

its behalf. He urged the ratification of the treaty, knowing that it meant war with the Filipinos; knowing that it meant the acquisition of territory by conquest.

Senator Money spoke even more prophetically than he knew when he said,

Prophetic. "we have already embarked in a war

that will not release the volunteers, and thousands of the best American youth will lay their bones upon the plains and in the jungles of Luzon and in other parts of the Philippines." The past year has more than fulfilled this prophecy.

Mr. Bryan defends his action in supporting the treaty by stating that he

Bacon Resolution. also favored the Bacon resolution

which declared for ultimate independence. This apology is weak and trivial. The Bacon resolution, if passed, would merely have been a declaration of the opinion of congress and would not have been binding upon any future congress. As Senator Money said, "these resolutions are simply the text for discussion in the open sessions of the senate, and they are worth that and little more." These resolutions were defeated before the ratification of the treaty. As they could not be passed before ratification there was every reason to believe they could not be passed afterward. Mr. Bryan then favored the final ratification of the treaty, without the Bacon resolution and knowing the futility of attempting to pass such a resolution later.

Mr. Bryan also says that he wanted to end the war with Spain. The power of

End the War. Spain was already broken. She could

not have prolonged the conflict. The protocol could have been extended until the treaty was amended and war with Spain would not have been resumed. Senator Daniel effectively answered this plea of Mr. Bryan when he said: "But this treaty is easily amended. You have only to substitute in respect to the Philippine islands what you have done as to Cuba, and it is done. If there are votes here to do that, it can be done next Monday. Do you think Spain will not consent? Why do you think so? There is nothing in the nature of things from which any man can fancy that Spain would not readily assent. She has done so in one case in respect to Cuba, and she did it there simply because we asked it. She wanted us to annex Cuba * * * But, against the wishes of Spain we said 'No, we prefer only a military occupation here.' If Spain assented to our wishes in that regard, why not as to the other? But suppose she did not like it. We did not go into this war for the pleasure and satisfaction of Spain. We went into it much against her liking, and we should not cease this war until we have registered our will and not Spanish will." The remarks of Senator Daniel indicate the trend of opinion among democratic

senators. Senator Hoar, the leader of the anti-imperialists, insists that he had the necessary votes pledged to amend the treaty in the manner indicated by Senator Daniel, if Mr. Bryan had not influenced certain senators to change their minds.

Senator Daniel stated the case clearly when he said: "That treaty fixes our policy. The rest of

Republic or Empire. our policy is a mere

matter of clerky detail. The Philippine treaty and a great standing army walk into the halls of congress hand in hand. Once fix sovereignty there and its roots go down to the centre of the earth. It is sovereignty, the most permanent act or human life, the most fixed, and the most immovable thing that ever nation did or could do." The difference between military occupation of the island and ratifying the treaty the senator said was "the difference between planting an empire there and maintaining the temporary ascendancy of American power there." Could the issue be more plainly stated or more concisely put? Yet Mr. Bryan favored ratifying the treaty and deliberately choose the empire in preference to the temporary ascendancy of American power. The Kansas City convention declared "imperialism" to be the paramount issue in this campaign. In order that a political principle may be an issue, it must be one in regard to which there may be logical disagreement. There can be no issue in "imperialism," for the reason that Mr. Bryan and Mr. McKinley favored the ratification of the treaty of peace and both thereby favored "the planting of an empire there." Bryan is even more culpable than his opponent for the reason that Mr. McKinley's plans would have been thwarted and the treaty would have been amended, except for the interference of "Imperialist" Bryan. How then can the record of these two men offer a basis for a paramount issue upon the question of "imperialism"?

Much as we may regret the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain and the policy then inaugurated, we cannot administer a rebuke this year. Both candidates favored the treaty. Both are equally responsible for its ratification. The record of Bryan is the more indefensible. He acted according to his own admissions, fully conscious of the iniquity of the act. Why did he do it? There is but one answer—for political reasons. He placed partisan advantage above the welfare of his country and the lives of his fellow citizens.

We must look elsewhere for "paramountcy." The real issue in this cam-

The Paramount Issue. paign is the question of honest money on the one hand and dishonest money on the other; financial integrity and national honor as against repudiation and dishonor. This is the issue, and the fiat of a political convention or the dicta of a political boss cannot change it.

IDENTITY OF THE BOXERS.

According to New York chinamen of good standing and repute, the "Boxers," who seem to have taken the initiative in the present uprising against foreigners in China, are no mere rebel horde of mushroom growth. Their origin has been obscured by their appellation. As a matter of fact, theirs is an organization over two hundred and fifty years old, and it has little changed from its original purpose—the overthrow of the Manchurian government. The apparently irreconcilable facts of alleged collusion between the Empress Dowager, who is a Manchu, and the Boxers in the struggles now going on in the Empire against the foreign powers, will later be explained.

For ages there has existed in China a class, who, from childhood, practice boxing and wrestling, pretty much as athletes do in this country, only instead of doing so for health, they do it for self-defence. To be able skillfully to defend one's self is not only a necessity, under conditions which have always existed in the country, but an accomplishment as well which in late years has led to displays of prowess somewhat analogous to the prize-fighting of our western civilization of today. From these exhibitions of its champions, the whole organization received its name from foreigners who witnessed them, and who knew of no better name to apply. The Boxers do not know themselves by the name comparatively recently bestowed upon them by the Caucasians, hence the ignorance of the Chinese in this country, generally, when you ask them about the organization of their rebellious compatriots. Ask them, however, if they have heard of the Hong Tau, or Redheads, and the educated ones will at once know, and tell you all about the Boxers.

Rebellion Quelled by Monks.

About two hundred and fifty years ago, soon after the change from the Ming to the Tsing dynasty, a rebellion broke out. The government soldiers found their efforts to quell it unavailing, so rapidly did it spread. At this time there existed in the mountains in northern China a noted religious order of monks, who never wore long queues. Their monastery was impregnable, although no one ever molested them, as they were looked upon as peaceful, pious and learned men. The community, comprising only five in all, offered their services to put down the rebels, and the government gladly accepted. They led the army, and the rebels were soon defeated.

The government, following its established custom, then set out to reward its benefactors for their services, but much to its surprise, the monks refused all offers of office, lands, and money. "The knowledge that we have done our country good is our reward," they said