

WHAT JEFFERSON WOULD DO.

An Address by Hon. John P. Altgeld on Problems Now Confronting the Democratic Party, Delivered Before the Albany Bimetallic League of Albany, N. Y., April 16, 1900.

It is not for the pleasure, the solace or the glory of the dead, but for the instruction, the guidance and the inspiration of the living that we celebrate the birth of one of the greatest men known to the annals of freedom.

In law, in medicine, in science, in government, in war, in every field of human activity, the deeds of the mighty dead light the path for today and point the road for tomorrow.

Today the men of America who love liberty and hate oppression, who love justice and despise hypocrisy, look to the shrine of Thomas Jefferson for new hope and new courage.

The foundations of the republic are shaking, and the altars of liberty are crumbling. Dirty fingers are laid on the Goddess of Justice, and soiled hands are pillaging the temple of humanity.

The effort to secure privilege and to maintain private monopoly in city and in nation is not only robbing us, but rotting us down.

In America enterprise has come to mean exploitation, and patriotism has become a new name for plunder. Any contingent will do, and one hemisphere is as good as another, so long as the government can be used for private enrichment.

Financing the government such a profitable asset, these private monopolists have taken possession of it. They seek to control caucuses, conventions and elections. They control legislation, they own courts, and they dictate to the President of the United States.

Naturally, they select men with no convictions to do their rear stair work and betray the public, and they have brought to the front a race of men who make deception their business and duplicity their stock in trade.

The creatures of monopoly. These men are mere creatures. They do not rise to the dignity of politicians, but have the impudence to sit in chairs once occupied by statesmen.

Through this class of men the functions of government have been perverted and from being the protector, it is being made the despoiler of the people.

At the dictation of the combines, the courts, which were intended to protect the citizen in his rights, have been used to straiten down trial by jury, that bulwark of liberty for which the English speaking people have shed more blood than for any other thing.

Although living in a republic, yet instead of being governed by the people and according to law, the corporations have had established for their convenience, government by injunction, and according to the whims or prejudice of an individual who acts as their creature and imprisons American citizens at pleasure.

Although living in a republic and having no need of an army, the corporations of America are fostering a military establishment and the bullpens of Idaho, where thousands of American citizens were last summer imprisoned by military authority for months without warrant, without indictment and without trial, merely because the governor of the state was simply a convenience for the corporations, show what is in store for the toilers of America if this corrupt rule of the syndicates is not arrested.

For over one hundred years our country grew great and covered the land with cities, railroads and shops, it protected life and property and punished crime. During this time government by injunction was not heard of, and the use of the military as a convenience for corporations was not thought of. But with the advent of private monopoly, growing out of tariff laws, growing out of franchises, growing out of special privileges, came a race of manipulators and corruptors—not captains of industry, but exploiters of the public, who trample down the liberty of the citizen at home and sneer at the idea of establishing free institutions abroad.

The Dead-ends of a Party. Once the republican party stood for great principles, once it had a message for humanity, once its leaders were men of conviction, once it believed in the Declaration of Independence; but the finger of the corporation has erased every great motto from its banners, and today the great party of Lincoln sits meekly in the market place and takes its instructions from the trust magnates of America.

Once it had conscience, now only hunger; once it loved liberty, now it worships the dollar; once it stood for humanity, now only for plunder. Time changes, men degenerate and parties rot. Cant is at a premium and hypocrisy passes for coin. The creed of King George has become the platform of McKinley and Mark Hanna's dollar sign breeches have become the flag of the republican party.

Under these circumstances it is natural for both republicans and democrats to ask what Jefferson do if he were here?

But there is a special reason why democrats should ask this question, because among some democrats there seems to be a misconception of Jefferson's character.

I have heard men call themselves Jeffersonian democrats who were opposed to every principle that the great Virginian advocated.

Who, then, was Jefferson? What did he do, and what did he stand for? A complete answer would fill many volumes. We shall be fortunate if we can catch even the outlines of his great career.

He was born a landed aristocrat in a country where that class was all powerful. He was educated, was a close student and sought the truth, no matter where it led.

