

A BRYAN BANQUET.

For the benefit of the New York silverites who are going to the dollar dinner at the Grand Central palace, the banquet of the Kansas democrats at Topeka last week may serve as a model, an inspiration or a warning. Eleven hundred of the brethren were on hand, apparently very hungry, for a historian records in *The Topeka Capital* that "Sergeant Jake Owens, with two policemen, had to fight the crowd back to prevent the doors from being broken in." The feast was given in the library hall of the state house, and amid distinctly plutocratic properties:

"Thousands of glowing incandescent lights caught the eyes. Row after row of glittering electricity, the crystal bulbs alternating with clusters of fragrant roses, swung from pillar to pillar about the vast expanse of immaculate table linen, which later in the evening was marked by dividing lines of black-coated masculinity."

Colonel Bryan, who occupied the seat of honor, must have been reminded of his old friend Belshazzar by these splendors, of which these further details are related:

"The two broad pillars on either side of the aisle leading to the speaker's table were wound with green bunting and garlands of roses, the style of architecture and general arrangement suggesting nothing so much as a feast in the days of the old Roman empire, when the statesmen reveled in luxury. Palms filled in the windows, and from every light branch hung a bouquet of roses. Thousands of flowers were used in the decoration, and they retained their freshness perfectly."

Nothing is too good for the colonel, but when the silverites dine amid the gorgeous decorations on which the idle holders of idle wealth are wont to spend the money wrung from the producing classes it is hard for the unregenerate to see the line between permissible and forbidden luxury. There the colonel sate, his diamond and the thousand incandescent lights flashing in competition. It was a proud night for him, and it will be difficult to beat it at the Grand Central palace.

The question of a proper costume for a silver statesman at one of these harmony sociables was not settled at the Topeka entertainment. Colonel Bryan wore a cutaway coat, perhaps as a compromise between evening clothes or the statesman's frock coat and the plain democratic sack.

But if the colonel stoops to compromise he is lost. A cutaway is a sort of mugwump among garments, indefinite, unclassified and nondescript. The colonel should declare himself more plainly or he will repel all genuine partisans.

Another pre-eminent statesman, the Hon. Champ Clark, of Missouri, wore a "dress suit." As Champ Clark would rather cut off his tongue than conde-

scend to plutocracy, it must be that evening clothes are in accordance with the democratic platform, after all. If they are, why didn't the colonel put them on? If we knew how the Hon. Horace Greeley Jumper, as good a populist as the colonel or Mr. Clark, was dressed at the dinner, it might be possible to tell how a silver banqueter ought to dress.

Whatever may be the judgment of the New York Bryanites as to the minor point, the chief duty of Bryan banqueters was performed at Topeka by the Hon. Champ Clark in his clear and confident manner:

"William J. Bryan, following the example of his illustrious predecessors, will be elected in 1900, re-elected in 1904."

It is understood that for the sake of etiquette Colonel Bryan prefers that the renomination, election and re-election ceremony shall be performed by somebody other than himself; and the New York Bryanites have doubtless appointed an orator for the purpose. Perhaps the solemnity of the functions that Champ Clark performed justified his evening clothes.—*New York Sun*.

A PRACTICAL SUGGESTION.

On Tuesday, April 4, a meeting was held in Boston

by the anti-annexationists, which, we trust, will be followed by many others of a similar kind in other states. It was addressed by the leading men of Massachusetts, and the following resolutions were adopted unanimously:

"(1.) That our government shall take immediate steps towards a suspension of hostilities in the Philippines, and a conference with the Philippine leaders, with a view of preventing further bloodshed, upon the basis of a recognition of their freedom and independence as soon as proper guarantees can be had of order and protection to property.

"(2.) That the government of the United States shall tender an official assurance to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that they will encourage and assist in the organization of such a government in the islands as the people thereof shall prefer, and that upon its organization in stable manner the United States, in accordance with its traditional and prescriptive policy in such cases, will recognize the independence of the Philippines and its equality among nations, and gradually withdraw all military and naval forces."

This is the more valuable because just as the meeting assembled, there came the very disappointing report of the president's commission, announcing as the result of their month in the Philippines, not an illuminating despatch for the president, but the issue of another proclamation to the Filipinos of exactly the same tenor and effect as the one issued in February by the president him-

self. That is, it is a promise to people whom we are killing by the thousand of all sorts of "blessings" if they will abandon the struggle for freedom which they have been carrying on so long. This sort of work the president or General Otis could have done themselves as well as the commission. The notion that the Filipinos will perceive the difference between the commission and the men who are killing them and the person who is ordering them to be killed, is quite illusory. To them we are all Americans of the same sort and same religion, and tarred with the same pitch. They know nothing about college presidents, or professors of eminence. The commission, therefore, it seems to us, should not have wasted its time in proclaiming to the natives what in substance the president has already proclaimed, but have given him some advice as to the best way of getting them to lay down their arms and stop the war. If they issued any proclamation to the natives at all, it should, as the *Springfield Republican* has pointed out in a sensible article, which we quote elsewhere, have offered them something which they have not been offered hitherto—namely, protection while they are building up a government of their own; in other words, something which would have shown them that we had abandoned the Russian and Austrian role of conquerors, for the American role of protectors of men struggling to be free and independent.

President Schurman is trying to make up for this defect in the proclamation by telling us the stories we used to get during the war of the rebellion from the "intelligent contraband" and the "reliable citizen" about the disaffection prevailing in Aguinaldo's ranks, the readiness of his army to desert him, and the eagerness of some tribe or other of the many, for our mild rule. A man who has passed a month in a camp of fighting men without ever going beyond their lines, with no knowledge of the enemy or their language, naturally enough swallows all stories of this kind. They are the staple gossip of an army in the field. They may be true in whole or in part. But they are not things to base policy on. What policy should be based on is the statements of the leaders themselves, of those whom the administration journals so comically and ignorantly call "rebels." The way to get this, as the Boston resolutions point out, is to tell Aguinaldo that we are not seeking to conquer him, but to help him; that we are not asking him to lay down his arms as our "property," but as a fellow-republic, struggling to be free, and which we desire to build up. But the main thing is to stop the fighting. There is no need to attack this new stronghold. What harm is it doing us? None whatever, except to offend our military dignity. We have become such warriors that we have to attack