

Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press and that cannot be limited without being lost.

He was the author of the statute of Virginia guaranteeing religious liberty and was also the father of the University of Virginia. He favored a free school system which would bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education.

He was an advocate of the jury system; and he argued in favor of freeing the slaves three-quarters of a century before Lincoln issued his emancipation proclamation.

His writings fill many volumes and cover almost every conceivable subject, but through all that he said there runs the evidence of a great heart as well as a great intellect.

There is need to-day of a revival of Jeffersonian principles. He was not an enemy of honestly acquired wealth, but he believed that the government had no right to exaggerate by favoritism the differences between individuals. He believed that all should stand equal before the law and that every department of government, executive, legislative and judicial, should recognize and protect the rights of the humblest citizen as carefully as it would the rights of the greatest and most influential.

Jefferson's principles, applied to the problems of the twentieth century, would restore the republic to its old foundations and make it the supreme moral factor in the world's progress. The application of his principles to-day would restore industrial independence and annihilate trusts. The application of his principles to-day would drive the money changers out of the temple, insure to the people a stable currency and harmonize labor and capital by compelling justice to both.

Society to-day has its aristocratic and its democratic elements; whether Jefferson's principles are applied depends upon which element controls the government.—The Commoner of Apr. 5.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF THE REPUBLIC.

Speech of George Gluyas Mercer, president of the American League, of Philadelphia, at the liberty meeting, Faneuil hall, Boston, Saturday evening, March 30, 1901.

"When liberty is in danger, Faneuil hall has the right, it is her duty, to strike the keynote for these United States." These, citizens of Boston, were the words uttered in this hall by your son, Wendell Phillips, some three and sixty years ago, in the first speech he ever made here

—a speech to be followed by many others made by the same champion of human freedom in this same sacred place. Two generations before that these walls had answered to the appeals of revolutionary patriots, and in those days Philadelphia and Boston stood side by side in the struggle for independent self-government, and I deem it a high honor to-night to have the privilege of standing here to bring you greeting from Independence hall.

It is my conviction that the fathers of our republic proclaimed to the world, not only a profound principle of political philosophy, but also a fundamental principle of social evolution, when they declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All political and social progress since that time has been in accordance with that principle, and we are here to-night to demand that wherever our flag goes that principle shall go with it, to distinguish our republic from the empires of Europe. Gov. Boutwell has adverted to the criticism sometimes made that we have not been faithful to that principle in the cases of women and negroes and Indians. As for the women, they give submissive assent to the present government. When they unite in demanding rights equal to those of men, which I, for one, believe they ought to have, they will get those rights. As for the negroes, our civil war lifted them to the plane of citizenship and any attempt now made to deprive them of their constitutional rights is wrong. As for the Indians, our treatment of them has properly been called "a century of dishonor," but we have never treated them as badly as we are now treating the Filipinos. We have recognized their nationality and made treaties with them and have behaved toward them far more nobly than toward our former allies in Luzon. But granting that we have not done our duty in these cases, is that any argument for a continuance of the wrong-doing? Because a man breaks one commandment, shall he disregard the entire decalogue? "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." What did Christ mean by that? Not, I take it, that perfection was attainable by all, but rather that perfection was the ideal for which all should strive. When the American fathers declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, they set that up as a standard.

They believed that the nation that did most toward reaching that standard would attain the nearest degree to political perfection. Prior to the Philippine war, America kept ever before her this lofty ideal of the declaration. As the years went by we succeeded in making the ideal more and more nearly real. Did the constitution make an exception to the rule in its provision as to slavery? Are we always faithful to the principle to-day? As applied to the situation in the Philippines, I care not how these questions are answered. They are beside the mark. What we protest against is that the government has deliberately abandoned that ideal in the Philippines and set up another policy. This eighteenth century political philosophy which Jefferson embodied in the declaration of independence—is it true? Is it what Lincoln said its author meant it to be—"a stumbling block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the paths of despotism?" Is it still an ideal for twentieth-century America, freer and more prosperous than in the days of her youth? Or has plutocracy bred tyrants, and must we give up our ancient faith? I see there are some who still believe in the principle. We believe it the highest duty to strive to bring the republic back to the ideals of her youth, and we shall not cease in our endeavor while life lasts.

