

Kossuth's reception in this country. He said that he was greeted with enthusiasm wherever he went. Daniel Webster received him as a hero; so did Henry Clay, William H. Seward, Robert Winthrop, Governor Hunt of New York, members of the cabinet, governors of states, senators, all took part in the reception to a man who was fighting for liberty.

Kossuth was arrayed against Austria; and at the very time, when we were opening our arms to receive him with true American hospitality and showering upon him genuine American honors, this government was maintaining diplomatic relations with Austria.

If Paul Kruger came to America today, would he be received as Louis Kossuth was received? Undoubtedly the people would welcome him cordially, but would the members of congress with one accord assemble at the banquet board to pay honor to Kruger as their predecessors assembled at the banquet board to pay honor to Kossuth? Would senators and governors and cabinet officers tumble over one another in the effort to speak a word of encouragement to the president of the South African republic? Would the president of the United States give to Kruger, as one of his distinguished predecessors gave to Kossuth, the assurance that the sympathy of the American people was with those who battle for liberty and for a republican form of government? If not, why not? What has brought about the change that makes it impossible in this day that we should take our stand on liberty's side, as the Americans of earlier days did?

It would be instructive to look a bit farther into the Kossuth affair. Remember that our relations with Austria were not seriously disturbed by the things we did, because Austrian statesmen understood that in liberty's cause this government and this people had the right, as it was their duty, to do anything to advance liberty's interests or to aid and encourage those fighting for freedom.

Zachary Taylor, then president of the United States, in a message to congress in 1849, said that during the conflict between Austria and Hungary, "there seemed to be a prospect that the latter might become an independent nation," and Taylor added that "however faint that prospect at the time appears," he thought it his duty in accordance with the general sentiment of the American people to stand prepared upon the contingency of the establishment by law of a permanent government to be the first to welcome independent Hungary into the family of nations. Then President Taylor informed the congress that with this thought in mind, he had instructed an agent to "declare our willingness promptly to recognize her independence in the event of her ability to sustain it." And then in the contemplation of Hungary's unsuccessful struggle, President Zachary Taylor made bold to say, "But the feelings of this nation were strongly enlisted in the cause, and by the sufferings of a brave people who had made a gallant though unsuccessful effort to be free."

In 1850, in his message to congress, President Taylor reiterated the sympathy of the American people with the Hungarians, even though they were unsuccessful and he added, "Although she is now fallen and many of her gallant patriots are in chains, I am free still to declare that had she been successful in the maintenance of such a government as we could have recognized, we should have been the first to welcome her into the family of nations."

What if President Roosevelt would say something like that in behalf of the republicans of South Africa, who are fighting in defense of their republics; and why cannot President Roosevelt say something like that? If President Roosevelt would say something like that, there would be no more question that he would reflect the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the Ameri-

can people than there was that President Taylor reflected the sentiments of the American people at the time he expressed sympathy for the Hungarians.

But the American people went considerably farther in the Kossuth affair than the mere expression of sympathy. Kossuth escaped to Turkey, and in spite of demands for his extradition, he was protected by the Turkish authorities. On March 3, 1851, both houses of the American congress adopted a resolution requesting President Millard Fillmore to authorize the employment of a public vessel to convey to this country Kossuth and his associates in captivity.

The story of how this resolution was carried out is told in President Fillmore's message to congress in December, 1851. The president said: "The instruction above referred to was complied with, and the Turkish government having released Governor Kossuth and his companions from prison, on the 10th of September last they embarked on board of the United States steam frigate Mississippi, which was selected to carry into effect the resolution of congress. Governor Kossuth left the Mississippi at Gibraltar for the purpose of making a visit to England, and may shortly be expected in New York. By communication to the department of state he has expressed his grateful acknowledgement for the interposition of this government in behalf of himself and his associates. This country has been justly regarded as a safe asylum for those whom political events have exiled from their own homes in Europe, and it is recommended to congress to consider in what manner Governor Kossuth and his companions, brought hither by its authority, shall be received and treated."

