

everything which does not like us. But what dignity or glory is to be had from "desperate fights" which after four hours give us one man killed and ten wounded? And can we forget Burke's shrewd criticism on "dignity?"

"They tell you, sir that your dignity is tied to it. I know not how it happens, but this dignity of yours is a terrible encumbrance to you; for it has of late been ever at war with your interest, your equity, and every idea of your policy. Show the thing you contend for to be reason, show it to be common sense, show it to be the means of attaining some useful end, and then I am content to allow it what dignity you please. But what dignity is derived from the perseverance in absurdity is more than ever I could discern."

The great thing for a Christian people, the *unum necessarium*, is not to be "dignified," but to do right, to help to educate and elevate your fellow-man, and not to destroy him except under stern necessity.—New York Evening Post.

MASSACHUSETTS VOICES.

In Protest Against the War of Conquest In the Philippines.

The following are extracts from the speeches at the anti-imperialist meeting in Boston on Tuesday night, April 4 Ex-Attorney-General Pillsbury said:

"Who, then, were the aggressors? Tried by the high declaration with which we began the war against Spain, who were the aggressors? Forcible annexation was declared to be not only aggression, but criminal aggression. It is said that we are not guilty of such criminal aggression, because we acquired the islands by purchase. Who sold them to us? The inhabitants have never sold them. We acquired from Spain only such title as she had, a title which never rested on anything but force. We took it such as it was, with full notice that it was disputed, and not only disputed, but broken.

"The headlines call the Filipinos 'rebels.' Why rebels? What allegiance have they ever owed to us? We have not even the paper authority of international law for claiming their allegiance. We knew, before we set foot on the islands, that they denied allegiance to Spain, and we took full advantage of this fact. Our \$20,000,000 paid to Spain did not purchase their allegiance, and much less did it pay for a drop of their blood. Do they owe more allegiance to us than the Cubans owed to Spain?

"We began the war with a declaration of both houses of congress that 'the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent,' expressly disclaiming any purpose to acquire sovereignty over them. What single title had the Cubans to freedom and independence, or to possession of their own

country, that the Filipinos do not possess today? Not one. Was our declaration, then, a lie—the declaration which alone reconciled the people of the United States to invoke, in the cause of liberty, the horrors and calamities of war? A few imperialists are candid enough to avow that it was a lie, and was never meant to be anything else. But that declaration was made in the name of the American people, and no less authority than theirs can recall it or depart from it, and they mean that it shall be made good, not only toward Cuba, but toward the world."

Ex-Governor Boutwell said:

"The president occupies the position in reference to the Philippines that Russia occupies in regard to Poland, and a position kindred to the position that Austria occupied to Hungary in 1848, when Kossuth was carrying on a contest in behalf of self-government, in which all America sympathized.

"The president abandons the declaration of independence, and sets aside the immortal words, 'Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.' He is now using an army of American citizens to overcome an obstacle—the opinion of the inhabitants of the Philippine islands, that they have a natural and inalienable right to govern themselves. In the presence of the proclamation of January 5, the conjecture even is impossible that the president contemplates a time when the inhabitants of the Philippines will be permitted to govern themselves.

"He is now engaged in carrying on a war for the purpose, as he alleges, of 'bestowing the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine islands, under the free flag of the United States.' Thus does the president avow a purpose through war to undertake the 'bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government under the free flag of the United States' upon unwilling peoples. What is the meaning of this declaration, when it is stripped of its rhetoric? Only this—we are to enter upon wars of conquest, and to govern the conquered by force. The flag which to us is a free flag would be to them only an emblem of tyranny."

Judge Dunbar said:

"The Filipinos have been subject to shameful oppression, and our duty towards them, if we owed them any duty, was to give them such justice as to enable them to free themselves from the oppression of Spain and leave them to carry on their government in their own way. There is time to correct this mistake in part. There is time for us to revert from evil, and to learn to do right; to follow the history of our traditions, the sound American doctrine, not the doctrine that leads us to colonization. And if we do this, we shall

not pursue a course of war and bloodshed."

State Senator Parsons said:

"Let me ask whether the people here assembled believe that when this question does come to its solution they are going to be guided by the great lights by which this nation has thus far proceeded? Do they propose to follow James Monroe? Do they propose to follow Abraham Lincoln, or do they propose to follow Stephen Douglas? Do they propose to follow U. S. Grant, who said, 'Let us have peace,' or Shafter, who says, 'Let's sweep half the people off the face of the earth, in order to have peace for the remaining half?' We have no doubt as to what course the American people will take. I believe that when we settle this question it will be but a new and strong demonstration of that well-phrased truth—the desertion of duty is not an American habit."

The World-SWALLOWER AND SWALLOWEE. Herald is conspicuous for having

been a protectionist of very earnest convictions and likewise for having entertained gold standard views of a very rugged type.

And this journal kindly digs up and republishes a carefully written letter of the editor of THE CONSERVATIVE which was printed first in November, 1890.

That letter proposed a getting together of all the elements of opposition to republicanism in Nebraska. The straight democrats had just won a signal victory by electing Hon. James E. Boyd governor. In the hour of victory it was therefore proper to propose taking into the democratic fold all voters outside of the republican ranks. It was not proposed to surrender either the principles or the organization of the democracy of Nebraska to populism. It was the intention to swallow the alliance and populist parties of this state and make them and the commonwealth democratic.

Since then principles, organization, traditions and name too have been surrendered to populism by democracy in Nebraska. Instead of being swallower it is the swallowee.

Foam and froth on the surface are sometimes mistaken for the force and volume of the current.

The boaster is not dangerous. Justice moves silently. Justice travels with a leaden heel; but it strikes with an iron hand.

Sir Walter Raleigh said very truly: "The shallows murmur, but the deeps are still." This accounts for the mistakes of practical politicians. They construe the boisterous avowals of the unthinking rag-tag-and-bob-tail to be public sentiment.