

that dire contingency should ever arise, then this questionable letter will be cited by the political descendants of the very people who are now using it, as a proof of the political aloofness and separateness of the Jew.

Remembering that Hirsch's letter appeared in the Chicago Tribune, and was made the subject of one of its editorials, and learning now that it is being circulated among the Jews for campaign purposes as a sort of pastoral, I do not hesitate to characterize it as unworthy the notice of respectable American Jews. I feel no reluctance, in the face of this letter, to declare to you and to the whole world, in my individual capacity, not as a rabbi, nor a Jew, but as an American, that I shall not vote for the candidate of the republican party for the office of president. Four years ago, as the chaplain of the national republican convention which nominated Mr. McKinley, I prayed for the success of that party which promised to maintain the honor and credit of the nation. At the coming election in November I shall vote against Mr. McKinley with just as much fervor. Four years ago I believed that the good name and the credit of our people would be endangered by the election of the candidate of the democratic party. To-day I believe the very life of the republic is jeopardized by the policy pursued by the republican administration. Four years ago the people were asked to decide whether our currency should rest upon a sound financial basis, and by their vote they declared that there can be but one standard of values in an honest household. In my opinion that question has been settled once for all, and its insistence in the platform of either party to-day is merely a political trick or by-play. But even if silver were not dead, and there were imminent danger of our going upon a silver basis immediately after the 4th of March next, I should still cast my vote for the democratic candidate, in view of the all-important and overshadowing issue of imperialism, which has come to the fore through the republican policy of criminal aggression. This policy has rudely shaken all our ideals and laid the ax at the very foundation upon which our government was reared. A mistake in our financial system would undoubtedly entail heavy losses, but our country is so rich that they would hardly be felt; moreover, after we had paid for our folly sufficiently, we would be only too glad to correct our

error and return to a sound and sensible currency, just as the Latin league did; but once wrench the foundation from under the free institutions which have been planted here and which have distinguished our country, and they will inevitably totter to ruin. Every act of the republican party, beginning with the treaty of Paris, whereby we bought (!) the right of sovereignty over a foreign, alien, unassimilable, unwilling and oppressed people, has been a step in the direction of high-handed imperialism, unworthy of a free and liberty-loving nation, and subversive of every principle and precedent established by the founders of our republic. The party that prides itself upon having achieved the freedom of the negro slave against his unwilling master, is now engaged in subjugating at the point of the bayonet a people who have never harmed us, and whose only sin is that they would be free and independent according to the bent of their nature, and in the land which God has given them. In taking and forcibly retaining the Philippines, we have torn our constitution in shreds, we have violated every genuinely American principle. The defenders of the administration tell us that if we had not taken the far-off islands, some other nation would; the same reason would justify every theft that ever was committed, for the thief might argue, if he had not appropriated the stolen goods some one else would. Again and again we are reminded that we made no promises to the Philippines of independence or self-government, as if that were a justification of the brutal course which the administration has pursued against these people. The only question to be decided is, How dare we Americans withhold a promise that is inherent in the constitution of the United States? This attempted defense in itself proves clearer than daylight, that we are on the high-road of imperialism. We first declared to the world that Cuba should of right be free and independent, and then we made our boast that our war should not be one of conquest and criminal aggression. I ask in the name of justice and common sense, Were not these declarations to the world not only implied but plain and direct promises made to the inhabitants of the Philippine islands? If not, then indeed we sugar o'er the devil himself with pious words.

Hypocrisy seems to be the order of the day. The republican leaders and platform mouth against trusts

and monopolies, and under the loving caresses and nursing of the republican party, they spring up all over the land like mushrooms. The republican platform, the republican leaders and the republican president give public and private, general and specific promises and pledges, that the civil service shall be maintained and extended, when lo and behold! at one fell swoop 10,000 positions are taken out of the classified service and opened to place hunters and political spoilsmen.

These are only a few of my reasons for supporting the democratic candidate in the coming election for president, the main one being, as we are all well aware, the issue of imperialism, which would dwarf every other consideration in the minds of all true and patriotic Americans.

I have no message as a Jew to the Jews, nor would I at this juncture deliver one if I had; but speaking as one American citizen to another, I recall the famous warning given by the decree of the ancient Roman senate to Lucius Opinius: "Let the consul see to it that the republic does not come to harm." I mean to heed that warning by voting for W. J. Bryan. Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL SALE.

