

Rights Cases" (109 U. S. Sup. Ct. Reps. 25), says:

When a man has emerged from slavery, and by the aid of beneficent legislation has shaken off the inseparable concomitants of that state, there must be some stage in the progress of his elevation when he takes the rank of a mere citizen, and ceases to be the special favorite of the laws, and when his rights, as a citizen or a man, are to be protected in the ordinary modes by which other men's rights are protected.

Under republican institutions there is place only for "mere citizens." We can offer no permanent asylum beneath the American flag for either "special favorites of the laws" or national wards. A nation which is committed to the proposition that all men are of inalienable right equal before the law, can make no provision within its jurisdiction for subject peoples. Our failures in the treatment of the Indians and the Chinese, to say nothing of the negroes, should lead us to hesitate in the presence of a proposal to acquire "a full line of islands," more or less remote from our shores and peopled with alien races without training in, or fitness for, self government. The New York Post significantly inquires: "If other races are rightfully to be held subject to our own, what moral basis is left for democracy? If taxation without representation is just, how long since it became so? If dark people have no rights that white people are bound to respect, what was the significance of the abolition movement?"

The nation may very properly hesitate when urged to abandon the policy of a century, under which it has prospered and wielded a growing influence in the larger world. That the United States has suddenly become "a world power," that it now has "world responsibilities," that it is moving forward at the behest of "manifest destiny," furnishes no rational solution of the grave problem of the hour. What international duty has our country in the past left unperformed? When and where has it refused or failed to share in the "work of the world?" In what precise particulars should it now change its attitude to its neighbors? What are its new duties, and to whom are they due? Is our new policy of aggression of general application, or does it extend only to our defenseless neighbors? Is it to be a mere expression of brute force, or a moral crusade? Is its motive a desire for empire, or a disinterested love for humanity?

We may frankly concede that a foreign policy which was wise in Washington's day and for a century thereafter, may require re-examination and even revision. The real question is, what should now be the foreign policy of the United States? This is a question of self-interest, having due regard to the rights of others. Our government is formed "to establish justice, provide for the common defense, promote the general

welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Its duty lies entirely within these purposes. The presumption is great that we shall still, as in Washington's day, best promote justice and the general welfare by cultivating "peace and harmony with all" nations, and by "diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing." We have long since reached the time which he foresaw, "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, aided by our justice, shall counsel. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?"

American civilization has substituted a state of peace for a state of war. Its fundamental idea is that the government exists for the people, not the people for the government. From this it follows that the nation can have no interest or duty apart from the people's welfare; that no question of national honor or dignity can properly arise which is not directly related to their material or moral well being; and that it is the chief end of their government to maintain justice and peace, so that nothing shall interfere with their fundamental rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is a gross abuse for such a government to appeal to the patriotic sentiment of the people in support of a meddlesome foreign policy touching matters in which they have no perceptible interest.

There are still those, even in America, who held that no objection based on their material interests should be raised to any demand upon the people in support of whatever the jingoes choose to say involves the national honor. What they mean by national honor is derived from the duelist's code. Their ideals of glory come from a military age whose clouds still obscure the modern sky. These ideals belong to a theory of government which rates ships and guns and armed men above ideas, and which still proclaims that might makes right.

The truth is that the achievement of permanent peace, opportunity for the steady pursuit by all the people of their wonted avocations, over vast areas of the earth's surface, which our century is the first to witness, is the greatest triumph of civilization. The possibility that this condition may be extended until the whole world shall become an arena for the cultivation of the arts of peace by the entire race is today our most splendid vision.

Our civilization rests upon a vast sys-

tem of trade and commerce, which extends around the world. It is the basis not only of our material but our moral well being. To give these vast interests free play by administering justice at home and cultivating peace and harmony with all the world has become the end of government. It has long been the glory of America that we are free from the military burdens which have so long rested with crushing weight upon the nations of Europe. For the moment, forgetting Washington's vision of a national life that shall impress the imagination of the world by a spectacle of peace, liberty and prosperity, we have been brought to consider the surrender of our unique position, to inquire whether there is not something nobler in national life than may be realized from the cultivation of the arts of peace.

The aggressive foreign policy, whose first fruits we have but tasted, does not become us well. It is a reversion to a lower type from that to which we are accustomed. It should be wholly abandoned before it becomes a national habit. Whatever we desire, and we may properly so desire, our country is to have an increasing influence in the councils of the world. Even now her voice, when she but speaks in the ordinary tones in which gentlemen converse, is heard in every capital of the world. Already her strength and disinterestedness are so respected that she has only to speak words of soberness and justice to be heeded as well as heard. Why forego the advantages of so splendid a position? Why quit it to stand upon lower ground?

The time has come to preach and believe that the problems of modern life demand moral, rather than physical, courage.

"Life may be given in many ways,
And loyalty to truth be sealed
As bravely in the closet as the field."

Mr. Cleveland does well at this crisis to remind us of our achievements and of our promise for the future, of "what we have done and what remains for us to do under the guidance of the rules and motives which have thus far governed our national life." We are surely "entitled to demand the best of reasons for a change in our policy and conduct, and to exact a conclusive explanation of the conditions which make our acquisition of new and distant territory either justifiable, prudent or necessary."

Ex-Secretary of Agriculture J. Sterling Morton has issued at Nebraska City the prospectus of THE CONSERVATIVE, a weekly journal to be published for "the conservation of all that is deemed desirable in the social, industrial and political life of the United States." Mr. Morton's new publication starts off with a large list of subscribers in advance, and under his vigorous and skillful direction it should wield a powerful influence in molding public opinion in the Far West.—Philadelphia Record.