

difficult to understand how a layman, or even a non-christian, can fail to see the wrongfulness of taxation without representation, even though we do the taxing and the Porto Ricans or the Filipinos are the victims. How, then, can a minister with a quickened conscience fail to see the error of our position? It is surprising that any one can regard stealing from others as less reprehensible, viewed from a moral standpoint, than being stolen from. And yet there are ministers who defend a government based upon force, merely because we administer the government and use the force against others.

But imperialism attacks the foundations of our religion as well as the foundations of our government; it substitutes arbitrary authority for persuasion and love. It makes our nation an exponent of the doctrine of war, conquest, and subjugation, rather than a high and noble example. The Christian religion rests upon the doctrine of human brotherhood, just as our government rests upon the kindred doctrine that all men are created equal, and the two doctrines will disappear together when we attempt to build a republic upon the bloody foundation upon which empires rest.

It requires moral courage and often sacrifice to do one's duty, and yet duty cannot be shirked with impunity. The minister believes that moral principles apply to nations as well as to individuals, and that nations cannot violate those principles with impunity. Ministers believe that the punishment meted out to nations is more terrible than the punishment meted out to individuals, because the sin is greater. Let them beware, then, of giving their endorsement, or even silent acquiescence, to national wrong-doing. No one can assume that others will be more interested than himself in the triumph of right, nor ought he to assume that the sacrifices of others will be sufficient to save him from the natural results of his own indifference. Every one, the minister included, is in duty bound to give to his country the benefit of his judgment and his conscience.

Fusion, Open and Secret.

In the last campaign the republican papers denounced democrats and populists for co-operating against the common enemy. Both parties were accused of sacrificing principle to "get office." The subject is mentioned at this time because D. Clem Deaver, a Nebraska politician who had charge of the middle-of-the-road populist campaign in the west, has recently received at the hands of President McKinley a substantial reward for opposing fusion. A republican by the name of Dickson severely criticised Mr. Deaver's appointment on the ground that Mr. Deaver was not a republican. In reply Mr. Deaver gave this explanation of his appointment:

"I have no desire personally to answer the strictures of Dr. Dickson, but as a matter of record I wish to say that my application for appointment to this office was indorsed by Governor Dietrich and every other republican state officer, also by R. B. Schneider, republican national committeeman, and the leaders of every faction of the republican party in this state.

"Further, upon the promotion of Governor

Dietrich to the senate, he took up my case and enlisted the support of Senator Millard, who had never met me prior to the time of his election, March 28.

"In view of the fact," concluded Mr. Deaver, "that the party leaders were a unit in supporting my application, Senator Millard's assent was cheerfully given. I have about perfected my bond and expect to assume the duties of the office August 1."

During the last presidential campaign Mr. Deaver went up and down the country urging the populists not to have anything to do with the democrats, and the republican newspapers spoke of Mr. Deaver as a populist who "stood by his principles." But now all the republican leaders ask for and secure a valuable appointment for him. This proves, if indeed proof was necessary, that there was secret fusion between the republicans and the middle-of-the-road populists. In 1896 the republicans and gold democrats denounced fusion between democrats and populists, and yet when the election was over prominent democrats like Bynum and Irish applied for and received appointments from the administration, showing that there was a secret understanding between the republicans and those who were in charge of the Palmer and Buckner movement.

The cry "Down with fusion" does not come with good grace from populists and gold democrats who have been affiliating with republicans. With even poorer grace does the cry come from republicans who have made use of the two extremes, gold democrats on the one hand and middle-of-the-road populists on the other.

Honest co-operation between the reform forces is natural and necessary and such co-operation will be advocated by those who are earnest in their effort to overthrow republican policies. Secret and dishonest co-operation will still be indulged in by those who denounce fair and open methods.

Inconsistent Bankers.

The Minnesota bankers in convention assembled have denounced the parole of the Younger brothers.

The Younger brothers were bank robbers. They had one advantage over some other bank robbers in that they had not been entrusted with the savings of men and women who had been led to believe in their integrity. They did not pose as first citizens of a community, and through the advantage thus obtained rob their trusting depositors of hard earned money.

President McKinley has granted immunity to 35 bank robbers. Of these, 21 were pardoned outright, and yet no one has ever heard of a convention of bankers criticising Mr. McKinley because of this exercise of the pardoning power.

Whatever difference there may be between the bank robbery of the Younger brothers and the bank robbery of the 35 men to whom Mr. McKinley extended clemency, the advantage, on the whole, is in favor of the Younger brothers. Society can protect itself in advance from the bank robbery of the Younger variety. But a society that prefers to believe that the

great majority of men are honest, that relies implicitly upon the promises and the pretenses of the respected bank official, cannot protect itself from that official's wickedness.

These associations of bankers have a few peculiar habits. They are wrought to the heights of indignation because of the release of bank robbers like the two whom the Minnesota authorities paroled, yet they have no word of condemnation for the pardon of the bank robbers like those to whom Mr. McKinley extended clemency.

In connection with the protest of the Minnesota bankers association against paroling the Younger brothers it is interesting to observe that the Younger brothers were sentenced to prison for life and that they served for a period of nearly 25 years. The term of service of the 35 men for whom Mr. McKinley issued pardon or commutation of sentence would aggregate 214 years. These 35 men served terms in prison aggregating not exceeding 85 years. The two Younger brothers were each sentenced for life and the aggregate term served was 50 years. The crime for which the Younger brothers were sentenced was an attempted bank robbery. The crimes for which the 35 men to whose importunities Mr. McKinley yielded were sentenced was the stealing of hundreds of thousands of dollars, the exact figures of which are not at hand, but it would not be surprising if they amounted to several millions.

And yet this Minnesota bankers association expresses indignation because of the release of the Younger brothers while it does not condemn the releasing of thirty-five offenders by the grace of the republican president.

Bank robbing is wrong, and bank robbers should be punished, but banks are robbed from the inside as well as from the outside. The official who robs from the inside adds breach of trust to larceny, and is certainly as much a criminal as the burglar who enters the bank in the night or the highwayman who breaks into the safe by daylight. It is only fair, therefore, that an association which condemns the parole of bank robbers after twenty-five years of service in the penitentiary should condemn the pardon of embezzling bank officials who have stolen more and yet have served for shorter terms.

Getting Something for Nothing.

The bankers associations have had much to say on the question of repudiation. They have waxed indignant and denounced as attempted repudiation the principle of bimetallism; and yet it is not uncommon to read in our news dispatches the reports of bank directors offering to settle with confiding depositors at rates varying from 10 to 60 cents on the dollar.

The man who in 1896 went to banking houses to obtain inspiration on the money question was told that the bimetalists simply wanted to "get something for nothing," and that such a thing was impossible in this busy and practical world. And yet as a result of the banker's victory in 1896 one of the things accomplished was to remove the reserve on the