

THE EXPANSION QUESTION SETTLED.

The report of the Philippine Commission clears the air. It disposes of any possibility of drawing a serious political issue on the question of our occupation of the Philippines, and leaves nothing open to discussion but the problem of the best methods of government to be introduced there.

As to the maintenance of our sovereignty in the Philippines, the report of the Commission is so absolutely conclusive that even the chief contractionist organ practically gives up the attempt to make out a case against it, and says:

In respect to the past, the report of the Commission will undoubtedly be accepted by the country as satisfactory. We have no disposition to quarrel with this conclusion.

What the American people especially want to know is what our occupation is like, whether it is morally necessary, and what effects it has produced. On all these points the verdict of the Commission is most satisfactory.

Incendiary fires occurred daily. The streets were almost deserted. Half of the native population had fled, and most of the remainder were shut in their houses.

The Filipinos wanted some proof that American promises would be kept, and they got it in the shape of the re-establishment of the civil courts, with five Filipinos and three Americans on the supreme bench.

The flow of population soon began to set toward the city. Natives who had fled from their homes returned, while many of those outside our lines began to clamor for admission.

Upon a thorough investigation the Commissioners learned that the anti-American feeling was confined to the ten Tagalog provinces of Luzon, containing about 1,500,000 inhabitants, and hardly existed in four of these.

Throughout the archipelago at large there was trouble only at those points to which armed Tagalogs had been sent in considerable numbers. In general, such machinery of "government" as existed served only for plundering the people under the pretext of levying "war contributions."

When the Americans began to advance, the insurgents drove the inhabitants in their path from their homes and burned the villages. It was hoped in this way to keep the people from finding out the falsity of the stories they had been told about the barbarity of the American troops.

It was not surprising that the insurgents should have lost popularity. When the Americans re-entered a district from which, on a previous advance, everybody had fled, most of the natives quietly awaited those who had run away soon came back.

They had been plundered by the insurgent troops, who had robbed them of jewels, money, clothing and even food, so that they

were literally starving. Peaceable citizens had been fired on, women had been maltreated, and there was general satisfaction that the Americans had come at last.

As an experiment, the Americans established native municipal governments in the very hotbeds of revolution. Bacoor and Imus, "notoriously the two most rebellious towns in the most rebellious province in the island," were selected for the test.

It is stated that with a single exception the officials elected proved worthy of trust, and "conditions very rapidly improved in the newly organized towns, each of which soon became a centre of attraction for the insurgent soldiers whose families resided within its limits."

Deserters began to come in, some of them bringing their arms. Opposition to the insurgent forces grew rapidly among the peaceable natives of the province.

The necessity for American guidance was shown by the experience of the island of Negros, where the people, having shown their loyalty, were given a very large measure of autonomy under American protection.

The Commissioners find that at present there is no Filipino nationality, and no hope of creating one except through American guidance. Throughout the archipelago, outside of the Tagalog provinces of Luzon, we are welcome.

Should our power by any fatality be withdrawn the Commission believes that the government of the Philippines would speedily lapse into anarchy, which would excite, if it did not necessitate, the intervention of other powers, and the eventual division of the islands among them.

The anti-expansionists would abandon the Philippines first to military despotism, then to revolts, tribal wars and anarchy, and finally to partition among European powers who would exploit them purely for their own benefit, regardless of the welfare of the people.

Can Social Inequality Be Abolished?

By Count Leo Tolstoi.

"The rich would not hoard another ruble to their wealth were they conscious of the peril that threatens them."

IS there an efficient remedy for the unequal social conditions of rich and poor, of learned and unlearned, in these modern days?

Let us conceive of a family—husband and wife, brother and sister, mother and son—belonging to the wealthy class which has become convinced that it is criminal to live in affluence and unrestrained luxury in the face of the miserable poverty of the masses and the actual starvation of thousands.

