

hereby and henceforth, the birthday of the said Annie H. Ide, to have, hold, exercise and enjoy the same in the customary manner by the sporting of fine raiment, eating of rich meats and receipt of gifts, compliments and copies of verse according to the manner of our ancestors;

And I direct the said Annie H. Ide to add to the said name of Annie H. Ide the name of Louisa—at least in private—and I charge her to use my said birthday with moderation and humanity, et tamquam bona filia familias, the said birthday not being so young as it once was, and having carried me in a very satisfactory manner since I can remember;

And in case the said Annie H. Ide shall neglect or contravene either of the above conditions I hereby revoke the donation and transfer my rights in the said birthday to the president of the United States of America for the time being.

In witness whereof I have hereto set my hand and seal this 19th day of June, in the year of grace 1891.

Robert Louis Stevenson. (Seal.)

Witness, Lloyd Osbourne.

Witness, Harold Watts.

A DEFINITION OF PATRIOTISM.

If patriotism means "our country, right or wrong," then patriotism is clearly nothing more than a form of selfishness. Such crude patriotism is merely one of the many modes of the monopolistic instinct. There is, of course, a higher and truer kind of patriotism; but then the people who display this kind are generally twitted by the vulgar and selfish "patriots" with being unpatriotic. A true patriot, in any good sense of the word, is a man who, finding himself born into a particular community, and, therefore, to some slight extent, sharing the responsibility of its corporate acts, desires to see the community of which he is a member behave always in the most upright and honorable manner. If his country did so behave, he might naturally be proud of her; unfortunately countries in the concrete oftener give one cause for shame and humiliation.

If such a man could see his land striving, not to find new markets for her iron and her cotton by unjust aggression, not to slaughter helpless savages at the instigation of her merchants, not to force opium or gin on unwilling lower races, but to act with such scrupulous justice that her name should be a synonym for fair dealing among the nations, then, indeed, he might justly be glad he belonged to

her. But if she does wrong, a true patriot ought to raise his voice against that wrong, even if it enriches her millionaires and gives congenial employment to her major generals.

Your true patriot would even desire to see his country defeated and humbled whenever she embarked on a course of oppression; he would desire to see her stripped of squalid dependencies which sap her manhood and degrade her moral sense; he would long to save her from the fate of the later Roman empire, to which every modern state is eagerly aspiring. Better, for example, a free England, made great by industry, honor, virtue, manliness, literature, science and (if she can ever evolve it) art, than an England which holds half the world in slavery, which crushes revolts on a thousand frontiers, which sends forth crowds of filibusters to South Africa and New Guinea, which wastes her efforts in military enterprises, doomed in the end to bring their inevitable retribution of national decadence. Empire has always destroyed every country that held it, because empire is only a masked name for slavery, and slavery is far more killing and debasing for the master than for the slave. What a true patriot would wish to see is not a "little England," but a great England; what he will always remember is that a great England and a big England are mutually contradictory.

No country can be great which enslaves others. Greatness is a moral, not a physical, quality.—Grant Allen, in *The Idler* (London), Colonial Edition, March, 1898.

THE GREAT AWAKENING.

A part of a paper read at the Cincinnati Literary Club, March 31, by Chas. B. Wilby.

The Puerto Rican incident, small as it is, is large enough to cause many to awaken to the difference between the theory of harmless beneficent expansion and the fact of cruel, despotic imperialism. The catch words about "trade following the flag," for which there was never any foundation in fact, are now giving way to theory, which sounds quite as well and has more to warrant it, about "the constitution following the flag." The present revolt, however, does not depend upon any catch words; it rests on the innate sense of justice which is strong in the people of this country. As to those people who are called "rebels," and during the pendency of that struggle which is called an "insurrection," many of our citizens have not paused to consider the

justice of the position taken by the administration; but when the same despotic hand was laid on those trusting islanders who relied upon the promises which were made to them to the extent of offering no resistance to the invasion of their country (probably owing to their lower degree of intelligence), then the injustice stood out unbefogged and our people have cried out their disapproval of it. In addition, the selfish or protectionist view of the situation has made many others, who a year ago were floating with the tide, pause and consider.

During the debate in the senate on the Puerto Rican tariff bill the other day, a very distinguished senator from the great middle west (the same gentleman who parried a troublesome constitutional point which was thrust at him by saying that the question had "passed beyond the law book stage"), frankly admitted if this country could not levy any duty on goods brought from Puerto Rico here, or any duty on goods taken from our ports to Puerto Rico, that we might as well, to quote his words, "dismantle our custom houses and go out of the business of collecting tariff revenue." And when the senator was asked what he would do with the Philippines, under those circumstances, his answer was: "That might make a very great difference in regard to our policy there." And when further asked what then would become of the philanthropy, the flag, the glory and the humanitarian pretext, he very adroitly changed the subject.

The humanity, duty and destiny mask is rapidly being discarded, and the most strenuous supporters of the administration have honestly planted themselves on the "might makes right" platform, otherwise politely called the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. I heard one of those speeches the other night which told all about how the march of civilization excused what we have been doing in the Philippines. The speech was charmingly phrased and well delivered. But the same argument would have excused anything ever done by Cortes or Velasquez or in the most cruel war of conquest ever waged. The orator drew some remarkable parallels between the invasion by our forefathers of this practically uninhabited country in the temperate zone, and our invasion of those tropical islands uninhabitable by two generations of Anglo-Saxons, and more thickly settled than the United States; but he took care not

to get so far down in our colonial history as the year 1776!

WHO ARE THESE WHO KILL KINGS?

For The Public.

