

dent Jordan of California and Wayne MacVeagh are a few representative names from the list, and among its chief endorsers are Cardinal Gibbons, Professor Norton and Robert C. Ogden. The committee will do what it can to commit either or both great political parties to the independence of the Philippines, upon terms similar to those "granted" to Cuba. This announcement is an indication of public sentiment and it will also guide public sentiment. It will give new hope to loyal Filipinos and do something to stir up our Washington officials. Mr. Taft is already aghast at the impertinence of the suggestion. Why, says he, the first thing you know if we make any such promise, the Filipinos will be sending committees here to ask us when we will give them freedom, and some of them will actually suppose that they are to have it during their life-time! Preposterous indeed! Why should people want liberty during their life-time, when it is so much pleasanter after they're dead!—The Union, for April.

THE IMPERIALISM WE FACE.

From an editorial in the Weekly Springfield Republican of April 22.

There is a dangerous group of imperialistic and plutocratic Democrats, the center of whose influence is in New York city, who did all in their power to help along the imperialism which began with the Spanish war.

These men must not be permitted to dictate to the Democratic national convention its principles with reference to American foreign policy, or to our military policy, or to our policy toward the retention or the future acquisition of dependencies. It is distinctly false to say that there is now no imperialistic issue before the people of this country. Imperialism did not begin and end with the forcible acquisition of the Philippines. That act signalized a policy which remains and which in the future must be fought, as occasion may require. The process of changing the republic into an empire, with its associated militaristic bedevilment, is a long-continued one, and as such the Democratic party should face it with permanent, irreconcilable opposition, because that process, unchecked, would rip from under it the foundation upon which democracy stands.

There are certain fundamental principles that really stand for tendencies rather than dogmas, which the Democratic party should sustain under whatever conditions, in whatever crisis. It should stand for the interests of the masses of the people, not for the interests of a plutocratic oligarchy; it should

stand for a democratic republic, not for a republican empire; it should be Jeffersonian in the true spirit of Jefferson, who dared to confess that his passion was peace, and whose political philosophy, hammered into the preamble of the declaration of independence, was the outgrowth of the natural aspirations of humanity, and will ring through all the ages to come. It will not be difficult to make the St. Louis platform conform to these essential principles in a sane and even conservative manner.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

HOW TO FIGHT THE RAILROADS.

According to Mayor Johnson Cleveland attorneys for the Pennsylvania Railroad company are largely responsible for the delay in the lake front case now pending in the United States circuit court.

"They now have in their possession," said Mr. Johnson, "the bill of particulars which was filed in this case and which needs only their 'O. K.' to bring an advancement and a rehearing.

"Just so long as this lake front case is unsettled, just so long will Cleveland be deprived of a desirable harbor. If the Pennsylvania company desired to be fair in the matter it would let this case come to trial and abide by the decision of the court. But no, it is delayed year after year, and the railroad continues to enjoy the proprietorship of property worth \$2,500,000, which was simply stolen from the people of Cleveland.

"Nowadays, when a man steals a loaf of bread he is sent to jail or the workhouse, but a railroad company may steal property worth millions and the case cannot be got into the courts. But I am waiting," said Mayor Johnson with a smile, "I am waiting until the Pennsylvania or the Lake Shore Railroad company comes to the city to ask a favor. I want to see them do it. It will give us infinite pleasure to turn them down. If it is to be war, these companies will discover that the city has some weapons of defense."

The lake front case had its original hearing before Judge Hammond, of the United States circuit court, who lives at Memphis, Tenn., and so long as the judge lives no other judge of the same court will take the matter up. In the first hearing Judge Hammond rendered a decision adverse to the city and Hon. George H. Phillips, who was then assistant corporation counsel, gave notice of a motion for a new trial. This motion has never been heard, and cannot be until Judge Hammond returns to Cleveland, which he has since refused to do. On several occasions pressure has been

brought to bear upon him to return to the city, but he has disregarded it. The belief of Mr. Johnson is that if the attorneys representing the railroads involved would consent to an advancement the judge would bring the case forward and return to Cleveland for a hearing of the motion.

Mayor Johnson is one of the strongest advocates of an improved harbor for Cleveland, but he believes that the way to accomplish it most quickly is to get this lake front case again into the courts. The mayor has hopes that Judge Wing may take up the case in the face of Judge Hammond's persistent refusal to do so.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 26.

WM. J. BRYAN ON IMPERIALISM.

The written part of Mr. Bryan's speech at Chicago on the 23d of April, 1904, on "The New York Platform," printed in full in The Public of April 30, at page 58, contained the following paragraph on imperialism: "Imperialism is an issue. Our government is now administering a colonial policy according to the political principles employed by George III. a century and a quarter ago, and yet there is not in this platform a single word relating to the question of imperialism, not a plank that defines the party's position on that subject, not a protest against the surrender of the doctrines of self-government. The Kansas City platform stated the party's opposition to a colonial policy, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the Kansas City platform, but fails to take any position at all on this important question." When in reading this paragraph Mr. Bryan said: "Imperialism is an issue," the sentiment was greeted by the large audience with general and great applause; and upon concluding the paragraph he spoke, extemporaneously as follows, as reported stenographically by Robert F. Rose, of Chicago:

I want to ask you, my friends, if we must submit to a retention of a colonial policy under the American flag, without a protest? If we are going to do it, let me call your attention by a natural process of reasoning to that which we may expect in this country. When a prominent English statesman was denouncing the revolutionary war he said his objection to it was that in order to defend that war the English people would have to assert principles which if carried out would destroy liberty in England as well as liberty in America. And my protest against imperialism is not merely that it affects the men in the Philippine islands. My protest against it is that you cannot defend imperialism in the Philippine islands without asserting principles which if carried to their logical conclusion will establish imperialism on American soil. (Applause.)