He practiced law, but devoted most of his time to an examination of public questions and of social conditions.

He had a passion for justice and his sympathies ran not with his class, but with the toiling masses of mankind. He was elected to the legislature of the Colony of Virginia, and instead of following ease and opulence, he devoted his energies to secure the abolition of the law of primogeniture and entail, which formed the foundation of a landed aristocracy, but was hostile to free institutions.

He succeeded in the great work and brought on his head the abuse and bitter hostility of the most powerful influences of the country. Every epithet was applied to him, but he never faltered.

Virginia had an established religion, and the clergy were in great force. Men who dissented were not only persecuted, but persecuted. The church controlled the circles of wealth, fashion and intelligence.

Jefferson broke down this medieval system and established freedom of religion so that every man could worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

How Jefferson Was Denounced. Curses loud and curses black were hurled at him. He was denounced as a destroyer of society, an emissary of the devil and an enemy of God.

The word anarchist had not yet been coined into a weapon for cowards to use in behalf of established wrong, but every epithet that the vocabulary of the age afforded was applied to him.

The weaknesses of fashion avoided him and stupid respectability hid up its hands in horror. Every argument, every influence, every inducement was used to dissuade him.

A weak man would have yielded; a timid one would never have begun; a selfish man would have compromised. But Jefferson kept his eye fixed on the star of eternal right and would not turn aside for a moment.

Education in the colony of Virginia was largely in the hands of the clergy and was a source of profit and of power. Only the well-to-do could afford to educate their children.

Jefferson established free public schools, to be supported by taxation. So comprehensive and thorough was his system that it became the model generally followed in America. This great achievement was not only opposed by the church, but he arrayed nearly all wealth against him.

The idea of compelling one man to help pay for the education of his neighbors' children was denounced as unjust, unconstitutional and demagogical. It was atheism, socialism, robbery.

It required conscience, courage and character to face such opposition, but Jefferson had all three. Had he done nothing except to establish the three great reforms I have named he would have been entitled to the everlasting gratitude of mankind.

In time, Virginia adopted a new constitution which he helped to frame. Into this he sought to incorporate the system which today is called the "Referendum," the principle of direct legislation by the people. He proposed that the acts of the legislature should be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection. He was overruled in this. It is claimed that the ever watchful slave interests feared such a measure and defeated it. But the fact that he favored it shows the wonderful insight and foreknowledge of the man.

Jefferson's Wise Foresight. We feel that he had an inspired vision of conditions that were to come a century later.

Here is the key to Jefferson's mind; here is the corner stone of his political philosophy.

Leave everything to the people, submit all important matters to the people; the people can be trusted, they may err, but they will right themselves.

He saw then what a century's experience has taught us, namely, that representative government is not government by the people.

True, the people elect their representatives, but they cannot control them and cannot even protect themselves against betrayal or robbery by their own representatives.

The bribe giver could not corrupt all of the people, or even half of the people, but he could bribe half a hundred, and even the full hundred, and when he does the people are helpless.

Had the principle of direct legislation, as proposed by Jefferson, been incorporated into the constitutions of America, federal, state and municipal, so that the people could have checked their representatives, there would have been no inducement to bribe a legislature or debauch a city council.

Consequently, we would not have had a forty years' carnival of debauchery and dishonor, a carnival whose history can only be written in shame on the pages of infamy.

Had the principles of direct legislation been in force throughout the land, we would not today be confronted with questions that alarm our people, and free institutions would not have been brought to the precipice of destruction by a McKinley administration.

Some of Jefferson's Achievements. I can only refer to the prodigious labor Jefferson performed as a member of the committee on correspondence which brought the different colonies together and paved the way for independence. Here, again, the wealth—the fashion—the conservatism—the respectability, favored the Tories. The agitators were despised and looked upon as a rabble of demagogues and mischief-makers, but he saw justice on that side, and gave his life to the cause.

You are familiar with his great principles. I shall not refer to them. My purpose is simply to see how he stood on the question which confronts us.

