

such as grain, salt and petroleum, of which the poor man consumes as much as, if not more than, the rich man; and then they are supposed to fall upon revenue, the rich, however, as is usual with such a tax, managing to get exemptions that relieve them of a very large proportion of what they would bear under this tax if it were justly administered. The truth is that in Italy the poor pay 50 per cent. of the taxes—taxes for a revenue spent by the monarchy in wasteful pride; among other things to keep up a great standing army to repress the people at home and subjugate peoples abroad, and to keep up a large, useless navy, or, if useful, then only to do the devil's work.

The Italians are naturally a happy, joyous people. We who have so many of them among us can see that. In Italy no Roman is too mean, no mountain cottage too poor to have its banjo or guitar or mandolin. The fascination of the people for music in the years not so long ago, when Rossini and the group of great composers made all Italy a land of song and sunshine, is illustrated in the story of a conversation between two Milanese gentlemen who chanced to meet in the street. "Where are you going?" "To the Scala, to be sure!" "How! Your father lies at the point of death." "Yes! yes! I know, but Velluti sings to-night."

"Dolce far niente" ("doing nothing; sweet idleness") expresses what a large part of these poetical, music-loving people might find it most easy to give themselves up to in their picturesque country, with its seas and mountains and lakes; its mild, golden sunshine, and its transparent blue sky. A monarchy that would not be oppressive, and that outwardly would show a care for the people, even if only a superficial care, might float along for years and years until some outside political and social convulsion would arouse this quick, sensitive, high-natured nation to throw off dreaming, become self-assertive and advance as a nation to active things. But ever since the House of Savoy at the palace of the Quirinal assumed the crown of Italy there has been nothing but oppression of the people. What must follow when a good carpenter can be had in Italy for 30 cents a day? When that same carpenter out of his scant wages must pay heavy taxes to be squandered by men who call themselves God-ordained rulers of the people? Through many years

we have seen the consequence. The youth of Italy has to great extent emigrated to other parts of the world—to Africa, to South America, but mostly to the United States. Here they have been absorbed into our nationality and become industrious, sturdy American citizens.

But with the finding of better social and political conditions in other countries Italians have yearned for the establishment of better things in the mother—their native—country. And the principles of free American political institutions have asserted themselves in the steady effort of the Italian American citizen to bring about the establishment of a republic in Italy, where the people shall by their votes govern and tax themselves. In such movements there have been in the past, and must be in the future, individuals with distinct ideas and acting alone or practically alone, and such a person we may call this man Angelo Bresci, who, filled with the wrongs of the Italian people, and seeing no recourse but to destroy the headpiece of the governmental despotism, took his own life in his hands and killed King Humbert.

I do not for a moment justify this murder, nor do I believe that good can come to Italy from such an act. I am merely endeavoring to show the forces at work in that country, which, if not relieved in some way, must soon break into a vast political and social eruption.

That anarchism, teaching the abolition of government of man by man and the constitution of society without government, involves the abolition of monarchy is as true as that the principle of a democratic republic gives monarchy no place; but the recognized teachers of the doctrine of anarchy—such men as the celebrated scientist Prince Krapotkin and the famous French geographer, Jacques Elisee Reclus—do not for a moment recognize that their principles are to be advanced by the murder of anyone. So that the great amount of talk about a vast Italian conspiracy of assassination and bloody revolution has no foundation. It is precisely the kind of statement that the Italian despotism might give out to the world in order to hide its own acts of oppression and to bind its chains tighter upon the people.—Henry George, Jr., in *Philadelphia North American* of Aug. 13.

Give me neither poverty nor riches, lest I be poor and steal, or lest I be rich and say "there is nothing to arbitrate."—Wilmington (Del.) Justice.

AN OPEN LETTER FROM RABBI SALE.

Rabbi Samuel Sale, of St. Louis, has written an open letter to George A. Schilling, of this city, in which he rebukes the statement recently made by an eminent Jewish ecclesiastic, that the Jews should hang together and vote as one man at the coming election. Dr. Sale's position is the Jews cannot and should not be led to the polls like sheep, to cast their vote for William McKinley. Rabbi Sale has always been an earnest republican, and in 1896 was chaplain of the republican national convention at St. Louis. He disclaims any intention of making his letter an encyclical to the Jews, but simply writes as an American citizen. He says in part:

You know as well as I do, that a Jewish minister has no other influence over his coreligionists than that of reason and moral suasion, and that they are not a flock of sheep, to be led by a bell-wether. So far as any political capital to be gained thereby is concerned, such letters might just as well remain unwritten, but the injury which may be done to the Jews is incalculable.

The very fact that a rabbi writes to a Jew, giving him information and advice on the political situation, carries with it to an outsider the inference that his fellow believers are politically a separate and distinct class, a foreign body in the state, and this inference is to-day the very life of all so-called anti-semitism, the world over. Let Mr. Blumenthal or any other Jew, who cannot advise himself in the present political crisis, get his information at the same sources to which all Americans, Jew and Christian alike, are wont to go; but let him not turn to the rabbi, who is not his father confessor. I am not an alarmist, and I can prove that my reasoning is based on a solid foundation by pointing to the fact that the national republican committee are now actually circulating Hirsch's letter as a campaign document intended especially for the Jews.

If, as I am inclined to believe, Dr. Hirsch's letter was written at the suggestion of some political fire worker in the national republican committee, and Dr. Hirsch is now aware of its perversion, then he should recall it at once.

