# BRYAN'S PLAIN TALK

## Discusses Paramount Questions of the Democratic Platform.

## EVILS OF REPUBLICAN POLICIES.

### Rights of the People in United States and Acquired Territories—Dangers of Imperialism and Militarism—The True Republic.

In response to the tender of the nomination for the presidency by the notification committee of the democracy, at Indianapolis, Wednesday, August 8, William J. Bryan said:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Notification Committee: I shall, at an early day, and in a more formal manner, accept the nomination which you tender, and I shall at that time discuss the various questions covered by the democratic platform. It may not be out of place, however, to submit a few observations at this time upon the general character of the contest before us, and upon the question which is declared to be of paramount importance in this campaign.

When I say that the contest of 1900 is a contest between democracy on the one hand and plutocracy on the other, I do not mean to say that all our opponents have deliberately chosen to give to organized wealth a predominating influence in the affairs of the government, but I do assert that on the important issues of the day the republican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to elevate pecuniary considerations and ignore human rights.

In 1859 Lincoln said that the republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar. This is the proper relation which should exist between the two. Man, the handiwork of God, comes first; money, the handiwork of man, is of inferior importance. Man is the master, money the servant; but upon all important questions to-day, republican legislation tends to make money the master and man the servant.

The maxim of Jefferson, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and the doctrine of Lincoln that this should be "a government of the people, by the people and for the people," are being disregarded and the instrumentalities of government are being used to advance the interests of those who are in a position to secure favors from the government.

#### The Desire of Democracy.

The democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage industry, economy and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stimulus to honest toil, when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are respected. Democracy strives for a civilization in which the reward of society will share according to his merits.

No one has a right to expect from society more than a fair compensation for the service which he renders to society. If he secures more, it is at the expense of some one else. It is no injustice to him to prevent his doing injustice to another. To him who would, either through class legislation or in the absence of necessary legislation, trespass upon the rights of another, the democratic party says, "Thou shalt not."

#### Republican Excuses.

Against us are arrayed a comparatively small, but politically and financially powerful, number who really profit by republican policies; but with them are associated a large number who, because of their attachment to their party name, are giving their support to doctrines antagonistic to the former teachings of their own party. Republicans who used to advocate bimetalism, now try to convince themselves that the gold standard is good; republicans who were formerly attached to the greenback are now seeking an excuse for giving national banks control of the nation's paper money; republicans who used to boast that the republican party was paying off the national debt, are now looking for reasons to support a perpetual and increasing debt; republicans who formerly abhorred a trust, now beguile themselves with the delusion that there are good trusts and bad trusts, while, in their minds, the line between the two is becoming more and more obscure; republicans who, in times past, congratulated the country upon the small expense of our standing army, are now making light of the objections which are urged against a large increase in the permanent military establishment; republicans who gloried in our independence when the nation was less powerful, now look with favor upon a foreign alliance; republicans who three years ago condemned "forcible annexation" as immoral and even criminal, are now sure that it is both immoral and criminal to oppose forcible annexation. That partisanship has already blinded many to present dangers is certain; how large a portion of the republican party can be drawn over to the new policies remains to be seen.

For a time republican leaders were inclined to deny to opponents the right to criticise the Philippine policy of the administration, but upon investigation they found that both Lincoln and Clay asserted and exercised the right to criticise a president during the progress of the Mexican war.

Instead of meeting the issue boldly and submitting a clear and positive plan for dealing with the Philippine question, the republican convention adopted a platform the larger part of which was devoted to boasting and self-congratulation.

In attempting to press economic questions upon the country to the exclusion of those which involve the very structure of our government, the republican leaders give new evidence of their abandonment of the earlier ideals of the party and of their complete subserviency to pecuniary considerations.

#### No Evasion.

But they shall not be permitted to evade the stupendous and far-reaching issue which they have deliberately brought into the arena of politics. When the president, supported by a practically unanimous vote of the house and senate, entered upon a war with Spain for the purpose of aiding the struggling patriots of Cuba, the country, without regard to party, applauded. Although the democrats recognized that the administration would necessarily gain a political advantage from the conduct of a war which, in the very nature of the case, must soon end in a complete victory, they vied with the republicans in the support which they gave to the president. When the war was over and the republican leaders began to suggest the propriety of a colonial policy, opposition at once manifested itself. When the president finally laid before the senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of this country.

#### Trust in the People.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the excuse for war expenditures, and then give to the Filipinos the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty.