His heart made, his brain shaped, and his hand wrote the Declaration of Independence, pronounced by all the statesmen of the earth as the greatest charter of human rights ever given to men. For one hundred and twenty-five years it was held sacred as Holy Writ, and the only discordant sounds heard today come from a few sharks and their pocket politicians. This immortal document has thrown its light around the earth, it has lifted the hopes of all people, and it will illumine the skies of all the centuries.

We get here the great principle that all men are born equal, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the people. No government by brute force, and no taxation without representation. Every breath he drew was a protest against militarism and arbitrary government. When the constitution was framed he was abroad, but expressed alarm over the manner of creating the federal judiciary. Here was a coordinate branch of the government that was neither republican nor democratic, but was aristocratic and monarchical in character, practically responsible to no one and holding office for life. Of these he wrote: "It has long been my opinion and I have never shrunk from its expression that the germ of dissolution of our federal government is in the constitution of the federal judiciary, an irresponsible body working like gravity by day and by night, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped from the states and the government of all become consolidated into one. To this I am opposed because . . . such a government will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we were separated."

In 1800 again he wrote to a friend: "You seem to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions. A very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men, and not more so. They have with others the same passions for party, for power, and the privilege of their corps, and their power is the more dangerous as they are in office for life and not responsible as the other functionaries are to the elective control. The constitution has created no such tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confidence with the corruptions of time and of party, its members would become despots. The constitution has more wisely made all the departments co-ordinate and co-sovereign within themselves." In 1789 he wrote to Mr. Labu Arnold: "We all know that permanent judges acquire an esprit de corps, that they are liable to be tempted by bribery, that they are misled by favor, by relationship, by a spirit of party, by a devotion to the executive or legislative power. Juries have been the firmest bulwark of English liberty. Were I called on to decide whether the people had best be omitted in the legislative or judiciary department I would say it is better to leave them out of the legislature."

The Question of Finance. When Hamilton made his famous report on finance, he submitted a copy to Jefferson and in referring to that part relating to the use of the two metals he said: "To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of the circulating medium and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation." In answer to this Jefferson wrote to Hamilton: "I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals."

On the subject of a bank currency, he wrote to Adams in 1814: "I have ever been an enemy of banks, not of those discounting for cash, but of those foisting their own paper into circulation. My zeal against those institutions was so warm and open at the establishment of the bank of the United States, that I was derided as a maniac by the tribe of bank managers who were seeking to flinch from the public their swindling and barren gains. The evils they have engendered are now upon us, and the question is how are we to get out of them."

In his day private toll roads existed in all parts of the country. He urged that the government should build public roads and other improvements, recommending even an amendment to the constitution if that should be necessary for this purpose. Privilege and monopoly were the horror of his soul—he wanted the people to have everything in their own hands. As president he consummated the Louisiana purchase, which opened up navigation with the Gulf and gave us the great territory to the northwest of the Mississippi. There is much history connected with the event that we can not go into here. The underlying motive at first was not territory, but the free navigation of a great river. He believed in growth. He thought that we should have Florida, and we know that he wanted Cuba to sometime be a part of the Union. He was an expansionist, but not an imperialist. Contiguous territory and a homogeneous people was his ideal. Free citizens but no subjects was his motto. The treaty by which we acquired the Louisiana purchase provided that the territory should become an integral part of the republic, and the inhabitants should be citizens of the republic—and they did not object. This principle was followed by the Democrats in the case of Florida, Texas and New Mexico, and by the Republicans in the case of Alaska. The blessings of the Declaration of Independence were applied to more people. Our constitution and our institutions were spread over more territory. This was growth—this was progress—this was moving along the lines of national development. This was building a mighty republic; this was statesmanship. But when the McKinley administration made a treaty with Spain it left this provision out, and it got the senate to adopt the res-

olution declaring that the Philippines should not become an integral part of the republic, and that the inhabitants of these islands should not become citizens of this republic. The inhabitants of these islands were told that they never could have the benefit of our Declaration of Independence, nor the blessings of free government. On the same day the administration had the senate vote down the Bacon resolution which declared that when the Philippine people should establish a stable government, which in our judgment was worthy of recognition, that then we would withdraw from the islands on such terms as might be just and leave the people to govern themselves. Here the administration practically said to the Philippines that we intended to hold and govern and tax them by brute force, against their will and without representation. The Bacon resolution set matters in our own hands. If the Philippines establish a stable government which in our judgment is worthy of recognition, then why should they not have their independence? The McKinley administration has reversed the history, and is seeking to destroy the genius of our government. It is not a question of expansion—not a question of growth—it is simply a question of imperialism and militarism. Shall we have government by brute force, or shall we stand by the Declaration of Independence and have government by the consent of the governed.

