The Oregonian.

Entered at the Postoffice at Portland, Oregon, as second-class matter.

TELEPHONES.
Editorial Rooms....166 | Business Office....667

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

By Mail (postage prepaid), in Advance—
Daily, with Sunday, per month.....$0 85
Daily, Sunday excepted, per year..... 7 50
Daily, with Sunday, per year..... 9 00
Sunday, per year..... 2 00
The Weekly, per year..... 1 50
The Weekly, 3 months..... 50
To City Subscribers—
Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays excepted.15c
Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays included.20c

POSTAGE RATES.

United States, Canada and Mexico:
10 to 14-page paper.....1c
16 to 22-page paper.....2c
Foreign rates double.

News or discussion intended for publication in The Oregonian should be addressed invariably "Editor The Oregonian," not to the name of any individual. Letters relating to advertising, subscriptions or to any business matter should be addressed simply "The Oregonian."

The Oregonian does not buy poems or stories from individuals, and cannot undertake to return any manuscripts sent to it without solicitation. No stamps should be inclosed for this purpose.

Puget Sound Bureau—Captain A. Thompson, office at 1111 Pacific avenue, Tacoma. Box 955, Tacoma Postoffice.

Eastern Business Office—The Tribune building, New York City; "The Rookery," Chicago; the S. C. Beckwith special agency, New York.

For sale in San Francisco by J. K. Cooper, 746 Market street, near the Palace Hotel; Goldsmith Bros., 236 Sutter street; F. W. Pitts, 1008 Market street; Foster & Orear, Ferry News Stand; L. E. Lee, Palace Hotel News Stand.

For sale in Los Angeles by B. F. Gardner, 250 So. Spring street, and Oliver & Haines, 106 So. Spring street.

For sale in Omaha by H. C. Shears, 105 N. Sixteenth street, and Barkalow Bros., 1612 Farnam street.

For sale in Salt Lake by the Salt Lake News Co., 77 W. Second South street.

For sale in New Orleans by Ernest & Co., 115 Royal street.

On file in Washington, D. C., with A. W. Dunn, 509 14th N. W.

For sale in Chicago by the P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street.

TODAY'S WEATHER—Partly cloudy and probably occasional rains; brisk westerly winds, decreasing in force.

PORTLAND, MONDAY, OCTOBER 29

BRYANISM TO DATE.

In his second Madison-Square speech and other addresses Saturday night at New York, the Democratic candidate sets out his position clearly and comprehensively. He covers the whole ground, and it is fitting to review Bryanism in its revised version, practically its final form. Let us start with

"Imperialism."

I believe that it is more important that we should have a republic than that we should have any particular money standard.

The question begged in this assertion is that retention of the Philippines will destroy the Republic. But neither here nor elsewhere has Bryan produced the evidence to prove that retention of the Philippines will destroy the Republic. He has made the assertion over and over again, but he never condescends to prove it. He sets at defiance the fact that every great republic of history has expanded as it has become great and prosperous—Greece, Rome, Venice, Holland, France—and that our own Republic has expanded by conquest and purchase over the Louisiana and Gadsden tracts, over Alaska, Hawaii and Porto Rico, without "endangering our form of government," and without subverting our liberties. Against the simple truth of experience that remote parts of a great nation are happy and prosperous according as they are justly or unjustly dealt with, he puts out the assumption that a nation cannot expand if its form of government is republican; or, in other words, that the only government fitted to extend its sway is a monarchy.

The Ancient Landmark.

Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set.

The Scripture reads "landmark" instead of "landmarks." The discrepancy is small, but important, for otherwise Mr. Bryan could for once be justly accused of quoting his authorities correctly.

Experience has taught us that the commands of the ancient Hebrew Scriptures cannot always be taken literally, or we should be involved in many absurdities and contradictions. It is dangerous to take an isolated text and give it universal application. In reply to Mr. Bryan's text, we might, for example, adduce Isaiah liv:2-3:

Enlarge the place of thy tent; and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited.

Unfortunately for Mr. Bryan's position, moreover, the history of the Jews, even more signally than their literature, bears upon the expansion problem with impressive pertinence; for so long as they listened to the command of Jahveh to go up and possess the lands he had promised to Abraham, they grew and prospered, but in the day they ceased to move the ancient landmark, in the day they chose the Chinese policy of isolation and stagnation, was the beginning of the end; so that today they are not only a people without a country, but are fast becoming a people divorced from the ancient religion.

