

the presidential election are at this time worthless, no matter from which side they emanate. As a curiosity, however, we submit the following guess:

McKinley's electoral vote, 1896.	271
Less New York, 1900.....	36
Less Kentucky, 1900.....	12
Less Delaware, 1900.....	3
Less Maryland, 1900.....	8
Less Indiana, 1900.....	15
Less Connecticut, 1900.....	6
Less Ohio, 1900.....	23
Less West Virginia, 1900....	6
	109

Plus California, 1900.....	1
Plus Montana, 1900.....	3
Plus South Dakota, 1900....	4
Plus Utah, 1900.....	3
Plus Idaho, 1900.....	3
Plus Wyoming, 1900.....	3
Plus Washington, 1900.....	4
Plus Nevada, 1900.....	3
	24

McKinley's electoral vote, 1900. — 186

Bryan's electoral vote, 1896....	176
Plus New York, 1900.....	36
Plus Kentucky, 1900.....	12
Plus Delaware, 1900.....	3
Plus Maryland, 1900.....	8
Plus Indiana, 1900.....	15
Plus Connecticut, 1900.....	6
Plus Ohio, 1900.....	23
Plus West Virginia, 1900....	6
	109

Less California, 1900.....	1
Less Montana, 1900.....	3
Less South Dakota, 1900....	4
Less Utah, 1900.....	3
Less Idaho, 1900.....	3
Less Wyoming, 1900.....	3
Less Washington, 1900....	4
Less Nevada, 1900.....	3
	24

Bryan's electoral vote, 1900... 261

As the vote necessary for election is 224, this guess leaves Bryan 37 votes to spare. That he will lose any of the electoral votes he received in 1896, other than those noted above, is altogether improbable. His election is probable, therefore, even though he fail to take from McKinley New York, or Ohio, Connecticut and Delaware, or Ohio, Connecticut and West Virginia. In this guess, moreover, Illinois is left in the McKinley column, though there is no probability that anything can keep it away from Bryan but democratic treachery in Chicago.

Whether such treachery is contemplated, we have no definite means of

knowing. But we do know that it is strongly suspected, and that the suspicion is fairly warranted by the fact that the regular democratic organization in Chicago is displaying none of that weariless activity which always distinguishes its operations when its leaders wish to win.

Nor are the dangers of treachery to which Bryan is liable in Chicago confined to the democratic "machine." His newspaper support, also, is of a dubious character. Four years ago the Chronicle, then the only democratic daily of the city, bolted Bryan's nomination. This almost cost it its life; its circulation dropped by scores of thousands. That experience doubtless enabled its democratic editors to influence its McKinley proprietor to allow the paper to support Bryan in his second campaign. Accordingly, early in this campaign the dead walls of Chicago were covered with colored pictorial placards announcing that the Chronicle would support Bryan and Stevenson. Editorially that promise has in the main been kept. Some of the best editorial contributions to the Bryan cause to be found anywhere have appeared in the Chronicle. But the influence of its McKinley proprietor is plainly noticeable in its news departments. This man is John R. Walsh. He is a Chicago millionaire who labels himself "democrat," but who hasn't the faintest perception of democratic principles, and who is personally supporting McKinley this year as he did four years ago in every possible way. And among these ways is a treacherous use of the democratic paper he controls. As an instance of this, we might direct attention to the publication in its news columns recently of a verbatim report of ex-Comptroller Eckels's speech for McKinley; not for the purpose of objecting to that in itself, but because Carl Schurz's great speech in New York, which should have been carried as far as possible by every democratic paper in this region, where the German population is large, had been

published by the Chronicle a day or two before only in emasculated form. In other words, the Chronicle acted with reference to these two speeches as the most partisan McKinley organ might have been expected to act. This matter, however, is serious only for what it portends. With such a paper so controlled—nominally democratic, but really under the mastery of a McKinley partisan of the most plutocratic type—a constant feeling of uneasiness is created and maintained, lest some piece of sensational treachery be sprung at a critical moment.

But the Chronicle is now not the only democratic paper in Chicago. There is one other. Mr. Hearst, of the New York Journal and the San Francisco Examiner, began publishing Hearst's American about mid-summer. At the start it gave promise of fully supplying the manifest want of a wide-awake democratic representative in Chicago journalism. It was calculated to and actually did reach the great masses of the working people of this western metropolis. Though its editorials lacked the dignity and polish of the Chronicle's they were probably, under the circumstances, all the better for that reason, and they did excel in cleverness and rugged force. But as the campaign comes nearer to its culmination, the political vigor of Hearst's American declines. Its editorials, at the moment when they should deal with the issues and incidents of the campaign most clearly and forcibly and vigorously, are devoted to such mildly inspiring topics as the wisdom of wearing mustaches, or such sociological analogues as the functions of earth worms as compared with those of trust magnates. These are excellent editorials of their kind, but they are of a kind which would be more appropriate in the hibernating period of winter or the silly season of summer than in the heat of a presidential campaign in which the issue is republic or empire. Mr. Hearst appears to be doing good democratic work as presi-

