

600,000 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 immediately 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 equal emphasis. It declares that the Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government. A republic can 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?

REPUBLIC AND MONARCHY CONTRASTED.

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 Republican platform promises that some measure of self-government is to be given 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 welcomed annexation, are to be denied the guarantees of our Constitution, what is to be the lot of the Filipinos, who resisted our authority? If secret influences could compel a disregard of our plain duty toward a friendly people living near our shores, what treatment will those same influences provide for unfriendly people 7,000 miles away?