

silver question to threaten borrowers and scare bank depositors, he truly says that "this could not have been avoided without a complete surrender to the influences which control the republican party." Incidentally he administers a merited rebuke to the men who call themselves democrats but who in the recent campaign urged "opposition to silver as a reason for defending trusts, a large army and an imperial policy." But what is calculated most to strengthen the confidence of those democrats who believe in Bryan's democracy, and to draw others of their kind toward him, is his brief but vital discussion of the shifting issues of political campaigns. Because no one can foresee events, no one in 1896 could tell, he says, what would be the paramount issue in 1900, nor can anyone tell what will be the paramount issue of 1904. But, he continues—

while no one can foresee events, parties, like individuals, can have fixed and definite principles and can apply these principles to new issues as they arise. The man who is determined to obey the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," cannot foresee what temptation may come to him or what emergencies he may have to meet, but he can know that he will not take that which belongs to another, no matter how great the temptation may be.

In this habit of meeting the shifting problems of daily life by reference to absolute principle, trying both to know and to apply the principle aright, lies the strength of Mr. Bryan's character and the tenacious quality of his popularity. It is also the explanation of his unpopularity. The man who truly makes principle his mentor and guide is a dubious character to a large proportion of mankind. They don't understand that mode of life. There would seem, at any rate, to be no other reasonable explanation of the bitterness of hate which a large class of conventionally good people exhibit toward this young man of manifest ability, of proved

moral character and of stainless life. He lives in the concrete what they only preach in the abstract.

Mayor James K. McGuire, of Syracuse, makes a plausible prediction regarding the democratic presidential nomination for 1904. He believes that if conservative forces secure control of the party, David B. Hill will be the nominee; but "if the radical element of the party develops strength enough to again get into the saddle," that then the nominee will be Mr. Bryan. This prediction is doubtless as nearly right as can be expected of political forecasts, and it is a very clear indication of the present condition of the party. Hill would not be an ideal candidate for the plutocratic elements, but he approximates it as closely as they could hope for, since Cleveland, who is their ideal, is out of the question. And though a large proportion of the democratic element of the party do not regard Bryan as an ideal democrat, neither his superior nor his equal has yet been heard of. Over these two names, then, as well as can be judged at present, the plutocratic and the democratic elements of the democratic party are likely during the next four years to wage the conflict that will determine whether the democratic party shall any longer represent democracy in party politics.

"Fusion being dead in Kansas, the democracy will again assert itself," is the substance of an observation of a leading democrat of that state whose democracy is marked with the McKinley brand—Col. William H. Rossington, to wit. Since the democracy of Kansas is to assert itself because fusion is dead, it should be interesting to observe how the democracy of Kansas did assert itself before fusion was born. And interesting it is. Cleveland lost the state in 1888 by more than 80,000 votes. Now, as fusion in its "death struggle" lost it by less than 26,000—

Bryan the "fusionist" getting 60,000 more votes than Cleveland the "democrat," and McKinley only 5,000 more than Harrison—a question arises. Which is the deader, Kansas fusion or Kansas democracy?

An astounding political confession is made by the Buffalo Express. After supporting Mr. McKinley throughout the campaign, and though still holding the attitude of a McKinley paper, it completely collapses in its support of McKinley's Philippine policy. And what is especially notable is its recognition of the fraudulent character of the McKinley campaign with reference to the war in the Philippines. We quote from a leading editorial in its issue of November 30:

It is high time the American public got over its delusions about this war. It has deceived itself too long with the notion that it was fighting merely an ambitious rebel chief, representing only a fraction of a single tribe and maintaining his power as much by the terror he inspires as by any sense of patriotism. We are not fighting a government or an army, but a whole people.

But the American public has not deceived itself, as the Express assumes. It has been deceived by its public servants and their obliging newspapers. Mr. McKinley himself contributed to the deception. He helped make a gullible public believe that he was trying to put down an ambitious rebel chief, who represented only a small and barbarous tribe and maintained his power by terrorizing a peaceably disposed Philippine population who were yearning for American protection. Not only did McKinley and his supporters falsify the situation in that respect. They also assured the same gullible public—which consisted, however, as the vote indicates, of only about 54 per cent. of the voting population of the country—that McKinley's election would so discourage the Filipinos that peace with American sovereignty would follow immediately. But here is what the Buffalo Express of the date noted

above, and in the same editorial article from which the foregoing quotation comes, now considers to bethe true situation with reference to peace:

