

IS IT TREASON TO PROCLAIM LIBERTY?

Extract from the speech in the Senate on American government in the Philippines, made by Senator Edward W. Carmack, of Tennessee, as reported at p. 5219 of the Congressional Record of May 1.

So far as I am concerned I have never permitted myself to be disturbed by this cry of treason. We have got used to it down in my part of the country. There is hardly a man of distinction in my section of the United States who has not at some time or other been denounced as a public traitor by some public thief. Men have been denounced as traitors because they opposed the protective tariff. They have been denounced as traitors because they opposed extravagant pension legislation. So long as men have the courage to oppose wrong and denounce it there will be knaves to raise the cry of treason and fools to repeat the cry.

For the most part, sir, such abuse comes from brawling demagogues and may be passed with patient and serene contempt. But I regret to say that there have been men whose utterances usually command and usually deserve respect who have used language that will give countenance and encouragement to crawling slanderers who are not worthy to lick the dust at their feet.

I believe, sir, that I have as high respect for the office of president as any man in the country. I have much admiration for some of the strong and splendid qualities of the distinguished gentleman who now occupies that office, and because I have I very greatly regret that he has uttered language which for his honor I am glad to believe he will some time be ashamed of. In his address glorifying the strenuous life he says:

No small share of the responsibility for the blood shed in the Philippines—the blood of our brothers and the blood of their wild and ignorant foes—lies at the thresholds of those who so long delayed the adoption of the treaty of peace, and of those who by their worse than foolish words deliberately invited a savage people to plunge into a war fraught with sure disaster for them.

And again:

It must be remembered that their utterances are saved from being treasonable merely from the fact that they are despicable.

Mr. President, I have not quoted that language for the purpose of expressing resentment. I do not feel any. I know, sir, that we must make many allowances for that remarkable man, and especially must we not expect from him the language of

moderation when dealing with the character and the motives of his political opponents. We must not judge the President in his moments of oratorical ferocity or by the way he ejaculates his parts of speech when the maniac frenzy of battle is in his blood.

The President is not vindictive, he is simply strenuous; and these outbursts are due to that abounding animal energy which makes it impossible for him to move except with a bound, to speak except at the top of his voice, or to express his disapproval except with the full strength of his vocabulary. He is the strong man Kwasind, and rends and tears not from fury but from sheer excess of strength and energy. He resembles, in his habits of speech, my friend Joe Ballanfant's horse, of which remarkable animal it was said that running away was his natural gait.

Now, I say that the President is not vindictive. I do not believe that he hates Democrats any more than he hates grizzly bears or mountain lions. He just loves to shoot them. He is an always loaded gun, and can only go off with the full force of the powder that is in him. In his talk about the "treasonable" and "despicable" utterances of men whose motives and opinions are as honest as his own, just as when he described Mr. Bryan as a red-handed anarchist in the last campaign, the President was simply "going off."

Mr. President, we are no more responsible for the resistance of the Filipinos than any man who anywhere or at any time has spoken the language of liberty and left his words upon the page of history as an inspiration to mankind. We are no more responsible than the author of that great document now being reveled by some of our military heroes as a "damned incendiary document."

I wish to suggest to our friends on the other side that when they get out a special Philippine edition of the Declaration of Independence they ought to edit it after the fashion of the distinguished junior senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Lodge), who in a recent address paraphrased one of its immortal sentiments so as to make it read: "All civilized governments ultimately derive their power from the whole body of the people." Diluted with this word "ultimately," it is not half so incendiary, and I doubt whether

in this form it would have ever set the American colonists on fire.

But, Mr. President, if we are to be held responsible because we are said to have held out words of hope and encouragement to the Filipinos, what shall be said of the responsibility of those who have habitually maddened them with words of insult and opprobrium, whose every utterance has been made as though with a deliberate purpose to destroy every hope of a just and liberal government at our hands and to plant in their bosoms an inextinguishable hatred of American rule?

THE MORGENTHALERBURG INSTITUTE ENTERS PRACTICAL POLITICS.

By Wardon Allan Curtis, in Puck, of Feb. 5. Reprinted in The Public by the courteous permission of Messrs. Keppler & Schwarzmann, publishers and proprietors of Puck. (Corner Houston & Elm Sts., New York.)

The faculty of the great Morgenthalerburg Institute of Sociology had emerged from the seclusion of academic discussion of sociological problems, into the field of actual politics. Ever since the establishment of this renowned post-graduate institution upon the John Charles Henry Williamson foundation, its faculty had studied every possible sociological problem from every possible point of view and the results of their studies had appeared in divers reviews and sociological journals, where they were devoured with avidity by scores of professors and students of sociology everywhere.

But when Dr. Charles Ephrosatus Raynebeaser assumed the presidency of the institute, he announced that it was high time for the school to take on a more practical phase, and, abandoning the mere academic discussion of theories, struggle to have them put into actual use.

The doctor was a faddist—what sociologist is not?—and for years he had meditated upon the problem of the treatment of the defective classes, the mutes, the imbeciles, the degenerates and criminals, and the best methods of preventing them from perpetuating their defects as a sad heritage to their descendants. The doctor was a disciple of the doctrine that for the benefit of the whole race, the defectives should not be allowed to perpetuate themselves. To attain this desirable end, there was but one effectual way, the most radical:—not segregation, but death. "True, some sadness is occasioned by