

the ownership of the street railway system of Glasgow, and other movements of the kind all the world over. Such questions as these are now before the public and promise to occupy leading place in the consideration of our home affairs.

The question is whether the democracy shall take the advance step and seek to deal with these new issues in the spirit of the declaration of independence or try to retrace its steps. To-day these questions in definite form cannot be said to be partisan issues—that is members of both leading parties are found on either side; it is to be hoped that they never may become partisan in a narrow sense. But that there shall be a political division along these lines cannot be doubted when we consider that special privilege does exist and its beneficiaries will seek to perpetuate it, while those who see its evils and experience its injustice will try to crush it out.—The Farmers' Voice of Nov. 10.

SIXTO LOPEZ TO GEN. WHEELER.

Extract from letter dated 41 Woburn place, London, W. C., June 30, 1900. We reprint from City and State.

Our contention is this: The Philippines were and are our country. "Forcible annexation," as your president has admirably expressed it, "would be criminal aggression." No legal quibble about "the right of conquest and purchase" will obscure the moral question or even serve as a lubricant to conscience. No profession of "philanthropy" or "benevolent assassination or assimilation"—we will not quarrel about the word, the meaning is practically the same—will serve to shield your president from the charge which he has made against his own policy.

Nor will it avail to offer insult to one's moral sense by claiming a legal title to sovereignty due to "cession" and "purchase" from Spain. Spain never had a moral right to our country. Her alleged ownership rested solely on might and not on right. She never possessed even the tentative right which comes to the provider of beneficent rule. This was recognized by the United States when it went to war on behalf of Spain's colonial possessions, and demanded that Spanish sovereignty should cease.

In addition to this Spain did not possess sovereignty at the time of the so-called "cession." Her territories were in the hands of the Filipinos (with the exception of one city) who had established an independent government, *de facto* and *de jure*.

If Spain, then, had no moral and no

legal ownership to the Philippines, who had?

There is but one answer: the owners were and are the inhabitants, the Filipinos.

Who, then, is the aggressor in this war? Who is it that is endeavoring to seize and annex the Philippines over the heads of the natural owners, the inhabitants, and to purchase a legal title in absence of a moral one? Who was it that fired the first shot and took the first life? Who is it that declares that "all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed?" Who is it that now seeks to deny the application of that principle of human rights to the Filipinos? Who was it that sought and accepted our aid in the conflict with Spain and now denies that we have any right whatsoever to a voice in determining the fate of the Philippines?

Whoever is chargeable with these acts, on him and on them must be laid the responsibility of the war and bloodshed.

If the United States administration had promised that the principle enunciated in the declaration of independence and quoted above would be made applicable to the Filipinos, there would never have been a shot fired, and if that promise were now made there would be no more war. That promise could have been made and can now be made.

MR. BRYAN AS A CANDIDATE.

In our opinion no higher type of man has ever been nominated by any political party for the presidency of the United States than William Jennings Bryan. No public man in our history was ever inspired by higher motives or loftier ideals of right and duty. Mr. Bryan is above all a manly man; frank, courageous, brave, clean of life, large of brain, great of heart. He possesses and fully deserves the admiration, the confidence, and indeed the love of several millions of his countrymen. He is one of the most picturesque and attractive figures that ever appeared on the stage of American politics. In spite of his two defeats for the presidency and of the disasters which have overtaken the democratic party under his leadership, it is entirely too early to assume that his public career is closed. He is yet comparatively a young man, and it is by no means improbable that conditions may yet arise which will impel the country to summon him to the highest public service.

No party leader in our history—not even excepting Henry Clay or James G. Blaine—has possessed a larger measure of personal magnetism or

inspired in a higher degree the enthusiasm and devotion of his following. But neither Henry Clay nor James G. Blaine became president. It seems that the American people—in tensely practical and utilitarian as they are—are disinclined to call men of this type to the executive office.

Mr. Bryan is perhaps too much of an idealist—too warm in his sympathies, too emotional in his temperament, and a trifle too radical in his methods for the cold American nature. Although more ardent and impulsive than either Thomas Jefferson or Abraham Lincoln, there is much of both of these great characters in Mr. Bryan's composition. Both were essentially radicals, and each was, like Mr. Bryan, a bit of a dreamer and more of a philosopher than man of affairs. Yet they rank as perhaps our greatest two presidents. Each proved a success as an administrator, as Mr. Bryan doubtless would if given the opportunity, and each wrote grand pages in our national history. But they lived in different times. It is safe to say that in the present temper and with the present tendencies of the American people, neither Thomas Jefferson nor Abraham Lincoln, if alive, would stand a ghost of a chance to be elected president.—Indianapolis Sentinel of Nov. 8.

MUST WE GIVE UP "THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER?"

For The Public.

As I write these lines a party of apparently highly intelligent men and women, a party of fathers and mothers almost exclusively, are singing "The Star Spangled Banner."

Ah, they have stopped at the end of the first verse and chorus!

Can it be that the same thought and feeling came to each one during that first verse? Else why did they stop so suddenly?

That was their first song of the evening! They are singing no other songs now, they have broken the circle and some are leaving the parlors. They stopped abruptly, like a piece of machinery, and, without apologies or excuses, instantly separated.

Now, why have they acted thus? They came together by prearrangement for an evening of song here in our hotel parlors. Instantly, and without previous warning, without discussion they break up their party, their circle, and separate.

Can the same feeling which took possession of my heart, instantly I heard the first strains of that heretofore inspiring music, have also swept across their heart strings?