How many times the ancient landmark has been moved since this Republic first began to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes! How many deserts have been braved and mountains scaled, how many marches made and treaties drawn and trains of prairie-schooners hurried West to carry the flag over lands held by France and Spain, Russia and Great Britain, Pequods and Cayuses and Seminoles! Under the equator's sun and in the far snows of the Arctic circle the American soldier has carried the banner of American expansion! "There it waves," said Dewey, "and there, I hope, it will remain forever."

The Filipino.

Why cannot this Nation be to the Filipino what France was to the American? France helped us to gain our liberty, and then left us free to enjoy it. We helped the Filipino gain his liberty, let us help him enjoy that liberty.

It is sufficiently well known to students of history, among whom we would not do Mr. Bryan the injustice of including him, that French aid to this country in the critical hour of the Revolution was prompted by a desire to injure England, and this in no wise reflects upon the noble actions of the Marquis de la Fayette. The parallel fails also because the colonists had been fitted by experience for self-government, while the Filipinos have not. As Professor Anderson, just home from Luzon, instructively observes, "the natives have not yet learned to trouble themselves over politics." But the essential thing in Bryan's assertion is wrong; that is, that "we helped the Filipino gain his liberty." The truth is, on the contrary, that we went to Luzon, not to liberate the Filipino, but to strike at Spain, with which we were at war. The outbreak of 1896 of Aguinaldo against the Spanish had come to an end by his acceptance of their offer of $800,000 to himself and certain of his leaders if they would surrender their arms and leave the islands forever. Months before war broke out between the United States and Spain, Aguinaldo had, at a banquet in Hong Kong, pledged the Queen Regent and young King of Spain as "the fairest and noblest of monarchs that had ever lived." With the same recklessness he showed in deserting his country for Spanish gold, he disregarded his pledge to remain away from the islands, and came back to foment rebellion against our authority before government had been set up and American sovereignty had had a chance to be judged by its performance. The "liberty" that Aguinaldo wants—to pillage, burn and massacre—will not be granted him; but liberty in a true sense, better than they enjoyed under Spain, and better than they could achieve and maintain for themselves, will be granted, not the bandits, but the inhabitants of Luzon and the other islands.

Disfranchisement.

And yet your own President has imposed qualifications on Porto Rico that exclude 83 per cent of the black men of voting age in Porto Rico from exercising the franchise, and, not only that, but he takes away from them the protection of the Constitution. Why should a man in Connecticut make that objection, for the last amendment to your Constitution fixes an educational qualification in the State of Connecticut?

This is Bryan's invariable answer to the charge that "consent" is not enforced in the South. The cases he cites are not parallel. In Connecticut and Porto Rico the ignorant are disfranchised regardless of color. In the South the ignorant blacks are disfranchised and the ignorant whites are allowed to vote. It is an amazing piece of shallowness to imagine that an equal educational qualification can be set up as an answer to an unequal educational qualification. It is amazing that Bryan should continue to cite equal treatment of the races in Porto Rico and Connecticut as parallel with that suppression of "consent of the governed" in the South, which alone gives him any possible standing in the Electoral College.

"Government by Injunction."

In his discussion of the labor question, Mr. Bryan is content to repeat a threadbare and shameless falsehood:

The Republican party does not today stand for any policy that is good for the laborer. One of the present injustices of the Republicans is government by injunction. The meanest thief, the blackest murderer, is given a trial for his offence, and the man who labors has an equal right to that proceeding.

This is the assertion that when President Cleveland and Attorney-General Olney used the Federal troops to sustain the decrees of the Federal courts to maintain law and order in the Chicago riots of 1894, they were depriving the laboring man of his right to trial by jury. It is a lie, made out of whole cloth. The men who were proceeded against were tried by a jury. It is a brutal appeal to mob violence, and a plea for mob rule. It is consistent with Bryan's uniform

Appeal to Class Hatred.

By the common people we mean those who are the producers, who contribute to the wealth of the country and advance prosperity.

By the common people Bryan does not mean producers who contribute to the wealth of the country and advance prosperity, unless they are hard up and unsuccessful. The employer of labor is a producer, as much as the employe, the rich, if they use their wealth wisely as the good workingman uses his muscle wisely, "contribute to the wealth of the country and advance prosperity," as much as the poor. But Bryan has no appeal for them. He has nothing to offer to the successful; he appeals only to the discontented or to those he thinks perchance he may make discontented. That is why he is continually saying things like this:

It is becoming generally understood that all dinner-pails are not full—in the anthracite coal regions, for instance. The laboring man's condition can never be considered prosperous so long as he is compelled to keep his children out of school and at work, in order to keep the wolf from the door.

