

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. Thornburn, 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

the Cubans; and Senator Hoar describes them to be probably better fitted than any race on the two American continents south of ourselves. In other words, freedom is to become, for the new republican party, a matter of complexion. If this doctrine is to prevail, what hope is there for the colored race in the United States? The answer is easy; there is in that case no hope at all. In the name of the old anti-slavery sentiment, we call on you to resist this great danger, even if you have, for that purpose, to turn your backs on the party you once had reason to love.

The undersigned, trained from youth in the strictest school of anti-slavery conviction, are following up the same early training when they now write to you. We wish to warn you that the imperialistic republican party of to-day is not the liberty-loving party of that name which set the American negro free 40 years ago. The time is past when you can safely give to it your implicit support. We warn you that the American negro must henceforth think for himself and must cut adrift from every organization which wars on darker races, as such, and begins to talk again of "the natural supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon."

Congressman Hull, of Iowa, an ardent imperialist and chairman of the military committee in the lower house of congress, when talking to a Chicago Record representative on the 4th, denied, as reported in the Record of the 5th, that he is advocating the retention of the Philippines for the protection of business interests of his own in the archipelago, but admitted—

being at the head of a company organized for the purpose of developing Philippine timber lands. . . . he declared that there was absolutely no connection between his position as chairman of the military committee and his private business.

Think of the impudence of it! This man, as chairman of the military committee of congress, is pushing with all his might a policy of militarism which has for its immediate purpose the conquest of distant lands in which he has acquired speculative private interests; yet he says there is no connection between those interests and his official position. He may be angelic enough to draw fine distinctions between his public duty

and his private speculations, when they conflict, but who believes it? Time was when the discovery of a double relationship like this would have driven the best trusted man in the country out of public life. That time passed, however, when McKinleyism came. Hull is not the only man in responsible public position whose private speculations depend for a profitable outcome upon his official actions.

Hanna's assertion in a Chicago speech that there are no trusts has been taken much more literally by the public than he intended. He is supposed to have stated as a fact what he knew to be false; whereas he only intended to deceive with a play upon words. Originally, trusts were combinations of corporations which had placed their stock in the hands of trustees so as to concentrate the control of their business and destroy competition between them. That kind of trust does in fact no longer exist. But trusts exist, nevertheless. They are formed now not by the intervention of a body of trustees managing many corporations, but by the merging of many corporations into one. The same effect is produced. Control is concentrated, and competition is destroyed. And properly enough the name which the intervention of trustees gave to the original trusts has in popular usage attached to these unified corporations that have taken their place. Mr. Hanna understood this. He knew that the essence of the trust evil is not trustees, but combination for the destruction of competition. Yet he said there were no trusts, because he knew that trustees are no longer a factor in corporate combination. It is by such indirect, misleading and fraudulent statements that public men of the Hanna type expect to make fools of the people. In this instance he overreached himself. The great gullible public is not quite so unsophisticated as to believe that there are no trusts. It knows that business is concentrated and competition strangled, and whether that is done through trusts

or through charters of incorporations it doesn't care.

It is discouraging to thoughtful men to find in the New York Nation a sneer at Bryan's assertion that if Americans are glad to lend money abroad at four per cent. it shows that profitable investments at home are few. The reason this is discouraging is not political. It is economic. A mere political organ might be expected to assume that low interest rates imply prosperity. On this point even populist organs go astray. So also a Wall street trade paper, bloated with pretentious assumptions of financial wisdom, might be expected to regard the matter. To the denizen of Wall street, to whom interest stands for nothing but money premiums, and whose financial horizon is limited by its gambling operations, low interest means plenty of chips, or easy money, and high interest means scarcity of chips, or tight money. But the Nation has a well deserved reputation for economic intelligence. It may make mistakes. It often does. Yet it is exceptionally intelligent when dealing with economic questions. Nevertheless, in one of its editorials of the 27th, while with more or less reason excoriating Bryan for his money theories, it assumes that low interest is one of the surest signs of prosperity.

"If money for long-time investment goes begging at four per cent.," argues the Nation, "the western farmer will not have to pay more than six or seven on his mortgages (instead of ten or twelve some years ago); the business man can borrow at the bank on commercial paper for five; new manufacturing industries can be launched on more favorable terms than ever before; rents will be lower; capital will be in search of the thrifty user of it." All this assumes that interest cuts no figure in economics except between borrower and lender. But the truth is that when capital searches for the thrifty user of it, offering itself at low rates of interest, it searches almost in vain. The