Mark you, I would not have the letter recalled for fear of any good it may do the republican party, for I assure you, it will neither make or unmake a single vote; but I fear the evil consequences that may spring from its spreading, if, which God forefend, at any future time, the dragon seed of Jew-baiting should be sown in the soil of our beloved land. If

that dire contingency should ever arise, then this questionable letter will be cited by the political descendants of the very people who are now using it, as a proof of the political aloofness and separateness of the Jew.

Remembering that Hirsch's letter appeared in the Chicago Tribune, and was made the subject of one of its editorials, and learning now that it is being circulated among the Jews for campaign purposes as a sort of pastoral, I do not hesitate to characterize it as unworthy the notice of respectable American Jews. I feel no reluctance, in the face of this letter, to declare to you and to the whole world, in my individual capacity, not as a rabbi, nor a Jew, but as an American, that I shall not vote for the candidate of the republican party for the office of president. Four years ago, as the chaplain of the national republican convention which nominated Mr. McKinley, I prayed for the success of that party which promised to maintain the honor and credit of the nation. At the coming election in November I shall vote against Mr. McKinley with just as much fervor. Four years ago I believed that the good name and the credit of our people would be endangered by the election of the candidate of the democratic party. To-day I believe the very life of the republic is jeopardized by the policy pursued by the republican administration. Four years ago the people were asked to decide whether our currency should rest upon a sound financial basis, and by their vote they declared that there can be but one standard of values in an honest household. In my opinion that question has been settled once for all, and its insistence in the platform of either party to-day is merely a political trick or by-play. But even if silver were not dead, and there were imminent danger of our going upon a silver basis immediately after the 4th of March next, I should still cast my vote for the democratic candidate, in view of the all-important and overshadowing issue of imperialism, which has come to the fore through the republican policy of criminal aggression. This policy has rudely shaken all our ideals and laid the ax at the very foundation upon which our government was reared. A mistake in our financial system would undoubtedly entail heavy losses, but our country is so rich that they would hardly be felt; moreover, after we had paid for our folly sufficiently, we would be only too glad to correct our

error and return to a sound and sensible currency, just as the Latin league did; but once wrench the foundation from under the free institutions which have been planted here and which have distinguished our country, and they will inevitably totter to ruin. Every act of the republican party, beginning with the treaty of Paris, whereby we bought (!) the right of sovereignty over a foreign, alien, unassimilable, unwilling and oppressed people, has been a step in the direction of high-handed imperialism, unworthy of a free and liberty-loving nation, and subversive of every principle and precedent established by the founders of our republic. The party that prides itself upon having achieved the freedom of the negro slave against his unwilling master, is now engaged in subjugating at the point of the bayonet a people who have never harmed us, and whose only sin is that they would be free and independent according to the bent of their nature, and in the land which God has given them. In taking and forcibly retaining the Philippines, we have torn our constitution in shreds, we have violated every genuinely American principle. The defenders of the administration tell us that if we had not taken the far-off islands, some other nation would; the same reason would justify every theft that ever was committed, for the thief might argue, if he had not appropriated the stolen goods some one else would. Again and again we are reminded that we made no promises to the Philippines of independence or self-government, as if that were a justification of the brutal course which the administration has pursued against these people. The only question to be decided is, How dare we Americans withhold a promise that is inherent in the constitution of the United States? This attempted defense in itself proves clearer than daylight, that we are on the high-road of imperialism. We first declared to the world that Cuba should of right be free and independent, and then we made our boast that our war should not be one of conquest and criminal aggression. I ask in the name of justice and common sense, Were not these declarations to the world not only implied but plain and direct promises made to the inhabitants of the Philippine islands? If not, then indeed we sugar o'er the devil himself with pious words.

Hypocrisy seems to be the order of the day. The republican leaders and platform mouth against trusts

and monopolies, and under the loving caresses and nursing of the republican party, they spring up all over the land like mushrooms. The republican platform, the republican leaders and the republican president give public and private, general and specific promises and pledges, that the civil service shall be maintained and extended, when lo and behold! at one fell swoop 10,000 positions are taken out of the classified service and opened to place hunters and political spoilsmen.

These are only a few of my reasons for supporting the democratic candidate in the coming election for president, the main one being, as we are all well aware, the issue of imperialism, which would dwarf every other consideration in the minds of all true and patriotic Americans.

I have no message as a Jew to the Jews, nor would I at this juncture deliver one if I had; but speaking as one American citizen to another, I recall the famous warning given by the decree of the ancient Roman senate to Lucius Opinius: "Let the consul see to it that the republic does not come to harm." I mean to heed that warning by voting for W. J. Bryan. Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL SALE.

AN ANALYSIS OF M'KINLEY'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

Extracts from an article by Dr. David J. Doherty, published in the Chicago Chronicle of Sept. 23.

THE PRESIDENT'S LOGIC.

Mr. McKinley's letter contains a number of fallacies, which will be easily apparent to any student of logic who will take the trouble to write out his arguments in syllogistic form. He is fond of using the style of argument called the dilemma, which is very perplexing to an adversary and may easily conceal a fallacy. I quote several instances, each of which offends the laws of logic by not being a complete or true dilemma. In his instruction to the peace commission (October 28, 1898), he says: "We must either hold the islands or turn them back to Spain." Here the alternatives are not mutually exclusive, because there is another line of conduct possible, viz., we may treat them as we have treated Cuba, and that is really the question which the American people desire to have answered, but the president does not, at least directly, refer to it.

Again, Mr. McKinley propounds to his adversaries (the anti-imperialists and democrats) a chain of questions which logicians call a sorites. This is