

—that of peace on earth and good will to men. I observe with especial sorrow that many Protestant clergymen mistakenly suppose that they can safely substitute at this day and in our country the teaching of Mohammed for the teaching of Christ. We all know the temptations to which such clergymen are exposed. It is so much more comfortable to "swim with the tide," and it is so much more certain that the incomes on which themselves and their families are dependent for the comforts and luxuries of life will share in the commercial prosperity of the country, if the doctrines preached by them and advocated in their religious journals recognize that the making of money is the first duty of man in the new century, and that keeping one's self unspotted from the world, so far from being, as was formerly supposed, true religion and undefiled, is a foolish and sentimental expression, incapable of application in the rough world in which we live, where each man's duty is to take care of himself. But, after making all allowance the most abundant charity can suggest, it will still remain a grave and menacing peril to American respect for the moral law if clergymen are permitted without rebuke to preach the righteousness of unnecessary or aggressive warfare, the killing of weaker peoples in order to reduce them to subjection, and the robbing them of their possessions.

It is quite possible there may also be great commercial value for us at the present time in the ethical ideal that all men are born equal and equally entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I fully recognize the present unpopularity of this ideal. I know that to declare one's belief in it is to expose one's self to the dreadful charge of disloyalty; but as in matters of religion American democracy rested at its birth upon the message of the herald angels, so in politics it rested at its birth upon the doctrine of the equality of men.

Great popularity no doubt just now attaches to money and great unpopularity to morals, on the ground that money is modern and practical, while morals are antiquated and impracticable; and they tell us that the race of to-day is a race for new markets won by war, for the exploiting of weaker peoples, for larger armies, for ever-increasing navies, for expanding trade and for greater wealth. I confess I would have thought the growth of our own be-

loved country in material wealth and prosperity in the last 30 years of unbroken peace and of amity with all mankind had more than satisfied any avarice which could have found a place even in the dreams of civilized men. Those 30 years demonstrated that in order to be a world power we need not be a robber nation.

There is still another ethical ideal which may soon prove to be of very great commercial value in American politics—the ideal of the citizen, whether in or out of office, exhibiting moral courage in dealing with important public questions. The truth is that physical courage has always been the most commonplace of virtues, and could always be bought at a very cheap price, so that it has become an unfailing proof of decadence for any people to become hysterical over exhibitions of animal courage without regard to the moral quality of the service in which it was displayed or of the comparative weakness of the adversary. Just the contrary is true of moral courage. It is among the rarest of virtues, and its services are of far greater value in this democratic age than ever before.

Indeed, the days may not be distant when the existence of law and order in America may depend upon it, for it may be found that it, and it alone, can protect us from the dangers which Mr. Webster believed would follow our present condition, a "rapid accumulation of property in few hands." For that reason the commercial value of such courage in a government by the majority can hardly be overestimated; and surely, if we are to find it a bulwark of defense in our day of need, we ought to be now commanding it by our example, showing how really brave men face grave problems of government, and set themselves as brave men should, to finding the best possible solution of them.

There is another very grave problem which we are also refusing to consider, and by which refusal the ethical ideal of law is also being destroyed. It is the problem presented by our negro population, now approaching 10,000,000 souls. We gave them the suffrage and we have allowed some of them to be killed for possessing it. We appointed some of them to office, and have stood meekly by when they were shot for having our commission in their hands. They are being burnt before our eyes without even a pretense of trial. We are allowing state after state, openly, even contemptuously, to nullify a

solemn amendment of the constitution enacted for their protection, to secure which we poured out our treasure without limit and shed the blood of our sons like water. All of us, whether in public office or in private station, now concur in trying to ignore the existence of any such problem at our doors while, laughing like the Roman augurs in each other's faces, we indulge in self-congratulations about the blessings we are carrying to another 10,000,000 of dark-skinned races in far-distant lands.

