

SPAIN A DEMOCRATIC NATION.

FEW nations in the world are so democratic in their history as the Spanish nation is; but at the beginning of this century, the century of creative revolutions, none was so oppressed, not even the recently-dismembered Poland. Excepting the Basque Mountains, whose peaks and passes stopped both foreign invader and domestic tyrant so effectively that their inhabitants could continue under republican institutions, the nation had been reduced to such a state of weakness that kings, come from abroad through the accident of inheritance, could dispose of its territory and its laws as the ancient despots of the Asiatic continent disposed of their lands and their subjects. The people who had founded the Pyrenean democracies, so steeled by liberty that they were able to defy the Roman Cæsars and the Germanic Carlovingsians; the people whose almost prehistoric municipalities are as firm to-day as the granite foundations of their native land; the people who possessed the Cortes of Castile and Navarre, the parliaments of Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia; the people who dictated the Charters of Leon and the Aragonese customs and traditions before the British barons imposed Magna Charta on John Lackland—the Spanish people, within whose bosom the national soul was condensing, like the vapors of the air in an ocean storm, became so enfeebled as to allow the wizard Charles II. and the imbecile Charles IV. to bequeath or to grant to the conqueror and the foreigner, as if it were a private landed estate, the nation created by the sacrifice of so many martyrs.

Our own generation has seen a king like Ferdinand VII., comparable only to Nero and Caligula, and stained by all sorts of crimes; the clergy holding the national wealth, the greater part of which consisted of inalienable estates and uncultivated tracts of land surrounding churches and monasteries; generals like the Frenchman who was wont to hang a dozen patriots in the morn-

ing whenever he felt so inclined, and who danced the Castilian dance in the sunshine while his victims writhed in horrible agony; dungeons so filthy that their prisoners chose a voluntary death in preference to life in such hells; hunting parties organized to shoot Liberals like wild beasts at the road crossings and on the streets: the terrors of ancient Cæsarism added to the terrors of religious war; spies, with ears ever attentive, following the citizens like their shadows; executioners at the doors, threatening all the members of a family, even innocent babes, that the new generation of patriots might die in the cradle; honorable women, the wives or mothers of "innovators," led through the streets on asses, to the sound of the drum, as if they were prostitutes, and even sent to the scaffold and decapitated for having embroidered banners of liberty for good men; confiscation of property, banishment, the extermination of a whole party—in short, whatever has stained the annals of humanity or tormented a people in the chains and racks of unbridled absolutism.

As the present generation came into the world amid such horrors, it befits us to take them into account. But we have been completely transformed; from an enslaved people we have become a free people. And it is natural that public opinion, seeing so profound a change, should investigate its causes, not only for the enlightenment of the intellect, but as an example in life. We explain with great difficulty events that we have witnessed, and, above all, those in which we have been actors. In order to observe clearly any period of history we must recede a little, so that it may stand out in perspective.

According to a well-known hypothesis as to the formation of the universe, the coldest and most inert stone was once an impalpable gas. So, in the formation of human societies, we see successive condensations of ideas. Nothing is so impalpable, nothing so ethereal as the idea, and yet nothing carries within itself so much life. A series of progressive institutions cannot exist unless it has been preceded by a series of progressive ideas, just as the condensed nuclei of worlds and of suns would not have existed if a diffuse, ethereal, radiant matter had not first existed in unfathomable immensity.

We can thus say clearly that, thanks to the power of an

idea, Spain is a true democracy, and a free and progressive democracy, at the moment in which these lines are written; for, though we see in its bosom two such historical and privileged institutions as an hereditary monarchy and a state church, their influence, compared with what it formerly was, is hardly perceptible in the luminous inundation of new ideas. A people that has a written constitution by which it can always preserve its sovereignty, its liberty of thought and belief, freedom of the press, a sacred and inviolable home for every citizen, a popular jury system, and universal suffrage, can well be called with pride a true democracy, notwithstanding the fact that some irresistible fate imposes upon it a few contradictions arising from the laws of nature and of history. We shall ultimately overcome these contradictions by the strength of our will and the nobility of our ideal, two forces that cannot fail to be irresistible, though their development may be gradual.

