

this idea at its foundation. Take care of the rich and the rich will take care of the poor! That is the kingly idea found in every monarchy which the protective tariff system has engrafted upon the republic.—Gideon, in Chicago Chronicle of Sept. 16.

**DEATH KNELL OF CUBAN INDEPENDENCE—A PROPHECY.**

A circular now being distributed in Chicago.

Senator Beveridge, in his speech at the Auditorium (Chicago), September 25, 1900, sounded the death knell of Cuban independence, as follows:

If the opposition declare that we ought to set up a separate government over the Philippines because we are setting up a separate government over Cuba, I answer that such an error in Cuba does not justify the same error in the Philippines. I am speaking for myself alone (pause), but, speaking thus, I say that for the good of Cuba, more even than for the good of the United States, a separate government over Cuba, uncontrolled by the American republic, never should have been promised. As an American possession Cuba might possibly have been fitted for statehood in a period not much longer than that in which Louisiana was prepared for statehood. The United States needs Cuba for our protection, but Cuba needs the United States for Cuba's salvation.

The resolution hastily passed by all parties in congress, at an excited hour, was an error which years of time, propinquity of location, common commerce, mutual interests and similar dangers surely will correct.

So generally is it understood that Senator Beveridge is a mouthpiece of the administration, that his pause after the statement "I speak for myself alone," and its reiteration after the remarks quoted above, were too evidently for the purpose of lulling suspicion in the minds of the unsophisticated that the speaker was, in an impolitic manner, just prior to the election, voicing the ultimate intentions of those who dictate the policies of the administration.

Not one of his audience but would have received with righteous indignation two years ago, the suggestion of a possibility that this country would attempt the subjugation of a weaker people for purposes of colonization. Yet the process of unconscious absorption of sophistical arguments, justifying this departure from our national traditions, had been gradually going on in their minds.

And into that mental soil Senator Beveridge placed the seed, the fruit of which will be the unquestioning and enthusiastic endorsement, by a majority of that audience, of the repudiation of the congressional resolution that "the Cubans are, and of

right ought to be, free and independent."

And this mental transition will be to them no mystery, for they will not be conscious of it, but will really believe that they "always thought so."

Is this subtle process going on in your mind?

Resolutions adopted by both houses of congress on the 18th of April, 1898:

Resolved, first, That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent. . . . Fourth, That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and assert its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

**A LETTER PUBLISHED IN A REPUBLICAN PAPER.**

I am a laboring man, and would like to say a few words about the "prosperity" which the republican newspapers and orators say abound on every hand.

I want to tell you my experience as a workingman and mechanic for the past year, and I may add that my experience is similar to that of tens, yes, hundreds of thousands of working people throughout the country.

I had been working in the wire factory in Evanston, when along came the trust and gobbled up the shops and closed them down. And yet you say there are no trusts, and that trusts are not an issue of the campaign. Well, myself, together with thousands of others who voted for McKinley in 1896, will give our verdict as to whether, or not there are any trusts, on November 6. I had a home partly paid for in Evanston, and not being able to get work near by, I was compelled to sell my place at a loss and great sacrifice. I had read of how the mills and factories of Indiana were booming with work, and I went there hoping to find employment. I found that in the manufacturing districts of Indiana the shops had not been running more than half time during the past two years, and the workers dependent upon them in a terribly poverty-stricken condition. My experience was the same as thousands of others who went to that state vainly trying to get work.

Despairing of procuring employment at my trade, I tried to get work in the mining districts of Illinois, and there I found conditions even worse than in Indiana. Thousands already there were unemployed, and those who were working received such a

miserable pittance for their labor, that I left the region in utter disgust and discouragement. I decided to return to Chicago, in hopes of securing work in some of the establishments in and about the city. I tried the steel works in South Chicago, and found half the plants shut down, with no promise of work in the immediate future. I then went to Pullman, with no good results. Every morning at the gates of the Pullman works there are hundreds of men waiting for the word to go to work, and hundreds are turned away every morning with the look of despair depicted upon their faces. I could picture in my mind the squalor of their homes, the ill-clad children, and hopelessness of the mother, for I know my own condition. I went from there to the stock yards in hopes of securing some kind of work, but I found conditions there as bad, if not worse, than other places I had been.

Now, what do you suppose all these men think of the talk and brag of prosperity? I will tell you. They feel insulted for being taken for such a lot of idiots as the republican papers and spellbinders assume that they are, by being taunted with the brazen lie and shameless falsehood that prosperity is abroad in the land. Prosperity for whom, pray?

And let me tell you that if the republican party is counting on getting the labor vote, they will be given a surprise party on November 6.

You may deceive yourselves into believing that the people are prosperous, but it will not hoodwink the laboring people, as they have the experience that brands as a lie your hypocritical pretenses.

Recall on November 6 what I have said. Yours for Bryan,  
—Thomas Buchanan, in Evanston (Ill.) Index.

**DR. ABBOTT ON THE BASIS OF GOVERNMENT.**

Having expressed the opinion that governments do not "rest upon the consent of the governed," the Outlook has been asked to defend its recreancy to a time-honored American principle. This it does in an article presumably written by Dr. Lyman Abbott on "the basis of government;" and in this we are told that

Just government rests neither upon the edict of a few strong men nor upon the consent of the many—it rests upon the law of God.

No government is just which does not conform to the law of God.

No edict of one or few or many or all can

serve to make it just if it does not so conform.

Just governments rest on conformity with the laws of God.