In view of the criticism which my action aroused in some quarters I take this occasion to restate the reasons given at that time. I thought it safer to trust the American people to give independence to the Filipinos than to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unfriendly nation. Lincoln embodied an argument in the question, when he asked: "Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected. With the treaty ratified, a clean cut issue is presented between a government by consent and a government by force, and imperialists must bear the responsibility for all that happens until the question is settled. If the treaty had been rejected, the opponents of imperialism would have been held responsible for any international complications which might have arisen before the ratification of another treaty. But whatever differences of opinion may have existed as to the best method of opposing the colonial policy, there never was any difference as to the great importance of the question and there is no difference now as to the course to be pursued.

#### Promises to the Filipinos.

The title of Spain being extinguished, we were at liberty to deal with the Filipinos according to American principles. The Bacon resolution, introduced a month before hostilities broke out at Manila, promised independence to the Filipinos on the same terms that it was promised to the Cubans. I supported this resolution and believe that its adoption prior to the breaking out of hostilities would have prevented bloodshed, and that its adoption at any subsequent time would have ended hostilities.

If the treaty had been rejected, considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified, and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind. If the Bacon resolution had been adopted by the senate and carried out by the president, either at the time of the ratification of the treaty or at any time afterwards, it would have taken the question of imperialism out of politics and left the American people free to deal with their domestic problems. But the resolution was defeated by the vote of the republican vice president, and from that time to this a republican congress has refused to take any action whatever in the matter.

#### Cowardly Accusations.

When hostilities broke out at Manila, republican speakers and republican editors at once sought to lay the blame upon those who had delayed the ratification of the treaty, and, during the progress of the war, the same republicans have accused the opponents of imperialism of giving encouragement to the Filipinos. This is a cowardly evasion of responsibility.

If it is right for the United States to hold the Philippine islands permanently and imitate European empires in the government of colonies, the republican party ought to state its position and defend it, but it must expect the subject races to protest against such a policy and to resist to the extent of their ability. The Filipinos do not need any encouragement from Americans now living. Our whole history has been an encouragement, not only to the Filipinos but to all who are denied a voice in their own government. If the republicans are prepared to censure all who have used language calculated to make the Filipinos hate foreign domination, let them condemn the speech of Patrick Henry. When he uttered that passionate appeal: "Give me liberty or give me death," he expressed a sentiment which still echoes in the hearts of men. Let them censure Jefferson; of all the statesmen of history, none have used words so offensive to those who would hold their fellows in political bondage. Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must choose between liberty and slavery. Or, if the statute of limitations has run against the sins of Henry and Jefferson and Washington, let them censure Lincoln, whose Gettysburg speech will be quoted in defense of popular government when the present advocates of force and conquest are forgotten.

Some one has said that a truth once spoken can never be recalled. It is true. It goes on and on, and no one can set a limit to its ever widening influence. But if it were possible to obliterate every word written or spoken in defense of the principles set forth in the declaration of independence, a war of conquest would still leave the legacy of perpetual hatred, for it was God Himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. He never made a race of people so low in the scale of civilization or intelligence that it would welcome a foreign master.

Lincoln said that the safety of this nation was not in its fleets, its armies or its forts, but in the spirit which prizes liberty and the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere; and he warned his countrymen that they could not destroy this spirit without planting the seeds of despotism at their own doors.

Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos, but they must also calculate its effect upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here.

#### Paralyzing Imperialism.

Even now we are beginning to see the paralyzing influence of imperialism. Heretofore, this nation has been prompt to express its sympathy with those who were fighting for civil liberty. While our sphere of activity has been limited to the western hemisphere, our sympathies have not been bounded by the seas. We have felt it due to ourselves and to the world, as well as to those who were struggling for the right to govern themselves, to proclaim the interest which our people have, from the date of their own independence, felt in every contest between human rights and arbitrary power. Three-quarters of a century ago, when our nation was small, the struggles of Greece aroused our people, and Webster and Clay gave eloquent expression to the universal desire for Grecian independence. In 1896, all parties manifested a lively interest in the success of the Cubans, but now when a war is in progress in South Africa, which must result in the extension of the monarchial idea or in the triumph of a republic, the advocates of imperialism in this country dare not say a word in behalf of the Boers. Sympathy for the Boers does not arise from any unfriendliness toward England; the American people are not unfriendly toward the people of any nation. This sympathy is due to the fact that, as stated in our platform, we believe in the principle of self-government and reject, as did our forefathers, the claims of monarchy. If this nation surrenders its belief in the universal application of the principles set forth in the declaration of independence, it will lose the prestige and influence which it has enjoyed among the nations as an exponent of popular government.

Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to confuse imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and used language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one occasion he declared: "If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest." And again he said: "Conquest is not in our principles; it is inconsistent with our government."

#### Right Kind of Expansion.

The forcible annexation of territory to be governed by arbitrary power differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into states as a monarchy differs from a democracy. The democratic party does not oppose expansion, when expansion enlarges the area of the republic and incorporates land which can be settled by American citizens, or adds to our population people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other tracts which have been secured from time to time, enlarged the republic, and the constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory already more densely populated than our own country, and to force upon the people a government, for which there is no warrant in our constitution or our laws. Even the argument that this earth belongs to those who desire to cultivate it and have the physical power to acquire it cannot be invoked to justify the appropriation of the Philippine islands by the United States. If the islands were uninhabited American citizens would not be willing to go there and till the soil. The white race will not live so near the equator. Other nations have tried to colonize in the same latitude. The Netherlands have controlled Java for 300 years, and yet to-day there are less than 60,000 people of European birth scattered among 25,000,000 natives. After a century and a half of English domination in India, less than one-twentieth of one per cent. of the people of India are of English birth, and it requires an army of 70,000 British soldiers to take care of the tax collectors. Spain has asserted title to the Philippine islands for three centuries, and yet, when our fleet entered Manila bay, there were less than 10,000 Spaniards residing in the Philippines.

A colonial policy means that we shall send to the Philippines a few traders, a few taskmasters and a few office holders, and an army large enough to support the authority of a small fraction of the people while they rule the natives.

#### Increase in Regular Army.

If we have an imperial policy we must have a large standing army as its natural and necessary complement. The spirit which will justify the forcible annexation of the Philippine islands will justify the seizure of other islands and the domination of other people, and with wars of conquest we can expect a certain, if not rapid, growth of our military establishment. That a large permanent increase in our regular army is intended by the republican leaders is not a mere matter of conjecture, but a matter of fact. In his message of December 5, 1898, the president asked for authority to increase the standing army to 100,000. In 1899 the army contained about 25,000 men. Within two years the president asked for four times that many, and a republican house of representatives complied with the request after the Spanish treaty had been signed and no country was at war with the United States. If such an army is demanded when an imperial policy is contemplated, but not openly avowed, what may be expected if the people encourage the republican party by indorsing its policy at the polls? A large standing army is not only a pecuniary burden to the people and, if accompanied by compulsory service, a constant source of irritation, but it is ever a menace to a republican form of government. The army is the personification of force, and militarism will inevitably change the ideals of our people as it draws into its ranks our young men from the arts of peace to the science of war. The government which relies for its defense upon its citizens is more likely to be just than one which has at call a large body of professional soldiers. A small standing army and a well equipped and well disciplined state militia are sufficient in ordinary times, and in an emergency the nation should in the future as in the past place its dependence upon the volunteers who come from all occupations of life to the country's call and return to productive labor when their services are no longer required—men who fight when the country needs fighters and work when the country needs workers.

#### Status of the Filipinos.

The republican platform assumes that the Philippine islands will be retained under American sovereignty, and we have a right to demand of the republican leaders a discussion of the future status of the Filipino. Is he to be a citizen or a subject? Are we to bring into the body politic 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 Asiatics, so different from us in race and history that amalgamation is impossible? Are they to share with us in making the laws and shaping the destiny of this nation? No republican of prominence has been bold enough to advocate such a proposition. The McEnery resolution, adopted by the senate and democratic house after the ratification of the treaty, expressly negatives this idea. The democratic platform describes the situation when it says that the Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization. Who will dispute it? And what is the alternative? If the Filipino is not to be a citizen, shall we make him a subject? On that question the democratic platform speaks with emphasis. It declares that the Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government, for we cannot have no subjects. A subject is possible only in a government resting upon force; he is unknown in a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. The republican platform says that "the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them (the Filipinos) by law." This is a strange doctrine for a government which owes its very existence to the men who offered their lives as a protest against government without consent and taxation without representation. In what respect does the position of the republican party differ from the position taken by the English government in 1776? Did not the English government promise a good government to the colonists? What king ever promised a bad government to his people? Did not the English government promise that the colonists should have the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and English duties? Did not the Spanish government promise to give to the Cubans the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and Spanish duties? The whole difference between a monarchy and a republic may be summed up in one sentence. In a monarchy the king gives to the people what he believes to be a good government; in a republic the people secure for themselves what they believe to be a good government. The republican party has accepted the European idea and planted itself upon the ground taken by George III. and by every ruler who distrusts the capacity of the people for self-government or denies them a voice in their own affairs.

