

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1900.

Number 132.

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.

Unusual industrial activity is reported from Mexico, yet neither McKinley nor Hanna is president of the Mexicans.

The utter collapse of the Chicago laundry trust, with its inflated capitalization of \$2,000,000, coming upon the heels of the dissolution of the national wall paper trust, furnishes additional proof of the impossibility of making permanent any trust which is not founded in or supported by some kind of legalized monopoly.

There was a time, not long ago, when anything which the London Times might say in favor of the American democratic party, would have been quoted far and wide by the republican press, and shouted from every stump by republican spellbinders, as evidence that the democrats had been "bought with British gold." But now McKinley and Roosevelt are supported by this great tory organ of Great Britain. Have McKinley and Roosevelt been bought with British gold?

Another comicality of the republican campaign is the widely circulated story that in the event of Bryan's election Croker will control the federal patronage in New York. The only voucher for this story is Senator Hanna. But upon much better authority, upon the authority indeed of actual experience during the past four years, it is known that in the event of McKinley's election Hanna will control all the federal patronage of the United States. Which were better, even if the Croker story were

true, to turn over to Croker a few New York appointments, or to Hanna the whole civil service system.

Roosevelt's attempt to make political capital out of a hoodlum demonstration by a few newsboys in Chicago, upon his return from an ostentatious attendance at church last Sunday, is of a piece with his outcry over the disorder at his meeting in a Rocky mountain mining town two weeks ago. No well behaved people countenance these disorderly demonstrations. But what right has Roosevelt to complain? They belong essentially to the "strenuous" order of life which he so highly commends.

"The greatest prosperity barometers in the world are coal and pig iron," says one of the campaign documents of the republican national committee. It bears the title, "Coal a Barometer of Prosperity and of Activity to Labor," and proceeds to explain that "coal, perhaps, is the greater of the two." In the light of that document the strike in the anthracite coal regions assumes marked political importance. Through that strike the public learns that wages in the anthracite region average \$240 a year—about \$4.60 a week. If coal is the barometer of prosperity, and miners' wages average \$4.60 a week, how much prosperity is there—for workmen?

The British elections, though not over as we write (October 11), have gone far enough to show that the tories have regained their former majority in the house of commons and probably added somewhat to it. To mere liberals this must be a sad though not unexpected defeat. But to the radicals, who have been unexpectedly successful, it is full of hope and promise. With this second over-

whelming defeat of the liberal party, coming as it does at a time when there is no traditional leader to hold the party in conservative leading strings, its radical elements have a most inviting opportunity to detoryize it and win. Should a leader spring up among them—such a leader, for instance, as the radical democrats on this side have found in Bryan—the next general election in Great Britain would make British landlords quake.

A confidential circular from the executive committee of the "Indianapolis monetary convention of the boards of trade, chambers of commerce, commercial clubs, and other similar commercial bodies of the United States," which bears date at Indianapolis the 1st of September and is signed by H. H. Hanna as chairman, purporting though it does to be a nonpartisan appeal in behalf of gold standard congressional candidates, is in fact a brazen partisan plea for McKinley's republican party, including its protection features. The names of H. H. Kohlsaat and Henry C. Payne appear properly enough upon this circular. They are pronounced republican partisans and protectionists. But those of such free traders as J. B. Henderson and George Foster Peabody look strangely out of place.

Republican papers announce in their Washington dispatches that the secretary of war is preparing to recommend to congress the increase of the regular army to 100,000 men—four times its size three years ago. Why? If we are about to leave Cuba, as the president promises, no troops will be needed there. Puerto Rico gives no evidence of any necessity for an increase of force there. In China we are to maintain only a legation guard—so our veracious commander

in chief announces. Should Bryan be elected, no more troops will be needed in the Philippines, for he has given a peace pledge. Should McKinley be elected, the necessity will be no greater, unless somebody is lying; for, from the Philippine commission up to the president himself, come positive assertions that nothing but Bryan's candidacy encourages the Filipinos to fight and that the war will end with Filipino submission upon Bryan's defeat. Why, then, does the secretary of war wish to raise the standing army to 100,000 men? Every truly patriotic voter will ask himself that question and answer it honestly before he votes.

