

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-

ployes the old theory of the court of justice, wherein disputes were settled by right rather than by might.

But I call especial attention to the fact that the republicans in this campaign have adopted three new and dangerous theories—first, that industrial despotism is wise; second, that a large army is necessary, and, third, that a colonial policy is right.

It is impossible to overestimate the effect of a change from industrial independence to the reign of private monopoly. It is a revolution the magnitude of which cannot be overstated, and the far-reaching consequences of which cannot be estimated.

The large army is a natural sequence of the trust system. If the people are to be plundered by a powerful and merciless monopolists; if hundreds of thousands of laborers are to receive a daily pittance at the hand of an industrial master, a large army will be necessary to silence complaints and overawe those who believe in the golden rule.

The adoption of a colonial policy can only be construed as a command to halt in our progress toward higher ideals and to turn back toward the dark ages of force and fear. It is a notification to the world that our day's work for humanity is done and that we are entering the twilight which presages the darkness of the empire.—Hon. William J. Bryan at Madison Square Garden, New York, October 27.

CLERGYMEN ADDRESS VOTERS.

Representative clergymen of several denominations, many of them men of national reputation, have signed an address to voters which was sent out October 30 by the American Anti-Imperialist league.

We, the undersigned ministers of religion, declare our deep conviction that the war against the Filipinos is not right. We regard it as a war of conquest, and directly within Mr. McKinley's definition of "criminal aggression."

We refuse to accept the undemocratic conclusion that because the American people can by might govern colonies, they ought to do so. We deny that either the president or congress may rightfully govern any man anywhere outside the protecting restraints of the constitution. We agree with Benjamin Franklin, "that neither the obtaining nor the retaining of any trade is an object for which men may justly shed each other's blood." We feel bound to withhold our approval of the immoral use of the public authority, even to accomplish an assumed moral end.

We hold that what is immoral for men to do acting singly is immoral

for them to do acting collectively as a nation. Each step in a course of action must be moral if the end is not to be tainted with immorality. No end can justify immoral means to secure it. It is too late to maintain the doctrine that in the sacred name of religion we may kill some men in order to convert those who survive. "Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart."

We desire to see America exercise her influence as a "world power" in a new rather than in the old way. We view with grave apprehension the tendency to make her what other nations are. We desire to see her become the supreme moral factor in the world's progress. Any great and permanent increase of her military establishment, with the cultivation of the military spirit among us, will indicate moral deterioration.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Cincinnati.
HENRY H. BARBER, Meadville, Pa.
THOMAS SCOTT BACON, Maryland.
WILLIAM T. BROWN, Rochester, N. Y.
WILLIAM M. BROWN, Bishop of Arkansas.

ROBERT C. BRYANT, Lisbon, N. H.
ELLISON CAPERS, Bishop of South Carolina.

JOSEPH H. CROOKER, Ann Arbor, Mich.
LEWIS J. DUNCAN, Wilwaukee, Wis.
QUINCY EWING, Greenville, Miss.
JOHN FAVILLE, Peoria, Ill.
W. C. GANNETT, Rochester, N. Y.
N. P. GILMAN, Meadville, Pa.

FRANK O. HALL, North Cambridge, Mass.

JOHN M. HENDERSON, Gerlaw, Ill.
JENKIN LLOYD JONES, Chicago.
LOUIS GEORGE LANDENBERGER, St. Louis.

CHARLES R. BROWN, Oakland, Cal.
WILLIAM R. LORD, Portland, Ore.
T. EMORY LYON, Chicago.
JOSEPH MAY, Philadelphia.
JAMES RYAN, Bishop of Alton.
JOHN F. SPALDING, Bishop of Colorado.
JOHN LANCASTER SPALDING, Bishop of Peoria.

J. T. SUNDERLAND, Oakland, Cal.
J. L. STERN, Cumberland, Md.
WILLIAM M. SALTER, Chicago.
HIRAM W. THOMAS, Chicago.
JOSEPH BROWN TURNER, Dover, Del.
GUSTAVUS TUCKERMAN, St. Louis.
EARL W. WILBER, Pennsylvania.
L. L. WEST, Winona, Minn.
FRANCIS M. WHITTLE, Bishop Diocese of Virginia.

ALBERT A. WHITMAN, Atlanta, Ga.
H. M. TIMMONS, Cincinnati.

"Then, my friend," said the Quaker democrat, "thee denies that Abraham Lincoln was right when he said that no man is good enough to govern another without the other's consent?"

"Deny nothin'!" retorted the imperialist; "ain't the administration fightin' night and day to get Agui-naldo's consent?"

G. T. E.

"MY COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG."

— For The Public.

"My country, right or wrong," he cries,
"And he who dares resist us—dies!
The Philippines are ours," he raves,
"Our flag forever o'er them waves!
Hot and relentless war we'll wage
While there's a rebel to engage—
While there's an answering rebel shot,
Our Gatling guns shall rake the spot!
Long wave our conquering flag unfurled!
Our destiny—a conquered world!"

Thus Beveridge spoke, amid applause,
Proclaiming empire's bloody cause.
Nor did the wolves or foxes seem
To fear exposure of their scheme.
None seemed to question or discuss,
As might have been expected, thus:

"Rash Beveridge, rash, impetuous youth!
Why, why so frankly speak the truth?
Imperial aims should be obscured
Till victory is quite assured.
Harp on the patriotic string;
'My country, right or wrong,' still sing;
Deny the coming of a crown;
Ask, Who shall pull 'Old Glory' down?"

"'My country,' shout—while you betray
her;

Proclaim for freedom—while you slay her;
Piously uphold our might—
This the way to win the fight.
Then, with imperial victory won,
Let the republic be undone.
Devotedly still spare the name,
But—on with empire, just the same."

Nay, no such counsel there was heard;
Imperialism was the word.
And neither sound, nor sign, nor look
Bespoke alarm, or meant rebuke
From those, his friends, assembled there;
But wild approval rent the air
When Beveridge cast aside the skin,
And thus revealed the wolf within.
And in their frenzy of delight
Others their sheep skins shed that night.

Since empire is the end in view,
Who are the traitors, Beveridge, who?
And who, that has a wisdom tooth,
Will trust the knave to tell the truth?
Who, stranger to the throne of grace,
Would, "right or wrong," uphold his case?

"My country, right or wrong," might be
A guide less base for you and me,
Were such professed devotion meant
For more than king or president.
But see our country now divide—
Unknown as yet the stronger side—
Then listen while a Beveridge raves:
Opponents all are traitor knaves;
Opposed to his imperial course,
All democrats are fools, and worse!

Rome must, of course, to Caesar turn,
If Rome the will of Rome would learn.
And we, the patriot part to play,
Some modern Caesar must obey;
And sing the sly oppressor's song:
"My king, my country, right or wrong."

"My country, right or wrong," thus means
"My" party; hold the Philippines,
Err as a misled party will,
Yet, right or wrong, my party still.

Apply this motto, down and down;
"My" state, "my" county, and "my" town;
"My" every thirst for power and pelf—
And first, last, "right or wrong," "my"-self.
Base motto. Catchy, foul and fell,
Vain-glorious, and false as hell.
A baser creed was ne'er designed
To crush all struggling human kind.