

they have the means, and they love feasts and parades and balls and music. I am convinced that, naturally, the Filipino is domestic and peace loving, but as a general thing susceptible to the arguments of those of his race more intelligent than he. For this reason the leaders of the revolution have easily obtained thousands of recruits who break their home ties and go out and fight desperately without knowing exactly what they are fighting for.

And, finally, a few general conclusions may be summed up thus: That the Filipinos are inclined to be lazy; that they are pretty generally religious; that the women are virtuous, and that if the people can ever be convinced that the United States is sincere in its desire to benefit them they will make a very good class of citizens.

MR. BRYAN AND THE PEACE TREATY.

A letter written by Louis R. Ehrich, of Colorado Springs, Col., to the New York Evening Post, and published in the Post of August 10.

Senator Hoar has charged that Mr. Bryan gave his influence in behalf of ratifying the peace treaty with Spain, doing it in bad faith and with the expectation of making the Philippine question a political issue. Other writers and speakers have repeated the charge, with the added claim that Mr. Bryan's procedure deprives him of the right of justly criticising the unhappy consequences which flowed from an act in which he virtually cooperated.

Let us examine the facts and the accompanying evidence. I am no defender or apologist of Mr. Bryan. I fought his election bitterly in 1896, and I opposed his financial theories long before 1896. I am actuated solely by the spirit of fair play and justice.

On June 14, 1898, three weeks before Cervera's fleet was destroyed and two months before the fall of Manila, Mr. Bryan delivered an address in the Nebraska building of the Omaha exposition. These words, uttered so long before the administration policy had declared itself, assuredly give evidence of the prevision of the statesman and patriot. He said:

History will vindicate the position taken by the United States in the war with Spain. In saying this, I assume that the principles which were invoked in the inauguration of the war will be observed in its prosecution and conclusion. If, however, a contest undertaken for the sake of humanity degenerates into a war of conquest, we shall find it difficult to meet the charge of having added hypocrisy to greed. Is our national character so weak that we cannot withstand the temptation to appropriate the

first piece of land that comes within our reach?

To inflict upon the enemy all possible harm is legitimate warfare, but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the orient merely because our ships won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila? Our guns destroyed a Spanish fleet, but can they destroy that self-evident truth, that governments derive their just powers, not from superior force, but from the consent of the governed?

This was the first public expression on the subject of imperialism, uttered over two years before the electoral campaign of 1900. If Mr. Bryan, with the soul of a petty politician, had been desirous of entrapping the republican party into a dangerous political issue, would he not have kept silent?

The plenipotentiaries of the United States and of Spain affixed their seals to the peace treaty on December 10, 1898. Three days thereafter Mr. Bryan gave out the following interview at Savannah, Ga.:

Our people defended Cuba against foreign arms; now they must defend themselves and their country against a foreign idea—the colonial idea of European nations. Heretofore greed had perverted the government and used its instrumentalities for private gains, but now the very foundation principles of our government are assaulted. Our nation must give up any intention of entering upon a colonial policy, such as is now pursued by foreign countries, or it must abandon the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . . Some think that the fight should be made against ratification of the treaty, but I would prefer another plan. If the treaty is rejected, negotiations must be renewed, . . . with the possibility of international complications. It will be easier, I think, to end the war at once by ratifying the treaty, and then deal with the subject in our own way. The issue can be presented directly by a resolution of congress declaring the policy of the nation upon this subject.

A month thereafter, January 9, 1899, (five days after the president had transmitted the treaty to the senate), Mr. Bryan published an article in the New York Journal, giving, as he says, "a few reasons why the opponents of a colonial policy should make their fight in support of a resolution declaring the nation's purpose rather than against the ratification of the treaty." After pointing out that the rejection of the treaty could be only temporary, because "the new senate will have a considerable republican majority," he gives the following as the weightiest argument:

The rejection of the treaty would be unwise, because the opponents of the treaty would be compelled to assume responsibility for the continuance of war conditions and for the risks which always attend negotiations with a hostile nation. The rejection of the treaty would give the administration an excuse for military expenditures, which could not be justified after the conclusion of peace, and the op-

ponents of the treaty would be charged with making such appropriations necessary. It must be remembered that, in case the treaty is rejected, negotiations must be renewed with an enemy whose ill-will is not concealed. Who is able to guarantee the nation against new dangers and new complications? . . . Our nation owes it to the nations with which we have dealings, as well as to the inhabitants of Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, to announce immediately what it intends to do respecting the territory surrendered by Spain.

Within less than a week after the publication of this article Senators Bacon and Hoar each introduced resolutions in the senate declaring it the nation's policy to give complete independence to the Filipinos. On January 24 Senator Lodge said:

The treaty cedes the Philippines to us. It commits us to no policy, to no course of action whatever in regard to the Philippines. When that treaty is ratified, we have full power and are absolutely free to do with those islands as we please. . . .

Suppose we reject the treaty; what follows? Let us look at it practically. We continue the state of war, and every sensible man in the country, every business interest, desires the establishment of peace in law as well as in fact. . . .

The treaty commits the disposition of the Philippine islands to congress and to the ways and practices of peace. Its rejection leaves them in the sole power of the president, subject to the usages and practices of war alone.

On January 30 Senator Jones, of Arkansas (who certainly stands close to Mr. Bryan), pressed for a vote on the Bacon resolution. He was foiled, as were all further efforts in that direction, by senatorial tactics. The next day, January 31, Senator Platt, of Connecticut, said: "To defeat this treaty relegates us to a state of war legally. What will happen then no human being knows or can foresee."

The very day of the ratification of the treaty (February 6) Senator Allen said in the senate:

Because I shall vote for the treaty it does not follow that I am in favor of annexation. . . . If we open up the subject matter of the treaty we will, in my judgment, especially in the light of very recent events, incur the danger of European interference and European interventions. It is because we will have the power, when the treaty is ratified, of determining the form of government to be set up in the Philippine islands and in the other possessions that have come to us as a result of the war, without incurring any danger from abroad, that I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty.

Within eight days after the treaty ratification, Senator Bacon introduced the following amendment to the McEnery resolution:

Resolved further, That the United States disclaims and disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said islands, and assert their determination, when a stable and independent government shall have been erected therein, entitled in the judgment of the United States to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms

which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

The vote on this resolution, taken February 14, stood 29 to 29. The vice president cast his vote in the negative, and the amendment was defeated. Be it noted that, of the ten democratic senators who voted in favor of the treaty ratification, only two—Senators Morgan and McEnery—voted against the Bacon amendment. This completely exonerates Mr. Bryan, so far as his influence extended, from the charge of selfishly desiring imperialism as an issue in this campaign. Had he fought the ratification of the treaty, he could very justly have been accused of being a narrow minded, rancorous, political obstructionist. He threw his whole influence in the direction of adopting a wise, humane, and noble American policy toward the Filipinos, thus rising above selfish partisan considerations in the plane of patriotic statesmanship.

ELEMENTS OF THE CAMPAIGN ISSUES.

For The Public.

Now that we have the declarations of both of the great political parties, some speculation ought not to be amiss as to the relative strength of their positions.

The two principal issues of the campaign, those of trusts and imperialism, are at bottom moral questions, which, in order to be intelligently decided, require an understanding of fundamental principles that are by no means generally understood.

It will, for example, become necessary for the citizen to decide whether it is right for one nation to make subjects of another nation, regardless of present day practices, and with seeming prospects of gain and glories of war to prejudice him in favor of an affirmative answer.

The element of gain will also enter the trust as well as the half dormant tariff issues, inasmuch as both of these are backed by powerful moneyed interests; and, in the case of the tariff, at least—the trust promoters not having had time as yet to confuse the public mind—a great many still regard it with superstitious reverence as a source of national prosperity.

Assuming—for the sake of argument, if it is not unreservedly granted—that the republican party stands sponsor for those issues; the democratic party, it is notorious, is their

avowed opponent. The position of the latter may be summed up as follows: On the expansion question, relinquishing of territory acquired; on the trust question, abolition of trusts; on the tariff question, abolition of its protecting features. These measures, all of them negations of those issues of republican creation, are urged by the democrats on grounds of equity.

So it will be seen that the prospects of material gain are seemingly almost entirely on the republican side, while the democrats have scarcely anything to offer except Righteous Indignation.

On one side we shall therefore, have all the appeals to the passion of gain, and all the forces inseparable therefrom; while on the other hand, we shall simply have appeals to Justice, seemingly irrespective of Material Gain. And the question of the success or failure of either party rests upon the question as to which has the strongest hold upon the majority of Americans, Sense of Justice, or Passion for Gain.

Those who have not already become blinded in the present intense struggle for wealth will have no difficulty in deciding for Justice. But, is there not enough of the "Gentleman of Fortune" in the American citizen for Gain to outweigh Justice with him? Time will tell!

Thus the question arises as to whether it is necessary that a clear separation be made between Justice and Gain; whether it is necessary to weaken the cause of Justice by implying that it must be accompanied by material loss—an implication seemingly involved in the negative answers of the democratic platform to the questions at issue.

So long has Justice been associated with self-sacrifice that it has become difficult to understand how material gain may be made by moral conduct.

Now, is that implication necessary for the reason that there are no positive moral answers to those questions? Or must it be admitted that present-day democrats are not sufficiently enlightened to answer those questions?

The latter seems to be the case. Present day democracy, radical as it is becoming, is not the elemental democracy of the days of Jefferson; nor is it possessed of the knowledge so highly developed in our day, and so much more essential on account of our more complex conditions—the elemental knowledge of man's relation to his environment.

In the light of that knowledge it would be well to inquire into the issues now before the nation.

To come directly to the point: What is the expansion question? In sober truth, laying aside the historical events which led up to the war, what is that public sentiment — for public sentiment it is—which has led up to this desire for territorial expansion, but a manifestation of that universal desire which has been aptly described as "land hunger?" On every hand we hear that "this country is getting too crowded." And, are not these two statements frequently made—contradictory as they are—that "we want new markets for our surplus products," and "new countries for our idle laborers to develop?"

Living in a country that is still in the pioneer stages and one of the most sparsely populated, why should our very laborers themselves express such sentiments, if it were not for the fact, that they do not know that their own country is still large enough to accommodate with comfort many times its present population, and, furthermore, that the use of this, their country, is withheld from them by our present land-tenure laws!

The expansion sentiment being simply a struggle for space on the earth, is but the old question of man's relation to the land of his country. So long as that question remains unanswered we will have expansion of the kind now being urged, the kind of expansion of which imperialism is a necessary complement; since, if we wish to add new territory to our domains by force we must prepare to hold it by force. Friendly relations, without any extension of our governmental authority over other countries, is the only expansion necessary!

Those are facts which ought to be patent to all those who wish to oppose successfully the present expansion movement. To be ignorant of them is to beg the whole question of territorial expansion, and to plead one's inability to cope with it. For it must be admitted that the expansion movement is the expression of a popular desire that is a real desire, a want that is a real want, and not mere fancy or fad of the present moment. It is repeated in history again and again; and the response has always been the same: subjugation of foreign territory and races.

Since the expansion movement is an expression of a want of land, it would