#### The President's Will the Only Law.

The republican platform promises that some measure of self-government is to be given to the Filipinos by law; but, even this pledge is not fulfilled. Nearly 16 months elapsed after the ratification of the treaty before the adjournment of congress last June, and yet no law was passed dealing with the Philippine situation. The will of the president has been the only law in the Philippine islands wherever the American authority extends. Why does the republican party hesitate to legislate upon the Philippine question? Because a law would disclose the radical departure from history and precedent contemplated by those who control the republican party. The storm of protest which greeted the Porto Rican bill was an indication of what may be expected when the American people are brought face to face with legislation upon this subject. If the Porto Ricans, who welcome annexation, are to be denied the guarantees of our constitution, what is to be done with the Filipinos, who resisted our authority? If secret influences could compel a disregard of our plain duty toward friendly people, living near our shores, what treatment will those same influences provide for unfriendly people 7,000 miles away? If, in this country where the people have the right to vote, republican leaders dare not take the side of the people against the great monopolies which have grown up within the last few years, how can they be trusted to protect the Filipinos from the corporations which are waiting to exploit the islands?

Is the sunlight of full citizenship to be enjoyed by the people of the United States, and the twilight of semi-citizenship endured by the people of Porto Rico, while the thick darkness of perpetual vassalage covers the Philippines? The Porto Rico tariff law asserts the doctrine that the operation of the constitution is confined to the 45 states. The democratic party disputes this doctrine and denounces it as repugnant to both the letter and spirit of our organic law. There is no place in our system of government for the deposit of arbitrary and irresponsible power. That the leaders of a great party should claim for any president or congress the right to treat millions of people as mere "possessions" and deal with them unrestrained by the constitution or the bill of rights shows how far we have already departed from the ancient landmarks, and indicates what may be expected if this nation deliberately enters upon a career of empire. The territorial form of government is temporary and preparatory, and the chief security a citizen of a territory has is found in the fact that he enjoys the same constitutional guarantees and is subject to the same general laws as a citizen of a state. Take away this security and his rights will be violated and his interest sacrificed at the demand of those who have political influence. This is the evil of the colonial system, no matter by what nation it is applied.

#### Title to the Philippines.

What is our title to the Philippine islands? Do we hold them by treaty or by conquest? Did we buy them or did we take them? Did we purchase the people? If not, how did we secure title to them? Were they thrown in with the land? Will the republicans say that inanimate earth has value, and when that earth is molded by the Divine hand and stamped with the likeness of the Creator it becomes a fixture and passes with the soil? If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, it is impossible to secure title to people, either by force or by purchase. We could extinguish Spain's title by treaty, but if we hold title we must hold it by some method consistent with our ideas of government. When we made allies of the Filipinos and armed them to fight against Spain, we disputed Spain's title. If we buy Spain's title we are not innocent purchasers. But even if we had not disputed Spain's title, she could transfer no greater title than she had, and her title was based on force alone. We cannot defend such a title, but, as Spain gave us a quit claim deed, we can honorably turn the property over to the party in possession. Whether any American official gave the Filipinos formal assurance of independence is not material. There can be no doubt that we accepted and utilized the services of the Filipinos, and that when we did so we had full knowledge that they were fighting for their own independence, and I submit that history furnishes no example of turpitude baser than ours if we now substitute our yoke for the Spanish yoke.

Let us consider briefly the reasons which have been given in support of an imperialistic policy. Some say that it is our duty to hold the Philippine islands. But duty is not an argument; it is a conclusion. To ascertain what our duty is, in any emergency, we must apply well-settled and generally accepted principles. It is our duty to avoid stealing, no matter whether the thing to be stolen is of great or little value. It is our duty to avoid killing a human being, no matter where the human being lives or to what race or class he belongs. Everyone recognizes the obligation imposed upon individuals to observe both the human and moral laws, but, as some deny the application of those laws to nations, it may not be out of place to quote the opinion of others. Jefferson, than whom there is no higher political authority, said:

"I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively."