We will assume that these people relinquish the enjoyment of their wealth, forsake their cultured environs and, setting aside an annual pittance for their support, resolve to go and live among the poor, to suffer with them and to assuage their misery to the best of their ability.

istence by such light manual or literary labor as they are capable of. They have settled down in humble quarters, begin to instruct the children of their neighbors, nurse the sick and comfort the dying, and in every possible manner seek to ameliorate the distress around them.

No other life seems more exalted than does this. Nevertheless, it is or must become a hell on earth, provided these earnest, helpful people are not hypocrites or live a life of self-deception.

These well-meaning philanthropists sacrifice the prodigality, independence and pomp which their money can provide. They do this because they regard all men as brethren and children of one Heavenly Father, not equal as to ability and merit, but equal as to their inalienable right to live and to all that life can offer.

These heroes have left refined society because they believe in a human fraternization which finds expression not in empty words but in real deeds, and because they want to take the initiative in the realization of the final fraternization of all mankind.

This experiment launches our benefactors into shocking situations, so long as they persist earnestly in their endeavors, not deceiving themselves or others. Accustomed from early childhood to order, comfort and cleanliness, they feel that it is not wrong to dissent from most of their neighbors in these qualities.

ness, they feel that it is not wrong to dissent from most of their neighbors in these qualities. They have papered the walls of their apartment, removed all dirt and vermin from it, and the furniture, though plain and cheap, is spotlessly clean.

The news of the arrival of the philanthropists and of their good intentions spreads like wildfire among the proletarians. At first, when it is known that the newcomers actually give of their belongings and their services without expecting anything in return, they are besieged only with verbal and written petitions for aid. But these petitions are soon changed into peremptory demands.

But gradually they find it necessary not only to give from their abundance, but also from their self-imposed penury.

A small quantity of milk is placed aside for the coffee and oatmeal of breakfast, but across the street is a pair of twin babies whose mother is very ill and can no longer nurse them.

Pillows and bed covers are given away one by one until, like Jesus Christ, their Master

and His disciples, they are deprived of their beds altogether, and the bare floor becomes their couch—for yonder lies a cripple sick unto death, sniveling in rags on a bed of filthy straw, and there are hundreds of poor scurvy creatures who must be protected from the bitter cold of the night.

Not even the vermin can be kept out of the house, for they feel in duty bound to provide shelter for the ill clad beggars who knock on the door.

Where is the limit here to benevolence? Only those who do not understand the motive of human fraternization which drew these helpful people down among the poor, only those who are used to lie until they are not able to perceive the difference between falsehood and truth, dare to define a limit. No, there is no limit to benevolence, if we literally imitate the Christ.

There is no limit. Even drunkards and gamblers must be aided. Here comes an incurable sot. On promise of reform he has often been helped on his feet again, but the money given him went to the saloon keeper. For the last time, with shaking voice, he begs for assistance. He has stolen three rubles and is in danger of arrest unless he returns the money. He is told that there are but three rubles in the house, and that these are needed for a payment on the morrow. But the wretch answers, "When it comes to ac-

tion you are no better than others. What do you care if your brother perishes?"

What is to be done? To practise benevolence without limit means misery and starvation for ourselves and those who depend upon us for support. Nor can any life be regarded as ideal which denies the duty of mutual help, which neither I nor even the Saviour invented. You cannot fear this conception out of the hearts of men, once it has been instilled in them. What is to be done? Is there no solution?

The majority of wealthy people call these exemplary philanthropists fanatics. They claim that the poor can better be served by the rich who spend their time in the securing of greater wealth. They can thus spare larger sums of money for alms. But these hoarders of money and bonds and real estate have no conception of the great need of the proletarian masses, nor do they realize the fact that the greater the hoard of gold the less generous becomes its owner.

Some sociologists teach that the true solution of modern social inequalities is to wipe out the intellectual inequality by educating the masses. This solution, however, is a phantasm.

This is proven by the statistics of all civilized countries.

