

of Virginia, has stated that Mr. Bryan in the fall of 1894 intended to speak in favor of the populist candidate for governor in Virginia, but was persuaded not to do so by Mr. O'Farrall, then the democratic candidate for governor. Mr. O'Farrall may have been so informed, but if so his informant was in error, for Mr. Bryan never contemplated any such thing. The criticism, however, comes with poor grace from Mr. O'Farrall, for while asserting that he prevented Mr. Bryan's speaking against him when he was a candidate for governor, he bolted the national ticket when Mr. Bryan was a candidate for the presidency. Certainly his fight against a national candidate nominated by the aid of Virginia's votes was a more serious breach than the failure to support a gubernatorial candidate, even if Mr. Bryan had opposed Mr. O'Farrall, which he did not do.

The charge that Mr. Bryan voted for Mr. Weaver has already been explained and the facts have been presented so often that one must confess himself misinformed if he circulates the charge as an evidence of Mr. Bryan's abandonment of the democratic party.

As the election of 1892 approached it became evident that it was impossible for the democrats to carry several of the western states, but that it was possible for the democrats to assist the populists in carrying them. This situation having been fully discussed, the democratic national committee, of which Mr. Harrity was chairman and Mr. Whitney the controlling spirit, (if the word "spirit" can properly be used of the Whitney type), instructed to urge the democrats of Kansas, Colorado and a number of other western states, to support the Weaver electors for the purpose of taking those states out of the republican column and throwing the election into the house of representatives where the democrats had a majority. The evidence of this is conclusive, and has been published time and again. The following letter from James E. Boyd, then the governor of Nebraska and the Nebraska member of the national committee, ought to set this fact at rest:

Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 17.—(Personal and confidential.)—Dear Sir: I have just returned from the east where I was honored by a consultation with the national committee and leading men of our party, with regard to the best policy to be pursued in Nebraska this fall in dealing with the electoral ticket; and they agreed with me that the wisest course would be for democrats to support the Weaver electors; the object being to take Nebraska out of her accustomed place in the republican column.

Information has reached me that a number of independents who were formerly republicans contemplate voting for the Harrison electors. With the republican strength thus augmented it would be impossible for the democrats to carry their own electors' ticket to victory. It is therefore the part of good judgment and wise action for democrats to support the Weaver electors in as large numbers as possible. For democrats to do this is no abandonment of principle; on the contrary, it is a definite step toward victory, and the ultimate triumph of Cleveland and Stevenson, and the principles they represent.

JAMES E. BOYD.

Mr. Bryan was then a member of congress as well as a candidate for re-election, and announced that if the election was thrown into the house he would vote for Mr. Cleveland, the democratic nominee, as against Mr. Harrison, the republican nominee. Mr. Bryan may be justly criticised for having known so little of Mr. Cleveland as to prefer him to Mr. Harrison, but from the standpoint of democratic regularity he cannot be criticised for obeying the democratic national committee, and voting for General Weaver in order to help elect Mr. Cleveland. In the election of 1896 Mr. Weaver was one of the most active supporters of Mr. Bryan, while Mr. Cleveland turned to republican advantage the influence which the democratic party had given him. When Mr. Bryan became personally acquainted with the two men, he found that General Weaver was infinitely more democratic than Mr. Cleveland in environment, principles, purpose and method.

As to the policies which Mr. Bryan has supported, only a word need be said. On the tariff question no one will dispute his orthodoxy. He helped to prepare the Wilson bill, which was much more acceptable even to Mr. Cleveland, than the senate bill after Mr. Gorman and Mr. Hill got through with it. The free list of the Wilson bill was practically identical with the free list set forth in the platform upon which Mr. Bryan

was elected in 1890, four years before. The democrats of the 52nd and 53rd congresses favored the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, and this was made a part of the democratic platform of 1900. This demand will be found in the democratic platform upon which Mr. Bryan ran in 1890. The Wilson bill contained an income tax, and this was supported by a large majority of the democrats of the senate and house. The income tax was also demanded in Mr. Bryan's congressional platform of 1890. Mr. Bryan's first congressional platform also contained a plank in favor of the free coinage of silver, and during that year the democrats of the house by an overwhelming majority voted to recommit the Sherman law with instructions to the committee to bring in a free coinage bill (16 to 1 being the only ratio then considered). For twenty years the democrats of the senate and house had been voting for bills embodying exactly the coinage provisions that the platform of 1896 contended for. There was not a plank in the Chicago platform that was inconsistent with the record of the party on questions dealt with, and that platform was prepared by a committee selected from all the states of the Union and was reported to the convention before Mr. Bryan's nomination was considered probable by any considerable number of the convention.

The money plank of the Chicago platform, while identical with the plank adopted by the democrats of Nebraska in 1894, had been endorsed by the democrats at the primaries in almost all the states and no one can say that its adoption was not the free and voluntary act of the rank and file of the party. At Kansas City the only controversy was over the money plank. No other plank of the Chicago platform was questioned or opposed, and the dispute over the money plank was as to whether it should be reaffirmed or reiterated.