No matter how prosperous we are, there will be some to have less than others, and Bryan makes it his business to seek out those who have little and may be disposed to harbor envy and malice, and say, "You are the victim of Republican rule—vote for me and be rich." You say the dinner-pail is full? Well, I can show you some dinner-pails that are not full. You say that 75,000,000 people are prosperous? Well, I can show you 1,000,000 that haven't nearly as much as they would like. Therefore your boasted prosperity is a dream.

His Remedies.

But let us admit that even now, as heretofore, the poor are not rich. Let us admit that some dinner-pails are not as full as others, and that while some children are in school, others' parents are too poor to send them. What does Bryan propose to do about it? What is his method of making the poor man rich and giving everybody so much that no one can complain his neighbor has more than he?

In the first place, he offers free coinage of silver, which spells a 48-cent dollar, panic. He will open the mints to the silver-mine owner, but close the mills to the laborer. He offers a debased currency, which falls with cruelest and most crushing force on the poor.

In the second place, he offers to abandon the struggle for Oriental markets. England may have her Hong Kong, France her Tong King, Russia her Port Arthur, Germany her Kiao Chou, but we shall have no Manila, though rightfully ours by conquest, purchase and treaty. If Europe wishes to divide up China into "spheres of influence" and bar out our trade, driving us back upon ourselves, all right. Let us not put the dollar above the man. Let us not maintain our rights if we can renounce them. Let us not hold trade if we can get rid of it. Let us not put up the flag if we can pull it down.

In the third place, he offers war on capital. He will lay so heavy a hand on corporations that they cannot exist. He will so terrify wealth and property that they will not venture a dollar in productive enterprise or provide employment for a solitary day-laborer.

This is Mr. Bryan's programme. It carries its own assurance of rejection. The danger of his being able to carry it out is so great that the opportunity will be withheld. The more likely his election seems, the more impossible it becomes. Many would like to vote for Bryan if they thought it could be done without electing him. But the greater his crowds and the more portentous his candidacy, the greater will be the country's alarm, and the more strenuous its efforts at self-protection.

CREED REVISION.

There are more opponents of creed reviston within the Presbyterian church than those who are perfectly satisfied with the Westminster confession. Numbers wish the subject postponed now, because any revision now possible of achievement would be at best a sorry compromise with conservatism, and they would prefer to wait until a more modern statement can be assured by the elimination of adherents of the old, and the accretion of those whose minds have been formed in scientific research and modern literary criticism.

This is one reason why the votes of the presbyteries are so hesitating and indecisive. Out of the 232 presbyteries in the Presbyterian church, 110 have taken action, with the following results: For revision only, 3; for a declatory statement explaining the confession, 2; for a supplemental creed, 30; for a substitute creed, 5; for revision and a supplemental creed, 10; for a dismissal of the whole subject, 33. Probably not more than 220 presbyteries will vote on the question, so that 110 more presbyteries are yet to be heard from, but it is hardly likely that their verdict will be essentially different from that of those which have already voted. Assuming this to be the case, there will be only about 60 presbyteries in favor of revision pure and simple, whereas the request of two-thirds, or 155 presbyteries, is required in order to bring the question before the general assembly.

Outside of the purely polemical elements of this controversy, there is one reason in public policy why the creed, or any creed, should be frequently revised or recast, and that is that long-continued acquiescence in declarations of principles that are confessedly erroneous tends to promote the conviction that standards are of no moment. To profess one thing and act another has become a matter of course to an extent not favorable to intellectual veracity or spiritual soundness. In the body politic the written law is in a constant state of fluidity, being amended by successive Legislatures in response to the changing needs of the time. Every political party meets once in four years to adapt its creed to the march of events. Corporations file amended articles every little while, without a thought that change and progress are confessions of weakness or error. It is only in the theological world that we hold beliefs once entertained as impossible of amendment or abandonment. It is 250 years since the Westminster confession was written out, and yet the Presbyterian church holds today that in views of doctrine it was impossible for its authors to have erred. But whenever a presbytery admits that it is unnecessary to amend the declarations that non-elect infants are damned, and that the Pope is "anti-Christ," it goes far toward denial to the creed of any binding force whatever in any part. If we can select from the creed what we like, what difference does it make what we believe, or whether we believe anything or not?

DESTINY AND ITS ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

Tacoma is a city of destiny, and the fact is fast receiving universal acknowledgment.—Tacoma News.

Tacoma has, indeed, long been known as a city of destiny. It has always had destiny to burn, destiny to throw at the birds, all the destiny there is in the world. Other places get business and population, but Tacoma hangs grimly on to her destiny. Whether anybody has ever thought of taking her destiny away from her does not appear of record. Anyhow, Tacoma keeps it, and long may she continue to be a city of destiny—of destiny exclusively and only, and nothing else.

