

"Well," said Mr. Dooley, "if ye feel that way ye ought to go an' inlist as an Indyun."—Chicago Evening Journal.

THE UN-AMERICAN POLICY.

The discussion of the future policy of the United States is increasing in interest—the opponents of expansion, as the New York Times has pointed out, having the advantage of character and ability. In the current number of Harper's Monthly is a clear and strong argument in behalf of the maintenance of American institutions by ex-Secretary Carlisle. It follows and supplements a recent article published in the same periodical by Mr. James Bryce, whose warning against the perils of colonial expansion is tempered by the natural self-restraint of a foreigner speaking to us concerning our own affairs, but is also quick with the intelligent interest which Mr. Bryce, beyond any other foreigner, has in our republic. On the same side have ranged themselves Mr. Carl Schurz, Mr. George F. Edmunds, Senator Caffery and Mr. Cleveland, among other Americans, and Mr. John Morley and other leading liberals, the long-time friends of the United States, among Englishmen. On the other side we have some exuberant and restless young adventurers, some politicians who find phrase-making and demagoguery easier than thinking, some editors who mistake cerebral excitement for patriotism and noise for statesmanship, some commercial adventurers who are eagerly interested in the proposition that the government shall buy markets for them with blood and treasure, and some Englishmen, like Mr. Chamberlain, who realize that if they can only persuade the United States to take the Philippines, Great Britain will be sure to have this country for an ally in any trouble that may arise in China between herself and Russia. Surely, if character and ability ever lend weight to one side of a controversy, there is good reason to ask the country to pause and consider before plunging into a departure toward world power, world responsibilities and world troubles, on the ground of the intellectual and moral differences between the opponents and advocates of expansion.

There is another reason for listening to the opponents of this new movement than the merits of their arguments. They are more consistently American than the advocates of expansion. They are the champions of the fundamental principles of the republic, the hopeful and confident

believers in the soundness of the democratic form of government, and in the high achievements of its future. The advocates of expansion, on the other hand, are proving their loss of faith in democratic institutions and their distrust of the American experiment. They denounce as old-fashioned and outgrown Washington's and Jefferson's counsels against mingling our affairs and our destinies with those of monarchical Europe. They hold that the Declaration of Independence erred in asserting it to be a "self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." They scout the word of Lincoln, and insist that "government of the people, by the people and for the people" has perished from the earth, notwithstanding Gettysburg and Bunker Hill. Whether they like it or not—and they profess not to like it—they are really imperialists, for they are endeavoring to overturn the democratic form of government, to destroy the ideals of the republic, to revolutionize American politics by changing the United States from a popular self-government to a power ruling over alien and unwilling peoples, who will not be free and independent, who will be subjects, who will not have a voice in making the laws by which they are governed, and who will be taxed without being represented. And yet these enemies of American institutions, these rebels against the policy which has made the United States what they are, and which has built up American citizenship as it exists, have the insolence to declare that those who favor the maintenance of these institutions and that policy are "un-American." In other words, they recognize the character of the task in which they are engaged by objecting to the labels which properly describe them, and by trying to attach one of them to their opponents. Illustrations of the old fable of the thief who sought to turn attention from himself to his honest pursuers are constantly cropping up in modern life, but no renewal of the old trick within our memory is quite so bold as this one made by those Americans who are so tired of their government and its foundation principles that they desire to join the mediaeval procession, the head of which, for the moment, is the tsar of Russia.—From Editorial in Harper's Weekly of October 8.

France and China are both in trouble. And, oddly enough, the people with its civilization ground to a razor-edge and the people without civilization, as we use the word, are in the same kind of

trouble. Each has balked in the road of Progress and refuses to move on, and the moderns are no less mulish than the ancients. China wants to preserve her inertia and seclusion; yet, little by little, she is being made to catch up with the world, partly by outside influence and partly by native impulse. France wants no less to preserve the traditions of a dead time, of a time when simple justice to the individual counted as nothing against a kind of false honor that was the chief glory of kings; and she, too, is being pushed on like China, partly by the outer world and partly by her own struggling ideal of honesty. Each has got to move in obedience to a law as unbending as the law of gravitation. Since our first parents ate from the tree of Knowledge in the world's greatest fable, no man or nation has been able to evade the penalty. If you eat of the apple you must live up to what you get from it or suffer. France and China are trying not to. Their struggles and their predestined failures will make some lively and instructive reading for the history books.—Editorial in Puck.

THE NEW CONSCIENCE.

An extract from a commencement oration, given at the Kansas state agricultural college, June 9, 1898, by Prof. George D. Herron.

The race is becoming sensible of a life and destiny of its own; it is a race life and a race destiny in which all individuals are to share, yet which is something altogether more than the mere sum of individual lives and destinies, just as a college is infinitely more than the faculty and students and educational machinery that happen to be present in any given year. The new conscience is teaching the individual that his life is a function of the race life, and that he can fulfill his individuality only through fulfilling this function. "A man passes like a traveler through the world," says one of Henryk Sienkiewicz' Polish knights, "and should not be concerned for himself, but only for the commonwealth, which is and must be without end. Amen!"