AN ANALYSIS OF M'KINLEY'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

Extracts from an article by Dr. David J. Doherty, published in the Chicago Chronicle of Sept. 23.

THE PRESIDENT'S LOGIC.

Mr. McKinley's letter contains a number of fallacies, which will be easily apparent to any student of logic who will take the trouble to write out his arguments in syllogistic form. He is fond of using the style of argument called the dilemma, which is very perplexing to an adversary and may easily conceal a fallacy. I quote several instances, each of which offends the laws of logic by not being a complete or true dilemma. In his instruction to the peace commission (October 28, 1898), he says: "We must either hold the islands or turn them back to Spain." Here the alternatives are not mutually exclusive, because there is another line of conduct possible, viz., we may treat them as we have treated Cuba, and that is really the question which the American people desire to have answered, but the president does not, at least directly, refer to it.

Again, Mr. McKinley propounds to his adversaries (the anti-imperialists and democrats) a chain of questions which logicians call a sorites. This is

an instance of the fallacy plurimum interrogatorium. It is a multiple dilemma, but not a true one, because all its terms do not cover the entire truth. It was right to send Dewey's fleet to Manila; it was right for the fleet to stay there; it was right to send Merritt "to strengthen Dewey;" it was right to protect the lives and property of those who came within our control by the fortunes of war;" it was right "not to have come away before the conclusion of peace." The president's political adversaries would have done no less than these things, but they would also have done more. It would also have been right explicitly to state to the Filipinos our purpose to aid them in the establishment of an independent government, as we did to the Cubans. To throw the onus on congress by saying that congress "did not see fit" to do certain things does not relieve the republican administration from responsibility, especially as we know how persistently the president uses pressure on members of congress.

A third instance of Mr. McKinley's use of the dilemma is the sentence: "The American question is duty or desertion." This is the fallacy of the ambiguous middle, because one term contains two meanings. The word "duty" includes the democratic plan of an independent Filipino republic as well as the president's plan of a Filipino colony under American sovereignty. Many citizens think it a higher "duty" to recognize the natural rights of a people than paternally to nurse that people.

The president's statement: "When nations make treaties they must keep them," is an example of the fallacy called *ignoratio elenchi*, or irrelevant conclusion. The statement is true as to the principals to a treaty. But we made no treaty with the Filipinos. We even ignored their protests and excluded their representatives from the proceedings preliminary to the treaty. How can a treaty with the Spaniards excuse us from being just to the Filipinos? One might go farther and say that the sanctity of a treaty which involves the rights of a protesting third party is very questionable.

Another form of fallacy in which the president indulges is a misstatement of the question. For example, he says: "The two essential steps upon which all agree were the war with Spain and the ratification of the treaty, and from these flowed all our responsibilities." This is not a fair statement. The ratification of the treaty had a string tied to it, viz., the Bacon resolution. The treaty would not have been ratified

if it could have been known that Mr. Hobart would defeat the Bacon resolution. Public opinion demanded then that the war be ended by ratifying the unsatisfactory treaty. It demanded then and has since demanded that the unsatisfactory portion of the treaty be cured by the Bacon resolution or some similar act giving the Philippines the same status as Cuba. A truthful and complete statement would run: "The essential steps upon which all agree were the war with Spain, the ratification of the treaty and our recognition of the rights of the Filipinos. From these flowed all our responsibilities and our troubles have come from our failure to carry out the third step."

THE PRESIDENT'S FACTS.

Presumably, by virtue of his office, Mr. McKinley should know the facts of the Filipino case better than anyone else. Yet many of them he cannot know of his own personal knowledge, and for these he must depend on other people. Hence it will not be disrespectful to dispute such facts.

His statement of facts includes these. There was no alliance between the Filipinos and the Americans; no promise of independence was made to the former by any official of the United States; the Filipinos began the war; the vast majority of the population welcome our sovereignty and have been loyal to us; the Tagal insurgents are only "a designing minority," "a small fraction of the population, a single tribe out of 80 or more inhabiting the archipelago;" "the insurgents desired to enter Manila that they might loot it and destroy those not in sympathy with their selfish and treacherous designs;" they had secretly planned to assassinate all foreigners on February 22, 1899, and had even "long before their leader reached Manila" resolved that they would later turn upon us, and finally the Filipino people "have no capacity yet to go alone," and are "unable to maintain a stable government at home and absolutely helpless to perform any international obligations."

