

is it significant of hostility to Mr. Bryan. This should be evident enough from the fact that the very majority of the committee that made Hopkins chairman, reaffirmed the Kansas City platform. But if that be not enough, there is ample confirmation in the further fact that Hopkins was supported by nearly if not all of Mr. Bryan's disinterested friends. It is no secret either that ex-Gov. Altgeld, whose loyalty to "Bryanism" is above question, threw the weight of his influence to Hopkins.

The simple truth about this matter is that Hopkins's election was a triumph over the "city hall gang," that political machine which is or aspires to be to Chicago what Tammany hall has been so long to New York. Robert E. Burke is the Richard Croker of this machine, and Mayor Harrison is his handle-bar. Of its disloyalty to Bryan in the presidential campaign no well informed observer of Illinois politics is at all in doubt. Mayor Harrison made professions of fidelity, and he went through certain motions calculated to lend his professions the color of good faith; but what the machine did and what it left undone were in the main precisely what would tend to serve the Bryan cause least or hurt it most. Harrison had come to Bryan's support, even nominally, only under compulsion. When Altgeld made a third party run for mayor in the spring of 1899, upon the Chicago platform, Harrison was notoriously arranging with Croker to prevent Bryan's nomination. He had presidential hopes of his own. But the 50,000 Altgeld votes, cast upon the Chicago platform, admonished him and the reactionaries with whom he was negotiating that although he had been reelected mayor (a result which he owed to combinations with the republican machine), he could not confront Bryan with a united party in his own city. He was discredited by 50,000 democrats. In this way Altgeld's object in entering the may-

orality race was served. He had checked Harrison's scheming and paved the way for a solid Bryan delegation from Illinois. From that time the Burke-Harrison machine has had the Bryan banner out. But it has played double all the way through, which is the reason that the sincere friends of Bryan throughout the state determined that the state committee should not fall into its hands.

To accomplish their purpose these friends of Bryan found it necessary to support Hopkins. It was only by doing so that they could be sure of defeating Harrison's man. Hopkins had a strength of his own which they could effectively supplement. He was not their choice, except as a choice of evils. He had been seduced by eastern plutocrats of the party in 1896; and, consequently turned out of control of the party by Altgeld's following, he had fought Bryan in the campaign of that year. Naturally the Bryan men had little love for him. But he came back into the party in 1900 and supported Mr. Bryan with every appearance of loyalty. This counted in his favor, for his reputation for candor is good. They realized, indeed, that he has private interests to subserve in politics. His relations to Chicago gas franchises, for instance, distinguish him as a man who in public life will bear watching. But in choosing between Hopkins and Harrison—and that was the alternative—sincere supporters of "Bryanism" had nothing left to do but to vote for Hopkins, and they did. Even on the question of franchises, there was less room for choice than might be inferred from Harrison's professions. In these circumstances it is absurd to think of the election of Hopkins as a set-back to Bryan. It was a set-back to Mayor Harrison, and a marked one, too. It was nothing more, so far as politics go.

But it may prove unhappily to be more in other respects. Mr. Hop-

kins is now in position to "do business" through the democratic minority with the republican majority at Springfield—to do business in gas franchises, for instance. That he will try to indulge in this profitable pastime no one who knows him doubts; he does not doubt it himself. And he would scorn to deny it. His principal virtue, which is candor, would preclude his doing that. Indeed there are indications that he has already begun operations. Unless the democratic state committee and the democratic minority in the legislature are prepared to saddle their party with a share of responsibility for vicious franchise legislation, they had better keep a sharp eye upon Mr. Hopkins.

Another negro burned at the stake! This time it is in the state of Kansas, at Leavenworth. In every way the savage crime was as disgusting in its infamy as that of some 15 months ago in Georgia, even to the collecting of charred remains of the dead negro's body as souvenirs. Apparently, the sheriff had arranged the matter to accommodate the lynchers. The negro had been placed for safety in the penitentiary, a lynching having been feared. But the sheriff demanded his custody. Ordinarily that would have been a proper proceeding. But the sheriff must have been aware of the desperate character and disposition of the mob, and should have taken precautions to protect his prisoner. Instead of doing so, he shoved the helpless man into a cell of the unguarded jail and left him to the devilish mercy of his murderers. The governor justly lays the blame at the door of the sheriff. But the governor himself palliates the lynching by saying he has no doubt of the negro's guilt. Why has he no doubt? The negro had not been tried. There was no evidence of guilt available either to the governor or the mob. And the victim himself protested impressively, from the moment of his seizure to

his last utterance in the midst of the petroleum-fed flames, that he was innocent. Fears are expressed by the governor that this lynching will make it necessary to revive capital punishment in Kansas. Curiously enough, however, it is the negro victim, whose guilt is in doubt, that the governor has in mind, and not the white assassins who boast of burning him. Their crime seems to be taken for granted as at worst an excusable outburst of passion. Yet if anything might make one wish to revive capital punishment, it would be the fiendish act of that mob.