Destiny is great. It has this advantage over mere trade or numbers—that it is serene and unapproachable. It hangs always in the future; it has no present. Years full many have passed away since Tacoma first appropriated to herself the proud title of City of Destiny. In the future she would be something. Nobody has risen to dispute the title. The future still stretches just as far ahead as it did at first. Her destiny is just as dim, vast, inscrutable and intangible, grand, gloomy and peculiar as ever. Take my life, says old Tacoma, take my life, but spare my destiny.

And "the fact is fast receiving universal acknowledgment." This is good, yet also bad. For the moment the character of Tacoma receives universal acknowledgment, that moment the end has come. Then there can be no more "fast receiving." It is to be hoped, therefore, that the fact will not be received too fast, or the pleasure of noting its advance will perish from the earth. The News, we take it, does not wish to be understood as saying that Tacoma's destinated quality is even now "receiving universal acknowledgment." That were a confession that her highest ambition is at last fully realized. For when it ceases to be denied that Tacoma is a city of destiny, and of destiny altogether, earth will hold no further object for her quest.

Why is it that some 40,000 people persist in living in Tacoma, instead of resigning the field to Destiny's unchallenged reign?

A CRISIS FOR THE TURF.

The London press correspondents of American journals seem singularly remiss in their reports of the protests against American turf habitues and their methods in England. A good deal of complaint is heard against these protests, and doubtless much of it is well founded, yet it is impossible to suppose the protests are entirely without adequate basis. The British sense of fair play is noteworthy, if not uniform, as was seen in the disrepute Dunraven earned over there by his unsportsmanlike conduct, and by the favorable reception always given our American athletes. It is fair to assume, therefore, that these complaints have a genuine foundation.

The British public, we may be sure, hates to lose its money, and hard losers are not always just in their abuse. Robbery and jobbery are the common cries of the unlucky on American racetracks, and, unfortunately, one reason why they are so is because the race is not always to the swift. The fact is that the turf with us has become, in common parlance, a pretty hard game to the outsider. It is so easy for shrewd manipulators to "lay up beats," to tamper with the horse or his appointments, to run to win or to run to lose, according as the betting has proceeded, that racing "on the square" has been superseded by a far more complicated problem. The harness-horse has developed a complex system of race management, which has spread its deleterious influence over the thoroughbred. The question at a trotting race is not simply which is the best horse, but which horse is most likely, under all the circumstances, to be given the race. An owner may not want to show just yet what his horse can do; he may not want to give it a "mark" till the close of the season; he hopes, by a series of defeats, to be able to "buy him cheap" in some great race and make a fortune on the clean-up. Owners have so much at stake that they hesitate to chance their all on the result of a single race, when by a little judicious management, a little transcontinental pool, as it were, they may with certainty avoid a catastrophe and may make a little sure money. The discretion that teaches the owner to manage his string as a conservative business proposition is death to the outsider who relies on capability alone to win the purse.

These methods, as we know, have permeated the American running turf, and in the hands of unrestrained owners and skillful trainers and jockeys they make a game where the percentage is very strong against the "outsider," who is pretty certain, in the long run, to lose far more than he wins. We can readily imagine that something of this sort, reinforced by the ringside operations of our predatory "touts," has made life at the racecourse an unprofitable venture for the old-time British sport. It is not surprising John Bull rebels, but it is far from clear whether he can break up the practice he complains of. The situation, in fact, prevails everywhere, and practically involves the future of the turf. If the owner, trainer and jockey are to lay aside their superior knowledge and skill and allow the "outsider" to compete with them on even terms, the result will be to throw the business of breeding and racing thoroughbreds back upon the precarious footing it occupied formerly, when a man had no protection against a run of bad luck that might any time reduce him to beggary. It's a choice for many between manipulation and starvation. Either way, the outlook is not bright.

Frederick Max Muller, known chiefly as "Professor Max Muller," is dead, at the age of 77. As a philologist he had long held highest rank among living men. His "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature," his "Lectures on the Science of Language," his "Chips From a German Workshop," his essays on "The Philosophy of Mythology," and his various books on "Religion as a Comparative Science," have made his name famous in the field of thought and letters, during many years. More than forty years, indeed, he has been before the world, and his work has been enormous in bulk, and of corresponding importance and value. It would scarcely be possible to name another man to whom philology, mythology and religion, as historical sciences, have been so much indebted during these forty years.

Within a month after his defeat in 1896 William Chinnings Bryan made this confident prediction:

Before the year 1900 arrives the evil effects of a gold standard will be even more evident than they are now, and the people, then ready to demand an American financial policy for the American people, will join with us in the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1.