His authority for these alleged facts is partly reports of the commissions and other officials and partly the archives of Aguinaldo's government, which were captured, forwarded to Washington and are now being doled out in a petty way to the press, whenever any political capital can be made by their publication. Some of these facts have been denied and some have been doubted. I have space to deal only with two or three.

Last spring when in Washington I spoke with several men who occupy

important positions under the administration. I asked them how they could justify the action of the government in forcibly repressing the efforts of an alien people to form an independent republic. Their answer was in almost the identical words of the president, that the Tagals are a mere fraction of the population. I denied their figures, and gave as authority Cavada's "Historia Estadística," published at Manila in 1876. Though dealing with Philippine matters, they had not even heard of the book. They knew Foreman, Worcester, etc., almost by heart, but they did not know Cavada. A messenger was sent to the congressional library and to the bureau of education, but the book was not in the possession of either. The Newberry library and the public library of this city have each a copy of this remarkable work, and any student who knows Spanish may get the facts and figures. Cavada's tables show that the population of the Luzon or Tagal group of islands was in 1870 2,900,000; that of the Visayan group 1,900,000 and that of the Mindanaoan group about 300,000.

Much more important than Cavada is Prof. Blumentritt, whose pamphlet on the Philippines has recently been published in Germany. He is a recognized authority on ethnology, particularly of the Filipinos, among whom he spent a number of years. His figures are as follows; The Negritos or original inhabitants number about 20,000 souls; the heathen, or mountain Malays (Igorrotes and most of the "80 tribes" scattered throughout 1,200 islands), vary from the lowest estimate of 600,000 to the highest of 1,100,000; the Christian and civilized Malays (the Filipinos proper) number from 6,500,000 to 8,000,000 souls. The Chinese are about 2½ per cent. and the Spanish and Chinese mestizos about 3½ per cent. of the population. Of the Filipinos proper, the Tagals number about one-third or near 3,000,000; the Visayans about one-half, the Ilocoans about three-tenths and the balance is made up by about eight other "tribes." All these Filipinos proper are practically one people, related like the English and the Scotch, or the branches of the Scandinavian race.

It is absurd to speak of them as a conglomeration of 80 or more tribes, as it would be to speak of the inhabitants of this country as being made up of 40 or more tribes, because there are some fifty-odd tribes of red Indians scattered throughout our country.

Let it be noted that we are fighting the civilized Malays, and that our only allies are from the mountain heathen.

As to their capability for independent self-government, Prof. Blumentritt says: "The excuse that the Filipinos are not ripe for self-government is not founded on facts." This he proves by comparisons with peoples of central Europe and Central and South America. It is certain that the ideals and aspirations of the Filipinos are European. Unlike the Chinese, they have no antipathy to foreigners. Their civilization is occidental, not oriental, and in this respect they are superior even to the Japanese. They only need freedom and a stable government to become the Yankees of the orient.

That the Filipinos meant to loot and murder foreigners is not credible. They did not do it at Iloilo, where they had full sway, and had established a well-ordered government before the arrival of Gen. Miller. They did not slay their Spanish prisoners. In his first proclamation issued from Hong-Kong before the departure of Dewey's fleet for Manila Aguinaldo said (I quote from Foreman's book):

Divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach in a manner worthy of a free and liberty-loving people. * * * An American squadron is at this moment preparing to sail for the Philippines. We fear you may be induced to fire on the Americans. No, brothers, never make the mistake. Rather blow out your brains than treat with enmity those who are your liberators. * * * Wherever you see an American flag there flock in numbers. They are our redeemers.

Alas, poor Filipinos! How they have had to change their opinion of their "redeemers." But even in the very proclamation referred to by the president the one, namely, in which Aguinaldo instructed his followers in Manila how to surprise and capture the city, the following sentences occur:

I charge and order that the persons and goods of all foreigners shall be respected and that the American prisoners shall be well treated.

The chiefs are charged to see that the officers and soldiers respect the consulates, the banks and commercial houses and even the Spanish banks and commercial houses, taking care that they be not seduced by the hope of plunder.

I charge that you will not forget the promises made by me to the civilized nations, when I have assured that we Filipinos are not savages or thieves or assassins, nor are we cruel, but, on the contrary, that we are men of culture and patriotism, honorable and humane.

Finally the president proves too much, for if these insurgents are such a small fraction of the population and if the vast majority are loyal to us the American people must wonder why it

took 60,000 soldiers so long a time to conquer them.

THE PRESIDENT ON IMPERIALISM.

Furthermore, Mr. McKinley says: "Imperialism has no place in the creed or conduct of the administration."

That depends on what is meant by imperialism. If with the "Encyclopedia Britannica" we take it to be "an overlordship over other peoples," this administration is certainly imperialistic and the more flagrantly so because the other people are fighting to the death against that overlordship.

AN ABSENT-MINDED NATION.

(With Apologies to Kipling.)

When you've sacrificed to Moloch, drained your nation to the bone;

When you've sniped off every burgher from his hill;

Will you squarely do some thinking of the Lord God on His throne,

And remember his command: "Thou shalt not kill?"

You're an absent-minded nation, and your vision sees but part;

You are brave to face the moment and to meet it;

But in doughty deed heroic, born from out your swelling heart,

You forgot, perchance, how history will repeat it.

Boer's son, your son., Son of the King of Kings!

By your resolve, by your decree, still going forth to slay—

The King will add those figures up (it is well to think on these things);

Fall on your knees for your honor's sake, and pray! pray! pray!

You're a great and mighty nation, noble, brave and very strong;

East and west and north and south your flag's unfurled;

You are waging bitter warfare now, and—be you right or be you wrong—

Your every act becomes a fact to all the watching world.

When the day of fight is finished, you must then make up your book;

And, you'll let a friendly fellow-man remind you,

You must enter on the debit side—however hard to brook—

The blood, the tears, the waste you've left behind you.

Your son, Boer's son, crushed in the crimson sod;

And which commingled dust is yours you'll know not on that day.

War's work is the devil's work (and how will you answer God);

Fall on your knees for your honor's sake, and pray! pray! pray!

There are widows weeping frantic tears, poor little ones who cry,

And mothers shriek whose souls have felt the sword;

From England fair and rugged veldt the cries ascend on high;

They are noted by a just and common Lord.

You're an absent-minded nation, but beware! do not forget!

You must hand your book unto the King to scan it;

In your heart you are too upright to risk piling such a debt,
Just because a reckless minister began it.

God's son, Boer's son, your own son proud and free;

There's a price for blood, O England, and that price you'll have to pay

When the Lord God audits your balance sheet. Oh, what will the profit be?

Fall on your knees for your honor's sake, and pray! pray! pray!

—The Monitor.

"Why do you doubt him, my daughter? You say that his declaration was made with apparent seriousness and sincerity, and—?"

"Oh, yes, mamma, I admit all that; and perhaps it is wrong for me to be suspicious of Mr. Smither. But I really cannot help fearing that he spoke in a McKinleyan sense." G. T. E.

"Alas!" said the Chinese statesman, "it is China against the world!"

"That," said his friend, "is our only hope. Singly, any of the powers could whip us; but it isn't quite certain that they can do it together."—Puck.

Linconer—It is costing us one hundred millions a year to hold the Philippines.

Hannermark—Oh, my friend, you do not look at the situation from a Christian point of view. Can you not understand that we are generously bearing this expense to relieve poor, impoverished Spain?—G. T. E.

The Philadelphian—Isn't the mud on this street a trifle deep?

Chicagoan (proudly)—Deep? It is the deepest mud on any paved street in the world!—Indianapolis Press.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "Our Foes at Home" (New York: Doubleday & McClure Co.), Hugh H. Lusk, formerly a member of the New Zealand parliament, holds up the political and economic experience of New Zealand as an object lesson to the United States. The book is especially valuable for its explanation of the successful reforms for which New Zealand has become famous—an explanation that is enhanced in interest quite as

Ten Cents

To encourage the circulation and extend the influence of

THE PUBLIC

during the remainder of the Presidential campaign, it will be mailed weekly to any address in the United States, Mexico or Canada, from the present date to and including the issue of November 10, 1900, for

Ten Cents

Address: THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.