When will this question of imperialism be settled? It will be settled only when this nation abandons imperialism in the Philippine islands, or establishes

it in the United States. As long as there is a conflict between these two theories of government it must always be an issue. And this conflict can only be settled in one of two ways. We must either make the Filipino independent, or must make ourselves imperialistic in our theory of government. And I believe that that great New York convention ought to have risen to the dignity of the occasion; and it ought to have said to this country: "You may vote us up or you may vote us down; but if we rise we will rise with liberty, and if we fall we will fall with death." (Great applause.)

Upon what theory do we hold the Philippine Islands to-day? I have heard two theories advanced. Some say we got them by purchasing the islands from Spain; others say we got them by conquest. Did we purchase the islands from Spain?

How did we get the people? Did we buy the people at so much a head? Or were they thrown in when we bought the islands? Which will you take? Will you buy people at so much a piece? Or will you say that when you buy dirt you buy the people who stand upon it? I deny the right of our government to buy people from any king on earth. (Applause.) I deny the right. More than that—not only can we not buy people from Spain, but if the Filipinos had unanimously declared that they wanted to sell themselves to us, I deny the right of any man to sell himself into slavery or into bondage.

I say: Meet these questions and fight them out. The Republicans are afraid to meet the question of imperialism. Do you ask me for evidence? Read their platform in 1900. Did they declare for imperialism? No. Did they mention endorsing colonialism? What did they say? They said we could not do anything until the Filipinos should lay down their arms. And when the Filipinos had laid down their arms, what did they say? They said there was "nothing to do—it is all over now." (Applause.) They first said: "We have not reached the question;" and then they said: "We have got past it." (Renewed applause.)

And to-day the Republican party dares not defend its colonial policy. Why did these cowardly New York Democrats run from a question, when the Republicans are afraid of it? Do you tell me that although we might not get title by purchase, we got title by force? that we had whipped the Filipinos, and they are ours? If you believe in that doctrine, let some big Republican try to whip a Democrat and then claim to own

him, and see whether the doctrine is good. (Laughter.) And if a big Republican cannot whip a little Democrat and then own him, how can a big nation like ours whip 8,000,000 people and then own them? (Applause.)

The question of imperialism is an issue—it must be an issue. And the Democratic party ought to be ashamed of itself in any State in this union to run from a principle that involves a question of American liberty. (Great applause and cheering.)

OUR COUNTRY.

Speech of General Nelson A. Miles before the Iroquois Club, of Chicago, April 13, 1904, on the occasion of the Club's banquet in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson.

It is a pleasure to meet the fellow-members of the Iroquois club, and to be again in this great metropolis, located in the center of America's business energies and material wealth. The results of your enterprise and industry are felt in every section of our country, and are seen vibrating through the marts of commerce in every quarter of the globe. It is well that as years roll on there should gather here practical business and representative men. There could be no place more suitable than this for discussions that affect our commercial and industrial welfare, and for the consideration of those important questions that rest at the very foundation of our national existence, which are vital to the perpetuity of our institutions and the preservation of the democratic governments of the Americas.

The great State of Illinois has furnished most eminent patriots and statesmen, who have written their names high on the immortal roll of fame. I believe at such a time as this Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas and Lyman Trumbull, were they now living, would be in sympathy with the objects of this meeting, together with one of your charter members, the eminent jurist who presides with such dignity and ability over one of the great coordinate branches of our government. Neither could a more suitable time be selected than the birthday of that most eminent statesman, patriot and philosopher—the author of the Declaration of Independence, and among the first and most eminent of our chief magistrates.

I may well quote on this occasion, and in this presence, the patriotic and now most appropriate eulogy of Thomas Jefferson by Abraham Lincoln, when he said: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

All honor to Jefferson—to the man who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people had the coolness, forecast and sagacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so embalm it there that to-day and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression."

There has been no time in the last century when the citizens of this great republic have more needed to be mindful of the theory of government established by the fathers, or should study more earnestly the character of the institutions then inaugurated and the design of the authors. It may be well to consider the character of the men that made up that assembly which proclaimed the Declaration of Independence, and also that convention which formulated and adopted the Constitution of the United States. Intelligent, conscientious men; such a body of men in point of moral worth, integrity of purpose and noble patriotism never assembled before or since. Through their wisdom and their devotion to the welfare of mankind they wrought out a form of government more just and perfect than any other ever conceived by man.

It was the avowed purpose of the authors to give to the people of this country "a constitution provided with more checks and barriers against the introduction of tyranny than any government hitherto instituted;" they were aware "that arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty;" and that "nothing but harmony, honesty, industry and frugality were necessary to make a great and happy people." For more than 100 years the inspiration of those men has been the guiding star of our progress and prosperity. They wrought not for themselves, for selfish purposes, for the gratification of ambition, or for the benefit only of the people living at that time, but they founded deep and strong the citadel of liberty, equality and justice. Through all the vicissitudes of the past century our fathers have preserved those institutions, and we must ever be mindful of our sacred duty and obligation to defend them.

Selfishness and apathy are the germs of political disease which cannot but result in the decay and ruin of the priceless institutions that we now enjoy. On this undeveloped continent the fathers and those that followed them found a safe refuge from the oppression of monarchies. Here they founded a state in which they took upon themselves