When the administration first entered upon this imperialist policy, the man who taught me political economy at Yale college, Prof. William G. Sumner, published an article entitled "The Conquest of the United States by Spain." Prof. Sumner had no intention at that time of assuming the role of prophet. He meant merely to indicate that the administration had entered upon the path which had brought Spain to ruin. Subsequent events, however, have shown that no paper ever had a truer title. The Spanish conquest of our country has steadily continued. Beginning with the denial to the Filipinos of their independence, it has gone on step by step until the Filipinos have to-day toward us the same feeling of intense resentment that they formerly felt toward the Spaniards. We protested against the reconcentrado method of a Spanish general, who was called a butcher, in Cuba. We have adopted the same method in the Philippines. "He has transported us beyond the seas to be tried for pretended offenses." That was one of the counts in the indictment against George III., as made in

our declaration of independence at Philadelphia. We have established a penal colony in Guam, and the most noted man to be banished is he whom Admiral Dewey calls the brains of the Philippine insurrection, Mabini, too weak to fight; Mabini, in Manila, which is under the control of the American forces, if there is any place which is; Mabini in prison, where one would think he could do no harm; Mabini paralyzed, but, in spite of all this, banished because he would not renounce his love of liberty and swear allegiance to the United States. Was there any fear that this paralytic could make forcible resistance to American authority? Was he banished lest he might escape from prison? No. He was banished because God's truth was on his lips, and because the administration feared the indignation of the civilized world over the hypocrisy masquerading in the name of American liberty. But this is not all. American soldiers are killing wounded and unresisting Filipino prisoners. Do you doubt it? Read the statistics cited by George Kennan in his papers written for the Outlook. Remember that that religious periodical has been an administration organ, and that the president has had no more able defender than its editor, Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott.

The support which imperialism is receiving from vested interests and so-called Christian pulpits reminds one of a similar support given to the cause of slavery in the days of our fathers. Again I am reminded of Wendell Phillips. As he appealed, after John Brown's raid, "from the American people drunk with cotton and the New York Observer to the American people 50 years hence," so may we appeal from the American people, drunk with the lust of conquest, and the New York Outlook to the American people when the light of history and civilization has at length made clear that militarism and democracy cannot abide together. But the Spanish conquest of our republican administration continues. We are now resorting to Spanish inquisitorial methods to compel silent prisoners to speak or reluctant witnesses to testify. An officer of our regular army, now serving in Luzon, has given in a letter details of the "water torture," which are too horrible to repeat. Gen. Sherman was right when he said that "War is hell," but the war in which he fought was not disgraced by any such atrocities as those just related as taking place in the islands of the

Pacific, until one may well exclaim: "O, liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name."

The culmination of the conquest of the United States by Spain was reached the other day when the Filipino leader was made a prisoner. It has been truly said that war legalizes nearly every practice that is held in abhorrence by civilized men in time of peace. I am not sufficiently familiar with military tactics and military ethics to enable me to say whether forgery, which would land a civilian in the penitentiary, is approved by military regulations, and I shall not waste time in any criticism of the trickery and strategy by which Aguinaldo was deceived. It may be worth while, however, to remember that of the capturing party five only were Americans, three were Tagalogs, and 78 were Macabebes, who, as Col. Codman has said, are now allies of the United States, as they were formerly allies of Spain, and who, as Gov. Boutwell has said, are savage mercenaries in the employ of our government. The report tells us that one of the Filipino traitors had been shot through the lungs in a recent battle in which he was taken prisoner. What threats of torture and punishment and what promises of reward induced these Filipino prisoners to turn traitors we can only guess. Until we know, we cannot justly estimate their guilt. My desire is merely to call attention to the fact that it was not until the Spanish officer, apparently in command of the party, said: "Now, Macabebes, go for them!" that the Judas who betrayed Aguinaldo threw his arms about the leader and said: "You are a prisoner of the Americans." I take this from Funston's story of the capture, as printed in the daily papers. So it was by command of a Spanish officer that Aguinaldo was captured at last. This was the culmination of the conquest of the United States by Spain. What could be more pathetic than the statement in Funston's report that Aguinaldo dispatched supplies to the party and directed kind treatment of the five Americans who were advancing to make him prisoner, and who, he thought, were prisoners in the hands of his own men. We may be able to give points to the Filipinos on forgery and stratagem, but they can give us points on the elementary and fundamental principles of Christianity. For my part, I would rather be the commander-in-chief of the Filipino forces, fighting for home and liberty and independence against great odds, and now at last a prisoner through