Bad purposes never lack plausible arguments to justify them. As some one has crisply said, "every falsity has its fallacy." So the enlargement of the standing army is held in some quarters to be justified by the increase of our population. But that reason is what a southern plantation hand would call "powerful weak." Our population was 60,000,000 in 1890, when a standing army of 25,000 was found experimentally to be quite large enough. Yet, though the population is now no more than 80,000,000, an increase of only 33 1-3 per cent., Mr. McKinley's imperialistic administration wants to raise the army to 100,000 men—an increase of 300 per cent. What is the necessity, even upon the theory of a relation between population and army, for this great disparity between the increase in our population and the proposed increase in our army?

Going deeper, what relation is there between the standing army of a country and the country's population? If a country's enemies increase, that is indeed a reason for increasing its army. We might add to the strength of our standing army if Canada needed to be more efficiently guarded against, or Mexico were to threaten to cross the Rio Grande. We might then point to the increase of Canadian or Mexican population as a reason for increasing our stand-

ing army. But why does an increase in our own population demand that our army be correspondingly increased? What point of relationship is there between the two—between domestic population and standing army? There is and can be but one. No reason whatever can exist for increasing the standing army in proportion to increase in home population, other than a purpose of using the army against the people.

To this there comes but one reply. It is said that an army of 100,000 men could not overthrow the liberties of 80,000,000 people. The possibility of an attempt is described as absurd. But that is the chatter of fools, to whom the history of imperialism is a closed book. Given an issue on which 80,000,000 people are divided, and an army of 100,000 men, shrewdly directed, could turn popular elections into a farce. It is not the magnitude of standing armies that makes them dangerous. It is the fact that they are military machines. Some magnitude is necessary, of course; but that point once reached, all else depends upon the discipline of the men and the boldness of the military master. It was with the aid not of an enormous standing army, but of obedient detachments of troops and a submissive faction in the legislature that Louis Napoleon, the president of the republic of France, transformed himself in the early '50's into Napoleon III., emperor of the French.

A republican spellbinder of the name of Boutelle, having, in pursuit of notoriety, challenged the democratic presidential candidate to go with him into the old slave states and "urge the repeal of all constitutions and laws designed to disfranchise the colored population or restrict their suffrage," the Topeka Capital—notorious for having for a week tried to be such a newspaper "as Jesus would publish"—observes that Mr. Bryan will not accept the challenge "because he does not believe in the 'consent of the governed' as much as he pre-

tends." Evidently the Capital got very little moral benefit out of its brief attempt at imitating Jesus. There is one quite sufficient reason for Mr. Bryan's ignoring Boutelle's challenge, and that is that Boutelle is not in Bryan's class. If the republicans wished in good faith to challenge Bryan to debate, in the south or elsewhere, the challenge would come from their candidate—from the man whose relations of responsibility to their party are the same as are Bryan's to his. Boutelle's challenge is a fake, and the Capital's comments are a fraud. And as to the subject of the challenge, the republican party should make its own pots clean upon the negro question before criticising democratic kettles. In Oregon, for instance, there is a clause in the constitution which, if it were not for the federal constitution, would reduce negroes to the level of brutes; but as late as last June, at an election at which the republicans carried the state, an amendment repealing that clause was voted down.

In his campaign speech at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia, Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, one of the candid republican leaders who, like Senator Beveridge, knows that we are in the Philippines for what we can get out of them and frankly says so, attempted to modify the nonsense about never hauling down the American flag by saying that where it "has been raised rightfully over territory belonging to it by the law of nations and by its own laws, it never has been hauled down—and certainly it never has been hauled down when it was being fired upon." This characteristic prevarication receives a scorching rebuke from City and State, a Philadelphia paper which, though republican, is not imperialist. Says City and State:

Yes, senator, but that does not fit the Philippine case; for in it our flag—as you will discover if you consult the record—was not raised on those islands according to our own laws or traditions, much less according to the laws of God, or of any respectable code of morality. As to the flag not