But what are the lines followed by this ideal? How does it pass from the mind to life? How is it condensed into social forms and crystallized into institutions? We know external phenomena much better than internal ones. Those psychological objects that are nearest to us escape our investigations on account of their very proximity to the faculties which study and analyze them. It seems as if they were inflamed and dissipated by so much light. Through the solar spectrum we know of the atoms in the star Sirius, but there is no instrument that can analyze the various shades of a subjective ideal. We know that storms lighten and fulminate by the shock of two contrary electricities, but we do not know that revolutions do something similar by the clash of two contradictory ideas. Every student knows to-day how the oxygen exhaled by plants serves for animal respiration, and how the carbonic acid exhaled by animals serves for vegetable respiration; but religions, as a general rule, do not know how philosophies have helped them, nor do philosophies realize how much they are indebted to religions. The ellipses described by the heavenly bodies have been determined by mathematical calculation; but not even by means of probabilities shall we be able to guess the ellipses described by ideas on the firmament of our souls. How the rays of the sun extract

sweet vapors from the bitter sea; how these vapors ascend to the air and condense in drops; how these drops descend to the ground and soak it, thus fertilizing the seeds in the field, we are taught by physics; but we are not taught by psychology how spiritual thought follows an analogous path from the abstract and theoretic to the concrete and real. The logical phases of the ideal, however, are so knit together that their historical results follow one another in unbroken sequence.

We speak of the French revolution, of the Spanish revolution, and of the American revolution, as if they were isolated and sudden movements, like the earthquake which suddenly terrifies a region and buries in an instant its unwarned inhabitants. But every revolution is a series of revolutions. Observe the genealogical tree of revolutionary ideas. First we had a revolution in time—we call it the Renaissance—in which history was rounded by the reappearance of the Hellenic world, long plunged in oblivion; after this there was a revolution in space, caused by the geographical discoveries of the Portuguese and Spaniards; after these revolutions in time and space came a revolution in feeling, through the new æsthetics that cut the stones of Santa Maria dei Fiori, and carved the doors of the baptistery of Florence, and raised the dome of Saint Peter's in Rome, and gave splendor to the halls of the Vatican and the Sixtine Chapel with the figures created by Raphael and Buonarotti; after this revolution in æsthetics, came a revolution in the domain of conscience through Luther; after this, a revolution in the understanding, through philosophy personified in Bacon and Descartes; then one in common sense through the Encyclopædists, and finally one in the popular will through the Conventions. A revolution, therefore, which at first sight seems to have sprung up singly and suddenly, may prove to be a corollary of all preceding revolutions.

Royalist Spain began to be changed into democratic Spain during that half century of universal revolution which began with the advent of Louis XVI. to the throne of France, and which ended with the calamitous Bourbon restoration. It is true that the Spanish nation, absorbed during three hundred years in the work of christianizing the new world, had remained behind on the way of progress in the old world. Our country, engrossed

in this important work, from which her star, whether for good or ill, had decreed that no other occupation should divert her, opposed with all her might the progress of the reformed churches, the canons of the new international law promulgated in the peace of Westphalia, and even the French revolution; because she was obliged to have the monarchical and the Catholic principles to serve as nuclei for the governments she was founding all over the globe, and as guides or beacons to lead her emissaries and representatives over seas never before plowed by European keels. Stationed as we were in the West and constrained to christianize the new world, the fate befell us that befell ancient Rome as soon as her conquests transcended the limits of Europe—we had to sacrifice, as a tribute to our discoveries, the blood of our veins and the liberty of our spirit. Over the virgin forests on the unexplored shores of the Mississippi and the Amazon, passing through dangerous straits in sight of the Southern Cross, multiplying, by continual discovery, continents and seas on our planet and suns and constellations in the heavens, that innumerable band of mariners, soldiers, and missionaries needed two moral guides in order not to be led astray in their Titanic efforts; and these were the monarchy and the church.

