

drowning man if he feels cold, and if he would be satisfied with a "guarantee" that the water would be comfortably warmed! What the drowning man wants is life; what the Filipinos want is national life. What will all your honeyed promises amount to if you deny us our hearts' desire? Take from us our national life and we will never be satisfied with your promised cake and wine. Material prosperity, though desirable, is by no means the most desirable condition. I therefore take the liberty of asking you, and those who think with you, a final question: Why do you shed all this blood; why do you spend all this energy, all these millions of dollars, in the effort to thrust upon us what we desire least and deny us what we desire most? Is it for our good or for your own? For an answer to this latter question I beg respectfully to refer you to Senator Beveridge's speech on the 9th of January.

In conclusion, I beg to assure the people of America, through you, of our faith in their righteousness, and of our belief that ere long they will give us the justice we crave, and cease to interfere with our dearly-won independence.

WHAT SHALL IT PROFIT A MAN OR A NATION?

My choice for president is William Jennings Bryan:

Because (a) by his election the confidence of the Filipino people in the good faith of the United States would be restored, and it would then be easy to establish them as an independent nation under our protectorate.

Because (b) by his election the people would free themselves from complicity in the crimes committed by President McKinley against the Puerto Ricans and Filipinos. Until now the people have had no chance to approve or condemn, but after November 6 they must bear their share of the blood-guiltiness unless they express their abhorrence of those acts.

Because (c) by his election the people of the United States would again declare to the "powers of the earth" that they "hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

I think that all American women should pray and work to revive in the

hearts of the people the love of liberty. The nation now stands at the parting of the ways, and although I should not "despair of the republic" should it make the wrong choice, yet I am sure that it would have to go through a long and fearful struggle before it could regain even its present position. When the people of the United States consent to deprive another people of its rights and liberties; they strike a terrific blow at the foundations upon which stand their own rights and liberties.

Lincoln said: "This government cannot survive half-slave and half-free," and it is equally true that this government cannot survive half-empire and half-republic. We paid a bitter price to free ourselves from the sin of slavery, and the nation will again pay a bitter price to free itself from the sin of empire, if, driven by fear of financial distress or lured by hope of wealth, it now deserts its ancient ideals. American men and American women should ponder well the awful question: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."—Josephine Shaw Lowell.

THE "INFERIOR RACE" QUESTION.

To-day we have come to the inferior race question. I will throw out this distinct challenge: I will ask anyone to point out one single case where an inferior race was ever elevated into self-madness through "benevolent assimilation." I fail to know a single case. Go back to the days of the Greeks and the Romans. They conquered inferior races. Name one inferior race which came under their domination which ever reached perfect development.

Forty years after Christ the Romans conquered the Britons. They held them 400 years and then abandoned them. With what result? They Christianized them, they did everything possible for their material welfare—all we say we are going to do for the Filipinos. It took the Britons 800 years to recover from the benevolent assimilation of the Romans, because they had become thoroughly emasculated during the period they were under the fostering care of an empire.

I make the proposition that the whole policy of benevolent assimilation is not American and that it is English. I assert that the theory put in practice in any community will never develop into self-government.

On the other hand, there was an American policy which we are now disposed to abandon—the Monroe doctrine. For 80 years we have been pur-

suage the policy of leaving weaker nations on the western hemisphere to work out their destiny in their own way, and to Europe we have in all instances said: "Hands off."

We went into Mexico and we dismembered it. We took the more sparsely settled half and to the inhabitants of the other half we said stand up on your legs and walk along. Now the Mexicans are on the upward march of progress.

Take Venezuela. I remember perfectly well that at the time of the Venezuelan crisis many men said it would be better for its welfare to allow England to take possession of the country. But it seems to me that it is far better to allow Venezuela to have a revolution a week, because in the long run the country will learn to stand alone.

It is a principle of evolution that no child in the family will ever walk if you always hold it up. And that is the principle I should like to see applied in the case of the Philippines. Benevolent assimilation only makes you permanently weak, we should say to the Filipinos, you should accustom yourselves to walk alone, and superior races must keep their hands off.—Charles Francis Adams, before the Chicago Historical Society, Oct. 24.

WHAT THE TWO PARTIES ARE STANDING FOR.

The democratic party is applying the familiar principles to new conditions; the republican party is removing the ancient landmarks.

In advocating bimetalism we advocate a financial system whose usefulness is attested by thousands of years of history, as well as by our national experience and by the past platforms of the republican party and all other parties. In advocating the greenback we are advocating a money first issued by the republican party, approved by the supreme court and never condemned in a republican platform. In advocating an income tax we advocate a system which received the sanction of Abraham Lincoln and which is now practiced in many of the leading nations of Europe. In opposing government by injunction we are simply defending the jury system, which has been described as the bulwark of English freedom, and is as important here as in England. The meanest thief and the blackest murderer are entitled to trial by jury. Why should a laboring man be denied such a trial merely because some great corporation is his antagonist? In advocating arbitration we are applying to the relations which now exist between employer and em-