

strength, not of men, but of demons.

Oh, what "splendid work," what valor, what heroism, what magnificent courage "the gallant Americans, wearing the uniform of the American republic," displayed. How "gloriously have they upheld the most glorious traditions of the past," as, protected by a moving breastwork of enforced Filipino citizens, they swept forward, armed to the teeth, to valiantly battle against those fierce Malay warriors, Filipino boys of eight and ten years, come out to defend the honor of their mothers, if perchance they escape the brutal massacre—come forth to avenge the slaughter of their sires and the murder of their brothers, whose life-blood drenched the soil of their native land. What "inconceivably dangerous and harassing warfare of the eastern tropics" was this for "the soldier of the present day."

How flattered must be the survivors of the Grand Army of the Republic, how exalted the military giants "wearing the blue and the gray," how elated the Sons of the American Revolution, whose ancestors fell at Lexington and fought at Bunker Hill, and left the prints of their bleeding feet upon the snows of Valley Forge—what worldwide fame to have their names coupled with "those gallant Americans," disgracing "the uniform of the American republic" in the Philippines.

Long will Theodore Roosevelt drink to the health of those who wrought the "splendid work" of death ere the spirit of liberty shall be crushed from the souls of the infant heroes of the Philippines; but not till the land is left desolate, not while humanity lives in the American heart, not till the doctrine of the brotherhood of man dies in Christendom, not until God forgets His brown children will the flag "stay put" on the bloodsoaked soil of the Philippines. Eternal shame on such ignoble warfare.—Rebecca J. Taylor, in Washington (D. C.) Post.

SENATOR HOAR'S LATEST LIBERTY SPEECH.

Extract from the speech of this venerable Republican, senior senator from Massachusetts, delivered in the United States Senate, May 22, 1902, as reported in the Congressional Record, pp. 6176-86.

... We said in the case of Cuba that she had a right to be free and independent. We affirmed in the Teller resolution, I think without a negative voice, that we would not invade that right and would not meddle with her territory or anything that belonged to her. That declaration was a declaration of peace as well as of righteous-

ness, and we made the treaty, so far as concerned Cuba, and conducted the war and have conducted ourselves ever since on that theory—that we had no right to interfere with her independence; that we had no right to her territory or to anything that was Cuba's. So we only demanded in the treaty that Spain should hereafter let her alone.

If you had done to Cuba as you have done to the Philippine islands, who had exactly the same right, you would be at this moment, in Cuba, just where Spain was when she excited the indignation of the civilized world and we compelled her to let go. And if you had done to the Philippines as you did to Cuba, you would be to-day or would soon be in those islands as you are in Cuba.

But you made a totally different declaration about the Philippine islands. You undertook in the treaty to acquire sovereignty over her for yourself, which that people denied. You declared not only in the treaty, but in many public utterances in this chamber and elsewhere, that you had a right to buy sovereignty with money, or to treat it as the spoils of war or the booty of battle. The moment you made that declaration the Filipino people gave you notice that they treated it as a declaration of war. . . . So you deliberately made up the issue for a fight for dominion on one side and a fight for liberty on the other. Then when you had ratified the treaty you voted down the resolution in the Senate, known as the Bacon resolution, declaring the right of that people to independence, and you passed the McEnergy resolution, which declared that you meant to dispose of those islands as should be for the interest of the United States. That was the origin of the war.

My desire to-day is simply to call attention to the practical working of the two doctrines—the doctrine of buying sovereignty or conquering it in battle, and the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. For the last three years you have put one of them in force in Cuba and the other in the Philippine Islands. I ask you to think soberly which method, on the whole, you like better. I ask you to compare the cost of war with the cost of peace, of justice with that of injustice, the cost of empire with the cost of republican liberty, the cost of the way of America and the way of Europe, of the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence with the doctrine of the Holy Alliance. . . .

In Cuba, of right, just government, according to you, must rest on the consent of the governed. Her people are to "institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

In the Philippine Islands a government is to be instituted by a power 10,000 miles away, to be in the beginning a despotism, established by military power. A despotism where there is treason without an overt act, and elections, if they have them, without political debate, and schools where they cannot teach liberty. It is to be established by military power, and to be such, to use the language of the McEnergy resolution, such as shall seem "for the interest of the United States."

Gentlemen talk about sentimentalities, about idealism. They like practical statesmanship better. But, Mr. President, this whole debate for the last four years has been a debate between two kinds of sentimentality. There has been practical statesmanship in plenty on both sides. Your side have carried their sentimentalities and ideals out in your practical statesmanship. The other side have tried and begged to be allowed to carry theirs out in practical statesmanship also.

On one side have been these sentimentalities. They were the ideals of the fathers of the revolutionary time, and from their day down till the day of Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner was over. The sentimentalities were that all men in political right were created equal; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are instituted to secure that equality; that every people—not every scattering neighborhood or settlement without organic life, not every portion of a people who may be temporarily discontented, but the political being that we call a people—has the right to institute a government for itself and to lay its foundation on such principles and organize its powers in such form as to it and not to any other people shall seem most likely to effect its safety and happiness. Now a good deal of practical statesmanship has followed from those ideals and sentimentalities. They have builded 45 states on firm foundations. They have covered South America with republics. They have kept despotism out of the western hemisphere. They have made the United States the

freest, strongest, richest of the nations of the world. . . .

