

recognize a fundamental difference. It is often supposed that trust combinations make monopolies. That is the notion of the republican platform. But the truth is just the reverse. Monopolies make trust combinations. The way to abolish the trust, therefore, is to abolish monopolies. Every oppressive trust has its seat in some legalized monopoly. If, then, the democratic party would be true to democratic principles, let it—

demand, as the sovereign cure for trusts, the abolition of all legalized monopolies, by the repeal, or by other legislation neutralizing the effect, of all laws that interfere with free competition.

And that this demand may not appear to be a harmless generalization, let it be supplemented with a specific demand to the effect that—

as a first step in this direction we demand the repeal of all tariffs on trust goods.

Though such declarations would drive friends of the trusts away from the party, they would draw to it every intelligent adversary of trusts who was not absolutely party-bound. And what is of more importance intrinsically, they would help pull the democratic party out of a quagmire and put it on firm foundations. But if a mere rhetorical denunciation or some centralized scheme for regulation be adopted, it can make little difference to anybody, so far as the trust issue goes, which party he votes for. Either way he will be voting to perpetuate the evil of trusts.

Roosevelt's nomination by the Philadelphia convention, to run as vice presidential candidate with McKinley, which was a defeat for himself as well as for Boss Hanna, was a victory—the only victory for anyone in that cut-and-dried convention—for Boss Platt, of New York. Boss Platt wanted Roosevelt out of the way at home, where he was an aspirant for reelection as governor. Not that Roosevelt refuses absolutely to obey the boss. He is obedient enough, and in magazine articles he makes a virtue of being so. But he assumes such

an air of independence as to give Boss Platt the fidgets whenever a delicate combination is being worked out, even though he knows that Roosevelt will finally take the place assigned him. It is annoying also to have to humor those whims of Roosevelt's by which he tries to save his face as an independent. His refusal to appoint Boss Platt's man Payn to the New York insurance department was an example. Payn he would not and did not appoint. But he did appoint Hendricks, another of Boss Platt's men, thereby leaving the powerful insurance department under Platt's control. This suited Boss Platt's purposes well enough; but then it was irritating to Platt to have to go through a bit of gallery play like that merely to keep Roosevelt's useless reputation as a reformer furnished up. So Boss Platt set out to unload Roosevelt upon the national ticket, that the ways of the machine in New York might be smooth; and with the aid of Boss Quay he succeeded in landing his man despite Boss Hanna's opposition. Hanna pretends, now, that he was in favor of Roosevelt all along, and opposed him only far enough to get Platt and Quay committed. But that is a mental attitude which the great fable writers have portrayed much better than we can, if in this instance it needs portrayal. So Roosevelt finds himself in a position where Boss Hanna does not want him and where he did not want to be himself, but where he will be out of Boss Platt's way in New York. Should he get in Boss Hanna's way in Washington, that will not unpleasantly concern Platt. This bird's-eye view of the affair is not vouched for as accurate; but it is the way the thing looks to a man up a tree.

The chorus of a new campaign lyric, sung at the initial republican ratification meeting in Carnegie hall, New York, on the 26th, is deemed sufficiently important to telegraph over the country. Here are the lines:

Hail the name of Bill McKinley, in trouble always calm!

Hail! Rough Rider, Teddy Roosevelt, the hero of San Juan!  
Up in Maine or down in Dixie forever and for aye,  
Honors due to Bill and Teddy from the Blue and the Gray.

Since Roosevelt has leaped—he always leaps—to the first place in point of picturesqueness upon the ticket where his official place is second, and as he is a thorough believer, as his outpourings of magazine articles go to show, in the maxim that “in the hands of one entirely great the pen is mightier than the sword” even as an instrument of deadly warfare, a better chorus (with apologies, of course, to the author of Pinafore) would run like this:

For he himself hath said it,  
And it's greatly to his credit:  
He's the Hero of San Juan.  
For he might have done the fightin',  
And let others do the writin'  
As becomes a modest man.  
But, spite of all temptations,  
He has published to the nations:  
He's the Hero of San Juan.

#### THE MCKINLEY-ROOSEVELT PLATFORM.

##### I.

In a delicious political satire by Stewart Chaplin, published in the June Century, the subtle art of constructing party platforms is exquisitely and humorously worked out. It is there explained that they must, for example, “please civil service people and not scare the beelers, please the gold people and not scare the silverites; please the people generally that want economy and not scare the cross-roads folks that want a marble post office and a granite bridge over their creek; please the anti-trust element and not scare the capitalists, and please the free traders without scaring the protectionists;” and that they must “be written with lots of nerve, sliding over all the things the people are hot about and going in strong for what nobody disputes.”