In the early days, this country was justly regarded as a safe asylum of those whom political events had exiled from their homes in Europe; but how different the situation is today! The American people, by an overwhelming majority, sympathize with Kruger and his people, yet this sympathy can find no voice through official channels. On the contrary, horses and mules and munitions of war are permitted to be shipped from this country for the benefit of the British soldiery. The only expression we hear through official sources is an expression of exceptional friendship for the oppressors of the Boers. Not one word is permitted to escape the lips of American officials which could be distorted into the slightest evidence of sympathy for the men who are fighting as Kossuth fought.

What has happened since the days of Zachary Taylor and of Millard Fillmore that the official representatives of this country dare not express the popular sympathy for republics in their struggle against empires?

### Lord Salisbury's Neighbors.

In his speech delivered at the Lord Mayor's banquet in London, Lord Salisbury referred to the war in South Africa, and among other things said: "We have had neighbors in South Africa whose conduct for years has been a menace to the stability of that section of our empire. Now we are engaged in removing this menace, and we are determined to do it so effectively that it will never require doing again."

The newspaper reports say: "This declaration was received with cordial, but with by no means enthusiastic applause." Probably Lord Salisbury's hearers were struck by the use of the word "neighbors." We have been told that the South African Dutchmen were subjects of Great Britain, that sovereign power was acquired by the English authorities, but Lord Salisbury frankly refers to them as "neighbors."

In this light it is interesting to recall the things which Great Britain sought to do with its South African "neighbors." Not content with telling these "neighbors" that they should not

seek in any way to interfere with British sovereignty or British possessions, the British authorities actually undertook to tell their "neighbors" what they should do and what they should not do with respect to the laws relating to their own government, and with respect to the rules which they should lay down whereby men might become citizens of the country over which these "neighbors" ruled. It is true that one nation has a right to insist that its neighbor shall not do anything that will injure the health or seriously affect the welfare of that nation, but it is something new in international law, something new in the realm of common sense, to be told that a nation has a right to control the domestic affairs of a neighbor.

Lord Salisbury's way of removing this menace "so effectively that it will never require doing again" is to remove the "neighbors," to exterminate the "neighbors," to destroy not only the "neighbors'" government, but to destroy the "neighbors" themselves. To be sure, Lord Salisbury is not succeeding in an eminent degree in this respect, but the purpose and the will are apparent.

General Buller promised to eat his Christmas dinner at the "neighbors'" table in 1898. The promise was not kept, and, while the British have possession of the "neighbors'" capital, while they hold as prisoners of war the wives and children of these "neighbors," it seems that there are yet in the field many of these "neighbors" fighting for constitutional government and waging heroic war against British aggression.

Perhaps Lord Salisbury did not intend to be frank when he used the word "neighbors," and yet the fact is that the two republics of South Africa were by no means subject to British authority. These two republics were neighbors of the British colonies. They had built for themselves governments embodying their ideals, and when the British ministry forced war upon them, destroyed their capital and drove their officials and their citizens from these republics, one of the blackest pages in history was written.

In the records the two South African republics were written as "neighbors;" in the view of Gladstone and former British leaders these republics were "neighbors," they were not colonies. And there is no claim more susceptible of complete proof than that Great Britain had no authority to interfere with or to control the domestic policies of either the Orange Free State or the South African Republic.

As Lord Salisbury stated, they were "neighbors," and Great Britain stands convicted before the civilized world of waging an unjust, lawless and merciless warfare, not upon men subject to British authority, but upon men who stood plainly and clearly on their rights and denied to Great Britain privileges which British testimony shows Great Britain was not entitled to, and which British testimony shows were rights belonging exclusively to the brave Dutchmen of South Africa.

### The Export Tax Decision.

The federal constitution provides: "No tax or duty shall be levied on articles exported from any state." Congress levied a duty on goods going from the United States to Porto Rico. The supreme court has held this duty to be not in violation of the constitution.

It is fair to say that the court expressly disavows any inclination to sanction an export tax, and yet it is not unfair to say that this disavowal was necessary in order for the justices to seriously maintain the position they assumed.

If a tax levied upon goods going from the United States is not an export tax, then it is difficult to understand what would be an export tax. The court, however, speaking through Justice Brown, reasons that "if a tax levied by congress on articles exported from the United States to the