What Jefferson Would Do. In order to answer the question as to what Jefferson would do if he were here with us, let us see what was the bent of his mind, what were his leading characteristics as seen in the brief glance we have taken, and how far has he expressed his views on the questions which confront us. First, he was one of the most radical men of his day, and was the most progressive and aggressive politician and statesman of that period. He was neutral in nothing, he never trimmed, he never dodged, he never straddled; he never asked whether a measure was popular, but whether it was just and eternally right. He was never silenced by salary, or self-interest, and did not belong to that class of men who fear to do their duty as citizens lest it hurt their business. He never asked: "What do the rich want?" but always "What do the people need?" Second, he was never negative, but always positive. He went forward, he shaped, he created. He was not anti—he was pro—but his pro made the anti unnecessary. Third, from his utterances it is clear that he would impeach and drive into eternal disgrace those judges who have usurped the functions of the legislative and executive departments by establishing government by injunction, and depriving the citizen of his constitutional rights and tramping trial by jury under foot. He would put such further safeguards around trial by jury as to preserve it inviolate for all times. Fourth, he would punish by proper proceedings all those men who use the military forces so as to violate the rights of American citizens, and instead of building up a great military system after the manner of McKinley for the benefit of contractors, the employment of rich men's sons, and the convenience of corporations, he would reduce the army to the actual needs of the country. Fifth, he would coin both silver and gold on like terms, because he agreed with Hamilton that one metal alone made too narrow a basis of money for the welfare of the people. He would at once have the government resume the governmental prerogative of issuing whatever paper money it was necessary to issue, for he was bitterly opposed to banks of issue. He would denounce the financial bill lately passed by Congress as a crime against a free people. This measure was the scrofulous infant that was born of a liaison between the followers of McKinley and of Palmer and Buckner.

Let me say by way of parenthesis, that I question no man's right to support McKinley or to follow Palmer and Buckner, excellent men have done this, but I do insist that a decent regard for truth, for history, and for the memory of the mighty dead should prevent him from then calling himself a Jeffersonian Democrat.

He would guard liberty. Jefferson would encourage the Filipino people in establishing an independent government, and probably give them such protection as we give the South American republics. I do not believe that he would consider it wise to incorporate them into our system as citizens, and he would consider it a crime to hold them in any other way by force, just as McKinley once said it would be. McKinley saw plain duty and wavered—Jefferson not only saw but conquered.

He would send a message of good-will and moral support to the two South American Republics that are now fighting for existence. We would not see the humiliating spectacle of the mighty American republic secretly supporting the world's great bully in strangling liberty on a new continent.

He would connect the two great oceans with a canal so as to bring our western and our eastern shores closer together, and he would not get on his knees in order to secure England's permission for this enterprise. England got control of the Suez canal without consulting us. If we get permission of the men and government that have the land, and if we pay all the bills, why must we get England's permission to connect our own shores? Under the treaty just signed by the McKinley administration, England would control the new canal after it was built with our money, for our navy will always be larger than hers.

If you are a Republican, let me ask you in all seriousness, do you approve of this todayism, this funkyness, this Anglo-mania which makes everything American subservient to English interests?

Jefferson would do today what he tried to do over one hundred years ago. He would establish the principle of direct legislation, now called the in-

itiative and referendum, so that the people could control their government under all circumstances and thus in a measure at least put an end to the bribery and debauchery, the chicanery and the trickery that are destroying republican institutions in America.

