

suit of happiness, as most American plutocrats would like to do, it adds this qualifying phrase: "Under treaty rights." That is truly an ingenious adaptation. We may now read in the venerable charter of our liberties that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and "that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under treaty rights." Mr. Morgan's paper applies the new version to the situation in China. It better fits the situation in the Philippines. The Filipino subjects of Uncle Sam have no rights, according to the imperialists, except treaty rights under a treaty about which they were not consulted and in which no rights are reserved to them. "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under treaty rights" in the Philippines, appears to be a license to pursue, subjugate and kill "little brown men."

And hidden in this amendment to the Declaration of Independence is a menace not only to the "little brown men" of the old east, but to the big white men of our own country. Workingmen who treat the question of imperialism as unimportant may yet realize, possibly after it is too late, that imperialism is a many-headed beast, not half so dangerous to our Asiatic subjects as to ourselves. For a colonial system means a standing army of growing proportions which will not operate in the colonies alone.

In some places imperialist orators themselves openly advocate a large army for home purposes. Among them is Congressman Dolliver, of Iowa, a man high in the counsels of the imperialists, whose nomination at Philadelphia for vice president was prevented only by the superior adroitness of Quay and Platt. Congressman Dolliver threw off all disguise regarding militarism, when he spoke last month at the Chautauqua at Ottawa, Kan. After a fulsome laudation of Grover Cleveland for rushing the regular army into Chicago during

the railroad strike of 1894, and an allusion to the St. Louis street car strike in progress as he spoke, Mr. Dolliver said:

I believe in an army large enough to maintain order not only in Chicago, but also in St. Louis or any other of our great cities.

The ominous meaning of that is plain, notwithstanding Mr. Dolliver's astute interjection about "maintaining order." The worst standing armies in history were for the purpose of "maintaining order." That is what the Russians did in Warsaw—they "maintained order." The object of the great army Mr. Dolliver advocated at Ottawa is not to maintain order in any legitimate sense; it is to be used in the interest and under the direction of great corporations in times of strikes. His words are heralds of militarism. Such an utterance, made before a nonpartisan assemblage of several thousand people in the midst of a great agricultural community, demands the most serious consideration from city workingmen. If militarism is to be advocated upon the country farm, it should at least be discussed in the city workshop.

John T. McCutcheon, of the Chicago Record, whom we have more than once had occasion to mention as one of the best, if not the very best, correspondents in the Philippines, contributes a letter this week to the Record, in which he speaks of the remarkable terror of the Americans by which the Philippine people are possessed. Telling of a trip he made last March with a military detachment to Mindanao, he says that "the coming of the Americans was looked upon as the coming of a dreaded scourge," and compares the terror they feel with that inspired by the Huns and Vandals. Mr. McCutcheon thinks the explanation easy. "The leaders of the insurgents had told frightful stories about the cruelty and bloodthirstiness of the invaders." But that explanation is altogether too easy. Doubtless such stories were told, but such stories would have been ineffectual unless they had had a basis

of truth. No terror of Americans could have been excited by stories of that kind in May, June and July, 1898, nor even in August and September, when the Americans appeared as deliverers, and a peaceable and orderly government under the Filipino flag looked to the United States for recognition of its independence. But after Mr. McKinley had proclaimed the destruction of that government in December, 1898; after he had sent a warship to wrest Iloilo from the inhabitants; after the war had begun in February, 1899, and American shot and shell, sweeping away whole villages, had slain Filipinos by the thousands; after an American army had laid the land waste and filled it with mourning and bitterness and hate—after these acts of invasive and destructive war, the people throughout the archipelago were naturally ready to welcome any story of brutality that could be invented against the Americans. At the bottom it is not these stories but the ruthless invasion that excites terror. The terror inspires the stories, and knowledge of the devastation confirms them. It would not be easy to parallel in history this instance of a loving and grateful people wantonly transformed into a terrified and embittered population.

Another imperialistic move has been made by the administration. This time it is the treasury department that acts. The general appraisers of merchandise at the port of New York decide that for all the purposes of the tariff law the territory of Hawaii is a foreign country. Accordingly they impose upon merchandise imported from Hawaii the same tariff duties that would be imposed upon similar merchandise coming from South America. This is the same in principle as if imports to Chicago from Arizona or New Mexico were subjected to the Dingley tariff. The Chicago Chronicle directs attention to the comedy feature of this latest manifestation of imperialism, when it says that—

it appears that the appraisers have overruled the supreme court and de-