

CURRENT TOPICS

A NEWSPAPER dispatch from Washington says: "As a result of the recent elections in the Philippines, war department officials have concluded that the Filipino people are wholly unfit for self-government—even for the small measure of self-government provided for by existing law. It is planned to ask congress, at its next session, to repeal the enactment providing for gradual participation of the natives in their governing, and return to absolute military control. Should congress listen to the war office and act upon its advice, it would mean a set back of at least half a century in its scheme for westernizing the little brown men of the Pacific islands. All the labors of the past nine years would go for naught, and the condition of the Filipinos so far as civil liberty is concerned, would be little better than it was in the days of Spanish rule."

COMMENTING on the above dispatch the Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer says: "Evidences multiply of the criminal folly of defeating Bryan on an American platform in 1900, and electing McKinley and Roosevelt on practically a Russian platform. The reason why the recent election in the Philippines is not approved at Washington is the same as that which caused despotic Russia to dissolve the duma, viz: the patriotic people, in the face of carefully devised plans to bring about a different result, elected patriots, instead of the hirelings of the Washington or the St. Petersburg government, to represent them. The moral is: Let Americans dethrone autocratic government at Washington and themselves get out of the Philippines—both things as soon as possible. In fact, the one will follow the other."

THE ELKHART (Ind.) Truth prints the following: "John D. Rockefeller and the Standard Oil company are not in it with some of the manufacturers with whom we deal," said W. F. Stanton of the Hill store today. This remark was apropos of the high price being charged for clothing and different articles sold in dry goods stores. "It is simply outrageous the way these manufacturers have advanced prices," continued Mr. Stanton. "Oil is cheap in comparison with some goods we buy—cotton for instance. Cotton has advanced from forty to one hundred per cent in the last few years. Other goods are up in proportion. Umbrellas that we used to sell for \$2.75, now cost us \$3. Especially have the prices advanced on articles that are protected by the tariff. I believe American industries should be protected to the extent of seeing that the laborers make a good living, but the tariff should not be made so high that the public can be robbed."

SECRETARY OF War Taft was given many ovations in Japan and he delivered several speeches which the Associated Press says aroused the wildest enthusiasm. Referring to one very cordial address of welcome the Associated Press says: "In replying Mr. Taft spoke with deep feeling and positiveness. He asserted that the talk of unfriendliness between the United States and Japan was 'due entirely to the commercialism of the newspapers in America.' The secretary declined to discuss the immigration question, saying that he would trespass upon the field of state department. Mr. O'Brien would say that the entire matter was 'easy of sensible argument between sensible men.'"

IN HIS SPEECH Mr. Taft said: "War between Japan and the United States would be a crime against modern civilization. It would be insane. Neither the people of Japan nor the people of the United States desire war. The governments of the two countries would strain every point to avoid an awful catastrophe. Neither would gain anything. Japan has undertaken with the legitimate interests of so close a neighbor to reform and rejuvenate the kingdom that is governed, or misgoverned, by fifth century methods. His majesty the emperor has shown his appreciation of the difficult task by

sending to Korea Japan's greatest statesman. No matter what the reports may be, no matter what criticism may be uttered, the world will have confidence that Prince Ito and the Japanese government are pursuing a policy in Korea which will make for justice, civilization and the welfare of a backward people. Why should Japan wish for war? It must stop or seriously delay the execution of her plans for the reform of Korea. Why should the United States wish for war? It would change her in a year or more into a military nation. Her great resources would be wasted in a vast equipment which would serve no good purpose but would tempt the nation into warlike policies. Why should she wish for war, in which all the evils of society flourish and all vultures fatten? She is engaged in establishing a government of law and order in the Philippines, fitting those people by general education to govern themselves."

CONCERNING the proposition to dispose of the Philippines, Mr. Taft said: "It has been suggested that we might relieve ourselves of this burden by the sale of the islands to Japan or some other country. The suggestion is absurd. Japan does not wish for the Philippine islands; she has problems of a similar nature nearer home. More than this, the United States could not sell the islands to another power without the grossest violation of its obligations to the Philippine people. Under these circumstances, then, could there be anything more wicked, more infamous than the suggestion of war between two nations who have enjoyed such time-honored friendship and with nothing to fight for? Some ask, why such reports and rumors of war? The capacity of certain members of the modern press for sensational dispatches to give rise to unfounded reports has grown with improvement of communication between distant parts of the world. The desire to sell papers, the desire for political reasons to embarrass the existing government or other, and even less justifiable motives have led to misstatements, misconstructions and unfounded guesses, all worked into terrifying headlines which have no foundation whatever. In each country, doubtless there are irresponsible persons, that a war would or might make prominent who try to give seriousness to such discussions. But when one considers the real feelings of the two people as a whole; when one considers the situation from the standpoint of the sanity and real patriotism of each country, it is difficult to characterize in polite, moderate language the conduct of those who are attempting to promote misunderstandings and ill feeling between the two countries."

