

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1904.

Number 331.

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 page.

Any person who thoughtfully considers present political conditions in the United States must take into account two facts which are usually overlooked. They are carelessly ignored by the indifferent and intentionally slurred over by the designing.

The first of these is the fact that the crystals of public sentiment, the world over, are agitated by new industrial questions which are generating new political issues. The other is the fact that these new issues are forcing upon American voters new alignments in their party politics and affiliations.

That this disturbance of party crystallization is vastly more disorganizing in its effect upon the Democratic than upon the Republican party is obvious. The reason for it is evident: the Democratic party happens to be the party out of power. But visible disorganization is not the only process whereby parties lose their vitality. If the Republican party, securely entrenched in power, has escaped visible disorganization, it has not escaped the potent forces of silent and invisible disintegration.

Both parties are vitally affected by these volcanic disturbances of public opinion, and if the party in power continues to present an organized front in spite of disintegration within, it is because its power enables it to appeal with success for the support and influence of the necessitous, the greedy, the conventionally respectable and the strenuously ambi-

tious, as well as those who have grown old and blind in its service and think it still what it used to be. Parties long in power excite patriotic emotions and control glittering opportunities. This strengthens the party machine and its power holds radicalism within the party in check.

It is different with a party long out of power. The party machine grows so weak that radical sentiment within the party breaks bounds. That is the condition of the Democratic party. Its organization is rent and torn by internal conflicts. On one side are mere office-seekers and traditional partisans, who hope to restore their party to power, and who are supported by conservatives wishing to perpetuate the existing order, or disorder, as the case may be. On the other are progressives who aspire to make their party vitally representative of their own newer views. This is the reason the Democratic party cannot present a united front to the united front of the Republicans.

Having been long out of power, the Democratic party has become, in the nature of things political, the seat of war in the clash of opinions over new political issues. Into it have come Republicans whose democratic ideas no longer find a congenial home in the Republican party. Out of it have gone Democrats whose plutocratic ideas make a party of democratic expectations and possibilities repulsive to them. Yet there are many plutocrats still in the Democratic party, and some who had left it returned when their hopes of controlling its machinery revived. So the conflicting forces of plutocracy and democracy in the United States center in this party.

There is at present a lull, while

the party awaits its Presidential candidate's speech or letter of acceptance. Its platform is satisfactory to the democratic element. Should its candidate accept that platform without equivocation, this element would doubtless make shift to accept him also. What that element will do if he takes the advice of plutocratic leaders and builds a platform of his own, inconsistent with the one upon which he was nominated, remains to be seen.

Democrats of the democratic variety will welcome the action of the anti-imperialists of Boston in their indorsement, at a meeting on the 1st in Faneuil Hall addressed by Gov. Garvin of Rhode Island, Bourke Cockran of New York and George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, of the Philippine plank of the Democratic platform. There is nothing equivocal about this plank. Without qualifying words or conditions, it distinctly insists that—

we ought to do for the Philippines what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now; and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

It is important to observe, however, that this is not the declaration which the plutocratic element of the party tried to secure. The draft made by Williams of Mississippi and approved by the Parker leaders, was as full of weasel words as a dead horse of maggots. It declared we ought to do this thing for the Filipinos "ultimately," as soon as it can be done "wisely and safely for the Filipinos themselves," and after securing for ourselves "naval stations" and "coaling stations," and having fixed up "trade relations."

Had this draft been adopted it would have been about as hard to distinguish a "regular" Democrat from a "regular" Republican on the Philippine question as on the money question.

