

constitution to all persons, of whatever race, within the jurisdiction of the United States." (*Lem Moon Sing vs. United States*, 158 U. S. 538, 547.) With the close of the civil war the idea that rights pertain to man, not to race or place, became the law of the land. Thus was removed the gulf which was so long fixed between our faith and our practice. Thus was won the noblest triumph of liberty.

Why is it proposed to depart from a course so long and so successfully pursued? Why reverse the movement for an equality that was the ideal of the declaration and the achievement of the amended constitution? Why substitute inequality for equality? Why again divide a Union for which such tremendous sacrifices were made that it might cease to be divided? Why transform "a republic, founded on the Declaration of Independence, guided by the counsels of Washington, into a vulgar, commonplace empire, founded upon physical force?"

The answers, thus far vouchsafed to us, are such as these: "Where the flag is up, it must stay up." "The Philippines are ours, forever." "Into our reluctant lap the hand of destiny dropped the Philippines." "The Philippines, like Cuba and Porto Rico, were entrusted to our hands by the providence of God." By treaty "Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine islands." We must "do our part in the regeneration of the world" regardless of "outgrown" ideals. "Beyond the Philippines, China!" "Behold the exhaustless markets they command!" Annexation, assumed to have been necessary or desirable, is even alleged in the prevailing opinion of the supreme court of the United States as sufficient reason for "large concessions" in the interpretation of the constitution itself.

That the islanders are not qualified for American citizenship is everywhere acknowledged. Indeed, their alleged unfitness for self-government is the excuse for making them subjects of a self-governing people. Because "they are not of a self-governing race" we may incorporate them into our body politic without representation. In order to hold lands and peoples that are alleged to be unfit for freedom, we have already created one of the costliest of naval and military establishments. That we, like England, may have colonies, we have returned to militarism with its greivous burdens and sordid ideals. That we may join with the "predatory nations" in the partition of the world, those who temporarily exercise our authority are striking at the vitals of free-government.

The conceded unfitness of the islanders for American citizenship would seem to indicate that we should let them go. On the contrary, it is

made the conclusive reason for their incorporation into our body politic without rights. We made tremendous sacrifices in the civil war that the Union might not remain half slave and half free. We now of deliberate choice, without any real necessity or a proper motive, sow the seeds of a new slavery within the republic.

Those, who still cherish the principles of the Declaration of Independence and desire that they shall continue the basis of our national life, would let the sovereignty of the islands pass to the natives who, like the Cubans, "are of right free and independent." Whether we should have acquired Porto Rico and the Philippines, it is now too late to discuss. If we are to remain a free people, it can never be too late to believe and proclaim that the United States ought not to acquire or hold any territory anywhere that may not be governed by American methods.

ABOUT BIRDS.

EDITOR THE CONSERVATIVE:

For many years I have been deeply interested in birds, their habits and ways, although, I have not taken the time from other duties to give the matter the study and research I desired. However, my observations have brought me to notice a habit or frolic of the ordinary chimney-swallow, or sweep, as he is generally called, which I do not understand, and which I have never noted in any other bird, but it may have been noticed by some of your readers who can explain. It is this:

Swallows.

A year ago last spring, I caused to be planted in my front yard, eight elm trees in a row. Owing to my absence in Nebraska the trees were neglected and all died except two. I did not remove the dead ones this spring but allowed them to stand where planted, with their dead limbs in contrast with the green foliage around them. Each afternoon, after five o'clock, pairs of these chimney-swallows, which perform such amusing evolutions through the atmosphere and occasionally drop, seemingly helpless, into the tops of chimneys, come to these dead trees.

They will start in at the end of the row and fly carelessly into and tangle themselves in the dead branches of the first tree; disentangle themselves only to repeat the action in the next and so on through all the trees and when free from the last one, will fly away and upward at an angle of about forty-five degrees; and with the air of an acrobat, who has performed some difficult gymnastic feat, return and repeat the action over and over again until the evening shadows drive them to their roost. At first, I thought they sought bugs or worms on the trees but by closely watching them, I discovered that this was not

the case and have concluded that it is only a species of frolic with them. They perform these funny acts only among the branches of the dead trees and never touch the live ones.

Here is another anecdote.

Do Birds Think?

Do birds think?

I have heard this question often asked by people who make a study of the habits of birds. Some time since, there stood in front of the house where I then lived and not more than thirty feet from the house porch, two soft maple trees. One on the right and one on the left of the board-walk, running to the street walk. The one on the right was large with long limbs trimmed almost bare, for much of their length. The other was a smaller tree, with dense foliage, so thick that the eye could penetrate it only here and there. In this dense thicket of leaves, a number of English sparrows had built their nests of strings, grass, feathers and everything else these industrious and much hated birds could carry, and from which they kept up an almost incessant and rasping chirrup. At an early hour one morning while sitting on my porch, reading the morning paper, my attention was attracted by the appearance of a large blue-jay, who, in all of his pride of feathers and person perched himself on one of the bare limbs of the larger maple and began arranging his morning toilet; smoothing a feather here and rearranging a feather there, to make the contrast between the blue and gray more fascinating; and ever and anon, like some giddy young lady, watching to see whether any one's attention was being attracted by his beauty of feathers and pose. He was discovered by the irrepressible sparrows and they seemed to organize themselves for an attack. First, one sparrow would fly swiftly past the blue-jay, followed by another and another and so on in quick succession, each nipping or pulling at the pretty, blue, feather dress of the blue-jay, and so persistent and energetic was their attack, that sometimes they would pull the blue jay from the limb.

This proceeding lasted, not to exceed three minutes, when the blue-jay straightened himself up on the limb and like a flash, darted into the maple where the sparrows had their nests and for about a minute, amid the painful shrieks and chirrups of the sparrows, the blue-jay scattered the strings, feathers, grass and sticks in every direction until the nests of the sparrows were in ruins. When the blue-jay had finished his work of destruction he flew back to his former perch on the maple and began to make his toilet of blue undisturbed. Was this revenge? And again, I ask, do birds think?

J. M. HAMMOND,

Hamburg, Iowa, July 1, 1901.