

mentally distinct as the European and the African. Syrians garrisoned the Great Wall in Britain for the Roman Empire; but there was less difference between the Syrian and the Ancient Briton than between the white officer and a Waganda or a Yoruba. The Briton and the Syrian were both citizens of the Roman Empire in a sense in which no African can be a citizen of the British Empire for many years to come. There was no color line, differences of civilization were less marked, and there was far greater possibility of personal sympathy between governor and governed. It is assumed, too, that what was done in Canada, Australia and other colonies in the strict sense of the term can be done in Africa. The two cases have nothing in common. The Red Indian and the Australian aborigines have become practically extinct; the African will never die out. He will always remain in an overwhelming numerical superiority to the white man, and over the greater part of Africa that superiority will increase every year. Up to now the African nationality has never come into sharp conflict with European, for the reason that the African as yet has hardly attained to national as distinct from a local and tribal patriotism. Yet imagine the crusade of black man against the white preached in Africa by some black Napoleon—by a Toussaint l'Ouverture, for instance,—as its converse is occasionally preached elsewhere, and the whole fabric of European civilization in Africa would fall like a house of cards. The military training we have given would be turned against us as it was in the Soudanese mutiny in Uganda, and Africa would be lost to Europe, probably beyond recovery. We hope for better things than this. Yet it is as well that we should see the other side of all the glib talk of civilizing Africa. If we begin by recognizing the fact that Europe has before it in Africa a far different task from any yet attempted in past history, we shall have taken the first step towards averting any such danger as we have indicated.—Manchester (Eng.) Guardian.

#### THE BALANCE OF TRADE THEORY IN THE LAST CENTURY.

An extract from a pamphlet entitled "The Decline and Fall of the English System of Finance," by Thomas Paine, published in 1796. This extract appears in the pamphlet in the form of a footnote on page 12.

Among the delusions that have been imposed upon the nation by ministers, to give a false coloring to its affairs, and by none more than by Mr. Pitt, is a motley, amphibious charactered thing

called the balance of trade. This balance of trade, as it is called, is taken from the custom house books, in which entries are made of all cargoes exported and also of all cargoes imported, in each year; and when the value of the exports, according to the price set upon them by the importer, or by the custom house, is greater than the value of the imports, estimated in the same manner, they say the balance of trade is so much in their favor.

The custom house books prove regularly enough that so many cargoes have been exported and so many imported; but this is all that they prove, or were intended to prove. They have nothing to do with the balance of profit or loss; and it is ignorance to appeal to them upon that account; for the case is, the greater the loss is in any one year, the higher will this thing, called the balance of trade, appear to be according to the customhouse books. For example, nearly the whole of the Mediterranean convoy has been taken by the French this year; consequently those cargoes will not appear as imports on the customhouse books, and therefore the balance of trade, by which they mean the profits of it, will appear to be so much the greater as the loss amounts to; and, on the other hand, had the loss not happened, the profits would have appeared to have been so much the less. All the losses happening at sea to returning cargoes, by accidents, by the elements, or by capture, make the balance appear the higher on the side of the exports; and were they all lost at sea, it would appear to be all profit on the customhouse books. Also every cargo of exports that is lost that occasions another to be sent, adds in like manner to the side of the exports, and appears as profit. This year (1796—Editor) the balance of trade will appear high, because the losses have been great by capture and by storms. The ignorance of the British parliament in listening to this hackneyed imposition about the balance of trade, is astonishing. It shows how little they know of national affairs; and Mr. Grey may as well talk Greek to them, as make motions about the state of the nation. They understand fox hunting and the game laws.

#### LET THEM CHOOSE THEIR OWN SYSTEM.

Extracts from the speech of the Hon. Henry U. Johnson, of Indiana, in the house of representatives, Wednesday, January 25, on "The Crime Against the Philippines, and the Evils of Territorial Expansion."

We are told that the Filipinos are

utterly incapable of self-government, and that therefore we should take them under our protection. Sir, are we to travel around among the various islands of the earth to apply our exacting standard of self-government and citizenship to them, and, if they fall short of our inexorable and exalted criterion, impose upon them, against their wishes, our peculiar system? If we do, in the name of God let us select for our victim some nation powerful enough to resist, to the intent that while the world is bound to say that we are aggressors, it cannot truthfully say that we are cowards. Ah, yes, the excuse is that these people are incapable of self-government. . . . When the governments of South America threw off the yoke of Spain, while many of us greeted them with cordiality, there were many pessimists—here and elsewhere who declared that they were utterly incapable of self-government. And yet, through stages of harsh experiment and much travail and difficulty, they have at last succeeded in establishing governments not only satisfactory to themselves, but which have answered reasonably well the requirements of the civilized world.

Sir, it is not true that the Philippine people are incapable of self-government. I grant you that they are alien in race, in language, in habits of thought to ourselves; that they are an inferior civilization, and have not the capacity for such a representative government as ours. . . . But with all this they are capable of constructing in their own way, if left free to do so, a government which will answer all of their legitimate needs and purposes.

That their government may be crude at the start I do not doubt. All government is progressive. Ours has been so. The science of government has to be learned by sore experience. The lot of the Filipinos will be the lot of every other people on earth that have ever undertaken to solve the problem of governing themselves. But I have no doubt that in the course of time they will be able to attain it. They at least have the right to try the experiment if they desire to do so. It is possible that they may have taken on some unfortunate characteristics and committed some wrongs under the system of tyranny and oppression to which they have heretofore been subjected; but if so, I confidently hope and believe that, under the inspiration of the spirit of liberty which now possesses them wholly, they will in due course of time be amply able to "rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things."