

principle of the right of everyone to earn an honest living is sound, it is a principle that applies with no more moral force to a labor "picket" than to a land monopolist. Both interfere with the right of others to earn a living. But the land monopolist is by far the greater offender. For every man that labor "pickets" deprive of a job, land monopolists deprive millions of jobs.

An example of one of the characteristics of imperialism, censorship of the press, when it is in smooth working order and not too drastic, is afforded by Russia, that model empire, which, with fire and sword, would carry its standards of civilization and Christianity to the inferior peoples, just as we are urged to carry ours. The example we refer to is the press instructions issued by the Russian minister of the interior to guide newspapers of Russia with reference to the Chinese situation. They are given by the American Associated Press in these words:

1. No reference to the movement of Russian troops or warships.
2. Papers must bear in mind that the czar is actuated only by a desire to maintain peace and good-will among the nations.
3. No gossip about differences among the powers that would be displeasing to the government.
4. No criticism of Russian diplomacy or of military or naval strategy.
5. Editorial writers should recollect that Russia is predestined to predominate in Asia.
6. Comparisons may be made between Russian and foreign troops and seamen when unfavorable to foreigners.

In reading these instructions an American must experience a crawly feeling. Yet to such press censorizing the imperialists are bringing this country. Don't smile incredulously. The American censorship of the press in the Philippines for the past year has not been one whit less autocratic and mendacious. Nor has it been confined to military secrets. Our press censorship in the Philippines has been distinctly political. What is worse, administration republicans assert the right to make it so in perpet-

uity; for, while they insist that the Philippine islands must be American territory, they declare that the liberty safeguards of the constitution do not protect the people there. Freedom of speech and of the press, then, should Mr. McKinley's colonial policy be sustained, is to be a mere matter of the grace of the sovereign power. It is even so in Russia.

When Mr. McKinley stated that he did not believe in "imperialism" it is evident to all that he was standing upon a definition. At the time he made the statement no dictionary, with the exception of Stormonth's, had added anything to the ancient and classical meaning of the term, though the citation from Pearson: "Roman imperialism had divided the world into master and slave," was not without instruction. But Stormonth, published in 1895, contained an addition, which is worth considering even from the McKinley point of view, as follows:

Imperialism, or Caesarism, as a party name, denotes the supposed government of a ministry, or the personal government of a minister of a constitutional country, hardly within the limits of the constitution; the supposed exercise of such a power as belongs to a despotic government.

The important connection made in this prophetic sentence between "imperialism" and "Caesarism" should not be lost sight of, nor the importance of the latter definition as implied in and logically proceeding from the former. But a still more authoritative signification is to be had from one of the recently issued parts of the Oxford dictionary, the only word-book in English which may be called international in the full sense of the term. The secondary meaning of "imperialism" is there defined to be—

the principle or spirit of empire; advocacy of what are held to be imperial interests. In recent British politics, the principle or policy (1) of seeking, or at least of not refusing, an extension of the British empire in directions where trading interests and investments require the protection of the flag; and (2) of so uniting the different parts of the empire having

separate governments as to secure that for certain purposes, such as warlike defense, internal commerce, copyright, and postal communication, they shall be practically a single state.

With this goes the further and more directly applicable American definition:

In the United States, "imperialism" is similarly applied to the new policy of extending the rule of the American people over foreign countries, and of acquiring and holding distant dependencies, in the way in which colonies and dependencies are held by European states.

That is what "imperialism" is generally supposed to mean; but then everybody was supposed to know just what "plain duty" was supposed to mean. What Mr. McKinley means is probably different, with phrases concerning "confidence in the American character," "belief in an overruling Providence," and "benevolent assimilation to the ideals of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln," to make it clear to the plain people.

In a recent issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal, a publication which cannot be fairly accused of having free trade sympathies, there appears an item that protectionists might reflect upon very much to their enlightenment. After reciting the fact that of the 661,669 tons of coal imported last year into Chili, only 3,200 tons were from the United States, this item observes that "we ought to furnish a very much larger proportion, but we will hardly do it unless we become buyers of ores and other products from that country." The item indicates that its writer's mind is only in the early stages of economic development. He evidently supposes that profitable commerce consists in exchanging goods with this, that and the other country, by direct trade between those countries respectively and our own; whereas it really consists in exchanging domestic goods for foreign goods, regardless of the particular country or countries to which the domestic goods may go or from which the foreign goods may come. It is immaterial, that is, whether the United States sends