Franklin, whose learning, wisdom and virtue are a part of the priceless legacy bequeathed to us from the revolutionary days, expressed the same idea in even stronger language when he said:

"Justice is as strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when singly; and the nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."

#### Force Creates No Right.

Men may dare to do in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals, but the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join in it. Force can defend a right, but force has never yet created a right. It was true, as declared in the resolutions of intervention, that the Cubans "are and of right ought to be free and independent" (language taken from the declaration of independence), it is equally true that the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be free and independent." The right of the Cubans to freedom was not based upon their proximity to the United States, nor upon the language which they spoke, nor yet upon the race or races to which they belonged. Congress by a practically unanimous vote declared that the principles enunciated at Philadelphia in 1776 were still alive and applicable to the Cubans.

Who will draw a line between the natural rights of the Cubans and the Filipinos? Who will say that the former has a right to liberty and that the latter has no rights which we are bound to respect? And, if the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be free and independent," what right have we to force our government upon them without their consent? Before our duty can be ascertained, their rights must be determined, and when their rights are once determined, it is as much our duty to respect those rights as it was the duty of Spain to respect the rights of the people of Cuba, or the duty of England to respect the rights of the American colonists. Rights never conflict; duties never clash. Can it be our duty to usurp political rights which belong to others? Can it be our duty to those who, following the example of our forefathers, love liberty well enough to fight for it?

Some poet has described the terror which overcame a soldier who, in the midst of battle, discovered that he had slain his brother. It is written: "All ye are brethren." Let us hope for the coming of the day when human life—which, when once destroyed, cannot be restored—will be so sacred that it will never be taken except when necessary to punish a crime already committed, or to prevent a crime about to be committed.

If it is said that we have assumed before the world obligations which make it necessary for us to permanently maintain a government in the Philippine islands, I reply, first, that the highest obligation of this nation is to be true to itself. No obligation to any particular nation, or to all nations combined, can require the abandonment of our theory of government and the substitution of doctrines against which our whole national life has been a protest. And, second, that our obligations to the Filipinos, who inhabit the islands, are greater than any obligations which we can owe to foreigners who have a temporary residence in the Philippines or desire to trade there.

#### Capacity of Self-Government.

It is argued by some that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government and that therefore we owe it to the world to take control of them. Admiral Dewey, in an official report to the navy department, declared the Filipinos more capable of self-government than the Cubans, and said that he based his opinion upon a knowledge of both races. But I will not rest the case upon the relative advancement of the Filipinos. Henry Clay, in defending the rights of the people of South America to self-government, said:

"It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then remanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the disposition of Providence himself, to suppose that He has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man."

Clay was right. There are degrees of proficiency in the art of self-government, but it is a reflection upon the Creator to say that He denied to any people the capacity of self-government. Once admit that some people are capable of self-government, and that others are not, and that the capable people have a right to seize upon and govern the incapable, and you make force—brute force—the only foundation of government and invite the reign of the despot. I am not willing to believe that an all-wise and an all-loving God created the Filipinos, and then left them thousands of years helpless until the islands attracted the attention of European nations.

Republicans ask: "Shall we haul down the flag that floats over our dead in the Philippines?" The same question might have been asked when the American flag floated over Chapultepec and waved over the dead who fell there; but the tourist who visits the City of Mexico finds there a national cemetery owned by the United States and cared for by an American citizen. Our flag still floats over our dead, but when the treaty with Mexico was signed American authority withdrew to the Rio Grande, and I venture the opinion that during the last 50 years the people of Mexico have made more progress under the stimulus of independence and self-government than they would have made under a carpet-bag government held in place by bayonets. The United States and Mexico, friendly republics, are each stronger and happier than they would have been had the former been cursed and the latter crushed by an imperialistic policy, disguised as "benevolent assimilation."

#### Responsibility of the Nation.

"Can we not govern colonies?" we are asked. The question is not what we can do, but what we ought to do. This nation can do whatever it desires to do, but it must accept responsibility for what it does. If the constitution stands in the way, the people can amend the constitution. I repeat, the nation can do whatever it desires to do, but it cannot avoid the natural and legitimate results of its own conduct. The young man upon reaching his majority can do what he pleases. He can disregard the teachings of his parents; he can trample upon all that he has been taught to consider sacred; he can disobey the laws of the state, the laws of society and the laws of God. He can stamp failure upon his life and make his very existence a curse to his fellow men, and he can bring his father and mother in sorrow to the grave; but he cannot annul the sentence: "The wages of sin is death." And so with this nation. It is of age, and it can do what it pleases; it can spurn the traditions of the past; it can repudiate the principles upon which the nation rests; it can employ force instead of reason; it can substitute might for right; it can conquer weaker people; it can exploit their lands, appropriate their property and kill their people; but it cannot repeal the moral law or escape the punishment decreed for the violation of human rights.

