

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 21, 1902.

## The Week.

It is apparently a choice of rumors, as regards the President's determination to call the Senate in extra session for the purpose of ratifying a treaty of reciprocity with Cuba. It is said that Mr. Roosevelt hopes to get a popular mandate in the November elections which will bring his Republican opponents to their senses. But how can clear instructions come out of a campaign which is essentially muddled and at cross-purposes on this subject? The Republican campaign book is absolutely silent about Cuba. In different districts, different views are taken by Republican candidates. If an unexpectedly sweeping Democratic victory *should* occur, it would, indeed, emphasize the general disgust with Republican shortcomings, in the Cuban matter and otherwise; but the President cannot be hoping for that! Short of it, however, we do not see how the elections can be of much aid to his Cuban policy. If he has assurances that a good treaty could be put through the Senate, it might expedite the business to have an extra session in November; though, of course, the House would have to act later. The only certain thing in connection with all these conflicting reports is, that they will renew the hopes of the Cubans. It would, therefore, be a peculiarly heartless proceeding to put them in circulation unless there is a firm intention to do justly by Cuba in the end.

The Detroit *Free Press*, the leading Democratic newspaper of Michigan, an opponent of Expansion and Imperialism from the start, regards this whole matter as eliminated from the present Congressional campaign by reason of Mr. Roosevelt's course during the last few months. So far as the question of cruelty toward the natives on the part of our troops is concerned, the *Free Press* holds that the President "has taken it out of the field of political controversy by his unqualified condemnation of acts of savagery on the part of the comparatively few offenders in the army, and particularly by his stinging reproof of Gen. Smith"; while on the larger issue of the permanent retention of the islands, "again the President spiked the guns of the enemy by leaving this an open question and displaying an admirable conservatism." The result of all this, in the opinion of this Anti-Imperialist Democratic journal, is that there is "no such living issue as militarism or Imperialism" in the present campaign; and this change from the situation of a few months ago it ascribes chiefly to the line of action adopted by the Republican

President. Of course the *Free Press* does not regard the Philippine question as permanently settled, but only as temporarily removed from the field of partisan controversy during the present Congressional campaign by Mr. Roosevelt's course. This is an impressive tribute to the influence which the Executive may wield as the leader of his party.

The same thing is illustrated at the same time in the current discussion of another question—that of Cuban reciprocity. Nobody can have studied the course of Republican State and Congressional conventions in the Middle West, the past few weeks, without becoming convinced that it is the personal attitude of Mr. Roosevelt toward this matter which is largely responsible for the general endorsement of the policy. It is equally noticeable that the "insurgent" Representatives and Senators, who stood out against it, like Mr. Tawney of Minnesota, are now most anxious to make their constituents believe that they really approve the President's position. The feeling of many Republicans about this matter appears to be well expressed by a Minnesota member of the party, who says: "We don't know anything about this Cuban question ourselves, nor care anything about it, but the President says we ought to give the Cubans reciprocity, and that's enough for us."

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, whose versatility inevitably suggests comparison with the "lightning-change" artists of stageland, appears in a new rôle. For the current *National Magazine* he has written an article in which he sets forth just how much liberty the new Philippines Civil Government Law confers upon our Asiatic subjects. Aside from the intrinsic literary merit of the article, its especial value arises from the fact that, while this law was in process of construction, Senator Lodge advocated a number of extremely obnoxious provisions, which even the House would not stand for. As a result, it forced the present measure upon the Senator and the Senate. The appropriateness of the Senator's now setting forth the beneficent character of the law must therefore be plain to all. The best that can be said about the law by any one is that it contains a step towards Filipino self-government, and does away with government by military men. The proposed Philippine Assembly is, however, vaguely set for an indefinite future, and might even be permanently held up. As for the rest, the law will be no serious obstacle to syndicates which wish to get land, by hook or by crook, or to the hungry promoters and advance agents who

have sat longingly in Manila these several years with their eyes on the mines and land which rightfully belong to the Filipinos alone.