stratagem, than be the commander-in-chief of the American forces, sworn to uphold and defend the constitution of the United States, and now directing a war against the fundamental principles of human liberty. "If this be treason, make the most of it." My brethren are men of whatever color and in whatever place, who are fighting for liberty and self-government. My foes are they who betray the sacred principles to which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The chairman of this meeting has alluded to the apathy of the American people on this great question. To my mind this is our greatest danger. If the president of the United States should boldly proclaim the empire, there is no doubt as to the answer of the people. Imperialism is making progress among us, just as it did in ancient Rome, by gradual stages, and without any clear conception on the part of the people of the trend of affairs. Men who love their country as dearly as we do, and who hate tyranny as bitterly, cannot be persuaded that there is danger to our institutions from the forcible imposition upon an alien race of what they regard as a superior civilization. They cannot see that benevolent assimilation is as false in principle as criminal aggression. They think that if there be imperialism there must be an emperor, and, as they read the honeyed words of presidential papers, they can find no Caesar in "the mildest mannered man that ever scuttled ship or cut a throat." But the essence of empire is absolutism. It makes no difference, so far as the existence of the empire is concerned, whether the absolute power is administered benevolently or malignantly, or whether it is wielded by one man or by many. Free government is by consent of the governed. Government without responsibility to the governed is imperial. It is in this sense that Gov. Boutwell finds an empire already in existence in the Philippines, where the people have no voice, and where the president rules 10,000,000 souls by the strong arm of military force, and without any constitutional restraint.

If I had my way, no one would call the McKinley party by the name republican—a name hallowed by its association with the names of the great men who freed the slave and saved the union. "No man is good enough to govern another man with-

out that other's consent—this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor of American republicanism." This is the definition of the word republican as made by Abraham Lincoln, and no man has a right to that party name who is false to that fundamental principle.

For my part I am not disposed to underestimate the strength of the forces against us. We are met just after the army bill has given the president absolute power over the Philippines, after the capture of the leader of the army of liberty, and when the war budget of our own nation is greater in amount than that of any of the military nations of the old world. Under these depressing circumstances there is the one supreme duty for us, and that is to make no compromise of American principles. It has been said here this evening that the power of the United States is so tremendous as to leave no doubt of the ultimate outcome of this struggle, and that the Filipinos must eventually yield to our force. That may be so, and yet the final victory may be with them. The long view gives the clearest vision. To his contemporaries there was never a greater failure than that of the Nazarene on the cross.

I began my remarks with a reference to Wendell Phillips, and it was he who said: "One, on God's side, is a majority." Let me leave with you in the present crisis those inspiring words of your poet, Lowell, which Phillips has quoted more than once within these walls:

Right forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,
But that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.
We see dimly in the Present what is small and what is great,
Slow of faith, how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate,
But the soul is still oracular; amid the market's din,
List the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within—
They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin.

And is not this slavery, say the people, that though there may be land enough in England to maintain ten times as many people as are in it, yet some must beg of their brethren, or work in hard drudgery for day wages for them, or starve, or steal, and so be hanged out of the way, as men not fit to live on the earth?—Jerrard Winstanley, Epistle Dedicatory to Oliver Cromwell, 1652.

CIVILIZATION?

Your armies pass from land to land,
With scientific murder stored,
That Christ and Mammon, hand in hand,
May leave no region unexplored.

Religion marches (so you boast)
With bayonets fixed and naked blade;
But do you think the Holy Ghost
Is Minister of War and Trade?

Or do you fancy men are led
From barracks and the seething street,
From harlots and from gin, to spread
The Gospel, by the Paraclete?

Your Gospel is the passionless
Half-dead indulgence, which is lust,
The blatant Bible of the Press,
And urban Ethics of the Dust.

