

cerely, seriously, and with your soul's whole strength. Then you will see what eager, reasonable, and harmonious activity will be displayed in the best spheres of society, bringing the best men of all classes to the front and depriving of all importance those who now disturb Russia. Do this, and all those terrible, brutal elements of revenge, anger, avarice, vanity, and ambition, and above all of ignorance, will disappear, which now come to the front, infecting, agitating, and tormenting Russia—and of which you are guilty.

Yes, only two exits are now open to you, men of the government—a fratricidal slaughter and all the horrors of a revolution leading to your inevitable and disgraceful destruction, or the peaceful fulfillment of the ancient and just demands of the whole people, showing other Christian nations both that the injustice from which men have suffered so long and so cruelly can be abolished, and how to abolish it.

Whether the form of social organization under which you hold power has or has not outlived its day, so long as you still hold power, use it not to multiply the evil you have already done, and the hatred you have already provoked, but use it to accomplish a great and good deed not for your nation alone but for all mankind. If this social organization has outlived its day, let the last act done under it be one not of falsehood and cruelty, but of goodness and truth.

* * *

"I LOVE MY COUNTRY TOO WELL TO BE A PATRIOT."

Ernest Crosby in "Swords and Plowshares."

I am no patriot.

I do not wish my countrymen to overrun the world.

I love the date-palm equally with the pine-tree, and each in its place.

I am as true a friend to the banana and orange as to the pear and apple.

I thank the genial breath of climate for making men different.

I am glad to know that, if my people succeed in spreading over the face of the earth, they will gradually differ from each other as they attune themselves to every degree of latitude and longitude.

Humanity is no air to be strummed on one note or upon one instrument.

It is a symphony where every note and instrument has its part, and would be sadly missed.

I do not take the side of the cornet against the violin, for the cornet needs the violin.

I am no patriot.

I love my country too well to be a patriot.

* * *

IMPERIALISM ABROAD HAS PRODUCED IMPERIALISM AT HOME.

Portions of the Address of the President, Moorfield Storey,
at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, Held in Boston,
Nov. 24 and Dec. 3, 1906.

At the meeting lately held in New York to honor the memory of our great leader, Carl Schurz, Mr. Choate quoted the words of Lincoln:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it.

In that faith we meet again to renew our adhesion to the principles of the great Declaration upon which

our government was founded and in which all Americans believed until 1898, and to record anew our protest against the brutal and wicked doctrine, that one nation has the right to govern another without that other's consent. Civilization the world over is suffering from the un-Christian doctrine that "all the nations upon earth" were not "created of one blood" and with equal rights; that the equal opportunity which we are taught now to call "the square deal" was denied to more than half the human race at their birth, and that the rich color of the Arab, the yellow of the Chinese and Japanese, the brown of the Filipino and the darker hue of the Negro, are all badges of inferiority. The so-called race problem confronts us everywhere, and this great country which has fought a civil war to deliver itself "from the body of this death" is face to face with it again in a most acute form.

The doctrine that one race or class of men is by nature superior to all others is as old as evil. It is not very long since in every country some men thought themselves set by divine appointment above their fellows of the same race and color. One hundred and fifty years ago the Duchess of Buckingham could say when asked to hear a sermon of Whitefield's: "It is monstrous to be told that you have a heart as sinful as the common wretches that crawl on the earth." Shortly before that time, to quote from Macaulay, the Englishman thought that the Irishman "did not belong to our branch of the great human family," and "very complacently inferred that he was naturally a being of a higher order than the Irishman." In 1789 the French noble called his fellow Frenchmen "canaille." Fifty years ago in our own country whites and blacks alike held themselves superior to "the poor white trash" of certain regions.

These delusions have passed. Those whom the Duchess would have called "the common wretches that crawl on the earth," are to-day a controlling force in the government of England. The Irish, the down-trodden and persecuted Jews, the poor whites, have all made good their claim, at least to equality with their fellow-men, if indeed they are content to stop there. The "canaille" have given to France some of her proudest names. The superstition that white men are necessarily superior to men of darker skins must go also, and another century or less will see its end. Russia has learned the lesson from Japan, as Rome learned it from the Arabs, and both paid dear for the instruction. Let us hope that we may learn the truth more easily, for learn it we must.

The present creed of the white man seems to be that greater strength gives him the right to deal with his inferiors as he pleases, and to force his will upon them no matter at what cost to them. Superiority gives him rights, but imposes no obligations, at least none to those who resist his desires. It is a curiously barbarous notion of what constitutes superiority, since among the attributes that distinguish man it exalts strength and cunning, which he shares with the beast, above those qualities which bring him a little nearer to the angels. Superiority is rightly defined in the words of Lord Russell about civilization, which I like to quote:

Its true signs are thought for the poor and suffering, chivalrous regard and respect for women, the frank rec-

ognition of human brotherhood, irrespective of race or color or nation or religion, the narrowing of the domain of mere force as a governing factor in the world, the love of ordered freedom, abhorrence of what is mean and cruel and vile, ceaseless devotion to the claims of justice.