Which is another but more solemn way of saying so undisputed a thing as that a just government is one which conforms to justice—as if this answered or even touched the question fairly put to the Outlook: If governments do not derive their just or rightful powers from the consent of the governed, from whom or what do they derive their just and rightful powers? To say from God, answers nothing, for no one who believes in God as the source of all righteousness, justice, goodness and truth, disputes it. What we want to know is, admitting all this, how are governments in a practical and natural way best and most fully in the long run brought into conformity with the laws of God, in the absence of a duly accredited representative of the Almighty living upon the earth in the flesh. And for the Christian there can be but one answer. It cannot be done by consulting the opinion or the will or the wishes of one man or one class of men; it must be in consulting all, for God is no respecter of persons, and on earth he is to be found in the conscience of the poor and lowly as much as in that of the rich and mighty. If God has any other way of manifesting himself in the world in this year of grace, except through the conscience of men, and of no one man above another, we have not heard of it. And the conclusion inevitably follows that governments derive their just powers, their rightful powers, their God-given powers—so far as they can acquire such powers in an imperfect world—from the consent of the governed, from the people, in whom God is to be found, so far as He is to be found at all upon the earth. And these powers obviously cannot, therefore, be obtained in any other way. And when the Declaration of Independence sets forth such a doctrine, it sets forth fundamental Christian doctrine, and when Dr. Abbott refers to that document as embodying an “exploded philosophy,” he comes near to repudiating his own religion—let alone the politics of the fathers.

Dr. Abbott, indeed, approaches close to an admission of the truth, for he says that

a righteous democracy is simply one way of ascertaining what are the laws of God, and of conforming the life of the community to them.

But is there any other assured way or more certain way in the long run, of ascertaining those laws, and bring-

ing government into conformity, except through democratic government? Is there any other way within reach of human society of so perfectly consulting God as through the conscience of the people, not one or several, but all—the general conscience, freed as far as it ever can be found of the individual warp and twist of interest or pride or prejudice or sin or hereditary defect? Dr. Abbott does not point it out. We conclude that there is no other way; and the conclusion from this is that his repudiation of the “exploded philosophy” of the declaration is utterly and un-Christianly wrong.

It must have been exceedingly embarrassing for Dr. Abbott, at just this stage of his discussion, to be confronted with something he had said 12 years ago on the same question. It is picked from one of his published sermons as follows:

There are not wanting Americans who would take the keys from the people and give them to the Anglo-Saxons. Ask the Chinaman, the Indian and the negro how this violation of the divine law works. Mankind is not fit for self-government. That is true. But mankind are better fitted to govern themselves than any portion of mankind, however selected, are fitted to govern any other portion of mankind. Democracy rests on the fundamental truth that man as man—not royal man nor aristocratic man, nor priestly man, nor Anglo-Saxon man, but man as man—was made in the image of God, and to man as man are given the keys of political, as of natural, dominion. Whenever, wherever and howsoever this divine order is violated, the result is always disastrous.

And so it comes about that Dr. Abbott convicts himself of entertaining un-Christian doctrine in his present campaign against the cardinal principle of democratic government. He does not need our word for it; he has his own word.—Editorial in Springfield (Mass.) Republican, of Oct. 8.

#### A DEFINITION OF IMPERIALISM.

Let us first consider what it is not. Imperialism is not necessarily the maintaining of an emperor or of imperial forms. Those who suggest this are trying to throw political dust into the eyes of the people.

Nor does imperialism necessarily involve an abridgement of the citizen's rights. The Englishman possesses as much freedom as the American, and, with the sole limitation in the choice of his ruler, enjoys an equal share of constitutional rights. But his queen is an empress, his country arbitrarily rules subject races without their consent, and he is consequently living under the reign of imperialism.

The Century Dictionary gives as one definition of imperialism: “The principle or spirit of empire.” In other

words, any government conducted according to the principles or spirit of an empire is a government of imperialism. Let me illustrate: President McKinley's message to congress (December 6, 1897), contained the oft-quoted paragraph:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of. That, by our code of morals, would be criminal aggression.

What did that mean? It clearly meant that forcible annexation might be right according to the moral code of monarchies and empires, but that it is a crime according to the code of morals which should govern a republic. In other words, forcible annexation is not republicanism; it is imperialism.

Still another illustration: Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, in his “Life of Benton” (page 266), says:

No one would wish to see any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our union; the time to have taken the lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors. We, wiser in our generation, have seized the waste solitudes that lay near us, the limitless forests and never-ending plains, and the valleys of the great, lonely rivers; and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession; and a score of years after each conquest we see the conquered land teeming with a people that is one with ourselves.

What does Mr. Roosevelt mean? Evidently, that the peopling of unoccupied or sparsely settled territory is republican expansion; but that the arbitrary seizure of thickly populated lands against the consent of the conquered race is European imperialism.

An early American poet, in an ode to Columbia, brings out the same contrast:

To conquest and slaughter let Europe aspire;

Whelm nations in blood and wrap cities in fire;

Thy heroes the rights of mankind shall defend,

And triumph pursue thee, and glory attend.

The arbitrary imposition of external laws on a people sufficiently numerous to constitute a nation is imperialism. The assumption by any nation of the right of adjudging the measure of self-government sufficient for any other nation is imperialism. The clause in the republican platform referring to the Filipinos: “The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law,” breathes the very essence of imperialism.

The government of men without their rightful participation in the governing legislative body—the enforcement of taxation without representa-