

The Chicago Journal serves notice that "the president and those who support him have no intention to yield to the weak sentimentalism of such men as Senator Hoar." And yet Senator Hoar insists that those who object to imperialism have no reason to lose faith in the republican party and he says "the irrevocable step is not yet taken."

Notice to Senator Hoar.

The Kansas City Journal says: "In the democratic press President Roosevelt has been represented as one who is for keeping the Philippine islands under every possible circumstance or condition, yet President Roosevelt has never declared for such a policy." What does the Journal have to say with respect to Mr. Roosevelt's declaration that the flag will "stay put" in the Philippine islands?

But He Said "Stay Put."

Congress has passed Senator Cullom's bill providing for the creation of a commission to decide on the designs and location for a monument to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. This is said to have been "a cherished project of Senator Cullom." With what reason do the republican statesmen who have repudiated Abraham Lincoln's principles exert themselves to raise monuments to Lincoln's memory?

Why These Monuments.

When a republican office-holder at Cleveland took an active part in behalf of Mark Hanna and was criticised for his offensive partisanship, Mr. Hanna is reported to have said: "When a man takes a government position, he doesn't forfeit his rights of citizenship." Because Miss Rebecca J. Taylor, a clerk in the war department, publicly expressed her opposition to the administration's Philippine policy she was removed from office. But it must be remembered that Mr. Hanna did not say that "when a woman takes a government position, she doesn't forfeit her rights of citizenship."

There is a Difference.

In a letter to Colonel Cutter Smith of Florence, Ala., Mark Hanna says: "I must insist that I am not to be considered in any sense a candidate for the nomination for president in 1904." It might disarrange Mr. Hanna's plans if he was "considered in any sense" a candidate for the nomination for president in 1904 until he has laid all the wires that he thinks necessary for securing the prize. Mr. Hanna does not insist that he must not be nominated. On the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that Mr. Hanna intends to become the nominee in 1904, if such a thing is possible.

Not to be Considered.

A libel suit is on trial at Manila before Judge Rhode. The defendant is the editor of a newspaper called "Freedom." The attorney for the defendant objected to trial before Judge Rhode on the ground that Rhode had once addressed opprobrious epithets to the editor of the paper, and had declared that he would not rest until he had landed him in Bilibid prison. The dispatches say that Judge Rhode admitted having made this statement, but insisted that he was capable of trying the case fairly. How many lawyers in the United States would be willing to have their client tried before such a judge under similar circumstances?

But Can He Do It?

The New York Herald says: "President Roosevelt truly asserts that the difficult art of self-government—an art which our people have taught themselves by the labor of a thousand years—cannot be grasped in a day by the Filipinos, and that not until they have learned this and shown their capacity for self-government will it be possible to decide whether they are to exist independently of us or be knit to us by ties of friendship and common interests." If the difficult art of self-government is "an art which our people have taught themselves," why do we deny to the Filipinos the privilege of teaching themselves this same art? Had "our people" shown their capacity for self-government? If so, when did they show it? Was it when they framed the immortal Declaration of Independence? Was it when they took up arms against the British crown? Was it when they demonstrated that their love of liberty was so intense that they were willing to fight for it and if necessary to die for it? It cannot have been forgotten that it was said by our British oppres-

They Taught Themselves.

sors, exactly as we say of the Filipinos, that we had not shown our capacity for self-government. But our fathers laid down several self-evident truths to which they dedicated their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. They knew it was necessary for them to pass through the experimental stage and upon the general foundation of government which they laid they built the structure which should now stand as an inspiration for all men.

The Boston Globe thinks it has discovered some "signs of the times," and the Globe serves interesting warnings upon the trust magnates. In one editorial the Globe says: "With the coal trust and the meat trust raising prices and refusing to raise wages, the issue between those concerns and the people is fast being made up. They are engaged in a monumental folly and every man of property in the country ought to find some way of communicating this universal opinion to the heedless barons of the mines and the abattoirs." In another editorial the Globe says: "Those who are forcing high prices of living and yet refusing to pay wages to correspond will yet find themselves face to face with the whole American people. Congress will be forced, as things are now drifting, to adopt drastic measures. No tariff traditions will be allowed to stand in the way. The people will not endure the strain forever."

Timely Warning From the East.

The platform adopted by the Ohio republican state convention declares: "All combinations that stifle competition, control prices, limit production or unduly increase profits or values, and especially when they raise the prices of necessities of life, are opposed to public policy and should be repressed with a strong hand." The republican party is in power in the White house and in both branches of congress. All over the land today there are powerful combinations that "stifle competition, control prices, limit production or unduly increase profits or values." All over the land today there are powerful combinations that have raised the price of the necessities of life. All over the land today there are powerful combinations that are "opposed to public policy." Why do not the republican congress and the republican president "repress with a strong hand" these powerful and unholly combinations?

Why Not do it, Then?

