

that a parliament of the islands, organized by representatives elected by 186 towns and provinces, chose Aginaldo president and framed a constitution, which was promulgated, defining the powers and duties of the separate departments of the government with remarkable clearness and ability and that the government so formed fairly represented the intelligence of the people of the islands.

It is also undeniable that on January 5 President McKinley issued a proclamation through Gen. Otis declaring that on the 10th of the previous month the Philippine islands had been ceded to this country by Spain by the signature of the treaty of Paris, and further ordered him to extend the military government of the United States "to the whole of the ceded territory," and to demand the surrender of Iloilo, which was then held by the Filipinos in an orderly manner by capture from the Spaniards.

It cannot be claimed in law that this assumption of power was warranted in advance of the ratification of the treaty by both parties, and there can be no doubt that the arbitrary claim greatly aggravated the people of the islands, whose hope of independence seemed thus rudely destroyed.

No declaratory resolution as to the future of the islands was assented to by the administration before the ratification of the treaty by the senate, and none has been made since.

Any right that we assert to ownership of the Philippines must rest, therefore, either upon conquest or upon purchase from their Spanish oppressors, or upon both, and in any case it is, as we believe, inconsistent with the principles of this republic and fraught with danger to its peace and to the peace of the world.

The first result we already witness, a war of subjugation, which must embitter the people we seek to rule, and which, however successful, must bring disaster and death to our soldiers and unmeasured cost to our people.

Profoundly impressed with the seriousness of the situation it is the purpose of the anti-imperialists to continue the circulation of literature, to assist in the formation of leagues, and by public meetings, and every proper means known to a free people, to agitate for the revival in the land of the spirit of Washington and Lincoln, to protest against a spirit of militarism and force, to oppose the colonial idea and a permanently large standing army and to assert the vital truths of the Declaration of Independence embodied in the

constitution and insolubly connected with the welfare of this republic.

They urge, therefore, all lovers of freedom, without regard to party associations, to cooperate with them to the following ends:

First. That our government shall take immediate steps toward a suspension of hostilities in the Philippines and a conference with the Philippine leaders, with a view to preventing further bloodshed upon the basis of a recognition of their freedom and independence as soon as proper guarantees can be had of order and protection to property.

Second. That the government of the United States shall render an official assurance to the inhabitants of the Philippine islands that they will encourage and assist in the organization of such a government in the islands as the people thereof shall prefer, and that upon its organization in stable manner the United States, in accordance with its traditional and prescribed policy in such cases, will recognize the independence of the Philippines and its equality among nations, and gradually withdraw all military and naval forces.

George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts.
George F. Edmunds, of Vermont.
John Sherman, of Ohio.
Donelson Caffery, of Louisiana.
W. Bourke Cockran, of New York.
William H. Fleming, of Georgia.
Henry U. Johnson, of Indiana.
Samuel Gompers, of Washington.
Felix Adler, of New York.
David Starr Jordan, president Leland Stanford, Jr., university.
Winslow Warren, of Massachusetts.
Herbert Welsh, of Pennsylvania.
Leonard Woolsey Bacon, of Connecticut.
Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts.
Samuel Bowles, of Massachusetts.
I. J. McGinly, of Cornell university.
Edward Atkinson, of Massachusetts.
Carl Schurz, of New York.
Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland.
Hermann Von Holst, of Chicago university.
Moorfield Storey, of Massachusetts.
Patrick A. Collins, of Massachusetts.
Theodore L. Cuyler, of New York.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, of Massachusetts.
Andrew Carnegie, of New York.
John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky.
Charles Elliot Norton, of Harvard university.
W. G. Sumner, of Yale college.
C. H. Parkhurst, of New York.

ONE OF THE CAUSES OF FRENCH CHEERFULNESS.

An extract from an article entitled "Studies in Cheerfulness," by Max O'Rell, published in The North American Review for January.