Such superiority cherishes, helps and lifts the lower man or race; it does not trample and kill. When we remember the speech of the German Emperor to the troops which he was sending to China, when we recall the hideous barbarities which marked the march of the Allies from Tientsen to Peking, when we think of the slaughter, pillage and torture for which we are responsible in the Philippines, when we read the words of Hoke Smith, "I declare to you, gentlemen, if one of the precincts in your county should have seventy-five Negro votes and fifty white, and should it become necessary, I would be favorable to a plan to reduce the population to ninety-nine," and find that such speeches were followed by his election to the governorship of Georgia; when we recollect the inconceivably barbarous lynchings that disgrace Southern and Northern States alike, and are compelled to see the harangues of a man like Tillman filling columns in our newspapers, we may well ask what claim we can make to superiority over any humble and peaceful Negro or Filipino, that would not exalt Nero above St. John. We need a lesson in humility; we must learn how true are the words of Lowell:

When the moral vision of a man becomes perverted enough to persuade him that he is superior to his fellows, he is in reality looking up at him from an immeasurable distance beneath.

Our cause has gained. In the Philippine Islands all parties are now united in favor of independence. No body of natives, unless perhaps a few office-holders, supports our rule, and all are working by peaceful means for the right never before denied by America to any people, the right to govern themselves as they will. Indeed how can it be otherwise, when in the midst of unexampled prosperity wherever men are free, they find themselves under foreign rule with every branch of business prostrate, and taxed beyond endurance to pay the expenses of a government in which they have no voice? American rule has meant for them war, pestilence and famine, the death of kindred and friends by hundreds of thousands, the destruction of their towns, the laying waste of their fields, reconcentration, torture, and ruin. They would not be men if they did not desire to be relieved from such oppression. Their union for independence gives new strength to their cause, and must appeal in the end strongly to Americans.

The race problem confronts us there, but merely because we insist upon invading a country whose people are brown. There as everywhere the difficulty is caused by white aggression. No colored race save perhaps the Arabs has ever invaded a white man's country. The Filipinos cannot leave their islands, but we can, and when we do there will be one country at least in which the race problem is settled.

Upon this side of the water the whole power of the Administration has proved insufficient to secure the legislation which the interest of the Filipinos imperatively requires, but it was found easy to pass a bill through both Houses taxing heavily the com-

mon cotton cloth that they wear, in order that American manufacturers may profit at the expense of the poverty-stricken islanders. Congress does not recognize its responsibility to them, and as between the American voter and the distant disfranchised Filipino our legislators will never hesitate. "The Philippines for the Filipinos," is a good election cry, but in practice, now as always, power will be selfish and American legislators will regard American interests. To quote the words of Senator Lodge:

While we regard the welfare of these people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first.

Here in a nutshell is the reason why America can never govern the Philippines well.

This very attitude, however, helps our cause, for if we will not give these subjects of ours such laws as they need, men will soon see that we ought not to make laws for them at all. There is an American conscience, and it will not sleep forever. That it is uneasy is shown by the very fact that apparently our people take no interest in their Philippine possessions. No associated press dispatches keep us advised of events there. Such information as the government vouchsafes us is from time to time published, and occasional private letters give us an inkling of the truth. There is no demand for news from the islands, hence the newspapers do not give it room. The people are tired of the Philippines, indifferent to their future, and this is the first step towards letting them go. When I was in Washington last spring I found that beneath the surface there was a very general feeling that we had made a mistake in taking the islands, and that we must give them their independence. One senator was quoted as saying to Rockwood Hoar, whose untimely death we all mourn: "Why, if that question should come before the Senate now, even with your father dead, there would not be twenty votes in favor of taking the Philippines." If nothing succeeds like success, it is equally true that nothing fails like failure. Our failure is recognized, and I cannot but believe that it will become more and more apparent until we all agree that we cannot in decency resist the demand of a whole people for freedom. And if it is said that they are not fit for freedom, that they will have trouble and dissension, perhaps bloodshed, we may reply in the strong words of President Eliot:

Political freedom means freedom to be feeble, foolish and sinful in public affairs as well as freedom to be strong, wise and good.

But there is progress to record in another direction. Our venerable leader, Governor Boutwell, often reminded us that this association was formed primarily to resist imperialism at home, and that we fought for liberty in the Philippines in order to preserve liberty in America. He believed with Lincoln that "a house divided against itself cannot stand," that this nation cannot endure with a government republican as to some subjects and imperial as to others. He believed also with Lincoln that "Those who deny freedom to others ~~deserve~~ it not for themselves, and under a just God ~~cannot~~ long retain it." The year has lent abundant support to his belief.

