

it any wonder that here and there "enterprising" individuals go into the business by retail? We can throw up our hands at such things, and weep and wail over them as deplorable; but so long as social and industrial injustice prevail as largely as they do to-day, the beneficiaries of this injustice need not be at all surprised if some great but misguided souls will do such terrible things under the awfully mistaken opinion that that is the way to bring about juster social-industrial relations.

But I am sure that it cannot be done that way. Better bear the ills that press so hard and appeal to the sense of justice and self-interest which rests in every human heart, and which can be reached by peaceful, intellectual means. While I am opposed to kingcraft, the way to kill it is not by killing the occupants of thrones. It can be killed by thought, by ideas, and by no other means.

PROVIDENCE, OR . . .

An editorial published in the Mexican Herald (City of Mexico) of July 26.

The clergy are sure that Providence is showing His hand in the Orient. It looks to us marvelously like the hand of Don Satanas, but we "aren't calling no names," and are not so cocksure as the preachers. They are always seeing providential straws floating on the stream of events. The plain fact appears to be that the yellow men are wild with wrath; they believe that the white race wants to steal away their country, and in their blind ferocity and general hellishness are torturing and killing white men and women who have been left to their fate among them. Native converts are realizing that the role of the martyr is not so romantic in reality as it is in the ecclesiastical histories. To be sawn asunder, boiled in caldrons, to have one's eyes gouged out and nameless tortures inflicted, are discouraging to enthusiasm.

It is evident that the Chinese rulers, responsible for the atrocities, will have to be punished by way of retribution. The difficulty is to catch the right people. They will save themselves by cutting off the heads of thousands of poor devils of Boxers, their facile tools, and will talk, with oriental slipperiness, to the white generals who shall eventually get to Peking.

Looking at things as they are and not as one would have them be, it seems quite likely that Providence may be going to give the yellow brother his turn. He has been badly treated; all

his favorite ideas have been attacked; he has been made to smoke opium against his will; his country has been parcelled out by European cabinets and he has been kept informed of the plans of the powers by his agents abroad. Everybody who is frank will admit this. The great powers have not said: "China for the Chinese," but, rather: "China for Us."

Perhaps Providence is going to show our race that open and barefaced greed does not pay. The China trade is a big trade, but a great war will use up as much money as could be made out of it in 50 years, at least calculation. So that the policy of stealing your neighbor's vineyard is not even "good business." Why we should imagine that Providence favors us because our skins are white it is hard to understand. It is part of the cant of the times. Kipling put it into his *White Man's Burden* jingle and he is the faithful voice of the age in Europe. He has never explained to our satisfaction why the *le bon Dieu* should care more for the Indo-Germanic race than for the Mongolian, Polynesian or African. Measured by the infinite standard, we are all backward barbarians together. Our race has had a good show as the phrase goes; but it can't keep the peace in its own sections of the habitable globe. Our cities are filled with slums, and insane hospitals are multiplying because we have made the tension of life too taut. A few people get inordinately rich and have monthly incomes as big as the great fortunes of 50 years ago. We have not learned how to keep famine out of the lands we administer, and, as to our faith, we can't agree on a plain statement of it so as to make it comprehensible by the intelligent heathen.

Allah started out by making the human race very various; his dislike of uniformity is shown by the many tribes and colors of men. The world, in every phase, shows a love of diversity, a hatred of sameness. It is quite conceivable that Providence, whom our excellent friends, the clergy, invoke, is weary of seeing the yellow and brown brethren being hammered so hard. They were reasonably content before our race essayed the role of Universal Boss. Marcio Polo, the Venetian, went a traveling in the far east a few centuries ago; he saw strange and gorgeous courts and mighty princes; he was treated well, and returned to Europe to tell his tale of Asiatic pomp and luxury. In those days, Europe, half barbaric, superstitious, credulous, and every few years ravaged by some pestilence, was not dreaming of getting the orient under its feet. It had a healthy

respect for distant civilizations. But with the newer facilities of commerce our race grew daring and hungered for dominion, and began to build up empires, dependent states, etc., in Asia. We have made the orientals identify our religion with land grabbing, which is most unfortunate. The oriental may wobble in his logic, but this time he is sure he is right. Undoubtedly the fight now begun must go on; but that it will be made evident that Providence is on our side is not so sure.

"GUARDING THE CROSS WITH KRUPP GUNS."

The point that I want to press, and upon which I venture to hope I shall have your cordial sympathy, is this, that the idea of carrying the gospel to the Philippines with the aid of shot and shell is not only no quotation from the gospel, but it distinctly antagonizes the divine utterances which the gospel records and the divine spirit with which, from the beginning to end, that gospel is inspired; and that bringing to them the story of the cross under the cover of our gunboats—redemption in one hand and shot in the other—is an infidel method of accomplishing evangelical results.

Now there are a great many questions clustering about this into which, as Christian ministers, we have no business to enter. For example, in our capacity as Christ's ambassadors we have, as it seems to me, nothing whatever to do with the possible commercial advantages that may accrue to our country by the reduction of the Philippines. Whether there will be money in it for us is not our concern. Whether we shall ever be reimbursed for the tremendous charges to which our government is now putting itself is an unanswered question; but even granting that the most ambitious anticipations are going to be more than fulfilled, that does not touch the particular nerve of the matter that is our ministerial responsibility. The one solitary question that we have to consider before our congregations is this: Is it in keeping with the expressed mind of Jesus Christ that his adherents should seek to extend his kingdom by the use of swords and guns? Can we conceive of his enlisting in the Philippine war, or encouraging, or even allowing his disciples to do so? How would Jesus and John and Paul have looked pleading the love of God one moment and alternating by puncturing the impenitent pagans with a bayonet thrust the next?

Of course, it can be claimed that the gospel, like Washington's farewell ad-

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-