dent of the League of Democratic Clubs. But it is at the expense of the better work he might do as the owner of what professes to be a great democratic paper. Unless a radical change soon takes place in the editorial policy of the American it will be politically dead. But for the good work as cartoonists which Davenport and Opper do for it, and an occasional spirited editorial, it would be even now quite useless to the cause that Bryan represents. Its department of news is wretched.

Sins of omission are the greatest faults of both the American and the Chronicle. But they are omissions that cannot fairly be charged to the working force. It is absurd to suppose that the staff of either paper is too stupid or too indolent to expose beyond question the methods whereby, if at all, the Bryan vote in Chicago is to be kept low enough to enable McKinley to carry the state of Illinois. Either of these papers could, if it would, put spurs to the city hall leaders and make them realize that this campaign is not less important than a fight for the mayoralty. Upon the staff of both papers there are industrious and alert men who know by what infamous means Senator Hanna is arranging to hold the Chicago Bryan vote in check, and who could and would make an exposure if they were allowed or encouraged to do so. These men know that the stock yards employes are being coerced to-day with hardly any more attempt at concealment than in 1896. They know that similar coercion is widespread in other employments. They know that business men, made timid by the consciousness of having short-time business paper out against them, for the renewal of which they depend upon the grace of the banks, are being warned to vote for McKinley or take the consequent risks of bankruptcy. They know, too, that the great "commercial, industrial and sound money parade" which is preparing for the 27th, is but a bold

expression of this policy of coercion. Any man of ordinary common sense knows what that parade means. What can be meant when Farwell & Co., the Pullman company, Marshall Field & Co., Armour & Co., the Deering Harvester company, the Illinois Steel company, the American Steel and Wire company, the American Barbed Wire company and the Union stock yards—what can be meant, we ask, when great trust monopolies like these, which control the livelihood of thousands of underpaid workmen, what can be meant when they order out a McKinley labor procession on the eve of election? What can it mean, what can it be intended to mean, but that the men whom these trusts employ must march in the procession or march out of their jobs? It is a thinly veiled menace, which the two democratic newspapers we mention fully understand. It is an expression of a purpose of which these newspapers are fully cognizant. And either newspaper has upon its staff able and willing men through whose agency that purpose could be plainly proved and widely exposed. Yet neither paper could be more placid if the stake of the election were a basket of peaches instead of an empire or a republic. Both would be more deeply affected by a prospective prize fight.

Secretary Gage makes a public apology for the national bank system, in which he says that "if the national bank act were repealed, the national banks would naturally dispose of their holdings in government bonds, and the effect upon the market would be extremely depressing." It is, indeed, true that the banks have nothing to do to depress the market but to unload their bonds. Suppose, then, that they—or that the banks that are able to control the system—should decide to depress the market! Suppose they saw profit or power in doing that. Would they have to wait for a repeal of the bank act? By no means. They can unload their bonds,

and load up again at will. So this national banking system places it within the power of a banking ring to depress and raise the market at pleasure by making cats and dogs of government bonds. Another good reason for doing away with the national banking system.

Besides that objection to the system is the fact that it is based on special privileges. In other words, the national banking system is a system of banking monopoly. An admission of this came recently from an unexpected source. It appeared in the Political Science Quarterly for September, over the signature of Prof. J. F. Johnson, of the University of Pennsylvania. Writing on "The Currency Act of March 4, 1900," he said, referring to the bonds and the banks:

It is morally certain that the United States could not sell two per cent. bonds at par, unless they carried with them special privileges.

One of the democratic obscurities whose names are mentioned in the list of McKinleyites is Rear Admiral Belknap, a retired naval official who declares, according to the press dispatches, that it is "as an old-fashioned democrat" that he turns to McKinley. Admiral Belknap's perceptions are clear. Old-fashioned democrats were pro-slavery men. Old-fashioned democrats are Bourbons. They belong with McKinley. If more of them would go to him, more genuine democrats would come over from the republican party to Bryan. Admiral Belknap has found his right place in politics. The McKinley republican party, which he embraces, is to-day what the party of "old-fashioned democrats" was in Lincoln's time—a lover of power, an enslaver of men, and a hater of the declaration of independence.

Jingoism in Great Britain has not gained the great political victory it counted upon. The ministry has a smaller majority in the house of commons, as the result of the elections,