Thus, somewhat separated from the intellectual movement which was transforming ancient religion into modern philosophy, and from the political movement which was undermining the absolute *régime* and replacing it by the democratic, we came, half a century later than our French neighbors, to those revolutionary eruptions whose heat changed the old absolute states into parliamentary and constitutional nations. Far from wondering at the delay of Spain, as some superficial minds are wont to do, we ought to marvel at the promptness with which we embraced the modern spirit, swallowed up as we still were by the results of the colossal civilizing work that had been initiated and carried out under the guidance of the old principles. Therefore, the hatred manifested by all the Huguenot writers from Guizot to Michelet toward the work of Spain, does not seem to me to be just, since in such a work the two principal and irresistible factors were space and time; that is, our peculiar geographical position and our historic traditions. But Spain, which preceded many na-

tions in other epochs of universal life, which was the first to impose the culture of the Latin empire on the barbarians of the North, which took the lead in transmitting the laic sciences of the middle ages to convents and other theocratic institutions, in organizing the municipality, and in giving the people access to the Cortes, which possessed an encyclopædia of all human knowledge as early as the thirteenth century, when other nations were a prey to superstition—this land had to remain behind when, in the sixteenth century, the modern age began, for the reason that her own greatness had enjoined on her a survival of historic institutions which were incompatible with the general progress. The writer cannot but bless this delay. Thanks to it, he has been enabled to join his name forever to the triumph of these three progressive principles: full liberty of conscience and of thought, the abolition of slavery, and universal suffrage.

Spanish democracy is the outcome of two similar revolutions in the present century—that which the infamous war of Bonaparte against our independence brought about in the year 1808, and that of 1868, which completed and crowned the first. The French Encyclopædist had already entered Spain, founding, by the natural radiation of their ideas, a school of thinkers which propagated those ideas and a school of great statesmen which applied and practiced them. Thus, the Spanish revolution resembled the French in having a long intellectual preparation and in having been begun by books and served by governments. When, in the middle ages, the bloody strife began, there was an unavoidable necessity of combating the armies of feudalism and those of theocracy. In order to oppose the first, kings devised the standing army, which they put entirely in their own control. In order to fight the armies of theocracy, these same kings obtained, more through force than through persuasion, the total suppression of the Knights Templars. Without intending it or suspecting it, they thus paved the way for the religious revolution.

Something similar to this happened in the last century. The kings were desirous of making their civil power absolute, but saw two obstacles—those very political organizations that they had instituted as councils, and the Jesuits whom they had revered during the religious revolution. Thus, the first thing they at-

tempted to do was to absorb the encyclopædic ideas and to personify them. From this personification came the philosopher-kings. And these philosopher-kings, completely putting aside their old advisers, gave the direction of their states to prime ministers, who were almost absolute, or, at least, partakers of the absolute royal power. The names of Pombal, of Choiseul, of Aranda will bear witness to the truth of this; and those of Charles III. of Spain, of Catherine II. of Russia, of Frederick II. of Prussia, of Leopold of Tuscany, and of Joseph II. of Austria, will confirm what I have just said concerning the philosopher-kings and their revolutionary influence, especially among Catholic nations. The permanent army of the Catholic power, the order of the Jesuits, fell by the decrees of such kings. And these pillars of the old intellectual *régime* once broken, the old political *régime* fell to the ground with them. Thus, long before the revolution was an established fact, the very power that was clearing the way for it began to be attacked. In Prussia attacks were made everywhere on the great, but philosophical and revolutionary, King Frederick. The Pope saw such adverse signs in this upper-class revolution, that he told Joseph of Austria that kings would soon be guillotined by the men they were emancipating. In Spain, Charles III. appears as the Constantine of the Encyclopædists and the Julian of the Jesuits. His orders of expulsion recall the worst acts of the Roman proscriptions during the terrible times of the triumvirate. And, not satisfied with this, he applied to civil laws and institutions as many principles as he could of the fashionable philosophy. But his royal orders, his implacable hatred of Jesuitism, his whole political system, demonstrated the dependence of the old absolute *régime* on the old religious *régime*. The great struggle between the jurists and the Jesuits—the former being desirous that the social supremacy should belong to the kings, and the latter, that it should belong to the popes—terminated in favor of the former. Aided by the active Encyclopædists, Charles III. banished the Jesuits. Then the people began to attack the kings—timidly at first, in riots and mutinies brought about by trifling causes; more resolutely afterward, disrespect turning into insult and outrage. The ancient monarchical power

had disorganized itself by its acceptance of the philosophical ideas, and had sown unconsciously the seed of the Spanish revolution.