AN ASSOCIATED Press dispatch under date of Washington, September 30, says: "Before leaving Washington, the president instructed Admiral Cowles to inform the American bidders for supplying coal to the battleship fleet that the president would be willing to award the contract, provided bids were not more than fifty per cent in excess of foreign bids. They have been given until Wednesday to reply."

REFERRING to the coal purchases the New York Evening Post says: "Two hundred thousand dollars in excess of the bids of foreign contractors, the president is willing to pay to American ships for carrying the coal for the fleet to the Pacific. But no more. When it comes to paying a superfluous million dollars the presidential gorge rises. Why should it? What has the republican party been doing all these years but teaching the public that foreigners much be prevented from getting American money at any cost, and that the true purpose of government is to make money for certain favored Americans? Anybody who has a shipyard has long been regarded as having a special claim on government pay; and the exclusion of all foreign ships from our coastwise trade has made ship-owners feel that the government was a silent partner in their enterprise. Now that they are to receive a bonus of \$200,000 they will doubtless forget any longer to marvel at the government's setting itself up to violate

the very laws it compels its citizens to obey, and will no longer growl because the administration has hired a British naval reserve steamer to run on its Panama line. Some good has plainly come out of this mischievous cruise. It has given the public another admirable lesson in what happens when there is a high tariff and a statutory restriction of trade. All Mr. Roosevelt's jauntiness in bestowing the gift of \$200,000 upon the ship owners will not prevent thousands of Americans from perceiving that they are the victims of a conspiracy to save one set of men from business competition, when others have to work out their own salvation without government coddling."

CLEVELAND, Ohio, dispatch to the Cincinnati Enquirer says: "Bishop Daniel Sylvester Tuttle, of the diocese of Missouri, primate of the Episcopal church in the United States, has joined the critics of President Roosevelt by supporting John D. Rockefeller in the latter's complaint that the administration is a runaway affair. Bishop Tuttle is in Cleveland, to attend the dedication of the great Trinity Cathedral. Asked his views on the present status of national affairs, Bishop Tuttle said: 'The present is an era of unreasonable and unreasoning clamor, both on the part of the people generally and on the part of the federal government. To an extent I agree with John D. Rockefeller when he calls it a runaway administration. The attitude of the government is neither just to the large corporations against which its crusade is aimed nor just to the people who are behind the movement. It is exaggerated. When we as a nation settle down, there will come a wholesome, stable, though I do not say kindly, at least a just public opinion which will bring a reasonable situation to pass. We declare we are being oppressed—strangled, if you will—by monopolies. This is not so. Taking advantage of this cry, we have begun actions against these corporations which are not prosecutions. They really are persecutions to a certain extent. In a little while we will begin to see that we are going at the thing too harshly. We and the president will find there is another side to the fight and that there is much to say for the corporations. I think our railroad presidents, our corporation heads will begin to see the rule of brotherly love is strong and that to prosper they must live up to it.'"

MR. ROOSEVELT is not greatly pleased with the platform adopted by the Nebraska republicans. A Washington dispatch to the Omaha World-Herald says: "The president told Senator Burkett all about his mixed emotions today, when the latter called on him, following his arrival in the city. The president is pleased with the indorsement of Taft, and hugely disgusted with the anti-injunction plank in the platform. Judging by the order in which he referred to the two matters, his displeasure with the platform declaration is more acute than his satisfaction with the Taft indorsement. The senator was shown into the public reception room, where there was a group of congressmen, senators and other people, and when the president greeted him it was with the prompt declaration that he didn't at all like that anti-injunction plank. He talked with the greatest frankness in the hearing of a considerable company, declaring that it was revolutionary in character and altogether wrong. Senator Burkett did not attempt to argue the matter at that time, and made no explanation. Toward the senator the president was very cordial, and he turned from discussion of the offensive plank to reference to the Taft indorsement, which had greatly pleased him. He wanted the Nebraska republicans to know how much he appreciated what they had done in this direction. Senator Burkett presented Bishop Williams of Omaha to the president, and the bishop had a pleasant talk. When the senator left the cabinet room and appeared before the newspaper men outside, he told them that while Nebraska had indorsed Taft he was positive that the whole west was still for Roosevelt, and intimated the strong impression that the president might yet be nominated in spite of his declinations. Later in the day, following an appointment made at his first