

ifest destiny. There must be some noble ends for which the independence of the United States was established. It was to demonstrate to the world what great good to mankind a free and independent people can do; to establish "a government of the people, by the people and for the people;" to preserve law and order; to treat all people alike with fairness and justness; to do away with selfish and clannish feeling; to make American patriotism synonymous with fair play, with the love of mankind, with freedom and liberty in accordance with law and justice. By pursuing these ends this republic will become the greatest power upon the earth and you citizens of this great country will be more than ever respected and loved by all.

That is the kind of "manifest destiny" of which a democracy might proudly boast. But there is all the difference of heaven from hell, between thus making this country the world's exemplar of liberty, which is Mr. Wu's ideal as it was Jefferson's, and shooting liberty into inferior peoples, which is the Chamberlain-McKinley ideal.

When "law and order" papers of the plutocratic type, those for instance like the highly respectable New York Times, inveigh against mob violence, they must not be taken too literally. What they really object to is not mob violence. It is only the kind of mob violence that hurts them and theirs. Such mob violence as interferes with the rights of persons to whom they have antipathy is, in their estimation, if not justifiable, at any rate excusable. In saying this we speak by the book. For here is an editorial published in the New York Times itself, on the 8th of July, with reference to the infamously lawless attack of a swell mob in Evanston upon a party of perfectly well behaved men and women, missionaries of the Dowieite persuasion, who were exercising their lawful right of free speech. Listen to the Times:

Mob violence is never commendable, except, of course, when it rises to the dignity of a justifiable revolution, but one cannot help feeling that the people of Evanston had several fairly good excuses for using means more vigorous and summary than the law provides in driving out of

that highly respectable suburb of Chicago the gang of Dowieite emissaries that had invaded it. Of all the exploiters of ignorant credulity by whom the country is troubled and endangered just now, the man Dowie is probably the most obnoxious. When addressing his dupes, of whom he has thousands in Chicago and not a few elsewhere, he talks like a raving maniac, but the sincerity of his grotesque claims to being a reincarnated prophet with supernatural powers and a large share of divine authority is more than questionable, since his apparent insanity has not prevented him from conducting large business enterprises with much and very practical shrewdness, and he has been even more successful than his feminine rival in the east in transferring to his own pockets the cash of his followers. They joyfully provide the capital for his banks and mills, and they support his pretensions, no matter how preposterous, with an enthusiasm and unanimity which Mrs. Eddy no doubt envies. Evanston, being something of a center of education and intelligence, naturally dislikes Dowie and all his works, and it has several times gone to the length of expressing its disapproval by showering Dowie's representatives with assorted missiles, and hustling them out of town in a rapid and tumultuous way. These are not the best of methods for answering and confuting false doctrine, and the Evanstoners presumably are more than a little ashamed of them, but—well, the Dowieite missionaries haven't been seriously injured, and a veneration of the contents of ancient eggs becomes them marvelously well. The eggs and the cult harmonize beautifully as to odors and otherwise, and harmony is always desirable.

If any "fairly good excuses" for the Evanston lawlessness are specified in that article, we should like to have them pointed out. For ourselves, we fail to find any at all, unless the Times considers that "a center of education and intelligence" is excusable for mobbing peaceable persons who utter sentiments which it "naturally dislikes." It is interesting to know, incidentally, that when a well behaved and reputable woman, whose only offense is that she preaches false doctrines, is hit in the eye with a rotten egg by a mob of "education and intelligence," as in the Evanston case, the New York Times does not regard her as having "been seriously injured," but on the con-

trary thinks that "a veneration of the contents of ancient eggs becomes" her "marvelously well." Most admirably does the Times represent the spirit of brummagem law and order that prevails with the upper class mob to which it caters. But is the Evanston mob any less ashamed of its New York defender than its defender thinks it probably is of its own "excusable" criminality? Probably not. That it is not ashamed of its own lawless acts is evident from its subsequent repetition of them with increased violence. Why, then, should it be ashamed of its lawless defender? May not this progress in lawlessness be due to the encouragement of hypocritical "law and order" papers like the Times?

The example of Colorado with reference to the Australasian system of taxation, has been imitated by Hawaii to the extent of the initial steps. At the legislative session this year, a joint committee of the Hawaiian legislature was selected, of which the Hon. John Emmeluth, of the house of representatives, is chairman, to ascertain the nature and effect of the system as exhibited in Australasia. Mr. Emmeluth will probably make the same tour of investigation for Hawaii that Senator Bucklin made for Colorado.

JOHN FISKE.

Justice to the memory of John Fiske would not be done, if his death were made the occasion only of recalling his greatness as a philosopher, historian and teacher. Great teacher though he was, both in philosophy and history, and also in the blending of the two so that each served the other, his larger greatness lay in his cultivation of those qualities of mind and heart which distinguish his philosophical and historical work and made its superiority possible. He was an intelligent theist and a profound democrat.