A most grave event was to crystallize all these ideas into multiple institutions. That event was our war of independence. We were combating the invading foreigner and revindicating the sovereignty of the people. In opposing Napoleon the Great, who threatened with his legions the existence of Spain, we re-established, not only the independent existence of our country, but liberty and law as well. From time immemorial, democracies have developed in periods of foreign invasion. Just as all Christian churches have a *Te Deum*, in which they praise God and his providence, so all free nations have a *Marseillaise* in which we find, mixed with lyric strains in praise of liberty, a cry of horror of the foreigner. Our fight with Bonaparte for independence can hardly be equaled in the future. The most depressed of the nations of that time, without treasure, without an army or a navy; sold and betrayed by her kings; her doors wide open to the invader, in whom she believed she would find a brother, but in whom she found only an enemy; her fortresses occupied by treason and perfidy; her capitol held by a garrison of invaders; confronted by the greatest captain the ages had ever known, and having nothing with which to oppose him but fragile houses, naked breasts, women's curses, pikes cut from trees, flames from the hearth, stones from the roads, and what was left of a decimated population—Spain nevertheless succeeded in terrifying Murat at Madrid, in driving back Moncey from Valencia, in defeating Dupont at Bailen, in disarming Lefebvre at Balmaseda, in disconcerting Napoleon himself in Chamartin, in stopping Ney at San Payo, in expelling Soult from Galicia, in compelling Massena to leave Salamanca, in eclipsing the marshals called by Europe the planets of the sun of battles, in sustaining sieges like those of Saragossa and Gerona, in holding mountain passes resembling that of Thermopylæ, in improving armed corps like those raised by Mina and Merina, which would have astonished Leonidas, in supplementing the most scientific tactics by a popular warfare whose successes were incomprehensible to the very men who employed it, because they were due to sudden inspirations of genius. See-

ing all this, we believe that there is nothing that the will of a people cannot accomplish when it resolves to sacrifice everything for liberty and native land.

By the side of these wonderful military deeds, we saw a moral spectacle that can never be sufficiently admired—the spectacle of the sovereign Cortes of Cadiz assembled by the impersonal call of the nation in the midst of pestilence and invasion, declaring the modern principle of national sovereignty and adopting a constitution so democratic that it was afterward invoked by all liberals in their efforts for emancipation, from the revolutionists of Genoa and Palermo to the patriots of Greece.

But the revolution that gave us the immortal Code of 1812 was followed by the reaction of 1814. The same infamous King Ferdinand VII., whose diadem the Cortes kept in its possession to save it from the dishonorable cession made by him at Bayonne and also from the Napoleonic invasion, which he himself had countenanced, violently closed the Cortes, and persecuted the immortal founders of our liberty like wild beasts. The stern law of reaction was fulfilled in Spain with horrible fidelity. As the heavenly bodies pass from aphelion to perihelion, as the seas ebb and flow, as the seasons turn from fruitful autumn to desolate winter, ideas converted into institutions pass from revolution to reaction in recurring phases that undoubtedly obey objective laws. But reactionary ideas pass, while progressive ideas persist. After the reaction of the year 1814 came the revolution of 1820. The vitality of the progressive principle was never before shown as it was then. An army that six years before had helped the crowned executioner, threw from its bayonets the spark of a redeeming revolution, and this spark did not stop in Spain; it galvanized Greece, moved Piedmont and Sicily, and even liberalized Portugal.