One of the causes of French cheerfulness is to be found in the settling of the land question by the French revolution, not in the way I should like it to

be, for I hold that the earth was meant for the human race, and not for a few privileged ones, even if these few were many. Yet, for a hundred years the land in France has been marketable, with the result that we have a contented peasantry, who own their bit of land, live in it and on it, and work it themselves. If the land is not to be nationalized, at any rate it should not be meant to keep three kinds of people, landlords, who do nothing for it, tenants who improve it for landlords, and laborers who starve on it. However, as it is, we have a landed proprietary, happy and contented.

Before the French revolution the land belonged, as it does in England now, to a few dukes, marquises and earls, who, to possess it, only took the trouble to be born. Their ancestors had been given that land as a reward, some for great services rendered to king and country, others for some bellicose exploits that would probably be rewarded to-day with 20 years of penal servitude. But those worthy ancestors of our dukes, marquises and earls were not given that land for nothing; they had some duties to perform in return. In time of war they had to levy troops at their own expense for the defense of the land against a foreign invader. That was the price for their tenure of the land. Their descendants went on keeping the land, but ceased to pay for its defense, and the people found that they had to do this themselves at the price of their own starvation. The difference between the merits of those ancestors and of their descendants is well illustrated by an interesting and amusing incident in Voltaire's life.

Voltaire had taken a box at the opera and was installed in it with ladies, when the duke of Lauzun, one of the worst libertines in the time of Louis XV., arrived and asked for a box. He was respectfully informed that all the boxes were taken. "That may be," he said, "but I see Voltaire in one, turn him out." In those times those things could happen, and Voltaire had to be turned out. No doubt he preferred that to being turned inside the Bastille. He brought action against the duke to recover the price he had paid for the box. "What!" exclaimed the advocate for the duke, "is it M. de Voltaire who dares to plead against the duke of Lauzun, whose great-grandfather was the first to get on the walls of La Rochelle against the Protestants, whose grandfather took 12 cannons from the Dutch at Utrecht, whose father captured two standards from the English at Fontenoy, who—" "Oh, but excuse me," interrupted Voltaire in the court,

"I am not pleading against the duke of Lauzun who was first on the walls of La Rochelle, nor against the duke who took 12 cannons from the Dutch at Utrecht, nor against the duke who captured two standards from the English at Fontenoy; I am pleading against the duke of Lauzun who never captured anything in his life except my box at the opera." It seems to me that this is the whole thing in a nutshell. In spite of warnings coming from all sides, the aristocracy would not see what was going on around them and what was slowly, but surely, coming. The great preacher Massillon, 90 years before the revolution, predicted the downfall of the nobles, but they took no heed. Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau, 70 years later, wrote books. The latter wrote one that was called "The Social Contract." The aristocracy laughed at it and called it a mere theory; but, as Carlyle once said in his own brutal way: "Their skins went to bind the second edition of that book," their land was put up to auction, and the people acquired it. The aristocracy ceased to be a power in the country.

Before the revolution the French peasant was a sort of wild animal, dark, livid, burnt with the sun, bound to the soil, which he dug and stirred with unflagging patience. At night he retired to his den and fed on black bread, water and roots. No wonder that Mme. de Sevigne was able to exclaim: "These people save other men the trouble of sowing, digging and reaping, and deserve not to lack of that bread which they have grown." To-day the French peasant lives in his own cottage and cultivates his own field. His ideal of life is the independence which is the fruit of labor and economy.

AGUINALDO.

For The Public.

A brave young patriot of heroic brand,
Who seems devoted to his native land—
Long may he live to guide that land aright,
In tranquil peace or in the torrid fight;
In council or in battle may he be
Ever victorious and forever free,
And may he lead his people out of strife
To law and liberty and placid life.

CHARLES J. BEATTIE.

THE PHILIPPINE TANGLE.

Extract from an article with the above title, by Prof. William James, of Harvard university, published by the Evening Transcript, of Boston, Mass., dated March 1.