It certainly would tend to make private property far more secure in America if the less fortunate majority of our population saw us of the more fortunate minority giving courage and time and thought to efforts to solve these problems and others like them, and thereby to lessen some of the evils which in many cases bear so heavily and so unjustly upon the poor. Indeed, the influence of ethical ideals upon American democracy ought to be considered of value if only because the cultivation of such ideals will inevitably tend to make more really patriotic all classes of our countrymen, for such ideals lift us all above the unsatisfied standards of public duty with which we are vainly trying to connect ourselves. They bring us into the air of a higher and purer love of country, and they set us face to face with the early American spirit in its best estate. In such communion a sordid and selfish public opinion, with low methods to mean ends, tends to disappear, and a cowardly and corrupt public life becomes less possible.

TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

An address issued by the American Anti-Imperialist leagues on July 4, 1901.

The Anti-Imperialist Leagues of the United States have been silent since the Presidential election, but not because they have less faith in their cause or believe the battle lost. They had hoped that those who voted for Mr. McKinley, while disapproving his policy in the West Indies and the Philippines, would see that their votes were misinterpreted, and would make their disapproval known and felt. They had hoped that congress would claim its place in our government, and would insist that the principles of freedom must be recognized and applied wherever our country holds sway. They had hoped that the supreme court would with no uncertain voice declare that no human be-

ing under our control could be without the rights secured by our constitution, and that neither president nor congress, nor both together, could exercise absolute power over men entitled to the protection of our flag.

These hopes have not been realized. Where Benjamin Harrison nobly led, too few have followed. The war in the Philippines has been prosecuted with unrelenting cruelty until the resistance of the unhappy islanders seems to have been crushed. Many thousands of their bravest men have been killed or have died of disease, during the contest; and to-day the president exercises a power as despotic as the czar's over the whole Filipino nation. Congress has abdicated its function, has given these people into the president's hands, and has adjourned without attempting to deal with the questions presented by the islands. Already it has learned that free government is hard and absolutism easy—a dangerous lesson in a republic. Liberty and absolutism cannot exist together.

Three years ago congress by joint resolution declared "that the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent"—that they were then independent, and were justly entitled to be independent. This country intervened to establish their independence, and by the same resolution promised not to exercise "sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof." To-day the president is the absolute ruler of Cuba. He spends the revenues of the island as he pleases. No constitution, no law, fetters his power. At his instance congress has violated the nation's pledge. The "independent" Cuban people have been told that they will not be allowed to establish any government in their own land, unless they surrender in part the control of their finances and foreign affairs; unless they give to this country the possession of strategic points on their territory; and unless in addition they give to it the right to intervene in their domestic affairs whenever in the judgment of our authorities the occasion shall demand such intervention. They are offered no option to refuse these demands, which are backed by the presence of American troops on their soil. Thus to the whole world our course has become an example of national perfidy. The enforced submission of the Cubans to these unjust requirements has made

the stain on our national record indelible.

The supreme court has spoken, but has left the law in doubt. Some of its members have given their countenance to views urged by the administration, of which their associate, Mr. Justice Harlan, says: "If the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will be the result. We will in that event pass from the era of constitutional liberty, guarded and protected by a written constitution, into an era of legislative absolutism."

Where such a revolution is threatened, and when congress and the supreme court both fail, there is no help save in the people. If they would avert the impending calamity they must help themselves. Let us not be misled by names. Imperialism is not a question of crowns and scepters, of names and titles. It is a system of government. Where a man or body of men, an emperor, a president, a congress, or a nation, claims the absolute right to rule a people, to compel the submission of that people by brute force, to decide what rights they shall have, what taxes they shall pay, what judges shall administer their laws, what men shall govern them—all without responsibility to the people thus governed—this is imperialism, the antithesis of free government. As Mr. Justice Harlan says:

The idea that this country may acquire territories anywhere upon the earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere colonies or provinces, and the people inhabiting them to enjoy only such rights as congress chooses to accord them, is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius as well as with the words of the constitution.

In organized society there is no liberty that is not constitutional liberty. Even in America, where we have only to fear the abuse of power by our own fellow-citizens, we all rely on constitutions, national and state, to protect our rights. We cannot conceive an American community without these safeguards. Do not the inhabitants of Luzon need against us the protection that we need against ourselves? It has ever been the American method to incorporate acquired territory with representation; it is now proposed to revert to the Roman method and hold conquered territory by force without representation. This policy which we oppose gives to the Filipinos and Porto Ricans no constitutional rights, no American citizenship, no hope of statehood, no voice

in the congress which rules them; it leaves them without a country, the subjects of a republic. To believers in free government this policy is monstrous.