But the revolutionary idea was then in its state of diffusion, brightly shining and radiating; it had not reached the less brilliant but more lasting and solid period of condensation and consolidation. After three years of democratic government we receded once more, owing to the inexperience of the Liberals, the perversity of the reactionists, and the deadly influence of the despots, who sent a hundred thousand soldiers of the French

Bourbons to restore absolutism in Spain. The horrors of this reactionary period, which began in 1823 and lasted till 1832, exceeded the horrors of 1814. The greater part of the Liberals was horribly oppressed; another part was banished; a third part was completely exterminated. The generals who had been the most illustrious figures in our war of independence were mockingly led on carts and in cages, like the animals of a menagerie, and then killed by Royalist mobs. And still, O changes of fortune! the dying Ferdinand VII. repeated, in reference to the Liberals, the words attributed by tradition to the apostate emperor in regard to the Christians: "Thou hast conquered, Galilean." And, indeed, those terrible reactionists, having grown strong under the safeguard of reaction, rose against Ferdinand VII., influenced by his elder brother Don Carlos, to whom the ruling despotism seemed not sufficiently theocratic, that is to say, not sufficiently reactionary. At the same time, the tyrant married, in his old age, a princess of Naples, who boasted of liberal ideas, and the fruit of their union was the future Queen Isabella, to whose rights as a daughter her uncle Don Carlos opposed the ancient Salic Law, which excluded women from the throne. Hence arose the war that we ought to call our war of succession, but which we have named the Seven Years' War, because it lasted from the beginning of 1833 to the beginning of 1840.

In the name of a child queen, and almost in the absence of monarchy, we were able for a whole decade to exercise the government of the nation by the nation, which had been begun by the Constitution of Cadiz, but had been subjected to long eclipses, as we have already seen. The regency, which governed in the name of Isabella II., passed from Christina, the queen mother, to Espartero, a popular general, and a constitution by royal grant, in which royal power predominated, gave place to a constitution discussed and sanctioned by the Cortes, in which parliamentary power was predominant. The promulgation of a very liberal code by the government, and the establishment among the people of what we might call a new social order, produced a most radical change. The abolition of secular vested rights, and of the mortmain of ecclesiastical patrimony, gave to the emancipated classes the enjoyment of property; the

principles of the fundamental code and the exercise of legislative power by both chambers insured to the nation its full sovereignty. After her long minority came the true reign of Isabella II. The Cortes allowed her a few of the years during which she should still have been under regency, and she entered upon the plenitude of her authority in 1844. But she acted toward the Liberals as her father had acted toward the patriots. The latter had defended Ferdinand VII. against Napoleon; but this wicked tyrant exterminated them with more fury and bitterness than the conqueror would have done. The former defended Isabella II. against the partisans of Don Carlos during seven years of fierce civil war; but the queen favored the principles and the partisans of Don Carlos as much as her own traditions and the spirit of her time permitted. The reign of Isabella II. proved to be a dark night of reaction occasionally illumined by the lightnings of revolution.

At last the law that reactionary ideas are always transitory, while revolutionary ideas are always permanent, was fully exemplified. The generation to which I belong turned in anger against the hypocritical absolutism of Isabella II., and resolved to end it. In this undertaking we certainly did not suffer as long as our fathers had suffered under Ferdinand VII., but at times we suffered as intensely. We conspired in the long preparatory period of the revolution, and we fought in the outbreak itself, as the martyr generations had conspired and fought in their time. Many of our efforts were dashed to pieces against unconquerable fate. As a consequence of such a purpose, and of the partial failures that followed it, we went into exile like souls in purgatory, and saw our names inscribed on death-warrants. Spain fell once more into absolutism. But this reaction served only, in the long run, to demolish the throne of Isabella II. The intensity of reactionary violence finally up-rooted the monarchy, an institution that had lasted since the time of Augustus, the oldest of all our institutions except the municipalities, and much older than our church, which did not have full sway over our people till the seventh century of the Christian era.

