

dress, is a back number, but it is not to that class of mind that this appeal is addressed. I am speaking only to one whom I believe to be standing unwaveringly upon the gospel as being still true to the mind and heart of God, and therefore absolutely binding upon the affections, consciences and utterances of everyone who presumes to stand before the world in Christ's stead as a divine ambassador. With that understanding, how, in the name of all that is sincere and unswervingly loyal, can you or I look with anything but grief and shame upon any blood-shedding scheme of gathering heathen Filipinos into the ranks of the redeemed? Is there any recorded word of Jesus Christ that can be construed into accord with such policy of any example left us by any of his apostles that can by any honest style of hermeneutics be interpreted as indorsement of such policy?

Another question into which we need not inquire too curiously is whether heathen cannot be shelled into the kingdom of heaven more rapidly than they can be preached in. That is a feature of the case that has no fascination for me and probably would not have for you. Perhaps, if in the wilderness Jesus had yielded to the devil, and made "a deal" with him by which all the kingdoms of the earth should have become subject to Jesus if Jesus would engage to become subject to Satan, it would have expedited matters, without very materially helping them. To trade with the devil for the sake of glorifying the Lord is a policy repugnant to sense and still more so to piety.

Another point that has frequently been made is that even if it is not quite Christian to try to save men's souls by driving them up into a corner with a shotgun, yet that is the way in which a great deal of Christian civilization has been effected, notably by the English, and that God has uniformly overruled to his own glory the questionable methods by which it has been attempted to promote his glory. There is nothing, doubtless, that God cannot overrule to his own glory, and to the spread of the gospel, even the denials of Peter and the betrayal of Judas Iscariot—but to allow our pulpits to encourage "the wrath of man" because "God can make the wrath of man to praise him," is a detestable way of going about the Lord's business; and to apologize (as I have recently seen done) for the Mohammedan way in which we are jamming Christian civilization upon the poor pagans of the Pacific by saying that, although it is bad business,

yet the Almighty will have no difficulty in making it the means of hastening the millenium is both hypocrisy and sacrilege.—Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D. D.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT AND TENDENCY OF BRYANISM IN AMERICA.

A letter published in the *London Speaker* of May 26, from J. Warren T. Mason, 179 Temple Chambers, London, E. C.

Will you allow me to trespass on your space sufficiently to place before your readers the views of a Bryan democrat on the tendency of democracy in America, and perhaps, incidentally, to correct a misconception of the causes and hoped-for results of Bryanism? Hitherto the opinions cabled and written from the United States have been by men either affiliated to republicanism or alienated from the democratic party by their refusal to support the candidacy of Mr. Bryan and indorse the Chicago platform in 1896. Neither of these classes is obviously in any position to advance an unbiased opinion. With the approach of the November presidential election, it is essential that students of international politics become alive to the importance of observing the trend of public thought in America. The people are awakening from their lethargy of political indifference—for so long the despair of social philosophers.

The belief seems prevalent that the radicalism dominating the democratic convention in 1896, like the nomination of Mr. Bryan, was the result of pure chance and will soon die out. It is held that Mr. Bryan is himself the present democratic party, and if he can be driven from his leadership democracy will again settle down to its former conservatism. There was never a greater mistake. The movement that culminated in the adoption of the Chicago platform four years ago had been slowly forming for decades, gathering renewed strength from every defeat. Since the reconstruction period the democratic national conventions had been dominated by a small body of eastern men to whom politics was an exact science, of which they were past masters. By cajolery and intimidation they drove the inexperienced western majority whither they willed. Tariff reform and the development of civil service were the beginning and end of their political platforms. Privately they were in politics for what they could get out of it. They considered themselves not only the leaders, but also the dictators of the party. The west, after a time, began to see this and tried to make democracy more representative of the people. But they were

impotent. The party machinery was in the control of the east, and the west had no organization to control or counteract it. Finally, after the nomination of Mr. Cleveland in 1892, the west decided to send to the next convention men impervious to the wiles of the east, who could be depended upon to uphold the programme of their constituents and abide by the decision of the caucus. They would then dominate the convention by sheer force of numbers.

This initial move should be more understood, for it is the keynote of Bryanism. It was the development of the primaries to its highest extent. It was like a New England town meeting made familiar to Englishmen by that prince of American historical writers, John Fiske. The westerners, farmers, mechanics and laborers generally came together in their villages and towns and discussed the future of democracy face to face. They gave that attention to it they had been accustomed to devote to any local matter that had to do with each personally. They thrashed out the matter completely, and the unanimous decision was that the time had come when America must realize the ballot was not meant to elect men to office, except incidentally, but to put the people themselves in power. This is not the high-sounding phrase of a demagogue. Anyone acquainted with American political life understands, even if he will not admit, that the baleful presence of the political machine is due to the voters' proneness to end their political duty by balloting for whoever is nominated by the few men in control of the party organization. The west decided to remedy this by deposing the leaders of the democratic machine and substituting themselves. Hereafter, not the opinions of a dozen or so politicians were to make the party platforms, but the people would create the planks themselves. Such was the resolve of the west, and how well they succeeded is a matter of history. Their victory was all the more complete because the other side went down with colors flying.

The platform once adopted, the convention turned its attention to the selection of a presidential candidate. This was a secondary matter, and as such well expresses the mood of the people and draws a distinctive line between the Chicago convention and any other in American political history. Hitherto, conventions had been for the purpose of nominating one of several rival candidates. They were miniature reproductions of the real cam-

paign to follow. What the party was to stand for, except in general terms, was of little moment. The delegates were concerned mostly with trying to make the best bargain for their votes. The candidate who could promise the greatest number of good berths to the leaders of the controlling delegations usually secured the nomination. At Chicago this was done away with. The single aim of the majority of the delegates was to adopt a platform setting forth their new principles. Their nominee was to be their instrument in carrying out these principles. In their choice fate was with them, and the one man who embodies the thought of the people to an ideal extent was selected.

