

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1900.

Number 130.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Mark Hanna may not be mentally demoralized by his discovery of unpromising political conditions in Chicago, but both upon the platform and in interviews he talks as if he were.

Another vicious assault upon Dowie missionaries in Mansfield, O., adds to the infamy which that town has already achieved through the lawless efforts of some of its inhabitants to interfere with freedom of speech and of worship. Whether any considerable number of law-abiding people are left in Mansfield is becoming a serious question.

The return to this country of Mrs. Blatch, the accomplished daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, for the purpose of devoting her excellent oratorical talents to the support of Bryan, is in obedience to no new impulse. Mrs. Blatch has long been a democrat of the Jeffersonian kind. As an advocate of woman suffrage, she never treats the question as one of class or sex rights, but always as one of human rights—of democracy.

Gen. Gobin, the commander of the Pennsylvania state troops in the anthracite coal region, would make a better impression upon impartial observers if he conferred with the great coal land monopolists less and with the strike leaders somewhat. The strike leaders are just as anxious to preserve the peace as are the coal land monopolists—probably more anxious. It is to their interest that peace be maintained; but to the coal monopolists, an outbreak furnishing a good

excuse for military interference would be a godsend.

Because "every progressive nation of Europe to-day is seeking lands to colonize and governments to administer," therefore the great American republic should do the same, is the point of Senator Beveridge's Chicago speech for McKinley. Senator Beveridge evidently knows that the president's policy is imperial, he himself obviously believes in imperialism, and with unusual candor for a McKinleyite he openly declares for it. The only thing about imperialism that he shies at is the name.

Senator Beveridge even more plainly disclosed the imperialistic ambitions of his party when he told his Chicago audience that it was a mistake to promise Cuba independence, and made no secret of his disposition to break the promise. He was discreet enough to explain that he spoke upon his own responsibility alone; but his view regarding Cuba is also Senator Lodge's view, and Lodge was permanent chairman of the Hanna convention, while Beveridge himself is officially put forward as a star in the McKinley galaxy. When men like these so openly advocate a policy of imperialism, it is the part of prudence for Lincoln republicans to refrain from voting for the candidates they support.

In one of his extraordinary campaign speeches in Chicago, after the outbreak of the coal strike, Mr. Hanna wished that he could "bring together all the striking miners and convince them that there is something more important than the mere matter of wages." Yet he had only a few days before the strike assured the country that the only issue in this

campaign is the dinner pail issue. Mr. Hanna's conversion from the dinner pail issue to "something higher and something more important" was sudden, and the strike did it.

President McKinley has improved upon his plan of suppressing state papers until they can be used as campaign documents and then publishing them. His last act of this character was not only to suppress the paper until he thought it would serve him as a candidate for reelection, but actually to have concocted it for that purpose originally. On the 17th of August last he ordered the Philippine commission "to report by cable the views of the commission on the general condition of the islands as to peace and industry." There was no reason of state for any report from it. Congress was not in session. The commission had not completed its work. The president, as president, wanted no information. And if any report had been required for state purposes, it would have been a report of facts and not of "views." It would have been a report, moreover, which would have required deliberation and time to prepare and could have been sent by mail; not one which could be dashed off and must be cabled. But while Mr. McKinley did not want any report as president, he did want one as candidate for reelection. And for that purpose he needed it at once. He was about to prepare a letter of acceptance as presidential candidate in which he wished to quote "views" of the Philippine commissioners; and he expected Bryan to give out a letter of acceptance the effect of which he wished to modify by publishing an "official" report of the Philippine commission's "views." So he cabled to it, as stated above, to send its "views" by cable. This

it did at an expense to the public of \$9,000. Being McKinley partisans to the core, enjoying good salaries through his favor out of the public purse for nondescript services, not averse to holding on, and being withal quick to take a political hint, the commissioners' "views" as cabled were put together so as to make a campaign document of no mean value apparently. It was as good a document as if it had been prepared at the Auditorium Annex; and better only because it bore the Manila instead of the Chicago date mark. From this precious document, which came on the 21st of August and was suppressed for a month, Mr. McKinley, in his letter of acceptance, quoted when he told of the rich mineral deposits in Luzon "a mile high."

