

tain any such conclusion. We shall probably have numerous homilies from well-meaning persons on the virtues of "economy and patience," but we think impartial history will record that most of C. P. Huntington's wealth was due to other and less admirable qualities, coupled with legislative favors and the granting of monopolies that ought never to have been granted to anyone, but which, supposing them to be granted, he, of course, had as much right to as anyone else.—Editorial in American Machinist of Aug. 23.

PRINCIPLE BEFORE PARTY.

Extracts from a letter written by Gen. John Beatty to the Columbus (O.) Press-Post under date of August 22.

We owe no fealty to a name; names may be changed at will, or they may be adopted by a party and held onto after the party has abandoned everything to which it originally adhered. The citizen's allegiance is due simply to fundamental principles. In these there can be no change; they are the bed rock upon which all political action should be founded. The right of the people to select their own representatives in state and national legislation and to choose their own presidents and governors as well, is the core, the essence, the vital and animating principle of republicanism. Without it the word republican becomes an empty husk.

The liberty party in 1843 declared in favor of the "restoration of the equality of rights among men" and affirmed "that the fundamental truths of the declaration of independence was the fundamental law of our national government." The liberty men of 1843 and 1847 becoming satisfied finally that a half loaf was better than no bread, united in great part with the free soilers of 1848, who in the Buffalo convention affirmed that "our fathers ordained the constitution * * * to establish justice, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty, but expressly denied to the federal government, which they created, all constitutional power to deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due legal process." This party also resolved to inscribe upon its banner—"Free soil, free speech, free labor and free men." In 1852 the free soilers again met in convention and declared "that governments, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, are instituted among men to secure to all those inalienable rights of life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness with which they are endowed by their Creator, and of which none can be deprived by valid legislation, except for crime." The liberty men of 1843-47, and the free soilers of 1848-52, uniting with others of like political predilections, met in Philadelphia in 1856, and formed the republican party. The platform adopted by this old party now again invested with a new name, and somewhat broadened in its purposes, affirmed "that with our republican fathers we hold it to be self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our federal government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction." The liberty men of 1843-47, the free soilers of 1848-52, the republicans of 1856, reinforced by multitudes of independent men from both the whig and democratic parties, met in Chicago in 1860 and nominated Abraham Lincoln for the presidency. After the manner and in their spirit of their predecessors, they declared "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; * * * that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This, I take it, is genuine republicanism and under this banner the political battle of 1860 was fought and won. It was a struggle for the truths of the declaration of independence, for the inalienable rights of men; and the same issue under slightly changed conditions is before the people to-day. For one, I shall look to the essence of the thing uninfluenced by a now empty, but once honored, name, strike for the old cause and stand by the convictions of a lifetime. . . .

I stand now where I stood 50 years ago, squarely on the assumption that the principles of the declaration of independence, and the precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ should be recognized as fully in the Philippines as in the United States. On this paramount issue I am in agreement with Mr. Bryan. How, therefore, as a consistent republican, can I do otherwise than vote for him? He may differ from me on minor questions, just as the democrat with whom I stood shoulder to shoulder on the battlefields of the great civil war differed from me on minor questions; but we

nevertheless fought together to obtain a righteous determination of the paramount issue of that day and then in good time gave attention to matters of lesser importance.

Equal opportunities for all men, irrespective of place, race, color or previous condition, was the paramount issue in 1776, in 1860, and is the paramount issue in 1900. In this struggle I shall neither dodge nor hide between the lines, but go promptly to the front and cast my ballot where it will be counted at its full value.

ROOSEVELT'S STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO THE FILIPINOS CHALLENGED.

From the Chicago Record of August 25 we take the following open letter to Gov. Roosevelt, written by Sixto Lopez, who was formerly secretary to the Filipino commission in Washington.

Dear Sir: I have read your remarkable speech delivered recently at St. Paul, Minn., in which you charge the Filipinos with being the "precise analogues" of the Boxers and Apaches and our government with being a "bloody Aguinaldoan oligarchy." Nothing appeals to the best human emotion so much as the spectacle of a brave man. Permit me to say that I cordially join with the American people in admiration of the chief of the "rough riders," but while admiring your achievements as a soldier and a fearless reformer, my admiration ceases when you strike at what I believe to be the truth. Indeed, I am afraid your brilliant career may receive a check in the unequal contest, for truth has never yet been vanquished.

I cannot believe that a gentleman and a soldier will make serious charges against an opponent without being in possession of absolute proof of his statements. Consequently if your charges are true I must cease to be a champion of the cause of my people. If they are false you ought to cease to be the champion of yours.

Therefore, in the name of my countrymen, for whom you and your colleagues have made such lavish profession of friendship, I challenge you to furnish proof of the truth of your charges or else withdraw them.

Let me draw your attention to the circumstances as we Filipinos view them: You came to our country. You call us "Dear Gen. Aguinaldo." You ask, accept and profit by our aid in the defeat of your enemy. You deliver Spanish prisoners over to our charge. You place a large number of