John W. Gates, the financier, in an interview with a Chicago Record-Herald reporter, said: "This prosperity is going to continue. Politics can't touch it. Every trust formed, every community of interest consummated, is a step upward for the social advancement of the laborer. If America continues to forge ahead for the next thirty years as she has in the last thirty, then we will own all the important railroads in the world." The advocates of the trust system are becoming bolder. A few months ago they insisted that there was no such thing as a trust; and now they tell us that "every trust formed, every combination made, and every community of interest consummated is a step upward for the social advancement of the laborer;" and the regrettable fact is that in spite of the overwhelming proof against the desirability of the trust system, there are those who will be willing to permit men like Gates to do the thinking for the country.

Now They are "Good Things."

The Commoner recently contained the following editorial comment: "The revelations concerning cruelties practiced in the Philippines prove not that we are worse than other peoples, but that human nature is too frail to be trusted with the use of arbitrary power. An irresponsible government will certainly result in atrocities. Man is not strong enough to withstand the temptation to misuse power, and therefore constitutional restrictions are necessary for the protection of the weak and for the maintenance of civilized government." An Ohio reader, referring to this editorial, says: "If these words could be burned into the inner consciences of the American people, the fight against imperialism would be won; it seems to me impossible to condense into fewer words a more stinging indictment of the republican colonial policy, and whole volumes have been written in defense of constitutional liberty and popular government controlled by law without saying as much in their favor as is contained in these few lines. They ought to be inscribed in letters of living light upon the walls of every school house and other institutions of learning in the land, published in every home and added as a supplement to the

An Appreciated Compliment.

Declaration of Independence." He commends the fight The Commoner is making "to vindicate and justify American principles of popular government." The Commoner does not publish many of the kind things that have been said, but the above is a sample of the words of encouragement which convince the editor that the paper is living up to the principles for which it is established.

Senator Vest objects to the election of United States senators by popular vote. He says: "What do you propose to do now? Instead of two legislative bodies, one representing the people at large, the other representing the conservative and deliberate judgment of senators not holding office for two years, but holding it for six years, and who are assumed to represent the states in their sovereign capacity, we are to have one great house of representatives, two bodies sitting separately, but both in reality what the popular branch of the congress is today." Under the proposed plan senators would continue to hold their office for six years. The fact that they would be elected by the people would not alter their status as "representatives of states in their sovereign capacity." With what reason may it be said that when the senators are elected by popular vote, their judgment need be less "conservative and deliberate?" It is the six-year term that makes the senators a bit more independent than the member of the lower house and the election by popular vote would not interfere with conservatism or deliberation. It might result in the selection of senators who would not imagine that to be "conservative" and to be "deliberate" they must work for the benefit of special interests and must ignore public interests altogether.

Conservative and Deliberate.

A London cablegram to the Chicago Record-Herald, referring to Whitelaw Reid's visit to England, says: "Presiding at a concert held on board the Umbria last Friday night in aid of the Liverpool Seaman's Orphanage, Mr. Reid said that King Edward was following in the footsteps of his worthy mother, who was always referred to in the United States, not as Queen Victoria, but simply as "the queen." It is very evident that Mr. Roosevelt knew what he was doing when he selected Whitelaw Reid to attend the coronation ceremonies of the king. Mr. Reid's address on the Umbria recalls an interesting editorial that appeared in the American Law Review in 1900. There is such a striking similarity between this editorial and Mr. Reid's Umbria speech that the editorial is worthy of reproduction. The American Law Review is one of the leading law publications of this country. It is edited by Seymour D. Thompson. In its issue of May-June, 1900, the American Law Review had an editorial in which it paid a very flattering tribute to the character of Queen Victoria and concluded thus: "Many of us feel that she is in a sense our queen; and whenever she wants the American boys to fight for her honor, or even for her political rights, they will embark or cross the Canadian frontier for that purpose in such numbers as will tax British resources to arm and equip them—every one of them "spoiling for a fight;" and they will acquit themselves as gallantly as their Canadian cousins have done in South Africa."

Mr. Reid on the Umbria.

William E. Curtis, writing from Washington to the Chicago Record-Herald, says: "It was a great mistake for the republicans in the house of representatives to head off the democratic attacks upon Governor General Wood of Cuba. It was bad political policy." Mr. Curtis thinks that the people will resent any criticism of General Wood's administration and expenditure of money. He declares that the criticism of the brutalities in the Philippines lost votes to the democrats and that the criticism of Wood will only tend to bring votes to the republicans. The republicans have not been able to successfully defend the brutalities in the Philippines and they have not attempted to justify General Wood's unlawful expenditures in Cuba. Consequently they resort to the republican habit of insisting that whenever it is criticised for any of its acts, the republican party is certain to gain strength. Once upon a time it was regarded as good policy for one party to expose and criticise the disreputable acts of another party and in those days it was regarded as good policy for the party criticised to defend itself. But in this new and strange political era, we are told that whatever the republican party or its agents may do is above criticism, and the people are expected to adopt the rule that "under any and all circumstances, the republican party is right and whoever opposes it is wrong."

A Party That is "Always Right."