The most important element in the construction of these platforms is what the satirist calls “weasel words.” They are the “words that suck all the life out of the words next to them, just as a weasel sucks an egg and leaves the shell;” so that “if you left the egg afterward, it's as light as a feather and not very filling when

you are hungry, but a basketful of them would make quite a show and would bamboozle the unwary." Examples of weasel words are "wise exceptions," "justly" "undue," "duly," etc., and their synonyms and variables.

When duly drafted in accordance with these principles of the art, a political platform is, in the estimation of the satirist we are quoting, a sort of stained glass window; "you look through one pane and see a purple dog, and you look through another and he's green, but what his real color is you can't tell till you throw open the window."

In some respects this ingenious satire of Mr. Chaplin's quite snugly fits the McKinley-Roosevelt platform adopted last week at Philadelphia.

A happy use of the weasel word "practicable" will be found in the civil service plank of the Philadelphia document, where it is declared that employment in the public service in our outlying dependences should be confined to their inhabitants—"as far as practicable." Happier still, in view of the Cuban postal corruption, is the weasel phraseology in which the administration is complimented, in the same plank, for having acted "wisely in its effort to secure for public service in Cuba," and our other colonies, "only those whose fitness has been determined by training and experience."

There is another weasel word example in the demand for the extension of the rural free delivery postal service, the demand being limited with neat vagueness by the phrase, "wherever its extension may be justified."

And without using any words of the weasel sort at all, several planks beautifully exemplify the weasel word principle. The demand for good roads, for instance, is cordially approved, but with a weaselly reference of the subject "to the earnest consideration of the people and of the legislatures of the several states;" while, for another instance, such monetary legislation is favored, with a view to reducing interest rates, "as will enable the varying needs of the season and of all sections to be promptly met in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed and commerce enlarged"—which is about

as definite as the size of a piece of chalk.

In one respect it is almost impossible to distinguish Mr. Chaplin's satire from the McKinley-Roosevelt reality. A plank in Mr. Chaplin's satirical platform deals with the trust question; so does one of the planks in the McKinley-Roosevelt platform; and they are so much alike that we quote them both for comparison. Here is one of them:

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade, but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectually restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition, and secure the rights of producers, laborers and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

And here is the other:

Dangerous trusts should be vigorously suppressed. Octopus-like, they threaten the very existence of our institutions. But large business enterprises, honestly administered, whatever their nominal form, which effect prudent economies, while paying more for their raw material, buying more of it, employing more labor, paying higher wages and reducing prices of the finished product, without injury to the interests of the public or of independent competitors, should be encouraged.

In one of these planks, it will be observed, the anti-trust sentiment is catered to in the opening clauses while the capitalists are reassured at the close, whereas in the other this arrangement is reversed. But that is the only difference, and it would require a shrewd guess to decide which plank was intended to be satirical and which serious. Nor is that difficulty a reflection upon the wit of the satirist, for both planks are satires. But the one that was intended to befuddle rather than amuse, and so was inserted in the McKinley-Roosevelt platform as a serious declaration, is, let us save the guessing energies of our readers by explaining, the former of the two.

Little if anything more, however, can be said of the weasel characteristics of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform. It is singularly short of

evasive planks. Well, indeed, will it be for the country if the Kansas City platform shall prove to be as free. On the vital issues of the campaign, with the single exception of the trust question, the McKinley-Roosevelt republicans have declared themselves in unmistakable terms. The charge against them, for the most part, is not that they have evaded issues, but that they have taken ground on the wrong side of them.

That they have done this, and not this alone, but also that in doing it they have stultified their earlier record and become essentially a different party from that which Abraham Lincoln led to initial victory, it is our purpose to show.

## II.

But before taking up the weightier questions pursuant to that purpose, we may advantageously run over some of the minor points which the McKinley-Roosevelt platform presents.