Who are these who kill kings?
They are those who seek death
While the careless kill time
And forget what God saith.

Who are these who kill kings?
They are those who lack bread
While the idle feed high
And malign the great dead.

Who are these who kill kings?
They are those who born wrong,
Rot beneath their hard work,
Hence can never grow strong.

They are those who lose hope,
They are those whom wrong brings;
'Twas for such that Christ died;
These are they who kill kings.

W. D. McCRACKAN.

HOW THE DEVIL QUOTES SCRIPTURE IN DEFENSE OF POVERTY.

An extract from a sermon delivered in the pulpit of the Vine Street Congregational Church, Cincinnati, Sunday evening, March 25, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

Poverty, that state of destitution from which there is no honorable escape, is slavery. Like chattel slavery, such poverty is the creation of human law. The preachers who quote Scripture to prove that such poverty is a divine institution are only doing what was done commonly a generation ago—they are quoting the Bible in defense of slavery.

Slavery exists whenever one man is protected in the ownership of another man's labor. When chattel slavery was abolished the planters still owned the plantations. The negroes were compelled to work on those same plantations. They were compelled to take what their former masters would give them. Except for the fact that they are usually free to change masters, and are not so liable to personal violence, it is a question whether they are much better off now than before the war. No man is obliged to feed them now. No man is obliged to keep them in sickness and old age. No man is obliged to give them work. If the freedman's wage is the least bit greater than the keep of the slave, the slave was sure of his keep, but the freedman is not sure of his wage. How many are compelled to bend their neck to the yoke and perform in hopelessness the slave's task for the slave's pay—a bare living!

But what part is the church taking in the great work of the hour, the abolition of economic slavery? Listen to some of the representative men of the church:

Dr. Talmadge says: "I think that when an entertainment that will scatter \$100,000 is given, the man who can't see that \$90,000 of it will reach the poor needs a pair of spectacles."

If we were not living under a form of slavery by which it is impossible for women to make clothes for their own children without the permission of their masters, it would never occur to us that there could be any profit in seamstresses spending their labor upon elaborate costumes that could serve only a moment of vanity. It only illustrates how insane our life is that waste should seem profitable.

No man ought to need a pair of spectacles to see that no man who depended upon some form of honest labor of hand or brain could afford to squander \$100,000 on a night's revel. This wealth belonged to the laborers of New York, and it was neither justice nor charity to allow them to redeem a portion of their own property by earning it the second time.

I would not dictate to a man how he should spend his money, if it is his. But I would not call robbers philanthropists, even though they chose to spend their plunder in riotous living.

A woman came into the free clinic of one of our hospitals showing signs of distress. The physician inquired what was the matter. She replied: "A gentleman kicked me." We are being robbed by gentlemen. They break no law. But even though the oppression they practice is legalized, the wine that flows at their revels is the blood of crushed and broken hearts, the spoil of the poor is in their houses, and their gold drips with the tears of bondmen.

But what of our industrial order has the elements of slavery in it? The Rev. Dr. Holland, of St. Louis, says: "Enough that signs of remaining bondage are not now; that in so far as the bondage remains it is necessary and good, both for the bondsman and the society that binds him." When would chattel slavery have ceased if men had acted on the assumption that in so far as bondage remains it is necessary and good? What a pity Jesus did not know of the modern doctrine that in so far as evils exist they are necessary and good! He might have taken things easy; he might have gotten a sinecure under Caiaphus, and let evolution reform the world.

Dr. Theodore Cuyler says that the best cure for the perils of a growing plutocracy would be the multiplication of men like Cornelius Vanderbilt.

A prominent clergyman of our city said recently that we should have the

poor with us always, because Jesus said so, and that the rich and the strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak and the poor. Charity tells the rich to bear the burdens of the poor. Jesus tells the rich to bear their own burdens. The poor can take care of themselves if you give them a chance. They bear their own burdens now, and a good share of the burdens of the rich besides. How many mothers there are who do the rich woman's work in the daytime and who go home at night to bear their own burdens, to clean their own home and suckle their own young! The poor build the rich man's houses, cook his meals, supply his table, nurse his children, fight his battles. And yet the rich man's preacher continues to indulge in pulpit pleasantries about the helpless poor who need the protection of the rich.

The greatest enemies of mankind are the priests who flatter men that they may please God by anything less than the performance of complete justice. In this last as in all former struggles for liberty.

The solemn priest to Moloch, on each God-deserted shrine,
Breaks the bondman's heart for bread,
pours the bondman's blood for wine.

Then let, O God, thy servant dare
Thy truth in all its power to tell,
Unmask the priestly thieves, and tear
The Bible from the grasp of hell!

THE REAL ENEMY OF LABOR.

To many capital has power, not only to grant or withhold employment, but to exact and oppress labor, a power that needs God's grace to restrain it. Capital has no such power; never had, never can have. Capital is labor's faithful henchman, ally, partner. Capital is labor's seven-league boots, telescope arms and multiple fingers. Capital is labor's creation and dependent. Withhold labor and capital pines away and dies. Labor can subsist without capital. Capital cannot exist without labor. The oppressor and exactor is not capital but a certain devilish force that will task the united grace and energy of pulpit and pew to exorcise it.

Let us discover this force and trace its genesis.

God, the Universal Father, giveth "to all life, and breath, and all things." Gifts all. Man can maintain the life that God gave him only by drawing sustenance from the earth. Land is among the gifts of God. But lo! we have wrested this gift and have perverted it into an article of merchandise. Land being everywhere in civilization withheld from use or offered at a price, labor in the primary in-