

naval engagement, and that the ships of Spain would be swept from the sea. I am not a prophet, but I believed what I then said, and it has been justified by events. Now I say, standing here, that, in my opinion, if we ratify the treaty with no declaration in it that we disclaim any right to enslave these people, or to hold them in subjection, or use language which does not mean giving them their liberty, we have already embarked in a war that will not release the volunteers, and thousands of the best American youth will lay their bones upon the plains and in the jungle of Luzon and in other parts of the Philippines."

Senator Daniel thus indicated the probable result of defeating the treaty as it was written :

"Peace, it is said, is in this treaty; peace—a pleasing name to conjure with.

Result of Defeating Treaty.

"Blessed are the peacemakers.' Are our friends upon the other side sure this treaty means peace? Are they sure that the spoken word will be substantiated by subsequent facts? Undoubtedly it means peace with Spain. There is nothing else in the future but peace with Spain. There is no contingency that can revive war with Spain. There is nothing that we would do with this treaty that can affect Spain."

These were the arguments used by senators in Mr. Bryan's own party. The arguments Bryan employs are those of Lodge and other imperialistic senators. Hence Mr. Bryan acted upon the side of the imperialists and took their interpretation of the meaning of the treaty and opposed that of his friends in his own party and other senators who were avowed anti-imperialists.

In answering Bryan's plea about the Bacon resolution, THE CONSERVATIVE quotes again from the speech of Senator Money :

"Mr. President, there are several resolutions for the consideration of the senate supposed to bear on the treaty.

These resolutions are simply declarations of opinion. They have no effect upon the decision of the controversy which we are about to engage in with the Filipinos, and that is the matter we are to consider now.

"If we pass any of these resolutions, of what avail is it? Does that determine our relations with the Filipinos? Does that induce them to come in and make terms with us? Does that disband the army? These resolutions are simply the text for discussion in open sessions of the senate, and they are worth that and little more."

A treaty is to nations what a private contract is to individuals. Only that which is written in the contract is binding upon either party. Mr. Bryan was once admitted to the practice of law and should know this. If he honestly favored independence for the Filipinos why did he oppose Senator Daniels,

Money and Hoar, who were trying to put such a provision in the contract or treaty, the only way it could be made binding? Why did he make their efforts futile by urging a simple declaration of the opinion of congress that would have no more effect in establishing our relations with the Filipinos than an oral statement of one of the parties would have upon a written contract?

The peerless explainer continues to explain: "I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected."

Of course we are. If the treaty had been rejected there would be no possibility of imperialism and it would indeed be a difficult proposition for even Mr. Bryan to "wage a successful contest" against nothing.

He further states: "With the treaty ratified, a clean cut issue is presented between a government by consent and a government by force, and imperialism must bear the responsibility for all that happens until the question is settled."

He might have added, if the treaty had not been ratified there would be no "clear issue" and there would not be any anti-imperialist candidate for the presidency. THE CONSERVATIVE has often hinted that Mr. Bryan favored the ratification of the treaty that he might have an issue in 1900 to replace the discredited tantamount of 1896. This confession confirms as truth what before had only been suspected.

We have some more artful explaining: "If the treaty had been rejected, considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified, and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind."

Senator Daniel effectually answered this plea when he said :

"Ah, but amend it, they say, and you delay. We are acting for all time, Mr. President. We are acting or immortality, not for a few days for a few weeks or a few months. Aye, would a few years be a long vestibule to that infinite stretch of time that goes with sovereignty?"

"But this treaty is easily amended. You have only to substitute in respect to the Philippine islands what you have done as to Cuba, and it is done."

Mr. Bryan's speech of acceptance is lame. His explanations do not explain.

He talks well. Sham Hypocrisy. No one questions his ability to do this. But the American people are concerned not so much in what men say they are going to do as in what they do. THE CONSERVATIVE admits that Mr. Bryan did denounce the acquisition of territory by conquest, but when the crucial moment came, he turned about and worked to

thus acquire territory. We admit that he also denounced government without consent, but when the time came to choose between a government with consent and a government without consent he deliberately chose the government without consent and used his influence to buy the Filipinos not only without their consent, but in spite of their armed protest. By doing so he proved his former expressions to have been nothing more than sham hypocrisy. It comes with poor grace for Mr. Bryan to denounce Mr. McKinley as an imperialist for favoring the treaty and at the same time seek to claim for himself the distinction of being an anti-imperialist for doing exactly the same thing Mr. McKinley did. It will not check imperialistic tendencies to elect as president a man who advised taking the first imperialistic step, which was "so apparent", that he might have a "clear cut issue" upon which to bid for votes.

SMYTH.

Blarneytime Jaw Smyth, Attorney-General of Nebraska, has been upon the war path and smitten the warriors of the Standard Oil Tribe hip and thigh. He now returneth to the wigwams of the populists with the gory scalps of Rockefeller, Flagler, and their unctuous savages dangling from his belt. Other corporations in Nebraska may look out for an ambush by the Jaw Smyth barbarians at an early day. Any combine for making money, paying wages and providing prosperity in Nebraska, is antagonized by Smyth.

TOWNE TALK.

The puerile attack of Charles A. Towne upon the character and public services of Grover Cleveland reminds THE CONSERVATIVE that Themistocles said: "Great men are like oaks, under the branches of which men are happy in finding a refuge in time of storm and rain; but when they have to pass a sunny day under them, they take pleasure in cutting the bark and breaking the branches."

When mushrooms are preferred over oaks for strength and durability Towne's talk will take the place of history. An attempt to batter down the great wall of China with mush and milk would be as fruitful of results as the assaults of Charles A. Towne will be upon the record and good name of Cleveland.

A RATIO.

"What is Bryanarchy?" asks a constant reader of THE CONSERVATIVE. Bryanarchy is a proposed government for the United States. It is to be made up of sixteen parts of vagaries, socialistic and agrarian, to one part of common sense. It is sixteen parts of danger to one of safety. It is inspired by anarchy and Bryan. All anarchists support him and hence the term Bryanarchy.