Whether we think of theism, the principle of the fatherhood of God, as involving democracy, the principle of the brotherhood of man, or of democracy as implying theism—that is, whether belief in a beneficent God generates belief in equality of human

rights, or belief in equality of human rights leads up to belief in a beneficent God—John Fiske's mind had traversed the path that connects them. Some of his writings are direct expositions of theism and all are vital with the spirit of democracy.

These are the qualities that will immortalize his influence if not his fame. Other writers may teach history as brilliantly; other thinkers may expound philosophy as clearly. So far, then, as concerns the outer shell of his life work, Fiske's fame may be dimmed or even totally obscured, and his influence be wholly superseded, by theirs. But that which constitutes the soul of his work, while it tends to preserve the one, will perpetuate the other.

Eminent as a teacher of philosophy at a time when philosophy was Godless, Fiske nevertheless found God even in the scientific know-nothingism of Spencerian evolution. Eminent as a teacher of political history at a time when plutocracy dominated schools and press, yet he bowed at the altar of democracy. As the principle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—the principle of the two great commandments, love of God with all one's heart and of the neighbor as one's self—grows to be more real and definite in human thought and action, the fame of such a teacher must grow with it, even though these teachings of his appear now to have been only incidental allusions instead of the primary impulses they were. At any rate, whatever may become of his personality the effect of teaching so inspired can never come to an end. Theistic democracy lays a wreath upon the bier of John Fiske.

THE CASE OF ST. CLAIR COUNTY

St. Clair county, Mo., is again furnishing food for the eastern press. Many are the times, for a generation, that it has done service in pointing a moral and adorning a tale of western lawlessness. One might judge from reading the New York Evening Post and eastern commercial journals that the people of St. Clair county are nothing more nor less than banded outlaws, ornamented with Winchester and bound together with blood-freezing, hell-born oaths, and that no

stranger with money on his person can safely set foot inside its borders without an attendant company of militia.

Yet when one goes to St. Clair county, one finds the people not at all different from people elsewhere. They do not carry arms nor gather at midnight. They attend church on Sunday and send their children to school. They pursue their peaceful vocations as quietly and industriously as people do in the best ordered communities. Crime is as infrequent there, and all the amenities of civilized life are just as observable there, as in other rural districts of the United States.

The immediate occasion of the present editorial eruption is the imprisonment of the county judges of that county, by order of the federal court, of which they are held to be in contempt.

True it is, that St. Clair county is, and for 30 years has been, in a sense in open rebellion against the government of the United States. The judges of the county court, which has charge of the administrative affairs of the county, have persistently refused to levy a tax wherewith to pay the county's bonded debt. When recently ordered to do so by the federal court, in which judgment had been rendered against the county, they steadily refused, and were promptly committed to jail for contempt, there to abide while their term of office lasts. There they will abide rather than yield to the order, for the same thing has happened to their predecessors in office for a generation. This gives rise to the cry of "repudiation," "anarchy," "brigandage," and other complimentary terms which have been so often applied to the case.

If, as a matter of fact, St. Clair county has repudiated a just debt, and has refused to levy a tax to pay it, even after it is reduced to judgment, then morally, as well as legally, such punishment and such epithets are well deserved. But is it so?

In the early seventies, while the constitution and the laws of Missouri authorized any county of the state to subscribe for stock in any railroad company organized under the law of the state, many of the counties voted

large subscriptions to such enterprises. The county courts of the several counties were authorized, in discharge of their ministerial functions, to provide the necessary funds (issue bonds) to pay such subscriptions. St. Clair county, like the rest, voted a subsidy in the form of a stock subscription to some mythical (as it turned out) railroad, and the county court at that time issued the necessary bonds.

Thus far the progress of the matter was clear and easily understood, but from that on the whole thing became involved in a fog so dense that no one has ever been able to penetrate it. By some means, those bonds got into circulation, without a mile of railroad, or any form of quid pro quo to the county, to show for it. Valuable negotiable commodities like county bonds don't lie around loose without attracting attention. They cannot safely be suffered to run at large even in a thinly populated region like St. Clair county, and the bonds in question got away, "without a bell on," as a Missourian would put it. Whether it was by some deal between a corrupt county court and bond sharks, or by the stupid yielding of the county court to some seductive flim-flam, nobody now seems to know. They were next brought to notice by a scire facias, in the hands of a United States marshal, issued from the federal court, where "innocent purchasers" were seeking to recover judgment on them. St. Clair county was not alone, for some 26 other counties in southern Missouri were in the same fix. There seemed to be an epidemic of corrupt bond deals. There was a general stampede of bonds from their corrals over the whole district, and the fugitives were "gathered in" somewhere east.

The people suddenly realized that their liberality and enterprise were to be repaid by persecution. Instead of the railroads for which they had so confidently voted, they were saddled with hopeless debts. Yet, some people affect to wonder at the hostility to bonds and bondholders which remains with them to this day, and that a Missourian has "to be shown" when a bond proposition comes up.

Counsel was employed, and the