"Would we tread in the paths of tyranny,
Nor reckon the tyrant's cost?
Who taketh another's liberty,
His freedom is also lost.
Would we win as the strong have ever won,
Make ready to pay the debt,
For the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet."

Some argue that American rule in the Philippine islands will result in the better education of the Filipinos. Be not deceived. If we expect to maintain a colonial policy we shall not find it to our advantage to educate the people. The educated Filipinos are now in revolt against us, and the most ignorant ones have made the least resistance to our domination. If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the declaration of independence and the constitution of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency.

The principal arguments, however, advanced by those who enter upon a defense of imperialism are:

First, That we must improve the present opportunity to become a world power and enter into international politics.

Second, That our commercial interests in the Philippine islands and in the orient make it necessary for us to hold the islands permanently.

Third, That the spread of the Christian religion will be facilitated by a colonial policy.

Fourth, That there is no honorable retreat from the position which the nation has taken.

The first argument is addressed to the nation's pride and the second to the nation's pocketbook. The third is intended for the church member and the fourth for the partisan.

#### Growth of a Principle.

It is a sufficient answer to the first argument to say that for more than a century this nation has been a world power. For ten decades it has been the most potent influence in the world. Not only has it been a world power, but it has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations of the world combined. Because our declaration of independence was promulgated, others have been promulgated. Because the patriots of 1776 fought for liberty others have fought for it; because our constitution was adopted, other constitutions have been adopted. The growth of the principle of self-government, planted on American soil, has been the overshadowing political fact of the nineteenth century. It has made this nation conspicuous among the nations and given it a place in history such as no other nation has ever enjoyed. Nothing has been able to check the onward march of this idea. I am not willing that this nation shall cast aside the omnipotent weapon of truth to seize again the weapon of physical warfare. I would not exchange the glory of this republic for the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

The permanent chairman of the last republican national convention presented the pecuniary argument in all its boldness, when he said:

"We make no hypocritical pretenses of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of these people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first. We see our duty to ourselves as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion. By every legitimate means within the province of government and constitution, we mean to stimulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

This is the commercial argument. It is based upon the theory that war can be profitably waged for pecuniary advantage, and that it is profitable to purchase trade by force and violence. Franklin denied both of these propositions. When Lord Howe asserted that the acts of parliament, which brought on the revolution, were necessary to prevent American trade from passing into foreign channels, Franklin replied:

"To me it seems that neither the obtaining nor retaining of any trade, how valuable soever, is an object for which men may justly spill each others blood; that war is not a sure means of extending and securing commerce are the goodness and cheapness of commodities, and that the profits of no trade can ever be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets and armies. I consider such wars as robberies, therefore, as both unjust and unwise."

I place the philosophy of Franklin against the sordid doctrine of those who would put a price upon the life of an American soldier and justify a war of conquest upon the ground that it will pay. The democratic party is in favor of the expansion of trades. It would extend our trade by every legitimate and peaceful means; but it is not willing to make merchandise of the blood.

But a war of conquest is as unwise as it is unrighteous. A harbor and coaling station in the Philippines would answer every trade and military necessity and such a concession could have been secured at any time without difficulty.

It is not necessary to own people in order to trade with them. We carry on trade to-day with every part of the world, and our commerce has expanded more rapidly than the commerce of any European empire. We do not own Japan or China, but we trade with their people. We have not absorbed the republics of Central and South America, but we trade with them. It has not been necessary to have any political connections with Canada or the nations of Europe in order to trade with them. Trade cannot be permanently profitable unless it is voluntary. When trade is secured by force, the cost of securing it and retaining it must be taken out of the profits, and the profits are never large enough to cover the expense. Such a system would never be defended but for the fact that the expense is borne by all the people, while the profits are enjoyed by the few.

#### Evils of Imperialism.

Imperialism would be profitable to the army contractors; it would be profitable to the shipowners, who would carry live soldiers to the Philippines and bring dead soldiers back; it would be profitable to those who would seize upon the franchises, and it would be profitable to the officials whose salaries would be fixed here and paid over there; but to the farmer, to the laboring man and to the vast majority of those engaged in other occupations, it would bring expenditure without return and risk without reward.

