

European countries have their basis, not in the ambition of kings and emperors, nor in the greed of armament manufacturers, but in the stupid international jealousy of the people. There are powerful interests that make for standing armies and great navies, it is true, such as gun manufacturers and shipbuilders, and a nobility seeking places for its younger sons; but these would be unavailing if opposed by the people who pay the taxes. But so long as those interested in maintaining great military establishments are able to persuade the taxpayers of France that except for their army they would be subject to the German yoke; or to convince the Germans that only their stupendous army stands between them and annihilation; or to make the Englishman believe his bread would be shut off but for his monster navy, anything grotesque in the way of militarism is possible.

It has long been felt by peace advocates that there must come an end of international military rivalry, but the people have borne the burden so long that it seemed as though their patience was inexhaustible. Two recent events, however, indicate the dawn of reason. When the German Reichstag, in consequence of the conflict between the people and the army in Alsace, passed a vote censuring the Chancellor, it gave evidence of life and vitality that must lead to the suppression of despotism. It matters little that the Chancellor did not resign, or that the form of autocracy remains unchanged; the magic spell of the "divine right" has been broken, and imperialism has been put on the defensive. The rest is merely a question of keeping on. A Parliament that censured the Chancellor, but lacked the courage to withhold supplies, thereby making its condemnation effective, will be followed by a Parliament that will assert itself. That moment will see the doom of autocracy.

But democracies, no less than autocracies, can be tyrannical. The French Chamber of Deputies has the power to make and unmake ministries, yet supports a military establishment even more crushing than that of Germany. Here, too, is evidence of an awakening. The Barthou Ministry, which gave expression to the new nationalism of M. Poincaré—which is the latest expression of French militarism—was overthrown on its attempt to launch a new loan of \$260,000,000. This loan, ostensibly to meet the cost of the new three years' service law, yet covering large deficits due to past military expenditures, was voted down

by a combination effected by M. Caillaux, the Radical leader, who declared emphatically for the gradual reversal of the law extending the service from two to three years.

These are wholesome signs. When the representatives of the taxpayers dare to stand up and defy militarism, there is hope of a speedy dawn of reason. Many things are transpiring to bring about a better acquaintance between the French and the German peasantry. Closer relations mean a better understanding of motives and purposes; and to be understood means to be appreciated. As soon as the people of these two nations surmount the stupid international prejudice, which they mistake for patriotism, and grasp the fact that they should consider their interests along economical, instead of geographical lines, there will be an end of militarism.

S. C.

### The Right Philippine Policy.

We are all confident of our own ability to govern ourselves. Whatever doubts exist concerning the advisability of democracy relate entirely to some other fellow. If it were necessary for each nation to wait for self-government until all other nations considered it fit, we would wait for democracy in vain. Failure to realize that fact accounts for the refusal of some who are democratic in most things, to favor institution of democracy in one or two instances. An example is furnished by a certain able exponent of democracy who nevertheless lacks confidence in immediate application of democratic principles to the Filipinos, and says regarding criticism of President Wilson's policy of delay in withdrawing from the Philippines: "Do you condemn compulsory education? Would you abolish the board of education and the truant officer and allow all children to govern themselves 'for better or worse'? Would it really be undoing a wrong for us to suddenly decamp and leave these unruly, untrained children to their own devices and in possession of all the costly machinery of government which we have built there and which it will take a generation or two to teach them to use? If you had studied the Philippine problem on the spot you would hardly advise defeating the object of American occupation by abandoning our half finished job."

Whatever views one may hold concerning compulsory education, the truant officer and the board of education, they relate primarily to the natural

responsibility of parents for the welfare of their children. This is not the question involved in the Philippines. Assuming, for argument's sake, that the object of American occupation is an unselfish one sure to have beneficent results if undisturbed, it is none the less our duty to withdraw. There is in the first place no argument advanced in behalf of compulsory education, which favors its application to residents of foreign countries, nor would the shooting of refractory pupils be endorsed by any of its advocates. So even if we were to assume all the Filipinos to be merely children, the compulsory education argument will not apply. Spain—or, more correctly, the Spanish ruling classes—offered the same excuse, not only for exercise of authority over the Philippines but over Cuba and Porto Rico. The Czar of Russia excuses his despotism the same way. Despots have usually urged such a claim everywhere and in many if not in all cases, superficial justification has not seemed altogether lacking. We cannot consistently criticize despotism anywhere as long as we insist on governing the Philippines.



It happens moreover that the Filipinos are not all children. The proportion of mature-minded adults is as great among them as elsewhere. They have the same natural rights that grown men and women everywhere possess. Government among them cannot derive just powers from any other source than it does elsewhere. The plea that we must stay in the islands in order to force an undesired government on the inhabitants for their own good ignores fundamental natural rights, which must first be considered in passing upon the merits of any question. No American community would consider boss rule justified even if the boss gave—as some actually have—better government than exists in some unbossed communities. Still less excusable is our legalized boss rule in the Philippines.



To our relations with the Filipinos as well as with ourselves applies the Truth, so eloquently portrayed by Henry George regarding Liberty: "She will have no half service," and "we must follow her further, we must trust her fully. Either we must wholly accept her or she will not stay."

S. D.



### Consistency of Taft.

At a dinner on December 19 in New York to ex-Governor Forbes of the Philippines, ex-President Taft criticized President Wilson's Philippine

policy. Independence, he declared, would put control of the government in the hands of the educated classes, leaving the ignorant at their mercy. When did Taft discover that self-government means rule by the educated? And how long has he been opposed to such rule? He has opposed the Initiative, Referendum and Recall in this country on the ground that "mob rule" would be instituted. Yet he opposes Philippine independence lest the educated classes rule. But perhaps he is not as inconsistent as he appears. He opposes both here and in the Philippines any change that may disturb privileged interests. Is that the real standard by which he judges reforms?

S. D.



### To "Give Business a Rest."

Perhaps Vice-President Marshall was not correctly quoted in the press report in which he is made to express the opinion that Congress should now give business a rest. For his own sake it is to be hoped that he was not. If correct it would indicate that he considers as an attack on business whatever effort to interfere with privilege the present Congress has made. That implies too deep a misunderstanding of both the nature and needs of real business to be held by one in his position. Nothing has been done by the present Congress to impede any useful business. What little it has done has been in the way of removing obstructions to business and of interfering to a slight extent with the powers that prey on business. Does Vice-President Marshall believe that enough of this has been done?

S. D.



### Forcing Railroads Into Bankruptcy.

"Urging the government to force the railroads to a point where they could be bought at bankruptcy prices," is how a correspondent defines opposition to allowing the proposed increase in railroad rates. The definition does not appear accurate. The Interstate Commerce Commission is not considering any proposition to deprive the railroads of any power which they now possess. But the railroads are asking for new and increased power. Refusal will leave them in the same condition they were in before. If that is a condition leading to bankruptcy it is not one forced on them by the government but due to the mismanagement of their own officials. They are not asking for anything that belongs to them but for power to levy additional tribute on the people. This power may rightfully be withheld and ought to be withheld. The withholding of what one is not obli-