"Let it be remembered," said the continental congress, "that it has ever been the pride and boast of America that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature." When this country denies to millions of men the rights which we have ever claimed, not only for ourselves, but for all men, its policy is suicidal. As Lincoln said: "Those who deny liberty to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it." Indifference to liberty anywhere breeds indifference to liberty everywhere. No man can defend despotic methods abroad and long retain his loyalty to democracy at home. The common speech of those who support our new policy gives us daily examples of this truth. We cannot have citizens and subjects under the same flag. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." For

Laws of changeless justice bind oppressor with oppressed,
And close as sin and suffering joined we march to fate abreast.

We insist that constitutional liberty shall be the inalienable right of every man who owes allegiance to our flag; that freedom shall belong to man and not to place; that our constitution shall be no respecter of persons, colors or races; that it shall recognize the equal rights of all. Ours is the policy of liberty. Ours is the cause for which the American revolution was fought and which triumphed again in the civil war. It is the cause of human freedom now threatened in the house of its friends. It makes little difference under what name we rally to its support. As Daniel Webster said:

Arbitrary governments may have territories and distant possessions because arbitrary governments may rule them by different laws and different systems. . . . We can do no such thing. They must be of us, part of us, or else strangers.

With Benjamin Harrison, we are unable to rejoice in the acquisition of lands and mines and forests and commerce, at the cost of the abandonment of the old American idea that a government of absolute powers is an intolerable thing, and, under the constitution of the United States, an impossible thing.

We agree with him that this view will not limit the power of territorial expansion; but it will lead us to limit the use of that power to regions that may safely become part of the United States, and to peoples whose American citizenship may be allowed.

We urge all lovers of freedom to

organize in defense of human rights now threatened by the greatest free government in history. Even if our government may exercise arbitrary power over millions of men in disregard of the constitution—which we deny—it can never be right for it to exercise such power. Right is higher than might. Let every citizen study the facts and make his conclusion known, combining with his neighbor to influence congress to stand true to the principles of the Declaration by which this government was founded and under which it has grown so great. The gravest danger our country has known till now has come from a denial of those principles. The incoming congress is not yet committed to the policy of incorporating the island peoples into our system without rights. Let it resume its place in the government in defense of the inalienable rights of man.

We appeal from those who for the moment exercise the power of the nation to the people who are the nation—that nation which, on July 4, 1776, was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

AMERICAN ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,

By George S. Boutwell, President, and W. J. Mize, Sec'y.

NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,

By Albert S. Parsons, Chairman Executive Committee, and Erving Winslow, Secretary.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE OF NEW YORK.

By Ernest H. Crosby, President, and E. W. Ordway, Sec'y.

AMERICAN LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA,

By George G. Mercer, President, and Samuel Milliken, Secretary.

WASHINGTON ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,

By W. A. Croffut, President.

CINCINNATI ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,

By Charles B. Wilby, Chairman Executive Committee.

MINNEAPOLIS ANTI - IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,

By Henry J. Fletcher, President.

We concur in the above address:

Carl Schurz, New York.
Charles H. Aldrich, Chicago, Ex-Solicitor General United States.

Leonard Woolsey Bacon, Connecticut.

John Beatty, Columbus, O.

James L. Blair, St. Louis.

Horace Boies, Iowa.

Donelson Caffery, Louisiana.

D. H. Chamberlain, Massachusetts.

Samuel L. Clemens, New York.

C. R. Codman, Massachusetts.

Louis R. Ehrich, Colorado.

William H. Fleming, Georgia.

Frederick W. Gookin, Chicago.

Arthur C. A. Hall, P. E., Bishop of Vermont.