It is not exactly candid in this platform—to begin with a very minor matter indeed—to imply as it does that in defeating Bryan in 1896 McKinley defeated Cleveland. For at that time Cleveland and all who sympathized with him were doing their utmost to defeat Bryan and elect McKinley, while of all Cleveland's critics the Bryan party was the most severe. This is matter of common knowledge. Yet the McKinley-Roosevelt platform has the unblushing effrontery, in its opening declaration, to say that—

the expectation in which the American people, turning from the democratic party, intrusted power four years ago to a republican chief magistrate and a republican congress, has been met and satisfied—

as if Bryan's defeat had been Cleveland's defeat, or Cleveland's supersession had been Bryan's condemnation. That clause embodies a clumsy misrepresentation.

There is a more subtle misrepresentation in that part of the platform which assumes credit for bringing on prosperity. The fact of prosperity might be very effectively disputed. It is certainly very sincerely doubted. But even if the false statement of the platform that "capital is fully employed and everywhere labor is prof-

itably occupied," be conceded, it is not honest to claim this as a result of the election of McKinley and the defeat of Bryan. The best argument for that claim is that whereas the democrats were in power during the hard times, the republicans are in power in the good times; and that would be bad logic even if it were a fact. The democrats in power during the hard times were not Bryan democrats, and if they had been, the argument that would make them responsible for the hard times of the 90's would make the republicans themselves responsible for the hard times of the 70's, for they were in power all through that terrible period which introduced the tramp to American civilization. And they had been in power for years before.

The platform under review drops from misrepresentation into something worse when it calls for—

legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

For these mild-mannered words mean much more than they express. What they mean was revealed last winter in congress when the ship subsidy bill, supported by Senator Hanna until the stench of it compelled even him to let it go, proposed to open the public treasury to the tune of millions of dollars annually to an eastern shipping ring.

After our examination, which is thus far so uncomplimentary to the good faith of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform, one might be justified in discounting the platform's promise to reduce the war taxes. But the language of that promise itself, in the light of very recent history, discredits it. The platform reads on this subject:

The country is now justified in expecting, and it will be the policy of the republican party to bring about, a reduction of the war taxes.

Why is the public justified in expecting this relief now? Why was it not justified in expecting it while congress was in session? What has happened meanwhile? Nothing. Yet the republican congress, completely under the influence of the republican administration, positively refused to lessen the war taxes. Moreover,

why promise merely to reduce? Why not abolish the war tax if it is true, as the platform asserts, that the Dingley bill has so well performed its work as to make it possible to reduce the war debt in the sum of \$40,000,000? With a tariff bill producing such a surplus, there should be no necessity for any war taxes.

It is to be feared that the promise to reduce war taxes is conceived in the same deceptive spirit as that which dictated the misrepresentations already considered and the mendacious plank about the gold standard pledge to be quoted in the next paragraph.

The gold standard plank of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform is contradicted not only by well-known facts, but also by the express terms of the preceding platform. This plank, referring to the platform of four years before, that of 1896, says that the party then—

promised to restore prosperity by means of two legislative measures—a protective tariff and a law making gold the standard of value.

But the well-known fact is that the party did not promise a law making gold the standard of value. What it did promise was to preserve, not create, the gold standard until bimetallism could be established by international agreement, which it pledged itself to promote. In testimony of this, reference may be had to the republican platform of 1896, in which the party then declared itself—opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved.

That pledge is so far short of a promise to enact a law making gold the standard of value, and so radically different from such a promise, that by no possibility could the declaration quoted above from the McKinley-Roosevelt platform have been adopted in good faith.

### III.

It is, however, to the great issues of which the McKinley-Roosevelt platform takes cognizance that we wish especially to draw attention; and foremost among these, of course, is the issue of protection. Not only is this so historically; it is so in a sense

the most broad and profound. The protection issue raises something more than a question of dollars and cents. It touches the question of human rights and of the world's civilization. For out of the protection seed has grown the upas tree of imperialism.

Yet it is as a question of dollars and cents that the issue of protection at first presents itself to the mind; and in the McKinley-Roosevelt platform, as in preceding republican platforms, it is considered in no other way. But in this platform the absurdity of the protection idea is exposed with unusual clearness in a charmingly ingenuous reference to the balance of trade fallacy, which is at the core of the protection theory as an economic doctrine.

Asserting that prosperity is more general and abundant than ever before, and claiming for the republican party the sole credit for this, the platform proceeds:

No single fact can more strikingly tell the story of what republican government means to the country than this—that while during the whole period of 107 years, from 1790 to 1897, there was an excess of exports over imports of only \$383,028,497, there has been in the short three years of the present republican administration an excess of exports over imports in the enormous sum of \$1,483,537,094.