He would crush monopoly. Jefferson would abolish all monopoly, and all special privileges. This much we know for he has told us. If this were done, there would not be a trust left in America. But how would he do it? In my judgment and I speak only for myself, there is only one way, and that is to have the people own and operate all necessary monopolies, such as municipal utilities and transportation. This done most of the others would dissolve. There would be no private monopoly in this country. Leave everything possible to individual enterprise, and where that will not suffice, let the people do it in their collective capacity, for they are all equally interested.

But is this not opposed to the principles of Jefferson? On the contrary it is in harmony with them. Government in his day was something distinct from the people, and he wanted that government to meddle as little as possible with their affairs.

But he always labored to have everything possible left directly with the people. He had confidence in them, and wanted them to govern directly. He and Lincoln were alike in regard to having confidence in the people.

The Menace of Corporations. Experience has shown that a corporation standing between the people and the state will, where possible, plunder the one and debauch the other, and is therefore a constant menace to free government.

Having confidence in the people and making their welfare his guide, I believe he would have them keep everything possible in their own hands and not put it in the power of any set of men to plunder them.

But no matter what the method of procedure, we know that he would enforce the law, and no attorney general from New Jersey would be paid a salary by the government to find out how not to do it.

Jefferson would establish a just income tax, and require concentrated capital to bear its share of the burdens of government and thus lighten the burdens of the smaller taxpayer.

Well, but what would he do as a citizen in the year 1900 if he were here? That question has already been answered. It is clear from his utterances, his character and his course that he would with all his might and main support the Chicago platform and William J. Bryan.

The Chicago platform is the breath of Jefferson and Bryan is his great prototype.

If we would follow Jefferson we must be honest with the people and protect them from spoliation.

We must be progressive and aggressive, and we must stand for definite things.

Men who make fair promises to the people and then slip up the rear stairs of corporations and betray their constituents should be prohibited by law from even whispering the name of Jefferson, for it is sacrilege.

It was this progressive and aggressive spirit of Jefferson, this standing for definite things, this solicitude for the welfare of the people, that caused the scattered but liberty-loving forefathers to rally around him and form the great Democratic party.

And it was this same spirit that gave to that party an impetus, a momentum which enabled it to remain in power a quarter of a century, and to shape the destiny of the nation for nearly half a century.

Time for Aggressive Action. This world is swayed by aggressive movements and is controlled by aggressive men.

Wrong when aggressive will triumph over right that is hesitating. In war and in politics aggression wins.

All of the great generals from Alexander, Hannibal and Caesar down to Napoleon led advancing armies—Grant, Sherman and Sheridan, Lee, Jackson and Stewart won immortality by forward movements.

The Republican party got a tremendous impetus by being not only right, but aggressive on the slavery question. For the last twenty-five years it has been wrong on every great question. Yet it has maintained its hold on the American people by constantly assuming the aggressive while its opponent stood hesitating.

Both the woman and the party that hesitates is lost.

In 1884 and 1892 we won not by reason of anything we stood for but simply because the Republicans themselves were weary of their leaders.

Had we risen to the occasion, had we possessed the progressive and fearless spirit of Jefferson, had we been true to the people, we would have remained in power for twenty-five years, and could have molded destiny for fifty years.

But we stood for nothing and were soon despised. Then we turned our backs on Jefferson and went chasing after the swamp lights of Hamilton, and men arose in their disgust and spat on us. In the early spring of 1896 there was scarcely a county in the land that we could have carried.

The universal verdict of the Democracy is that our national triumph in 1884 and 1892 was a misfortune for both the country and the party, and my friends, I believe that a majority of the Democrats of America would rather be defeated for all time than to have another triumph of that character.

Our Party Looking Forward. In the summer of 1896 we quit slipping around in the underbrush—we came up out of the lowlands—we took a position on the hill side, and turned our faces toward the morning.

We again proclaimed the principles of Jefferson—we flung new banners to the breeze—we dedicated ourselves to the cause of humanity. We assumed the aggressive and fought the great-

est campaign ever waged on this continent. The patriots of the land rallied to our standards, we won in the forum of reason, we triumphed in the arena of intelligence, and we polled one million more votes than we ever before cast for a Democratic candidate. Even on the face of the returns 30,000 more votes would have elected our candidate.