There is a fourth solution to the problem. We must destroy the causes that generate this inequality—the power prompted by greed. Greed itself, the source of all evil, will continue so long as the world exists, but we can legislate barriers to the power of greed. This power lurks in the bank safes, in the police, in the military, in trusts and monopolies. Destroy this power and you destroy human slavery, its fruit. This is not the work of a day. You can suppress but not conquer force by force. You cannot cure one evil by another. This refers even to the application of money acquired by force for the relief of the oppressed.

Few people are aware of the terrible danger in store for the world on account of the ever widening chasm between rich and poor. The rich would not hoard another ruble to their wealth were they conscious of the peril that threatens them. There are few self-sacrificing Christ-like people who in compliance with the command of the Saviour will "go and sell all they have, give it to the poor and follow Him." There are few who by these means will help to put off the day of universal disaster. All honor to these few, for it cannot be denied that theirs is the true, unsophisticated brotherly love, which requires an uninterrupted sacrifice until death. But their benevolence is like attempting to empty the ocean with a few small buckets.

A New Explanation of Biblical Texts.

By Canon Farrar, Dean of Canterbury.

FROM the press of Dodd, Mead & Co. there will appear in a few days a volume entitled "Texts Explained," by Canon Farrar, the famous English churchman, wherein he tries to make clear portions of the Bible which he says have always been misunderstood. Here are some extracts:

ATT. XXV. 8: "Our lamps are some oil," etc. The true rendering of the present tense is "Our lamps are going out"—literally, if English idiom permitted the rendering—"are being extinguished," or, in older English, "are a-quenching." Here the wrong rendering adopted in our familiar version involves a positive theological error. The torch of divine grace in the human soul may smoulder into an almost invisible spark, but on this side the grave it can never be wholly extinguished.

Mark vii. 15: "And goeth out into the draught, burping all meats." No sense can be made of this rendering, which is also entirely impossible and ungrammatical. If we follow the true reading, and adopt the right punctuation, the meaning is "This He said, making all meats clean." The passage thus becomes nothing less than the most absolute declaration of Christ's utterances in abrogation of the Levitical law, which had now been rendered needless

by the advent of the Son of man, and had only been necessitated by the "hardness of heart" of the people to whom it had been delivered.

John x. 16: "And there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." The true reading and rendering are, "They shall become one flock, one shepherd."

The importance of this correction can hardly be overestimated. On earth there always has been, and so far as we know, always will be, "One flock of the one Shepherd," but there are, and always have been, in that one true flock many folds. The Church is "the blessed company of all faithful people;" but in that Church there have been, and are, and it is perhaps even desirable that there should be, many communities, united in essentials, and one in charity, but separated by minor differences of opinion and organization.

Acts ii. 47: "The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." This unfortunate misrendering, tending to strengthen Calvinistic errors, should be corrected into "those who were being saved," "those who were in the way of salvation."

Rom. iii. 25: "To declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Here the mistranslation obliterates the meaning of the whole argument. The necessity for demonstrating God's righteousness rose from His preference of—His overlooking of—the sins of the generations before the death of Christ.

I. Cor. xiv. 20: Here the correct version—"Prove ye not children in mind; howbeit in malice be ye babes; but in mind prove ye adults" (or "of full age")—is one of hundreds of instances where the force and beauty of the original is brought out by noticing the exact terms of the Greek.

Gal. vi. 17: "The marks of the Lord Jesus." St. Paul does not merely say, "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus," but, "I bear branded on my body the stigmata, the slave-brands, of Jesus." To the ancients, familiar with the sight of slaves branded with the name or cognomine of their owners, the phrase would be full of picturesque force.

Eph. iv. 32: Here the Authorized Version has "forgiving one another even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." It is from this verse that the very common phrase, "for Christ's sake," is exclusively derived. That phrase, though capable of a true explanation, does not once occur in Scripture in this connection. The true rendering is far fuller, and far deeper, in meaning—"even as God also, in Christ, forgave us." The phrase "in Christ" has been called "the monogram of St. Paul," and occurs in his epistles many times. Christians are often said to endure "for Christ's sake" (Rom. viii. 36; I. Cor. iv. 10; II. Cor. iv. 5; xii. 10; but the phrase that God forgave us "for Christ's sake" is unknown to the Apostles.