In the midst of the revolution we cast forth the germs of new ideas, utterly heedless whether they fell upon the stony

ground where they could not bear fruit, or on the flood that might sweep them to the profound abyss without profit. God had granted the apostles of the Spanish revolution the same gift that he had bestowed on the apostles of the *Cenaculum*—the precious gift of tongues. In that great assembly of the revolution, all the members displayed upon their brows the flame of the ideal, and from their lips came forth a word as divine as the creative word—the word of liberty. In order to sow so much and to put ourselves, in a short time of incessant creation, on a level with the foremost nations, we were forced to exhaust our spirit; and in order to implant all those ideals in our soil, we had to furrow it deeply. God alone could create the universe without pain, by the mere breath of his lips, by the mere echo of his word. A creative generation like ours must be an unhappy generation. Among the various forms of government that might be deduced from the principle of national sovereignty, we looked for anchors for our liberties, and lo! we could not find them. The democratic monarchy and the radical republic failed in this work of carrying out the new ideas, and another reaction came. On December 30, 1874, we saw a dynasty similar to the one that we had expelled on September 30, 1868, restored in the person of Alfonso XII. As soon as the dynasty returned to the throne, I went back to exile; but this time it was a voluntary exile.

Then I withdrew within myself and resolved to restore all we had lost by that reaction. To do this, I realized that it was necessary to change our methods. During the revolution, we had acquired a revolutionary temperament; it behooved us to throw off that temperament and to accommodate ourselves to a slower but surer method—that of evolution. Revolutions are like wars, after all; and in wars we can forge heroic warriors, but we cannot educate good citizens endowed with that juridic conscience and that respect for the law that the moderate and legal exercise of liberty demands. The most progressive thoughts gleaned by modern science had been sowed in the furrows opened by revolutionary force; but an extreme reaction had hidden them under its deep frost, and it was necessary not only to wait for the thaw, but to get ready to look carefully after their roots, their stems, their flowers, and their fruits, convinced that

no individual human strength could hasten the time of their inward development. A habit contracted in the times of our conspiracies and our combats had inclined us to prefer the conquest of the state through revolutionary violence to the conquest of public opinion through a continued and pacific apostolate. Society has its physiology. Organs that are not exercised become atrophied and disappear. A people that needs self-government, but unlearns or forgets the pacific exercise of legal forms, finally contracts a sickly temperament under which it passes from revolution to reaction, and from plebeian dictators to absolute kings, with sudden changes of internal temperature, fatal to its life. The first day of the restoration, I saw that it was perfectly possible to restore all the democratic principles and the government of the nation by the nation, on condition that we, looking about us with true circumspection, should agree to grant to the conservative parties all that which no human force can oppose, and which must be recognized as necessary to a certain social period.

Thus, I declared that in politics I placed law and order above all else. And having said this, I added that while bound by restricted laws, I intended to work for liberal laws; within these laws, for other laws still more liberal; and within these more liberal laws, for the most liberal, without ever deviating from strict and necessary legality. I acknowledged that laws should be improved, but in a lawful manner. I said that in order to define ourselves, we ought to limit ourselves, never going beyond what was possible and demanded by our great social aspirations. Provided each Spanish citizen could be as free within his home, and in the exercise of his individual rights, as the citizen of the United States, and that all collectively could govern themselves through their own chosen representatives, we ought not to be shocked by the contradictions left in the state, nor obstinately to insist, as of old, on having all institutions logically systematized and made to correspond to the ideal in a single minute; inasmuch as contradictions analogous to those we lament exist in countries as free as England.

With these practical ideas, the motors of most tenacious purposes, I entered the first parliament of the restoration, chosen

by the electors of a city traditionally democratic—the noble Barcelona. I was alone in Congress. Of all the historic Republicans, I was the only one who had reached so high a place. At the first session in which I rose to speak within that hostile body, the flight of an insect could have been heard in the place, full of reactionary representatives, among whom some bewailed the old Catholic unity broken by my efforts, others their slaves, emancipated by my government, and still others the monarchical sentiment, rooted out of the country by laws and institutions to which I had given my voice and vote; and none of whom was without some wound in his interest or in his faith. But noticing how those enemies, in spite of their hatred, listened with attention to what I said, I told them how I, shipwrecked by civil discord, though finding unfriendly shores whithersoever I turned my eyes, accused no one in my misfortune, but on the contrary, appealing to all by my teaching and my example, proposed to restore, without violence, the democratic principles that seemed crushed under the overwhelming weight of the restoration.

