

you want any more development go down into your pocket and pay for it."

Verily the ingratitude of republics is a mild thing compared with the ingratitude of tariff millionaires.—Columbus (O.) Evening Press.

**GHOST DANCE VS. FRENCH BALL.**  
News article in Chicago Chronicle of March 11.

John Olin, William Dyer and John Young, whose Indian names translated into English mean respectively *Afraid-of-Death*, *Late-to-Awake* and *Trembling Knees*, passed through Chicago the other day on their way back from Washington to the Bad River Indian reservation.

They went to Washington in response to a summons from Secretary Root, who wished to talk to them about the ghost dances which usually take place in Montana and Dakota at this time of the year. Olin was educated at Carlisle and speaks English like a college professor, though his speech at times is slow. He saw both President Roosevelt and the secretary of war.

"I admit," said Olin as the trio stood at a bar near the Northwestern depot yesterday morning and swallowed three glasses of whisky with gusto, "that ghost dances do harm to my race in that they excite too much. I am perfectly willing to use my influence to stop them. We educated Indians realize that the only hope for our tribes is in education and civilization."

"But speaking of dancing and civilization, I went to a ball in Washington while I was there. It was the product of civilization and was called the French ball. I saw scenes there which would have disgusted my tribe. I am told that the women who danced were not received in Washington society. That may be, but the men who aided and abetted them were senators and congressmen and persons who held high government positions. If the Indians were thoroughly civilized I don't believe they would permit such antics as that to take place."

In coming through from Washington to Chicago the Indians were in the company of a reporter for the Chronicle. All seemed to have a good knowledge of American history and affairs. When Harper's Ferry was called out by the brakeman Young burst out:

"Harper's Ferry! John Brown! I wonder if the Indians will ever have

a John Brown. We need one almost as much as the slaves of the south did. We do not wish to be freed from bondage, but we wish to be freed from ignorance and crime."

#### AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR PLATT.

For The Public.

Illustrious Sir: The academicians seem to be playing havoc with our blessed balance of trade theory, and it looks as though their sacrilegious onslaught upon our favored institutions may make headway with the voters. It is evident that the time is at hand for one of our traditional coups d'état. We have been so successful with our changes of front heretofore that we need not fear the one that we are now due to undertake. The G. O. P. must become the free trade party. We have, in turn, taken from the Democrats each of their pet theories, and made it our own. That is because we have the courage which they lack. They elected Cleveland on a free trade campaign. At least his election was a protest against our "protection" position. But they had not the valor to stand by their guns.

Proclaiming themselves for liberty, the Democracy of the country became the bulwark of human slavery. Our own party was launched amid demands for "Free land, free men, Fremont." We did not get Fremont or the other freedoms, but we got Lincoln four years later. We have managed to get away from Lincoln, just as we have departed from our enthusiasm for free land and free men. We started as a Republican party, and have by easy stages become an imperial party. We can hold our voters together easily if we make our changes carefully. We were the original greenback party, and at the proper time we retired the greenbacks. We were for silver, then bi-metallism, and are now for gold. There has been no jar in these various transitions, because our party has always had able leadership. I contend that our leadership to-day is in safe hands, and so I feel confident that I shall soon be able to give free expression to my free trade views and remain an ardent adherent of our party. It is for you to "strike the keynote."

My impression is that we can elect several presidents on a free trade avowal. We got in quite a number on the bloody shirt, some on protection to American industries, and at least one on a full dinner pail. Let us whirl in and reverse our "balance of trade" theory in such a way as to make it ap-

pear that we were always on the sophomoric side of the controversy.

Have no fear that the "flop" will be apparent. See how easy it was for us to condemn reconcentrado camps in Cuba, and approve them in Asia and South Africa. No difficulty attended our change from free silver to "sound money." From our protestations of "The land for the people," we found an easy course to give the public domain to the railroad owners.

There was a time when a free trader might be charged with being in the employ of the Cobden club, and bribed with British gold. But we have, since then, adopted so many of the British policies, including those of the Marquis of Bute and George III., that our people are now ready for anything we set before them bearing the British trade-mark.

With profound esteem,

HERMAN KUEHN.

#### THE FILIPINOS ARE CHRISTIANS.

For The Public.

From a recent speech in Boston by President Schurman, of Cornell university, it would seem that he is becoming somewhat dissillusioned. When the McKinley administration adopted the British form of oppression in its treatment of the Christians of Luzon, President Schurman was led by the hypocritical, false pretenses of the administration to believe that the "sole object of taking the Philippines was the humanitarian aim of carrying to them the blessings of liberty." It is encouraging to believe that President Schurman is not the only supporter of the McKinley administration who was animated by the spirit of American liberty; and that they would not have sanctioned our brutal colonial servitude on the British plan had they not been deceived into believing that the administration was honest and true to American principles of liberty.

It is to be hoped that the more honest Roosevelt will make partial amends for the wrongs committed by his predecessor. The worst of it is, though, that full amends cannot be made. It is impossible to return the lives that have been taken, or to fully restore the confidence which the Filipinos had in us before they knew us as well as they do now. It is also to be hoped that others besides President Schurman will have their eyes opened; and that unless the United States government abandons the imperialism of the old world, which we have, been taught

to despise, and returns to the democratic principles of liberty, which we have been taught to revere, they will express their disapproval in the only way which the administration seems to respect, viz.: by means of the ballot.

