

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