The present query is whether Bryan knows anything more now on any subject—say on "militarism," "imperialism," etc., than he knew about the gold standard four years ago.

It seems now to be certain that young Venville has been murdered, and murdered in a horrible manner. It is for the people of the United States to say whether such monsters as these murderers are worth the tears shed over them, in the name of liberty, by W. J. Bryan, J. Hamilton Lewis and C. E. S. Wood. The Oregonian believes the people of the United States will show their deep displeasure with men who are in league with such savages, in the name of liberty.

How large an Army does the United States require? If you ask Bryan that, he will answer that the Republican party puts the dollar above the man. As the Army, in his view, is used solely to prevent the workingman from having trial by jury, he would probably say that the smaller the standing Army, the better. So prosaic a thought as that the Army should be large enough to do the work required of it has probably never occurred to him.

The unprecedented amount of gold in the United States Treasury affords Bryan a good chance for a campaign argument. Our debt to Europe appeared to him no greater mark of calamity than did the recent phenomenon of extensive American loans to Europe. So there is probably only one thing more calamitous to Bryan's way of thinking than an empty Treasury, and that is one that is overflowing.

The precipitancy with which the Bryan campaign has gathered around the "trust question" lends added point to its candidate's complaint that the Republicans are trying to get away from the "paramount issue."

Kentucky Democrats are making all things ready for election day. It is well. If the result should be close, their efforts may be needed. We must have consent of the governed at any cost.

"I am a small part of the campaign," says Bryan. The remark may be only premature, but for the present it is rather startling, coming as it does from a man who is the Whole Thing.

Mr. Bryan has heard of France in the time of our Revolution; but he has never heard, evidently, that France, though a republic, has colonies.

It is Bryan and free silver over again. Bryan and free silver remain, after all is said, the "paramount" issues.

A Clear Object Lesson.

Chicago Evening Journal.

There is a marked difference between Senator Beveridge's advice to young men and Mr. Richard Croker's utterances on the same subject. Senator Beveridge holds that prudence, temperance, loyalty to friends and principle, stern and inflexible devotion to duty, will win success anywhere for any young man that breathes. Mr. Croker, after announcing, with characteristic violence, that "the young man of today hasn't any show," points to his own success in politics and the betting-ring as the surest road to wealth. In one picture we have the clean portrayal of right, the decent, careful advice of a brilliant man who is himself decent; in the other, the cynical discouragement to honest effort offered by an individual who has climbed to power and money-influence over the necks of besotted riff-raff, and is proud of it. The comparison between the two men as they stand is a more powerful object-lesson to the rising generation than anything that either of them can say.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT,

A Word About the Man of Patriotic Impulse, of Energy and of Action.

Chicago Journal, Ind.

Let us take a look, if you please, at Theodore Roosevelt, and see what manner of gladiator it is that has come among us.

To begin with, the Vice-Presidency is an office but little sought. When gained it brings its winner scant renown, except when it serves as the stepping-stone to higher honors. Roosevelt did not want it, and said so frankly. He already held a high and honorable office that pleased him better. He consented to go on the ticket only when convinced it was to the interests of his party to do so. His name, he was shown, would lend it strength. There were people who idolized him. It is no disloyalty to McKinley to say that in his absence they would just as readily have voted for Roosevelt.

This candidate's first refusal to run for the office he now seeks was the blunt outburst of a nature always boyish and always honest. He was satisfied with honors already won until shown the possibility of reaching those that were greater. When taught by older minds the wisdom of acceptance, he accepted promptly; and, having accepted, lo, what a beautiful fight he is making! Full of energy, charged with the courage of the proud race of gentlemen from which he sprang, he was handsomely equipped for this battle. His meanest enemy can not deny that he is making the most of his opportunities.

Roosevelt's life thus far is a romantic story, founded on sturdy facts. His blood gave him courage; his studies gave him capacity; God gave him brains. If there is anything above all others he loves it is action—a square fight for an honest principle. In such a fight he gives no quarter and asks none. He is the Coeur de Lion—the mailed knight—in the lists of this election.

Roosevelt's behavior in the war with Spain was the behavior to have been expected of any thoroughbred American. There were plenty as brave as he, no doubt, but his position rendered his acts conspicuous. As it is, the brief picture of him as a soldier is the most brilliant in his career. His course was so like the man. With a war afoot, no desk in Washington would have held him. He knew where he could find kindred spirits—the rough-handed, big-hearted men of the wilderness—the natures that he loved—and he rushed away to gather them to his pennant. He was joined by men of another class—dandies of the clubs and salons, but heroes at that—who loved him, too. Not a man of his regiment but would have died at his order. The simple fact of that fidelity tells the character and spirit of Roosevelt. It is a fine fidelity. No poltroon can command it. The story of the Rough Riders has been told. Every schoolboy knows it.

