

is. Why should there be any objection to an independent pulpit, an independent press, an independent man or woman? One would sometimes think they were more dangerous than a mad dog. Hence the attempt to muzzle them. Independence is the bed-rock of Americanism. If there is anything American it is that. The Pilgrims planted it on Plymouth Rock. It is a historic fact. It is not a tradition. The Puritans planted and cultivated it on the stone-clad hills of New England's rock-bound coast. The foundation of this country was laid in independence in religion. Our political institutions have a religious foundation. The fathers built more wisely than they knew. The revolution was fought for independence in government. The constitution is laid in individual independence. The rocks of true socialism are laid in the same cement.

Why then complain of or condemn independence in the individual, the pulpit or the press? What is there to fear? Ideas! For shame! An idea never killed a man. Men behind guns have done so. Men are more often in error than right. The pathway to truth has been ploughed in the blood of error.

The man who says "stop my paper" is not an American, no matter if he traces his ancestry to Plymouth Rock. He is like the man who built his house upon the sand. Were all such the fate of the country would be that of the house. The storms of ignorance, the riot of revolution, the devils of anarchy would prevail against it. The nation would fall. Great would be the fall thereof.

What manner of man is he who only reads the machine partisan press? It is not many years since there were men in this country still voting for Andrew Jackson, not knowing the king was dead. The machine built by him still lives. It still enslaves the people. This is on account of the scarcity of a free and independent press. The man who says "stop my paper," because of its contrary ideas, is as blind and ignorant as the Jackson democrat who did not know his king was dead. Such men are the strength of machine despotism. No matter how personally "good" they may be they are bad men. Like a "bad injun" civilization has no place for them. They are unredeemable. Never having been made in the "image of God" they cannot be reformed. They are automatons without manliness. They are the soil in which the seed of corruption grows plentifully. No crop mete for repentance ever develops therein.

Freedom of the Press Not License.

The purpose of a free press is for the discussion of principles and men as the representatives of principles. Rightly understood that is all men do represent. Freedom of the press does not and should not mean license to personal abuse.

Freedom is not ignorant or blind subjection to law, traditionalism, public opinion or anything else. Freedom means intelligently walking in the law, having no offense. Liberty too often has the flavor of anarchy. License is the direct road to anarchy. It is broad, though crooked. The American press too often degenerates to license. It too often lends itself to abuse. For partisan ends it stops at nothing. Corrupted and corrupt itself it spreads the seeds of corruption. The press knows and feels its power. The might of power is intelligent self-control within the limits of manly independence.

There is nothing holy which shall not be revealed. The only road to revelation is through the path of error. The roadway to truth is straight. The gate is narrow. Only the few go in thereat. Should they be gagged or muzzled? There is nothing too sacred for discussion, even the idea of God. If the idea of God cannot stand discussion it is a false assumption. Truth is holy. Truth is divine. It can stand discussion. How shall we know the truth unless constantly attacked. Error falls by the wayside. He who fears attack is conscious of his own weakness. He who fears discussion or attack of his opinions has no faith in their rectitude. He who says "stop my paper" because it attacks or discusses his party's principles or acts, is an unworthy member of that party. He only half believes. He is a weak brother needing stiffening. He who defies the president of his party and who fears criticism of him, falls down before an "unknown God," as Paul said of the Athenians. He has no faith in the infallibility of his party leader. He who gets angry at honest criticism is mad at self-conscious weakness. He who opposes a free and independent press is a traitor. A free and independent press is the rock of national salvation. The fathers builded the national house upon it; shall their sons undermine it? A house or nation built on the sands of traditionalism and blind party subjection will surely fall. Only an intellectually independent people can be free. Are the Americans such a people? A free and independent press is the voice of a free and independent people. Have we such a press?

FRANK S. BILLINGS.

Grafton, Mass.

"TREASON."

"I believe in the Declaration of Independence."—Thomas B. Reed, August 13, 1899.

"Whatever may happen, I am sure that the First Maine District will always be true to the principles of liberty, self-government, and the rights of man."—Thomas B. Reed, September 16, 1899.

"Rather than make a war of conquest, on this people (Filipinos), I would up

anchor and sail out of the harbor."—Admiral Dewey, January, 1899.

"I have never been in favor of violence towards the Filipinos. The islands are at this moment blockaded by a fleet, and war reigns in the interior. This abnormal state of things should cease. I should like to see autonomy first conceded, and then annexation might be talked about. This is my opinion, and I should like to see violence at once put a stop to. According to me, the concession of self government ought to be the most just and the most logical solution."—Admiral Dewey, August 20, 1899.

"What we want is to stop this accursed war. It is time for diplomacy, time for mutual understandings. These men are indomitable. At Bacoor bridge they waited till the Americans brought their cannon to within thirty-five yards of their trenches. Such men have the right to be heard. All they want is a little justice."—Gen. Henry W. Lawton, as reported by the Rev. Peter MacQueen in the Congregationalist, September 7, 1899.

"Conciliatory methods would have prevented the war. General Otis's unfortunate proclamation of January 4 rendered conciliation almost impossible. At every step of the peace negotiations he stipulated that nothing should be considered until the Filipinos laid down their arms. Herein is where the natives mistrusted the Americans. The Filipinos had many lessons from Spain in the folly of laying down arms. They were not able to comprehend the difference between Spanish and American promises."—Gen. C. McC. Reeve, September 13, 1899.

"I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of. That by our code of morality would be criminal aggression."—President McKinley to congress, December 7, 1897.

"Human rights and constitutional privileges must not be forgotten in the race for wealth and commercial supremacy. * * * The government of the people must be by the people, and not by a few of the people; it must rest upon the free consent of the governed and all of the governed. Power, it must be remembered, which is secured by oppression, or usurpation or by any form of injustice, is soon dethroned. We have no right in law or morals to usurp that which belongs to another, whether it is property or power."—William McKinley, December 22, 1890.

"With Bryan, but another name for free silver, it is utterly out of reason to talk of conciliation next year," says the Davenport Democrat (dem.). "But with a new man who is equal to the new and grave issues victory may be won."