

that the Administration managed to give the impression that England was contemplating a great outrage, and the people were ready to fly to arms without stopping to ask what it was all about. A similar belligerent note from Washington to-day against Germany would undoubtedly lead to a similar result. It would be easy to make out a plausible case. "The scheming foreigners say that they only want to collect money justly due them, but how do we know that the debt is a just one? Is it not an example of the land going with the money? How do we know that, once in possession of the sacred soil of republican America, these monarchists will ever give it up? We must resist the very beginnings of aggression. The Monroe Doctrine is in peril, and we must awake, arise, or be for ever fallen!"

But President Roosevelt has met the situation with such calm good sense that the country is as quiet and indifferent as it would have been in 1895 had a similar course been followed then. The correct attitude was indicated unmistakably in the President's latest message. "No independent nation in America need have the slightest fear of aggression from the United States." So much for that side; then for the other—"It behooves each one to maintain order within its own borders, and to discharge its just obligations to foreigners." That tells the whole story. The language used is perhaps a little harsh; it will no doubt grate on some South American ears; it is in a tone which we should never think of using towards Italy, for example, or of tolerating for an instant if used by Italy towards us. But it states the true position accurately. No stretch of the Monroe Doctrine or of American big-brotherhood will enable the South Americans to assume the part of spoiled children. If they are naughty they will be whipped and sent off to bed. If they play fast and loose with their international obligations, they will have to take the consequences. No ægis of Monroeism will be held over them. We shall neither pay nor guarantee their debts nor prevent their creditors from forcing them to settle. They are always welcome to our good offices, but just at present our good offices consist in telling them bluntly to be decent and meet their obligations to foreigners. It is a great point gained. The firm and sound position taken by President Roosevelt in all this business contributes not only to the peace of the world, but to our public peace of mind. We shall not begin to see horrid visions and to talk of war every time a South American country takes to playing its tricks, and shall look upon the sailing of a foreign warship to enforce justice in South America as calmly as we should upon a deputy sheriff going out to make a levy.

OUR SULU TREATY.

The announcement in the fall of 1899 that Gen. J. C. Bates had negotiated a treaty with the Sultan of Sulu which forever bound him to our service as a loyal vassal, at a cost of only \$760 monthly in "salaries," was received with joy by the Imperialists and by the McKinley Administration. It was possible, its organs said, that we had made a mistake in not working through or buying up Aguinaldo, but that was then a dead issue. In this Sulu matter we had taken a leaf out of England's book and had improved upon it. It established, as every one could tell at a glance, a political order similar to that among the minor principalities in India and in the Malay states. It was bound to work well, for the *Tribune* described it as the "happiest omen" for the future good government of the Philippines, and regretted that similar arrangements could not be made with all the other "grand divisions" of the archipelago. With that wise foresight which ever distinguished him, Gen. Otis saw in this treaty a "happy adjustment of all apprehended pending difficulties." A serious observer in Manila even wrote that "the foundation which has been so admirably laid by Gen. Bates may well stand for years as the basis of the work of the others who may come after him."

Of course, there was a fly in the pot of ointment. The pesky Anti-Imperialists could not refrain from pointing out that this treaty was practically dictated by the Sultan of Sulu. Gen. Otis had no troops to spare from Luzon at that time, so the Sultan decided that our tribute to his majesty should be \$760, and not \$599.99, or \$699.99, or any other bargain-counter figure. Then the Anti-Imperialists insisted that the "party of moral ideas," which had once freed a race at home, stultified itself by becoming a party to the slavery practised in the Sultanate. Assistant Secretary of State Hill at once came to the Administration's defence and "indignantly denied" these aspersions. We were no more responsible for the customs of the Moros, he explained, than we were for the scalping propensities of the Sioux. The fact that the Sultan acknowledged our sovereignty had nothing to do with the matter. The Constitutional provision forbidding slavery under the United States brought up a nice point in Constitutional law, "about which there will be wide difference of opinion." But, any way, he said, in dealing with such questions we must use "practical means," and, as Mr. Roosevelt had even then taught us, we must all bow low before the god Practicality. In any case, Mr. Hill said, "the spirit and genius of our American institutions" would not long permit slavery and polygamy to continue under our flag. But the *Tribune* scorned such a qualified defence. "To not one of the condi-

tions is exception to be taken on any ground of equity or reason" was its whole-souled declaration.

