

tion which men like Schurz have maintained ever since President McKinley set out upon his imperial policy, but also by the declarations of other great gold standard leaders. One of these leaders is William L. Wilson, Cleveland's postmaster general, who opposed Bryan vigorously in 1896, but who supports him now upon the principle that the issue of imperialism casts all other issues into the background. Another is Richard Olney, Cleveland's secretary of state. He also opposed the election of Bryan in 1896, and through his great influence in business circles contributed materially to McKinley's election. But now, in a letter published on the 6th, he declares that in the defeat of the republican party in the coming election lies the only hope of the reversal of dangerous policies and a return to more wholesome conditions. He believes that the election of McKinley would "sanction a syndicated presidency—a presidency got for the republican party by the money of a combination of capitalists intent upon securing national legislation in aid of their particular interests;" that it would confirm the plundering tariff legislation; that it would encourage land grabbing schemes in contempt of the rights of alien peoples, and approve the brutal Philippine policy of the past two years; that it would be an endorsement of militarism, a condemnation of civil service reform, an invitation to tumble into international complications, and a cringing submission to the power of money in politics. Though Mr. Olney finds many reasons for denouncing McKinleyism and coming to the support of Bryan, the impelling one is evidently the same that has moved Schurz and Wellington and Wilson and Boutwell, and all the other gold standard men who nevertheless do put the man above the dollar. They would, in the language of one of their number, "rather live in a silver basis republic than in a gold standard empire."

If the demonstration of workmen at Chicago on Labor day was at

all indicative of general opinion, Bryan will score a sweeping victory in November. The discrimination in his favor and against Roosevelt, both by the marchers in the parade of organized labor and by the audience at the labor mass meeting, was so marked as to be painful. The republican candidate for governor of Illinois, Mr. Yates, and the democratic mayor of Chicago, Mr. Harrison, were cheered vastly more than Roosevelt, while the cheering for Bryan was a marvel of enthusiasm. So pronounced a preference had not been looked for. It had been supposed that Roosevelt's reputation as a cowboy and rough rider would guarantee him a warm reception even from men who did not share his political sentiments. But that was a mistaken notion. He hardly attracted notice. Though he sat almost at Bryan's side during the parade, and Bryan's name was shouted in a continuous cheer by the procession of labor unions as it passed, Roosevelt's was seldom heard, and all attempts to evoke cheering for him were humiliating failures. The same spirit was manifest at the mass meeting. Bryan could hardly get through the crowd to the platform, so great was the pressure to grasp him by the hand; but Roosevelt passed through without difficulty and without much observation. When they spoke, there were only a few unseemly interruptions. But while Roosevelt was listened to with attention and was occasionally politely applauded, Bryan's points were applauded vigorously and heartily again and again. And when they left Roosevelt passed through the crowd as he had come; but Bryan, to the music of continuous cheering, was lifted above the swaying and cheering crowd and carried to his buggy. One peculiarly remarkable thing was the fact that many men who wore McKinley buttons covered their buttons with their hands while they shouted and cheered for Bryan.

Roosevelt's speech, in comparison with Bryan's, was a poor performance. Though Bryan's speech was

political, it was not partisan. It did not trespass upon the proprieties of the occasion, but was a statesman's speech, with the Declaration of Independence as its ideal—one which discussed public questions freely and vigorously, but only in so far as they affect labor interests. Government by injunction, for example, was a subject upon which Mr. Bryan enlarged. Gov. Roosevelt, however, in an effort to be nonpartisan became insipid and patronizing. He seemed not to know how to be at once nonpartisan and public-spirited. His speech was an excellent specimen of the style which mission school superintendents adopt when they tell ragged little street boys how important it is to be good.

The unexpected and unprecedented demonstration for Bryan in the very presence of Mr. McKinley's strenuous and spectacular running mate will doubtless result in an attempt on the part of Mr. Hanna to get up a McKinley labor parade in Chicago during the campaign. It has already been proposed. The idea suggested is that it be called a "prosperity procession," and that it be made up of the working forces of the different Chicago factories. There should be no difficulty in surmising what this means. The men are to be ordered out, as they were five years ago; and that none may dare stay away, the hint is to go around that this is a case of "no parade, no job." Prosperity for working men is about as scarce in Chicago as it well could be, and as scarce as anywhere unless in Mr. Hanna's own city of Cleveland. But the power of the employer is none the less on that account. It is greater. To control a job in times like these is very close to owning a man.

The condition of affairs in China is as enigmatical now as when the allied troops were marching upon Peking and the correspondents of London papers were setting the pagan Chinese an example in Christian lying. The only difference is that whereas then the safety of the foreign

ministers was the problem, now it is the intentions of the allied powers.

