

The Public

Dr. H.J. Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1900.

Number 126.

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.

It has been suggested that meetings in support of Bryan and Stevenson be opened with the reading of the second paragraph of the declaration of independence, and that they close with the singing of "My Country 'Tis of Thee." The suggestion is a good one. Since Mark Hanna has assumed to appropriate the flag for partisan purposes, the democrats might neatly retaliate by emphasizing whenever possible the fact of their adoption of the declaration of principles that the flag stands for. They can afford to let Hanna exploit the symbol if they exploit the ideals symbolized. Let democratic meetings ring, then, with the reading of America's liberty charter and the singing of her liberty hymn.

The 'Commercial and Financial Chronicle, that famous Wall street organ of plutocracy, exhibits its sense of the eternal fitness of things when it precedes a laudatory article on the late C. P. Huntington with an expression of the hope for "such a defeat of Bryan as will bury him and his ideas so deep in votes against them that they can never experience a resurrection." The destruction of the Bryans of this country is indeed the hope of its piratical Huntingtons.

There is matter for reflection for superstitious historical students in the fact that the three great political epochs in the history of this country were signalized by the triumph of the new political forces at the presidential election immediately following one at which they were defeated. The first of these

epochs was in the closing year of the last century, when Jefferson swept the federalists out of power after having been defeated four years before. Then came the Jacksonian era. Andrew Jackson failed of election in 1824, but was victorious with an enormous electoral majority in 1828. It was not until 1860 that the third political era began. Lincoln was elected then; and, although he had not suffered defeat personally in 1856, the first leader of his party had. In other words the republican party was beaten once before it succeeded, just as the Jeffersonian democrats had been three score years earlier and the Jacksonian democrats in the twenties. And now we are at the beginning of a fourth political epoch. Will history repeat itself? Was Bryan's defeat in 1896, like Jefferson's in 1798 and Jackson's in 1824 and Fremont's in 1856, prophetic of triumph four years later?

McKinley newspapers have a good deal to say about the part that moving pictures are to play in the campaign in behalf of McKinley. Among other things, they are to exhibit factories in operation by way of illustrating McKinley prosperity. Why not exhibit some of the factories which this prosperity has closed? It would lend variety to the exhibition, and there need be no difficulty in finding such factories. For example, "the fine new plant," says the Cleveland Press, "erected less than a year ago by the Coshocton Rolling Mill company and recently sold to the American Sheet Steel company, is a thing of the past"; it was operated spasmodically for a few weeks after the trust bought it, and was then shut down. Other instances of like character are given by the Youngstown

Vindicator. In all probability more pictures could be obtained of factories that have been closed by trusts since McKinley's inauguration than of new factories that are working.

Secretary Gage is credited with a remarkable newspaper interview, first published on the 25th in the Washington Star, in which he predicts that in the event of Bryan's election the country will be placed upon a silver basis. This is Mr. Gage's explanation of his dire prediction:

There is no doubt Mr. Bryan could order his secretary of the treasury to make payment in silver of all of the public debt payable in coin, and for all current disbursements of the government as well, which amount to \$1,500,000 to \$1,750,000 per day. That he would give such an order, too, is very certain, if he is in the same mind that he was in 1896.

We commend Mr. Gage's interview to the thoughtful consideration of Senator Stewart, of Nevada, and of such other silver republicans as may have concluded to support McKinley on the ground that the silver cause has nothing to hope for from Mr. Bryan. If Mr. Bryan is of the same mind regarding the silver question as he was in 1896, something which nobody doubts, and if as president he could put the country upon a silver basis, as Mr. Gage says he could, what more could silver republicans desire than his election? McKinley gives them no such hope. Mr. Gage's interview, if of any effect in "shoo"-ing eastern gold democrats away from Bryan, ought in the name of all that is consistent to be quite as effective in "shoo"-ing western silver republicans back to him.

The fact that Mr. Gage puts forth such an interview and that the McKinley papers take pains to exploit it, shows how badly the Hanna-McKinley party is demoralized. Can it be

possible that they realize its true significance? It is, indeed, the severest commentary that has yet been passed upon the good faith of the republican party with reference to the money question. For at the last session of congress the republicans forced through a measure the very first section of which declared—

that the dollar, consisting of 23 8-10 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, as established by section 3511 of the revised statutes of the United States, shall be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury to maintain such parity.