In an address at Boston condemning "Uncle Tom's Cabin," Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith took occasion to say that "as a boy he was brought up among the slaves" and that he loved his "old mammy" and hugged and kissed her as if she were white." This remark was intended, apparently, to illustrate the love that existed between the black slaves and their white masters. Mr. Smith was, of course, only a child when he hugged and kissed his "old mammy." He doubtless stopped that as he grew older. But the point of the illustration is that even though grown-up whites did not express affection for their slaves by kissing them, as the children did, they expressed it as pronouncedly in other ways. This idea of brotherly love is wholly false. Emotions that manifest themselves in expressions of personal affection toward men and women whose rights are at the same time and by the same person denied, is not brotherly love. There is nothing to distinguish it from similar manifestations toward horses, dogs, cats and doll babies. Justice is the distinguishing attribute of love. This might not be worth saying apropos of Mr. Smith's remark about the love of masters for their slaves, for that is an old story. But old stories are constantly coming up in new forms. The new form of this story is the emotional love that some rich people now express for the im-

poverished victims of plundering institutions which they themselves persistently defend. Such love is like that of the—

considerate crocodile,  
Which lay on the banks of the river Nile.  
He swallowed a fish with a face of woe,  
While his tears flowed fast to the stream below.  
"I am mourning," he said, "the untimely fate  
Of the dear little fish which I just now ate."

Justice Harlan's son is not the only supreme court justice's son who has come into the full blaze of the light of President McKinley's favor upon the eve of the decision by the supreme court of the question of the constitutionality of Mr. McKinley's colonial policy. Not only has Mr. McKinley appointed the son of Justice Harlan as attorney general of Puerto Rico, but he has favored a son of Justice McKenna with swift and pleasant military promotion. It must not be assumed that in passing upon the Puerto Rico cases either justice will be influenced by the president's partiality. It ought to be assumed that neither of the young men will cast suspicion upon his father's integrity in case the decision of the court proves to be what Mr. McKinley wants, by accepting the appointment. These considerations are entirely apart from Mr. McKinley's motives in making the appointments. What those motives were we make no guess. We do not charge that the appointments were made for the purpose of influencing the court, though it would look that way to the traditional "man up a tree." We go no further than to repeat and endorse the sentiment of the Chicago Times-Herald, a thorough-going republican paper, which, in its issue of the 9th, editorially commented in these words:

Across the undimmed mirror of the supreme court has passed the breath of a suggestion of personal influence from the executive.

The supreme court cannot afford to have even "the breath of a suggestion

of personal influence from the executive" pass across its "undimmed mirror," and Senator Pettigrew is to be commended for obstructing confirmation of young Harlan's appointment on the ground that under the circumstances it is indecent.

In an editorial article on socialism, notable rather for dislike of the term than for an understanding of its significance, the Chicago Chronicle gives perfect expression to the true principle of democracy. We could wish that it understood the plain meaning of its own definition, and that it might be depended upon at all times to champion the principle as well in its practical applications as in the abstract. We quote:

Democracy insists upon a return to first principles, leaving the individual unhampered by laws devised in the interest of others, and withholding from him the benefits of any law intended to give him an advantage over another.

If the democratic party would adopt that principle in good faith and support it with vigor in all its bearings, the Chronicle would soon have no further occasion to worry about socialism.

Before forming an opinion with reference to the barbarity charged by the reports to the account of the Boer general, De Wet, in having flogged three British peace envoys and shot one of them off-hand, it will be wise to follow Winston Churchill's example, and doubt the reports until they are confirmed. Mr. Churchill declares that the act does not tally with his personal knowledge of De Wet. It certainly does not tally with the humane conduct which has characterized the Boers throughout the war. Yet the tory papers of London, without waiting for confirmation of the reports, are raising a great din about it. They probably hope in this way to minimize the barbarity of Lord Roberts's war upon non-combatants—his burning of farm houses and savage destruction of great districts of improved country and his Weyler-