

1896 and the Bryan of 1900 as a man is even more striking than that between the two as orators, and it was made very plain last evening. Four years ago the democratic-populist candidate was perfectly frank and outspoken. He declared his position so plainly that nobody could doubt it. He took pains to say that he wanted nobody to vote for him under any misapprehension. At Philadelphia, September 23, 1896, for example, he said that "if anybody should believe that the gold standard was absolutely essential to the welfare of this country, he ought not to vote for me at all. I do not want any man to vote for me and then object to my doing what I expect to do if you elect me, and if I can prevent the maintenance of the gold standard, you can rely upon my doing it the very first possible opportunity given me."

But now Bryan evades the gold standard issue. The other day he asked Roosevelt a dozen questions, and the governor promptly answered every one. In turn Roosevelt asked him three questions, the first of which was as to his intentions regarding the gold standard, and he refused to answer. He began his speech at the Garden last evening by saying that he was "glad to defend our cause in this great centre of population, of industry, and of wealth;" and he knew that what this population is most concerned about is his attitude toward the currency question. But he refused to state his position. He refused, too, although he discussed another question than the so-called "paramount" one of Imperialism, and talked at length about Trusts. There was never so plain a case of a candidate's evading an important issue.

The dominant impression produced by Bryan's appearance in this city, as by his course during the last few weeks, is that of lack of sincerity. He often gives utterance to the most excellent sentiments, particularly on the subject of Imperialism; but the listener cannot help wondering whether he means any thing more by them than he did four months ago when he declared, over and over again, that the currency, Trusts and Imperialism are the three great issues before the people this year, one as important as another, while now he will not tell how he stands on the currency question. Wherever Bryan appeared last night, he seemed the actor in his bearing; and he seemed the actor, too, in his treatment of public questions, taking up one part and then another as one or other promises to draw well.

It is not such a candidate that appeals to the independent voter at best. Least of all does he commend himself to such a voter when he comes to a metropolis cursed by the domination of the worst political machine that ever afflicted a civilized city, under the patronage of its odious boss, and exclaims, "Great is Tammany, and Croker is its prophet."

DR. ELIOT ON POLITICAL TENDENCIES.

The current number of the Outlook contains an article by President Eliot of Harvard University, entitled, "Political Principles and Tendencies," in which he discusses the political problems now confronting the people.

"You have asked me," he begins, "for an academic article on the political principles and tendencies involved in the approaching presidential election—an article which shall not dwell on the fears and hopes of today, but rather describe the deep and far-reaching currents of events and opinions. This request seems to imply that the election this fall is not a supreme crisis, like the second election of Lincoln but only one indispensable act in a long drama. At any rate that is my opinion."

Referring to commercialism as a permanent policy for the American people, he says:

"Those men and those parties that suppose the American people likely to be permanently guided in their political action by any sordid commercialism or other form of national selfishness are grievously mistaken. Some party managers and all mercenary voters are governed by mean motives; but the mass of the people is never much influenced by pecuniary considerations in politics. The American people have long had a characteristic political and social enthusiasm. Their two steady, passionate sentiments are for the security, prosperity, and honor of the republic, and for the spread among the white races of free institutions and of the good social conditions which grow out of them. Whenever the people of the United States are to be called on for great exertions and sacrifices, they have first to be persuaded that such exertions and sacrifices will contribute to one or other of these two causes which they have at heart. The various policies, whether domestic or foreign, of political parties should always be considered with reference to these fundamental national passions and sentiments."

He then takes up the three principal topics of political discussion, the gold standard, the civil service and the protective tariff. About the gold standard he says:

"The important gains which have lately been made on this subject are due to a majority of the republican party and a minority of the democratic; but at this moment the great cause of sound currency is practically defended by the republican party alone."

The subject of next importance is "a public service based on merit only, but the mass of neither party is as yet to be trusted with it." He asks how this reform can be promoted at the present moment, and replies: "The personal and political history of the candidates of the republican party should cause them to be preferred on this issue to the candidates of the democratic-populist party; for of the two candidates nominated by the latter party, one is a

notorious spoilsman, and the other, being a civilian without military experience, accepted a colonelcy in time of war. That act speaks louder than orations. Moreover, recent experience shows that neither party can as yet be trusted to forego a spoils debauch at a complete change of the national administration."

Tariff Legislation.

Speaking of the possibility of freer-trade regulations he says:

"Since the democratic party has absolutely thrown away the low-tariff position which such leaders as Cleveland, Carlisle, Wilson, and Russell won for it, the reciprocity doctrine of the republican party seems to afford the best immediate opportunity for liberal legislation; although it must be confessed that progress towards world-wide trade is more likely to come through the logic of events than through legislation—that is, through the increasing superiority of American industries and the manifest insufficiency of the home market. Against this chance of improving commercial and industrial conditions by reciprocity treaties must be set the strange subserviency of the republican party leaders to small groups of capitalists, who, having made great sums of money by means of high-tariff legislation, are willing to make large contributions to republican campaign expenses in the expectation of preserving their special privileges. The 'machine' or 'boss' is, however, much the same corrupt and corrupting agency in both parties, Messrs. Quay and Platt being well matched by Messrs. Gorman and Croker."

The Integrity of the Courts.

He refers to the labor outbreaks which have, on several occasions, required the use of the military and the aid of the courts to establish order. "In this state of affairs," he says, "any attack on the independence of the judiciary is much to be deprecated. Such an attack is made for the second time in the platform of the democratic-populist party."

"In regard to foreign policy it is not easy to state any material difference between the declared policies of the two great parties. President McKinley and Mr. Bryan use different phrases in describing their foreign policies; but when it came to action, in all probability their policies would be much alike. President McKinley, in his unwonted function of sovereign and arbitrary ruler, committed a lamentable error in the tone of his proclamation to the Filipinos of December, 1898, and thereby involved his country in a cruel war—or rather a long series of military executions—with a semi-civilized but liberty-loving people who fought by our side against the Spaniards, and who ought to have been invariably addressed with the utmost consideration, not as purchased subjects or conquered foes, but as comrades and friends. The patriotic citizen may well hesitate to contribute by vote or influ-