

discreet behavior can save her independence. A peaceable, persistent, patient policy, which withholds acceptance of American suzerainty, yet continually but not boisterously forces upon the attention of our government and our people the Cuban pledge of 1898 and the fact that the time for redeeming that pledge has arrived, is the policy that all good friends of Cuba will hope to see her statesmen pursue. Her constitutional convention has already indicated its inclination toward that policy. The adoption by it of the series of concessions to the United States, printed in another column, which in dignified form yet with full regard for the island's independence intimate a "thus far and no farther," is the most encouraging event of all this Cuban controversy.

The part played by the McKinley confederacy in this crusade against the independence of Cuba has been in the last degree hypocritical. Here and there obscure confederates have turned up who made no secret of the matter. In the presidential campaign one of them, less obscure than the other candid ones—we allude to Senator Beveridge—declared at a great campaign meeting in Chicago, with the boldness of a pirate, that the United States ought to disregard its pledges to mankind in general and the people of Cuba in particular, and seize upon the richly-stored little island without ceremony. But as a rule the confederates have protested, with hand upon heart, their most earnest, most heartfelt, most pious desires to surrender Cuba wholly to her people, provided only they were fit for self-government. The hypocrisy of these protestations is now apparent. The Cubans have proved their capacity for self-government. Never before, under such trying circumstances, have a people proceeded to organize their own government with so much regard for peace, order and sound principle. Their elections and the sessions of their constitutional convention were marvelous in-

stances of popular self-control. The pretense that they must be left under American tutelage for their own good, has consequently of necessity been abandoned. It is a bird that will no longer sing. And now the mask is thrown off. The whole McKinley confederacy comes out as boldly as Beveridge for the subjection of Cuba not for her sake but for ours.

Boston has been listening, at her Lowell Institute, to 12 lectures in series by Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott on the general principles of government and the rights of man. Ostensibly these were the topics, but the evident purpose of the course was to whitewash imperialism. As for the rights of man, in Abbott's extraordinary apologetics for the holy wars waging in the Philippines, South Africa and China, they are practically disposed of in the manner of the chapter on snakes in the celebrated account of Ireland. The barbaric dog in the manger of the Anglo-Saxon ox has no rights, says Dr. Abbott, in so many words. Rev. Dr. Berle, another Congregational clergyman, suggests the substitution of the word "hog" for "ox" in Dr. Abbott's golden aphorism, and there are other signs that Dr. Abbott has slopped over badly and well-nigh worn out his welcome with the enlightened part of the New England public. But there is a good deal of the genuine, unadulterated article of British jingoism entrenched in the Boston public and Harvard university. There are two or three professors there who were born and reared in Canada, like President Schurman, of Cornell and the Philippines commission. Boston had a bad habit of importing English and Scotch divines a little while ago, and some of them still linger to impose the Anglo-Saxon gospel upon their hearers. One of the most prominent of these, Rev. Dr. Gordon, of the Old South church, last Sunday week actually introduced Mark Twain into his prayer, not by name, of course, but in a way to give the savage gratification that all Christians of the

Abbott type must feel to have the author of "The Person Sitting in Darkness" lambasted in God's sight. Dr. Gordon prayed that those who criticised Mr. McKinley might be led to see the impropriety of their conduct, not knowing the difficulties of the job in hand as do Mr. McKinley, the Almighty—and Dr. Gordon.

What a time-serving opportunist a doctor of divinity is apt to be when he gets into politics! A few years ago Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, as Henry Ward Beecher's successor, was raising all kinds of trouble to get a probation for the heathen in the next world, in the American board trouble; and now he wants them to have only a limited liability (Anglo-Saxon Salvation Co., Limited) chance in this.

Admiral Sampson has had a chance to learn that discretion is the better part of American snobbery. He is probably no worse snob than a large majority of naval officers. They, as well as he, look upon enlisted men as inferior creatures, and shrink from promotions that give to these inferiors a place among themselves. But Sampson has made the mistake of saying so. In a letter advising the secretary of the navy not to issue commissions to warrant officers, for no other reason than that warrant officers "are recruited from a class of men who have not had the social advantages that are requisite for a commissioned officer," he explains:

In time of peace the navy's function consists to a certain extent of representing the country abroad, and it is important that the navy's representatives should be men of at least refinement. While there are perhaps a certain few among the warrant officers who could fulfill this requirement, I am of the opinion that the vast majority of them could not. Once they are commissioned they will have the same social standing as other officers, and no distinction properly could be made in extending general invitations. The consequences that would arise from their acceptance might not redound to the credit of the navy or the country which the navy represents. I do not mean to detract from the sterling worth of the warrant officers of the

navy. I merely mean to suggest to the department that, unfortunately for them, they have been deprived of certain natural advantages and in consequence their proper place is that of leading men among the crew and not as representatives of the country in the wardroom and steerage.

