

against Russia, Austria and Italy; to Greece against the unspeakable Turk, to Turkey as against all Europe; and to China to protect Manchuria against Russia—in short, to the whole world; it being not yet too late to embrace within the Monroe doctrine the failing cause of the Boers.

There is no limit to the foreign complications and the imperialism to which Mr. Bryan's use of the Monroe doctrine would lead. Suppose the Filipinos get into war with Japan and are conquered, after giving just cause of war. Japan would claim the rights of conquest. Then we must go to war with Japan, with the "Monroe doctrine" nailed to the masthead, to preserve Philippine independence. To call such a scheme nonsense does not fit the occasion. The scheme is full of actual, perpetual, enormous danger. It departs as far from Washington's admonition and from the Monroe doctrine as the Chicago platform departs from the principles of Jefferson, Benton, Jackson, Cleveland, Tilden and Bayard.

The initial point of departure in the discussion of this subject is at the word "independence". I am not arguing against Philippine independence. I do not pretend to foresee the outcome. But I see only three possible solutions. Either those islands will remain under the political sovereignty of the United States, with a territorial government, as any other territory not admitted as a state, or they will ultimately be admitted as a state, or they will be granted independence. With their independence granted our military forces, our flag, our protectorate should be withdrawn. Otherwise the Filipinos will not be working out their own destiny. There would be no necessity for withdrawing the Monroe doctrine. It never went there.

Some candidates for the presidency have been better, politically safer, than the declaration of principles or policies formulated by the party conventions which nominated them. Mr. Bryan's platforms are bad enough, but the candidate is worse.

For the present purpose it will be assumed that Mr. Bryan is absolutely sincere and politically honest. That would make his election a much greater danger than if he were only a clever demagogue playing on passion, discontent and ignorance for the purpose of vote catching. He has given sufficient proof of a willful and imperious temper.

An Unbalanced Mind.

His wanton affront to a gentleman, and to all democrats who had dissented from the populist departure of 1896, in answer to an official invitation to a political dinner, and his singularly indiscreet meddling in the Kentucky contest of 1899, against the advice of discreet and conservative democrats of that state, are striking admonitions of his

mental and emotional make-up. If the relations between the executive and the legislative departments of the government, and if our relations with foreign countries are to be expressed in the style of the letter to Mr. Belmont, neither internal harmony nor external peace will be long secure. If great political functions are to be discharged in the feeling that prompted Mr. Bryan to congratulate the Kentucky legislature on the fact that it was of a particular partisan complexion, that body then being about to enter upon the discharge of a very grave constitutional duty, a function at least semi, if not wholly, judicial in its nature, and in the discharge of which a decision agreeable to Mr. Bryan could not be rendered without overriding the choice of a majority of the people of Kentucky as duly ascertained and certified by a board of officers, a majority of whom were democrats, then indeed it may be asked whether in his view partisan ends are not more sacred than the right of self-government by majorities. The final determination of that great litigation is not here criticised. The decision of the supreme court of the United States that it had no jurisdiction to review and reverse the decision of the court of appeals of Kentucky was right. And in view of the provision of the constitution of Kentucky that the legislature should be the tribunal to decide finally such contests, it is not perceived how the court of appeals of Kentucky could do otherwise than to follow the decision of the legislature and accept it as final, though it may have been purely partisan and against the evidence. It was Mr. Bryan's method and style of treating the question that illustrates his alarming unfitness to have a controlling influence in any great public emergency.

Dangerous, if Sincere.

And why would he, as president, be more dangerous, if honestly earnest, than if he were a mere clever political intriguer? Because most men, even conscious demagogues, when actually clothed with office and power and confronted with responsibility, are toned down and made more cautious, prudent and conservative by a sense of that responsibility. Mr. Bryan's narrowness of view and fierceness of will would drive him all the more irresistibly, for being politically sincere, to the accomplishment of his wishes and the fulfillment of all his promises. What are those wishes? What are those promises? To whom have those pledges been made? Think of it, and then let voters imagine, if they can, William Jennings Bryan refraining from urging and carrying into effect any one of his pet theories and policies; and imagine, if they can, that a will so imperious as his undoubtedly is, could resist the clamor of his followers if he dared to make the attempt. He would have three-fourths

of them arrayed against him at the first sign of hesitation.

What are those pledges? Dominating all others is 16 to 1, with all its consequences. The conversion of the supreme court into a political instrument and machine. To stop "government by injunction," which has no meaning if it does not mean that when mobs are destroying property, detaining the United States mail and bringing inter-state commerce to a standstill, courts shall not exercise a well-established power, and grant a peaceful and bloodless remedy. To prevent all "arbitrary" interference by the United States military forces in the affairs of the states—a denunciation aimed at president Cleveland's suppression of the Chicago riots, or else aimed at nothing.

Bryanism Characterized.

Then, what is Bryanism? Undisguised ambition that has passed the point of fever heat and settled into a permanent consuming white heat; arrogance of temper that brooks no opposition; conceit that is ridiculous; unbounded self-confidence and self-sufficiency; abnormal activity, so restless and intense, that it comes near being a disease; catching at his own new born ideas, no matter how crude or how vague when put on paper, as flashes of revealed truth; gifted with a torrent of language that "goes on forever"; beyond doubt with the courage of his convictions and having in his following every element of unrest, every material for civil commotion; these qualities and forces, behind the platforms of Kansas City and Chicago, constitute Bryanism. No offense or sneer is meant by annexing the final syllable to his name. The ism is a necessity of the case in attempting to express the whole situation in one word. The platforms if fairly tried in practice would soon tumble to pieces. Bryanism is congenital. And whoever thinks that such a character, with such forces behind him, would not as president press all that he believes and all that he has promised is a political ostrich who does not see his own danger because he intentionally thrusts his head under the sand to avoid seeing his pursuers.

Writing, as I do, for democrats, it is not irrelevant or egotistic to state the obstacles I overcame in resolving to support McKinley against Bryan as soon as it was manifest more than a year ago that 1896 had to be fought over again.

Viewed as a Democrat.

I believe the war against Spain was just. I believe that Porto Rico is as much a part of the soil and territory of the United States as New Mexico or Alaska. Therefore I believe that the Porto Rican tariff was a legal, a financial and a political error. I believe that all tariff protection is erroneous in the-