When Roosevelt went to the war none knew whether it would last six weeks or ten years. He was ready with his sword, his strength and his life. He would be so again. It was not his fault if the war was short. The two-footed cattle that are now vilifying and traducing him are of a class that never fight, because they are afraid. They are creatures of the kind that would die of dread if shot in the back with a baked apple.

Fiery, fearless and sunny-tempered; brilliant in intellect; tireless in labor; respected by women and beloved by men; the hero of his own family; a dashing knight of bravery and high fortune. That is Roosevelt, the future Vice-President. A gentleman by birth, a warrior by instinct, and every inch of him a man.

THE REAL ISSUE.

Not to Be Lost Sight Of in the Last Days of the Campaign.

Indianapolis News, Ind.

The campaign oratory on both sides is gradually growing more violent and passionate, and in some cases more insincere. Mr. Bryan is developing an increasing tendency to shrink from the important issues, and, we regret to say, the recent speeches of Governor Roosevelt show a decided lack of dignity. Instead of argument, we are getting abuse and recrimination. Fortunately, the issues of the campaign are exceedingly simple. We believe that they are understood by the people. What we are going to settle is not so much the fate of the Filipinos—for that will be settled by Congress, guided by public opinion—as the fate of the people of this country. No matter what the result of the election may be, it will not fix any permanent and irreversible tendency in foreign affairs. And those who on one side are talking about empire, and on the other about manifest destiny and world supremacy, alike miss the real point.

Calm consideration should convince voters that the election will decide whether there is to be a continuance of conditions under which business prosperity will be possible, whether the gold standard is to be maintained or overthrown, and whether we are to be a harmonious and united people, co-operating industrially, commercially and politically for the welfare of all. The great questions of this campaign are not foreign, but domestic. And on domestic questions Mr. Bryan has been proved to be wrong and dangerously wrong. Since his speech in this city accepting the nomination, he has lost steadily in the confidence of the people. He has allied himself with the worst elements in our politics, and he stands today before the people as a political agitator, apparently unwilling to adhere to any principle the advocacy of which seems likely to cost him votes.

The Reality and the Fiction of It.

Tacoma Ledger, October 26.

Four loaded vessels are anchored in the stream with full crews awaiting tugs to tow them out when the storm now raging off the coast shall have abated. The Ventura had her tug ordered for Wednesday, but it is not likely that either of the four vessels will be able to get beyond Neah Bay inside of a week, owing to the storm.

Seattle Post-Intelligencer, October 28.

Compare these conditions (on Columbia River) with the open and unhindered navigation of Puget Sound, and there will be no lack of reason for the growth of Seattle's commerce and the decay of Portland's. It is not "discrimination," dear friends, that is the matter; it is a difference of natural advantages that man cannot overcome.

The Democratic "Tip."

New York Mail and Express.

"Shout for Bryan, but bet your money on McKinley," is the "tip" in Democratic circles at this stage of the exercises. Word has evidently been passed around that the jig is very decidedly up.

Looks That Way.

Philadelphia Ledger, Ind.

Apparently the people who are going to vote for Bryan are still betting on McKinley.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE ORIENT

Throughout the long discussion of the new responsibilities assumed by the United States in the Pacific, one point has stood clearly and distinctly: That this country has only followed other civilized states in the general movement to find outlets for surplus capital and the products of labor. The United States has reached, or is approaching, the economic state where such outlets are required outside their own boundaries, in order to prevent business depression, idleness and suffering at home. This new movement is a problem of labor as well as of capital. The question is not whether American laborers can find opportunities for work under the tropical sun of the Orient, but whether they shall find such opportunities at home by the maintenance of adequate markets abroad for absorbing their great product of finished goods and saved capital. Only by keeping such markets open can these products be sold upon conditions which will keep labor steadily employed, afford encouragement for additional production, and open new fields of employment.

Charles A. Conant does not undertake to discuss all aspects of expansion in "The United States in the Orient," which has just come from the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston. He concerns himself chiefly with the economic side of the question and not with ethics or politics. The dominant note, he says, of modern economic life, since the beginning of the epoch of machinery and negotiable instruments, has been saving for investment. The benefits of saving have been inculcated with such effect for many decades that savings accumulate beyond the development of new demands for capital which are legitimate, and are becoming a menace to the economic future of the great industrial countries. Capital is no longer needed in excess of the supply, but is becoming conjested. The restlessness of capital under diminished earnings has been illustrated in many ways during the past few years. In every great capitalistic country there is an eager reaching out for new investments, which is sometimes willing to assume great risks rather than accept small returns. There are three important solutions of this enormous congestion of capital in excess of legitimate demand. These are:

First—Abandonment of saving, the application of the whole earnings of the laborer to current consumption, and the support of old age out of taxes levied upon the production of the community.