Well, three years of the Empire have passed since then and the "foundations so admirably laid by Gen. Bates" have begun to tremble and shake. The Sultan is content, for when he failed to get his money the other day he telegraphed to Manila and "ordered it hurried along." The Philippine Commission "immediately held a meeting" (according to the *Sun's* dispatches), and appropriated the money out of the Philippine revenues. Naturally, the good Sultan is pleased at this prompt recognition of his powers. Not so Gen. Davis, the new commanding general in the Philippines, one of the "others" who have "come after" Bates and Otis. Gen. Davis demands "that the Bates agreement be abrogated and set aside; that no sultan or king over all the Moros of any region or over other dattos be recognized"; and—wicked as it may seem when viewed in the light of 1899—insists that "no pension or subsidy be allowed to any sultan or heir apparent, or to any other chief, and that government over the Moros be military." There, be it observed, speaks the true soldier. No diplomacy or filthy lucre for him. He knows his policy means war, for he calls upon Congress to act, because "the Moros surely will never willingly give up the rights they now enjoy."

But what of that? There has been comparatively little American blood spilled of late. "When these born pirates," Gen. Davis says, "feel the weight of our power, they will believe we are in earnest and respect us, but until then they will despise and hate us." So he would have our new policy of blood and iron "announced at once and enforced at every cost." But this bull in the china shop is not willing to stop there, for he continues to demolish the arguments of 1899 in the following plain and satisfactory way:

"If we pursued the English or Netherland plan, governing native races through native kings, sultans, rajahs, and dattos, then this sultan would fit into the scheme, but it seems to the writer quite out of the question for us to quote to the Moros the Declaration of Independence, and particularly the clause which asserts that all men were born free and equal, and at the same time concede to certain persons living under our flag the inherited legal right to tax, enslave, and even behead their fellow-men."

What in the world are Secretary Root and President Roosevelt about, to allow a general to "let daylight" into their policy in this way?

As for ourselves, we think Gen. Davis entitled to a vote of thanks from every lover of his country for his plain speaking. The hypocrisy and hollowness of our attitude towards the Moros are now as evident as is our wrongdoing in Samoa since King Oscar's rigid investigation. But Gen. Davis has rendered a greater public service than that. He

has laid bare the exact nature of our rule by force—by rifle and cannon—in the archipelago. "I see in all this," writes an army officer of rank now in Manila, referring to the general outlook in the islands, "the manifestation of the well-known inclination of humans to rule arbitrarily unless held in check by a determined public. Our very Presidents, our Secretaries of War, and our generals here and in Cuba have shown an ill-concealed desire to rule despotically, even when reared in a republic. And our army officers—well, you should hear some of their ideas as to how we should handle these people."

Gen. Davis has ventilated these ideas in advocating fire and slaughter among the Sulu Moros. Considering the news they are getting from Luzon of the cessation of agriculture, of the destruction of 90 per cent. of the field animals, of a debased currency, of pestilence, famine, and starvation—all as a result of our benevolent assimilation by force—no one can blame them if they should resist Gen. Davis to the last gasp, in case Congress approves of his un-Christian policy of conquest.

EDUCATIONAL DIVERSITY.

At the last Oxford Convocation the traditional requirement of Greek at responsions (a qualifying examination which follows matriculation by only a few months) escaped repeal by a narrow majority. The Oxford discussion has found a wide echo in the press, and England is going over the pros and cons which with us, some twenty years ago, followed the publication of Mr. Charles Francis Adams's "A College Fetish." Curiously, the most valuable aid to an apparently lost cause has come from the ranks of the enemy. Sir Philip Magnus of the City and Guilds of London Institute (a technical and industrial institution) writes in the *Spectator* of November 22 a plea for the retention of Greek at Oxford, on the ground of maintaining a wholesome diversity in higher studies:

"Education would lose in width and variety if all universities were to adopt the same conditions for the admission of students; and we may be certain that if Greek be no longer required as a necessary subject of examination in responsions at Oxford, the language will gradually cease to be studied in nearly all schools, and exact scholarship in this country will seriously suffer. It is because I desire to see our new universities stamped each with its own individuality that I should be sorry if the University of Oxford took any step that would dissociate it from its great traditions, and indirectly tend to introduce undesirable uniformity into the teaching of our secondary schools."

