

hereby and henceforth, the birthday of the said Annie H. Ide, to have, hold, exercise and enjoy the same in the customary manner by the sporting of fine raiment, eating of rich meats and receipt of gifts, compliments and copies of verse according to the manner of our ancestors;

And I direct the said Annie H. Ide to add to the said name of Annie H. Ide the name of Louisa—at least in private—and I charge her to use my said birthday with moderation and humanity, et tamquam bona filia familias, the said birthday not being so young as it once was, and having carried me in a very satisfactory manner since I can remember;

And in case the said Annie H. Ide shall neglect or contravene either of the above conditions I hereby revoke the donation and transfer my rights in the said birthday to the president of the United States of America for the time being.

In witness whereof I have hereto set my hand and seal this 19th day of June, in the year of grace 1891.

Robert Louis Stevenson. (Seal.)

Witness, Lloyd Osbourne.

Witness, Harold Watts.

#### A DEFINITION OF PATRIOTISM.

If patriotism means "our country, right or wrong," then patriotism is clearly nothing more than a form of selfishness. Such crude patriotism is merely one of the many modes of the monopolistic instinct. There is, of course, a higher and truer kind of patriotism; but then the people who display this kind are generally twitted by the vulgar and selfish "patriots" with being unpatriotic. A true patriot, in any good sense of the word, is a man who, finding himself born into a particular community, and, therefore, to some slight extent, sharing the responsibility of its corporate acts, desires to see the community of which he is a member behave always in the most upright and honorable manner. If his country did so behave, he might naturally be proud of her; unfortunately countries in the concrete oftener give one cause for shame and humiliation.

If such a man could see his land striving, not to find new markets for her iron and her cotton by unjust aggression, not to slaughter helpless savages at the instigation of her merchants, not to force opium or gin on unwilling lower races, but to act with such scrupulous justice that her name should be a synonym for fair dealing among the nations, then, indeed, he might justly be glad he belonged to

her. But if she does wrong, a true patriot ought to raise his voice against that wrong, even if it enriches her millionaires and gives congenial employment to her major generals.

Your true patriot would even desire to see his country defeated and humbled whenever she embarked on a course of oppression; he would desire to see her stripped of squalid dependencies which sap her manhood and degrade her moral sense; he would long to save her from the fate of the later Roman empire, to which every modern state is eagerly aspiring. Better, for example, a free England, made great by industry, honor, virtue, manliness, literature, science and (if she can ever evolve it) art, than an England which holds half the world in slavery, which crushes revolts on a thousand frontiers, which sends forth crowds of filibusters to South Africa and New Guinea, which wastes her efforts in military enterprises, doomed in the end to bring their inevitable retribution of national decadence. Empire has always destroyed every country that held it, because empire is only a masked name for slavery, and slavery is far more killing and debasing for the master than for the slave. What a true patriot would wish to see is not a "little England," but a great England; what he will always remember is that a great England and a big England are mutually contradictory.

No country can be great which enslaves others. Greatness is a moral, not a physical, quality.—Grant Allen, in *The Idler* (London), Colonial Edition, March, 1898.

#### THE GREAT AWAKENING.

A part of a paper read at the Cincinnati Literary Club, March 31, by Chas. B. Wilby.

The Puerto Rican incident, small as it is, is large enough to cause many to awaken to the difference between the theory of harmless beneficent expansion and the fact of cruel, despotic imperialism. The catch words about "trade following the flag," for which there was never any foundation in fact, are now giving way to theory, which sounds quite as well and has more to warrant it, about "the constitution following the flag." The present revolt, however, does not depend upon any catch words; it rests on the innate sense of justice which is strong in the people of this country. As to those people who are called "rebels," and during the pendency of that struggle which is called an "insurrection," many of our citizens have not paused to consider the

justice of the position taken by the administration; but when the same despotic hand was laid on those trusting islanders who relied upon the promises which were made to them to the extent of offering no resistance to the invasion of their country (probably owing to their lower degree of intelligence), then the injustice stood out unbefogged and our people have cried out their disapproval of it. In addition, the selfish or protectionist view of the situation has made many others, who a year ago were floating with the tide, pause and consider.

During the debate in the senate on the Puerto Rican tariff bill the other day, a very distinguished senator from the great middle west (the same gentleman who parried a troublesome constitutional point which was thrust at him by saying that the question had "passed beyond the law book stage"), frankly admitted if this country could not levy any duty on goods brought from Puerto Rico here, or any duty on goods taken from our ports to Puerto Rico, that we might as well, to quote his words, "dismantle our custom houses and go out of the business of collecting tariff revenue." And when the senator was asked what he would do with the Philippines, under those circumstances, his answer was: "That might make a very great difference in regard to our policy there." And when further asked what then would become of the philanthropy, the flag, the glory and the humanitarian pretext, he very adroitly changed the subject.

The humanity, duty and destiny mask is rapidly being discarded, and the most strenuous supporters of the administration have honestly planted themselves on the "might makes right" platform, otherwise politely called the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. I heard one of those speeches the other night which told all about how the march of civilization excused what we have been doing in the Philippines. The speech was charmingly phrased and well delivered. But the same argument would have excused anything ever done by Cortes or Velasquez or in the most cruel war of conquest ever waged. The orator drew some remarkable parallels between the invasion by our forefathers of this practically uninhabited country in the temperate zone, and our invasion of those tropical islands uninhabitable by two generations of Anglo-Saxons, and more thickly settled than the United States; but he took care not