

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

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-