That letter is a candid expression of wardroom sentiment, and the denunciations it has evoked from naval circles reflect rather upon the writer's sense in thus exposing naval snobbery than upon the fact that he is himself a naval snob.

Nor is that view of the matter confined to naval circles. Sampson has fallen under the animadversions of the press for two reasons. In the first place, the warrant officer whose application for promotion called out the Sampson letter, proves to have superior social connections. It is regarded as especially snobbish for Sampson to embrace such a person in his category of exclusion. The second reason is the discovery that Sampson himself is the son of a common ditch digger. A man with these antecedents presumes too much when he becomes exclusive. But the real significance of this sensational disclosure of snobbishness receives scant attention. At Annapolis, and also at West Point, we are educating a brood of snobs. The air they breathe at those places is tainted with caste distinction. It is more than doubtful if any possible use they can be to the real welfare of the country offsets the injury that their false social standards may yet do to our national ideals. Sampson is a product of one of these institutions, and his letter does credit to his powers of absorbing the aristocratic virus.

It is impossible to read last Sunday's sermon of Rev. R. A. White, of Chicago, without some sense of pain. When atheists propose human breeding schemes, or advocates of special privileges try to confuse the scent by accounting for poverty and crime as hereditary evils, it is to be expected and endured with patience. But

from a man of Mr. White's theistic convictions and profound desire for the establishment of social righteousness, propositions of that kind come with a shock. "When society is wise enough," Mr. White says, "to take as much care in the breeding of human beings as it does in breeding cattle, race-horses, cats and dogs, much of the evil of life will disappear." What could be more repulsive than that? If no one is wise enough and virtuous enough to govern another, assuredly no one is wise enough and virtuous enough to regulate the production of another's children. When the marital and parental instincts fail us, we shall be lost indeed. No impertinent paternalism can then avail. Nor is there any value in this connection to the heredity theory which Mr. White, along with all other stirpiculturists, invokes. Crime has not been scientifically traced to heredity. There is no more reason for believing it to be hereditary than there is for believing language to be hereditary. Mr. White cites a case. It is a familiar one, the only real value of which is the proof it gives of the pigmy premises upon which "scientists" rest gigantic conclusions. This case is to the effect, we quote Mr. White, that—

out of 709 descendants of a criminally inclined ancestress 106 were illegitimate, 162 were beggars, 181 of the women were dissolute, 76 were criminals, seven were condemned for murder, etc. Five hundred and ninety-six out of the 709 were tainted with the criminality of their ancestor.

Suppose we were told that 596 out of 709 descendants of a German woman spoke no other language than German, what should we infer? Would it be that those descendants were born with their ancestor's habit of speech rooted somewhere in their systems? Would it not rather be that they had grown up in the environment of the German tongue? Yet the hereditary "scientists" from whom Mr. White quotes, ignore the simple probability that those criminal descendants of a criminal ancestor had come to maturity in criminal surroundings, and jump to the dubious

conclusion that a spiritual taint of criminality had affected their physical blood.

Two reports on the removal of Prof. Ross from Leland Stanford Junior university, have again brought that case to public notice. One report comes from a committee of the San Francisco alumni, and the other from a voluntary committee of members of the American Economic association, headed by Prof. Seligman, of Columbia. The committee of San Francisco alumni report their inability "to find any evidence that Mrs. Stanford ever took exceptions to Dr. Ross's economic teachings." In their opinion "her ultimate demand for his resignation" was based upon her estimate of his unfitness made in 1896 and confirmed by three years of subsequent trial. It appears from this report that in the presidential campaign of 1896 Dr. Ross issued a pamphlet entitled: "An Honest Dollar," signed by him "as 'Professor of Economics in the Leland Stanford, Jr., university,'" illustrated with political cartoons, and published and circulated by one of the political parties. Though the committee does not say so, this pamphlet was a plea for the free coinage of silver and was published by the democratic party. Mrs. Stanford regarded the pamphlet as "undignified in its form and manner of treatment," and objected to the time and manner of its publication as "jeopardizing the university's right to a reputation for political non-partisanship." That incident, "together with Dr. Ross's general conduct throughout the campaign of 1896," says the alumni report, "was deemed by Mrs. Stanford a symptom of unfitness for the responsible position of head of the economics department of the university." But this was not because her opinions were at variance with Dr. Ross's. "She had at that time no opinion upon either side of the particular financial theories then in issue," and whether her views are hostile now to what his were then is immaterial, since "his views