

wealth, then the tocsin must be sounded, and our citizens rallied under the leadership of men whose interest in the welfare of their city is paramount to mere party fealty when such parties are controlled and used for purely mercenary purposes.

It is contended by anarchistic writers that government, the state, the political element of society, is purely predatory and parasitic. If this contention is to be disproved, our citizens must elect a more conscientious and intelligent body of public servants than those who comprise our official class today. What are the facts? Your constables and petty judges plunder the poorest people of our city every day in the name of law. Their conduct often results in the destruction of homes and the scattering of families. Your city government levies special assessments far in excess of cost, and then lets the citizen whistle for the rebate. The treasurers of our cities, counties, and the state, constantly withhold the payment of bills due, so that they may draw enormous interest on the deposits of public funds. Your legislative, executive and judicial officials, with but few exceptions, are the mere lackeys of corporate wealth. Within the shadow of the city hall of every city in this country thrive the political microbes, contractors and officials, who through criminal methods are exploiting entire communities. Our courts of justice are invaded and their findings perverted by the bribe giver, representing the interests of the public service corporations. Whatever we do, wherever we turn, in our dealings with our political machinery, corruption and venality stalk abroad; not in shame, but holding up their heads proudly and arrogantly.

If this condition is not overdrawn, and I contend it is not, then what are we to do about it? In spite of all the discouragements that meet the reformer, there are many hopeful signs. Look at the emphatic expression of the people at the spring election in favor of the initiative and referendum and municipal ownership. Look at the work performed by Catherine Goggin and Margaret Haley, representing the School Teachers' Federation of Chicago. Two years ago these women were unknown outside of their immediate circle of friends. To-day they stand before the community and the country as victors, crowned with a glory that

should bring the blush of shame to us men who have followed a do-nothing policy. Surely if these school teachers, without a vote, can "round up" the corporations as they have done, and are still doing, what may we men not accomplish, if we but do our duty to our city and state?

But let us be wise in our methods of procedure and just toward the Democratic party. Let us ask that the spirit of Bryan and Altgeld be embodied in its platform, and that it nominate men, for all legislative positions at least, who will not be driven like a herd of cattle in the interest of corporate wealth. All the signs of the times point to Democratic victory this fall, if those who control the party's destiny but act wisely and justly toward the public. Let no one at this time urge independent political action. But should the Democratic party be false to Democratic principles, we will then appeal to the independent citizenship of Chicago, and do all in our power to arouse this community against the predatory elements that control both Democratic and Republican machines. Meanwhile, let us organize, and remember that the god of battles is ultimately with the persistent and aggressive forces of the world.

SPLENDID BARBARITY.

In the face of the official Philippine horrors that are being discussed, horrors which have been perpetrated with the knowledge and by the command of the military authorities in the islands, the American people will read with dismay that at the recent banquet of the Sons of the American Revolution the President of the United States, the commander-in-chief of the army and navy, "drank to the health of the soldiers and sailors of the present day, who, during the last three years, have done such splendid work in the inconceivably dangerous and harassing warfare of the eastern tropics."

Without an uncivilized mode of warfare during the last three years, the "splendid work" could never have been accomplished. The struggle for liberty would still be going on in Samar had not "the soldiers of the present day" done that "splendid work" of creating a "howling wilderness." Are we to interpret the expression of the President as approval of the official barbarities committed in the Philippines the past three years? There is abundant proof that the barbarities began with the war, only increasing in degree,

growing "stiffer and stiffer," until, as Gen Hughes testified, the "splendid" work is nearing completion.

If the work done was "splendid," the workers may not be classed as "wrongdoers," subject to punishment. But should such become a political necessity, a Chaffee-Smith-Bell-Hughes-Waller-Funston scapegoat will not appease the sense of justice of the American people. They will demand the political lives of those in authority who place a seal of approval upon the diabolical work these human bloodhounds have accomplished.

What is this "splendid work" that has been done in the tropics? The glory, if glory it be, died with the booming of Dewey's cannon. Our army officers surrendered all claim to honor by carrying on a policy of deception and trickery, which began as soon as the army disembarked upon Philippine soil. Failing by such means, they have operated under double-distilled Spanish methods until the United States counts more victims in three years than Spain dispatched in three centuries.

Is it a "splendid work" to hold up a people and rob them of country and nationality at the point of the bayonet? Is it a "splendid work" to turn the cannon upon allies because they decline to yield their inalienable rights? Is it a "splendid work" to sweep thousands from the earth because they take up arms in defense of home and liberty? Is it a "splendid work" to apply the torch to the homes of earth, while helpless women and babes and tottering age flee before the flames that blot out those hallowed spots? Is it a "splendid work" to make God's fair isles a "howling wilderness"? Is it a "splendid work" to slay the wounded on the battlefield, to spare no prisoners of war, but to make them the target of a three days' shooting match? Is it a "splendid work" to choose by lot an innocent person—a prisoner of war—and execute him for the crime of another? Is it a "splendid work" to torture human beings until, racked with pain, writhing in agony, frenzied with anguish, the will power shattered, they admit anything charged, however false, to gain a moment's respite? Is it a "splendid work" to exterminate a people by murdering non-combatants, all over ten years of age, leaving the remnant to the horrors of starvation? All these facts are in evidence. They have been admitted by the official perpetrators. Is this the way "strong men, not weaklings," prove their strength. This is the

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