That is to say, while this country from 1790 to 1897 sent away wealth, in excess of the wealth it got back, to the amount of \$383,028,497—impoverishing itself to that extent—the McKinley administration has in three years raised the excess, and thereby increased the impoverishment, to \$1,483,537,094.

An assumption is implied, of course, that an equivalent has either been or is to be received back. But that assumption has no basis. There can be no equivalent in credits to be drawn against. For Europe is not in debt to us. Despite this vast excess of exports we are notoriously in debt to Europe. Neither has the excess of exports been paid in gold or silver. Our exports of gold and silver exceed our imports of those metals. So far as the statistics go, this enormous excess of exports is a dead loss to our country. Yet the McKinley-Roosevelt platform brags about it

as the one single fact that more strikingly than any other tells "the story of what republican government means to the country"! What it does mean in fact is that the extortions of non-resident bondholders, trust owners and landlords have been increased.

In the British statistics a similar story is told as to what British government means to India. According to the Statesman's Year Book for 1899, the excess of exports from India over imports to India averages \$130,000,000 a year; and like our excess of exports it is continuous year by year. There is never a counter-balancing excess of imports. The British government tells about this in its statistics. It has to. But it doesn't brag about it as if such a drain of wealth from India were evidence of prosperity in India.

There is where the McKinley-Roosevelt platform differs from the British government. It actually brags of an enormous drain of wealth from the country, as if that were proof of greater wealth in the country. Its absurd theory is that the more goods an individual or a nation gets rid of, without ever getting anything back—either money, other goods, or an account to draw against—the richer it is! And that is the extraordinary notion upon which protection as an economic theory rests.

This theory found timid expression for the first time in a republican platform in 1872, in this demand for a tariff for revenue with incidental production:

That revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote the industries, prosperity and growth of the whole country.

No advances beyond this had been made by protection in 1876, nor yet in 1880, when the platform in that respect did not materially differ from the plank just quoted; but in 1884 a distinct though still cautious advance may be noted. In that year the platform demanded that—

the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made not "for revenue only," but that in raising the requisite revenues for the government such duties shall be so levied as to af-

ford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor as well as capital may have its just award and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

More boldness was exhibited in 1888, when the platform declared the party to be "uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection," and to meet the demand for a reduction of revenues proposed the repeal of certain internal revenue taxes, and—

such a revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which cannot be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is required for the wants of the government, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system, etc.

By this time the party had fully accepted the protection doctrine, and in 1892 it reaffirmed "the American doctrine of protection," "calling attention to its growth abroad," and unreservedly declaring that—

all articles which cannot be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty; and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be duties levied equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

Until now the notion that the country is enriched by what it exports and not by what it imports and that continuous prosperity therefore requires a continuous excess of exports, had figured only as a stump speech argument, like the kindred notion that the foreigner pays the tax. In this platform of 1892, however, the excessive export notion was formally adopted as a party doctrine in a plank which pointed to the "success of the republican policy of reciprocity," because under it our—

export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops.

This declaration was an advance in unconscionable preparation for the policy of imperialism, so soon to supplement the protection policy. For the business element in the policy of im-

perialism is the belief that trade consists in exporting more than you import, and consequently that the business of the country needs new and enlarged markets for its exports. That may be seen by reference to the McKinley-Roosevelt platform where it advocates an isthmian canal because "every effort should be made to open and obtain new markets, especially in the orient," and to the business arguments that are put forth in support of imperialism. Imperialism is relied upon to afford an outlet for American goods. The idea of enlarging markets for exports was finally clinched in the platform of 1896 with the declaration that—

Protection builds up domestic industry and trade and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.

This advancing policy of protection, put forward by American plutocratic interests in the name of American labor, and out of which has developed the most gigantic aggregation of monopolies the world ever saw, is at bottom a denial of human rights. For it contemplates and has caused the enactment of laws forbidding men to trade their labor and the products of their labor in freedom. That invasion of personal liberty once secured, the total destruction of liberty is only a matter of keeping on. It is not strange, therefore, that the republican party, founded in liberty and dedicated to its establishment, should have drifted with the current of protectionism out upon the unbounded and boundless sea of imperialism. That it has done this is now assured. The McKinley-Roosevelt platform, though it retains some of the phrases, repudiates the great principles of human freedom for which the republican party once stood.