When America, which for a century had preached the doctrine that "all men are created equal,"

that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," struck down the Filipino government upon the ground that the Filipinos were inferior by reason of their race and color, and that therefore we had the right to govern them against their will, at that moment the foundation of equal rights in America was destroyed.

The Filipinos were an ancient people who had been governed by Spain, but never enslaved. The University of Manila was older than Harvard College; the Filipinos had been hailed by us as allies, and our troops had fought side by side with theirs. They had a Congress largely of educated men, and a constitution modeled upon our own.

The Negroes in this country were a little more than forty years removed from slavery, and were regarded by their former masters as essentially inferior in every way. The Civil War had secured them freedom, citizenship, and the right of suffrage, but the force which assured them their rights was the traditional pride of the Republican party in the results of the war, and its determination that these results should not be destroyed.

The moment that the party of equal rights at home refused to carry its principles abroad, this force was paralyzed. It was intellectually and morally impossible to claim in one breath that brown men were not fit to govern themselves in their own country, and in the next to insist that black men were fit to govern us at home. When the administration of McKinley destroyed the Philippine Republic it laid the axe at the root of the tree,—the tree of human freedom,—which the Republican party had planted, and brought to vigorous maturity. Since then our progress backward has been rapid. State after State has taken the right of suffrage from its colored citizens, until the Fifteenth Amendment is openly flouted. Senator Tillman in his Chicago speech, when he said "To hell with the law," only gave coarse expression to the feeling with which the Southern States regard that provision of the Constitution, and the Northern States do not lift their voice in protest or defense. The laws which protect men against illegal violence, the provision of the Constitution which forbids cruel or unusual punishments, do not exist for the Negroes in large parts of the South. Leaders of public opinion insist that Negroes are brutes, incapable of elevation or education, and then complain because they are brutal. They deny them justice in their courts, and blame them because they are outlaws.

It is not the Negroes as serfs and laborers that Southerners like Tillman, Smith and Vardaman, object. It is to educated and self-respecting Negroes. It is on Booker Washington that Tillman especially pours out the vials of his vulgar abuse. To our shame be it said that race prejudice in the North increases until some ten millions of American citizens find the avenues of employment closed to them, and that equal opportunity, which is the birthright of every American, openly denied them. They have no "square deal." The Republican party does nothing to defend them. The President who has such scorn for "the weakling and the coward" does not bid his attorney-general assert their rights, nor take steps to enforce the Constitution. In their case we see how imperialism abroad begets imperialism at home,

and also how men in this country who have no votes have no rights. The blow which deprived the Filipinos of their liberty has deprived ten million Americans of theirs. . . .

The worst results of imperialism are here. The most serious problem which we have to meet is the race problem at our own doors. As a people we are denying justice to some ten millions of our fellow citizens. We cannot persist in this course without terrible consequences. We cannot let the race hatred of to-day grow more intense until "the live coal behind the thought, long blown on, flames," unless we would pay as bitterly for this injustice as we did for the crime of slavery. There is to-day in the United States no party, no organized movement to secure for our colored fellow-citizens their rights under the law. We cannot neglect their rights without jeopardizing our own. How long shall we stand idle?

The future of the Philippines seems to me assured. Irresistible forces are at work which will terminate our dominion in the islands, and the end is not distant. The future of the United States is far less certain, bound up as it is with the future of the colored race. Until we are men enough to do them justice the worst consequences of our imperial policy must fall on us, and our crime in Asia will be punished on our own soil. Here is to-day the greatest field for the Anti-Imperialist.

+ + +

THE SOUL'S FUNCTION.

Ernest Crosby in "Broad-Cast."

I found my soul lying neglected, and I picked it up and wondered what the strange mechanism was for. I went to school to learn what use to make of my soul. They taught me to think with it, but it strained and creaked and nearly gave way under the ordeal. They showed me how to amuse myself with it, but it speedily got out of order and refused to work. Then they trained me to hate with my soul, but it broke down utterly and nearly fell to pieces. I came back from school disgusted with my soul and my teachers. It was long after (alone, lying on my bed in the night-watches) that it flashed upon me what my soul was for. Why did none of them tell me that my soul was a loving machine?

+ + +

THE QUESTION THAT COMES TO EVERY MAN.

Leo Tolstoy in a Letter to Ernest Howard Crosby, as Published in "Essays, Letters, Miscellanies," by Count Lyof N. Tolstoi, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York.

The real question is not whether it will be good or bad for a certain human society that people should follow the law of love and the consequent law of non-resistance. But it is this: Do you, who to-day live and to-morrow will die, you who are indeed tending deathward every moment, do you wish now, immediately and entirely, to obey the law of Him who sent you into life, and who clearly showed you His will, alike in tradition and in your mind and heart; or do you prefer to resist His will?