

having been hauled down before, when under fire—when was it under such a fire before? When did the flag ever before shoot men down for believing in the American declaration of independence? Dear senator, ought not we for very shame's sake to haul it down from such a devil's staff as it floats from now? And ought not your cheeks and your master's to grow red as its red stripes with confusion at having hauled it up on such a business?

At the Rock River Methodist conference, now in session in Chicago, the missionary bishop, J. H. Thoburn, who has spent 40 years as a missionary in the orient, has delivered a series of lectures in which he appropriately likens American protectionists to the Chinese. There is something so eminently sensible, not to say extraordinarily Christian, about the bishop's lecture on this point that we take pleasure in quoting:

Our fathers never intended to build a Chinese wall around this nation by putting a duty upon things, and keeping the foreigner from bringing in his goods. We are doing what the Chinese have done for centuries. We must get broader notions about these matters. The Chinese built a stone wall that they thought would keep out the foreigners. Our stone wall is the custom houses that we set on our borders. Before I became a missionary I believed in the republican policy of protection. I have learned that if a nation wants to survive it must open wide its doors and trade with the world. Let our revenues be raised from direct taxation. The true policy to be adopted in dealing with the people of the east is to abandon the old principles. Let us give up being a semi-Chinese nation and excluding other people.

The New York Staats Zeitung abandons Bryan and comes out for McKinley because, to quote its own explanation, "the democrats have not succeeded in the attempt undertaken by their convention to make imperialism the paramount issue and to place the silver question in the rear." That explanation calls to mind the experience of the colonial lay judge who made a good reputation by his decisions until he began to give reasons for them, whereupon he was removed for incompetency. No ex-

planation at all would have been less suspicious than that one. Imperialism not the paramount issue, when McKinley devotes two-thirds of his letter of acceptance to apologies for it! The money question not sent to the rear, when Roosevelt abandons its discussion throughout his cowboy campaign in the west! Where does the Staats Zeitung find the money question at the front except in Hanna's subsidized Wall street papers? Where does it find imperialism ignored? We make no charges, but suspicions are unavoidable. When it is recalled that early in the campaign there were indications of a purpose on Hanna's part to buy up German newspapers in behalf of McKinley, and that fact is considered in connection with the Staats Zeitung's absurdly inadequate explanation of its sudden "flop," a prima facie case is made out which calls for some sort of assurance at least from the Staats Zeitung that it has not changed editorial masters. More especially is this so in view of an admission in the "flopping" editorial itself. It expresses its convictions.

beyond all doubt that a continuation of the policy of conquest must hopelessly corrupt our public life and either destroy our free institutions entirely or at least compel us to engage in a severe struggle for their preservation.

Nevertheless, it considers Mr. Bryan "the greater immediate danger" because he still believes in the free coinage of gold and silver at 16 to 1. If that is not putting the dollar above both the man and the nation, no such inversion is possible. Why not have said plainly: "Mr. Hanna wanted us, and we are his"?

Mr. McKinley's campaign document, prepared under the direction of the secretary of war, by the Philippine commissioners, nominally for state reasons but really for election purposes, and which states that the Philippine islands are virtually pacified, is refuted not only by the reports of hard fighting and severe American losses, but also by Capt. David F. Allen, of the Thirty-eighth

volunteer infantry, who, in accepting the democratic nomination for congress from his district in Indiana, though declining to come home to participate in the campaign, writes—to correct any statement that may have been made in the district, to the effect that the island of Luzon is pacified, or that the backbone of the war is broken. The president's amnesty proclamation was published throughout the municipality of Bala-yan. It was read at high mass by the priest at least a month ago, thus giving it the widest possible circulation throughout the city, and yet, out of a population of fully 50,000, not one person has thus far taken advantage of it. The military authorities, by general orders published throughout the island, offered to pay 30 pesos (thirty Spanish silver dollars) for any kind of an old gun that could be fired. This order was published months ago, and yet in all the province of Batangas, composed of more than 200,000 people, not one rifle or gun has been offered for sale. The war is not over. The people have not become reconciled. These are the exact facts.

When three such historic names in connection with the abolition movement as those of George S. Boutwell, Thomas Wentworth Higginson and William Lloyd Garrison, are affixed to an appeal to American negroes to vote against imperialism at the coming election, it is high time for negroes who prize the security of human rights for their race more than republican patronage for themselves, to take anew their political bearings. This appeal, which was published on the 4th, takes high ground upon the race question. Here is an extract that thoughtful Americans of all races may profitably consider:

Every day in the Philippines is already training our young American soldiers to the habit of thinking that the white man, as such, is the rightful ruler of all other men. This is seen, for instance, in the fact that these very soldiers in writing home letters from the seat of war describe the inhabitants of the Philippines more and more constantly as "niggers," thus giving a new lease of life to a word which was previously dying out among us. Every defender of the war in congress sustains the contest on the assumed ground that the Filipinos are unfit for freedom, although Admiral Dewey at first described them as more fit for it than