

CAST ASIDE THE OMNIPOTENT WEAPON OF TRUTH TO SEIZE AGAIN THE WEAPONS 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 baldness when he said:

"We make no hypocritical pretense of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of those people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of 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 rightly 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 other's blood, that the true and 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 this war against us, 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 HEAD 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 TRADE. IT WOULD EXTEND OUR TRADE BY EVERY LEGITIMATE AND PEACEFUL MEANS, BUT IT IS NOT WILLING TO MAKE MERCHANDISE OF HUMAN 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 today 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 connection 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 a few.

BURDEN UPON THE MASSES.

IMPERIALISM WOULD BE PROFITABLE TO THE ARMY CONTRACTORS; IT WOULD BE PROFITABLE TO THE SHIP-OWNERS, 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 OFFICIAL 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