The educational drift to-day is unquestionably towards uniformity of institutions and diversity of studies within each institution. The elective and group systems which perhaps make for the individualizing of the student, as surely make for the reduction of institutions to a common category. It is no longer

possible to say "alle we studie the same Latyne," but it is coming to be the case that all our students at about the same period make their choices from about the same list of subjects with numerical coefficients. The colleges, as far and as quickly as they may, are trying to turn out A. B.s "equally as good as" those of Harvard or Johns Hopkins. It is highly significant that no American university has asserted a distinct pre-eminence, or even a distinctive character, such as the traditional reputation of Oxford for classics, of Cambridge for mathematics. Why one goes, say, to Columbia rather than to Princeton, or to Harvard rather than to Yale, could hardly be expressed in terms of intelligent academic preference, and the small colleges retain their prestige on wholly valid but also completely unacademic grounds. Much of this uniformity is the inevitable result of simultaneous reforms in the colleges, much of it is wholesome and in the direction of thoroughness as against display. The remarkable thing is that institution after institution should be so willing to give up the tradition under which it has achieved a distinctive success, to assume that there is no dignity and scarcely safety except in following at a respectful interval the leading universities, finally to prefer frankly utilitarian ideals of education. We hear much talk of the peculiar advantages and special function of the small college, but where is this faith proved in works? Which are the small colleges that are not, as fast as their means permit, trying to become simply a large college in miniature? Few but the Roman Catholic colleges.

Now the value of the elective system may be regarded as settled, and the fact that Greek is only most desirable, not indispensable, in a liberal curriculum may also be considered as proved. What is not proved is that all the colleges should, therefore, renounce Greek, or put it in the category of elementary history, contemporary fiction, and experimental psychology. The precept, "Hold fast that which is good," is by no means obsolete. The newest theories of education become fads unless the conservatives offer a sturdy opposition. Too ready and too universal assent seems likely to deprive higher education of any concurrent testing of various theories. Colleges, like men, are afraid of "getting left," and the result is that we have insufficient data to determine the value of any educational system. If only for the sake of experiment and the advance of educational science (if such a science there be), we need a few backward institutions—a few Oxfords to train our practical youth in impractical lore, and to show confidence in the generally disciplined as against the specifically trained spirit. This is why an officer of the newest kind of English technical

school wishes Oxford to retain the traditional requirements that assure every graduate a certain acquaintance with the historians, poets, and dramatists of Hellas.

This discussion might have more than an abstract bearing. If a few of our American colleges would stand firm upon the traditional course in Greek, Latin, mathematics, and philosophy, teaching each student the elements of one natural science and of two at least of the modern languages; assuming that he who knew the Attic dramatists intimately would need no ambassador to Shakspeare, Corneille, Molière, and Goethe, we believe that what might seem a wholly reactionary experiment would be fully justified by its practical results. Because it seems best for the average American student to browse at random through an elective schedule, it by no means follows that it is not good for some American students to follow an austerer way. And this is better done in a college where the *genius loci* is steadfastly favorable, than attempted amid the confusion of tongues of a modern university. The small colleges should look well to it before they sacrifice the strength of the traditional curriculum and engage in the hopeless competition with the "American-plan" menu now offered by the universities.

ANDRÉ CHÉNIER.

PARIS, November 19, 1902.

M. Émile Faguet is a distinguished critic, whose feuilletons in the *Journal des Débats* are always read with much pleasure. The volumes he has published on French literature are very interesting, and it is almost a pity that he should take time every week for the analysis of plays which are almost always without merit. He has just added a volume to the series of "Les Grands Écrivains Français," and undertaken to inform us very thoroughly about the great poet André Chénier, one of the victims of the French Revolution.

André-Marie Chénier was born at Galata, a suburb of Constantinople, on October 30, 1762, in the house of his father, who was French Consul, Louis Chénier, agent of a commercial house at Marseilles. In Constantinople he was the "deputy" of his nation—that is to say, the representative of French commerce at the French Embassy. Louis Chénier married in 1755 Elisabeth Santi-Lomaca, belonging to a family which pretended to be allied to the hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia. He was afterwards appointed Consul-General in Morocco. Madame Chénier remained in Paris for the education of her children. Her husband resigned in 1782, and returned to France. When the Revolution broke out the family was divided in sentiment. The ex-diplomat was very conservative; Madame Chénier, who was semi-literary and had associated with many writers and artists, was a "démagogue," to use her husband's expression, and imparted her principles to her son Marie-Joseph, whom she preferred to André, the future poet.

André had for his spiritual fathers Lebrun, the poet; David, the painter; and