

shall recognize and insist upon these principles.

There is political significance, using that word in its broader sense, about the spread into northern states of the anti-negro feeling. That it is spreading is no longer open to doubt. Nor is this horrifying Colorado lynching the sole evidence of it. Only a few months have elapsed since a reckless hue and cry against negroes was raised in New York, and instances of discriminating treatment in different parts of the country are becoming more and more frequent. Considering these facts in connection with other familiar facts, it is evident that the race question is on the eve of settlement against the negro. Highly significant in this connection are the reports that keep on coming from Washington to the effect that Mr. McKinley is hoping to organize a strong white party in the southern states, now that the race question has been settled there by the suppression of the negro vote, reports that are confirmed by the marked refusal of administration congressmen to reduce southern representation in congress by the number of negroes the southern states disfranchise. This means that the disposition of the republican party to maintain equal rights is at an end. It is as clear as day, to whoever will observe and think, that there is a fast growing tendency, among the classes of people that give the republican party its strength, to treat negroes in all respects as an inferior race—to deny them the full protection of the laws and to encourage their exclusion from participation in government. This tendency has grown with the raising of elementary issues in politics, with the issues of classes and masses, of plutocracy and democracy. The negro's status is such that the blow against the "lower classes" can be delivered most effectively first at him. Prior to the recurrence of those elementary issues in American politics the democratic party had, as a matter

of pro-slavery tradition, been ranged against negro rights. But with its return to democratic principles, its recognition and defense of those rights were inevitable. It could not long plead for the declaration of independence without casting aside its traditional prejudices against negroes. And it is fast doing so. "Bryanism," as it is called, or the "new democracy" as it should be known, stands for equal rights, politically and industrially and regardless of race. Yet we find the New York Age, the leading negro paper of the east, congratulating its readers upon "the passing of Bryanism." Let us take the liberty of warning the American negro that if "Bryanism" does pass, the hope of negro and white alike—those of both races who depend upon their own labor for their living—will pass with it. This is a critical time for the negro, and if he cares for his rights he will do well to think more and trust less, before it is too late.

Disappointed at the refusal of the Filipino patriots to lay down their arms upon Mr. McKinley's election, as his supporters had promised the American people they would do, the administration is now inspiring Washington correspondents to feel the public pulse on the subject of adopting the barbarous tactics which Kitchener in the Transvaal has copied from the Weyler regime in Cuba. The war must end, and the Filipinos are to be literally crushed, no matter what lengths of brutality it may be necessary to go to in order to do it. Such are the intimations. One inspired correspondent puts it succinctly when he says:

The administration, according to a high official, has become weary of the long-drawn-out war. It is now proposed to give the Filipinos a taste of real war; and, though the innocent may suffer, it is only by this means, it is believed, that the guilty can be reached.

That sort of thing wouldn't have sounded nice before election. But the popular endorsement of McKinley eases the way for more aggressive steps in the direction of imperialism

now than would have been prudent then.

Another inspired Washington dispatch puts the same idea into some such shape as this: "No mercy is to be extended in future to the Filipinos, but the innocent are about to be made to suffer with the guilty." To that dispatch Sixto Lopez, the distinguished Filipino, replies with a rebuke that should make Mr. McKinley's blood tingle with shame. It is humiliating to the true spirit of American patriotism to be obliged to acknowledge the justice of Lopez's exalted condemnation, when in reply to this American threat to exterminate his countrymen without mercy, he says:

The Filipinos have not been able to discover any special evidences of mercy in the past. If by showing no mercy to the innocent it is meant that noncombatants are to be treated the same as combatants, I fail to see any difference between the proposed methods and the methods of Spain in Cuba, which were so vehemently and justly objected to by the people of the United States. Apparently the scandal of the reconcentrados is to be reenacted by America. But the point is this: The Filipinos neither ask nor desire mercy, and would not accept it from America nor from any other nation. What they want is justice.

Compare that appeal to justice by this representative of our Filipino "subjects," with the grossness of the American policy of subjugation, which every now and again frankly discloses its plutocratic character. Once more has it done this through no less important a traveler in the Hannaistic procession than Congressman George H. Ray, chairman of the house judiciary committee. Mr. Ray is confronted with the possibility of a supreme court decision denying congress the constitutional power to impose a tariff upon trade between the United States and the "colonies." Should that court so decide, congress would find it necessary either to get rid of the Philippines or to forswear all further "protection to home industries." For free trade between the states and the Philippine archipelago would throw the states open

to free trade with all the world. It would be practically impossible to avoid it. The pending supreme court decision in the Puerto Rico tariff case, therefore, may threaten the protective system, and here is the ground regarding that probability which Mr. Ray takes:

If the decision of the court should be that the Puerto Rican tariff is unconstitutional and that Puerto Rico is a part of the United States, it might necessitate our having to give up the Philippines. We are bound to the open door in the Philippines. That means that the products of all nations can come into the Philippines on the same basis as our own. If we cannot raise a tariff against Philippine products coming into the United States then our labor would be brought into competition with the cheap labor of the orient.