That measure professed, as this first section shows, to establish the gold standard so firmly that nothing short of a new act of congress could disturb it. And this is what the republicans claimed for it at the time, and again in their national platform. Alluding to the measure from which we have quoted, their platform described it as an act by which—

the parity of all our money and the stability of our currency on a gold basis have been secured.

But now Secretary Gage declares that Mr. Bryan could if elected "order his secretary of the treasury to make payment in silver of all the public debt payable in coin, and for all current disbursements of the government," thereby putting the government upon a silver basis. What does all this mean? It can point to only one of four things: unless (1) Mr. Gage is merely manufacturing demagogic campaign material to influence the weak-minded, or (2) is honestly mistaken in supposing that Bryan could depart from the gold standard, either (3) the republicans have proved themselves incompetent to make an effective gold standard law, or (4) they were guilty of a false pretense in the gold standard law they did make.

Who can have forgotten how the McKinley press told us last spring that the money question was settled for years to come. The new gold standard law had settled it, and

Bryan's free silver thunder was gone. But now, when imperialism comes to the front as the dominant issue of the campaign, the same press trots out the money question not merely as the dominant issue, but as the only issue! The issue of imperialism, it tells us, is a bug-a-boo, having no existence outside the democratic imagination. What do these apologists, with all their backing and filling, mean by imperialism? Is it the name they are quarreling with? There is nothing in names. The vital point is that McKinley proposes to hold and fortify and fight for what are called our "new possessions," but to deny forever to the people of those possessions the right to participate in the government that governs them. Now that is government without the consent of the governed. It is non-republican. It is imperial. But by any other name it would be as offensive to American ideals. Dare Mr. McKinley deny that this is his policy? He has not yet denied it. But he has said and done much to make it his policy. Whether it be called imperialism, or paternalism, or benevolent assimilation, or what not, the detestable fact remains that President McKinley and all the other Hanna republicans have committed themselves to the un-American policy of permanently establishing subject colonies, to be governed arbitrarily, regardless of their own wishes, from Washington.

Some McKinleyites are more candid than others in their acknowledgment of this imperial policy. One of these is Edward A. Belcher, a judge of the superior court of San Francisco, and a man of recognized light and leading in his party throughout California. In the Los Angeles Herald of July 29, Judge Belcher closed a review of the question of the American citizenship of natives of Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippines with this concise but complete statement of the McKinley policy:

While it is freely admitted, indeed, the writer has many times strongly urged, that mercantile and strategic

considerations make it imperatively necessary that we should hold and fortify these island possessions, and fight to retain them, it is nevertheless urged that they should be kept perpetually as territories. Nothing should make against that save the remote possibility that the native races may be supplanted by the Caucasian race. Upon none, in the writer's estimation, save the intelligent people of the Caucasian race, should the inestimable privilege of United States citizenship be conferred.

If that is not imperialism, will some benevolent assimilationist kindly give it an appropriate name?

The growing desperation of the McKinley press over election prospects is well illustrated by the action of the Chicago Tribune in devoting half a page of its valuable space to a list of what it describes as "some of the prominent men in various states who voted for Bryan in 1896, but cannot find it in their hearts to repeat the act this time." It then spreads out its imposing list, which consists of 63 names, gathered from all sources as with a fine tooth comb. But the prominent names in the list are as scarce as hen's teeth in an aquarium. In all the list, the only names that are prominent enough to even approximate a national reputation are these:

Senator Stewart, of Nevada; E. Ellery Anderson, of New York; ex-Senator Mantle, of Montana; ex-Gov. Hoadley, formerly of Ohio but now of New York; Senator Marion Butler, of North Carolina; ex-Senator Peffer, of Kansas.

Let us pass them in review. Stewart was a republican silver mine owner who voted for Bryan because he hoped free silver would increase the value of mining stock. For this statement we have the authority of the McKinley papers of 1896. E. Ellery Anderson is a Cleveland democrat, who did not vote for Bryan, but energetically opposed him. How Senator Mantle voted in 1896 nobody knows, unless probably Mantle himself. The same is true of Peffer. Hoadley, the law partner of a republican machine leader, did not vote for Bryan in 1896. Senator Butler, who did, has given no intimation of his intention of doing otherwise in 1900.