But we were borne down by corruption, by coercion, by bribery, by fraud and by crime.

This year we are going to fight the battle over and the signs of victory are already printed on the heavens.

It is gratifying to note that the people are getting in earnest and are demanding that their public men shall represent something.

The successful trimming politician commands no respect and the unsuccessful one is simply despised.

Office-getting is no longer looked upon as an honor, in fact it has a tendency to lower a man in the estimation of the public. As a rule the ablest men do not hold office.

This is because we have gone through a period in which our public men stood for nothing.

Independence in Politics. A spirit of independence is growing and neither of the great parties can be delivered as they once could.

You remember that in 1893-94 and '95 independent parties, known by different names, well-nigh controlled North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and some other southern states. They polled 150,000 votes in Texas, 75,000 in Illinois, and absolutely dominated Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, the two Dakotas, and a number of other states.

In a sense these people constituted the advance guards of political thought and were weary of trickery and sham.

In 1896 most of them came with us because we represented something definite.

In that great campaign men were told to be true to their manhood and act on their convictions and they acquired the strength that comes from breathing pure air and standing in the sun. For three years this has gone on and that politician makes a fatal mistake who imagines that the Democratic party can again be delivered on any kind of a platform.

The people are as much in earnest today as they were in the civil war North and South, and they will stand no trifling.

While they will honor a hero they are not men worshippers.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific you hear people talk, not about men, but about policies and principles.

This campaign is going to be a campaign of mighty questions and not of candidates.

Those men who imagine that if they could by hook or crook—by trick or trade—nominate some hero in the National Democratic convention, that they, with the aid of money they could carry the country—had better be disillusioned, for they could not carry six states in this Union.

This is not a year in which politicians can deliver. Even the democracy of the east is straightening its spine. To simply say that we are democrats may sound laconic, but unless we stand for something definite that earnest men and earnest women can lay hold on in life, unless we offer hope to the tolling, suffering, sorrowing children of men, we will be despised by mankind.

Why Bryan is Strong. What is it that gives Mr. Bryan such a hold on the democracy of America as no man has had since the days of Jackson? It is his principles and his earnestness.

There is no hero worship about it. They favor the principles he advocates and have absolute confidence in his honesty and courage. He is an idol, not a hero. People love him because they believe he sympathizes with them.

I hear some good man say, why could not Bryan consent to modify some features of the Chicago platform so that we could all unite and then we could win?

My friend, you have simply read the newspapers and have not studied the conditions. You have not heard the earnest heartbeats of our people.

The moment Mr. Bryan consents to modify the Chicago platform in any particular, that moment he is destroyed.

He would at once sink to the level of the ordinary politician, who was trimming his sails to catch votes.

He would at once cease to be the idol of the democratic heart. Now you respect him for his sincerity—then you would despise him for his weakness.

Look around, you can count hundreds of able, learned and eloquent men who hold high place in the democratic councils and are today wayside wrecks hidden in dust because in the supreme hour of trial they wavered.

No, if you are weary of the McKinley cant and hypocrisy—if you believe in the declaration of independence—if you wish to transmit the blessings of free institutions to your children—then take hold and help to save this republic—take hold and help to overthrow this reign of debauchery, destruction and death.

And if, when the pirates have been driven off of the ship you can show that we are wrong on any or on all points the American people will soon help you establish the right.

The Impending Crisis. We are at a crisis in the history of the race. Shall the hand of toil be emancipated, or shall it have new shackles riveted on it? Shall the American millions be free men or serfs? Shall government protect the weak or be a mere convenience for the strong? Shall justice uphold the right or smile on iniquity? Shall liberty illumine the earth or be slain in her own temple? For many decades this republic has been the greatest world power on the globe; not through her armies, or her navies or her wealth, but through her moral force; through high ideals,

through the divinity of human rights. Shall she go on in this course, lifting the hopes of all people, and brightening the skies of all nations, or shall she abdicate her high position, get on to the low plane of brute force, and move along the barbaric road of tinseled oppression, misery and death?