Mr. Bryan has defended the Chicago platform and the Kansas City platform, and if his democracy can be questioned because of his advocacy of those platforms, then the same objection must be made to the democracy of the millions who believe in those platforms as firmly as he and have advocated them as earnestly.

Space has been given to the above not because Mr. Bryan's conduct or views ought to influence others, but because the reorganizers are seeking to make the fight a personal one against Mr. Bryan, whereas it is and ought to be made upon principles. A principle is neither good nor bad because it is advocated by any man; it is good or bad in itself, and this discussion of Mr. Bryan's personal connection with these questions would not appear here but for the fact that the friends of the Kansas City platform are continually annoyed by the misrepresentations that are made by the gold democrats and by the republican papers which take great delight in assisting the gold democrats.

Like Two Peas in a Pod.

Insisting that the democratic party must "throw both Bryan and Bryanism overboard," the Brooklyn Eagle undertakes to state just what will be the position of the democratic party as well as of the republican party in the event the reorganizers have their way. The Eagle says the republican platform will be about as follows:

"No tariff revision is necessary; none should occur until necessary; none, when necessary, should be made except by us; none, when made by us alone, should affect articles produced by trusts, whether those trusts are monopolies or not. On the expansion question the republican platform will be in favor of taking expansion for granted and of regarding the Philippines, Hawaii and Porto Rico as colonies always and states of the Union never. On the currency question the republican party will seek to legislate, on the basis of gold as the standard, in the direction of making the supply of currency through the banks automatically respond to the needs of localities or of exigencies. The rest of that party's platform will doubtless comprise republican claims to have produced all the good things which have occurred and which have taken the name of prosperity among politicians, promoters and the like, and of inflation among philosophical economists. Of course, the platform will arraign democracy."

The democratic party, according to the Eagle, while not admitting in so many words that it has been entirely wrong, will, in the event the reorganizers gain control, admit that the party has

been wrong without directly saying so. The Eagle describes the democratic platform in this way:

"The party will assume gold to be the standard. It will assume expansion to be permanent and unalterable. It will omit all allusion to an income tax, and it will not flatter mobs, in the name of labor, or attack the securities of order by slurs at the judiciary.

"The party will have a good deal of trouble, even if it should get these dangerous questions out of the way, in dealing with the tariff matter. The country has become used to protection. It is opposed to free trade, or to what can be truthfully or falsely called free trade. It would, however, have a rational and not a radical revision of duties, and it does not believe that the republican party can or will give it."

According to the Eagle's plan, then, the democratic party, like the republican party, will be in favor of the single gold standard; it will assume expansion to be permanent and unalterable; it will be opposed to the income tax, and will ignore the very general complaint against government by injunction. According to the Eagle's plan, the democratic platform will differ from the republican platform in three particulars. The Eagle's platform will not assert nor admit the republican claims to have produced all the good things which have occurred; the Eagle's platform will not arraign democracy; the Eagle's platform, while leaning somewhat in the direction of protection, will provide for "a rational and not a radical revision of duties."

In other words, after "throwing Bryan and Bryanism overboard," the Eagle and its associate reorganizers would make the democratic party so similar to the republican party that the two organizations would differ in name only, and would make the platform as nearly like the republican platform as it would be possible to do, leaving at the same time sufficient margin in the hope of hoodwinking the voters and making them believe that, after all, the democratic party had not been completely swallowed up.

Perhaps it has not occurred to the Eagle, although it will doubtless occur to a great many people, that there will be considerable difficulty even after the democratic party shall have adopted the republican platform, in educating democrats up to a point where they may grow enthusiastic in following republican methods and in advocating the policies dear to the hearts of the trust magnates.

But He Did Not.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, commenting on the formal and insignificant message sent by President Roosevelt on the opening of the Philippine cable, says:

"Suppose, instead of the commonplace greeting President Roosevelt sent to Governor Taft he had sent to the people of the Philippines a message like this:

"I pledge all my energy, ability and power as president of the United States to the task of enabling the people of the Philippines to enjoy the blessings of liberty and to secure a government based upon the principles of liberty and equality embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the constitution of the United States."

"That would have been a memorable message and it would have made the Fourth of July as blessed and memorable to the Filipinos as it is to Americans. It would have enhanced the blessings of the day to Americans because it would have been a notable step toward the proclamation of liberty throughout all the possessions of the United States.

"A message like that would have done more than merely go around the world; it would have thrilled the world with the spectacle of a great man at the head of a great nation placing the cause of human liberty above all other considerations; it would have cheered the lovers of liberty in all lands and struck a deadly blow at imperialism. Mr. Roosevelt could well have given up all that the presidency offers for the privilege of sending such a message to a people in bondage.

"It would have assured him the right kind of immortality."

The president might have said something worthy of the occasion—but he did not. Why? Because he has been paralyzed by imperialism.