Second—Creation of new demands at home for the absorption of capital.

Third—Equipment of new countries with the means of production and exchange.

For the means of finding new productive employments for capital, it is necessary that the great industrial countries should turn to countries which have not felt the pulse of modern progress. The duty of this country in this world-seeking of outlets for unemployed capital and large production is thus defined by Mr. Conant:

The United States cannot afford to adhere to a policy of isolation while other nations are reaching out for the command of these new markets. The United States are still large users of foreign capital, but American investors are not willing to see the return upon their investments reduced to the European level. Interest rates have greatly declined here within the past five years. New markets and new opportunities for investment must, therefore, be found, if surplus capital is to be profitably employed.

The entry of the United States upon the competition for the world's markets means some radical changes in existing policy, but it means an enlarged share in the world's earnings, and in the respect of other civilized states. The system of protection, whatever its original merits, will lose its importance when the producers of this country are able to compete in the markets of the world with the producers of all other countries.

The position of the United States as a factor in international politics makes it more important than in her earlier history that she should pursue a continuous and resolute diplomatic policy. Says Mr. Conant:

The great Republic of the West, in girding her loins for this struggle, should so direct her policy that if she is compelled to draw the sword, it should not be to enforce the privileges of the classes, but on behalf of the essential mission of democracy—equality of opportunity for all—and as the champion of the future in the realization of its highest ideals. If this contest should bear something of the character of that between Persia and Greece of old, our race, by its training in representative government, has at least learned how to guard against the fatal divisions which made the Greek cities of Asia a prey to Darius and Xerxes, and how to confront the organized forces of absolutism and trade exclusion by the united democracy of America. For this great industrial empire, the sword must ever be a last resort, unsheathed only in behalf of the freedom and civilization of the world.

Mr. Conant dismisses the political aspect of expansion in a few pointed words. The argument made by the fathers of the Republic, more than a century ago, he says, in favor of "the consent of the governed," was not meant by them to include universal suffrage, or to exclude sovereignty over annexed territory. Reduced to its real meaning in the minds of the men who uttered it, the Declaration meant that "self-government should not be denied to those who were competent to exercise it for their own benefit and that of society." The Government of the United States, in seeking to establish orderly government in the Philippine Islands, with the limitations which grow out of conditions as they are, and refusing to make promises for future generations, which might not be fulfilled, "would seem to be pursuing a wiser course than to expect the people of those islands to set up an ideal Republic on a soil where even local self-government has hardly taken root, and where the sanctions of order and justice which promote industrial development are scarcely understood."

A Campaign Novelty.

Washington Post, Ind.

The discovery that Adlai gets his quotations from Lincoln from a spiritualist medium rather refutes the notion that there are no novelties in the campaign.

The Ducks Are on the Wing.

Colorado Springs Gazette.

The nipping wind is whistling and the gray clouds scurry by;
Upon the edges of the lakes the thin ice ribbons cling;
The morning breeze is sighing through the rushes, dead and dry,
And guns are gayly popping—for the ducks are on the wing.

The canvas-back drops quickly from the clouds toward the lake;
From the marsh's weed-grown mud the lazy mallards swing;
The dainty teal flies swift and low when daylight's colors break,
And all the air seems throbbing—when the ducks are on the wing.

The drake's discordant clamor sounds across the wind-stirred flood;
And through the frosty, bracing air the countless pinions sing;
The old sand blind is waiting, and the fever's in our blood,
The red gods loud are calling—for the ducks are on the wing.

So get the twelve-bore ready; the old hunting coat as well;
Decoys and ammunition, boots and every needed thing;
Leave this dull world behind you for a while, and go to dwell
Where Nature bids you welcome, and the ducks are on the wing.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

The ex-Presidents' Association is not preparing for an initiation this year.

After election day Bryan will be able to find an active market for his convictions in Kentucky.

Bryan has yet an opportunity to distinguish himself. He can move to make it unanimous November 7.

Among enterprises which will not be developed until after election is the farm of W. J. Bryan, near Lincoln, Neb.

Two men were fined the other day for hissing in a Kansas City theater. It looks as if the actor's millennium had arrived.

Croker is flying Bryan's picture on kites from the skyscrapers in New York. Thus we see that all of the boosting for Bryan is done on wind.

Grover Cleveland is going to be a college president. His degree of M. A. stands for Mighty Angler, but the abbreviation will be useful in his new career.

