolent assimilation. Our missionary societies should study the gospel of the Prince of Peace.

### The Value of an Education.

It should not be necessary to quote eminent authorities as to the importance of an early education and yet there are all too many young people who fail to grasp their opportunities in this respect. To be sure, all of life is education and while the college course does not properly terminate endeavor in this line, it is of the highest importance than the young man and the young woman avail themselves of the opportunity of profiting by a college education.

The wisest men of our times have sought to impress upon the youth of their generation the importance of securing an education, and with the present as with preceding generations, it is important that this wholesome counsel be impressed upon the young. Addison wrote: "What sculpture is to a block of marble, education is to the human soul. The philosopher, the saint, the hero, the wise, and the good or the great very often lie hid and concealed in a plebeian which a proper education might have disinterred and brought to life." Benjamin Franklin wrote that "An investment in knowledge always pays the best interest." Washington wrote: "Promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." Judson wrote: "Planting colleges and filling them with studious young men and women is planting seed for the world." Varle wrote: "Education is the companion which no misfortune can depress—no crime destroy—no enemy alienate—no despotism enslave. At home a friend; abroad an introduction; in solitude a solace; and in society an ornament. Without it what is man? A splendid slave, a reasoning savage."

To be sure, just as John Randolph said: "All the professors and teachers in the world would not make you a wise or a good man without your own co-operation;" but as E. H. Chapin said: "Do not ask if a man has been through college; ask if a college has been through him—if he is a walking university."

The young man or young woman who under disadvantageous circumstances struggles for a college education will certainly appreciate it. Under such circumstances, such a person will not merely seek to go through college. The result will be that the college has gone through the man.

Perhaps it is not possible for everyone to obtain the advantages of a college education. Some are able to surmount the obstacles of life without such an education, but we think it safe to say that the most successful of these will cheerfully testify that their struggle would have been easier had they had the advantages of a college education.

Attention is therefore directed to the offer made by The Commoner, the details of which are stated in another column of this issue. As already stated, the publisher of The Commoner will be gratified if this offer serves as an inducement to a large number of young men and young women to enter college. It is suggested that those who desire to obtain a college education carefully consider The Commoner's proposition and upon application to this office further details will be given.

### Questioning the Juror.

The Chicago Chronicle continues to show signs of agitation because the editor of The Commoner occasionally refers to the fact that the Chronicle is owned by John R. Walsh, a republican banker, and run in the interest of the corporations with which Mr. Walsh is connected. Now, there is no reason why the Chronicle should get angry and hurl epithets at Mr. Bryan.

Is it ashamed to have its owner known? Is he connected with corporations that ought not to be defended? If a juror presents himself for service he is always questioned as to his interest in the case about to be decided; why should an editor or newspaper owner conceal his interest in the matter under consideration? It is because in the eyes of the public, a pecuniary interest in the re-

sult of a case always incapacitates a juror for service in that case and the owner of the Chronicle knows that his connection with the paper would, if known, make it impossible for the paper to have any influence with democrats. But why does he not call the paper a republican paper and thus deal honestly with the public? Because a republican paper could not hurt the democratic party as much or aid his private plans as well as a paper calling itself democratic.

As the Chronicle assumes to sit in judgment on matters affecting the democratic party is ought to be willing to answer questions touching its fitness to serve in the case.

First—What proportion of the Chronicle stock does John R. Walsh own?

Second—In what corporations affected by legislation does John R. Walsh hold stock?

Third—How did John R. Walsh vote in the presidential campaigns of 1896 and 1900?

The Chronicle ought to be willing to answer these questions without compensation, but The Commoner hereby offers the Chronicle five dollars reward for the answer to each question, gold or silver, the answers to be published on the Chronicle's editorial page.

### Another Slap at Miles.

Although General Miles has endeared himself to the people because of his faithful service, present and past republican administrations have marked this old soldier as their victim. By order of President Roosevelt, Colonel C. A. Woodruff, chief commissary in the Philippines, was recently promoted to be a brigadier general, and under the regulations will be promoted to go upon the retired list.

The Washington correspondent for the New York World says that Woodruff's promotion is "regarded as an intended punishment to General Miles for his disclosures concerning the rice transactions in the Philippines." The World correspondent reminds us that Colonel Woodruff was the originator of the system under which tons of rice, much of it second class, was bought with army funds and sold at a profit to Filipino reconcentrados in certain provinces in the island of Luzon. More than 20,000,000 pounds of rice were thus disposed of at a total outlay of \$300,000 in commissary funds. It was claimed in defense of this plan that it was a charitable act made necessary by war and pestilence and that it was intended to sell the rice only at a price that would pay the expenses. But this statement did not correspond with the fact that the system yielded a profit of nearly \$66,000.

On the day that General Davis took command of the Philippines, he ordered the discontinuance of this practice and as the result of his investigations and his orders, the sum of \$66,000, representing certain profits, was paid over to the civil government. The World correspondent reminds us that the rice transaction was severely arraigned by General Miles in his report on the Philippines and was referred to as an open violation of the law and army regulations. In the report of General Miles made public by Secretary Root the reference to the rice transactions was omitted, but subsequently Mr. Root made public the suppressed part of it referring to the rice transaction. Accompanying the correspondence was a letter from General Davis in which he said that the transactions were clearly in violation of the law, and that he had stopped them and ordered the profits turned over to the civil government on the day he took command. General Davis said that there might have been some excuse for these transactions while the island was under military rule, but there was no possible reason for their continuance after peace had been proclaimed.

It is strange that Mr. Roosevelt should lend himself to an attempt to rebuke General Miles by an undeserved promotion, and in this instance it is all the more strange because of the experience which Mr. Roosevelt himself had with Colonel Woodruff. The World correspondent reminds us that at the time of the war with Spain, Colonel Woodruff bought nearly 1,000,000 pounds of canned beef, one-third of which had been shipped back from Europe. This was the material which Mr. Roosevelt, then a colonel, testifying in the beef investigation, declared was "an utterly unfit and utterly unwholesome ration."

The World correspondent says that hundreds of Colonel Roosevelt's Rough Riders were made sick by the canned beef and that his testimony against it was the strongest brought out in the investigation. Colonel Woodruff, in his examination, testified that he had served in the army in the far west prior to 1878 and that during all his service there he had never seen beef on the hoof served to the troops, but this testimony was in