Green, pleasant places you despoil
With dirt and drudgery and din,
That, scarcely clothed, your slaves may
toll,
And, scarcely fed, their children spin.

You touch the sensitive wires of trade;
Your feast from others' bread is carved;
And lo! there is a fortune made,
And lo! there is a city starved.

Then with your riches—gathered, mark!
Within the law, by rule and right—
You buy a title and a park,
Endow a church, and dole delight

To village serfs; you hunt and shoot,
You race and bet; give balls, and prate
Of poor-laws; for the destitute
You organize and legislate.

You legislate; but do you think
You help the world along, one whit
Nearer to joy, or rive one chink
Where men may get a glimpse of it?

Are you convinced true joys reside
In clambering on another's head?
For you perchance a merry ride,
But not for steeds discomfited.

For if success be true delight,
How few that true delight may gain!
And none shall gain it, save he smite
Some other with the spurs of pain.

Ambition—not to think and know,
But to indoctrinate and teach—
That this is half our cause of woe
Is half what Jesus came to preach.
—From "The Mystery of Godliness," by
Francis B. Money-Coutts.

The one cloud that hangs over the Gen. Funston enthusiast is the fact that history repeats itself, and that while every kindergarten pupil is familiar with the names of Napoleon and Jefferson Davis, hardly a man of this generation remembers the names of their captors.

G. T. E.

We should not be especially interested in the survival of the fittest. The fittest are well able to look out for themselves. We should be interested to see that the largest number possible are made fit to survive.—Mrs. Susan Look Avery, in Chicago, April 6.

A highly civilized man can sympathize with the men of every country.—Wu Ting Fang.

Branes—Funston's feat is not so monstrous now as it would have been a year ago.

Poynter—No, it isn't to Mr. McKinley. A year ago antedated the last republican convention.

G. T. E.

Hicks—Yes; Wilkins is a mind-reader. You know Hilarum, the crazy man? Well, the other day he was crazier than usual and then got drunk, to boot. And we set Wilkins to work reading his mind.

Wicks—Must have been interesting. Hicks—Interesting? Wilkins said it was just like reading a Sunday paper.—Puck.

MAGAZINES FOR MARCH.

—The Peacemaker (1305 Arch street, Philadelphia).

—The Criterion (41 E. Twenty-first street, New York).

—Washington News Letter (Washington, D. C.) is largely a compilation of Reformed Christian Science sermons.

—The Chautauquan (Cleveland) tells of Russian women, of Crete and the Cretan question, and of our half-forgotten magazines.

—The Open Court (324 Dearborn street, Chicago) opens with a delightful little story of the time of Christ, by Paul Carus, the editor.

—The American Monthly Review of Reviews (13 Astor place, New York) makes the most of its editorial story of the billion dollar steel trust.

—Eliza Stowe Twitchell's contribution to Why (Cedar Rapids, Ia.), is a sound presentation in novel manner and remarkably readable form of several vital points in political economy.

—Sound Currency (52 William St., New York), has for its four topics the currency question in the Philippines, the currency legislation of the Fifty-sixth congress, the deposit and clearing house system in Austria-Hungary and an inquiry into the redemption of national bank notes.

MAGAZINES FOR APRIL.

—Public Libraries (215 Madison street, Chicago), contains the usual varied collection of useful and interesting matter relating to libraries.

—An illustrated description of Hull house and an article on compulsory arbitration are the interesting features of the Locomotive Fireman's Magazine, Peoria, Ill.

—The Social Crusader (609 Ashland block, Chicago), quotes George D. Herron on class-conscious socialism and concludes Mrs. Wentworth's condensation of the Herron course of lectures.

—The International Journal of Ethics (1305 Arch street, Philadelphia) offers a discussion of the moral problems of war and a presentation of the theory of value with reference to its place in the history of ethics.

—McClure's (141-145 E. Twenty-fifth street, New York) offers one of Ida M. Tarbell's historical narratives, "Disbanding of the Confederate Army," and gives place to another of Edwin Lefevre's fine studies of Wall street. This is a trust manipulation story in which there is much instruction.

THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico,

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago.