

and immediately prior to, the Spanish-American war period.

These messages are full of denunciations of the practices in Cuba, which practices were not so brutal as recent revelations would indicate the practices in the Philippines to be.

In the message of December 1, 1897, Mr. McKinley referred to the concentration system, then established in Cuba by Spain and now maintained by the United States in the Philippines, as "a cruel policy." He said that this was not "civilized warfare," it was "extermination;" and he referred to this policy as "an abuse of the rights of war." And in his message of April 11, 1898, Mr. McKinley reiterated the statements of his 1897 message and, referring to this concentration system, declared: "The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave."

In his message of December 6, 1897, Mr. McKinley denounced Spain's policy in Cuba as a system of warfare that tended "to drive the Cubans to the horrible alternative of taking to the thicket or succumbing to misery." He referred, in that same message, to "the policy of cruel rapine and extermination that so long shocked the universal sentiment of humanity." He referred also to the Spanish commander "whose brutal orders inflamed the American mind and shocked the civilized world." He denounced "the horrible order of concentration."

In his message of April 11, 1898, Mr. McKinley referred to Spain's policy in Cuba as "the horrors of strife of a new and inhuman phase, happily unprecedented in the modern history of civilized Christian peoples." He denounced a policy wherein "the farms were laid waste, dwellings unroofed and fired, mills destroyed, and, in short, everything that could desolate the land and render it unfit for human habitation or support."

In the same message Mr. McKinley said: "The prospect of a protraction and continuation of the present strife is a contingency hardly to be contemplated with equanimity by the civilized world." He spoke of the United States acting "according to the large dictates of humanity;" and as the first ground for intervention, he proposed: "In the cause of humanity and to put an end to the barbarities, bloodshed, starvation and horrible miseries now existing there and which the parties to the conflict are either unable or unwilling to stop or mitigate."

It has not been forgotten either that in the preamble of the war resolutions, it was said that "the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States and have been a disgrace to Christian civilization."

When Spain did things in Cuba similar to the things we are now doing in the Philippines, these things were bitterly denounced. No attempt was made to apologize for them; and yet today when American citizens protest against these evils in the Philippines they are arraigned as enemies of their own government and as assailants of the American army!

What special dispensation can there be that would justify a wrong committed in the name of our own government which, if done by the representatives of any other government, would call for prompt and vigorous protest in every section of this country?

### Listen to Charles Sumner.

The republican party once claimed Charles Sumner as an authority. In the United States senate on March 27, 1871, Charles Sumner delivered an address relating to the acquisition of the island of San Domingo, a thing which President Grant had been most anxious to accomplish. But the hopes of President Grant in this respect were destroyed because the opponents of the acquisition, led by Sumner and men of his class, appealed

to the traditional principles of this government.

In this speech Mr. Sumner said: "When I speak for republican institutions it is because I would not have our great example weakened before the world and our good name tarnished; and when I speak for the republican party, it is because, from the beginning, I have been the faithful servant of that party and aspire to see it strong and triumphant. But beyond all these considerations is the commanding rule of justice, which cannot be disobeyed with impunity."

Mr. Sumner then proceeded to say that two questions should be considered in dealing with the proposition before the senate. The one was, "Is it good for us?" and the other was, "Is it good for them?" He added: "The more I meditate these two considerations I find myself forgetting the former and considering the latter, or rather the former was absorbed in the latter."

Would it not be well for men who claim Charles Sumner as a patron saint to consider the Philippine question from the same standpoint that Mr. Sumner regarded the San Domingo question?

If, concerning the acquisition of the Philippines, we ask, "Is it good for us?" we find that there is no practical reason why we should assume this burden at the sacrifice of our most precious principles.

If we consider this question from the standpoint, "Is it good for them?" we are naturally directed to the claim made by the founders of our own government that the governed rather than those who would assume to govern are the best judges of what is well for the governed.

In the solution of this latter problem Mr. Sumner applied for himself the principle that "the acquisition of this territory would not be respectable or even tolerable unless by the consent of the people there, through rules of their own choice and without force on our part." He asserted the principle that a contract for the cession of territory must be fair and without suspicion of overawing force; and he added that "where one party is more powerful than another, this principle becomes more imperative, especially must it be sacred with a republic for it owes nothing but the mandate of justice. The rule is general in its application; nay more, it is part of universal law, common to all municipal systems and to international law." Mr. Sumner also said: "Plainly there can be no cession of territory and especially no surrender of national independence except as the result of war, so long as hostile cannon are frowning."

### The Method of the Fathers

The Minneapolis Journal, in indorsing the proposition that senators be elected by the people, says:

There is a widespread disappointment with the method of the "fathers." During the last decade the public have witnessed very shameful proceedings in the elections of senators by legislatures. The country desires a change to the broad basis of the popular vote. The people are not likely to "go wrong" very often. A century of trial has shown that the constitutional method is not the best. The house has four times tried to give constitutional power to the popular vote method and the senate has declined to further the purpose. The resolution now in the keeping of the senate committee should not be allowed to stay there.

The Journal is mistaken on one point. The fathers were not necessarily irrevocably committed to the present method of electing senators. Intensely patriotic themselves, they did not imagine that the time would come when the senate as they had constructed it, would blast rather than nourish the hopes of the people.

Benjamin Franklin once illustrated the object which the fathers sought to accomplish by the different methods of choosing members of the lower house and members of the senate by pointing to a cup filled with hot coffee. He said that one desiring to cool the liquid, would pour it into

the saucer; and the senate being the less numerous body and chosen directly by the legislatures rather than by the people would consider proper legislation more calmly than the lower house would do.

The thing which the fathers hoped to accomplish was wise and patriotic legislation and they believed that none but the very best men would be elected to the senate. But in this day when the millionaire and the representative of selfish interest is the rule, rather than the exception, in the membership of that body, the very thing which the fathers sought to accomplish has been made impossible of accomplishment under the present plan.

It is doubtless true that the rank and file of every political organization are heartily in favor of the election of senators by the people and nothing more clearly shows the impunity with which republican leaders act on public questions in defiance of public sentiment than the position taken on the question of the election of senators by eminent republicans in the United States senate.

### The Crowder Report.

Several weeks have passed since Colonel Crowder made his report concerning the British camp at Port Chalmette and yet no announcement of action upon that report has been made by Mr. Roosevelt.

The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, referring to Colonel Crowder's report, says:

He found a state of facts on which this government would be justified in asking the British authorities to make a radical change in their methods. At first it was understood the government would meet the issue and send such a request to the British government, not in any way weakening the principle for which America has always contended—the right of our citizens to sell to belligerents—but in disapproval of objectionable methods employed by the British in this instance. "The British have done their business here in the most offensive way possible," says a member of the cabinet. "They have kept within their legal rights, but they ought to be compelled to quit for their stupidity."

Attorney General Knox has not finished his examination of the subject. Probably he will not finish it for several weeks to come. The truth is, of course, that the administration wishes to offend neither the Boer sympathizers nor the British government, and hopes that by delaying action peace may be declared in South Africa and the whole question be wiped off the slate.

Does not Mr. Roosevelt owe something to the dignity of the United States? Here a republican correspondent of a republican newspaper quotes a member of the cabinet as saying, concerning the British camp: "The British have done their business here in the most offensive way possible." And yet it is added that because the administration wishes to offend neither the Boer sympathizers nor the British government, it will withhold action in the hope that peace may be declared and the necessity for action may be avoided.

Even though the British were not fighting men who are struggling to maintain a form of government with which we are presumed to be most in sympathy, it would yet be the duty of our national representatives to rebuke any attempt on the part of Great Britain to establish a military camp upon United States soil.

The methods of these British campmasters are admitted by a member of the cabinet to be decidedly objectionable and yet the president delays action!

It is significant that in every instance that has arisen when the administration has been urged to do something that might result indirectly in advantage to the Boers, it has been insisted that the administration was anxious to avoid giving offense to either party; and yet whenever the administration has had an opportunity to do anything of advantage to the British ministry, it has promptly seized the opportunity.

If the administration wishes to offend neither the Boer sympathizers nor the British government, and to this end withholds action upon the Crowder report, how would it do for Mr. Roosevelt to withdraw the appointment of special representatives to the coronation ceremonies of the king? This proposed representation certainly offends the Boer sympathizers and yet we do not observe any indication of an inclination on Mr. Roosevelt's part to avoid giving offense in this particular.