

of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, and the payment of National obligations in silver at that ratio, would be followed by at least temporary disaster, will hardly be questioned by any. The immediate effect of such a change would be to overthrow credit, public and private; to paralyze industry; to compel a readjustment of values; to produce an immediate collection of debts, with a consequent distress of debtors, and in many cases bankruptcy and impoverishment. The advocate of free silver under present conditions must place his advocacy upon the ground either that the ultimate benefits will recompense for the immediate disasters, or that 16 to 1 is a mathematical formula of absolute and eternal justice, and justice must be done though the heavens fall. On the other hand, it would be difficult for Mr. Bryan or Mr. Towne to specify a single instance of injury as yet inflicted or immediately threatened by that imperialism which, in their judgment, threatens the downfall of the Republic. Doubtless very great powers have been intrusted to Mr. McKinley by Congress, but what citizen has had his rights to life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness impaired in consequence? Soldiers have died in Cuba and in the Philippines; but they have been volunteers who offered up their lives of their own free will for humanity, fighting against despotism in the one case and against anarchy in the other. It would be easier to find a thousand men in New York City who have suffered injustice from the imperialism of Mr. Croker than one man in the United States who has suffered from the imperialism of Mr. McKinley. Abroad, in Cuba there is satisfaction with present conditions and confident hope of early independence, promised by a Republican Congress and reiterated assured to the Cubans by the President. From the Porto Ricans we hear no complaints against the tariff, which it is in their power to abolish when they will. In Hawaii the only complaints come from Japanese laborers, who, having had their wages raised several times since annexation, are, American-like, inspired by the increase to strike for more. It is only from the Philippines that any complaints come back to us, and with them come the indications of a desire for peace under the United States flag, and greetings of

thousands of children already gathered into schools never before opened to them, and certain to be closed if the American flag should be pulled down. The terrors of Mr. Bryan and Mr. Towne are either a dramatic fright assumed for effect or a hysterical fright which sober-minded men will not share. The Republic is not so feeble. It survived the election of Mr. Jefferson, whose election was supposed to be subversive of Christianity; of General Jackson, although from his corruption of the Civil Service we have not yet fully recovered; of Mr. Polk, though it brought upon us the Mexican War; of Mr. Pierce, though it involved the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; and of Mr. Buchanan, though it prepared the way for the War of Secession; and the Republic will not be whelmed in ruin, or converted into an empire, by the re-election of Mr. McKinley.



What is Self-Government?

The actual problems of government, as they are presented to the statesman in life, are not so simple as they sometimes seem to the scholar in his library or to the editor in his sanctum. It is easy for the two latter to coin a formula in which they suppose they have embodied a fundamental principle, and then calmly demand that all questions shall be brought to this formula and determined by it. Such a solution of the library is afforded by the word "self-government." It is so simple to say "Leave each community to govern itself;" it seems to lift from the shoulders of the Nation so great a load of responsibility; it furnishes so simple a solvent or apparent solvent. But what does it really mean as applied to actual conditions? For example:

What shall we do in Cuba? Withdraw our forces? recall General Wood? leave the Cubans to govern themselves? This is the formula. But no sooner is there some indication that this formula is to be acted upon by the United States, than representative men of property, who have everything to lose and nothing to gain by revolution, appeal to us not to withdraw and leave them to the mercy of the revolutionists. America has promised to Cuba her independence; and so far as we can

see no one desires to cancel that promise, though some think it was made too hastily and not wisely. But when is Cuba "pacified"? Is it pacified because it is at peace while our troops remain there to keep order? And who are the people of Cuba to whom the duties and responsibilities of government should be handed over by us? Are they all the men and all the women? or only all the men? or only all the white men? or only all the native-born Cubans? or only the men who have some measure of intelligence or some property interests, or both? These and kindred questions come in to perplex the real man of affairs, who has to consider the property interests involved, the industries just coming into existence, the schools just established, the sanitary laws reluctantly recognized and obeyed for the first time in Cuba's history. Such questions cannot be cavalierly dismissed with the formula, "self-government." Self-government is not the simplest, it is, on the contrary, the most complicated form of government. How to organize it and set it in operation is a difficult problem.

What shall we do in Porto Rico? The figures are somewhat in doubt, but apparently not over five per cent. of the inhabitants can read and write. Does self-government mean that the ninety-five per cent. shall be put under the government of the five per cent.? Does it mean, on the contrary, that the men of intelligence and property shall be put under the government of the ignorant and the propertyless? What that kind of self-government did for the Southern States is matter of recent history; what it is doing for some of our great cities is matter of present history. Intelligence, virtue, and property are probably strong enough in America to stand the strain; but we all know that they were not strong enough in France. It is by no means certain that they would be strong enough in any country inhabited by a Latin race and educated under a Spanish despotism.