To the astonishment of the world, Russia has proposed withdrawing from China. So ostentatiously gracious a proposition from such a source naturally excites suspicion; and the fact that Russia has been waging a successful little war all by herself in the Manchurian provinces of China seems to account for her willingness to join the other powers in withdrawing from the more southerly regions of the empire. With Manchuria secured, Russia might find it to her advantage to delay further encroachments until she could do so without confederates. Yet the fact must not be ignored that there are two Russias, just as there are two Englands, two Germanys, two Americas, and so on; that is, that in Russia as in other countries the imperialists do not have it all their own way. Though Russia is not so far advanced in democracy as other countries, democratic influences are at work there as well as elsewhere, and they reach far up. They have certainly affected the royal family in some respects more than once, and the present tsar most assuredly has no love for war. His instincts are for peace. It may be, then, that the proffer of Russia to withdraw from China is a genuine expression of democratic influences in that imperial country. And there is some indication of this in the assurances she makes of her willingness to withdraw not only from all China, but also from Manchuria.

Russia's proposition has been approved by the United States, under the influence doubtless of the anti-imperial sentiment which is manifesting itself so strongly as the presidential election approaches. In harmony with the Philippine policy, American arms should stay in China, whether Russia wishes to withdraw or not, until a stable government is established there with no more autonomy than we think the Chinese capable of appreciating. But the election approaches, and that operates as a check upon new ventures in imperialism.

There is, however, no indication of an actual movement to withdraw from China. The ministers are safe. It is now known that they need never have been in danger. But the flags have gone up, and some of the allies have no hesitation in asserting the imperial principle that when their flag goes up it must not be hauled down. No one can predict the outcome. The most probable guess would be a world war. Meanwhile, reports of the most atrocious acts of barbaric cruelty perpetrated upon Chinese peasants by the civilizing forces that have invaded the empire, begin to leak through the censor's sieve.

In reporting, at page 314, the action of the International Typographical union upon the resolution offered by Robert Bandlow, of Cleveland, and described in the report as a socialist resolution, we copied so much of the resolution as we used from the news report in the Chicago Record. We are now authoritatively advised that the one actually presented and acted upon was entirely different from that which we fell into the error of using. It was in these words:

Resolved, That the International Typographical union emphasizes that it is distinctly a class organization, embracing in its membership all workers following the kindred crafts in the printing industry, who upon the industrial field are antagonized by their employes on every occasion, which fact should impress the members of this organization that to subserve their interests as wage-workers it is essential that they act as a unit upon the political field from whence capitalism derives its power to oppress, and we declare it consistent with the ethics of unionism and the sacred duty of every honorable member of this union to sever his or her affiliation with all political parties of the exploiting class which are constantly encroaching upon the liberties of the working people.

The Record reporter, instead of forwarding to his paper a true copy of the resolution offered at the convention in Milwaukee, had forwarded one which had been offered by Mr. Bandlow last year at the convention in Detroit. The essential difference is that the resolution of last year called upon

the members of the union to ally themselves with the socialist labor party, whereas the one this year called upon them to sever their connection with parties of the "exploiting class." Both resolutions were designed to strengthen socialism in American politics.

Clarence S. Darrow, the well-known Chicago lawyer, increased his fame more than he could have guessed, when, at the celebration in Chicago of Henry George's sixty-first birthday, he expressed his preference for prize fighters to college professors and college graduates for "genuine sympathy and warm heartedness." "Dead right, and that's no dream of a burlesque star," was the verdict of the prize fighters whom one of the local papers interviewed. But the professors whom it also interviewed were evidently annoyed at the comparison. It may be conceded that Mr. Darrow's view of the matter was expressed in extreme terms. But that is frequently excused and sometimes required by the necessity for emphasis in a world in which vital truths stated in commonplace form pass without notice. The thought which Mr. Darrow doubtless had was that the college education has a tendency to harden the heart as it hardens the mind. This is true. It is especially true in those departments of college study that have to do with economic problems. The professor or student who, for instance, allows his mind to become saturated with the merciless principles of Malthusianism, certainly is in a fair way to lose all "genuine sympathy and warm-heartedness." Though his affections may be strong for parent and child, wife and friend, they will be like the love of the beast for its mate and brood. Love for the race cannot long abide in the heart after belief in the social necessity of war, pestilence and famine as checks upon population takes possession of the mind.

A writer in a recent number of the Westminster Review has very opportunely been discussing the logical position of those superior jingoes who