

COL. JOHN P. IRISH ON COL. BRYAN.

The second campaign of Mr. Bryan is arranged with artfulness and design that were absent from that of 1896, which was made in the honeymoon of his ambition. He is now attempting to accomplish what he then threatened, and has the advantage of the most extraordinary situation disclosed by the history of American politics. He is at liberty, if elected, to reduce to working plans the whole Chicago platform, effect the overthrow of the gold standard, turn backward the progress of financial reform, introduce Calamity Weller's "more and fitter currency," embark the country in government ownership and operation of railways and all the instruments of commerce, and to revolutionize the government itself by introducing direct legislation through the initiative and referendum, which will abolish representative institutions, transfer the veto from the executive to the ballot box, and obsolete the judicial courts. He is pledged to all this in the several platforms upon which he has accepted his second nomination, and proposes to secure power to effect it, by an appeal to the anti-expansion sentiment of the country which regrets the unsolved problems left by the Spanish war. I affirm and pass over his responsibility for those problems, assumed when he successfully lobbied the ratification of the treaty of Paris. His excuse for that is unworthy a leader of men, for he declares that he favored the treaty lest holding it up to amend out of it the Philippine purchase, would have caused "public agitation". His fear of agitation is like a fish pleading fear of the water.

You will indulge me in a brief examination of the merits and sincerity of his anti-expansion views. In the first place he relies upon the South for 120 electoral votes, and in that section the sentiment in favor of holding the Philippines is practically unanimous. The opposition is in the Middle states, New England and the mediterranean region of the upper Mississippi valley. His present most active supporters were the first advocates of taking and holding the Philippines. In August, 1898, Senator Morgan of Alabama, in a speech in San Francisco, said: "Our flag is hoisted in the Philippines and the American people will never consent to haul it down. That flag will remain. The hand of God planted it there."

Hearst's Hypocrisy.

His chief newspaper support is from W. R. Hearst's triplets, the New York Journal, Chicago American and San Francisco Examiner. On June 27th, 1898, Hearst hoisted over his papers in big type, "An American policy for an American people. Nail the flag to the Philippines." He is now president of the national association of Bryan clubs,

and is talking about the constitution. Aug. 9th, 1898, he denounced as "little Americans, Torries and Copperheads," all who opposed holding the Philippines, and said we should hold them with an army "the cost of which will be paid out of the island revenues, on which it will be a proper charge." In the same year and month, in the Examiner, he said we must hold them because they are treasure islands and it will pay; that being there "by right of conquest, the American flag must be nailed to the Philippine flag staff," and if Aguinaldo resisted he would have to answer for it to an American army.

In an editorial bitterly abusive of Mr. Cleveland, he said: "It is in the right and power of congress to devise any sort of system that may apply to such dependencies, and this power is in no wise limited by the national constitution, nor does its application involve any modification of our domestic system." Again he said: "We can rule in the Philippines unhampered by the provisions of the constitution."

Constitution and the Flag.

Passing now to Mr. Bryan's platform, what does it propose? It declares that the constitution follows the flag, and that the Philippines are to be alienated if he get the power. But the constitution is not to be treated like the resolutions of a debating society. No one questions that the treaty of Paris put the flag in the Philippines, and Senator J. K. Jones says: "The constitution is there with all its blessings, immunities and privileges."

Now, the primary issue settled by our civil war was that territory once under the constitution cannot be alienated, for that is a dissolution of the Union. Accepting Mr. Bryan's theory and reducing it to practice, if he be president and let the Philippines go from under the constitution, how can he stop South Carolina from following? Under his theory anti-expansion becomes secession and the settlement of the civil war is reversed. Reaction as to the results of the Spanish war is reasonably sure. If the people have been deceived it is self-deception, and they must extricate themselves by enlightenment, but Mr. Bryan's plan bars their extrication by a constitutional question of the gravest nature. It will be observed that the Philadelphia platform is tentative in its declaration on the Philippines, while the Kansas City platform professes to be conclusive as to the flag and constitution being there, and proposes a remedy that then becomes impossible.

All this seems to have been known to the men who made that platform, for a vast majority of their constituency, being in the South, favors holding the Philippines. If the indissolubility of the union holds, they can hold the Philippines. If the islands are alienated the constitutional theory held by-

Jefferson Davis is vindicated, the decree of our civil war is vacated and the southern confederacy moves for a new trial. With this scheme in view Mr. Bryan asks the support of the anti-expansionists in the North, joined to that of the expansionists in the South to make him president. If elected, he is bound, as an honest man, to not only abolish our representative democracy, upset our public credit, destroy Jefferson's doctrine of inalienable right, but to dissolve the union.

Bryan Lobbied The Treaty.

Surely cool headed anti-expansionists will rather trust to that sober second thought of the people to remedy any evils inherent in the Paris treaty, lobbied to ratification by Mr. Bryan, than plunge into that chaos and black night which he is pledged to bring about unless he is as false to his professions as Mokanna.

As for my own position as a sound money democrat, I do not propose to risk what has been gained and lose all financial reform in prospect by permitting the election of Mr. Bryan, if I can do anything to prevent it.

As the case stands, with Mr. Bryan for president, the anti expansionists can get what they want only at the cost of a dissolution of the union, but the Southern expansionists who support Mr. Bryan will get the Philippines, substitute silver for gold as our standard, and the populists will get greenbacks, government ownership, the initiative and referendum.

Mr. Bryan's anti-expansion kite is too light for the tail it carries.

JNO. P. IRISH.

THE GERMAN-AMERICAN VOTERS.

Dr. Preetorius, editor of the Westliche Post, one of the most influential German papers in the United States, has given THE CONSERVATIVE the following authorized statement as published in the St. Louis Censor, of the reasons impelling him to oppose Mr. Bryan. It is addressed more particularly to German-American voters:

"Yes, the Westliche Post will continue as heretofore to support the republican party and candidates. I have not abandoned my views nor do I consider it necessary or possible for any man to shape his principles to full conformity in order to support a candidate or platform. The republican platform more nearly fills the measure of my belief than does the democratic, and it is natural to give your own party the benefit of any compromise that any man is compelled to make who becomes an integer of any party. Every man in becoming so is compelled to concede something, because the views or opinions of no two men who were ever created were in exact accord.

"The plank on expansion in the repub-