How are we to know what any unorganized community desires? How can we know what is its will until a government is organized which can express that will? How can we know whether a majority of Cubans desire independence or organic relations with the United States, until a government is framed through which they

can peacefully, and without fear or favor, express their desires? or whether the Porto Ricans desire to raise their necessary taxes by a tariff or an internal system of taxation, until they have the machinery for discussing the question—a free press, a free forum, a free election—a machinery which cannot be constructed in a day? or whether the Filipinos really desire to be under the American sovereignty or independent of America, while their country is overrun with guerrillas, and any friend of American sovereignty is liable to have his throat cut? Some form of government must be organized before self-government can express itself. What it took the Anglo-Saxon race centuries to accomplish for themselves, cannot be accomplished by Spanish-Americans and Malays in a night. There is no genie of the lamp who can erect a temple of liberty in an hour.

Is self-government identical with self-will? Does it mean that no community may interfere to protect life and property in any other community? Does home-rule mean that the Governor of Missouri must not interfere with the mob in St. Louis? or that the Federal Government must not interfere with the mob at Cœur d'Alene? or that the European Powers must not interfere with the cutthroats in Turkey? Does it mean that wherever vice corrupts or crime terrorizes, they must be permitted to corrupt and to terrorize? What does it mean in China? Does it mean that America must not interfere though a mob kills Americans who are peacefully pursuing their vocations under treaty provisions and murders the representatives of foreign governments, under their respective flags, while the Empress Dowager looks supinely on, or connives at if she does not instigate the mobs? Does it mean that if the government *de jure* asks us to help it preserve public peace and order against the mob and against the usurping government *de facto*, we must reply: "No! the sacred principles of self-government require us to leave you free, not only to cut each other's throats, but to cut the throats of Americans who have their home among you"?

We do not undertake to answer these questions. We do not ask them in a polemical mood. But we wish that the men of the desk, who think only of

abstract principles, and suppose that self-government is the magic solvent of all political problems, would try sometimes to put themselves in the place of the men of affairs, and consider what they would do or wish done, if their lives and the lives of their children were dependent on the maintenance of sanitary laws in Cuba, or the accumulations of their life industries were dependent upon law and order in Porto Rico, or their right to labor were questioned by a mob in St. Louis, or their dearest friends were in hazard of their lives in China. These are the practical questions with which the men of affairs have to grapple, and while they are glad to get light upon them from the men of the library and the sanctum, they do not get light, if these questions are ignored, and self-government is offered to them, without qualification, without definition, without even an explanation of what it means or how it is expected to work.



The Outlook in China

The news from China, which reaches us as we go to press, and of which we give an abstract on another page, is so terrible that we reserve fuller comment until fuller information is received. The annihilation of an entire group of Ambassadors, representatives not only of foreign nations, but of the most powerful rulers of the world, is a piece of audacity which has seemed so incredible that Europe has been slow to believe it, even in the face of growing testimony. In the West the Ambassador is such a sacred person, and has been for so many centuries free from the slightest danger of even an insult to his dignity, that his slaughter by a mob, at the end of a long series of riots, seems impossible. But if it be true that the company of a thousand Europeans who were gathered at Peking have died at the hands of the Boxers, they have paid the price which progress has exacted at every stage. They have been martyrs in the cause of civilization; it is less for the nations whose representatives they are than for the Chinese, that they have suffered.

Terrible as this tragedy may become in the light of fuller reports, it ought not to control the action of the Western races. It

is of the utmost importance at this stage not to array China, as a nation, against the Western world. The characteristically adroit statement sent out by the Chinese Government, declares that all the deeds of violence have been committed by a revolutionary mob which it has endeavored to suppress, and that the later and more violent outbreak was due to the fury of the populace—aroused by the act of the Great Powers in bombarding, without cause, the forts at Taku—and the Government distinctly disavows, not only all connection with these deeds of violence, but all responsibility for them. The declaration is drawn with great skill; but there are obvious discrepancies in it, in view of the many facts which connect the Empress with the Boxer movement, both by identity of feeling and by the events of the last two years. None the less, it is undoubtedly the policy, and ought to be the principle, of the Western Powers, in dealing with China, to treat this movement as that of a mob, not as that of the Chinese Government. Our policy, as admirably outlined by Secretary Hay, is to co-operate with the Chinese Government, as represented by the Emperor and the Viceroys of the south, in suppressing the lawless mobs which are now terrorizing a large part of northeastern China. Our policy is to fight not China, but anarchy in China.

This attitude will not interfere in any way with the proper punishment which must fall upon that mob in some form. The Great Powers cannot suffer their citizens, still less their Ambassadors, to be ruthlessly murdered without identifying such ferocities, in the popular mind, with swift, sure, and adequate punishment. If we are to have Ministers abroad we must protect them; and if our Ministers or citizens are murdered on foreign soil, we must set up there the proper agencies of justice, and inflict the adequate penalty. But that action must be prompted, not by vengeance, but by a stern sense of justice. Civilization can find no satisfaction in indiscriminate slaughter of Chinese by way of making the Chinese pay for the killing of its Ministers. It is justice, not vengeance, which the Western nations must enforce.

In this enforcement of order and justice, Chinese nationality must be respected. It is only through the Chinese that China