That little touch at the end is only for the sound of it. It is not American labor, but American monopoly, that Mr. Ray wishes to protect, and that the tariff does protect. But what, in view of this elevation of the protective system to the higher place, becomes of the McKinley contention that we cannot in honor let go of the Philippines? Were they not dropped into our lap by Providence? Did this not impose upon us a religious obligation to nurture and milk them? Was it not our duty, marked out by destiny, to keep them at all cost of blood and treasure? Would it not be a breach of trust to let them go? And then the flag, who would dare haul it down? Yet Mr. Ray is ready to tell providence to "go 'long" with its unsolicited gifts; is ready to plead that the obligation is only from ourselves and to ourselves, and may be repudiated between ourselves; is ready to divorce duty from destiny; is ready to haul down the flag, even Old Glory—is ready to do all this if the alternative is the abrogation of the tariff system which enables one class in the United States to plunder another under the forms of law. What a conveniently adjustable code of national morals the McKinley patriots and moralists have! It is as handy as a reversible conscience.

One of the monthly magazines to secure popular favor within the decade is "The Munsey." Its circulation, however, which probably exceeds that of any of its contemporaries, is a greater tribute to the business sagacity of Frank A. Munsey, its editor and proprietor, than to the discrimination and intellectual vigor of a large proportion of magazine readers. And if its patrons may be fairly judged by the ethical standards which Mr. Munsey sets up in the November number, their mental deficiencies are not offset by moral tone. Having issued that number on the eve of the presidential election he loaded it with an editorial on "The Paramount Issue," in which he gave his notion of what the paramount issue was and ought to be. A conception more frankly sordid and recklessly debasing and demoralizing has seldom found expression in print. In Mr. Munsey's estimation the paramount issue, beside which all other issues combined were nothing but bubbles, was the one that meant "the most dollars in a man's pocket—in the pocket of the average American citizen." Whether these dollars were to be fairly got called for no consideration. The whole issue reduced itself, in his view, to the simple question of getting dollars—no doubt honestly, if possible—but of getting them.

Such is the civic immorality which this astute dollar-getter thrusts into the sluggish consciousness of his scores of thousands of readers. To what extremes it is capable of reaching he himself shows in another article, one published over his signature in the same number of his magazine—the article entitled "The Greatest Charity Scheme of the Century." This article is a bold demand that the United States violate not only its own code of morality, but its faith pledged to the civilized world, by forcibly annexing Cuba. All through his argument runs the same sordid plea that characterizes his editorial on the para-

mount issue. Cuba has cost us every life we have lost and every dollar we have spent in the Spanish war; to concede her independence is, therefore, not "good business." No "first-rate business house," no "first-rate financial organization" would for a moment contemplate "such colossal folly." What if congress did solemnly disclaim going to war for land grabbing purposes? That was a blunder and should be treated as one. Why let "any foolish sentimentality interfere?" He for his part, would never yield an inch of Cuban territory. He "can't see any good business" in leaving Cuba to herself, nor "where we come in." That, he assures his readers, would be "the business way of looking at it." He neglects to add that it would also be the pirate's way, the brigand's way, the highwayman's way, the sneak thief's way. But it certainly would be their way, and the confidence sharp's, too. If it is the business man's way, so much the worse for the morality of business men.

Nor is Mr. Munsey a selfish patriot. He considers the Cubans "and their best interests as well as our own," and believes that our treachery for the sake of their dollars would benefit them as well as ourselves. Consequently, and in view of the fact that our pledge to commit no criminal aggression upon Cuba was not made to any organized government in particular but only to the people of Cuba and to civilized mankind in general—or as he somewhat nebulously considers it, to "our own inane folly"—he thinks "there is an oversensitiveness and over nicety about 'keeping faith' in the Cuban matter that is abnormal, unhealthy and unnecessary"!

An agreeable companion, indeed, would this same Mr. Munsey be to fall in with in a lonely place, if one had valuables which he wanted and which he thought it would be beneficial to both for one to hand over to him! If his standards of personal