Many have been confused by the pretense that national honor required the subjugation of the Christian Filipinos. How false and dishonorable is this claim, when we remember that the reason given for bribing with salaries, instead of subjugating the polygamous, slave-holding Mohammedans of Sulu, was, that they were a fierce and warlike people, who would savagely resist any interference with their institutions! How false and hypocritical is this plea of national honor, when we consider that instead of treating the Christians of Luzon as well as we did the savage Sulu Mohammedans, we adopted the suggestion of Mr. John Foreman, who advised our government: "The islands are a splendid group, well worth picking a quarrel and spending a few millions sterling to annex them." (See P. 556, Government Document, No. 62.)

What becomes of the national honor and the pretense of conferring the blessing of Christian civilization, when we pusillanimously hire the Sulu Mohammedans to float the stars and stripes over polygamy, slavery and despotism, while at the same time we kill Christians in Luzon by the thousands because they are guilty of only one crime—the same crime of which the American colonies were guilty in the days of George III?

Since we believe in killing Christians because they desire self-government, while we protect Mohammedans in the practice of polygamy, slavery and despotism, it is fair to ask whether we believe in the principles of Christian civilization, to say nothing of a desire or the ability to teach them to other peoples, who are already Christian.

A. B. CHOATE.

Minneapolis, Minn., Feb. 10, 1902.

## SHALL WE ABANDON GREAT MORALS?

For The Public.

To denounce as "sentimental" or "academic" every protest against the present un-American foreign policy of the United States appears to be a favorite occupation of the administration politicians and of the subsidized administration press.

If the intent be to identify "sentiment" with "sentimentality," the effort is wide of the mark, for the one term is a gross perversion of the other. "Sentimental" may be predicated of that to which the reason has not contributed—the result merely of feeling. But a sentiment is an opinion derived from the cooperation of the intellectual and moral faculties.

The cultivation of just sentiments strengthens the character and enriches the individual life. It is sentiment that controls our relations with our fellow men in society. It is sentiment that originates law, and it is sentiment that induces obedience thereto on the part of every right-minded citizen. It is sentiment that effects every private contract, and it is sentiment that gives to every treaty its binding force. It is sentiment that dictates every just national policy. As an individual without sentiment is a poor creature indeed, so a nation whose policies evince its want, is a spectacle for men and gods.

It is perhaps natural that they who attempt the defense of policies permeated with that which Holy Writ declares to be the root of all evil should resort to an expression implying excessive sensibility. It might be expected that the apologists for highway robbery and murder on a national scale would object to considerations suggested by the Decalogue.

But to return to sentiment. What were Magna Charta and the English bill of rights? Sentiment. What was the declaration of Hampden: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute?" Sentiment. What was the assertion of our revolutionary fathers: "Taxation without representation is unjust?" Sentiment. What was the declaration of independence? Sentiment. What is the "bill of rights" in our federal constitution? Sentiment. What has been the demand for civil and religious liberty in all history? Sentiment. It ill becomes men to sneer at sentiment, who are to-day enjoying that constitutional liberty which is the product of some of the best sentiments of the race.

And the protest against certain governmental policies, we are told, is "academic," too; that is, theoretical, and not practical. The discussions eventuating in the declaration of independence were indeed academic, but they were at the same time eminently practical.

Our revolutionary fathers were disposed to square every political consideration with the moral law—a law whose obligation they knew could be impaired by no enlargement of terri-

tory, no increase of population, no development of trade—a law which they knew to be more binding on a village community than on an imperial state.

The constitutional creation of the fathers was not builded for a generation, or for a century, but for the ages. It was builded to be, not a republic to-day and an empire to-morrow, but a republic forever. Neither war, nor trade, nor colonization, were to be the glories of the nation they builded, but education, and science, and art, and the perfection of self-government. They builded a nation whose freedom from foreign alliances should be regarded as not more important to the weakness of its youth than to the strength of its later years—a nation which should be recognized the world over, not as the exploiter of the bodies and souls of men, but as a moral menace to every invasion of man's rights—the political emancipator of the race.

"Academic" this may be, but observance thereof is as binding on the national conscience to-day as it was yesterday, and no more obligatory to-day than it will be to-morrow. "Academic" this may be, but, if anything is practical for the statesmanship of the year 1902, it is these very considerations. Disregard of them means nothing more or less than the beginning of the end of the republic of the United States.

It is believed that if the fathers could have foreseen the blighting commercialism of the present day, and the infinite shame it is bringing to the national escutcheon, they would have provided positive constitutional guarantees against present abuses. That they did not make such provision can only be ascribed to their inability to anticipate such political apostasy on the part of their descendants.

JOHN SAMPSON.

No. 2420 14th St., Washington D. C.

Jan. 20, 1902.

## JOHN P. ALTGELD'S LAST SPEECH.

An abstract of the speech delivered at the pro-Boer meeting in Joliet, Ill., March 11, by Hon. John P. Altgeld; furnished to The Public from Joliet under date of March 11.

At a great pro-Boer meeting held at the opera house here to-night, ex-Gov. Altgeld declared that all friends of humanity owed a debt of gratitude to Gov. Yates for issuing a proclamation soliciting assistance for the Boer women and children who are perishing in foul concentration camps which the British are maintaining in South Africa.

He said that the kind people of