It is only necessary to observe the temper of the campaign in Vermont, where the three-cornered contest for the Governorship is blazing daily and nightly, to understand why Secretary Shaw's attempt to discuss national issues there failed to find attentive listeners. The *Montpelier Journal*, which is supporting Gen. McCullough, the regular Republican nominee, thus describes Mr. Clement, the independent candidate: "Riding in a private car, surrounded by every luxury the heart can ask for, backed by wealth untold, a snob, an aristocrat, Percival W. Clement deludes himself with the impression that his charming personality, associated with his erratic characteristics, will win the votes of the majority of the workingmen of Vermont." To this the *Rutland Herald*, which upholds Mr. Clement's side of the argument, cheerfully retorts that the *Journal* is urging the election of a candidate "from whom you could not draw a plea of 'not guilty' to charges of political bribing, even if you used a log chain and a yoke of stags." Another newspaper, the *Vermont Watchman*, a McCullough organ, alleges that Mr. Clement discharged men employed on railroad construction because they would not work for a dollar a day. It calls upon Mr. Clement to answer this charge, but declares that he cannot, because "in his own soul he knows that the truth will punch another big hole in his balloon, which will collapse like the soap bubble it is." Altogether it seems clear that from now until September 2 it will be difficult to get the voters of the Green Mountain State to take interest in the details of the tariff or the need of Cuban reciprocity.

Editors and judges in some Southern States continue to do their duty by speaking out plainly whenever a case of lynching occurs. A few days ago, a mob took from the jail at Leesburg, Va., and hanged a negro who had killed a prominent white citizen and was awaiting trial for the crime, with every prospect of prompt conviction and execution. The worst feature of the affair was the fact that the mob consisted largely of men of standing and education, and that they acted with deliberation after refusing to heed earnest appeals from preachers and laymen to let the law take its course. Judge Tebbs has charged the grand jury to investigate what he pronounces "a crime of unexampled magnitude, at least in this community, and of far-reaching consequence, a reproach to our people and a foul blot on the hitherto unstained

escutcheon of Loudoun." The Judge properly scored those most to blame—"men whom we should expect to find upholding and maintaining, ready to fight for, even to die for, the laws and rights and government so dear to their ancestors; and these men were the leaders in needless violence, in rank lawlessness." The *Richmond Times* heartily applauds the action of Judge Tebbs, and asks if Virginians can contemplate such a lynching without a shudder. "It all comes back to this," concludes the *Times*: "Either the law must be supreme or the mob will rule. The mob was in full control of Leesburg on the day that Charles Craven was lynched, and the law was trampled under foot. The flag of Old Virginia went down in the dust, and the black flag of the mob was held high."

There appeared in the July number of the *Atlantic Monthly* an article entitled "The Negro: Another View," which has attracted no little attention North and South, and which has had very serious consequences for the author, Prof. Andrew Sledd of Emory College, Georgia. In itself the article cannot be said to be strikingly original. It is merely a very able restatement of certain fundamental facts in regard to the rights of the negro as a human being which have often been brought out before, generally by Northern students of the negro problem. But Professor Sledd is a Southerner, born and bred, and a teacher of Southern youth. Hence his opinions, since they are in a large measure severely critical of the Southern white man in his relation to the negro, have created a sensation throughout the South, and Professor Sledd has resigned in order that Emory College may not suffer by the odium which he has incurred. The intense feeling against him is all the more noticeable because he begins his paper by laying down the Southern doctrine of the hopeless inferiority of the negro: It is radical and inherent, he declares, and "cannot be erased without the lapse of indefinite time." The doctrine of the amalgamation of the races, which he thinks some Northerners have advanced, fills him with horror. Speaking of the general question, he declares that Northern writers have theorized about conditions which they did not understand "with a bitter and indiscriminating zeal." These hardly read like the words of a Northerner or one taking a partisan Northern view of the situation. But they have not prevented his being denounced as a "Boston nigger-equality citizen." This class of vermin "shan't live in the South," declares a letter from Georgia received by the editor of the *Atlantic*, who is likewise told that he had "better keep this class of Boston citizens in Boston."