Moses Hallett, Denver.
Edward Holton James, Seattle, Wash.
William D. Howells, New York.
Henry U. Johnson, Indiana.
Henry W. Lamb, Boston.
Daniel S. Lord, Chicago.
J. Laurence Laughlin, Chicago.
Henry B. Metcalf, Rhode Island.
J. Sterling Morton, Nebraska.
Charles Elliot Norton, Cambridge, Mass.
Warren Olney, San Francisco.
George L. Paddock, Chicago.
Robert Treat Paine, Jr., Boston.
Wheeler H. Peckham, New York.
Henry Wade Rogers, New Haven.
James Ryan, Bishop of Alton.
Edwin Burritt Smith, Chicago.
Rufus B. Smith, Cincinnati.
Charles B. Spahr, New York.
J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria.
Moorfield Storey, Boston.
Charles M. Sturges, Chicago.
William G. Sumner, New Haven.
John J. Valentine, San Francisco.
Herbert Welsh, Philadelphia.
Horace White, New York.
C. E. S. Wood, Portland, Ore.
Sigmund Zeisler, Chicago.

THE DREAM OF A DREAMER.

Last night I dreamed that I
Ruled over all the land—
Held all 'twixt earth and sky
In the hollow of my hand;
I dreamed I ruled the beasts,
Likewise the birds in air—
Ships, mills and mines and men
I governed everywhere.

Kings yielded to my sway,
And fawning princes came
To ask my favor, and
The whole world knew my name;
My trains rushed o'er the plains,
My ships rode on the sea,
The tolling millions all
Paid tribute unto me.

Yet woe was in my breast,
For in my dream, alas!
I sat and gazed upon
My image in a glass
And saw that o'er my face,
Once boyish, there had spread
The cold and ghastly look
Of one whose soul is dead.
—Chicago Record-Herald.

WHAT DOTH IT PROFIT US?

Figures issued by the treasury department appear to show that business in the Philippines is booming. During the first nine months of 1900 there were imported into those distracted islands goods to the value of \$17,187,872, which was 21 per cent. more than the imports of the previous year. The exports, apparently for the entire year, were \$17,883,200. Those figures sound well and are apparently made public to give the American people some idea of the magnitude of the benevolent work which we are doing. And it is benevolence unadulterated. Out of the entire volume of the purchases of our "subjects" during the first nine months of 1900, only \$1,571,872 were bought of their "imperial" masters. They are very unprofitable servants. During the

period considered we had American soldiers in the archipelago to the number of about 60,000. If we divide the total importations from the United States by this number we shall get for our quotient \$26.19, which we may be sure does not exceed the average purchase for the period of the lusty young Americans whom we sent there to carry on the work of civilization. Before the most of us discovered the Philippines, while we were very good customers for their products, our annual sales to them ranged from \$61,000 to \$162,000 per annum. From the above showing it would appear that if we should call home the army which we hire to stay there and buy things from us we should not be shipping to that wretched country a dollar's worth more than we were selling to them before we ever heard of them. Their trade is with Europe, Asia and Africa—anywhere but with the United States, and we are paying say \$100,-000,000 per annum and a great many lives to keep them in order while they trade with other people. It is lucky that we are rich. A poor nation could not afford such nonsense.—Editorial in San Francisco Chronicle of June 8.

Casey—An' phwy shud Oireland be taxed to pay for the Boer war?

Brady—Oh! That's fair enough. 'Tis a shmall price to pay for the injymint she's had out av the disasthers!—Puck.

Lord Salisbury, in his last speech on the Boer war, says: "We are defending the king's territory against the invasion by neighbors whose international law had no complaint against us and who were merely actuated by the greed for territory and the desire of enlarging their dominions." So Great Britain went to war against the Boers merely to protect British territory against forcible invasion by the two republics! Our politics has not a little hypocrisy, but nothing in depth and breadth equaling this solemn cant from the British premier.—Des Moines Leader.

Tom L. Johnson is already giving the Ohio politicians more trouble than anything that has come down the pike since the war.—Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat.

Dollard—"Bis dat qui cito dat." That's Eye-talian, I guess. What's it mean? Do you know?

Scollard—Literally, "He gives twice who gives quickly." A freer translation would be: "He who gives quickly gives twice as much as he would