And it would have been adopted had the plutocratic element prevailed in the committee on platform. It would have been made worse. For Williams had garnished his dish with some democratic rhetoric, innocuous to plutocrats yet agreeable to democrats, which the sub-committee on platform did away with. The sub-committee's plank is entitled, in passing, to the credit of having also done away with Williams's weasel word—"ultimately;" but it limited the good intentions of the party, both as to time and conditions, even more plutocratically than had Williams. The time for independence, according to the sub-committee, was to be, as Williams had it, when it could be granted "wisely and safely for the Filipinos"—the same time that President Roosevelt is willing to fix; the conditions precedent were to be American "naval stations," "coaling stations," "trade" privileges, and "guarantee of protection" not merely to foreigners, as Williams had it, but "to all national and international interests"—thereby making secure provision for the safety of land and franchise exploitation. If that is anti-imperialism, Hanna was as good an anti-imperialist as anybody.

But, thanks to Mr. Bryan's vigilance, industry and ability, that imperialistic plank was struck out, and in its place was inserted the honest and unequivocal anti-imperialist plank which now appears in the platform and which the anti-imperialists of Boston have indorsed. Anti-imperialists everywhere are looking forward with no little interest to the 10th of August, the time set for Judge Parker to remove the seal from his political convictions, for an expression of his opinion on the Philippine plank of his platform. Will

he endorse the Bryan version without equivocation, will he restore the weasel-wordy version of Williams or that of the sub-committee, or will he dodge the issue altogether? This may prove later in the campaign to be a question of some moment.

Bryan's call to the Democracy to move forward has had a startling effect on the New York Nation. Its eyes are bloodshot and its jowls a-foam.

Having been told that Mr. Bryan refuses to speak for the gubernatorial candidate of the fraudulent Democratic convention of Illinois, the Chicago Chronicle, a Republican organ of long standing which has but recently put on the Republican label, explains it on the ground that the treasury of the Illinois Democracy is empty and Bryan speaks "for revenue only." Bryan's character in this respect is too well established to need any defense. Whatever weaknesses he may be supposed to have, no sane person believes that one of them is sordidness. But while Bryan does not need a defense from such an accusation as the Chronicle's, the accusation itself is significant. Does it not fairly arouse suspicion as to the Chronicle's own understanding of the relations of public politics to private finance?

There would be more to hope for out of the strenuous times in which we live, if men were disposed to give judgment according to their conceptions of what is just and fair all around, and not with reference alone to personal interests or class sympathies. Take the assassination of Plehve, for illustration, and why do we denounce the assassin for his crime while applauding the officials who have tortured him? If it is just to torture a Russian subject who murders without the arbitrary authority of a czar, why is it unjust to assassinate a Russian official who murders with the arbitrary authority of a czar? If one is right, why is the other wrong? Let us try to be fair about

these things. Did the Russian subject arbitrarily kill the Russian official? Very well, then let us approve the subject's execution so that he can assassinate no one else. Did the Russian official arbitrarily kill Russian subjects? Shall we say, Yes, and yet excuse his crime while denouncing his murderer's? We cannot do this and be fair. Murder is murder. The sad truth is that we are all too much disposed to appeal to Right when we are of the weak who suffer from the strong, while deifying Might when we are of the strong who make the weak to suffer. Plehve arbitrarily hurls the destructive power of an empire at its helpless subjects, not because they are criminal but because they are weak, and we find him an excuse in the philosophy that explains that the only right is Might; subjects hurl a destructive bomb at him under circumstances in which for the moment they are stronger than he, and forthwith we search our moral codes for assurances that might is not Right. Is this attitude of mind conducive to law and order?

Bishop Potter, who is in high degree, perhaps in the highest, the clerical representative of aristocracy in the United States, declares that "we must make the home of the workingman cleaner and brighter, and we must see that he gets his recreation." Whereupon the kindly bishop assists at the dedication of a workmen's saloon. We do not join in the pious hue and cry against him. But how his solicitude does seem, to quote his own words back at him, yet not harshly, to be appropriate to "the most tragic and at the same time the most comic feature in modern history." What a touching instance this, to be added to the vast catalogue of instances in verification of Tolstoy's idea that "the rich are willing to do anything for the poor except to get off their backs." If the aristocracy of this country, upon which Bishop Potter has so much influence, were to realize that its duty to "make the home of the workingman cleaner and brighter" and to "see that he