The present Governor of Arkansas,

who is running for reelection, and a Republican candidate for the same office, have been holding a series of "joint debates," in which they called each other such names as "pie-hunter," "renegade," "liar," "thief," and "murderer." At last they grew so angry that at Si-loam Springs, the other day, they started for each other on the speakers' stand, and only the prompt interference of the town marshal prevented a fist fight in public between the Chief Executive of the State and the man who aspires to succeed him. In South Carolina the Democratic candidates for the United States Senate are canvassing the State, presenting their own claims and exposing the weakness of their rivals. John J. Hemphill, formerly a Representative in Congress, and Asbury C. Latimer, now a Representative, appeared together in Gaffney last week, and soon drifted into a controversy which ended in Latimer's striking Hemphill a hard blow in the face, and Hemphill's attempt to hit back, when the crowd rushed between them. A few weeks ago, Senator Bailey of Texas made a physical assault upon Senator Beveridge of Indiana while the latter was sitting in his chair, for a remark in debate which was entirely warranted. A few weeks before that, Senators Tillman and McLaurin of South Carolina had a fight on the floor of the Senate. This sort of thing demands the serious attention of the Southern people, and particularly of editors, clergymen, and other leaders of public opinion.

It was, of course, certain that, sooner or later, the Tammany squabbles would break out into charges and countercharges of manipulation and fraud. "Set a thief to catch a thief" is a good maxim, not only because he knows the tricks of the trade, but also because he is not in danger of placing too much confidence in anybody. Doubtless enrolment frauds have been practised in many of the districts; it would be astonishing if it were not so wherever the sordid strife between the Tammany factions is going on. And where illegal practices are discovered, they should be punished with the utmost severity, for the value of our primary system depends on its provisions being enforced with the same rigor and strictness as the laws governing the actual election. It must be remembered, however, that there is a certain amount of so-called colonization, both for primary and for election purposes, which the law is powerless to prevent in any great city where there is a large floating population but lightly attached to any particular district or vicinity. The law permits persons who enrolled in one district in the fall to move to another district and transfer their enrolment up to a certain date in the early summer. Similarly the election law, while requiring a residence of four months in the county, requires but thirty days' residence in

the election district, and in both cases it is not illegal for a party to move its less settled element about into districts where it is "needed." All that can be done is to see that the legal requirements are fully complied with. It seems unfortunate that this should be true, but it is open to question whether or not any remedy which could be proposed would not be worse than the disease. The arguments which were advanced last spring against the bill abolishing the spring enrolment, and which caused the Governor to veto it, were certainly very strong. A primary law is at its best when it permits and encourages a large enrolment, and, despite the present Tammany recriminations, the addition of 35,000 names last spring was a distinct gain. Nothing which has thus far been brought out indicates that more than an insignificant part of this large total was even tainted with fraud.

Evidence of the superior morality and healthfulness of the Jews is furnished almost simultaneously in New York city and in Manchester, England. At the recent meeting of the British Medical Association, Dr. J. M. Rhodes read a paper on infant mortality, which drew a shocking picture of the situation in Lancashire generally, and in Manchester particularly. Infant mortality in that city reaches the appalling proportions of 198 per thousand, which means that one child in every five born dies before it is one year old, whereas even in London the proportion is only 154. But there is one district, Cheetham, which is largely occupied by Jews, and here the death rate is but 124—less than two-thirds of the average for all the districts. Dr. Maurice Fishberg, an East Side physician, has recently studied the mortality statistics for New York city with reference to races, and finds that the densely populated wards which are largely inhabited by Russian Jews—the Seventh, Tenth, Eleventh, and Thirteenth—had an average death-rate of only 15.92 when that for the whole city was 18.53; while in two where the population is almost exclusively Jewish, the figures sank to 14.52 and 14.23. Dr. Rhodes lays stress upon the general freedom from drunkenness among the Jews of Manchester as an important element in the case, and Dr. Fishberg reports that they are generally temperate here, although he finds that alcoholism is increasing among the younger generation, "who are adopting the habits and customs of life of their Gentile neighbors."

