

tain any such conclusion. We shall probably have numerous homilies from well-meaning persons on the virtues of "economy and patience," but we think impartial history will record that most of C. P. Huntington's wealth was due to other and less admirable qualities, coupled with legislative favors and the granting of monopolies that ought never to have been granted to anyone, but which, supposing them to be granted, he, of course, had as much right to as anyone else.—Editorial in American Machinist of Aug. 23.

PRINCIPLE BEFORE PARTY.

Extracts from a letter written by Gen. John Beatty to the Columbus (O.) Press-Post under date of August 22.

We owe no fealty to a name; names may be changed at will, or they may be adopted by a party and held onto after the party has abandoned everything to which it originally adhered. The citizen's allegiance is due simply to fundamental principles. In these there can be no change; they are the bed rock upon which all political action should be founded. The right of the people to select their own representatives in state and national legislation and to choose their own presidents and governors as well, is the core, the essence, the vital and animating principle of republicanism. Without it the word republican becomes an empty husk.

The liberty party in 1843 declared in favor of the "restoration of the equality of rights among men" and affirmed "that the fundamental truths of the declaration of independence was the fundamental law of our national government." The liberty men of 1843 and 1847 becoming satisfied finally that a half loaf was better than no bread, united in great part with the free soilers of 1848, who in the Buffalo convention affirmed that "our fathers ordained the constitution * * * to establish justice, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty, but expressly denied to the federal government, which they created, all constitutional power to deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due legal process." This party also resolved to inscribe upon its banner—"Free soil, free speech, free labor and free men." In 1852 the free soilers again met in convention and declared "that governments, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, are instituted among men to secure to all those inalienable rights of life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness with which they are endowed by their Creator, and of which none can be deprived by valid legislation, except for crime." The liberty men of 1843-47, and the free soilers of 1848-52, uniting with others of like political predilections, met in Philadelphia in 1856, and formed the republican party. The platform adopted by this old party now again invested with a new name, and somewhat broadened in its purposes, affirmed "that with our republican fathers we hold it to be self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our federal government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction." The liberty men of 1843-47, the free soilers of 1848-52, the republicans of 1856, reinforced by multitudes of independent men from both the whig and democratic parties, met in Chicago in 1860 and nominated Abraham Lincoln for the presidency. After the manner and in their spirit of their predecessors, they declared "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; * * * that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This, I take it, is genuine republicanism and under this banner the political battle of 1860 was fought and won. It was a struggle for the truths of the declaration of independence, for the inalienable rights of men; and the same issue under slightly changed conditions is before the people to-day. For one, I shall look to the essence of the thing uninfluenced by a now empty, but once honored, name, strike for the old cause and stand by the convictions of a lifetime. . . .

I stand now where I stood 50 years ago, squarely on the assumption that the principles of the declaration of independence, and the precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ should be recognized as fully in the Philippines as in the United States. On this paramount issue I am in agreement with Mr. Bryan. How, therefore, as a consistent republican, can I do otherwise than vote for him? He may differ from me on minor questions, just as the democrat with whom I stood shoulder to shoulder on the battlefields of the great civil war differed from me on minor questions; but we

nevertheless fought together to obtain a righteous determination of the paramount issue of that day and then in good time gave attention to matters of lesser importance.

Equal opportunities for all men, irrespective of place, race, color or previous condition, was the paramount issue in 1776, in 1860, and is the paramount issue in 1900. In this struggle I shall neither dodge nor hide between the lines, but go promptly to the front and cast my ballot where it will be counted at its full value.

ROOSEVELT'S STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO THE FILIPINOS CHALLENGED.

From the Chicago Record of August 25 we take the following open letter to Gov. Roosevelt, written by Sixto Lopez, who was formerly secretary to the Filipino commission in Washington.

Dear Sir: I have read your remarkable speech delivered recently at St. Paul, Minn., in which you charge the Filipinos with being the "precise analogues" of the Boxers and Apaches and our government with being a "bloody Aguinaldoan oligarchy." Nothing appeals to the best human emotion so much as the spectacle of a brave man. Permit me to say that I cordially join with the American people in admiration of the chief of the "rough riders," but while admiring your achievements as a soldier and a fearless reformer, my admiration ceases when you strike at what I believe to be the truth. Indeed, I am afraid your brilliant career may receive a check in the unequal contest, for truth has never yet been vanquished.

I cannot believe that a gentleman and a soldier will make serious charges against an opponent without being in possession of absolute proof of his statements. Consequently if your charges are true I must cease to be a champion of the cause of my people. If they are false you ought to cease to be the champion of yours.

Therefore, in the name of my countrymen, for whom you and your colleagues have made such lavish profession of friendship, I challenge you to furnish proof of the truth of your charges or else withdraw them.

Let me draw your attention to the circumstances as we Filipinos view them: You came to our country. You call us "Dear Gen. Aguinaldo." You ask, accept and profit by our aid in the defeat of your enemy. You deliver Spanish prisoners over to our charge. You place a large number of

your own sick and wounded practically in our care.

When your enemy has been defeated you turn upon us, shoot us down by thousands, and when our resistance is greater than you anticipated you declare that we are the precise analogues of Boxers and Apaches, and him who you once styled "dear general" when you required his aid you now refer to as "Bloody Aguinaldo."

