

sion, more land, more property, more poor people she could ride over with some cheap politician with a crown on his head. Are we going to keep the crown room there that Spain occupied? Is the throne room to be kept intact for Tammany Hall or the republican party, when we send our envoys there?

Spain is an expansionist and has been for centuries. And say, my friends, have you forgotten the first rule proved by all history, without exception, that every square inch of territory taken by force has to be held by force? Go to your children who are in the first year of the high school, and they will tell you the rule, that in all history every square foot of ground taken by force from an alien nation has to be kept by force. There is Alsace-Lorraine, between Germany and France. A standing army is kept there on both sides, and there is a continuing threat of war. Are we to continue to imitate Spain? She has believed in the expansion of territory, expansion of commerce by force, without the consent of the governed, and her ships are lying at the bottom of the sea. Her men are rotting in the ocean and upon the land all over the world. Her flag has been dishonored, disgraced, defeated and sent back to her peninsula, and the golden crown of imperialism that she sought against the will of the people has turned to ashes in her palsied hands.

But distinguished gentlemen who claim a monopoly of patriotism, who do not seem to observe the difference between expansion and explosion, say that we who believe in getting the consent of the governed before we govern them want to give back the Philippines to Spain. Everyone who makes the statement knows that is not what we want. May I repeat the old story of Lincoln? Driving in his carriage one day, he alighted to turn a tumblebug to his legs. Replying to the Cabinet minister within the carriage, he said: "I merely wanted to give him a show with all the other bugs of his class." He did not want to annex the bug or to tell him how to run his business. He did not seek to tax him or to tell him that he did not know how to govern his bugship. He set him along the highroad, along the line of the survival of the fittest.

Do you remember when Mexico was invaded by the French and Uncle Sam said, "Go; there is the Monroe doctrine; Mexico is covered by the shadow of its wing," and the French soldiers left, and the brave little Republic of Mexico is slowly but surely climbing

the ladder to a better education, a better civilization. Ah, Mr. President, that is the expansion I believe in. That is the imperialism the fathers taught.

THE RETURN OF HAMILTONISM.

Look about you! Nearly all of the wealth of the land is passing into a few hands, and not one of these hands favorable to the freedom of the citizen. Every great industrial, commercial, mining or transportation enterprise is passing into the hands, first of corporations, and then by further consolidation into the hands of trusts, which thus have an absolute monopoly, a monopoly which can, arbitrarily, fix prices, fix wages and regulate output—a monopoly which has no soul, and whose chief purpose is to plunder the public. The monopolist and the speculator prosper, but the masses wither. Men of moderate fortunes and of fair incomes, who were the bulwark of the republic, are slowly but surely being wiped out. We are being reduced to two classes; in the first stage these will be known as the very rich and the moderately poor, and in the second stage as the masters and the slaves. We have established a monied aristocracy and are now fastening a yoke on posterity. A standing army is to be enthroned and bayonet argument is to govern.

Republican institutions cannot live amid these conditions. Wealth has never been the friend of liberty. Concurrently with the progress of these changes we hear the snarling voices of men who deride the doctrines of Jefferson and Lincoln that made our country great and mighty. Already we see magazine articles urging the establishment by law of a permanent aristocracy in our system of government, and from high quarters we hear a demand for Hamiltonism. Hamilton believed in monarchy and aristocracy bottomed on corruption. He was in love with the English system as it existed in the last century, thoroughly rotten from top to bottom, and he labored to transplant whatever he could of that system. He once said to John Adams: "Purge the British constitution of its corruption and give to its popular branch equality of representation and it would become an impracticable government. But as it stands at present, it is the most perfect government that ever existed." He did not advance a single new thought, did not promulgate a single new principle; and he sneered at the idea that the people were capable of self-government.

England herself has since that time repudiated corruption and established equality of representation. Hamilton

favored the adoption of the new constitution, but was not satisfied with it, and openly expressed the hope that some future war would centralize the powers of the government. When he was made secretary of the treasury, the new constitution had been adopted, congress had been given power to raise money, everybody could see that the republic could now easily pay its debts, and that it was not necessary to introduce corruption of any sort. But, true to his theory, he at once secured the establishment of a national bank and introduced the British funding and bond-issuing system, coupled with its limitless opportunities for plunder. A short period of unparalleled speculation and speculation followed. The sharks and financial birds of prey made fortunes and Hamilton became the hero of the hour. The whole system collapsed in a few years and scattered ruin and misery over the country. Yet for a whole century the men who used the government to plunder the country have shouted for Hamilton. Whether Hamilton himself shared in the plunder is immaterial. He expressed his belief in the system, and deliberately furnished the opportunity to others. During the administration of Mr. Adams Hamiltonism ran wild. Almost every principle of the Declaration of Independence was trampled under foot, and those provisions of the new constitution that were intended to protect the individual were ruthlessly brushed aside. No man dared to criticize the administration. Scores of good men were denied trial by jury and languished in prison for exercising the right of free speech. A tyranny was established that surpassed anything existing in England. Four years of this regime was all the American people could then stand; they declared that they had not cast off a foreign yoke to take up a more galling home yoke, and in 1800 they arose and overthrew it so completely that it has taken it nearly a century for a resurrection.

Had Hamiltonism prevailed at that time the whole history of the republic would have been different; the brains, the industry, the skill and the enterprise of the earth would not have flocked to our shores. The genius of man being cowed would have withered here as it had in Europe, and the American republic would to-day be simply an oligarchy, stretching in small settlements from the Mississippi to the Atlantic. Hamilton was a member of the constitutional convention, and succeeded in establishing that aristocratic branch of our government known as the federal judiciary, un-republican and un-

democratic; it is not chosen by the people and is not accountable to them. In fact, for practical purposes is not accountable to anybody. Jefferson opposed this manner of creating a judiciary with all his might, and he pointed out that here would ultimately be found the tomb of American liberty. How prophetic was that vision? During its whole career this branch of the government has never been on the side of the weak, but always on the side of power. First it stood for federalism and usurpation.