President Cantor's recommendation of a commission to plan for the artistic development of the Borough of Manhattan is worthy of the most favorable consideration. Such a commission, working in harmony with all the municipal departments, would, first of all, take



a survey of the present condition of the island, and then would prepare a plan to which public improvements for many years to come would adapt themselves. The Municipal Art Commission, which already serves the city admirably in an advisory capacity, has no authority except to pass upon individual improvements, so that it could not well undertake this large task. We need not say that such a commission should be carefully chosen from the most enlightened citizens, should be large enough to represent the various elements of the city, and should include laymen as well as artists. Certain immediate needs of the situation, and opportunities for a general commission, President Cantor points out in his quarterly report. There is the problem of housing the executive department about City Hall Park; here President Cantor advocates the costly, but, we believe, the only satisfactory plan of razing everything upon the square except the City Hall, and building on Chambers Street from the Hall of Records to Broadway. Another problem which offers peculiar opportunities for an architect is the relocation and rearrangement of the city markets. In general, President Cantor's position that no such change should be made without regard to the attractiveness and convenience of the city as a whole, is a sound one. We hope that he will get his commission, and that it will have sufficient authority to enforce the principle of foresight against that of haphazard improvement.

A change in the Presidency of the United States Steel Corporation may easily be given more importance by the public, and even in financial quarters, than it really deserves. As head merely of the Carnegie plant, Mr. Schwab may well have seemed almost indispensable. But the work of minute management and control becomes impossible for any single man when so many and such vast properties are consolidated as we see now united in the Steel Trust, and Mr. Schwab must have long since turned over the larger part of this to competent subordinates. His real duties have been those of what has been called a "financial statesman"; and as such the general verdict is probably not far wrong in considering him not highly successful. Not merely his Monte Carlo imprudence, but a somewhat marked tendency to indulge in glitter, has given to his public appearances an air of not exactly that staid sobriety and poise which the figure-head of a \$1,400,000,000 corporation should exemplify. If, therefore, he should now be forced by ill health or for any other reason to resign his office, he would but create a vacancy which could be filled by another man without any shock or injury to the interests of the Steel Trust.

After the evidence brought out on Fri-

day in regard to the Northern Securities suits, there can be no doubt that dummy stockholders were shamefully used to bring an action purely for stock-jobbing purposes. This fact is now well established, to the serious smirching of the reputation of those who lent their names to the affair. But other facts remain just what they were. One is, that the Attorney-General of the United States has moved in the Federal courts to test the legality of the Northern Securities merger. There can be no question of interested motives, in that instance. Only grave considerations of law and of public policy could have actuated the Department of Justice to take so serious a step. The other thing to remember is, that such "strike" suits as have now been exposed would not have been hatched had not it been thought an open question whether the Northern Securities Company were not proceeding in violation of at least the spirit of the law.

No American can hear the names of De Wet and Botha and Delarey without in some fashion reviving boyhood memories of "The Song of Marion's Men," and, if the English have no such close analogue to these partisan chieftains, they, none the less, are giving them a splendid and wholly spontaneous ovation. The case is surely rare in history—the generals of a beaten nation passing freely within a few months of their surrender among their conquerors, and everywhere greeted with courtesies from the Government and cheers from the populace. It is hard to believe that it is the same English people which, only two years ago, had no word too bitter and contemptuous for the defenders of the veldt. One may feel sure that the warmth of the Boer leaders' reception rests upon something more substantial than the mere good nature which victory brings. If only the joy of success were involved, the visit of the Boer generals would be merely the final adornment of a triumph. Such an idea, it is safe to say, has occurred to no Englishman, from King to costermonger, and the spontaneous tribute of admiration to these brave foes does much to condone a former bitterness which was wholly un-English. One would like to credit the report—if an invention, a happy one—that the King, on receiving the generals, spoke of the humanity with which the Boers had treated wounded British prisoners. But whatever may have been the terms of the meeting on board the royal yacht, it is certain that the dignified, manly, and loyal attitude of the Boer chieftains will remove any lingering doubts as to the temper of their people, while the frankly expressed admiration of the English people for a foe whose worth they have dearly learned, will go far to convince the Boers that they may count unquestioningly upon the generosity of their

conquerors. In this way a popular enthusiasm—a case rare indeed—ministers to high statesmanship.