The responsibility of the individual for the whole human life, and the responsibility of the whole for each individual, is the distinct mark and quality of the new conscience. The individual feels himself enslaved and oppressed in the enslavement and oppression of his brethren; he feels himself guilty of his brother's blood in every custom or system or necessity that makes for poverty and the solace of vice, ignorance and helpless toil; he feels himself a traitor in the prosperity which political debauchery builds on

the prostrate bodies of citizens, a destroyer in the luxury that feasts on the flesh of boys and girls, of women and men. No longer is it possible for men to be content to have while their brothers have not. Superior privileges of any sort now carry with them the sense of shame. The disgrace of wealth, the puerility of culture, the corruption that inheres in the possession of power, are making themselves widely and deeply felt. There are few so lost as to escape the feeling that superiority is a thing to be expiated in social sacrifice. Thus the might and right of the social problem, with the immensity and intricacy thereof, is matched by the honest and searching subtlety of the new conscience. . . .

When I call this conscience Christian, I do not use the word in any professional or pietistic sense; I do not mean that any particular form of religion is, or need be, accepted. This conscience does not come in the names or terms of Christianity; it comes without observation, almost as a new religion springing up from the human soil. Its most manifest activities and evolutions are unconscious of any relation to him we call Christ. The truest Christian conscience of to-day utterly rejects that which is preached and professed as Christianity. Many things that are done in Christ's name are the things which Christ stood against, and the things he stood for are done by many who call themselves materialist or agnostic. The atheist or profligate with human sympathies and social ideals is profoundly Christian in comparison with the professional Christian of faultless morality who conserves only his religious interests and the existing order; the latter is in fact solidly atheistic. We speak of our free school as secular; but it is probably the most concrete social expression of Jesus' idea.

By the term Christian conscience I mean that quality of conscience and sympathy which suffers not a man to rest short of some altar, however rude, on which he offers his life for the common service, the social good. He refuses to drink of the fruit of the vine until he can drink it in fellowship with all his brethren in the full-come kingdom of God. Therefore doth the father love him, because he lays down his life for the sheep.

Now that which makes the ethical tragedy of the present moment is the chasm between the existing civilization and the new conscience. Civilization no longer represents the conscience of the individuals who must find therein their work. The facts and

forces which now organize industry and so-called justice violate the best instincts of mankind. The social crisis discloses conscience and civilization becoming separate entities. Civilization affords no machinery by which the Christ-spirit can express itself in things. This best force in civilization is helpless to effectuate itself in facts. The highest moral reason of the world can find no way to enforce its dictates. The best faith of the world offers no method by which the individual can obey its principles. Without regard to his conscience, the economic system involves a man in the guilt of the moral and physical death of his brothers; their blood cries to him from the adulterated and monopolized food he eats, from the sweat shop clothes he wears, from his educational advantages, his special privileges, his social opportunities. Civilization denies to man that highest right under the sun—the right to live a guiltless life.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

A year and a half ago Prof. Hadley, of Yale, made an address on railroads before the Twentieth Century club in Boston. He argued against public ownership on financial grounds, and because, as I noted his thought, "England and the United States, the most progressive and enlightened nations, have private roads, and low grade peoples have public roads."

President Mead called upon me, without warning, for a five-minute's reply. . . . I thought the statistics of rates and costs were capable of a very different interpretation, if all the circumstances were taken into account, and I could not see the propriety of calling the Germans a low-grade people. England and America may be the most progressive and enlightened nations, but that does not prove all their institutions and conditions to be good. They have more slums and sensational newspapers and stock gamblers and suicides than the "low grade" peoples, but it does not follow that these things are good. Some of the states of Germany and other "low grade" countries started with private railroads, but as they advanced in civilization and experience they came more and more to the conclusion that public roads were best. They tried both ways and found the public plan superior. England and America have only tried one plan, and the continuance of the private system is chiefly due, not to superior civilization, but to the fact that the railroad corporations have greater power over the governments than they had in the

"low grade" countries. The main point I tried to make, however, was that the discussion should rest chiefly on planes above the financial. Economy is good (and it is with the public system), but impartial, undiscriminating, efficient service and the wages and conditions of labor are the most important railroad matters. Large classes of railroad employes are reported by the United States commissioners as making only \$123, \$150 and \$300 per year per individual. The average receipts of all the railroad employes, high and low, are only about \$500 a year, while the letter carriers get \$1,000 and Boston policemen \$1,200 for fewer hours and more agreeable service. If the railroads were made public property, under reasonable civil service rules, employment would be more secure, the hours shorter, the wages higher, the service safer (through automatic couplers, block switches, better-paid labor, etc.), and the men might average as much as the carriers, or double their present wage, and thousands would be able to have comfortable homes of their own instead of getting only half or a quarter of a man's fair pay. Nine hundred dollars or \$1,000 I thought was little enough for a man to have to keep a family and raise and educate his children. The work of a man is worth \$1,000, and he ought to have it. No competent worker ought to be asked to give a year of his life for less, and the fact that the government would see that the men it employed received enough to have good homes and educate their children properly, was one of the strongest reasons for the public ownership of railroads. Good citizens, happy homes, well educated children are worth more than anything else. Civilization is with public ownership, because it tends to manhood, the fair diffusion of wealth, and a wider cooperation.

Edward Atkinson followed me upon the floor, and said it was dangerous to hold out the hope of doubling the average wage of railroad employes. Prof. Hadley also said it was dangerous doctrine to talk of paying the railway men as much as the carriers.

Dangerous doctrine? Yes, it is dangerous; but dangerous to what? To private monopolies and unjust profits—to the wastes of the compound, competitive, monopolistic system we enjoy to-day; to the trusts and combines, and the favorites that get free passes, and special rates and rebates and all the inequities and discriminations that accompany private railroading. Dangerous to whom? To Wall street gamblers in railroad stocks, to transportation