You also, my imperialistic friends, have had your ideals and your sentimentalities. One is that the flag shall never be hauled down where it has once floated. Another is that you will not talk or reason with a people with arms in their hands. Another is that sovereignty over an unwilling people may be bought with gold. And another is that sovereignty may be got by force of arms, as the booty of battle or the spoils of victory. . . . What have your ideals cost you, and what have they bought for you?

1. For the Philippine islands you have had to repeal the Declaration of Independence. For Cuba you have had to reaffirm it and give it new luster.

2. For the Philippine islands you have had to convert the Monroe doctrine into a doctrine of mere selfishness. For Cuba you have acted on it and vindicated it.

3. In Cuba you have got the eternal gratitude of a free people. In the Philippine islands you have got the hatred and sullen submission of a subjugated people.

4. From Cuba you have brought home nothing but glory. From the Philippines you have brought home nothing of glory.

5. In Cuba no man thinks of counting the cost. The few soldiers who came home from Cuba wounded or sick carry about their wounds and their pale faces as if they were medals of honor. What soldier glories in a wound or an empty sleeve which he got in the Philippines?

6. The conflict in the Philippines has cost you \$600,000,000, thousands of American soldiers—the flower of your youth—the health and sanity of thousands more, and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos slain.

Another price we have paid as the result of your practical statesmanship. We have sold out the right, the old American right, to speak out the sympathy which is in our hearts for people who are desolate and oppressed everywhere on the face of the earth. Has there ever been a contest between power and the spirit of liberty, before that now going on in South Africa, when American senators held their peace because they thought they were under obligation to the nation in the wrong for not interfering with us?

. . . . This war, if you call it war, has gone on for three years. It will go on in some form for 300 years, unless this policy be abandoned. You

will undoubtedly have times of peace and quiet, or pretended submission. You will buy men with titles, or office, or salaries. You will intimidate cowards. You will get pretended and fawning submission. The land will smile and smile and seem at peace. But the volcano will be there. The lava will break out again. You can never settle this thing until you settle it right.

UNCLE SAM'S SOLO IN THE CONCERT OF POWERS.

For The Public.

Tune: Kill everyone over ten years of age, and leave the provinces a howling wilderness.

Come, let us sing and laugh—
Enjoy the wine we quaff;
'Tis children's blood,
A warm, red flood,
And is not bad by half.

Chorus:

We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

They're young and brown and slim—
So tender—like of limb;
The children lie
Beneath the sky,
Shot down in name of Him!

Chorus:

We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

And spreads a Herod fear
Whenever we come near;
And mothers moan,
For, like our own,
Their babes to them are dear.

Chorus:

We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

It is our pious Job,
Though many millions sob,
To teach the youth
The precious truth—
Of Destiny by God.

Chorus:

We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.
We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

Now all you pulpiteers,
Go tell to Christian ears
That war is good—
Christ's precious blood
Is glad of mother's tears.

Chorus:

We are a powerful nation;
In the interest of humanity
We wage a war—but strictly by
The rules of Christianity.

We've learned some ancient tortures,
But we pump with great urbanity,
For we are highly civilized,
And we whipped Spain!

C. E. S. WOOD.

Bull—The Boers are not so invincible as they are said to be.

Ball—Why don't you think they are?

Bull—Why? Didn't Kruger's grandson surrender just because he had lost an arm and leg?

In spite of Gen. Smith's censurable acts he should receive credit for not placing the age of execution at less than ten.

We could not help but observe that our heathen allies were mystified when we fell on our knees and prayed for victory in the conflict which was plainly at hand.

"To the God of Battles," we courteously explained.

"But the God who said: 'Thou shalt not kill!' will not He be offended?" urged they, anxiously.

We did not laugh at them; it was a solemn occasion; and, besides, it was too much to expect of these simple people that they rise at once to a just conception of the essential unity of the Christian deity.—Puck.

"What is a captain of industry?" asked the boy who is going to be very wise some day.

"It is a term that is applied to the head of a great monopoly when he is at a banquet."

"And what is a robber baron?"

"It's the same man when he is in politics."—Washington Star.

"Captain," remarked the nuisance on shipboard who always asks foolish questions, "what is the object in throwing the anchor overboard?"

"Young man," replied the old salt, "do you understand the theory of seismic disturbances? Well, we throw the anchor overboard to keep the ocean from slipping away in the fog. See?"—Baltimore News.

"What is your policy?" inquired the inquisitive individual of a great railroad lawyer.

"Our policy," replied the railroad lawyer, "is millions for defense, but not a cent for damages."—Columbus (O.) State Journal.

BOOK NOTICES.

A handsomely printed edition of Clarence S. Darrow's "A Persian Pearl,"