The ovation given to Lieut. Hildebrandt of the German army on his release from a brief confinement in a fortress, for the murder of a fellow-officer in a duel, is nothing less than shocking. Lieut. Hildebrandt's victim, it will be remembered, met his death for having "insulted" this brother officer when intoxicated. His apology went for nothing, and he was killed to satisfy the regimental "honor." The responsibility for the continuance of these savage practices rests with the Emperor personally. True, he has issued several orders against duelling, but whenever he has had a flagrant case like this one before him, he has nullified the orders and encouraged the practice by imposing light sentences or mitigating those awarded by the military tribunals. His power in the matter is absolute. Were he to make only one speech giving to duelling its proper name and character, and declaring that he would withhold his favor from any officer abetting it, the present state of affairs would be ended forthwith. It was only the other day that we were able to praise his speech against excessive drinking among students in the German universities. But his voice has never been raised against the demoralizing routs, of frequent occurrence in almost every officers' club, which often have just such tragic endings as that in which Hildebrandt figured.

As was to have been expected, the Emperor's dispatch to the Prince Regent of Bavaria offering to pay the Bavarian appropriation for fine arts has stirred up a veritable hornet's nest. The Vienna *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in calling him the "Telegraph Kaiser," has given him a name which will stick, just as the term "Travel Kaiser" has clung to him since he first began his flying trips in all directions. A large part of the Munich press finds it a peculiarly trying case of purely gratuitous interference in the domestic concerns of a sovereign state. There is every likelihood that the telegram will give rise to some frank talk in the Diet, and that it will strengthen the already too-powerful Centre in its opposition to the Prussian and Protestant influences, as well as the Separatist feeling which has never even begun to die out in Bavaria as it has elsewhere. The Emperor has steadily strengthened his reputation in the last four years by his growing conservatism and marked ability in appreciating the needs and opportunities of the Empire. It is, therefore, the more astonishing that, by so hasty and ill-considered an action, he should have deeply offended a part of the Empire where conciliation and a proper tolerance are especially called for.

## DREAMS OF EUROPEAN FEDERATION.

Another German professor is just reported as believing that Europe will be forced into an economic federation to withstand the United States. His plea recalls an interesting study by the Russian Novikoff of "United Italy" as a model for his cherished plan of European federation. His article appeared in a recent number of the *Vita Internazionale*, and the writer begins with a bird's-eye view of Italy about the middle of the fifteenth century. The twenty states into which that country was divided resembled the division of the modern political states of Europe in their varying differences as to wealth, power, civilization, and geographical extent. The kingdom of Naples, with its extensive boundaries, but an archaic and unprogressive government and a population miserably circumstanced despite a fertile soil, greatly resembled modern Russia. The Florentine republic derived its immense power from its wealth and its industrial and commercial conditions. It was the centre of active capital, not less than of art. Its resemblance to the France of to-day is striking. The duchy of Milan in the north, with its rich and well-cultivated Lombard fields and the constant conquests of its rulers, the Visconti, occupied in Italy a position not unlike that of Germany in the Europe of to-day. On the other hand, Venice, whose strength lay in its sea power, bore a strong resemblance to modern England, while the Genoese Republic, in its small size, its vast possessions, and its important commerce, reminds us of modern Holland. These, with the Papal States, constituted the five "Great Powers" of Italy, around which the others gravitated.

The political tendencies of these Cinquecentist states of Italy, whether republican or monarchical, were all towards territorial expansion or conquest, which is the political spirit of modern Europe. France looks longingly to the Rhine; Austria to Serbia and Macedonia; Germany has her eyes on the Baltic provinces, which are Russian, and Russia hers on Galicia, which is Austrian. Such a spirit of expansion, in the fifteenth century as to-day, sought an outlet in distant places whenever checked at home. Venice and Genoa fought their hardest fight for the commercial supremacy of the Black Sea, on the economic sophistry, so honored even in our time, that the prosperity of one people can be achieved only by shutting off competition and causing detriment to another. Hence to-day we see Europe fighting for the markets of the East.