The conditions now existing in the Philippines are as near to peace as any that are likely to prevail for a good many years—probably for a generation, perhaps for several generations. They are the conditions under which we must expect to govern the islands so long as the population is hostile to us and we are determined to keep them under American sovereignty. Increasing the army will make no difference unless it should be raised to such size that a strong garrison could be put in every hamlet and a guard over every farm. A column of 500 American troops could probably march anywhere in the archipelago now. After such a triumphant demonstration of our power, let the same column be broken up into detached parties of 25 men each, and every man of them would most likely be killed or captured within 50 miles of Manila.

That is what the democrats said during the campaign. The republicans denied it then. But there is worse to come. In the same article, the Express admonishes the American public, whom for the sake of McKinleyism it joined last fall in deceiving, that when we abandon the Philippines we must exterminate the native inhabitants. After assuming that probably in the course of years, after the present generation both of Filipinos and Americans has passed away, hostilities may die down, it proceeds:

But if we are going to conquer the people, we must recognize the fact that we will have to fight the people, not an army or a government. We shall have to imitate the course of Great Britain in South Africa. Where an armed body of rebels appears we must burn the village that gave it shelter and destroy the crops on which it fed. We must concentrate non-combatants in small garrisoned districts, as the Spanish did. We must send all prisoners to distant exile. We must execute promptly any who are detected in breaking their oaths of allegiance. We must make our soldiers a terror to the whole population, because a people can be ruled by force only after they have been taught to fear. The work

of tyranny can be done only by the methods of tyranny.

There you have as lurid a picture of imperialism as any supporter of Bryan ventured to draw even in the most exciting moments of the presidential campaign. Yet it is now given us calmly by a leading McKinley journal. The election being over and won, the truth comes out. Lurid as the picture is, it is not over-colored. The opportunity was ours once, to foster a republic off the shores of Asia, a republic modeled after our own, and whose people would be our most grateful and devoted friends. Instead of availing ourselves of that opportunity, we first deceived those people, then bullied them, then fought them until their armies were scattered and their government demolished, and now, even according to this Buffalo organ of McKinley, we must either abandon them or reduce them to subjection by terror. And the Buffalo paper is right. Though wrong, terribly wrong when it supported McKinley and his imperial policy by helping to inspire the American people with delusions which it now begs them to get over, it is nevertheless right at last. The work of tyranny can indeed be done only by the methods of tyranny.

The British government is now well packed with nephews, sons and sons-in-law. Nepotism has never before flourished in England so luxuriantly. It was made a subject of debate in parliament on the 10th, when a member moved to the address to the queen an amendment expressing the regret of the Commons that Lord Salisbury had recommended so many of his own family to offices under the government. The motion was lost, but the fact that 128 members voted for it indicates that it was taken seriously. While the debate was on, Mr. Balfour, a nephew of Salisbury, and one of his governmental family, op-

posed the motion with the plea that "the unhappy accident of birth ought not to be a bar to public service." Mr. Balfour appears to be something of a humorist. That plea had always been used against nepotism. Mr. Balfour is the first person, either nepotist or nepotee, to give it the other turn.

Lord Salisbury's remarks in parliament apropos of the address to the throne in response to the queen's speech is significant of a radical and disquieting departure in the laws of war. Great Britain must make it felt, he said, that no one, by the issue of an insolent and audacious ultimatum, can force the British government to humble itself and abandon its rights; in such a case not a shred of independence should be left. It might be observed in passing that the "audacious ultimatum" which the Transvaal issued was a justifiable demand that the British government cease threatening it with military invasion, accompanied with an offer in return to withdraw the Boer troops from the British border and to submit the differences between the two countries to arbitration. That was not insolent, even if audacious. But the vital point about Salisbury's remarks is his cool contention that because this ultimatum was issued and in the hostilities following the Boers were defeated, they forfeited their independence. If any principle at all is involved in this contention, if it is not a mere assertion of unlicensed power, it means that Great Britain is asked by Salisbury to establish a principle and a precedent in international law for the extinction by victors in war of the independence of the defeated power. Let that principle be established, and the world is on its way with lightning speed back to the barbarism from which it has partly emerged.

In his argument this week before the supreme court, John D. Lindsay, the able New York lawyer who