Farmers and laboring men have, as a rule, small incomes, and, under systems which place the tax upon all consumption, pay more than their fair share of the expenses of government. Thus the very people who receive least benefit from imperialism will be injured most by the military burdens which accompany it.

In addition to the evils which he and the farmer share in common, the laboring man will be the first to suffer if oriental subjects seek work in the United States; the first to suffer if American capital leaves our shores to employ oriental labor in the Philippines to supply the trade of China and Japan; the first to suffer from the violence which the military spirit arouses, and the first to suffer when the methods of imperialism are applied to our own government.

It is not strange, therefore, that the labor organizations have been quick to note the approach of these dangers and prompt to protest against both militarism and imperialism.

The pecuniary argument, though more effective with certain classes, is not likely to be used so often or presented with so much emphasis as the religious argument. If what has been termed the "gunpowder gospel" were urged against the Filipinos only, it would be a sufficient answer to say that a majority of the Filipinos are now members of one branch of the Christian church; but the principle involved is one of much wider application and challenges serious consideration.

The religious argument varies in positiveness from a passive belief that Providence delivered the Filipinos into our hands, for their good and our glory, to the exultation of the minister who said that we ought to "thrash the natives (Filipinos) until they understand who we are," and that "every bullet sent, every cannon shot and every flag waved means righteousness."

#### No Gatling Gossip.

We cannot approve of this doctrine in one place unless we are willing to apply it everywhere. If there is poison in the blood of the hand it will ultimately reach the heart. It is equally true that forcible Christianity, if planted under the American flag in the far-away orient, will sooner or later be transplanted upon American soil. If true Christianity consists in carrying out in our daily lives the teachings of Christ, who will say that we are commanded to civilize with dynamite and proselyte with the sword? He who would declare the Divine will must prove his authority either by Holy Writ or by evidence of a special dispensation. The command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," has no Gatling gun attachment. When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive Him, some of the disciples suggested that fire should be called down from Heaven to avenge the insult; but the Master rebuked them, and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Suppose He had said: "We will thrash them until they understand who we are," how different would have been the history of Christianity! Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of imperialism with the Golden Rule and the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart. A missionary recently told me that the stars and stripes once saved his life because his assailant recognized our flag as a flag that had no blood upon it. Let it be known that our missionaries are seeking souls instead of sovereignty; let it be known that instead of being the advance guard of conquering armies, they are going forth to help and to uplift, having their loins girt about with truth and their feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of Peace, wearing the breastplate of righteousness and carrying the sword of the Spirit; let it be known that they are the citizens of a nation which respects the rights of the citizens of other nations as carefully as it protects the rights of its own citizens, and the welcome given to our missionaries will be more cordial than the welcome extended to the missionaries of any other nation.

The argument, made by some, that it was unfortunate for the nation that it had anything to do with the Philippine islands, but that the naval victory at Manila made the permanent acquisition of those islands necessary, is also unsound. We were not in a position at San Juan hill to have did not compel us to hold Cuba. The shedding of American blood in the Philippine islands does not make it imperative that we should retain possession forever; American blood was shed at San Juan hill and El Caney, and yet the president has promised the Cubans independence. The fact that the American flag floats over Manila does not compel us to exercise perpetual sovereignty over the islands; that flag waves over Havana to-day, but the president has promised to haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic is ready to rise in its place. Better a thousand times that our flag in the orient give way to a flag representing the idea of self-government than that the flag of this republic should become the flag of an empire.

#### An Honorable Solution.

There is an easy, honest, honorable solution of the Philippine question. It is set forth in the democratic platform and it is submitted with confidence to the American people. This plan I unreservedly indorse. If elected, I shall convene congress in extraordinary session as soon as I am inaugurated, and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose, first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in the island of Cuba; second, to give independence to the Filipinos, just as we have promised to give independence to the Cubans; third, to protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, at least by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba. An European protectorate often results in the exploitation of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a shield to neighboring republics and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burden upon us. After the Filipinos had aided us in the war against Spain it would not generously turn them over to their former masters; we could not leave them to be the victims of the ambitious designs of the European nations, and since we do not desire to make them a part of us, or to hold them as subjects, we propose the only alternative, namely, to give them independence and guard them against molestation from without.

