

**RISE AND SING.** Page 626 of the gospel of St. Bryan known as "The First Battle" contains this and the glee club of 16 to 1 will rise and sing:

"The year 1900 is not far away. Before that year arrives the evil effects of a gold standard will be even more evident than they are now, and the people, then ready to demand an American financial policy for the American people, will join with us in the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation."

Glory! Glory! Was ever prophecy so perfectly verified? Money five per cent on farm lands, and begging for takers! Nobody starving, smiles plenty, tears scarce!

**GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT.** It will be extremely difficult for the Bryanarchists to harmonize the anti-imperialist declaration of their platform with the imperialist record of their nominee. The platform says:

"We declare again that all governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is tyranny; and that to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic."

The treaty of peace with Spain stipulated that upon the payment of \$20,000,000 by our government, sovereignty over the Philippines should pass from Spain to the United States. Many able and conscientious senators, defenders of the theory of the consent of the governed, opposed the acquisition by purchase of sovereignty over the people of the Philippines and for this reason made a determined fight against the treaty. Mr. Bryan, whose regiment was about to be ordered to Cuba, suddenly changed from an ardent war man to a peace-at-any-price man even to the extent of paying \$20,000,000 to obtain it. He very patriotically resigned his commission as colonel of the Third Nebraska, and rushed to Washington to carry on the fight for ratification. At that time consent did not enter into his inventory of the essentials for a just government. He did not bother to find out whether the Filipinos consented to the proposed arrangement or not but used his influence, as leader of the party opposed to the republicans, in favor of the treaty, in favor of buying from Spain the right to govern the Filipinos. Not only did he do this without the consent of the Filipinos but he did it in spite of their protest. At the time the vote was taken on the treaty, the people of the Philippines were in open revolt against the authority of the United States. It was

well known that if the treaty was ratified and our sovereignty extended to the Philippines, force would be required to maintain it there.

If "any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny," by bringing about the extension of our sovereignty to the Filipinos, Bryan is responsible for whatever of tyranny there may be in it. If "to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic," by advocating the purchase from Spain of sovereignty over the Filipinos, in spite of the protest of the people, Bryan did favor the "substitution of the methods of imperialism for those of a republic." If Bryan is so conscientiously opposed to government without the consent of the governed, why did he not join in the effort of those senators who were making a fight in the senate of the United States to uphold this principle? If he did not believe in the purchase of sovereignty and maintaining it by force, why did he advocate paying \$20,000,000 to Spain for her rights in the Philippines, in the face of the armed resistance on the part of the Filipinos to even our military occupation of the islands? If the paying of \$20,000,000 to Spain was buying people, as Bryan has on several occasions declared, why did he become a party to such infamy by advocating the purchase?

**Tyranny.** The policy outlined in the Kansas City platform, relative to the government that shall be established in the Philippines, is also inconsistent with the declaration about the consent of the governed. Bryan thus expresses his purpose:

"We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America."

Bryan favors "an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give the Filipinos a stable government." A government by consent means a government established by the people for themselves instead of somebody else establishing it for them. Who is to establish this stable government referred to in the Bryanocratic platform? This platform distinctly states that it is the "nation's purpose to give the Filipinos a stable form of government." It will not be a government by the Filipinos, but a government donated by the United States to the Filipinos. What if the Filipinos object to Bryan fixing up a government for them instead of letting them do it themselves, as the theory of consent implies? Would Bryan recede from the purpose, so distinctly and em-

phatically stated in his platform, or would he insist, by the use of force, upon giving them a government? The purpose to do a thing means the intention of doing it, the determination to overcome all obstacles. The purpose to give the Filipinos a stable government is the dominant idea in Bryan's platform, and the consent of the governed only incidental. Bryan's government would be a government by consent if the consent of the Filipinos should happen to coincide with his purpose and not otherwise.

Bryan's platform next declares the nation's purpose to grant the Filipinos independence. When? Immediately? No, not until we have given them a stable government. The query naturally arises who is to be the judge of its stability, the Filipinos or ourselves? This, of course, is the prerogative of the power establishing the government. It will be for the United States to determine when a stable government is established and when it would be safe to give the Filipinos independence. It may require 1 year or 1,000 years to establish such a government in the Philippines and, until it is established, the Bryanocratic platform does not contemplate the granting of independence.

**Inconsistent.** While Bryan now declares himself so ardently in favor of the principle of the consent of the governed, as enunciated in the declaration of independence, it should not be forgotten that he did advocate the acquisition by purchase of sovereignty over the Filipinos, regardless of their consent. Neither should it be forgotten that he is now a candidate upon a platform that announces the purpose of giving the Filipinos a government instead of letting them establish it for themselves. While Bryan has denounced the withholding of independence from the Filipinos, his platform declares that it is the purpose of the nation to continue to withhold it and not give it to them until we have given them a stable government, or until we get ready, a promise so indefinite as to be absolutely worthless. Wherein does Mr. Bryan's policy differ from that of the administration? In what particular does it give promise of terminating the insurrection in the Philippines?

The Filipinos insist upon establishing a government for themselves and resist the attempt of anybody else to do it for them. They would not welcome Bryan as a maker of their government any more kindly than they have received McKinley. It is the principle of the government and not the personality of the individual they oppose. If it be imperialism to give a people a government instead of letting them establish it for themselves, we would have imperialism

**Militarism.**