#### IV.

The event in our country's history which opened the way to that repudiation was the Spanish-American war of 1898. It was a war, says the platform, "for liberty and human rights," and "no thought of national aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards were unfurled." All that is true.

But the republican administration did not allow the war to continue as

such a war, nor its high purpose to remain untarnished; and now the platform of the party indorses the recalcant acts of that administration.

When the question of the Spanish war came before congress in April, 1898, the joint resolution demanding that Spain withdraw her forces from Cuba and Cuban waters contained this clause:

Resolved, first, that the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent.

That resolution was adopted with great difficulty, a long contest occurring over the words "are and." The point involved in the contest was the question of the existence of the provisional government of the republic of Cuba. To have cut out the words "are and" would have left the resolution as declaring merely that the people of Cuba ought to be free and independent. But to leave those words in the resolution was to decide that they were then free and independent in their organized capacity as the republic of Cuba. To contest over those two little words was between congressmen and senators who believed that we should assist the republic of Cuba to throw off the Spanish yoke, and others who believed that we should ignore the republic of Cuba altogether; and the question was determined in favor of intervening in behalf of the republic. It was so understood at the time and there was no room to understand it otherwise.

But when the war had got under way the significance of those two words, "and are," was totally disregarded by the administration; and from that time on the resolution, though a law of the land in the form quoted above, was lawlessly treated as if it had read:

Resolved, first, that the people of the island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent.

The republic of Cuba, that is, was ignored in spite of the law, and that was the beginning of the policy of imperialism.

This policy soon developed the Philippine question. As the invasion of the Philippine islands had not been foreseen by congress, which had had no other country than Cuba under consideration, the resolution quoted

above was not in terms applied to those islands. But in spirit it applied to them as well as to Cuba. For there, as in Cuba, the people had risen in rebellion against the Spanish yoke. Yet, because the congressional resolution as to independence had not been expressly applied to the Philippines, the administration, pursuing the policy of imperialism, secured a bare technical title to the islands and proceeded to treat its people literally as "subjects" of the American republic. And now that imperial policy is adopted as the established policy of the republican party in these words:

In accepting by the treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish war, the president and the senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the western Indies and in the Philippine islands. That course created our responsibility before the world and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain, to provide for the maintenance of law and order, and for the establishment of good government, and for the performance of international obligations. Our authority could not be less than our responsibility, and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the government to maintain its authority, to put down armed insurrection, and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples. The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

In fact the people of the Philippines were not an "unorganized population." American official reports show that they had a government of their own which governed the country in liberty and peace. In fact, too, the so-called sovereign rights of the United States did not extend, even technically, beyond Manila, when the administration assumed sovereignty over the whole archipelago and thereby declared war against the native government. But these matters were fully set forth, with extracts from official documents in substantiation, in No. 111 of *The Public*, at page 83. The important part of the platform as quoted above, for consideration at this time, is the last sentence, which promises the Filipinos—the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties.

Compare that imperialist prom-

ise of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform with the truly democratic sentiments of the earlier republican platforms.

In the first platform of the party, that of 1856, we find this:

The maintenance of the principles promulgated in the declaration of independence and embodied in the federal constitution is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.

And in that same platform the doctrine that might makes right was denounced as a highwayman's plea.

Still more explicit on the question of self-government was the republican platform of 1860, the one on which Lincoln was elected. Quoting that clause of the declaration of independence which declares that all men are created equal and endowed with rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," it reasserted that the maintenance of those principles is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions. In 1868 it recognized—

the great principles laid down in the immortal declaration of independence as the true foundation of democratic government.

And in 1876, again quoting the same principles from the declaration of independence, the platform declared:

Until the truths are cheerfully obeyed, or, if need be, vigorously enforced, the work of the republican party is unfinished.

Allegiance to these same principles was reaffirmed in 1884.

But in 1900, after such a record of devotion to the great elementary doctrine of liberty, this party of Lincoln, which discreetly refrains from mentioning his name on this fortieth anniversary of his first election, and dare not quote his immortal words, sinks to that level of autocratic complacency where it dare proclaim its purpose to confer upon 10,000,000 people such measure of self-government as it thinks consistent with their welfare and its duties! The imperial Caesars of declining Rome were not less generous nor more presumptuous.

V.

Having reached this stage of imperialism, the republican party as it

now exists, represented by a McKinley and a Roosevelt and bossed by a Hanna, a Platt and a Quay, could have expressed no greater sympathy than it did for the struggling Boers.