But the best use of Mr. McKinley's \$9,000 official campaign document from Manila was reserved until Mr. Bryan's letter had appeared. Then McKinley gave his document to the public, to let them see that according to the "views" of his campaign document-makers in Manila almost everything in Luzon was "lovely and the goose hung high." Unfortunately for Mr. McKinley, however, in the same newspapers in which this document appeared there appeared also a news dispatch from Manila telling of one of the worst battles of the Philippine war, fought right in the neighborhood of Manila. An American captain and lieutenant and 22 men were killed in the battle, while 19 were wounded, five were captured, and apparently the Americans were defeated. Nor was it any little irresponsible guerrilla band that had wrought this havoc. It was a force of 800 men, organized, officered, entrenched, and acting in accordance with the rules of civilized warfare. No wonder Mr. McKinley was "heart-broken," as one Washington correspondent put it. Another attempt to use his office for campaign purposes had been frustrated by the unfriendly geni he himself had unbot-tled.

It is no less interesting than important to note in this connection that John Foreman, the Englishman whose familiarity with the Philippines led to his employment by the peace commissioners at Paris as an expert, has come out in a flat repudiation of McKinley's Philippine policy and an indorsement in principle of Bryan's. His article may be found in the September number of the London National Review. Mr. Foreman does not weigh these policies as those of McKinley and Bryan respectively. He does not so much as consider the relations to the question of either candidate. He writes merely as an expert giving his own views without reference to their political bearing. His advice to the United States is that she ought to extricate herself from the Philippine dilemma, and that she can do it by authorizing the governor general to—

inform the representative Filipinos that the United States' policy is to gradually but conditionally relinquish control over the islands.

That was a wise reflection of the American Machinist, the leading trade paper of the country in its field, when in its issue of September 13th it warned the coal operators that by refusing to confer with their employes they had not only assumed a heavy responsibility but had perhaps hastened—

the time when it will be generally regarded as absurd that private individuals owning mines and railroads should dictate the terms upon which this bounty of nature shall be used by the human family.

One of the comicalities of the campaign is Carroll D. Wright's attempt to show statistically that trusts have both raised wages and increased the number of employes. The joke is a grim one, of course, to employes who have been thrown out of a job, but even they might smile at Mr. Wright's simplicity in putting forth officially as facts to prove the beneficence of trusts the statements made to him by trust managers. Do not all criminals plead "not guilty?" This is, indeed, an instance regarding which Mr.

Wright should be reminded, as Senator Avery, of Cleveland, reminded him regarding another of his statistical exploits, that "the value of figures, like the value of sausages, depends upon who makes them."

In references in these columns to "senate document 62" of the Fifty-fifth congress third session—the collection of official documents on the Philippine question—we have frequently said that copies can be had of the government printing office for 35 cents each. Unfortunately this is no longer true. From readers who have tried to procure copies, we learn that the supply has been exhausted.

DOCUMENTARY OUTLINE OF THE TRANSVAAL CASE.

In the pending presidential campaign in the United States, both the great political parties call attention to the British conquest of the South African republics. The platform of the democratic party would place our government in the same sympathetic attitude toward them that it held toward Greece in the days of Marco Bozaris, while the republican platform is coldly indifferent to their fate. The issue thus presented is one of direction of sympathy. So far as this issue goes, therefore, a vote for Bryan is a vote of sympathy for the still struggling republics, and a vote for McKinley is a vote of sympathy with the British tory ministry. It is consequently important that the American voter, whether native born or naturalized, if he intends to allow the Boer question to affect his vote, should grasp the merits of the South African war.

I.

The great primary fact in the matter is this: Whatever claims of authority Great Britain sets up over the Transvaal Boers—whether sound or unsound, good, bad, plausible, or absurd—rest upon conquest. Let us prove that at the outset.

On the 17th of January, 1852, the Transvaal became an independent state. Great Britain had previously asserted jurisdiction over its inhabitants on the ground that as natives of Cape Colony they continued to be British subjects wherever found—an application of the doctrine, now abandoned, of "once a British subject