When Gen. Jackson tried to protect the American people from the clutches of the great rotten bank the federal judiciary used all its power to help that institution. After the bank went down this same judiciary did the bidding of the mighty slave power, and after this went down these courts took the corporations under their wings and many of them seemed to become mere side-door conveniences for concentrated and even corrupt capital. For the last 30 years the corporations have fled to the federal courts as the ancient murderers fled to cities of refuge—there they felt safe. Recognizing that the construction of the laws is more important than making laws, these powerful influences have allowed no man to be appointed judge whom they did not believe friendly to them. They do not buy federal judges because it is not necessary. In their eagerness to serve the corporations, these judges have in recent years established government by injunctions in this country, under which a judge becomes legislator, court and executioner. They brush free speech—the liberty of the citizen—and trial by jury away with a contemptuous sneer.

The Anglo-Saxon race has shed its blood to maintain these bulwarks of liberty, and our constitution guarantees them to every citizen. But they have already been stabbed to the vitals. For several years we have beheld the spectacle of some supreme court and other federal judges dragging their ermine around over the land to act the part of advocates for those interests which are destroying republicanism in this country. What are the liberties of America worth when committed to the guardianship of such men? During the recent campaign Mr. Depew came to Chicago under the auspices of the Hamilton club to deliver a partisan address at the Auditorium. Federal Judge Peter S. Groscup mounted the rostrum for the purpose of introducing the orator, and told the audience, among other things, that the light of Jefferson was waning—that on the dial plate of our

nation's history this hour was Hamilton's, that Hamilton's great name exactly fitted these times, etc.

My friends, must we admit that Judge Groscup was right? Let us look around again. The senate of the great state of Ohio has just indicted a Hamiltonian senator for bribery and debauchery in securing a high office. A grand jury in Pennsylvania has just indicted another Hamiltonian senator for robbing the treasury of the state. Almost every great trust appears to have one or more Hamiltonian senators as standing conveniences. In the house of representatives, where the voice of the people was supposed to be heard, we find a pensioned ring-master of monopoly stifling the voice of the people's representatives and reducing republican congressmen to a condition of pity and contempt. Two years ago a horde of Hamiltonian statesmen went to the capital of Illinois and not only sold out the people but robbed the state of everything in sight. Wherever you find dirty finger marks in the temple of justice or a foul odor in the halls of legislation, there you will find Hamiltonism. Verily the spirit of Hamilton fits these times, but what shall we say of a judiciary that openly rejoices over the fact that an era of corruption has enveloped the land, that the betrayal of the people has become a science, and that the robbing of the people has become a fine art? And now we are to widen the sphere of this class of statesmen by giving them a chance to rob the Filipinos! Heaven pity those poor people. The Spaniard took what was in sight, but the Hamiltonite, with his bond jobbery, enters the womb of the future and plasters his mortgage on remote generations.—Hon. Jno. P. Altgeld before the Jacksonian Club of Omaha.

JAIL BOYS.

Statements made to a reporter of the Chicago Evening Post, by Miss Nellie J. Flood, the teacher of the school in the jail of Cook county, Ill., for the boys who are confined there awaiting trial.

I think my boys are easier to manage than the average boy in the public schools. This does not mean that the boys in the jail are better than those outside. Probably their tractability is partly to be accounted for by the fact that their teacher is the only woman with whom they come in contact, and the novelty of this association makes an impression on them, for they are just as impressionable as any other boys, and perhaps a little more so. Then most of these poor little fellows are strangers to anything like womanly affection and a sincere and active

interest in their welfare. This is not true of all of them, but I am afraid it applies to the majority of my pupils. My work has gone far toward disproving the doctrine of "natural and inherited depravity." On the other hand, it has forced me to the conviction that depraved surroundings and associations are mainly responsible for the acts which bring the boys behind the bars.

Only a few months ago I visited the home of one of my boys and talked with his mother. She insisted he was a bad boy and nothing short of the reform school would better him. In the course of the conversation I learned that he had been allowed no liberty at home and that he was strapped for the slightest offense. After a long argument she was prevailed upon to give him another chance under the condition that in the place of the strap she should show a little motherly affection and allow him to enjoy some of the privileges that are the natural right of a boy. On my recommendation the court gave the lad his liberty. Shortly after this, on entering the Sunday school I attend, my hand was grasped and I heard a childish voice exclaim: "How do you do, Miss Flood? Everything's all right now."

As I glanced down I looked into the happy eyes of the boy who had been returned to his home. He has been "made over" by the new treatment he has received at home, and now gives excellent promise of becoming a useful and honest man.

SIR ROBERT GIFFEN ON LAND-LORDISM.

From an essay on "Taxes on Land," written in 1871 by Robert, now Sir Robert Giffen.

At the past rate of increase, the real property of England, which is now worth about £150,000,000 a year, will be worth £250,000,000 in another 30 years. And a large part of this additional £100,000,000, perhaps the half of it or more, will not be owing to any investment of capital in improvements, but to increasing monopoly value. At the past rate of increase, however, our rates will be under £30,000,000, so that, at the outside, there will not be an additional burden of £15,000,000 to set against an additional value of £100,000,000, while much of that additional burden will also have fallen, not on the property generally, but on the profits of the improvements. There is little hope of touching this immense augmentation. But this is hardly a result to be rejoiced over by the defenders of private property in land. If they were wise in their generation it should be