It made this declaration in its platform of 1868:

This convention declares itself in sympathy with all oppressed peoples who are struggling for their rights.

In 1872 it declared that the American government should maintain honorable peace with all nations while—sympathizing with all peoples who strive for greater liberty.

In 1888 it earnestly hoped—that we may soon congratulate our fellow citizens of Irish birth upon the peaceful recovery of home rule for Ireland.

And in 1892 it declared—

The republican party has always been the champion of the oppressed, and recognizes the dignity of manhood irrespective of faith, color or nationality. It sympathizes with the cause of home rule in Ireland, and protests against the persecution of the Jews in Russia.

But now that the national life of the two South African republics hangs in the balance, with an enormous imperial army from Britain invading their country against the resistance of one barely a tenth as large and asserting an intention to destroy every shred of their independence, all that the McKinley-Roosevelt remnant of the grand old champion of the oppressed can say is this:

While the American government must continue the policy prescribed by Washington, affirmed by every succeeding president, and imposed upon us by The Hague treaty, of non-intervention in European controversies, the American people earnestly hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to determine the strife between them.

Non-intervention in European affairs cuts no figure when these American imperialists talk grandly of abandoning the "little Americanism" of Washington and blooming out as "a world power" in copartnership with the empires of Europe. But when two little republics are in a fight for existence with one of those European empires, the American imperialists cannot even hope for their independence. They can hope only for honorable peace! That is what Great Britain offers—honorable peace without independence.

The whole democratic life appears to have gone out of the republican party. Nothing but the old shell is left and that is vitalized by an all-absorbing imperial ambition.

## VI.

The form which this ambition takes is indicated by the clause of the McKinley-Roosevelt platform already quoted with reference to the Philippines. It is the form of colonial empire, under which such measure of self-government is to be given as this government may think consistent with the welfare of its subjects and its duties regarding them. That is not national growth; it is colonial acquisition. It is not expansion, but imperialism.

This policy rests upon the theory that the colonies or territories are not within the protection of the constitution and have no right to become states in the union.

But that was not always the doctrine of the republican party. While it is true that the platform of 1856 declared that—

the constitution confers upon congress sovereign power over the territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the imperative duty of congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery—

that declaration did not mean and was never understood by the party to mean that constitutional guarantees do not extend over territories.

This is evident from the same platform, which charged the then federal administration with a "high crime against the constitution," for acts done in a territory. It is further evident from a plank in the republican platform of 1860, which insisted, though that was long prior to the anti-slavery amendment, that slavery cannot constitutionally exist in a territory.

Neither did the declaration quoted above imply that the admission of territories into the union as states is mere matter of congressional grace and not an inherent right. In the platform of 1888 the declaration quoted above from the platform of 1856 was supplemented by this entirely harmonious and genuinely democratic explanation:

The government by congress of the territories is based upon necessity, only to the end that they may become states in the Union. Therefore, whenever the conditions of population, material resources, public intelligence and morality are such as to insure a stable local government therein, the people of such territories should be permitted as a right inherent in them to form for themselves constitutions and state governments and be admitted into the Union.

By no ingenuity can these declarations of inherent right in the territories be harmonized with the doctrine of absolute federal power over territories, to which the McKinley-Roosevelt party is now formally committed. That doctrine is not a development from those declarations; it is in absolute hostility to them.

The republican party has reversed itself. From a democratic party in the true sense of that much-abused term, it has become, like the tory party of England, an imperialist party. Having abandoned the declaration of independence and turned its back upon Lincoln's ideal of a government not only of and for the people but by the people, it is now no more the party of Lincoln than the slavery-ridden democratic party of Buchanan was the party of Jackson or of Jefferson.

## NEWS

Though the newspapers have been vocal this week with sensational rumors about the situation in China, they have not been able to publish much trustworthy news. The only authenticated fact of importance is the taking of Tientsin by the allied foreign forces.

Tientsin is the port of Peking. It lies up the Peiho river 30 miles above Taku, which, as explained last week, is a fortified place at the mouth of this river on the Gulf of Pechili. There were reports on the 22d that the American consulate at Tientsin had been destroyed and other foreign property badly damaged on the 18th, after a bombardment of the foreign quarter by Boxers and Chinese troops lasting 36 hours, the assailants being resisted by a foreign garrison of some 3,000 troops, mostly Russians. A large foreign force was then massing at Taku for their relief. The next day