Never has anyone occupied the same relative position to his party as does Mr. Bryan. Presidents and leaders have been selected from the masses, but their parties have been subservient to them, while Mr. Bryan is simply the spokesman of his party. Look at other presidents. Jefferson was a man of the people, but he gave the people their views and drove them as he pleased, though ever with a loose rein. He dominated the party, the party did not control him. Jackson was a man of the people, but he put himself above party, or rather was a party unto himself. His "Kitchen Cabinet" was the first political machine to seize the reins of national government, and his successor, nominated by himself, was, perhaps, the most astute machine politician America has ever known, and was the developer, if not the founder, of the corrupt methods that exist in the politics of New York state to-day. Lincoln was a man of the people, but Lincoln was born to direct the salvation of the people in another way. These three men stand out most prominently as leaders most in touch with the people, but their hold was not that of Mr. Bryan. This may be due to different conditions, but it is none the less true.

In their time social reform in its deepest significance was scarcely considered seriously beyond the confines of a little coterie of enthusiasts. Political questions were of prime importance, and necessarily so, for the advancement of the union demanded it. Internal development, the settlement of the tariff, the Indian question, and the establishment of foreign relations occupied all attention. True, the slavery question was continually recurring, but its social aspect, except indirectly, did not concern the people themselves. With the meeting of the

Chicago convention this had changed. Social emancipation, as the legitimate child of political freedom, took precedence over everything else. The democratic party then and there became the party of a new socialism; not the socialism analogous to anarchy, not the socialism of the European parliaments, but socialism in its pure meaning, a synonym for ethical changes; socialism, meaning the elevation of humanity; the socialism that allows an old age pension bill to be introduced in England's parliament, and that provides a workman's compensation act for the benefit of English laborers.

This is the sort of socialism Bryanism means, and because it includes antagonism to special privileges and class legislation, purely as acts of self-preservation, it is reviled as anarchy and nihilism. The new democratic party is, however, convinced that these things are the birthrights of the people, and there will be no turning back until the results are achieved. Mr. Bryan is but an incident, the free coinage of silver is but an incident, the real issue is the social uplifting of the people by political means. Conservatism, prejudice and selfishness stand in the way of present success, but time will bring a change, and until then democracy will struggle on directed by the people themselves, and expressing the ideals of the masses.

A FABLE FOR THE TIMES.

A great eagle one day,  
Who would plously prey,  
Took his seat on a towering cliff by the sea;  
And, observing from there  
The land, water and air,  
He considered what best for his dinner  
would be.

Pretty soon he perceived  
(So at least he believed)  
A good prospect of daintily dining on fish;  
And in truth he was glad  
That such game could be had;  
For at that time of year 'twas his favorite  
dish.

A fish-hawk he descried,  
With his pinions spread wide,  
Overhanging the face of the billowy brine.  
"Good for him," thought the king  
Of the birds, "for he'll bring  
From the deep a fair prize that will shortly  
be mine."

Then the hawk with a lunge  
And a desperate plunge,  
Takes a shad in the depth of its watery  
lair;  
Thence, emerging, he draws  
The big fish with his claws;  
And in triumph he bears it aloft through  
the air.

"What a sight to behold!"  
Says his majesty bold;  
"How the tyrant's abusing the innocent  
shad!"  
In an instant he starts;

And like lightning he darts,  
And denounces the hawk for his govern-  
ment bad.

In surprise and dismay  
Hawk releases his prey;  
And the fish is returning toward water—  
the elf!

But the eagle declares,  
With magnificent airs:  
"The poor thing is not able to care for  
itself!"

So he plunges head first,  
As if fearing the worst;  
And his powerful talons are holding the  
shad.

"Let me go," says the fish;  
"For 'tis freedom I wish!"  
Says the eagle: "Your conduct is horribly  
sad.

"How ungrateful you are,  
Since I've traveled so far  
To emancipate you from the tyrannous  
hawk,  
To pretend you've a claim  
To the home whence you came;  
And how grossly depraved thus of freedom  
to talk!

"For in fact I've designed  
And had only in mind,  
As distinctly I said in my late proclama-  
tion,  
To secure for your race  
A superior place  
By means of benevolent assimilation."

Thereupon through the air,  
Spite of protest and prayer,  
The poor fish was borne off to the bird's  
habitation;  
And the bird was so filled  
With the fish that he'd killed  
That he died of benevolent assimilation.  
—W. Colegrove, LL. D., in Signs of the  
Times.

OUR CAMPAIGN SONG.

For The Public.  
Now choose the flag you'll follow;  
Fight the fight who can—  
McKinley for the Dollar,  
Or Bryan for the Man.  
VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

Britannia was plainly perturbed.  
Her brow was almost a perfect under-  
study for a corduroy road.

"I wonder," said she, "should I give  
my allegiance to Rudyard, who  
preaches the gospel of main strength  
in his verse, or to Alfred, who prac-  
tices it in building his compositions?"  
—Indianapolis Press.

CAMPAIGN OFFER :

To extend its circulation and influence  
during the presidential campaign,

THE PUBLIC

will be mailed weekly to any address in  
the United States, Mexico or Canada, from  
the present date to and including the issue  
of November 10, 1900, for

TWENTY CENTS

Address:  
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.