Phil. ii. 6: In this memorable passage about the humiliation and exaltation of Christ, the meaning is, in one phrase, absolutely reversed by the Authorized Version. It is not "who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God;" but "Who, being originally, (or essentially) in the form of God, counted it not a prize"—"not a thing to be grasped at," "a thing to be seized on," "a prize which must not be let go"—"to be on equality with God."

In the following clause the "made Himself of no reputation" of the Authorized Version loses the transcendent force of the "emptied Himself" of the original, though on the verb in the original is based the important theological doctrine of Christ's kenosis, i. e., of His emptying Himself of His divine prerogatives to assume perfect humanity. The verse thus becomes one of the strongest bulwarks against the Apollinarian heresy which denies the perfect humanity of Christ.

Col. iii. 24-25: In the original this is the clearest passage in the New Testament in proof of the essential nullity of asceticism and ceremonialism. In the Authorized Version the meaning is weakened, obscured, all but lost. From this passage alone the medieval Church might have learned that "will worship, and voluntary self-humiliation, and severity to the body" are valueless to subdue the indulgence of the flesh. So far, indeed, are

they from being the right methods to produce spirituality of mind, that "will worship" has a chronic tendency to produce the arrogant and dead Pharisaism which Christ denounced in such burning words; and ascetic extravagance by a universal pathological law, instead of weakening the impulses of the body, add to them a more imperious violence.

I. Thess. v. 22: The direction of the original is not only that we are to abstain from all appearance of evil, but the more comprehensive rule that we are to abstain "from every form of evil."

II. Thess. ii. 2: St. Paul did not here tell the Thessalonians that the day of Christ was not "at hand." On the contrary, he, like most Christians in the first century, fully believed that it was "at hand;" and rightly so believed, if we see in the destruction of Jerusalem the close of the old dispensation, and therefore a marked "day of the Lord;" but what he says is "do not be thrown into a state of excitement as though the day of the Lord is 'already beginning,' or 'now present.'"

I. Tim. vi. 10: The love of money is not "the root of all evil" (Authorized Version), though it is "a root of all kinds of evil."

II. Tim. iv. 14: "The Lord reward him according to his works." The words may be softened down, but read like a malediction. The true reading and rendering show that the phrase is practically a quotation from Prov. xxi. 12, and means "The Lord will reward him (as He rewards all) according to his works." St. Paul expresses no wish for the retribution to fall on Alexander. He simply refers the matter to God, and leaves it in His hands.

Tit. iii. 10: "A man that is an heretic . . . reject." Neither "heresy" nor "heretic" occurs in the New Testament. The words so rendered mean "faction" and "factious."

Heb. xii. 17: "He (Esau) found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." There is no instance in Scripture of true repentance being unavailing. The meaning is that Esau found no room to change his father's purpose, though he sought the lost blessing with tears. "The son who had sacrificed his right could not undo the past; and it is this only which is in question" (Bp. Westcott).

James ii. 14: "Can faith save him?" This might sound like an implied contradiction of St. Paul; but, in the true rendering, it is nothing of the kind. It is "can that faith" (a dead faith, faith without works) "save him?"

I. Peter, i. 5: The attribution of "virtue" here to Christ is very noticeable, and the use of this word, which only occurs twice in the entire New Testament (see Phil. iv. 8), has a bearing on the question of the genuineness of the epistle, as the idea of the passage seems to be based on a paragraph of Josephus. "Virtue" is the ideal of beatitudinous "holiness" is the higher and more heavenly ideal of the Gospel. It may well, therefore, surprise us to read no loftier word than "virtue" ascribed to Him who was "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners."