

MISCELLANY

THE POOR VOTER ON ELECTION DAY.

The proudest now is but my peer,
The highest not more high;
To-day, of all the weary year,
A king of men am I.
To-day, alike are great and small,
The nameless and the known;
My palace is the people's hall,
The ballot box my throne!

Who serves to-day upon the list
Beside the served shall stand;
Alike the brown and wrinkled fist,
The gloved and dainty hand!
The rich is level with the poor,
The weak is strong to-day;
And sleekest broadcloth counts no more
Than homespun frock of gray.

To-day let pomp and vain pretense
My stubborn right abide;
I set a plain man's common sense
Against the pedant's pride.
To-day shall simple manhood try
The strength of gold and land;
The wide world has not wealth to buy
The power in my right hand!

While there's a grief to seek redress,
Or balance to adjust.
Where weighs our living manhood less
Than mammon's vilest dust—
While there's a right to need my vote,
A wrong to sweep away,
Up! clouted knee and ragged coat!
A man's a man to-day!
—Whittier.

CHIEF FACE-BOTH-WAYS M'KIN-LEY.

Then:	Now:
1 Bimetallism.	1 Gold Standard.
2 Criminal Aggression.	2 Benevolent Assimilation.
3 Freedom for the Blacks.	3 Slavery Among the Sulus.
4 Plain Duty.	4 Fifteen per cent.

THE MODERN CAIN.

For The Public.

Cain of old killed his brother, and then asked:

"Am I my brother's keeper?"

Our modern "duty and destiny" Cain, on the other hand, says:

"I am my brother's keeper!" And to assert his keepership, goes and pumps lead into the brother that refuses to be "kept."

J. L. STERN.

THE BALLOT ITSELF IS NOT LIBERTY.

The old enthusiasts for political liberty were right in expecting social felicity from free institutions. But they expected such institutions, the ballot especially, to be used to secure such felicity. The ballot itself is not liberty, but liberty may be had by rightly using the ballot. The ballot bears only the same kind of relation to social felicity that knowing how to read bears to learning: it is a means. —Circular of R. I. State Employment Assurance League.

RESULTS OF OUR FIGHTING IN THE EAST.

I do not suppose that in case of a Franco-Russian war the Russian soldier would be allowed to spear children in the streets of Paris. I do not suppose the American soldier would be permitted to sack London and bring home candlesticks from St. Paul's church or furs from the back of the lord mayor. But put the American or the Englishman into Asia and he becomes Asiatic. In hardness of heart and greed, in lust and cruelty, he will, if unwatched, out-do the oriental within a fortnight.

The leprosy which we bring home from the east fall instantly upon ourselves. Our negro problem broke out afresh as soon as our contempt and cruelty were excited towards the Asiatic. Not since 1864 have we had a race war in our northern cities; but to-day we see the practice of negro-baiting revived. This has come about through a slight intensification of race fellyings.—The Political Nursery, of New York.

GOV. ROOSEVELT'S LITTLE "TRIBE" THEORY.

Gov. Roosevelt continued to the end of his western campaign flinging his Philippine learning about profusely. He brought out again in Ohio on the 16th inst. his dear little "tribe" theory of the situation. Did his hearers know that there were 80 tribes in the Philippines? Only two of them are "against us." Think, then, of the absurdity of sacrificing 78 tribes to two! But Roosevelt's friend, Prof. Worcester, of the Philippine commission, threw a good deal of light in advance upon this absurdity, as if for the governor's special discomfiture. In his book on the Philippines he says, referring to the number of the tribes, that it is easy to fall into "an exaggerated idea of their importance," since "many of them are numerically insignificant." Prof. Worcester proceeds to say that it is with "the 5,000,000 of civilized natives" that we must chiefly reckon, and adds that "they belong for the most part to three tribes, the Tagalogs, Ilocanos and Visayans." And it is two of these three tribes which Roosevelt admits are against us! "Only two," he says. This is much as if he should say of Switzerland, only the German and French element are against us, and should boast that the nine per cent. of Italians are for us. Gov. Roosevelt might as glibly say, only the Germans and Hungarians of Austria are against us, and the Poles

for us. Against all his furious ignorance on the subject of the Philippines, we have only to set the calm words of Prof. Worcester, written before any thought of trouble: "I think that the civilized natives show sufficient homogeneity to be treated as a class."—The New York Nation.

THE SLAVE POWER WENT; THE SYNDICATE IS TO GO.

George William Curtis and other writers tell us that slavery once sat in the white house and made laws in the capital; that courts of justice were its ministers, that senators and legislators were its lackeys; that it controlled the professor in his lecture room, the editor in his sanctum, the preacher in his pulpit; that it swaggered in the drawing-room; that it ruled at the clubs; that it dominated with iron hand all the affairs of society; that every year enlarged its power, every moon increased its dominion; that the men and women who dared to even question the divinity of that institution were ostracized, prosecuted, vilified, aye, were hanged.

But the great clock in the chamber of the omnipotent never stands still; it ticked away the years as it had once ticked away the centuries; finally it struck the hour, and the world heard the tread of a million armed men and slavery vanished from America forever.

Note the parallel: To-day the syndicate rules at the white house and makes laws at the capitol. Every year enlarges its power; every moon increases its dominion; and the men and women who protest against the crimes that are being committed by organized greed in this country, who talk of protecting the American people, are ostracized, are vilified, are hounded, are imprisoned. It seems madness to even question the divinity of the American syndicate. But that great clock is still ticking; soon it will again strike the hour, and the world will see not 1,000,000, but 10,000,000 free men rise up armed, not with muskets, but with a free man's ballot, and the sway of the syndicate will vanish from America forever.—Hon. J. P. Altgeld, at the Auditorium, Chicago, Oct. 23.

IS THE REPUBLIC TO BE SAVED?

If the republic shall be saved! This is the doubt that determines my vote to-morrow; this is the question that has weighed on me ever since I reached intellectual maturity and began to strive to discover how all republics before our own had passed into monarchies and despotisms, and how, since freedom is the natural estate of men,

the masses of mankind have everywhere been enslaved.

I love the American republic, not for what it is, but for what it was intended to be, and for what in fullest measure it yet may be. For the sham republic that to-day exists I care nothing. What is such a republic worth to the ordinary citizen? Is there any great principle of individual liberty that is more fully and more quickly recognized in the United States than it is in Great Britain? Is there any duke or earl who exerts such power over the fortunes and the lives of his fellows as do our simple citizens, mere heads of trusts, and rings, and pools? Was ever a tyrant of Greece more completely master of his city and colony than are some of our "bosses?" While we have been glorying in the mere forms of the republic and permitting the Hannas to wrap themselves in the American flag and suffering "patriotism" to be used as Dr. Johnson defined it in the first edition of his dictionary—"the last refuge of a scoundrel"—all that is worth preserving in the republic has been passing away under our eyes and the American republic is dying as the Roman republic died, but by steps as much quicker as the modern steamship and locomotive are quicker than the ancient galley and chariot. A republic where the social extremes are represented by multi-millionaires on the one side and tramps on the other cannot remain a democratic republic. It must be in the very nature of things pass the way that Rome passed when monstrous estates increased and the proletariat grew.

What is really in issue in the election that takes place to-morrow is the very life of the republic.

It may not be a final conflict, but it must be a conflict that will make the side that wins stronger and the side that loses weaker for conflicts yet to come. And it is drawing near to the close of the century when, as I have long thought, the great struggle must in fact, though not in form, be determined.—Henry George, on the day before election, 1896.

THE REAL ISSUE.

It may be that the democrats will not do much better than the republicans, though they will certainly break up the continuity of the imperialist programme, and call a halt in the mad rush to ruin. But that is not the point. The real issue is an awful one: "Shall the people of the United States, which has not yet declared its judgment on the iniquitous policy of the republican party during the past three

years, now solemnly sanction that policy by a vote of the majority, condone betrayal of the republic, establish an empire, renounce the principles of the declaration of independence, destroy the American ideal, and forswear the moral law of justice to all mankind?" If that is the people's decision, it is the irreversible failure of the democratic experiment in this greatest of all democracies, and so far extinction of the hope of the world. Every wise patriot must elevate his mind above the clamor of short-sighted and selfish parties, and look now to the honor of his country in the light of the history we are making. This is no time to flatter the people. They are on trial before the tribunal of the moral universe. Every note for McKinley now, no matter how innocently or ignorantly cast, is a vote to assassinate democracy; every vote for Bryan, no matter how stupidly or selfishly cast, is a vote to rescue democracy from its assassins. "Liberty Enlightening the World," or, "Tyranny Darkening the World;" that is the awful issue. If Bryan, when elected president, fails at last to execute the will of the people, that will not be the people's fault, but his; the people will still have stood true, the fight for freedom and justice will still go on, and the victory at last will be on the side of the rights of man. But, if McKinley is re-elected president, the people themselves will have voluntarily assumed all the shame and all the guilt of his policy, and I see not what hope will be then left for the cause of free political institutions in this country. "dedicated" to the proposition that all men are born free and equal." Only on the surface is this election a "choice between evils." Deeper down, on a more comprehensive view, it is a choice between democracy and the rights of man as man, on the one hand, and plutocracy, tyranny and contempt for all rights, as rights, in comparison with self-interest, on the other hand; and that is a choice between the supreme good and the supreme evil. In such an issue, I dare not hesitate. My vote will be for Bryan.—Francis Ellingwood Abbot, in the Springfield Republican of Oct. 20.

SENOR SIXTO LOPEZ TO GEN. WHEELER.

An extract from a letter written by Senor Sixto Lopez, a member of the Filipino diplomatic service, dated 41 Woburn Place, London, W. C., June 30, 1900, and addressed to Maj. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, United States army, Washington, D. C. The letter is in answer to a circular of questions addressed by Gen. Wheeler to "Eminentes Filipinos." We reprint from City and State, of Philadelphia:

Notwithstanding Senator Beveridge's speech in which he compared us

to the "noble "Red Man" who, I note in passing, has already been "benevolently assimilated;" notwithstanding the apparent cordial approval with which his extraordinary speech was received by your coannexationists, we cheerfully admit the absolute honesty and sincerity of intention of the people of America. At the same time we do not believe for one moment that you or they could give us anything approaching in perfection to the government which your commissioners have promised. But even if we were to admit that your ability is commensurate with your promises, we should still prefer to rule ourselves. All the "protection of life and property;" all the "liberty under the Stars and Stripes;" all the "peace and charity" and "liberty of opportunity" and "fostering care" and "honest" administration which your great nation might be able to give us, would not compensate us for the loss of national life. Put the question to yourself: Would you be satisfied—assuming that some powerful nation were to deny you your independence and at the same time offer you the millennial government which you promise to give to us—would you be satisfied with such foreign rule? You know that you would not. Then do not unto others as ye would not that others should do unto you. There is no necessity to tell us how incapable we are and how enlightened you are; there is no need to argue about "legal" titles or "sovereignty by right of conquest and purchase" or the "task which Providence has imposed upon you." Put all such puerile considerations aside and come back to the Golden Rule. It is simple enough and embraces the whole of man's duty to man. It will show you whether you are doing right in the Philippines, and whether your legal contentions will stand the moral test. Come back to the Golden Rule and take your dripping sword from out our heart. * *

The final intimation in your circular letter is that "any other note on the well-being and prosperity of the Philippine government will be appreciated." I therefore beg to remark that I consider it somewhat strange that you make no mention of Filipino independence. You ask us: Are we satisfied with Aguinaldo? would there be opposition to his government causing revolutions and other conflicts? would we be satisfied with a guarantee of happiness? do we desire railways and other improvements? But you do not ask the most important question of all: Do we desire independence? You might as well ask a