Territorial expansion at home, on the part of the larger states of Italy against the smaller ones, was checked by the same method which we call the "balance of power" in European politics. When the Visconti sought to extend their dominions, they were met by the coalition

of Venice, Florence, Savoy, and Naples—the same in essence as that of Prussia, Austria, Russia, and England, which, centuries later, curbed the ambitions of France. By 1450 it became clear that there could be no "universal monarchy" in Italy, as no single state had the power to conquer the others. Thereupon wars of conquest, as was natural, ceased. A sort of equilibrium was tacitly established, and the conquest of the weak by the strong, such as that of Siena by Florence, became more and more difficult. A similar condition was reached by Europe about 1870, when its component parts seem to have settled into irreducible units. Through the necessities of the balance of power, none of the great states can ever hope, and hence none aims, to absorb the lesser ones.

With the elimination of the forces of territorial expansion at home, the Italian states after 1450 began to develop friendly relations among themselves. Means of communication in the peninsula increased, commerce became diversified, and capital circulated more widely. Artists and literary men travelled from place to place. Italy had but one literary language and a common civilization. Hence grew the feeling that Italians were all bound together by a community of political, intellectual, and economic interests which distinguished them from other people, such as the French or the German. We see a similar condition in modern Europe. There is to-day an enormous exchange of merchandise and capital among its states. Men and ideas circulate rapidly. It takes about as long to go from London to St. Petersburg, Vienna, or Berlin to-day as it took in the fifteenth century to travel from Venice to Milan, to Florence, or to Rome. Likewise, all Europe has a sense of solidarity in its common civilization which differentiates it strongly from the Asiatic nations.

It must be remembered, however, that though bound together by intellectual ties, the Italians of the Cinquecento had no thought and no desire for political union; and, indeed, looked upon such a possibility as a great calamity. It was an age of brute force, which could not imagine political unity except by the Roman method of conquest and the consequent destruction of liberty. Moreover, great lovers of art and science as they were, they had learned that violent annexation always resulted in the death of intellectual culture. But the day came when Italians saw that their hope of progress and greatness lay in the complete union of their peoples. At a fearfully bloody cost this was obtained, and modern tendencies helped to fuse the five great powers of Italy into one. Has such union resulted in those evils which her statesmen of the Cinquecento saw in such an event? Venetian and Genoese ships carry their commerce without det-

riment to each other, and each city has advantages of its own as a port of entry to the benefit of both. Nor has the much dreaded abolition of customs duties between Italian states affected the national production. Tuscany, Piedmont, and the other principalities endeavored when they were separate entities, by governmental means, to diminish imports and increase exports. Who regulates commerce there to-day? Economic laws, which work magnificently and which increase the national wealth.

The statesmen of Europe to-day are troubled by the fears of their Cinquecentist brethren in Italy. They imagine that European federation will mean the annihilation of the liberties of each state; that the establishment of juridic relations between them will be the beginning of the end. What, asks Novikoff, made Italy one? It was that the ideas of the fifteenth century gave way to better ones. When the foreign invaders brought destruction into their land, patriots and statesmen understood that, if Italy had been united, this could never have been. This idea gradually became a passion and ideal of the people, and Italy was made one. So will it be, Novikoff claims, with European federation. The misery of the proletariat will be found remediable only through the union of civilized peoples. Such union, however, will not be—and no reasonable man would wish it—on such intimate lines as that of Italy. "It will not be a 'Pan-European monarchy,' but a federation in which national characteristics of language, customs, religion, law, literature, and art will mean only the establishment, outside and above the various national governments, of a common institution which will assure the independence, the security, and the welfare of all states."

## EDUCATION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

In a recent number of the *Independent* Mr. James A. Le Roy, private secretary to Professor Worcester of the Philippine Commission, makes an authoritative concise statement of what has been attempted and what accomplished among the Filipinos along educational lines. This is the twelfth month since eight hundred American teachers began the work of making English the national language of the Filipinos. To expect great results in this short period would be to demand the impossible, even if the undertaking were an easy one. But so important an educational enterprise will repay watching at every stage of its progress.

Dr. Atkinson, the "General Superintendent of Public Instruction," early divided the archipelago into eighteen districts for the purposes of his highly centralized school system. Each one of these divisions is presided over by a trained educator from the United States, who is in turn at the head of a cen-