

doubt, fall upon the people of our own country. Such a policy would not only be opposed to our own self-interest, but would be antagonistic to the best interests of China. To us it would mean the abandonment of the fundamental principle of our form of government, viz., local self-government. It would mean a combination of conflicting and irreconcilable ideas of government—a republic at home, a despotism abroad. Shall we depart from those paths, that have proven safe, that have contributed so much to our national greatness? Or shall we cling to the safe and sure foundations of the republic and abandon our dreams of empire and despotism?

This view is in accord with the English idea of our responsibilities should we once interfere in China. The St. James Gazette in commenting upon the lessons we are now learning from China says:

"China is teaching America the impossibility of a great trading nation avoiding imperialism. America's experience will teach her it is not the desire to grab distant lands, but unavoidable destiny, that drives great Britain ever forward. Washington has no choice but to protect imperiled American citizens, and having once interfered in China to protect her interests, she shall never be able to shake from her shoes the dust of the Celestial Empire."

The St. James Gazette advances the same reasons for our remaining in China that were presented in favor of the extension of our power over the Philippines. If this argument was of sufficient weight to determine the policy of the present administration in dealing with the Philippines would it not be equally effective with some future administration when applied to China, especially since the Philippines can be cited as a precedent? Unless we wish to place ourselves in a position where we will "never be able to shake from our shoes the dust of the Celestial Empire" we had better act upon the sage advice given by Polonius to Laertes, "Beware of the entrance to a quarrel."

While from our standpoint China has not kept pace in the onward march of civilization, while her industrial life is crude and primitive, yet this cannot be urged as a justification for war. These things cannot be changed in a day. Society is an organism. It grows naturally, not phenomenally. *Natura non lapsus* applies with peculiar force to the organism we call a state. As the child cannot, *presto change*, be a man, so China cannot in a moment be evolved into the highest type of national life. China is the most densely populated portion of the globe. Her industrial system sustains more people per square mile than does that of any other country. The slow process of hand labor enables all of her people to be em-

ployed. A revolution in her industrial life such as the immediate displacement throughout the empire, of hand labor by modern machinery, would throw millions out of employment and deprive them of the means of livelihood. They would be forced to steal or starve. The country would be overrun with hungry hordes of idle men. A greater calamity could not befall China than the sudden transition from the old to the new, as is agitated by ultraprogressive people. A change in industrial life, in order to be effective and beneficial, ought to be gradual, thereby giving the people ample opportunity to adjust themselves to the new conditions. China will make greater progress industrially and assume more rapidly the ways of modern civilization if left to work out her destiny in her own way, as Japan has already done, and we will better fulfill our destiny and more nearly approach the ideal of a republic, by confining our activities to present boundaries and avoiding entanglements in the Orient.

RIGHT. The super-sensitive conscience of Mr. Bryan forced him, in 1893, to condemn the "gold standard" and to say of the democratic party in Nebraska, which at that time stood for the gold standard:

"Gentlemen, I know not what others may do, but duty to country is above duty to party. * * * If the democratic party, after you go home, endorses your action and makes your position its permanent policy, I promise you that I will go out and serve my country and my God under some other name, even if I must go alone."

And speedily after this swashbuckler bravado, the same citizen declares all those who think of the silver standard as he pretends to think of the gold, and of all those who "place duty to country above duty to party," when the party seeks to debase the currency and the morals of the republic by 16 to 1, to be "conspirators," "traitors upon whom the brand shall be placed and they shall not come back."

The conscience and ambition of Mr. Bryan were set up as the only conscience and the only ambition for democracy to heed. Under the rulings of that conscience and the inspirations of that ambition democracy has been merged into and lost in the vagaries of populism. And after four years of this fanaticism the same man and the same vagaries in finance are again forced to the front. If it were impossible during hard times and low prices to push them to victory, how shall they be made to triumph now?

Will the support of Tammany, Croker, the New York City ice trust and the silver conspirators be able to buy the election for Bryan? And if it is right for those elements to support him how can it be wrong for decent business men everywhere to oppose him?

AN OVERSIGHT. Why did not Mr. Bryan see that the Chicago platform was brought up to date and made to apply in every particular to the new conditions that have arisen since 1896? He should have insisted that the plank condemning federal interference with the Chicago rioters, be supplemented with a declaration endorsing the action of St. Louis strikers in denuding lady passengers of the street cars. He would thus have placed himself in complete accord with this new form of anarchistic demonstration and would have made impossible the displacement of his leadership. His neglect is unpardonable.

THE BRYAN VOTE. The Fremont Herald challenges the statement that appeared in THE CONSERVATIVE that Mr. Bryan was a weaker candidate for the democrats than Greeley. THE CONSERVATIVE can easily demonstrate that this assertion is correct. In 1892 Mr. Cleveland received 5,556,928 votes or 46.09 per cent of the popular vote. Mr. Weaver the populist candidate received 1,041,011, or 8.63 per cent. The combined vote registered against the republican candidate was 54.72 per cent. The combined vote, however, is not the proper test of the democratic party strength. The only way to determine the relative strength of the candidate is by a comparison of the strict party vote. Applying this test to Mr. Bryan and assuming the populist vote of 1896 to be that of 1892, his party vote may be obtained by taking from the total vote the 1,041,011 populist votes, leaving 5,461,914 as the democratic vote for Mr. Bryan. It was but 39.22 per cent of the popular vote. The democratic vote for Mr. Bryan was 95,014 less than the democratic vote for Mr. Cleveland in 1892, notwithstanding there were in 1896 1,868,150 new votes.

Owing to the agitation of the slavery question in 1860 the democratic party was divided upon sectional lines. The democratic vote, however, opposed to the republicans that year, was 60.92 per cent of the popular vote, or 14.22 per cent more than the combined democratic, silver republican and populist vote against the republicans in 1896. The democratic vote polled by Greeley in 1872 was 44.21 per cent of the popular vote. The democratic vote for Cleveland in 1892 was 46.09 per cent. The democratic vote for Mr. Bryan in 1896 was but 39.22 per cent. THE CONSERVATIVE can see no reason for retracting the statement that Mr. Bryan was the weakest man ever nominated by the democratic party.

The vote in 1896 shows that a political party, by abandoning its party principles, loses more of its party vote than it gains from the party to which it caters. The democratic party need not hope to succeed this year by again clothing itself in the livery of populism.