

enthusiasm of an initiator over his own work, and does not all history speak loudly against it? Is it likely that a succession of Tafts can be provided? And if we turn from official life to private life, can the leopard change his spots, or the Anglo-Saxon his unsociability? And can Americans of the sort that go to try their fortunes in the tropics ever be expected to succeed in the role of sympathetic friends and helpful elder brothers?

The trouble is that every step in the success of the Taft programme will breed new kinds of trouble. Suppose the Filipinos take all the education we give them—that will only make them the more frantic for independence—it is the "educated" natives of India who are the really troublesome enemies of British rule there, and if independence is out of reach there will be endless agitation for Statehood, as even now in Porto Rico it is beginning.

It is impossible seriously to believe that 100 years or 200 years will be different from 20. They will still show a terrier-and-rat relation. History shows that no force endures like hatred of the alien ruler. The Filipinos had it when we arrived there, and they have national ideals which no yellow race except the Japanese has ever possessed. We have immensely deepened this side of their nature, enriching their history with imperishable legends and traditions and with a procession of heroes and martyrs. Two hundred years will alter this no more than 20.

Secretary Taft is too good a liberal to say the word "never" when independence is suggested. He simply says: "For God's sake, don't mention such a thing just now. Let things drift along as they are indefinitely." Does he forget that it was through the McKinley policy of drift that we lost our hold on the original situation? Benevolent drifting can hardly be much more satisfactory than crafty drifting. People's minds are settled, not unsettled by a certainty, and when Secretary Taft affirms the contrary I can only suspect his interest in his own schemes of government to be growing a little convulsive.

The real obstacle to a promise of independence by our Congress is the old human aversion to abdicating any power once held. When love of power and the desire to do good run in double harness the team is indeed a difficult one to stop. Cant and sophistry then celebrate their golden wedding. It is then that we have to kill thousands in order to avert the killing of tens or hundreds by one another. It is then that the boss-ruléd Yankee finds the sacred duty laid

upon him of preserving alien races from being exploited by their own politicians.

If after 20 years or so we let the Filipinos part in peace, it is likely that some American commandments will be broken. But the situation will have this much of good about it, that it will then have become endogenous and spontaneous. It will express native ideals, and natives will be able to understand it. Continuity is essential to healthy growth. Let the Filipino leaders try their own system—no people learns to live except by trying. We can easily protect them against foreign interference; and if they fail to be good exactly according to our notions, is not the world full even now of other people of whom the same can be said, and for whose bad conduct towards one another we agree that it would be folly to make ourselves responsible?

Any national life, however turbulent, should be respected which exhibits ferments of progress, human individualities, even small ones, struggling in the direction of enlightenment. We know to our cost how strong these forces have been in the islands. Let them work out their own issues. We Americans surely do not monopolize all the possible forms of goodness.

It is for such reasons as these that, with all respect for Secretary Taft, I am not in the least degree converted by his pronouncements against promising the Filipinos independence.

I repeat so that all men may hear, that I am a free trader, and proudly take my stand with Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright and Henry George. I may be an humble member of that illustrious company, but it is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of honest free traders than to dwell in the tents of wicked protectionists.—Hon. Champ Clark.

He who consents to special privilege, is logically estopped from criticism of any proposed plan for amelioration to the unprivileged.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

Curse me, O Lord, with want and ill,  
But make my spirit strong, and still;  
Give me, whate'er Thy hand denies,  
A soul no swine-trough satisfies.  
—A. St. John Adcock.

BOOKS

LAND MARKS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Ably assisted by W. D. P. Bliss, editor of "The Encyclopedia of Reforms," Dr. Josiah Strong has edited a new year-book (Social Progress. New York: The

Baker & Taylor Co., Union Square, North), the first number of which, that for 1904 (\$1 net), has just appeared. This American annual undertakes to furnish statistics and other information relative to the economic, industrial, social and religious activities of the world; and on the whole it appears by the initial number to have made more than a fair beginning.

Defects in the first number of such a publication are inevitable. It is not altogether surprising, therefore, to find such omissions as Shearman's "Natural Taxation" from a bibliography of the "land question and the single tax," in which Seligman's tax essays appear, nor such another as George's "Protection or Free Trade" from the bibliography of "tariff and taxation," in which Seligman's essays again appear. These omissions are somewhat conspicuous, inasmuch as Shearman's book is widely known and contains the antidote to Seligman's essays, and George's is the best known as well as the most radical discussion of the tariff question. However, such omissions are doubtless due to oversight and can easily be remedied in future numbers of the Annual.

One other defect of the book is illustrated by the reference at page 128 to the popular defeat of local option in taxation at the Colorado election a year and a half ago. That defeat, due to a multiplicity of causes, is accounted for, as matter of opinion, by one cause. The fact that this was probably one of the minor causes is less important than the expression of a mere opinion as explanatory of facts in a work that ought to be absolutely colorless, and must be so if it is to acquire the kind of reputation without which no such periodical can command unquestioned confidence.

But after all is said that can be said about its shortcomings, Dr. Strong's "Social Progress" annual remains a book for ready reference which men interested in the public activities of the time can ill afford to be without. There are few if any subjects of vital public interest regarding which the book does not furnish at least a pointer for investigation, and on many it supplies all the information the ordinary citizen needs. Its scope has been thoughtfully outlined and the work has evidently been done with skill and patient care. The contributions on the progress of socialism are by H. Gaylord Wilshire and A. M. Simons, and that on the progress of the single tax is by Henry George, Jr.

PAMPHLETS.

The Federal Single Tax Council of Australia, which may be reached by addressing

Mr. John Z. White Writes for "Why."

Mr. White will have an interesting letter in April "Why" and each month thereafter, until further notice, describing his lecture tours and the work of the Henry George Lecture Association. You should not miss any of these issues. Send twenty-five cents in stamps or coin to FRANK VIERTH, Editor "Why," Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This pays for yearly subscription.