

the masses of mankind have everywhere been enslaved.

I love the American republic, not for what it is, but for what it was intended to be, and for what in fullest measure it yet may be. For the sham republic that to-day exists I care nothing. What is such a republic worth to the ordinary citizen? Is there any great principle of individual liberty that is more fully and more quickly recognized in the United States than it is in Great Britain? Is there any duke or earl who exerts such power over the fortunes and the lives of his fellows as do our simple citizens, mere heads of trusts, and rings, and pools? Was ever a tyrant of Greece more completely master of his city and colony than are some of our "bosses?" While we have been glorying in the mere forms of the republic and permitting the Hannas to wrap themselves in the American flag and suffering "patriotism" to be used as Dr. Johnson defined it in the first edition of his dictionary—"the last refuge of a scoundrel"—all that is worth preserving in the republic has been passing away under our eyes and the American republic is dying as the Roman republic died, but by steps as much quicker as the modern steamship and locomotive are quicker than the ancient galley and chariot. A republic where the social extremes are represented by multi-millionaires on the one side and tramps on the other cannot remain a democratic republic. It must be in the very nature of things pass the way that Rome passed when monstrous estates increased and the proletariat grew.

What is really in issue in the election that takes place to-morrow is the very life of the republic.

It may not be a final conflict, but it must be a conflict that will make the side that wins stronger and the side that loses weaker for conflicts yet to come. And it is drawing near to the close of the century when, as I have long thought, the great struggle must in fact, though not in form, be determined.—Henry George, on the day before election, 1896.

THE REAL ISSUE.

It may be that the democrats will not do much better than the republicans, though they will certainly break up the continuity of the imperialist programme, and call a halt in the mad rush to ruin. But that is not the point. The real issue is an awful one: "Shall the people of the United States, which has not yet declared its judgment on the iniquitous policy of the republican party during the past three

years, now solemnly sanction that policy by a vote of the majority, condone betrayal of the republic, establish an empire, renounce the principles of the declaration of independence, destroy the American ideal, and forswear the moral law of justice to all mankind?" If that is the people's decision, it is the irreversible failure of the democratic experiment in this greatest of all democracies, and so far extinction of the hope of the world. Every wise patriot must elevate his mind above the clamor of short-sighted and selfish parties, and look now to the honor of his country in the light of the history we are making. This is no time to flatter the people. They are on trial before the tribunal of the moral universe. Every note for McKinley now, no matter how innocently or ignorantly cast, is a vote to assassinate democracy; every vote for Bryan, no matter how stupidly or selfishly cast, is a vote to rescue democracy from its assassins. "Liberty Enlightening the World," or, "Tyranny Darkening the World;" that is the awful issue. If Bryan, when elected president, fails at last to execute the will of the people, that will not be the people's fault, but his; the people will still have stood true, the fight for freedom and justice will still go on, and the victory at last will be on the side of the rights of man. But, if McKinley is re-elected president, the people themselves will have voluntarily assumed all the shame and all the guilt of his policy, and I see not what hope will be then left for the cause of free political institutions in this country. "dedicated" to the proposition that all men are born free and equal." Only on the surface is this election a "choice between evils." Deeper down, on a more comprehensive view, it is a choice between democracy and the rights of man as man, on the one hand, and plutocracy, tyranny and contempt for all rights, as rights, in comparison with self-interest, on the other hand; and that is a choice between the supreme good and the supreme evil. In such an issue, I dare not hesitate. My vote will be for Bryan.—Francis Ellingwood Abbot, in the Springfield Republican of Oct. 20.

SENOR SIXTO LOPEZ TO GEN. WHEELER.

An extract from a letter written by Senor Sixto Lopez, a member of the Filipino diplomatic service, dated 41 Woburn Place, London, W. C., June 30, 1900, and addressed to Maj. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, United States army, Washington, D. C. The letter is in answer to a circular of questions addressed by Gen. Wheeler to "Eminentes Filipinos." We reprint from City and State, of Philadelphia:

Notwithstanding Senator Beveridge's speech in which he compared us

to the "noble "Red Man" who, I note in passing, has already been "benevolently assimilated;" notwithstanding the apparent cordial approval with which his extraordinary speech was received by your coannexationists, we cheerfully admit the absolute honesty and sincerity of intention of the people of America. At the same time we do not believe for one moment that you or they could give us anything approaching in perfection to the government which your commissioners have promised. But even if we were to admit that your ability is commensurate with your promises, we should still prefer to rule ourselves. All the "protection of life and property;" all the "liberty under the Stars and Stripes;" all the "peace and charity" and "liberty of opportunity" and "fostering care" and "honest" administration which your great nation might be able to give us, would not compensate us for the loss of national life. Put the question to yourself: Would you be satisfied—assuming that some powerful nation were to deny you your independence and at the same time offer you the millennial government which you promise to give to us—would you be satisfied with such foreign rule? You know that you would not. Then do not unto others as ye would not that others should do unto you. There is no necessity to tell us how incapable we are and how enlightened you are; there is no need to argue about "legal" titles or "sovereignty by right of conquest and purchase" or the "task which Providence has imposed upon you." Put all such puerile considerations aside and come back to the Golden Rule. It is simple enough and embraces the whole of man's duty to man. It will show you whether you are doing right in the Philippines, and whether your legal contentions will stand the moral test. Come back to the Golden Rule and take your dripping sword from out our heart. * *

The final intimation in your circular letter is that "any other note on the well-being and prosperity of the Philippine government will be appreciated." I therefore beg to remark that I consider it somewhat strange that you make no mention of Filipino independence. You ask us: Are we satisfied with Aguinaldo? would there be opposition to his government causing revolutions and other conflicts? would we be satisfied with a guarantee of happiness? do we desire railways and other improvements? But you do not ask the most important question of all: Do we desire independence? You might as well ask a