When our opponents are unable to defend their position by argument they fall back upon the assertion that it is destiny, and insist that we must submit to it, no matter how much it violates moral precepts and our principles of government. This is a complacent philosophy. It obliterates the distinction between right and wrong and makes individuals and nations the helpless victims of circumstances.

Destiny is the subterfuge of the invertebrate, who, lacking the courage to oppose error, seeks some plausible excuse for supporting it. Washington said that the destiny of the republican form of government was deeply, if not finally, staked on the experiment intrusted to the American people. How different Washington's definition of destiny from the republican definition. The republicans say that this nation is in the hands of destiny; Washington believed that not only the destiny of our own nation, but the destiny of the republican form of government throughout the world was intrusted to American hands. Washington was right. The destiny of this republic is in the hands of its own people, upon the success of the experiment here rests the hope of humanity. No exterior force can disturb this republic, and no foreign influence should be permitted to change its course. What the future has in store for this nation no one has authority to declare, but each individual has his own idea of the nation's mission and he owes it to his country as well as to himself to contribute as best he may to the fulfillment of that mission.

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee: I can never fully discharge the debt of gratitude which I owe to my countrymen for the honors which they have so generously bestowed upon me; but, sirs, whether it be my lot to occupy the high office for which the convention has named me, or to spend the remainder of my days in private life, it shall be my constant ambition and my controlling purpose to aid in realizing the high ideals of those whose wisdom and courage and sacrifices brought this republic into existence.

I can conceive of a national destiny surpassing the glories of the present and the past—a destiny which meets the responsibilities of to-day and measures up to the possibilities of the future. Behold a republic, resting securely upon the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth—a republic applying in practice and proclaiming to the world the self-evident proposition: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Behold a republic in which civil and religious liberty stimulates all to earnest endeavor and in which the law restrains every impulse for a neighbor's injury—a republic in which every citizen is a sovereign, but in which no one cares to wear a crown. Behold a republic standing erect while empires all around it are bowed beneath the weight of their own armaments—a republic whose flag is loved while other flags are only feared. Behold a republic increasing in population, in wealth, in strength and in influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of a universal brotherhood—a republic which shakes thrones and dissolves aristocracies by its silent example and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness. Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a republic whose history, like the path of the just, "is as the shining light that shineth more and more into the perfect day."

# PROUD DOROTHY.

Despite his fine qualities Culbertson was a very modest fellow, and no word of his love for Dorothy had ever passed his lips. He was no coxcomb, and though he was conscious of his ability to hold his own among men he saw in himself no quality to attract women. So when the proud Miss Preston treated him with even less consideration than she bestowed on her other admirers he accepted it all as only what was due him and went his way in silence.

Meanwhile Dorothy Preston chafed and groaned in spirit under the sting of wounded pride. She refused to see what was patent to every one else—that Fred Culbertson loved her—and only knew that she had, after a struggle, given her heart to a man who had never spoken an affectionate word to her.

It was after a ball one night that her position first came so strongly home to her mind. She had long tried to deny to herself this passion of her heart, but now it rose a strong, full blown love and clamored to be heard. She clasped her hands and with flushed face admitted to herself that she loved Ned Culbertson.

"Shame, shame upon me!" she cried, "I love him, and he has never given me a word, and they call me proud too." Her lips curled, and she half laughed.

"Well, I will be proud. I will be too proud to let it be known that I have given my heart unsought to a man who"—

She did not finish the sentence, but the blood flamed up into her cheeks and over her forehead, the tears came into her eyes, and she clinched her hands sharply together.

From that time on if Ned Culbertson had any faint gleams of hope they must have been entirely extinguished, for Dorothy Preston's manners toward him were a revelation of frigid disdain. Did she touch his hand in the dance, it was shrinkingly, as if she abhorred the slight contact. Did she speak to him, it was with such distant hauteur that his blood froze. And so it continued until he was in despair.

Alone in his office one evening during a busy week he was trying to finish some complicated designs for the interior of a church which was soon to be erected. Could one have peeped at him as he sat with bent head over his work, drawing hard at a cigar, one would have said that he was all absorbed in the labor before him.

But any such thought would have been efficiently routed when he suddenly sprang to his feet and, dashing his pencil into a corner, exclaimed:

"I can't do it, confound it! I can't! With that girl's face before my eyes constantly I am getting as incapable of thought or performance as an imbecile. And what does it all amount to? She looks at me as if she would like to walk over me, and when she speaks it's like pouring ice water over my head. I can't do anything this way. Rather than endure this suspense I would tell her and have her freeze me with a gl