"Crocodiles, Lizards, Snakes!" is the title of a recent editorial in the Baltimore Sun. The editor evidently was among the guests at the Croker banquet to Bryan.

The President of the City Council of Cleveland, O., is in jail, and they are talking of sending the other members to the penitentiary. Political ambition in Cleveland is evidently accompanied by some little risk.

A college student visited a Philadelphia photographer the other day and sat for his picture. When the plate was developed the astonished photographer saw plainly on the young man's forehead a clearly defined death's head with crossbones beneath it. Thinking it was some imperfection in the plate, the photographer arranged another sitting. Again the skull and crossbones appeared in the picture, and the mystified photographer was fairly struck dumb with amazement. Then he noticed the smiling sitter and finally induced him to tell the joke. The trick simply consisted of painting on the forehead the grim design with a solution of bisulphate of quinine. This is invisible to the eye, but shows pure white to the camera.

Once there was a learned critic
Of the drama of today.
And knew from abstruse study
How to analyze a play.
He could spot a rising actor
When he saw him first come on,
And could tell the very minute
That a player's "verve" was gone.
He was deeply read in Shakespeare,
He was versed in Marlowe, too,
And he knew the Lincoln Carter
Style of drama through and through.
But somehow he never managed
To dope out a single guess
As to just what play was "faded"
Or to see a new success.
He would write grave criticisms,
And the sole effect they had
Was to bring him notes from actors
Whom he'd made exceeding mad.
When he'd say some unknown player
Couldn't act a little bit,
Straightway would that hard-knocked actor
Make a large and handsome hit.
When he'd say a certain drama,
Wasn't half worth while to see,
That some drama never failed to
Play to full capacity.
So this wise and learned critic,
Took a long, long think one day,
And concluded that he didn't
Know so much about a play.
And thereafter when he essayed
A success to prophesy,
Or to say a piece was faded,
And to tell the actors why;
To the gallery he hied him
'Way up by the bracing rods,
And while there he sat and gathered
Inspiration from the gods.
Now his pen is sure and certain,
For a play that "goes" up there
Need not worry what the critics
Say about it anywhere.

The demand for persons of more education as employes in all sorts of establishments is becoming more imperative every day. The excellent and efficient public schools found in every part of this great and glorious country give every child an opportunity to acquire a fair education—but only the best universities in the country can give the education required to meet all the emergencies of these strenuous times. A case in point occurred in a popular restaurant yesterday. A swarthy stranger entered, hung up his hat and took a seat at one of the tables. One of the young women waiters stepped up to take his order, but after a hard endeavor was unable to understand a word he said. She called in the proprietor of the place, who has had dealings with people of all nationalities, who undertook to wring from the stranger the secret of his native tongue. French, German, Swedish, Russian and several other languages were tried on him, but it was at last ascertained that he was a Graeco-Italian, a sort of an Italian who speaks Greek. The restaurant man strode to the rear of the room where several of the young women waiters had collected to witness the struggles with the stranger, and sternly inquired if there was no one among them who could speak Greek. They all admitted that they could not, and after some rather tart comments on their ignorance, he remarked that customers who visited his restaurant must be able to get what they wanted, whether they gave their order in Greek, Hebrew or Chinook, and suggested that, as there was a night school for Chinese in the neighborhood, it would be well for the girls to spend their leisure time there, instead of going to dances, etc. One of the young women replied that it would not be unreasonable to expect waiter girls to understand French and German, but he could hardly expect to secure a force all of whom would be competent to fill the position of professor of ancient and modern languages in a university, and, as he knew Greek and was so smart, he could wait on the customer himself, and he had to.

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

As Unjust Accusation.—"Tom, you are terribly lazy." "No, I'm not lazy at all; I simply don't like to work."—Chicago Record.

Mother—Johnnie, your face is very clean; but how did you get such dirty hands?" Johnnie—Washin' me face.—Tit-Bits.

Extreme.—"I just now saw her get off a car facing forward!" "Yes, she affects an extremely masculine air, in public."—Detroit Journal.

"Do you know, Willie, it pains me to have to punish you?" "It's different than the pain I feel, though, isn't it, ma?"—Yonkers Statesman.

As Usual.—Assistant—Here are more dispatches about that battle in the East. Editor—What do they say? Assistant—It appears that both sides were greatly outnumbered, but each defeated the enemy with severe loss.—Harlem Life.

A Thorough Sportsman.—Snyman—So your automobile came in first, eh? Wynner—Yes. It was a close thing, though. Would you believe it, when I ran over that nurse and baby, I felt inclined to quit; but something said to me, "This is no time for puling sentiment."—Brooklyn Life.