Honor bright, do you consider all this as consistent with the conduct of a gentleman and a soldier? There is only one escape. Prove your charges.

Look at it in another light: You are powerful and wealthy. You can bring to your task of extermination the most deadly weapons of so-called civilized warfare. Your soldiers are well armed, well fed, well quartered.

We, on the contrary, are without wealth and without a single field piece. We have very few arms and inferior ammunition. We have only such food as our soldiers can find in forest and mountain, and we have to live in swamps, jungles, exposed to every weather.

The contest is thus fearfully unequal, but of this we have not complained. Our Philippine mothers and sisters have silenced the pang when an imperialist shell or bullet has robbed them of husband, father or brother. We have fought fairly; even your own officers have admitted that we have conducted the war fairly and in accordance with the customs of modern war.

Yet, not content with having all advantages on your side, you would now try to take from us our good name. How pitiable, how infinitesimal!

A brave man will always sympathize with the "smaller dog." A worthy foe will be generous to his weaker opponent. A gentleman and a soldier will not heap dishonor upon his adversary.

Do you believe these mere truisms? Then there is only one escape—prove your charges.

Indeed, you ought to have proved the charges when making them. Honor, fair play, the generosity you should have shown to a weaker opponent who is absent, all proclaim that you ought to have given proof at the time. But let that pass. It is not too late even now.

It will not, however, suffice to appeal to imagination or assumption, to rumor or unfounded reports. Such rumors and reports cut both ways.

There have been as many evil reports against the American soldier as against the Filipinos. Your own commissioners admit "isolated occurrences are regrettable, indeed, but incident to every war," but they do not "feel called upon to answer idle tales without foundation in fact."

Why do you and they not apply this noble reasoning to the Filipinos? Similar charges have been made against Boer and Briton, against union and federal, against every army in active war since time immemorial.

With the belief that you will either prove your charges or withdraw them and offer the amende honorable, I have the honor to be, etc.

SIXTO LOPEZ.

THE COMING CRISIS.

For The Public.

To the lookers-on it seems as if all the force, the awful, terrific force, of the water above Niagara falls increased at a tremendous rate just before the final plunge down the fall. One hardly dares stand without support near the edge of the bank or on the little islands for fear of being carried to destruction. Such is the power of this surging, rushing mass of water which for miles has been gathering force. Mad, insane would anyone be who even for an instant thought to stay the rush or to attempt to steer a boat in it, however strong. So alive does the water seem that one almost unconsciously feels he ought to warn this torrent that it is rushing on to destruction; that it is carrying with it everything within its reach, and that it cannot for a long time return again to the peaceful, quiet stream it was miles and miles back.

And hundreds of people go every day in the tiny "Maid of the Mist" to see this fatal plunge; go so near that their faces become dripping wet from the spray and only a complete covering of rubber clothing prevents a thorough bath. How many of these people feel awe-stricken at the insignificance of man before such almost infinite power one can never tell; but he who does not feel it must be made of stone.

Are not these rapids suggestive of the state of our society at the close of the century? The world, it is true, will not suddenly change either for better or worse at the moment when the last night of this century is tolled out; yet all the forces for good and bad seem to be rapidly gathering, just as the water seems to gather rapidly at the last before making the final plunge, while in reality both are the result of time.

The censored press gives daily indications of a seething, a restlessness and a breaking away from the fetters which

bind the masses, strong as those in power have tried to forge them; and those who look below the surface and see what must inevitably come unless the gathering force is staid, and that quickly, tremble for the future. Let us devoutly hope that we may not have a social Niagara.

At home strikes are becoming more and more frequent; the rights of the masses are each month, increasingly trodden upon; great fortunes are piling up for the few, made possible by special privilege laws which a few years ago no one would have even dared to propose; "government by injunction" is hardly a matter of surprise; political dishonesty, blackmailing and open stealing and bribery are too common to provoke more than a passing comment; taxes have increased together with the price of living, so that an occasional increase of money wages is not enough to compensate for the increased price of living; and a chapter of such straws, including the enormous growth of trusts, indicating the direction of the wind, might be written.

But worse than all these, because the cause of them, is the repudiation by so many men in high official places of the principles as laid down in the Declaration of Independence. Men who should—and do—know better deny that we all have an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. When these principles on which our government was founded, belief in which has for over a century been our boast, are denied by our rulers what is there to hope for?

We have boasted not only that we were a free people, but that the bulwark of that freedom is universal suffrage. This has not been strictly true, for nearly one-half of the population has been denied the right of suffrage because of sex limitation, and in many states there is a property or an educational qualification.

William Lloyd Garrison recently said:

A republic means a government of the whole people, not of a part. It includes all within its borders, regardless of sex, subject to its laws. Otherwise it has no right to the name. To make laws and deny the governed a voice is simply despotism. The most dangerous foe of democracy is he who, in its holy name, seeks to make it an oligarchy.

And Wendell Phillips said:

The community that will not protect its humblest, most ignorant, most hated member in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves.

Yet the number of those who would still further limit the ballot is increasing rather than diminishing. Would they have only the "intelligent" people