What was only vaguely apprehended is now clear with a definiteness that is startling indeed. Here was a people towards whom we felt no ill will, against whom we had not even a slanderous rumor to bring; a people for whose tenacious struggle against their Spanish oppressors we have for years

past spoken (so far as we spoke of them at all) with nothing but admiration and sympathy. Here was a leader who, as the Spanish lies about him, on which we were fed so long, drop off, and as the truth gets more and more known, appears as an exceptionally fine specimen of the patriot and national hero; not only daring, but honest; not only a fighter, but a governor and organizer of extraordinary power. Here were the precious beginnings of an indigenous national life, with which, if we had any responsibilities to these islands at all, it was our first duty to have squared ourselves. Aguinaldo's movement was, and evidently deserved to be, an ideal popular movement, which as far as it had time to exist was showing itself "fit" to survive and likely to become a healthy piece of national self-development. It was all we had to build on, at any rate, so far—if we had any desire not to succeed to the Spaniards' inheritance of native excretion.

And what did our administration do? So far as the facts have leaked out, it issued instructions to the commanders on the ground simply to freeze Aguinaldo out, as a dangerous rival, with whom all compromising entanglement was sedulously to be avoided by the great Yankee business concern. We were not to "recognize" him, we were to deny him all account of our intentions; and in general to refuse any account of our intentions to anybody, except to declare in abstract terms their "benevolence," until the inhabitants, without a pledge of any sort from us, should turn over their country into our hands. Our president's bouffe-proclamation was the only thing vouchsafed: "We are here for your own good; therefore unconditionally surrender to our tender mercies, or we'll blow you into kingdom come."

Our own people meanwhile were vaguely uneasy, for the inhuman callousness and insult shown at Paris and Washington to the officially delegated mouthpieces of the wants and claims of the Filipinos seemed simply abominable from any moral point of view. But there must be reasons of state, we assumed, and good ones. Aguinaldo is evidently a pure adventurer "on the make," a blackmailer, sure in the end to betray our confidence, or our government wouldn't treat him so, for our president is essentially methodical and moral. Mr. McKinley must be in an intolerably perplexing situation, and we must not criticise him too soon. We assumed this, I say, though all the while there was a horribly suspicious

look about the performance. On its face it reeked of the infernal adroitness of the great department store, which has reached perfect expertness in the art of killing silently and with no public squealing or commotion the neighboring small concern.

But that small concern, Aguinaldo, apparently not having the proper American business education, and being uninstructed on the irresistible character of our republican party combine, neither offered to sell out nor to give up. So the administration had to show its hand without disguise. It did so at last. We are now openly engaged in crushing out the sacred thing in this great human world—the attempt of a people long enslaved to attain to the possession of itself, to organize its laws and government, to be free to follow its internal destinies according to its own ideals. War, said Moltke, aims at destruction, and at nothing else. And splendidly are we carrying out war's ideals. We are destroying the lives of these islanders by the thousand, their villages and their cities; for surely it is we who are solely responsible for all the incidental burnings that our operations entail. But these destructions are the smallest part of our sins. We are destroying down to the root every germ of a healthy national life in these unfortunate people, and we are surely helping to destroy for one generation at least their faith in God and man. No life shall you have, we say, except as a gift from our philanthropy after your unconditional submission to our will. So as they seem to be "slow pay" in the matter of submission, our yellow journals have abundant time in which to raise new monuments of capitals to the victories of Old Glory, and in which to extol the unrestrainable eagerness of our brave soldiers to rush into battles that remind them so much of rabbit hunts on western plains.

It is horrible, simply horrible. Surely there cannot be many born and bred Americans who, when they look at the bare fact of what we are doing, the fact taken all by itself, do not feel this, and do not blush with burning shame at the unspeakable meanness and ignominy of the trick? * * * *

Shall it not in so far forth be execrated by ourselves? Shall the unsophisticated verdict upon its hideousness which the plain moral sense pronounces avail nothing to stem the torrent of mere empty "bigness" in our destiny, before which it is said we must all knock under, swallowing our higher sentiments with a gulp? The issue is perfectly plain at last. We are cold-