These are some of the questions that confront our people? Let them but clearly understand and there will be no doubt about the issue.

My friends, look up; this republic has not yet performed its mission. It is not going to fall—Liberty will not die—the human race is about to move forward.

Something like industrial and financial freedom will be established. Social and political reforms will yet come.

While we can not name the day or the hour, yet the mighty movement in which we are all laboring is going to bring the human race to a higher plane.

The Almighty is cutting a road through the forest and its coming is scheduled on the calendars of destiny.

ARE WE AT WAR?—AND WHEN? For considerably more than a year now the American army has been engaged in the bloody business of trying to subjugate the Philippines. During all that time President McKinley has held that no war existed; that, although the Philippines had never acknowledged allegiance to the United States, they were "insurgents" just the same, and that the trouble was simply an insurrection which would speedily be put down. No war existing, army officers could not be court-martialed and dismissed the service under the army regulations without the approval of the president; and this position was held late in March, in the case of Captain Walsh of the Forty-seventh infantry.

But on the heels of Walsh's case, commuted by the president, comes another case, much more embarrassing. Major Kirkman, of the Forty-ninth infantry, was dismissed the service on court-martial, the offense being drunkenness on the voyage from San Francisco to Manila and an insult to Archbishop Chapelle, who happened to be on the transport. In this instance the president holds a view exactly opposite to that he held and enforced a fortnight before—in other words, he holds that the findings of the court-martial are sufficient to dismiss the officer without his official concurrence, because war exists in the Philippine islands. Last month there was peace in that archipelago; this month gorgons and hydras fill the air, and war prevails. But if war prevails, it can not be that we actually possess the Philippine islands, for a violent outbreak within a nation's territory is always called a rebellion or an insurrection. It is possible that the Philippine islands were a part of our territory last month and are in the possession of somebody else this month? Those bad persons known as anti-imperialists have all along claimed that the Philippine islands were the property of the Filipinos, and could not be transferred to anybody else without their consent; is it possible that President McKinley at last admits this view of the case to be the correct one? If it is possible that he has been studying international law or has his Protean mind inadvertently changed itself again?

Or has Archbishop Chapelle something to do with the new decision? He has been sent to Manila to confer with the infamous Spanish Archbishop Nozalada, the leader of the Spanish Inquisition in which Filipinos have been tortured for years, and holds commissions from the Pope and the president of the United States, authorizing him to settle the controversy between the friars and the people—the result of which is expected to be to rob the people of Luzon and confirm in the hands of the friars millions of acres of the choicest lands and millions of dollars worth of the most valuable buildings. To furnish Chapelle with a private secretary without cost to himself, a Catholic priest has been commissioned as chaplain and assigned to that duty. People so distinguished and sent on a mission so remarkable are certainly entitled to protection, and the president ought not to shrink from the business of defending his ambassadors merely because the punishment, if made conspicuous, might excite embarrassing comment. Or did the ship which bore the great peace-maker (whose arrival at Manila is followed by the declaration that we are at war) carry also a cargo of canteens for the captured Philippine cities? And is it desirable to hide that fact from the fierce light which beats upon a conqueror.

W. A. CROFFUT.

IT IS TO LAUGH. "What is the reason," indignantly exclaims Senator Davis, taking his seat from the ground, "that this tariff rate, anomalous, unheard of, unprecedented, and temporary, should be applied to Puerto Rico, while the other day a bill was passed in the other house appropriating \$2,000,000 for Puerto Rico from the treasury?"

"The answer is not far to fetch. One reason is, it enables the trusts to absorb the tariff money and also the donation; a double profit, see? Another reason is to give Senator Davis and other Hannaites an opportunity to hoodwink the dear people with their pretended humanity."

BRIGHT DAYS FOR DEMOCRACY. Looking over the field we see the most hopeful signs of Democratic success. There is hardly a state in the union where the party, with good management, does not have what is called a fighting chance. It is practically certain that the next house of representatives will be Democratic. The voters will not tolerate that significantly suspicious subterfuge which has led a majority of the Republican congressmen to suppress their own convictions and vote as the president dictated—Atlanta Constitution.