

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