Nearly fifteen years have passed since I uttered such words, and what I then promised has been fulfilled with the greatest exactitude and fidelity by the methods to which I have alluded. When we compare what our Spain was under the above-mentioned Congress with what she is to-day, the realization of so much practical progress and the harvest of so many democratic ideas seem like a dream. A cruel proscription was then weighing upon the Republican professors who had been deposed during the revival of religious intolerance. These professors occupy their chairs in the universities to-day, because the liberty of thought and faith has been recognized, in accordance with the dictates of reason and of conscience. Trials were then held secretly, as in inquisitorial times; justice now seeks the light, giving greater security to the citizen. We then depended on tribunals which themselves were dependent upon the government; popular jury trials to-day give back to the people the foremost of all sovereign attributes—the administration of justice. Our party, called factious by the public power, and as such persecuted, was then declared illegal; to-day, Republican doctrines can be preached in the light of day, and will be carried out,

when the nation shall hold it fit, within the bounds of legality. Meetings then could be held only through the tolerance of the government; now we assemble because our right to do so is acknowledged by the law. The Minister of the Interior then had the sole power of granting permits to publish newspapers, and he subjected journals to capricious suspensions and suppressions. To-day, any Spanish citizen can found a paper without making a deposit or giving the name of the responsible editor; and the excesses of the press are restrained by ordinary penal legislation and punished by public conscience and public opinion. The epithet "factious," applied to our party by the reactionists, naturally brought with it the prohibition of our organizing committees and of our open-air demonstrations. But, thanks to a law passed by the last Cortes, all committees, to whatsoever party they may belong, can now exist at their own pleasure in permanent activity, can institute chairs of political propagandism, and can hold debate upon all imaginable themes without danger of being molested, so long as they do not commit transgressions punishable under the code. Even the decree for the abolition of slavery met with restrictions in the subsequent institution of patronship. Among the glories which liberal congresses will present to the judgment of posterity, numerous and great as they are, the extirpation of patronship will stand out, for by means of it slavery was rooted out of our land.

The only thing wanted to complete all this marvelous evolution was to extend to all the privilege of voting, formerly enjoyed by a few. Universal suffrage, promulgated in June, 1889, makes Spain a complete democracy—a free and parliamentary democracy. In the exercise of all individual rights and in the ample field which our laws open to all ideas and aspirations, we may hope to see the crowning of such a work and the practical government of the people by the people. As we rest now by the wayside and withdraw into ourselves to examine our own consciences, as we contemplate the way over which we have come, seeing how much has been done and how little remains to be done, we feel satisfied with ourselves, and for the perfecting of our work we put our trust in the God of liberty.

EMILIO CASTELAR.

SOUTH-WESTERN COMMERCE AND GULF HARBORS.

THE deliberations of the recent Pan-American Congress at Washington, the interest developed in our sister republics of South America, their increased knowledge of our resources and their better understanding of our disposition toward them, the reciprocity agreements recently entered into with Brazil and Venezuela, the prospect of similar agreements with Mexico and with the states of Central and South America, and the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—all combine to direct attention just now to the harbors on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico.

From Cape Sable to Mexico is a line of coast more than 2,000 miles long, and on this entire coast the only harbors of importance are the following: On the Florida coast, Key West, Charlotte, Tampa, Appalachicola, and Pensacola; on the Alabama coast, Mobile; on the Mississippi coast, Biloxi; on the Texas coast, Sabine Pass, Galveston, Aransas Pass, and Brazos Santiago. Of the Florida harbors on the Gulf coast, Tampa seems to be attracting the most attention. In its improvement the western, the middle, and southern States have taken a profound interest, claiming that several millions of dollars may be saved to the people on goods from Cuba, Central America, South America, and Mexico, now brought by the way of New York and the Atlantic seaboard. Such goods now pass out of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea through the reefs of Florida, enter the Atlantic Ocean, and pass on by way of Cape Hatteras to New York, costing a burdensome extra insurance and a fearful annual loss of vessels and of perishable goods. It was asserted, in a hearing before the Senate Committee on Commerce, that \$265,000,000 worth of goods are carried yearly to and from the eastern seaboard over this dangerous route; that out of this amount \$165,000,000 are consumed, handled, and manufactured west of the eastern boundary of Ohio; and that the whole of this latter amount ought to enter this country at Tampa Bay, and