

voted to British rule, notwithstanding that it was alien in its origin and is still virtually so to a considerable extent as regards the personnel of the higher branches of the Executive administration. is inconceivable to them and can be made plain, if at all, only by occasional public expressions of loyalty on the part of responsible leaders who cannot be suspected of a desire to flatter Government from interested motives. Perhaps, also, it will enable them to understand why India is an exception to the general rule in Western countries, if we explain that the people of India are divided by sectarian and provincial jealousies of an acute character which makes them, for all practical purposes, as much aliens to one another as the British are to them. . . . The only unifying force in the country at present, besides its geography, its sunshine and its general poverty, is British rule: all else is distractingly divided. And even British rule, unfortunately for us, and also, we think, for its own stability, is betraying a tendency to adapt itself to the separatist and fissiparous tendencies of Indian society rather than to maintain itself as a constraining influence on such tendencies."



This statement has a wider application than that made by the editor. It shows the danger that lies in the attempt of any people to aid by force the people of any other country, whether it be India or Mexico. It also shows the futility of the efforts of a small band of enthusiasts to establish by force political institutions for which the people, as a whole, are not ready. Government, like all things else, is subject to the law of evolution; and since it is wholly a human relation, it must necessarily be in accord with the people over whom it exercises authority. It cannot be in accord with all the people, but it must be in harmony with the major part. And when it is realized that the same substance may have various forms, and be known by different names, it will be seen how far away the Indian Republic is. As the English monarchy is just as liberal as the American Republic, so the British rule in India may, for the present, be more beneficial than that of native princes. The young men of India who have been educated in Europe and America, and who have become enamored of the western idea of individual liberty, return to preach the gospel of freedom to their countrymen. They are doing a great work through their press, and through their personal devotion. But they must not make the mistake of supposing that the change effected in them by a few years' residence abroad can be wrought in the masses at home in a like period. This is a work, not of years, but of

generations; and the best friends of India are not the impatient force-party, but those men and women who are working along educational lines.

S. C.



Cheap Education.

Insufficient as are teachers' salaries in this country, they are princely as compared with those of some other countries. English teachers, according to the findings of a member of Parliament, are paid almost incredibly low salaries. Men principals having certificates receive \$17 a week, women principals \$12; men assistants receive \$12.25, and women assistants \$9. Teachers without certificates receive as low as \$6.25 for men, and \$5 for women. What kind of talent and service can such a wage command? Is it any wonder that English servants "know their place"? When the aristocracy and the nobility have such splendid schools as Eaton and Harrow, Oxford and Cambridge, while the workers have but a few months under the tutelage of five-dollar-a-week teachers in crowded rooms, is there any likelihood of confusing the classes with the masses? These masses have made England the richest nation in the world; they support the largest military establishment and the wealthiest aristocracy; yet their children have a few months' schooling at the hands of scantily paid teachers. Truly, the stupidity of man is past comprehending!

S. C.



How News Is Manufactured.

How some newspapers misrepresent public sentiment is shown by a recent incident implicating John R. McLean's Cincinnati Enquirer. Recently the following telegram was received by the Elkhart, Indiana, Progressive Democrat:

Cincinnati, Ohio, April 10, 1914.

Some Reliable Newspaper Man, Elkhart, Ind.:

Please file early Friday evening 300 words showing unfavorable sentiment in your section toward President Wilson's stand on Panama canal tolls. Interview big business men and get them to say something hot.

ENQUIRER.

The newspaper men who received this particular message happen to be truly reliable, however they may appear from John R. McLean's point of view. They not only refused to become parties to this plot to deceive the public, but exposed it. It would be interesting to learn to what extent public opinion has been misrepresented through fake interviews obtained in this way. These methods have probably not been confined to the canal tolls question, nor to the Cincinnati Enquirer. How much